

Council Meeting #13
Monday, May 5, 2014
6:00pm, Price Center Forum

- I. Call to Order [6:07pm]
- II. Approval of Agenda
 - A. *Motion to move* Finance Bills to after Public Comments and Announcements, *seconded*
 - B. *Motion to add* Mukanth as Finance Budget presenter
 - C. *Motion to approve*, *seconded*
- III. Old Business - Approval of Council Meeting 12 Minutes
 - A. *Motion to approve*, *seconded*
- IV. Public Comments and Announcements
 - A. About 5 walking food tour tickets left; get them fast
 - B. Robby Boparai: newly elected AS president, here to sit in on the meeting. Really open and willing to work with GSA to push initiatives forward
 - C. Roaming social hour this Friday, 5pm, hosted by Skaggs
 - D. Transportation referendum will be voted on Week 8. We have lots of posters, please take them back to your departments. We need to do info sessions and other outreach initiatives; let Ted know if you are interested. Let people know questions can be directed to Ted as well as neutral links on the fliers.
 - E. Town Hall/discussion from the EDI office tomorrow in the Dolores Huerta room at 1pm about the campus climate survey. Open forum; there will be food
- V. Finance Bills
 - A. APRF 13: professional headshots for students in the Literature department
 1. First time doing this?
 - a) Yes, if it is popular we will make it regular
 2. *Motion to approve*, *seconded*
 - B. DRF 10: \$250 for dinner hosted by SIO students to foster celebration of cultures. Money for food and beverages
 1. *Motion to approve*, *seconded*
- VI. Presentation on 5-week Mini-MBA Program: Steven Rees
 - A. PhDs often end up in management roles in the lab, etc but don't have any business or leadership training so we had this idea of a mini-MBA. I participated in one and found it really helpful, reached out to Harvard and found out they provide a low-cost introductory course.

- B. We're getting stakeholders; talking to Dean Barrett and Dean of the Rady School. We're pushing this idea to you today to ask for your help in promoting this and answering any questions.
- C. Details: would be twice a week, each course 1.5 hours, 10 lectures in 5 weeks. It would be taught by Rady professors. The tentative schedule is June-mid July depending on faculty availability. The book is the "10-day MBA" and course will include interactive activities like coffee chats with business leaders, etc
- D. Cost break down: book, business cases (\$5 each) and paying professors: \$150. Benefit: figuring out if a full MBA is something you should pursue; fast and inexpensive; will look good on a resume; networking.
- E. OGS Dean has expressed support and so has Rady Dean. We're working closely with Rady. We sent out a survey to see general interest and willingness to pay for this course. We had 180+ responses. Most people available June-July and willing to pay. We want to get the word out to all the departments and see what works best for grad students; would appreciate any help in publicizing
- F. Questions?
 - 1. Considered having more than one class? (ie two classes in the same summer)
 - a) We could, we'll have to gauge interest
 - b) This is a pilot program, we don't want to invest too much before we see the amount of interest
 - 2. Closed to only current UCSD students?
 - a) Yes, for now only UCSD PhD/postdocs, including Scripps, SIO students.
 - b) Up to 300 people now, the idea is spreading but we do want to prioritize UCSD students
 - 3. Likelihood of accreditation? And what if I take the class and then it gets accredited?
 - a) We will discuss this later once we know how many students sign up. It probably won't happen this year or anytime soon.
 - (1) No retroactive accreditation?
 - (a) I doubt it will ever get accredited, some schools may just give you 2-3 credits towards a full MBA. In general this isn't something where you need a certification to get the value of it. What's important are the skills you learn for increased fluency in business.

(b) Plus faculty will want more money to teach accredited courses

(c) To add: Academic Senate will have to approve for accreditation and they are slow

4. What about IR/PS? We do have an international business focus.

a) This is primarily for people who don't have the opportunity to get that training within their coursework. For example, Econ PhDs would have lower priority in the application process

5. Open to Masters students?

a) No, so far only PhD and postdocs

b) The application process is more about why and how you can use this. We'll work with Rady for selection of 100 students. We don't think what you study will have much bearing; we'll be looking at intentions/future goals

VII. Presentation on GSA Bill of Responsibilities and Rights: Jordan Gosselin, VP Academic Affairs

A. Long-term goal of the BORR: establish the role of grad students as junior colleagues of faculty. It clearly states our expectations of the university and their expectations of us. It's brought together from different policies

B. History: first written in 2010 and sent to Academic Senate; it was returned with lots of comments. We made revisions that were summarily reversed and sent back. We revised it a second time and took it directly to the Graduate Council in 2013. They made small changes but passed it. It was sent it on to the Senate, and informally we were told it would pass, but it wasn't.

1. Senate's concern is that it would be distributed and viewed as a legal document and would lead to the university getting sued.

C. We sent it back to the Senate and again it was sent back. A compromise was proposed to drop all the "rights" and rename them as "goals". We thought this was absurd, so we wrote a disclaimer that university policies and regulations prevail in the case of conflict.

D. Now: three possible options. 1) it gets rejected for the same reasons as before and we start over. 2) it gets endorsed by the Senate. 3) it gets conditionally endorsed by the Senate. We think 3) is most likely. We're not sure when will be sent back but were told it would be before the end of the year.

E. Where do we go from here? It depends on what happens with the Academic Senate. We've been in talks with the Academic Senate Chair in regards to the document and it seems possible that we get an endorsement that is longer than BORR. They have committed to getting it

through before summer (Senate membership changes in the summer)

F. Questions:

1. If administration wants something that's not enforceable, what does it mean to get their endorsement?
 - a) We want them to say that grad students do have these rights. They should be considered junior members of the academic community. One of the sticking points has been the first one and the right to an intellectual and diverse grad student community. The comment that comes back: we can't promise you that; we're totally unable to do that or even work on achieving that. We've been working on this for 5 years, so it seems we need new strategy
 - (1) Adding to this: we know it's symbolic, but it only works if the faculty agree to it. Senate endorsement gives it more credibility
2. Why can it not be brought to a level of a legal document? It could be a contract between grad students and the university. Lots of PPMs leave open questions and aren't legally enforceable.
 - a) Senate is worried about conflict between the language in this doc and the already-written policies and regulations
 - (1) We've been trying to take it to UCOP, but it just gets thrown around. President met with UC President Napolitano; we're trying all avenues. However the Senate is pretty influential and has the power to stop it
 - (2) OGS is on board, so we've already sent it around at orientation. Half of it is just continuing to fight.

VIII. ARCH Pet Policy Update: Cory Stevenson, ARCHAC Committee Representative

- A. We advise housing about pet policy. Staff dominates the committee membership. We also hear housing appeals: we get a lot of appeals for exceptions to the 2-year policy, which don't usually get approved.
- B. Pet policy: we've been discussing for a while. We need a clear definition and standardized rules that keep in mind admin considerations while following student needs.
- C. There were issues with the current policy, so we sent a survey: 1211 respondents. Results were polarized with lots of comments. 80% were okay with dogs in the community, 60% okay with dogs in unit, 23% not okay with any pets in unit. 10% already have pets

- D. The committee approved a new policy that is similar to the old one but with better defined consequences and rules for enforcement. Things are better defined: what you can have and where
 - E. We also passed the budget. Tried to lock in prices for the next few years, but there have been increases: 3.3% increase for '14 and '15.
 - F. Questions:
 - 1. What were the main points against relaxing the pet policy?
 - a) Staff often goes the easy route when things come to ARCHAC. Housing is okay with relaxed policy but the committee just wanted to get it over with. Another issue was potential cost, because dogs can cause damage, and issue with the fact that some students just don't want to deal with pets at all: possible roommate issues, etc.
 - G. One thing that was brought up is that there is no mandate for a pet policy because the survey was not totally positive. Grad students should consider in the future to give ARCHAC a mandate
- IX. UCEN Budget Update: Daniel Jacobsen, UCAB Committee Representative [10 mins]
- A. UCAB advises over UCEN locations. \$76 fee → UCEN budget. Also included: rent from vendors
 - B. We're trying to increase the budget through new attractions: lemongrass chicken from the farmers market, Starbucks to take over Cafe Roma. Starbucks was the top choice for the new coffee place; also adding Taco Villa in the Old Student Center. Starbucks will be franchised, so we pay Starbucks some money and keep most of the revenue. It'll be managed by the university, as opposed to old business model where outsiders manage the vendors.
 - C. UCEN currently in a spending deficit of \$1.5 million dollars. Lots of deferred maintenance that is building up. We've considered many solutions: considered charging student orgs for usage, bringing in non-food vendors to PC, reducing facility hours, but none of them help the deficit too much,
 - D. Biggest change: Che Cafe: June 30 deadline to address \$850,212 worth of safety violations. Proposed: move Che to Old Student Center until UCEN can do the renovations. Che has not been a nonprofit organization for several years, and if they're moved they don't have to be; will also get a new kitchen, space from Porter's etc. Won't have to pay rent, insurance etc → save UCAB some money.
 - E. Fee referendum: not feasible along with transportation fee increase but UCAB has been in a deficit for a while. Fee planned for Winter 2015 (has

not been increased since '90s). Revitalization of Che would come from this fee

F. Questions:

1. Last year, GSA rescinded the MoU with Che and AS kept it. They need both to operate, so how have they been able to do so this year?
 - a) Basically UCAB just puts Che into default every 30 days. Every 30 days they rescind the default then redo the process the next day while they present progress towards nonprofit status. They have been making progress and they are really close, can get it in 3 months
2. What is the average hourly cost of keeping PC open?
 - a) Pretty low, because we only save \$19000 for closing it for 5-6 hours through the whole year. Whatever we save by closing we probably lose through profits

X. Presentation on Legislative Liaison for State and Local Affairs: Lobby Corps:
Holly Dembinski

- A. Lobbying efforts: CA state budget is up for approval in mid-May. We need more money as it stands, but now the government's budget proposal isn't matching the Regent's proposals
- B. SB 259/AB 1834: allow grad students to be viewed by the university as employees (more rights, ie healthcare, right to unionize, etc)
- C. A few other acts: energy efficiency, pregnancy discrimination (would allow students who get pregnant to be viewed as employees, not students) and Career Pathways Internship program
- D. Lobby Corps: training with UCSA Legislative Director Sean Connelly. Also met with Toni Atkinson's office and SLC
- E. UCSA: as Leg. Liaison, I along with the VPE travel to meet with UCSA's Board of Directors often. UCSA allows us to be viewed as the collective voice of UC students. Would just like to share that there's a lot of value (inherent knowledge, institutional memory and resources) to staying in UCSA but a lot of time/energy/effort could go towards lobbying if I weren't travelling to these meetings every weekend

XI. Motion on withdrawing from membership to University of California Student Association (UCSA) - Ash Arianpour, VP External Affairs

- A. I've worked with UCSA for 2 years. Last year: two motions to leave UCSA. Back then I supported UCSA but now my recommendation is to leave UCSA for one year as a trial, and concentrate on lobbying efforts, go meet with the actual people in Sacramento, etc. It's better in my opinion than sitting in a room with students writing up symbolic resolutions and will

save us \$7500 while allowing more students direct lobbying experience

B. Questions:

1. UCSA's objective is to represent students as a whole. What are the issues that are preventing UCSA from being effective?
 - a) Lots of bickering/drama, personal attacks and little things. First resolution of this year was to condemn Israel, and it took 2 hours. It was difficult to figure out to navigate the association. Next meeting: resolution to support Nicaraguan unions that are responsible for the stitching of our UCSD sweaters, then two more meetings about the Israel resolution.
 - b) Also, there was the idea for a grad student report card about how Congress votes in terms of budget. Because of political ties, UCSA didn't want to be honest on the report card to avoid offending political allies.
 - c) *Point of information*: Is there a motion? Or are we just discussing?
 - (1) Discussing the motion to leave UCSA
2. In regard to the one year, what's your expectation of change and how would the Council evaluate that next year?
 - a) You can always be assessing, looking at minutes and resolutions, and seeing what UCSA is actually accomplishing or trying to do. We can always go back; fees are paid quarterly. Next year, we need to look at their concentrated lobbying efforts.
3. If UCSA were ideal, how could it act? ie what should we be looking for next year when we reasses>
 - a) The biggest thing is the ideological differences and the amount of bickering. There have been motions for compromise, but things get pushed through by whoever has the numbers/majority. Every campus has new leadership each year, making it difficult to work together. In an ideal world, UCSA would be a perfect advocate with UCOP, Regents, etc
4. How many other UCs are withdrawing?
 - a) Lots of them, Merced and Davis have already left. Hastings and Davis undergrads aren't members. Almost ever group every year has this conversation. There was a push for two separate UCSAs, one for undergrads and one for grads; would be ideal.

- b) AS President: UCI just withdrew and our AS will be seriously considering and assessing our membership in UCSA (not sure yet if we'll withdraw)
 - (1) AS undergrad EVP was great this year, UCSD undergrads and grads have worked together very well this year and hope it'll continue
- 5. Seems like the majority of student associations are re-evaluating so how did the situation get like this?
 - a) One story i want to tell: 2 African-American EVPs, one named Melissa and one Marissa. Director was accused of racism for confusing the two: one example of the kind of discord that UCSA faces every meeting.
- 6. Leg. Liaison: a lot of my time is spent at UCSA. I do see the value in the mission, but we can always enter or exit every quarter. GSA could do great things with LL and EVP if we weren't tied up with UCSA
 - a) UCSA traditionally acts as a link between campus and UCOP. But this year we've revitalized the Council of Presidents, and all the GSA and AS presidents meet with UCOP and we have a good connection with the office.
- 7. Proposed use of the \$7500 we are saving?
 - a) Discussed in Finance Committee and will be presented in the budget presentation. EVP doesn't have a preference but something useful
- 8. As the next EVP, I just want everyone to keep in mind that I have ideas for the two Leg. Liaison roles; we can move the roles in a new direction.

C. *Motion to leave UCSA, seconded*

- 1. But do we have language?
 - a) Motion to withdraw from UCSA membership
 - (1) Immediately or next year? And do we include a mandate for next year's council to revisit in Spring 2015?
 - (2) Language on CR-08 written, see attached
- 2. Vote: 24-0-3 on Council Resolution 8, CR 8 passes

XII. Presentation of GSA Budget 2014-15: Negin Nazarian, VP Financial Affairs

- A. Mukanth from finance committee presenting. We have rollover of \$5000 and unused department funds.
- B. Changes:

1. Deduction in exec salaries due to the VP Internal having been cut. Appointed salaries have increased to include Chief of Staff and second Social Coordinator added and to reflect Webmaster being cut. Student Worker amount increased to reflect addition of Webmaster
2. Add \$1000 to exec dinner fund.
3. Add amount for graduate appreciation dinner
4. GSA executive training amount increased for next year's council
5. Grad events fund: want more grad student participation in community awards. Deductions in quarterly Free-for-Alls, was able to plan these under budget this year.
6. Diversity events fund: transferring to Diversity request funds due to increase in demand for funds from there. Detailed conversation about the two funds, which will be continued next year.
7. Lots of interest in the events conducted by Cultural Coordinator so increasing that fund for more events
8. Branding fund: mugs, merchandise, etc
9. Summer event fund since lots of grad students are on campus over the summer; added some funds for an event
10. Would like to add \$1 → \$7/person guideline and up the funding guideline accordingly (used to be \$3-\$6/person) and come up with new metrics to assess event success as well

C. Questions:

1. VPI and Webmaster removed, so how much did the student worker cost increase?
 - a) \$4000. We decided to relegate most of the admin work to the student workers so we expect the hours they work to increase
2. *Motion to remove* the Branding item and add it to the Cafe Vita fund, which is currently \$0, *no second, motion dies*.
 - a) *Point of information*: that line item was used when it was run as a Cafe. The way it stands that line item doesn't exist.
 - (1) Rationale behind motion: since that space is being run by GSA, money might be needed just to maintain it occasionally. It also seems we can use the money to promote Cafe Vita and get grad students involved rather than sell merchandise, which would not be as effective
 - b) Would like to add: should think of these as two different motions. We are adding Chief of Staff and one of their

bylaws is to market the GSA brand, and having a budget item would create some incentive for creative marketing and getting more participation

3. What will the extra money for training be used for?

a) Last year training was 2 hours, we had pizza and received an intro to GSA. We want more participation and appreciation--ie maybe something at a fancier location like the Loft.

D. *Motion to call the question, seconded*

1. Vote: 24-0-1, budget passes.

XIII. Appointments

XIV. Call for Council Meeting 14 Agenda Items

XV. Adjourn [7:55pm]