

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

March 4, 2010

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:32 p.m.

Announcements

Joanna Doran, a representative of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Dependent Care, said new cuts were being imposed for daycare, especially for grad student parents. Low-income students can receive a subsidy from the State for daycare, but due to campus disinvestment, the daycare program can't draw down those funds. The money being withdrawn was from students' Reg Fees. Measures were distributed for people to take to advocate for this.

GA 2010-11 Elections

The GA considered election of the Rules Chair, and elected Tiffany Ng as 2010-11 Rules Committee Chair, a second-year in Music.

Reports

The report from the Funding Committee was planned to be determined in part by Resolution 1003c, which the GA, by unanimous voice-vote, voted to fast track.

The GA considered 1003c, Resolution to Amend the GA Budget for a \$12,000 Transfer from the GA Contingency Account to Student Group Funding - Graduate Events Round 4 Account. The bill amended the GA budget to transfer \$12,000 from the contingency account to Student Group Funding - Graduate Events Round 4.

Mr. Tahir said that for Graduate Events Round 4 they had \$73,000 and \$24,786 to give away. Approval of the bill would result in a 41% cut, and a 61% cut without it. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved 1003c.

With no objection, the GA approved the Funding Committee report, \$36,761.70 for Graduate Events Round 4, and \$12,324.35 for Grants Round 4.

Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item

The Co-Chairs of the Lower Sproul Student Council reported. This student group was directing the student efforts to revitalize Lower Sproul and have been working on the Referendum to appear on the ASUC spring ballot.

Students and campus leaders have been considering this for about 15 years. Eshleman Hall would be demolished and replaced with a longer, five-story building. MLK would be renovated, have a two-story glass laminate, open-air kind of lounge, and have additional retail space. There would also be some

improvements to the place and to Cesar Chavez, provide a 24-hour library-type space. Anthony Hall would be renovated at \$900,000 to \$1 million.

There would be space for student groups, especially dance and performance groups, and more space student group offices. There would also be a grad student lounge in the Student Union.

The autonomy of student government would be protected with improved retail space.

The estimated cost was \$220 million. The campus committed \$99 million with the remainder raised through a student fee, if the Referendum was approved. Financing would be for 40 years. This has received unanimous support from the ASUC Senate.

This was different from a Systemwide fee the Regents approve, which affect all students. These are the fees that students have been protesting. The fee would start at \$35 for the first number of years.

Budget Report

The GA has two guaranteed sources of revenue: student fees and \$50K from a Coca-Cola contract the ASUC has. The GA spends around \$530,000 and next year will bring in about \$435,000. They'll probably cut themselves 10%, or so until they get to some sort of steady state. Numbers will be presented at the April meeting, with the budget completed by the May meeting.

They had been budgeting unspent funds, carryforward, thinking it was income and not savings, and have \$100K left in unspent funds. Part of the confusion came from the miscommunication with ASUC Auxiliary accounting.

The GA has \$476K in reserves. The GA established \$100,000 for two endowments with the UC Berkeley Foundation, which will provide annual operating funds in the future. That will include setting up a Foundation, a 501(c)(3).

By hand-vote of 35-1-4, the GA approved giving the go-ahead for creation of the 501(c)(3).

Operational Excellence: Solicitation of Student Feedback at Midpoint on Studies

A question was raised about OE and centralization and decentralization, such as with IT. In response, it was noted that any "centralization" would actually be a cluster. It wouldn't mean HR or IT people would be all taken from the edges and a central building. OE understood that sentiment. But more could be done with fewer people than what was happening in a lot of departments.

The next phase will be for people in various roles to come together and come up with some solutions. They had to think about the right design was for the types of services to be provided, and figure out the model that worked and the resources that worked for them.

OE has had small, workshop-type forums, with 10 to 15 people. And they've talked to, 20, 30, or 40 committees. A survey was held that 1,300 or 1,000 graduate students responded to.

Student services was one area on campus where they had to be careful to think about service quality first, and deliver that at the lowest possible cost. They also want to see which services were well aligned with the mission of the University.

GA 2010-11 Elections (cont'd)

Nominations were open for Funding Chair. The Funding Committee decides how much to give to groups. The Ad Hoc Funding Committee will also make decisions on how to do that. The budget to give to student groups was \$120,000. No nominations were made.

Nominations were open for GA President. The office focused organizing Assembly meetings, meeting with administrators, students, and others, and reading and responding to e-mails.

Philippe Marchand was elected 2010-11 GA President. His term begins on July 1.

Nominations were open for Campus Affairs Vice President. The position is the main GA point person for advocacy on campus-related issues, dealing with the Graduate Division, the Academic Senate, and placing graduate students on committees. No nominations were accepted.

Positions in the GA were to some extent what people made of them. So people could make themselves as busy as they want, or limit themselves.

If positions weren't filled, the election would carry over to the next meeting.

Resolutions

By voice-vote, the GA approved 1002a, Resolution to Amend the GA Budget to Increase External Affairs Funding for SAGE 2010 Day on the Hill and UCSA Membership Dues. The bill increases the Travel Budget of the External Affairs Committee by \$4,000 to send GA representatives to attend SAGE "Day on the Hill" lobbying. SAGE is a new national group of 11 of the top public universities in the nation. They're advocating for tax exemption for fellowships and grants, extension of the loan forgiveness program, and other items. The bill would also fund extra UCSA dues because of the larger number of grad students at Berkeley.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved Resolution 1003b, Resolution to Allocate Funds In Support of the Empowering Women of Color Conference (EWOCC) . The bill authorizes a one-time allocation of \$7,500 from contingency funds to EWOCC. This is the 25th anniversary of the Conference and the Conference will be two-days instead of one. Sources that funded it in the past were not available.

GA 2010-11 Elections (cont'd)

Nominations were open for External Affairs Vice President. The position deals with anything that affects grads beyond the campus, at the City, State, or federal levels. It works with the UC Student Association. Berkeley voice-vote, Alberto Ortega was re-elected to be the GA 2010-11 External Affairs Vice

President.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 4 -

Resolution Referral

1003a, By-law Amendment to Rename the Technology Committee to the Communications Committee, was referred to the EAVP, the Budget, and the Rules Committees.

Resolutions (cont'd)

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approve, as amended, 1002b, Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund Incentives for the 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey. The bill allocated \$2,000 from the unspent funds in the Campus Affairs stipend line item as incentives for prizes to fill out the survey, with prizes subject to approval by the GA Budget Chair and President.

By voice-vote, the GA approved 1002c, Resolution to Facilitate Procedural Resolutions. The bill amends GA By-laws to allow a three-fourths vote of the Assembly, or by unanimous consent of the Executive Board, to allow the Assembly to consider a resolution at the same meeting the resolution was introduced, if notice of the bill was included in the agenda packet.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved 1002d, Resolution to Create a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target Action Agenda Item . The bill creates a GA Action Agenda Item for the rest of the year, to create a UC Berkeley energy efficiency target by December, 2010. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved John Mikulin as Action Agenda Item Coordinator.

With no objection, the GA tabled discussion on 1002e, In Support of Securing a Space on Campus for the Berkeley Student Food Collective.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daal said the first announcement was from Joanna Doran, speaking about UCB infant/childcare issues that were coming up. Ms. Doran said she distributed a sheet about new developments in daycare provisions. She's a representative of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Dependent Care. Only for

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

the last three years have graduate students been allowed to participate on this Committee, which considers dependent care as well as daycare.

Ms. Doran said she was present that evening to make an announcement about new cuts being imposed, especially for graduate student parents. To present a slightly broader picture, the Early Childhood Education Program, the University program that provides childcare, was nowhere meeting the demand of childcare for students, faculty, and staff. There have been recent cuts in the ECEP budget, which comes from Registration Fees, which the University passes along to the program. There has also been a change to the student profile that determines the amount to be paid for this. As a result these class, low-income grad students will no longer be able to have infant care through the school's daycare program. In addition, public grants have been greatly reduced for this group. To put it in context, low-income students are eligible to receive a subsidy from the State of California for daycare. But because of the campus' disinvestment, that has made it impossible for the daycare program to even draw down those funds from the State. They cannot provide matching funds in order to get start funds because of the disinvestment. While this just occurred this year, it was part of a trend. Last year the University's middle-income graduate student parents were also pushed out of the program. The University used to provide matching funds for these students, so they didn't have to pay the full fee, but withdrew those fees.

Ms. Doran said it was Registration Fees money that was being withdrawn, something the students pay. And it seemed that most students were not aware that the program was in jeopardy through the withdrawal of these funds. She distributed different measures they could take to advocate for this. They could inform channels of people they represent, and if they could write letters to the Chancellor, that would be wonderful. This wasn't a good thing to take away. The subsidy enables graduate students who are low-income to have daycare. And in case they were wondering, it wasn't possible for graduate students to get this care outside, in the private sector because there was simply no care out in the community that would take a State subsidy. o in effect, if a graduate student family was poor, they were just out of luck, and basically had to leave. If people had any questions, her e-mail address was listed.

Mr. Daal called for any questions. Mr. Marchand said she mentioned cuts in the Registration Fee, which is paid by every student, grad and undergrad. To put this in perspective, \$2 million went to Intercollegiate Athletics. The campus was working to reduce that and to have Athletics be self-sufficient. But that's one thing that students have criticized. That was student money. Only a fraction of it could be used for childcare, which might be a better utilization of the money.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES AND THE AGENDA

Mr. Daal said he would like to have some understandings about the agenda. First, the President's report needed to be after 6:15 because somebody was coming to assist him with an explanation of the By-laws for the 501(c)(3). Secondly, the speakers scheduled for that evening will be ready to speak at 6:30, and they may have to interrupt something to do that. Third, there's an urgent funding Resolution whose pas-

sage determines the nature of the Funding report. So when they get to the Funding Committee's report, they need to first consider the Resolution and fast track it, if that's what the Assembly decides. They would then consider the Resolution immediately. If it passes, the Funding report will be one way, and if it fails the Funding report will be another way.

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes (cont'd)
GA 2010-11 Elections

- 6 -

Mr. Daal called for any other changes to the agenda. Ms. Anderson moved to move the election of the Rules Committee Chair to immediately after Approval of the Agenda and the minutes. Only one person talked to her about taking the position and had to leave early that evening. Mr. Daal said that seeing no objection, that change was made.

Mr. Daal called for any of amendments to the agenda, and seeing none, called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Daal called for a motion to approve the minutes from the February meeting. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2010 MEETING, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

GA 2010-11 ELECTIONS

Mr. Daal said they would consider election of the Rules Chair. The way they do elections is that he will ask for nominations and give people enough time to consider it. Nominations would then be closed. The candidates would be given one minute to give a spiel about why they want to take on the office. The candidates will then leave the room. The GA will discuss them off the record and vote on them. Even if there's just one candidate, they'll be asked to leave the room.

Mr. Daal called for any nominations for the position of Rules Chair Officer. Mr. Zachritz nominated Tiffany Ng. Mr. Daal called for any other nominations and seeing none, called for a one-minute presentation on why she wanted to be Rules Chair. Ms. Ng said rules were sort of an invisible presence for most organizations, but they were actually one of the things that could make or break the organization. For the past year, Ms. Anderson has done a really great job in looking at the GA's rules and procedures critically and streamlining them. Ms. Ng said she would like to continue in that path and to look at the By-laws really carefully. There's still a lot of redundancy in them and ways in which they were not clear. Basically, she was running because she would like to make their delegate experience better every month.

Mr. Rajan asked about her Department and year. Ms. Ng said she's in the Music Department and this was her second year, and was also her second year in the GA.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no other questions he would ask Ms. Ng to leave the room for a discussion and a vote.

A discussion was held and Ms. Ng was elected as 2010-11 Rules Chair. Mr. Daal said he would like to congratulate her. (Applause)

REPORTS

Reports

- 7 -

Resolution 1003c, To Amend the GA Budget for a \$12,000 Transfer from the GA Contingency Account to Student Group Funding - Graduate Events Round 4 Account

Mr. Daal said the first report was from the Funding Committee, and they would shift their attention to Resolution 1003c, which they would first need to fast track. It was so moved and seconded. Mr. Daal said approval would require a three-quarters majority vote. He called for any discussion.

Mr. Rabkin asked if this was money they'd apply to the next round of funding. Mr. Tahir said it's money voted this current round, which will start next week.

On a point of order, Mr. Froehle said they were discussing fast tracking, not the Resolution itself. Mr. Rabkin said knowing what the Resolution said was applicable. Mr. Daal said the discussion should focus on why the Resolution needed to be fast tracked.

Mr. Rabkin asked if the funding reports that were distributed that evening were the way funding would go if they approve the Resolution, and would reflect the Resolution. Mr. Tuchman said that if the GA didn't approve the Resolution, he had another sheet he'd distribute. Mr. Rabkin asked if people have seen that. Mr. Tuchman said they haven't. Mr. Daal said the hand outs that were part of the agenda packet anticipate passage of 1003c. If the GA doesn't pass it, Mr. Tuchman has the alternate funding report.

THE MOTION TO FAST TRACK RESOLUTION 1003c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daal said they would discuss the Resolution at that time.

The following Resolution, 1003c, was authored by Asadullah Tahir:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET FOR A \$12,000 TRANSFER FROM THE GA CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT TO STUDENT GROUP FUNDING - GRADUATE EVENTS ROUND 4 ACCOUNT

WHEREAS, \$20,000 of money allocated towards the GA contingency for the year 09-10 was originally part of Student Group Funding; and

WHEREAS, other department within the GA should also have access to contingency funds; and

WHEREAS, the global budget cut for student groups applying for funding for Graduate Events Round 4 will be excessively high;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA budget be amended to allow the transfer of \$12,000 from the contingency account towards Student Group Funding - Graduate Events Round 4.

Mr. Tahir said that for Graduate Events Round 4 they had \$73,000 in requests and only had \$24,786 to give away. They would have needed a budget cut, over 50% less for groups. But considering this round was towards the end of the year and they still have money left over that was not originally part of the Funding Committee budget, they're asking to move \$12,000 of that from the Contingency Fund to the Funding Committee in order to give that money to student groups for funding for Graduate Events Round

Reports

- 8 -

Resolution 1003c, To Amend the GA Budget for a \$12,000 Transfer from the GA Contingency Account to Student Group Funding - Graduate Events Round 4 Account (cont'd)

4. That was all the Resolution did. The cut would then be 41% if the Assembly passes the bill. If they don't pass it, the cuts would be 61%.

Mr. Rabkin said the bill would take money out of the Contingency Fund, and asked if they were confident a contingency wouldn't occur before the end of the year. Ms. Hsueh said that at the beginning of that budget year, they allocated \$157,000 and only counted \$130,000. As part of that, they set aside about \$12,000 for contingency, just for funding. So they would be able to survive if they allocate that amount, the \$12,000. There's money in the Contingency Fund to cover any other expenses. Mr. Daal said they allocated a special contingency within the contingency for funding.

Mr. Rajan said there were many requests for the contingency, all of which will be on this meeting's agenda, to be considered as a package. Approving this would be okay as long as they don't plan to do anything major in the last two months of the term. At the end of this, all the contingency they have allocated at contingency funding they allocated for the current year will have been spent, except for about \$4,000.

Mr. Mikulin said that the second funding report they have which states, "Amount requested, \$73,000," assumes that the \$12,000 in contingency was allotted. So the amount that will be awarded to student groups will be \$36,761. Mr. Daal said that was correct. Ms. Hsueh said that as they could see, with the \$12,000, there would still be a 42% cut.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no other discussion, they would come to a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1003c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET FOR A \$12,000 TRANSFER FROM THE GA CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT TO STUDENT GROUP FUNDING - GRADUATE EVENTS ROUND 4 ACCOUNT.**

Mr. Tahir said that now that Resolution 1003c passed, there will be a 42% global budget cut for student groups for Graduate Events Round 4. This was the last round of applications for the Funding Committee.

Mr. Tahir said the Funding Committee was considering working with the ad hoc committee. A preliminary report of the ad hoc committee was made available that evening. There are currently two main alternatives to the way they fund student groups. The Graduate Assembly spends one-third of its budget on student groups. The ad hoc committee was trying to figure out how to best do that and came up with some recommendations to consider that would be big changes in policy. This will impact student groups in Delegates' departments. If they wanted to have any say in how funding was allocated to student groups, there was a link in the Officers' reports that was part of the agenda packet. If people would like to attend a meeting to discuss this, they should submit their availability. The link to the resolution of the Web site was in officers' reports, under "funding."

Mr. Daal called for any questions for the Funding Chair. Since they passed the Resolution, 1003c, the Funding Committee report that was distributed was now the correct report. Now that the GA allocated an additional \$12,000 of funding, they need to approve those allocations for funding in the report. He called for a motion to approve the Funding Committee report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION,

Resolution 1003c, To Amend the GA Budget for a \$12,000 Transfer from the GA Contingency - 9 -
Account to Student Group Funding - Graduate Events Round 4 Account (cont'd)
Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item

\$36,761.70 AWARDED FOR GRADUATE EVENTS ROUND 4, AND \$12,324.35 FOR GRANTS ROUND 4. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Mr. Tahir.

LOWER SPROUL ACTION AGENDA ITEM

Mr. Daal said the report will be given by Joey Guzman and Joycerine Lee.

Joey Guzman introduced himself and said he was the Co-Chair for the Lower Sproul Student Council. Joycerine Lee introduced herself and said she was other Co-Chair. The Lower Sproul Student Council was kind of a student group that was directing the student efforts to revitalize Lower Sproul. They wanted to come to the GA that evening and introduce this project to the Graduate Assembly. They're launching a campaign to pass a fee referendum in April that would fund the work.

Mr. Guzman said they'd go over the project a little bit, its structure, programs, and finances, and then answer any questions. To give some background, this has been a project that has been in the minds of students and campus leaders for about 15 years. As they look at the Lower Sproul area, it was often times not very used. It's been the goal of people to revitalize this area to make sure it supports student needs, more so than it does now.

Mr. Guzman said the current scope of the project was to knock down the building they were in, Eshleman Hall. He was sure that many of them knew that it was very hazardous if an earthquake struck. It would be replaced with a five-story Eshleman building that would stretch from about where the Bear's Lair bar is down to Zellerbach Hall. And then on the west side of MLK there would be an additional two-story glass laminate surrounding where it was right now. It will be an open-air kind of lounge for students go and hang out and study. Additionally, there will be an addition to the south side of MLK for retail space. There will also be some Plaza improvements and increasing accessibility for disabled students. There will be a rain garden and some improvements to the south side of Cesar Chavez, which will afford a kind of 24-hour library-type space. Anthony Hall will be renovated. There were a few things wrong with it, mostly having to do with the health and safety of people in there. About \$900,000 to \$1 million would be dedicated to renovating Anthony Hall, which will remain the center for graduate students. Mr. Guzman said that was the project scope and the background. Ms. Lee would talk about why this was a project they were putting forward at that time.

Ms. Lee said that this was a project that has been discussed by students and administrators for about 15 years. Through the years, they've kind of enumerated multiple reasons for this project. The first reason was to improve student life on campus, which was their mission for this revitalization. The ways this

project has been tailored to do that includes a 24-hour café and library on Lower Sproul. That was currently a service that was not available on campus. A prominent multicultural center has been one need that students, for many years, have been asking for, and it would be met with passage of this Referendum. A plan to move the Career Center from its current location to right across the street on Bancroft and would increase all of the accessibility problems of the Career Center and improve its accessibility for many students.

Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item (cont'd)

- 10 -

Other than that, there would be improved, additional space for student groups, especially dance and performance groups that currently have no place to practice. Most of them now practice outside on Lower Sproul, as he was sure many of them have seen. Also, with this Referendum, there would be more space and efficient space for student group office space. They also included a graduate student lounge in the new Lower Sproul Student Union area. They're currently thinking about placing that in MLK, but those specifics have not been set in stone.

Other than that, Ms. Lee said there were many other programmatic elements that have been discussed, such as a meditation and transit centers, and moving the Student Learning Center so that it could be a more visible study area for students. But in general, the main purpose of this project was to improve students' services on Lower Sproul and to create a kind of campus living room for all students there.

Ms. Lee said she also thought a great advantage of this project was a commitment to environmental sustainability. The new replacement of Eshleman, which will be called the "Student Government Center," will be LEED certified. It will include a green roof and efficient heating, lighting, and ventilation. Martin Luther King will also be improved, with new heating, lighting, and ventilation. A garden will be built in Lower Sproul Plaza and there will be solar panels on both Eshleman and MLK.

Ms. Lee said that one of their mission goals was also to kind of demonstrate sustainability on campus, and for this to be a laboratory and an example for sustainability nationwide.

Other than that, Ms. Lee said they have protected the autonomy of student government with improved retail spaces in MLK, with a new retail shell, and a larger Bear's Lair Food Court area. That should improve ASUC revenue and help to secure the fiscal autonomy of the ASUC. It also improves safety and accessibility of the Plaza, which was a great, underlying concern, besides the safety of Eshleman and the accessibility of the whole Plaza. Ms. Lee said that Mr. Guzman would talk about the finances and then they'd take questions.

Mr. Guzman said that as for the nitty-gritty stuff, the project at that time was estimated to cost \$220 million, of which \$99 million has been committed by the campus. The rest of the money, if the referendum is approved by students in April, will be raised through a student fee. A hand-out that was distributed included a list of the fees. The financing period was for 40 years, so they're talking about 40 years of campus-based fees. In the center aisle were the fees are in today's dollars. They also did some inflation adjustment for the fees, which was in the highlighted section.

Mr. Guzman said there was no doubt that right now was a difficult time to pass such a fee increase, so the Lower Sproul Student Council has been taking this to a lot of groups and getting their feedback. So far, many groups have expressed a lot of interest. As far as the undergraduate student government, the project has pretty much received unanimous support from the Senate. There are some details that were being

ironed out as far as an Memorandum of Understanding to be negotiated between the University and student government. But there's been support despite the fact that this wasn't the greatest day to talk about a fee increase, especially with the strike that happened that day. There's been a lot of feedback for this project, which was why they were bringing it to the GA.

Mr. Guzman said there were a few details to look at in considering this fee. It would be a student-initiated, campus-based fee, approved by students, and for student service. It wasn't a Systemwide fee that the Regents approve. Those were the fees that students have been protesting, and those were the Systemwide fees that affect all students and have been increasing over the last 10 to 15 years.

Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item (cont'd)

- 11 -

In addition, Mr. Guzman said that pursuant to UC policy, one-third of all fee increases must go back to financial aid. So for those whose families make under \$70,000, they will likely not see a fee increase.

Mr. Guzman said they had a few minutes left in their scheduled time and realized this was a lot of information. He called for any questions.

Mr. Rabkin asked what they'll do if the students vote the Referendum down, and asked what they'd do if there were substantial cost overruns. Mr. Guzman said that if students vote it down, the project obviously won't happen, and it will be left to future student governments whether they want to put this on again. The number one concern as far as time went, he thought, was Eshleman and its safety. There will be some sort of seismic upgrades that summer. But no matter what's done to improve it, the building will remain rated seismically poor. So it will be a danger, and will remain a danger. But there was a potential that the Chancellor could extend Life Safety Fee money, which could be used to destroy buildings, but not to re-build them. So the worst-case scenario as far as student government went was that money could be used to knock Eshleman down without being rebuilt, and students would be left without Eshleman. That probably won't happen, but there was a potential.

Mr. Daal said he could answer the second question. They would compress the project scope. But the budget for the project was substantially padded at that time to accommodate for typical cost escalations that they see in capital projects.

Mr. Rabkin asked if he thought they were being suitably cautious. Mr. Daal said the people who were doing this also do it for the campus, and the campus trusts them. Mr. Rabkin asked if these were cautious estimates. Mr. Daal said they were very cautious. Mr. Guzman said that every time they had an option, the highest option they gave the highest option for inflation. Mr. Daal said they gave the total project cost and item and increased it by 5%.

Mr. Mikulin asked if there was any potential for just redoing Eshleman if this fails, doing something that was discreet rather than the entire Plaza, since Eshleman was a priority. Mr. Guzman said that absolutely was an option.

Mr. Mikulin asked if the renovation of Anthony Hall had anything to do with LEED certification going on there, and asked if there would be any upgrades to bring it to a higher level. Mr. Daal said they were still negotiating what will occur to Anthony Hall. But the specific requested renovations were all in the direction of LEED certification. Renovations would include a urinal in the bathroom, native-plant landscaping, new, energy-efficient windows, a bunch of things.

Mr. Mikulin asked when the project would be completed if it's approved, and if that would be in the next election. Secondly, relative to the project completion date, he asked how the fee schedule could be front-loaded such that those in the first year of the building's operation would pay the highest amount the fee reached, because the people who experience the benefit when it's brand new should be the ones paying the most. In the current fee schedule however, it looked like in the out years, the fee actually maxed out at \$396.00. Rather than looking at being inflation adjusted, if you front load it in the first year of the project's operation, that would probably be a little more equitable in terms of the benefits derived by the people who use the facility.

Mr. Guzman said that the answer to the first question was that the project was phased. Eshleman would be on line he believed in late 2015 or early 2016. The entire project will be completed in 2017, the

Lower Sproul Action Agenda Item (cont'd)
Budget Report

- 12 -

second semester. As for the fee model, UCOP forced them to have blocked funding. So it's \$35 for a certain amount of years, then \$150 for a certain amount of years. They originally had increasing fees over the long run, and that's where they started to see people down the road paying more. As of now, do they do the model so that in the year the facilities open, people pay the most. He thought it was possible from a sellability standpoint, but it was a little harder when they see that amount of fee in five years. It would be harder to get students to approve that.

Mr. Daal said the time for discussion was up. If there were urgent questions, people could talk to Mr. Guzman and Ms. Lee. But they had to move on to their next agenda item.

Ms. Lee said she would write their e-mail addresses on the Board.

Budget Report

Mr. Rajan said he had hoped to have more of a presentation at this meeting, but it seemed a lot of issues with the budget were still unresolved. There was still a lot of input he needed from various groups before he could present the budget. But he did want to take this opportunity to tell what was going on with the budget in a more global picture. People on the Budget Committee and in the GA, if they've been there a while, know that in the past, the GA used to spend a lot more than it brought in. It only had two guaranteed sources of revenue at that time. One was student fees, which depends on how many graduate students are enrolled. Last year it was about 9,000, and this year it's about 10,000. That was a boost to the funding that came in this year. For next year they're assuming there will be about 9,500. That was actually good compared to what it's been in the past.

However, the GA also expects some other sources of revenue to fall away. It wasn't clear if the beverage contract the ASUC has with Coca-Cola will be renewed. If it is, that would be wonderful. But it was hard to plan their budget making that assumption. So they'd lose \$50,000 a year in income. In the past, they also used to have Graduate Division support at a larger level than they do currently. The Grad Division now gives much more targeted support.

Mr. Rajan said that when he first got there four years ago, the GA was spending \$750,000 while only bringing in about \$450-470,000. In the last three years they've been cutting constantly, trying to get to where their operating revenues match their operating costs. That has been a significant challenge for the

Assembly, but one he thought they've risen to quite well. Of course, these sorts of cuts can't be made while expecting the GA to be just as strong as it was before. Obviously, the global funding cuts have been growing larger and larger. They had a 42% cut that evening. Funding this year might \$119,000, whereas last year it got \$130,000. So next year's global cuts will be as large, or larger. It will be tough to figure out how to make all this work, but it's close. They have a buffer stop that they're using to smooth out the landing and they have maybe one or two years left.

They're around \$530,000 as to what they're spending. Next year they'll bring in about \$435,000. They would like to make that cap go away, but it was going to be very hard to cut themselves by 25%. So probably they'll cut themselves 10%, or something along those lines, and get to some sort of steady state. These were the sorts of numbers he'll present at the April meeting. And it looked like it might be May

Budget Report (cont'd)

- 13 -

before the budget was complete. There's a lot of challenging and interesting work coming up, and they could probably expect another tough year. Hopefully, they'll make some tough choices that will make them stronger, as opposed to doing across-the-board cuts. However, having across-the-board cuts was easier to do, so that might end up what happens. If people had questions they should e-mail him at budget.berkeley.edu. He called for any questions.

Mr. Ellsworth asked how they'll make up the shortfall. Mr. Rajan said another source of revenue that they've been budgeting in the past was unspent funds from previous years. They used to think that was tracked year by year, but they found out this year that it wasn't. In the past they budgeted unspent funds from previous years. But those were not merely flows, but were entirely savings. So they continually kept budgeting their savings account, thinking their savings was income. Thankfully, they didn't spend all of it, and they still have some savings. But they've stopped doing that, which makes their budget a little bit tighter. They have \$100,000 left in their unspent funds. They could use that this year and make the problem go away, although next year they'd have the same problem, with no unspent funds. Or, they could cut half this year, spend half their unspent funds, and cut again next year. So they'd do a 20% cut incrementally and then hopefully, be at a steady state, with some play. The GA has a lot of reserves, so they wouldn't be bankrupt, but they'll be closer to making operating revenues match operating reserves, barely.

Mr. Rabkin asked how it happened that savings were confused for income, and why no alarms went off. Mr. Rajan said it was massive stupidity of the Budget Chairs. Mr. Rabkin said he was saying they spent most of half a million dollars in savings because they thought it was income. Mr. Rajan said they still have not quite half a million. They'll have about \$450,000 in reserves. Mr. Rabkin said they have, however, burned through half a million dollars in savings. Mr. Rajan said that over the past three years. Mr. Daal said they had half a million and burned through \$200,000.

Mr. Rabkin asked where the savings were from. Mr. Rajan said he didn't have enough numbers to say how much was savings and how much was income. He only had about three years of information. When he came in they were spending \$750,000 while only bringing in \$450,000. And that was noted immediately. Where the savings come from, he didn't have the institutional knowledge. Basically, he didn't know how they got to this point. Mr. Daal said that in the past the GA really didn't know what was going on with its finances, and only recently, in the past two years, did they start to understand their books.

Ms. Anderson said that as to how they thought savings was income, and having a better idea than in past years, she thought that was selling herself and Mr. Rajan a little short. They have a much better idea in

the last four years. She thought the budget Mr. Rajan walked into four years ago was a great mystery, and now they kind of have an idea, and kind of know what they don't know. The reason there are things they don't know is because a large part of their accounting was done through the Auxiliary. They can poke the Auxiliary three times and get three different numbers. And those numbers could be differences of \$5,000 or \$2 million. The GA had a number it thought was being reported as their local carryover from the previous year when, in fact, it was the GA's entire carryover. It wasn't actually the GA's entire savings and was a separate savings account. That was still half a million dollars. Every year they don't spend a fraction of their budget, and the report they got of the figure was actually a cumulative figure for their carryover. It just had to do with asking the Auxiliary for a number and getting several different answers.

Mr. Rajan said the GA's income was \$435,000, and there was possibly \$50,000 as well from the beverage contract, which might end. That's been their income over the past few years, their real income, money

Budget Report (cont'd)

- 14 -

that comes in, for as long as he could remember, for four years. The \$435,000 fluctuates depending on how many grads there are from year to year. The \$50,000 was constant. And there were outside sources of income from various groups on campus which weren't listed because the GA couldn't plan on them. And they have \$100,000 squared away, and got approval from the Assembly last year to invest that in the Berkeley Foundation. The GA will hear later about By-laws to invest commercial reserves. They'll notice commercial reserves and reserves add up to a few hundred thousand, so any investment they get from reserves will offset inflationary costs. Whatever interest they get from their investment should balance those out almost by design, in theoretical economics.

Finally, carryforward was \$104,000. The problem was one of stalk and float. They were thinking it was a float, and every year would get this number as a flow of what was unspent. In reality, it was a stalk, and was the total number that was reported every year. But that was never clear until this year. Now that it was clear, they know this was about \$50,000 in two years.

Mr. Rabkin asked who was in charge of the GA's bank account. Mr. Daal said it's the Auxiliary. Mr. Rabkin said the relationship didn't seem to be working. Mr. Daal said they're working on an MOU to try and fix it, but they don't have control over the Auxiliary. Mr. Rajan said that was irrelevant to this particular budget.

Mr. Daal said that his report was all about what they will do with some of their reserves. As Mr. Rajan pointed out, the GA has \$476,000 in reserves. Of that, \$100,000 was from student fees. Money from student fees has all kinds of limitations on it. For example, they can't buy alcohol with that money. If they mix that money with any other types of money, like commercial revenues, which has no limitations, all of the mixed amount was subject to the more controlling limitations. So they keep those funds separate. With the \$100,000 they're executing two endowments with the UC Berkeley Foundation. That will provide a source of annual operating funds for the GA. The payout was 5%. The \$376,178 figure was commercial revenues reserves. What the GA decided to do last semester, as per a Resolution, was to create a foundation, the Berkeley Graduate Student Foundation. That Foundation would receive those funds and would invest them in its own endowment. The payout from this endowment would go annually to the operating budget of the GA in the future, when both the endowment and the Foundation were set up. When the GA approved this Resolution last semester, it was to have the GA go forward with this and put together terms for this 501(c)(3) organization. That has been done. They put together the terms and had

their lawyer look at it, and everything was all set to execute those terms with the State and to create this Foundation.

Also in that Resolution, Mr. Rajan said it was stipulated that before the GA was to execute those terms and create a 501(c)(3), they'd have to come back and get the Assembly's final approval of the terms. He sent out those terms via e-mail for Delegates' review. The discussion they'll have at that time was to approve those terms.

Mr. Rajan said he invited Blake, a second-year graduate student in Law, who actually put in all the work in designing these terms, to field any questions about the detailed 26-page By-laws for the 501(c)(3).

Blake said any corporation, much like the GA, has a set of By-laws that determine how the organization will function from an organizational standpoint, such as how a board of directors would be elected, how the board would appoint officers, etc., in order to manage the operation of the corporation. The document

Budget Report (cont'd)

- 15 -

they have there, which they worked on with the GA's lawyer, was a pretty standard corporate document for a 501(c)(3). It also very much paralleled the foundation that the undergrads set up in 1996 for kind of a similar purpose. So this model has been tried and tested for setting up these organizations and documents. It was reasonably standard. These are the documents that will go to the State to incorporate this organization in order to carry out this purpose. He called for any questions.

Blake said some of the key provisions were outlined in the summary document. It sets up how they'll establish a board, how the board will meet, etc.

Mr. Ellsworth asked about the composition of the board. Blake said that much in the way the undergrad student foundation handled that, board positions would automatically overlap with Executive Officer positions at the GA level. The chairman of the board would be the GA president. The ASUC Senate has three members of the Senate nominated and elected to the board. The GA will have one representative from the GA elected, since the GA had a few more Executive Officers on the board and one alumnus, who will also maintain some of the institutional knowledge. The board will have seven members composed of Executive Officers and that one at-large member.

A Delegate asked how they could find out more information on appropriate investments and risk. Mr. Daal said that evening they would like to decide whether or not to create the non-profit entity. Later they'd talk about where they would put the money and how it would come back to the GA. There was a plan, and what they were thinking of ways to invest the money in a community foundation. They're looking at the East Bay Community Foundation, another non-profit organization, which invests money of non-profit organizations, manages it for them as endowments, and sends the money where the organizations want it sent. The Delegate asked how much oversight they'd have as to where that would be. Blake said it would be just like any other corporation. There would be an annual meeting that coincides with the second meeting of the GA. The board would give a report on the performance of the organization. But the point of investing would be with the board to allocate that money.

Mr. Rajan asked if he was wondering how much say the GA as a whole would have on how these funds were allocated or if Delegates would have enough say as to whether the Exec Board allocated the money appropriately. The Delegate said his question was to find out what detail they'd have as to where their money was and what return they'd have. Mr. Rajan said there were two sorts of investments going on.

The student fee, the \$100,000, was going to the UC Berkeley Foundation. It will be invested with the Foundation, which would manage the money. It was unlikely the GA could get the Foundation or the East Bay Community Foundation to change their asset allocation because the GA was small. But the GA will have, he was sure, full authority to invest and disinvest from that fund at any time. So if they find a better fund in the future, the GA would be able to take money out of there and put it elsewhere. Mr. Daal said it was hard for the GA to pick and choose. For example, their first choice would have been the Boston Trust, which was where the undergraduate 501(c)(3) was invested, \$1.3 million. It's a socially responsible fund. But the Boston Trust said the GA's \$300,000 was far too small.

The Delegate said the most important thing was being able to see where the money was invested. He understood the GA was a small drop in the bucket and may not get to choose, but maybe they could see that. Mr. Rajan said the prospectus of both funds will be available upon Assembly request. Blake said all voting members of the GA were also voting members of the corporation and could vote at annual meetings and have the authority to look at the books at any time. That was in addition to reports that were given.

Budget Report (cont'd)

- 16 -

A Delegate asked what the costs were to set up the foundation and run it, compared to the interest to be gained. Mr. Daal said they had a model with the Resolution they passed that was fairly detailed, based on their lawyer's advice, for administration and taxes. The Resolution had a graph that showed at what point they'd break even. Mr. Daal said he thought it was five years.

Mr. Zachritz said there was no guarantee that the endowment would grow at all. Mr. Daal said that was correct. When money is invested, that couldn't be guaranteed. The Delegate said the investment might also go down. Mr. Daal said that was correct.

Mr. Mikulin asked if there was any consideration of looking at a fixed income asset allocation rather than equities and securities. Mr. Daal said they could look at that.

Mr. Rajan said the main problem with this sort of discussion is that what they want is a passive strategy, where they put money in there and then don't pay attention to it. This year they might know enough about it, but next year, when they're all gone, no one would know about it. So it would be very hard to change the mix every year. Rather than looking at types of strategies, like weighting towards fixed income and other asset classes, they look at the kinds of funds that will provide them cover. For instance, investing in the UC Berkeley Foundation was a great benefit to the GA. The blame wouldn't go to them if something went wrong. It's insurance, on that level. If they chose different asset allocations, they could be criticized for those decisions. There are points on both sides that could be made.

Mr. Mikulin said the reason he asked the question was not to place blame, but to have certainty over return. When they invest money that wasn't their own, it behooved them to be very responsible. That's why he thought exposing themselves to the volatility of the market may not necessarily be the best course of action. In his personal opinion, it would probably be a good idea to consider something that was slightly greater than inflation as a return rate rather than something invested in securities.

Mr. Rajan said he was correct. They could put it in a mattress, and putting it in a bond fund or treasury fund were good ideas. It really depended on what they want out of it. What they want from this fund was growth that would offset inflation. They need some level of risk, which was why they weren't just keeping these funds in a bank account, where the funds were currently deposited, at 0.5%.

Mr. Rabkin asked if discussion of asset allocation was relevant to the By-laws. Mr. Daal said it wasn't, not really.

Ms. Anderson said this was not a debate on the Resolution, but an announcement, and people could talk about what they wanted.

Mr. Daal said he wanted to talk about creation of the organization. He asked if they were ready to vote on this. It wasn't a Resolution, but a motion to move forward with the creation of the 501(c)(3). It was so moved and seconded.

Mr. Rabkin said they didn't know what they were voting on. If it wasn't a Resolution, there shouldn't be a vote. Ms. Anderson said it was like voting on the Funding Committee report. The Resolution said the President had to come up with a report. Mr. Daal said the motion was to move forward and execute the 501(c)(3).

Budget Report (cont'd)

- 17 -

Operational Excellence: Solicitation of Student Feedback at Midpoint on Studies

The motion was made to give the GA the go-ahead to go forward on the creation of the 501(c)(3). THE MOTION TO CREATE A 501(c)(3) PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 35-1-4.

Mr. Daal called for any remaining questions for Officers or Chairs, and seeing none, said they would move on to the speaker.

OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE: Solicitation of Student Feedback at Midpoint on Studies

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Sam Israelit, Bain & Co., and Khira Griscavage, UCB VC Admin., for attending. He would like to introduce Sam Israelit, from Bain & Co., Moita Ferez, from the Graduate Division, and Whitney Stall, from Bain & Co.

Mr. Daal said they'll have a discussion about Operational Excellence.

Ms. Griscavage said they would like to thank the GA for allowing them to spend some time with them. They had a video to show that was part of the Operational Excellence mid-point review. She asked if everybody knew about OE, and said that seemed to be the case. In the video, the Chancellor introduces the program and Frank Yeary talks about where they are today with the project. After that, Ms. Griscavage said they would then like to hear from the Assembly whether this resonated with people in the room, and the issues, concerns, and questions they have, and also talk a little about the potential benefits of addressing some of these things.

A video was shown. Ms. Griscavage said they handed out a copy of the slides that were shown in the video. They've gone through a process of meeting with staff, faculty, and student groups to get input.

Mr. Zachritz said that one thing that struck him as problematic was people doing human resources work who were scattered around. A lot of people doing human resources work were doing other things, and

that's why they were scattered. He'd be concerned with this number because they don't have enough human resources staff.

Mr. Rabkin said there was a question about centralization and decentralization. It was extremely important that department control their IT. At Cornell, where it was decentralized, there was barely concealed warfare between IT and the departments. Departments needed to do research one way, but policy called for doing things another way. In every other program where IT was a big part of the institution, say the sciences and engineering, centralization of IT was extremely painful. People ended up just going around it and building their own IT operations anyway, because central IT didn't do what was needed, and had very special, itemized demands. And when a department hires their own IT people, they do other things for the department as well. They're quick and responsive. Central IT was useless. His department thought they got their money's worth from decentralized services, because they work.

A Delegate asked if most departments were happy about the idea of having decentralized human resources, and asked how many jobs would be lost in the centralization process. Ms. Griscavage said they structured session with the GA to capture people's questions. They want to use their time there wisely. The Delegate said she thought answers would be good.

Operational Excellence: Solicitation of Student Feedback at Midpoint on Studies (cont'd)

- 18 -

Mr. Israelit said the question raised some great points. It wouldn't be centralized, but was actually a cluster. They'd take a bunch of departments and tell them to work together. That was the type of design they want to fall under more. No one was saying to take all HR people out of the rim or edges and to put them in a building centrally. OE got that sentiment. But more could be done with fewer people than what was happening in a lot of departments. One thing that needed to be explored, and they have not set an answer to, was understanding if there were other opportunities like that which they could take advantage of. This was a great example, and one that's been held up as very successful.

As for the point about centralized IT, Mr. Israelit said OE understands that Computer Science needs to have its computers there. But there are servers in all kinds of buildings, including buildings that weren't designed for them. At minimum, that caused high energy costs. They should be placed where they could actually be taken care of. That was the point of that proposal. They're not calling for things to be taken out of Soda Hall. But the current system seemed inefficient, and there was probably some opportunity there.

Mr. Israelit they have not proposed a design. They have ideas. The next phase will be for people in those roles to come together and actually come up with some solutions. They'll see if there were other opportunities to cluster some of these administrative functions. He believed these opportunities exist, but as for what they look like, he had no idea. They have not sized how many people need to go or anything like that at all. They really had to think about what the right design was for the types of services to be provided, and have that drive them and then figure out the model that worked for them, and then figure out the resources that worked for them.

Mr. Peters asked if office space per employee becomes an asset that needed to be maximized. Mr. Israelit said space was a huge asset there, 10 million square feet around campus. Right now it wasn't managed very well. The measure of square footage per person was just a measure, but they had to consider the standards that were used. For example, Stanford has gone through a process of improving space utilization, with standards that gives each person a certain amount of space, with space designed for each organization.

Mr. Shah said that in a time of resource constraints, if they could better put people in buildings in a smarter way and delay construction of a building for a year or two, that would represent real savings. Ms. Griscavage said their space was managed more on an exception basis. If someone needs space, there's a process to help them find it. But it wasn't managed in terms of thinking about how many people they have, the work they do, and the spaces they have, and how much space that area should own.

Mr. Briggs asked how much of the 10 million square feet of campus space was actually office space and manageable space. Mr. Israelit said he wasn't sure. Ms. Stall said that included everything. She could look up the exact amount. The campus every year spends about \$10 million in rent. There were trade-offs, but the thought was whether there was a way to better manage their administrative space on campus to potentially reduce the amount the campus spent on rent.

A Delegate asked who has been consulted in getting the data. Focus groups were referenced, and she asked who that would be. Mr. Israelit said they've talked to more than 500 people, including one-on-one meetings, where they talk to people about their ideas for an hour or two. Of the 500, half were staff, a third faculty, and the rest were students. So it's been relatively cross-sectional, but weighted towards people in those functions.

Operational Excellence: Solicitation of Student Feedback at Midpoint on Studies (cont'd)

- 19 -

The Delegate asked if there was incentive for people to give feedback or if these were voluntary, casual interviews. Mr. Israelit said there was no incentive. Some of them were proactive, with OE going out and saying they needed to talk to people, representative across a set of functions and activities. There were also ad hoc people who opted in. People could go to the Web site and say they wanted to be interviewed. OE was still doing that. There's also been a number of smaller workshop-type forums, with 10 to 15 people. Plus all the committees they've talked to, 20, 30, or 40 committees.

The Delegate asked if there was estimate of how many graduate students have been consulted so far. Mr. Israelit said he didn't have that figure. Mr. Daal said he could answer that a little bit. Bain and the OE team came to the GA last semester. Before that, at the Exec Board level, they had extensive conversations with Bain and the OE team. They also endeavored to have a feedback session with the Operational Excellence team at a separate time, aside from the Assembly meeting. But unfortunately, nobody came to that.

Ms. Griscavage said they also had a survey as part of their work on student services. Ms. Stall 1,300 or 1,000 graduate students responded. The Delegate asked if that was an electronic survey by e-mail. Ms. Stall said it was. She said she was new to the GA and never heard of this before. Also, not every department was represented in the GA. Mr. Israelit said that Mr. Daal was also a member of the Steering Committee, which met monthly. Ms. Griscavage said that if people could think of things OE should be doing to get the word out, suggestions and feedback would really be appreciated.

Ms. Berkeley said that one way to reach all graduate students was through a newsletter the Dean had. One thing that spoke to her in the video that was shown was the issue of procurement. Her department was procurement-heavy. She was confused about that issue because a lot of things come out of professors' research funds, which were separate from the University budget. In talking about procurement, she asked what kinds of costs they were talking about and if that was overhead or administrative. There was no real incentive for professors to spend less of their grant money. She asked how that helped the University.

Ms. Griscavage said that in terms of professors spending less of their grant money, if there was an opportunity for professors to get the same thing for less, they'd benefit because they could spend the remainder of their money on something else. In terms of the breakout, there are central funds, Auxiliary funds, and funds that are restricted. They realize the savings will be across all those buckets. Mr. Israelit said these were direct savings, and not people buying things. If two areas buy a printer, even if one was paid for by a grant, buying together might allow them to get a reduced price. There's a network externality to the broader campus if they could consolidate spend.

Ms. Berkeley said professors might want to spend more of their grant money because the more they spend, the more they get. She asked if there was a plan to work with the LBNL and National Labs, which her department interfaces with. She asked if there was a way to link into that. Ms. Griscavage said they actually went up to LBL a few weeks ago to hear what they were doing with procurement. They're really in a diagnostic, understanding how they operate now, and less into ways to do things in the future. She thought there were opportunities to improve procurement, but that was to come. Mr. Israelit said the Director of Procurement has been trying to do what was done at LBL and finally felt that people now were actually listening, and that this was a great opportunity to make progress. There already was investment in central procurement. Ms. Stall said she wasn't sure everybody knew what was going on at LBL because only certain departments interact with the Lab. So it might be worth explaining that.

Operational Excellence: Solicitation of Student Feedback at Midpoint on Studies (cont'd)

- 20 -

Ms. Griscavage said LBL has an online procurement system, with catalogs online. Approval was also online. So there were a lot of savings potential, including because having contracts for online procurement could result in low costs.

Mr. Mikulin asked about eliminating positions versus potentially reallocating people to other job functions. Ms. Griscavage said that was an excellent question that they'd have to talk through and figure out, in the design phase. If managers manage one, two, or three people, they need to figure out if that meant that managers should be individual contributors as opposed to managing, or if there was an opportunity to potentially remove a manager; and if so, to understand what the policies were.

Mr. Mikulin asked if the authority existed to reallocate human resources where they were most effective and derive the most value for the University. Ms. Griscavage said their HR policy was very complex. That was a hard question. A lot of areas have people who have worked there for 20 years, and people have been saying that this is what they've been saying for 20 years. This was an opportunity to get the attention of senior-level administrators and the Chancellor to actually make change happen. She agreed that implementation was the difficult part. Ms. Stall said that as they go through this, one thing the everyone was doing was capturing what the barriers were. If people agree where they'd like to get to, but a policy prevents that, then the conversation was who had the authority to change that policy and where that policy came from, and if it was an historical legacy or an OP policy. Ms. Griscavage said that sometimes it wasn't even a policy, but the way things were done, without people realizing that things could be done differently. Ms. Stall said the challenge was identifying those things and then not assuming they couldn't do anything about them.

Mr. Peters asked about some examples of supervisors and if the problem was that there were too many supervisors and not enough workers. He asked how one person would only report to another. Ms. Griscavage said that last year, on a temporary basis, she was Director of Finance and Budget for all administration. In that role she had three people working for her. She decided to consolidate that with a budget officer, and now those people report to somebody in the Budget Office who already have three or

four people reporting to them, and now has four. Obviously there's some additional work, but it didn't make sense to have that role any more. Mr. Peters asked if it was, then, about cutting down the supervisory role and pay and consolidating that. Ms. Griscavage said that was the case. Ms. Stall said that if they have a lot of people supervising one, two, or three people, that ends up with a lot of layers in the organization, from the Chancellor to the person being supervised. When there are a lot of layers, a really bureaucratic organization, a lot of time was spent communicating up and down the chain. Removing layers removes the work that people had to do. It simplifies the organization and makes it easier to get things done and communicate. And it makes employees' lives better. There's a savings component. Positions might remain, but who people report to could change. So there was benefit there.

Mr. Israelit said there were reasons why one manager might manage only one person. What he heard in a bunch of his interviews was that people were promoted to a supervisor because that was the only way the person could get a raise. So not only the structure had to be changed, but also the compensation system and the performance management system.

Mr. Rabkin asked if this included people on the academic side who have staff support. Ms. Stall said they weren't counting faculty or staff support. Mr. Rabkin said staff could be for research purposes. Mr. Israelit said it included deans and their administrative support.

Operational Excellence: Solicitation of Student Feedback at Midpoint on Studies (cont'd)

- 21 -

Mr. Shah asked if they could briefly talk about what the opportunities were. Mr. Israelit said they were still early in this process. They surveyed a bunch of students and got very good feedback. What they're really trying to understand was the opportunity for student services. The chart they showed indicated that student services work was being performed in five different organizations across campus. That was not efficient.

Student services was one area on campus where they really had to be careful and make sure they think about service quality first, and then deliver that quality at the lowest possible cost. And the other idea was how to get costs down and to right-size the quality. They had to make sure they don't denigrate the actual quality of what was being delivered. As part of this, they also inserted into the survey questions that tried to get a sense of priorities. If they do 55 services across campus, they asked how students think about those relative to each other, which ones were important, which were more important than others. That whole survey was a ranking process. He didn't know if anyone there actually filled it out, but it was intended to help them understand from a student perspective what services students valued the most.

The other dimension they're looking at was that they're working with the Administration to see which of these services were really well aligned with the mission of the University. So what they end up with was a two-by-two of importance to students and in alignment with the mission of the University. Things that were really important to students and really aligned with the mission of the campus, top-notch services on that had to be delivered. In fact, they should probably reinvest in that to make sure they're even better. For those things that were of low value to students and weren't aligned with the campus' mission, they probably should think of another way to do them and reinvest that money, and find alternative ways to deliver that at much lower cost. If students don't care about that and the University didn't feel like it should provide it, that's a place to start questioning why they were providing it. There may be a very good reason for it. The campus may be legally required to do it, or there may be small, particularly focused interest groups that need that service. There could be lots of reasons. But at least they should question it, and perhaps distribute those funds elsewhere. And if they're in the off-diagonals, if it was really important to students but not aligned with the campus' mission, then they could ask whether there

were other people who could provide those services, who could be brought in and do it better than the campus did, that would lower the cost. And the other diagonal was if students didn't care about it, but it was important to the University, they could ask how the campus could help students understand why it was important and what the right level of service was to provide.

Mr. Israelit said that was where they were. The design team has not come up with an answer. They've started to gather data. Examples come out. Tutoring, e.g., was very important. They found three different groups that do tutoring. If they look at the cost per student/tutor, it ranged from \$170 per student per head to \$2,400 per head. As to why that differential existed, they don't know. Maybe it would be possible to share infrastructure, or see if there were processes used to make it work better, or maybe they could get some skill advantage. They don't know. The suggestion wasn't to cut tutoring, because tutoring was actually pretty important. But these are the types of things the analysis will look at.

Mr. Israelit said the other intermediate one is if they have five different groups doing this, the question was whether they should restructure this.

Mr. Daal said they were out of time and he would like to thank the speakers. (Applause) If people wish to send in additional remarks about Operational Excellence, there's a Web site, berkeley.edu/oe. There's a comment section there, and an e-mail address.

GA 2010-11 Elections (cont'd)

- 22 -

GA 2010-11 ELECTIONS

Mr. Daal said the first office up for election was the Funding Chair. He would open the floor to nominations. If people would like to hear about the position, they could make a request and the Funding Chair would give them a brief description.

Mr. Tahir said that at least four members of the Funding Committee will remain on the Funding Committee for the next academic year, so a new chair would at least have members with institutional memory. The Funding Committee gets a budget from the GA. They decide how much to give to groups. The Ad Hoc Funding Committee will make decisions on how to do that. If people wanted to be Chair, they should start to attend. And if they become Chair, they'd also be part of the GA's Executive Board.

Mr. Tahir said that if nobody becomes Funding Committee Chair, then \$120,000 would sit there and no students would get it. One big reason the GA was there, and what most graduate students want from the GA, was for student group funding, and that wouldn't happen.

Ms. Anderson nominated Brad Froehle, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no nominations, they would come back election of the Funding Committee Chair.

Mr. Daal said the next position up for election was for GA President. Mr. Daal said it's a very intensive office. He wouldn't talk about how much time it took, because the amount of time one puts in was proportional to how well the Administration knew them and sent them little e-mails asking if they would be willing to do this or that. It was also proportional to how efficient one was at doing the things the GA President does. So he wouldn't talk about time. What the office focused on was to organize Assembly

meetings and make sure everything worked out; go to a lot of meetings weekly, with administrators and students and other people; and read and respond to e-mails. That day he got, he believed, 90-something e-mails to respond to. That was what the office did, in broad strokes.

Mr. Daal said he would open the floor to nominations for GA President. A Delegate nominated Mr. Marchand. Mr. Rabkin nominated Mr. Ortega, who respectfully declined. Mr. Ortega nominated Mr. Daal, who respectfully declined. Ms. Anderson nominated Mr. Saxena, who respectfully declined. Mr. Briggs nominated Ms. Chavez. Ms. Chavez said she was graduating. Mr. Briggs nominated Mr. Froehle, who respectfully declined. Ms. Anderson nominated Mr. Briggs. Mr. Briggs said he was graduating. A Delegate nominated Mr. Rajan, who respectfully declined. Ms. Anderson nominated Mr. Koht, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no other nominations, nominations were closed.

Mr. Marchand said he felt bad about leaving the position of Campus Affairs VP. It was a good position and a lot of fun, and if he got elected President, he would encourage people to run for CAVP. They need to keep the organization together and improve communication internally, and make sure their influence increases on campus. That doesn't mean he'd set the agenda, and the Assembly will set the agenda. But he wanted to increase how much they're heard and how effective they were. It was a very vague platform

GA 2010-11 Elections (cont'd)

- 23 -

and he'd be responsive to other people. Finally, at the end of the meeting, the GA will elect its representatives to the Graduate Council. It would be good if they represent the diversity of graduate programs because it was important that people in the sciences, the humanities, and in professional programs were represented. They've seen things that happen with different factions of graduate students. The other positions were also very important. He called for any questions.

Mr. Briggs asked what program he was in. Mr. Marchand said this was his second year in Environmental Science. He's a Ph.D. candidate, so he wasn't taking classes. Mr. Briggs asked when he planned to graduate. Mr. Marchand said it was a five-year program.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no further questions, he would ask Mr. Marchand to leave the room. After a discussion off the record and a vote, Mr. Daal said that Mr. Marchand was the new President of the GA. He asked to have Mr. Marchand brought back into the room, and said he would like to congratulate him. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said Mr. Marchand's term will begin on July 1.

Mr. Daal said the next office up for election was Campus Affairs Vice President. Mr. Marchand said the main thing with Campus Affairs VP was that the person is the main GA point person for advocacy on campus-related issues. They ask things of the Graduate Division, have relations with the Academic Senate, and were responsible for placing graduate students on committees. And if they find some time, they do their own projects and respond to graduate student issues as they arise. He was also doing a survey on Faculty Mentor Awards. But the essence of the position was advocacy on campus and making committee appointments.

Mr. Daal said nominations were open for Campus Affairs VP. Ms. Anderson nominated Ms. Polosukhina, who respectfully declined. A Delegate nominated Carrin, who said she was graduating. Mr. Briggs nominated Lucy, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Daal noted that all these positions had a stipend. For the Vice Presidents and the President, it was \$12,000, and didn't show up against financial aid or fellowships, and was like being employed elsewhere.

Ms. Anderson said people didn't need to be a Delegate to fill the position, or even a grad student. Mr. Daal said the GA elected an undergrad as President five years ago. Mr. Briggs nominated Mickie, who respectfully declined. Mr. Shah nominated Ms. Harrison-Shermoen, who respectfully declined.

A Delegate asked about the position's workload. Mr. Marchand said the time was calculated at 16 hours at \$16 an hour. But in reality, it varied. There were a number of meetings to attend, including the GA once a month, the Exec Board once a month, and a meeting with the Chancellor once a month. Sometimes they happened in the same week. So the time fluctuated. He thought someone could try to do the work and limit themselves to 16 hours a week if they were very organized and delegated work. He thought that was possible. And people had to be ready for slow weeks as well. Meetings tend to be bunched.

Mr. Ortega said that all the positions in the GA were to some extent what people made of them. So in that sense, people could make themselves as busy as they want, or limit themselves to a bare minimum.

GA 2010-11 Elections (cont'd)

- 24 -

Resolution 10021, To Amend the GA Budget to Increase External Affairs Funding for Sage 2010 Day on the Hill and UCSA Membership Dues

Mr. Marchand has been quite active in the position that past year, so he was probably not the best reflection of the actual time commitment. But it really was up to the individual.

Ms. Chavez said that during the late summer and fall, the position makes appointments to campus-wide committees. That was a basic requirement for the beginning of the year.

Ms. Anderson said she believed when Ms. Harrison-Shermoen will be around next year, and would probably be on the Campus Affairs Committee. So there would be experienced people involved, even if they didn't necessarily have time to do it themselves. And Mr. Marchand would be around.

Mr. Daal said that if they couldn't find somebody to accept the nomination, or couldn't elect somebody even with nominations, the election would carry over to the next meeting, and then the next meeting, until the positions were filled.

Mr. Daal called for any other nominations for CAVP, or asked if they should put it off.

Mr. Ortega asked if they could consider a Resolution they needed to do it before the next Delegates meeting, the funding for SAGE. The motion was seconded. Mr. Daal said the motion was to immediately consider 1002a. Mr. Rajan asked to also consider the Empowering Women of Color Conference Resolution, 1003b.

Mr. Daal said the motion was to immediately consider 1002a and to consider fast tracking for 1003a. The motion was seconded. Mr. Daal said amending the agenda required a two-thirds vote. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO CONSIDER IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Rajan said he would talk about all the Resolutions for the sake of efficiency. The Budget Committee looked at these. Both SAGE and EWOCC had major events coming up. The money exists to approve this funding as long as the GA didn't engage in any more major events for the next two months. The Committee found this to be a useful method of spending money. The "Day on the Hill" was one of the signature events for the External Affairs VP. And EWOCC was having its 25th anniversary. The GA had and the Budget Committee was in full support of the Resolutions.

Mr. Daal said they would first consider 1002a.

The following Resolution, 1002a, was authored by Alberto M. Ortega:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO INCREASE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FUNDING FOR SAGE 2010 DAY ON THE HILL AND UCSA MEMBERSHIP DUES

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly's Mission states: "The Graduate Assembly's vision is to engage and

Resolution 1002a, To Amend the GA Budget to Increase External Affairs Funding for Sage 2010 Day on the Hill and UCSA Membership Dues (cont'd) - 25 -

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO INCREASE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FUNDING FOR SAGE 2010 DAY ON THE HILL AND UCSA MEMBERSHIP DUES (cont'd)

empower graduate students to work together for academic, political, and social change -- both inside and outside the UC Berkeley community. As a graduate student government, we are actively engaged in pinpointing graduate student needs, providing resources, and advocating for graduate students through campus and community activism." And;

WHEREAS, lobbying on behalf of graduate students at the federal, State and local government to increase access, affordability, and quality of education as well as quality of life for graduate students is an important component of the GA to satisfy its mission; and

WHEREAS, in the fall of 2008, representatives from the UC Berkeley graduate students participated in a summit of the premier public universities, hosted by the University of Texas at Austin, with the intent to strategize how best to serve our constituents; and

WHEREAS, the Coalition of Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE) was created at the UT Austin summit where UC Berkeley became one of 10 charter members with the intent of being a national advocacy group to lobby at the federal level on behalf of graduate students at public graduate universities to increase access, affordability and quality of education as well as quality of life at public graduate universities; and

WHEREAS, SAGE will be organizing its second Day on the Hill at Washington, DC this April to lobby

the legislature on graduate student issues that include loan forgiveness programs, and UCB GA representatives will be participating; and

WHEREAS, the current budget did not account for these expenses and currently does not have sufficient monies to participate in the SAGE DOH; and

WHEREAS, although we are currently seeking external funding from the Chancellor's Office and Graduate Division, which if received, will help cover some of the cost, we do not believe we will receive adequate support from these avenues alone; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly is a member of the UC Student Association (UCSA); and

WHEREAS, UCSA dues are based on student enrollment, costing \$1.20 per student per year; and

WHEREAS, the budget allocation for this year's membership was based on last year's dues; and

WHEREAS, this year, student enrollment, and hence membership dues, increased, and the budget is underfunded by \$312.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA budget be amended to increase the Travel Budget of the External Affairs Committee by \$4,000 to supplement funding, as needed, for the travel of UCB GA representatives to attend the SAGE DOH.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA budget be amended to increase the UCSA membership dues budget by \$312.00.

Resolution 1002a, To Amend the GA Budget to Increase External Affairs Funding for Sage - 26 -
2010 Day on the Hill and UCSA Membership Dues (cont'd)
Resolution 1003b, Resolution to Allocate Funds In Support of the Empowering Women of Color
Conference (EWOC)

Mr. Ortega said SAGE is a new national group, created about a year and a half ago. The GA has been member since its founding. SAGE is 11 of the top public universities in the nation. They advocate for issues related to students in public, graduate universities. This year they're working on tax exemption for fellowships and grants, extension of the loan forgiveness program, and other items related to immigration reform and health care reform. This was something they hoped to do every year to ensure the longevity of SAGE.

Mr. Mikulin asked about the request. Mr. Ortega said the amount was \$4,000 for the trip to Washington and \$312 for dues the GA owed for its UCSA membership. It was a little bit more that year. UCSA dues are based on a fee per student, and there were a few more graduate students enrolled this year than last year.

Mr. Rabkin said that it seemed like a lot to spend on travel. He moved to amend the meet from \$4,000 to \$2,000.

Mr. Mikulin asked what minimum amount was needed to make this happen. Mr. Ortega said it was \$1,200 per student. California has a lot of legislators in the Capitol and they need enough students to visit all of them. Last year they took six people, and that was an ideal number. They have less funding for this because last year the GA had \$1,000 from the Graduate Dean and \$1,500 from the Vice Chancellor of

Government and Community Affairs. This year they only have \$1,000 from the Dean. So they were struggling to get the funds to be able to take that many people. With just \$2,000, they'd only probably be able to take three people.

Mr. Rabkin said he would withdraw his motion to amend.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1002a PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO INCREASE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS FUNDING FOR SAGE 2010 DAY ON THE HILL AND UCSA MEMBERSHIP DUES.

Mr. Daal said the discussion at that time was whether or not to fast track Resolution 1003b.

Mr. Rabkin said that if there was no allocation, the Conference would expire, so the GA had to do this. THE MOTION TO FAST TRACK RESOLUTION 1003b PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution, 1003b, was authored by Lucero Chavez and Yomaira Figueroa:

RESOLUTION TO ALLOCATE FUNDS IN SUPPORT OF THE EMPOWERING WOMEN OF COLOR CONFERENCE (EWOCC)

WHEREAS, EWOCC was founded in 1984 by a group of undergraduate students as their semester project for a DE-Cal Democratic Education at Cal) class. The project, entitled "Women of Color in the United States," received an overwhelmingly positive response, and students

Resolution 1003b, Resolution to Allocate Funds In Support of the Empowering Women of Color Conference (EWOCC) (cont'd) - 27 -

RESOLUTION TO ALLOCATE FUNDS IN SUPPORT OF THE EMPOWERING WOMEN OF COLOR CONFERENCE (EWOCC) (cont'd)

decided to organize another event with the help of the Graduate Assembly (GA), Berkeley's graduate student government; and

WHEREAS, in 1986, with the formation of the GA's Graduate Women's Project (GWP), it was decided to institutionalize this event and make the Conference an annual project under the auspices of the GWP. EWOCC was one of the first Conferences to present women of color with an opportunity to address the racial, class, and gender issues facing American Indian, African American, Asian American, and Chicana/Latina women. These occasions have offered ways for women of color to build stronger bases of social and political support; and

WHEREAS, as the years progressed and the Conference grew the Graduate Assembly decided to create an additional Project Coordinator position (Women of Color Initiative Project) to deal directly and plan the Conference; and

WHEREAS, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Conference, and to commemorate this occasion we have decided to host a two-day Conference and include a more direct youth component to go along with our theme "Intergenerational Wisdom: Celebrating Our Past, Present, &

Future." Because we are hosting a two-day conference our budget has doubled while our funding sources have not. In fact, some funding sources render us ineligible to apply for this year's Conference because we have received funding from them in the past, an obstacle we could not have foreseen; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Committee has applied for funding through other sources, including the Ethnic Studies Fifth Account and the Multicultural Center. However, with two weeks left until the Conference we fear we are going to fall short; and

WHEREAS, graduate students will benefit greatly from this Conference and the Graduate Assembly has the ability to support it in this capacity for this year;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the graduate students of UC Berkeley authorize a one-time allocation of \$7,500 from its contingency funds to EWOCC.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that representatives from the Planning Committee will report back on the success of the Conference during the April Delegates meeting.

Ms. Chavez said this is the 25th anniversary of the Empowering Women of Color Conference, so they're having a two-day conference instead of one day. That doubled their costs. They're bringing in folks who founded the Conference, former Berkeley students and professors. Graduate students, women, and professors attend every year in high numbers. Funding sources the Conference applied to in the past have restrictions on when another request could be made. The organizers weren't aware of that.

They've been fundraising and got money from the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion, the Ethnic Studies Fifth Account, and other sources. They thought the GA, whose constituents were most served by this Conference, could help contribute to this one-time, unique event, its 25th anniversary.

Resolution 1003b, Resolution to Allocate Funds In Support of the Empowering Women of Color Conference (EWOCC) (cont'd) - 28 -

Mr. Mikulin asked how much they held this event for last year. Mr. Rajan said it was in the order of the amount in the Resolution. The budget for the entire Conference was generally about \$17,000 at most, with a lot of that to pay the Project Coordinator.

Ms. Figueroa said she was the Project Coordinator for the event and the Conference. They have about \$4,000 in Project money. So money going to the program had to be fundraised. Last year the budget was about \$17,000, and this year, about \$25,000.

Mr. Daal said he would like to note that for this project, attempts have been made to find external funding sources. Unfortunately, they weren't very successful. They did get \$500 from the Vice Chancellor of E&I.

Mr. Saxena said he understood they already fund the Graduate Women's Project and the Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project. He asked how much money they put into both of those, because this seemed like quite a lot of money. And for other funding, he asked if there's a registration fee for participants. Ms. Figueroa said there was. Berkeley students get in for free and community members have a registration at the door. Also, the Graduate Women's Project was different from the Women of Color Initiative, which comes from the Graduate Women of Color Project. They target different communities among graduates.

Mr. Saxena said he felt they already fund many of the intentions of this Conference through various other projects, and his concern was that it was an awful lot of money.

Mr. Froehle said that many of them received a survey that was sent out recently about graduate student satisfaction. There were some questions on it about this, and he could share some preliminary results. Roughly 1,300 people responded. Only 1% had ever participated in EWOCC; 24% heard of it; and 76% never heard about it.

Ms. Berkeley said that in response to Mr. Saxena's point, the GA just allocated money to the EAVP. This was part of a bigger issue over spending. The GA was obviously overextending, and they needed to prioritize. She didn't think it was fair to do that on a case-by-case basis, and to not fund this just because they happened to consider this Resolution today, and happened to be sensitive to the budget level that day. They had to do this on a bigger level. The GA has the money. They gave the EAVP thumbs up and it was only fair to do that with EWOCC, and then step back and evaluate in an extensive, global way, what their priorities were as a body and how they allocate funds.

Mr. Peters said that on the 25th anniversary they were opening up a can of worms, and should talk about whether to fund the 25th anniversary adequately. It's happened for so long, and seemed to be valuable to the campus and community. Having this discussion the month when this project needed the money seemed to be untimely.

Mr. Daal said they were about to run out of time. He called for a motion to extend time by ten minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Briggs said they have GMORR, EWOCC, the Graduate Women's Project, the Graduate and Diversity Project, all of which target different groups. Just because they use similar terms, it wasn't the same. In

Resolution 1003b, Resolution to Allocate Funds In Support of the Empowering Women of
Color Conference (EWOCC) (cont'd)
GA 2010-11 Elections (cont'd)

- 29 -

this case, he believed the GWP was donating 100% of its budget for this. So it wasn't as if there was redundancy. GMORR helps all of the groups and targets very different aspects. The terminology was similar, but the programs were individualistic.

Ms. Anderson said they had difficult decisions to make. This was a project that's been supported in the past. It moved forward this year with the assumption that it would have money that ended up not being available, and was coming to the GA for help. The GA has the money. They might decide it happens this year, and then decide to make more cuts next year, and maybe decide next year they don't want to do keep doing this. But they have the money at that time and shouldn't throw the program out the window and let this wonderful Conference flounder. There wasn't time to find the funding somewhere else.

Mr. Rajan said that Mr. Saxena had a good point, but they could have that discussion next month when he presents the budget.

Mr. Rabkin said that this was an emergency, which puts the GA in a very awkward position, coming two weeks before an event that was being done more lavishly than ever before. It was a bad idea in general to tinker with budgets two weeks before an event. It puts the GA in a position where they couldn't say no.

He resented not having a choice.

Mr. Daal said the question was why this has come up so late. Mr. Rajan said it was his fault. Ms. Chavez said she would take fault as well. Mr. Rajan said he should have put this on the agenda earlier. The money exists in contingency to make this happen. This event has been budgeted by Budget Committees in previous years. So this vision was something previous Budget Committees planned for. There's a line item in last year's budget, "Women of Color Initiative." Knowing it was the 25th anniversary, he failed to communicate that to Delegates and the Assembly last year and this year. The resources exist to support this budget, but people feel like they were being forced into a decision.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1003b PASSED BY UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO ALLOCATE FUNDS IN SUPPORT OF THE EMPOWERING WOMEN OF COLOR CONFERENCE (EWOCC).

Ms. Anderson moved to have the EAVP election and then table the rest of the elections until the GA's next meeting. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

GA 2010-11 Elections (cont'd)

Mr. Daal said they were under consideration of the election of the EAVP. He asked if Mr. Ortega could say something about the office. Mr. Ortega said that External Affairs deals with anything that affects graduate students that pertains beyond the boundary of the campus, whether at the City, State, or federal levels. They do quite a bit of advocacy at the State and federal levels and interact with the Office of Government and Community Relations. Much of the role of the Office was to work with the UC Student

GA 2010-11 Elections (cont'd) (cont'd)

- 30 -

Resolution Referral

Resolution 1002b, Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund Incentives for the 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey

Association, which works on Systemwide initiatives with both the OP and at the State level to improve things for students.

Mr. Daal said nominations were open. Mr. Mikulin asked if Mr. Ortega was willing to serve another term. Mr. Ortega said he was. Mr. Mikulin nominated Mr. Ortega. Mr. Daal called for any other nominations, and seeing none, said nominations were closed. Mr. Froehle moved to suspend the rules and immediately elect Mr. Ortega as EAVP. The motion was seconded. Mr. Daal said suspension of the rules required a two-thirds majority. THE MOTION TO SUSPEND THE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE ALBERTO ORTEGA AS GA EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT FOR 2010-11 PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Daal said Mr. Ortega was reelected. (Applause)

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

1003a, By-law Amendment to Rename the Technology Committee to the Communications Committee, to the EAVP, the Budget, and the Rules Committees

Mr. Daal called for any objection.

Mr. Ellsworth moved to extend the meeting time by ten minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Resolutions (cont'd)

The following Resolution, 1002b, was authored by Philippe Marchand and Miguel Daal:

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND INCENTIVES FOR THE 2010 GRADUATE STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly will be conducting a survey during the Spring 2010 Semester to assess the satisfaction of UC Berkeley graduate students with respect to their academic program, funding, student services, and the work of the GA; and

WHEREAS, one aim of this survey is to compare the responses among academic units (colleges, fields -- e.g., humanities, sciences, or even individual department), which requires a significant sample size;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a total of \$5,000 (\$2,500 from the GA Contingency Fund and \$2,500 from a planned GA gift to the UC Berkeley Foundation) be reallocated for prizes to serve as incentives to boost graduate student participation in the Spring 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey.

Resolution 1002b, Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund Incentives for the 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey (cont'd) - 31 -
Resolution 1002c, Resolution to Facilitate Procedural Resolutions

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND INCENTIVES FOR THE 2010 GRADUATE STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the actual prizes, the total value of which might be lower than the amount allocated, will be subject to approval by the GA Budget Chair and President.

Mr. Marchand said he sent out the survey by e-mail. He would encourage them to get people from their departments to answer the survey. There's been a small change since the Campus Affairs Committee met, and they would like to amend the bill from \$1,500 to \$2,000, for prizes. Cash prizes are \$800, \$500, and \$200, with the rest as small gift certificates. The motion to amend was seconded.

A Delegate moved to amend the amendment to just the other prizes to \$2,500, and to make corresponding adjustments. Mr. Marchand said the \$2,000 comes from the CAVP's budget and was transferred.

Mr. Mikulin asked what total amount was allocated for the survey. Mr. Marchand said it was \$2,000. It

would come from savings from not having a CAVP for so long. This would just move money from the CAVP.

The amendment would have the Resolved Clause read as follows:

Therefore Be It Resolved, that a total of \$2,000 (from the CAVP stipend line item) be reallocated for prizes....”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Rabkin said the survey has been e-mailed out, and prizes were mentioned, and now the GA was being asked to approve something that has already been promised to spend. Mr. Daal said the President has a discretionary fund. Mr. Rabkin said that was fine.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1002b, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON BUDGET AMENDMENT TO FUND INCENTIVES FOR THE 2010 GRADUATE STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY.

Resolution 1002c

The following Resolution, 1002c, was authored by Meghan Anderson:

RESOLUTION TO FACILITATE PROCEDURAL RESOLUTIONS

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly often considers procedural and uncontroversial motions that do not necessitate committee consideration; and

Resolution 1002c, Resolution to Facilitate Procedural Resolutions (cont'd)

- 32 -

Resolution 1002d, Resolution to Create a UCB Campus Energy Efficiency Target Action Agenda Item

RESOLUTION TO FACILITATE PROCEDURAL RESOLUTIONS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the committee referral process and exception procedures take up a significant amount of Assembly meeting time;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly By-laws be modified so that section 6.4.2.6 reads:

6.4.2.6 Assembly Exception.

A three-fourths (3/4) vote of the Delegate Assembly may suspend these procedures and consider passage of a resolution during the same Assembly meeting at which the resolution is introduced, but only if notice of the resolution is given in the Delegate Assembly meeting agenda and the full text of the resolution included in the Delegate Assembly meeting's supporting materials.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly By-laws be modified to add section 6.4.2.7, reading:

6.4.2.7. Executive Board Exception.

The Executive Board may also suspend these procedures by unanimous consent and present a resolution to the Assembly for consideration at the same Assembly meeting at which the resolution is introduced, provided that notice of immediate consideration is given in the Delegate Assembly meeting agenda, and the full text of the resolution is provide to the Delegates at least six days before this Assembly meeting.

Mr. Rajan said this was about budgetary procedures. Any major shift of more than \$1,000 would have to go through the Assembly so Delegates were aware of how the money was spent, and so the budget reflects their priorities. In some sense it was never intended to give the Delegate Assembly at this point any input into how they should spend their money. That's done for next year's budget. So all of their concerns were absolutely valid, and he would ask people to repeat them at next month's meeting, where they'll actually get input in saying something should be up or down. Unfortunately, that's how their budgeting procedure works.

Mr. Rabkin said they go through this routine every meeting, where there's something they want to do because it's an emergency, and they spend time voting to fast track things.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no further discussion they would proceed to a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1002c PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE,
RESOLUTION TO FACILITATE PROCEDURAL RESOLUTIONS.

The following Resolution, 1002d, was authored by John Mikulin and Nell Green Nylen:

Resolution 1002d, Resolution to Create a UCB Campus Energy Efficiency Target Action
Agenda Item (cont'd)

- 33 -

RESOLUTION TO CREATE A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET
ACTION AGENDA ITEM

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley does not have a stated target for campus-wide energy efficiency; and

WHEREAS, the Cal Climate Action Partnership (CalCAP) has set a 2014 carbon emissions reduction target for the campus (i.e. reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2014); and

WHEREAS, according the 2009 UC Berkeley Sustainability Report, campus-wide energy use included 153,681,818 kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity and 153,091 million British thermal units (MMBtu) of natural gas in 1990 versus 213,729,043 kWh of electricity and 189,120 MMBtu of natural gas in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the close interrelationship between energy use and carbon emissions make it prudent to

establish a campus-wide energy efficiency target that compliments CalCAP's existing carbon emissions reduction target; and

WHEREAS, reducing energy usage saves money and reduces pollution, which is in the interest of all UC Berkeley students; and

WHEREAS, getting more students involved will provide additional guidance and support for administrative efforts to improve campus resource efficiency; and

WHEREAS, it is important for UC Berkeley to maintain its role as the environmental and resource efficiency leader within the UC System; and

WHEREAS, John Mikulin has agreed to be a coordinator;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that an Action Agenda Item be created:

Goal:

Develop a campus-wide energy efficiency target for UC Berkeley by December, 2010, which includes a baseline year, performance metric, and percentage goal as determined by the Graduate Assembly in collaboration with CalCAP. Meet with relevant administration and facility management staff to determine how to implement the targets in a cost-effective, technologically feasible, and timely manner. Support the implementation of the campus-wide energy efficiency target.

Membership:

The coordinator shall be in charge of convening ad hoc meetings with CalCAP members, relevant UC Berkeley faculty and staff, and Graduate Assembly (GA) and Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) Delegates on an as-needed basis to establish and implement a campus-wide energy efficiency target.

Mr. Mikulin said that he and some folks on the Environmental Sustainability Committee have been working on this Resolution for the past few months. In reading through the campus sustainability report, they found there were a number of good campus-wide resource management and climate action targets. However, none entail a campus-wide energy efficiency goal. As a member of the CalCAP Steering Committee and the TGIF Grant Committee on campus, he has chosen to author the Resolution, along with his colleague Nell Nysten, who had to leave. They hope to get the Graduate Assembly's support in an Action Agenda Item that would sunset at the end of this calendar year. With the help of students at the Energy and Resources Group, they'd develop an appropriate metric and baseline year for campus-wide energy and performance and help to facilitate implementation of such a target with the help of such entities as CalCAP, the GA, and relevant faculty, staff, and department heads. This would be an ongoing Resolution for this year. They will likely come back with a supplemental resolution identifying a specific metric and target for the campus that would then be voted on at a later date.

Mr. Daal said that when they approve an Action Agenda Item, he asked if they approve the Coordinator at

said they would consider the Resolution and then hold an election.

Mr. Froehle asked what existing Action Agenda Items the GA central had. Mr. Daal said there were two, on mental health and on Lower Sproul.

Mr. Daal said that Action Agenda Item Committee chairs attend Executive Board meetings and give monthly reports.

Mr. Rabkin asked if an Action Agenda item had a goal of setting targets or to choose those targets. Mr. Mikulin said it was to set the targets.

Seeing no further discussion, Mr. Daal said they would move to a vote. The motion to approve 1002d passed unanimously by voice-vote, **RESOLUTION TO CREATE A UC BERKELEY CAMPUS ENERGY EFFICIENCY TARGET ACTION AGENDA ITEM.**

Mr. Daal said they would next have an election for the Coordinator. A Delegate nominated Mr. Mikulin. Mr. Daal called for any other nominations, and seeing none, said nominations were closed. Mr. Daal said he thought they could move to a vote and not have discussion, unless anybody objected.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE JOHN MIKULIN AS ACTION AGENDA ITEM COORDINATOR REGARDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY ON CAMPUS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Anderson moved to table the last Resolution on the agenda, 1002e, In Support of Securing a Space on Campus for the Berkeley Student Food Collective, since the sponsor wasn't present and there was one minute for the extension of meeting time. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO TABLE RESOLUTION 1002e PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Mr. Marchand said they need people to run for other positions.

This meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,
Steven I. Litwak, Recording Secretary

Amended Resolutions

- i -

The following Resolution, 1002b, was approved by the GA as amended to read as follows:

Resolution on Budget Amendment to Fund Incentives for the 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly will be conducting a survey during the Spring 2010 Semester to assess the satisfaction of UC Berkeley graduate students with respect to their academic program, funding, student services, and the work of the GA; and

Whereas, on aim of this survey is to compare the responses among academic units (colleges, fields -- e.g., humanities, sciences, or even individual department), which requires a significant sample size;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that a total of \$2,000 (from the CAVP stipend line item) be reallocated for prizes to serve as incentives to boost graduate student participation in the Spring 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey.

Be It Further Resolved, that the actual prizes, the total value of which might be lower than the amount allocated, will be subject to approval by the GA Budget Chair and President.