

GSA Meeting 12
Monday April 21, 2014
6:00pm, Price Center Forum

- I. Call to Order [6:05pm]
- II. Approval of Agenda
 - A. *Motion to move* Finance Bills to #6 after Conduct Presentation, *seconded*
 - B. *Move to strike* the presentation from the Legislative Liaison, *seconded*
 - C. *Motion to approve*, *seconded*
- III. Old Business - Approval of Council Meeting 11 Minutes
 - A. *Motion to approve*, *seconded*
- IV. Public Comments and Announcements
 - A. Rahul: Chancellor approved 3% pay raise for faculty and staff. It was brought up that the raise is not being given to people on the GSR. We talked to Dean Barrett and starting this summer GSR salaries will go up 3%. OGS will give 3% more money to departments in the hope they will give that money to you
 - B. Timia: Walking Food Tour during Memorial Day Weekend
 - C. Ted: GSA Community Awards tomorrow at the Loft 5-7pm, free food
 - D. Lindsay: Roaming Social Hour next Thursday 5/1 hosted by Scripps
 - E. Jon: This Friday is the Spring Fling, Ballroom West, karaoke band due to under-spending of budget, starts at 730pm
- V. Presentation on Revisions to Student Conduct Code: Ben White, Director of Student Conduct
 - A. The Office of Student Conduct provides leadership for the student conduct process at UCSD, is the central authority on conduct, and trains conduct officers, AS advocates, judicial officers, etc. The Student Conduct Code was derived from relevant UCOP policies
 - B. Revision process: key revisions to the Conduct Code and Student Regulations
 1. 2009-2012: long and intense revision process; the Code hadn't been updated properly or regularly. We decided that every year we would take a look at it and revise it. Nothing too drastic but just so we don't have more issues later
 2. We are proposing several changes for implementation in fall 2014. The group reviewed and proposed the changes, and now we're in the community comment stage. This stage is open until May 19 to get feedback from the campus.
 - C. Key revisions:

1. Centralization of reviews for college judicial boards. Before, those reviews were administered and facilitated by the Dean's Office of each college. We don't have many, only around 20 cases per year. With this small number and seven different offices, no one was getting good at the process so we decided to centralize to just our office, as they are for Community Boards.
2. Clarification of sanction recommendation process. Sanction recommendations are made by boards and review officers to the original review officer; the original review officer then makes the final sanction decision. It's not written clearly: nothing is specific and there was a lot of confusion, so we clarified it. Recommendations are now specified to be non-binding: the original review officer makes the decision independently.
3. Clarification of Medical and Pharmacy School students, who were in the past sanctioned by both their professional committees and by the school. We changed it so only the professional committee makes the decision, to avoid the double-punishment.
4. Preservation of suspension decisions: currently, we hold suspension decisions forever. We revised it so now only dismissals are held indefinitely and suspensions are held for 7 years like everything else
5. New dating violence and stalking standards: they've been broadened and essentially watered down. We've given our input: it's important to have a continuum of behavior. Stalking is not just annoying behavior, it must be reasonable for someone to believe they are in danger as a result of the behavior.
6. We established a central group for multi-region cases (ie students from different colleges)
7. Renamed from "Student Regulations" to "Student Standards." We re-ordered them: before they used to be penal code-like, but now it follows the Code's format. We reordered it to show priority of each aspect.
8. Updated basic student rights: health care put it in the front as a priority.
9. Registered student organization policy: took out a large portion that was redundant
10. Looking to make a universal alcohol policy, not one that is based only on events

D. GSA and grad involvement in the conduct process

1. GSA can have two reps but for the last year or so, there has only been one. We would like to see more involvement from graduate students.
 2. Community Standards Board: we only have 3 graduate reps although we can have 6. It's important to have grad students' perspective on tricky cases as well as in cases involving graduate students. We don't have many cases so it's just going to review session and being available.
 3. We've talked to the graduate community before about having a graduate student advocate. Undergrads have AS advocates; it's important for grad students to have someone on their level to go to and get help from during the process.
- E. Next steps: Comment period from 4/23-5/9. We've asked UCOP for their comments as well. After this stage, we will do one last revision by SCSG, then pass it on on to VCSA Houston and finally the Chancellor for their approval. We hope to get it to the Chancellor by the end of the school year so we can use the summer to implement
- F. Questions:
1. Regarding the alcohol policy: so it's being revised now but soon?
 - a) We're planning to do a full review of the policy, as it hasn't been reviewed in years. It's hard to decipher; there are a lot of things about campus events but not the actual policy. We want to make it a lot more known and visible.
 2. I just want to reiterate that the stalking language was rewritten to be very broad and vague, and eliminates a lot of the limitations that the previous code had
 - a) The way it is now, it's too restrictive. It's like "unwanted contact," not necessarily danger or threat to safety

VI. Finance Bills

- A. GRF 13. \$3000 for LASO, 250 students expected
 1. *Move to approve, seconded*
 - B. GRF 14. \$500 for BEGS and BioEast, expecting 60 grad students.
 1. *Move to approve, seconded*
 - C. GRF 15. \$80 for Opportunities for Scientists (alongside academia)
 1. *Move to approve, seconded*
- ## VII. Review of UC San Diego Library and Librarian: Roger Bohn
- A. We're interested in your comments on the UCSD library system
 1. I've had positive experiences with the system. The BioMed library's email notification and the large amount of time you can hold on to books is an improvement.

2. I received a notice about my book getting recalled. I have certain issues with the recall system: I expected to have the book for much longer.
3. Do a better job of IOL, how it works, etc. About the recall system, maybe establish some type of recall protocol; see who recalls the book so you can personally meet with them.
4. I have a problem with not being able to browse the journals and about the closing of the Scripps Library. We lost a source of knowledge; I used to visit 2-3 times a week. We also lost the Script Collection
 - a) Can you recall hearing about the closing?
 - (1) They remained open for another quarter after the protest and suddenly closed down
 - b) A lot of the journals are already digitized, how would you comment on this?
 - (1) I'm still concerned about the browsing
5. I'd like to see everything digitized, especially classic books
 - a) There is copyright issues about this, especially older books
6. Something I found: library states it has access to a particular, but students on campus can't access it. Improvement: set up a centralized system for this issue
7. There is no library access in Scripps; no public computer lab/ university computer or study space for people at Scripps
8. In term of digitalize, can we possibly digitalize the older journal that I know the library has? There is a journal I can't get from anywhere- you have to purchase the PDF
 - a) On top of that, e-link only gives you an abstract of the journal
9. Is there any way to request library to subscript a particular journal ?
 - a) Yes, you can request it but no guarantee that they will
10. Are there only two scanners? Because of that, it takes a long time to scan material. I'd like to see a larger format scanner in the library

VIII. Presentation of GSA Budget 2014-15: Negin Nazarian, VP Financial Affairs [10 mins]

- A. For service fee, we used to pay 30K in the past two years and this year we reduced to 12K, AS pays 1.75 FTE
- B. Can we go over the executive funding?
- C. VP finance: We have bi-weekly Council Meeting, and we are requesting a fund especially for council dinners. We do have this fund this year but from a different source

1. In the past years, executives have to use other source for the dining, such as from the discretionary budget.
 2. What is the actual money spent this past year?
 - a) VP Finance: \$30-40 / meeting , w/ 20 GSA executives.
- D. VP finance: There is also a conversation about the budget for UCSA, which is \$7500.
1. There are both pro and cons about UCSA. In term of cons, UCSA haven't gotten much better. Majority of its funding used on traveling to different lobbies--that money could be better used. However, UCSA is presenting a collective voice; as UCSA goes to lobby together, they empower all the others. They have their own staffs and professional people working on these issues.
 2. We are not having any debate, this is just the first preview of the budget breakup. If you have any comment on the budget breakup, any related suggestions should go to finance committee first and we will review/debate them again in the council meeting.
 3. Again, we should considered it carefully, since it's a good amount of money. We still have 2 more weeks for consideration.
- E. VP finance: GSA events: There are couple changes on the GSA event fund. Orientation event: because of the number of attendance and the history of the event. Cultural has been increased, there is request from the culture coordinator because people found those events interesting,
- F. Diversity fund: added to the university request fund decrease. This fund has been running low this year. We would like to add the dollar amount per grad students. Confusion arose about how the money will be spent. Recall the history of confusion that happened: there were some events that received funding from both funds.
- G. A plea for all reps: bring questions to next meeting and will be addressed to the next meeting
- H. VP finance: I will set up a separate meeting regarding this issue
- I. It seems like these are policy changes more than allocation changes. The question will still be there. I prefer a policy change.
- J. Suggestion: there are success matrices, which should be useful in person.
- K. You said there are increases in the funding, yet the number is the same on the screen
1. It will go up by \$5000
- L. What are the differences between the funds?
1. VP finance: university fund has specific process to go through, diversity event fund is the fund used to outreach to the other groups, discretionary fund is used by the executives to enhance the

office

- M. Interested in increasing the orientation funding since there are a thousand grad students. It is important to leave a good impression, thus I would like to increase this budget.
- N. I have asked the cultural events budget to be increased, so I can have more funding for movie events. I had a lot of positive feedback about the cultural events and would like more money to put on more events
 - 1. There are limitations on the movie events; there are only a limited amount of students who are able to participate.
- O. Organizations should be representing themselves
- IX. Presentation on Graduate Mentorship Workgroup: Timia Crisp/Lynn Waterhouse
 - A. Asking the Reps to respond to the survey that was sent out. In order for us to ask the rights questions, we need responses so we can tailor the program for your needs.
- X. Appointments
 - A. Cory Stevenson for Single Grad Housing Representative
 - 1. *Motion to approve, seconded*
- XI. Call for Council Meeting 13 Agenda Items
- XII. Adjourn [7:17pm]