GSA Lounge Assembly Meeting Minutes 6:00 p.m. January 8th, 2003

I. **Approval of Agenda** (15 sec) (This requires a quorum, and may be amended now or during the meeting.)

Started at 6:06pm. Jess Barrie motioned to approve the agenda, and Andrea Haupt seconded. Motion approved by unanimous consent.

II. **Approval of Minutes:** (15 sec) (See the web page, or pick up printouts of the December Minutes for review.)

Matthew Armstrong motioned to approve the minutes, and Daniel Mandell seconded. Motion approved by unanimous consent.

III. **Announcements** from **Graduate Division** and/or **Student Affairs**: (5 min)

Departments are in midst of admissions and recruiting season—apps to UCSB up 50% over same time last year. Many departments will be asking for assistance, meeting with prospective students and such. Please take the time to offer this assistance, as it will benefit UCSB.

IV. **Information Items (Vox Populi!)** (<1 min each, if no one asks questions… otherwise longer. If you submit something in advance, I add it, shorten where possible, add a synopsis, and read the synopsis if you want. I will read what is underlined, for emphasis, and move on if no one asks questions.)

A. **How to end debate and bring a motion to a vote, AKA Calling the Question:** If someone "calls the question" (a.k.a. "move the previous question") it does not immediate cut off debate. The motion to end debate must be seconded and the Assembly, by a two-thirds vote, must approve ending debate and voting on the question. [Ref.: Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, 10th ed. (2000) page 189-201] (Edward Collins, suggestion by Alan Levy)

B. **How to move an item to next month's agenda:** If someone moves to "table the motion" until the next meeting, and it is seconded, the motion can be tabled by a majority vote. (Edward Collins)

Edward discussed items A and B for reference for the current and future assembly meetings.

C. **Next Month- Invited Speaker- Library:** Please send in any questions you would like the University Librarian to address to: president@gsa.ucsb.edu (requested by Sarah Pritchard, University Librarian)

D. **APCC Committee Report:** The Long Range Academic Development Plan is in the final review process. Please review the plan and make comments as appropriate. See Appendix V for details.

E. **Student Immigrant Detentions**: Some odd detentions of international students have occurred, but this has not affected UCSB yet. Office of International Students and Scholars has been on top of things, and more info is available at: http://www.oiss.ucsb.edu/AnnouncementsNL.htm

A series of "visa checks" imposed on immigrants of Arabic/Persian origin (particularly Iranians, this first wave) has resulted in teenagers and older men being detained in LA pending clarification of their status and background checks.

The pretense for these detainments has been a request to voluntarily come in with their documents for a check on their status. Apparently, any irregularities with their applications (late filing of required forms, for example), has resulted in arrest and detainment. Their status is now uncertain, as this is the first time the INS has put this new policy into effect, and it seems they did not expect so many people to come in voluntarily. Many of these people have been living in the U.S. for years, and are close to getting permanent residency. Needless to say, this is not a great approach to curbing possible terrorist threats, and is not the greatest protection of civil liberties.

OISS has been contacted, and a response is expected. Further information will be posted.

F. **Problems with providing a reasonably priced GSHIP plan for spouses/partners and children**:

Summary: The problems with providing a reasonably priced GSHIP plan for spouses/partners and children include: 1) Low numbers of participants increase risks to the insurer and increase the plan cost. 2) The optional plan may attract more people who know in advance that they will need the services, which also tends to increase cost.

The GSA welcomes people interested in meeting to pursue better options.

Text: Unlike the GSHIP plan for graduate students, The GSHIP plan for spouses/partners and children is voluntary. This causes the following problems:

1) The number of participants is usually low. When you have several hundred or more "random" people in an insurance plan you can make some pretty good estimates of what is going to happen based on what is known about the larger population. A very small number of participants in a plan makes possible very large variations in usage from year to year, making the plan risky for the insurance company. Risk is partially managed by charging more.

2) The participants in the plan are more likely to be heavy users. Large plans like GSHIP accept all individuals who qualify regardless of health condition. GSHIP must also accept any spouses/partners and children who qualify and apply. Most individual plans require underwriting where the company examines the person's medical history to decide if selling that person insurance is a good risk. By not accepting people with expensive pre-existing conditions, the insurance company can reduce risk, the money they spent taking care of people, and, thus, the cost of the plan. This means that people who cannot get insurance except through GSHIP are more likely than average to be people who will be heavy users of the insurance. People who rarely use their health coverage are more likely to find a different plan (perhaps a cheaper one with lower benefit levels). This tends to make GSHIP more expensive for the spouses/partners and children who do sign up.

So what are our options? Making GSHIP mandatory for all spouses/partners and children is not really workable or necessarily desirable. Encouraging a large number of spouses/partners and children to sign up and commit to sticking with the plan for several years is a possibility but also probably difficult to manage. Also, we don't actually know how many graduate students have spouses/partners and/or children. The number may be relatively small. Other possibilities include helping people find good individual plans or government programs and funding grants to help people pay for insurance for spouses/partners and children. The GSA needs interested graduate students willing to become educated on GSHIP and think about these issues to commit to spending some time discussing options and make recommendations to the GSHIP Committee and the GSA.

Alan Levy, 01/07/2003 (requested by Edward Collins, GSA President)

Reminder: The Women's Center gave partial child-care scholarships from initiative-generated funds.

G. Submissions from the floor:

Isabelle, EVP statewide affairs—statewide conference on Feb 28-Mar 2, dealing with war and how it affects the different communities. If you would like to participate or get more information, attend SCORE meetings, Tuesdays 6:30pm, at the MCC. Participation could include set-up work, fundraising & grant writing, and getting more workships.

V. **Invited Speaker- Student Health Service:** (presentation: 5-10 min, discussion 10 min) (Separate handout) Doctor Cynthia Bowers will be presenting on future plans at SHS. This presentation is separate and distinct from the following GSHIP options request discussion.

Dr. Bowers gave a presentation that pointed out the wealth of information available at the Student Health Services website, including lists of available services, health education, the "Distressed Students Guide", after-hours care information, and online forms. In addition, SHS is planning improvements, online and service-based, so please let them know what would be helpful to you and your students. The SHS website is at http://www.sa.ucsb.edu/studenthealth/index.asp

VI. **Discussion Items:** (5-10 min. each. No decision planned this meeting, possible vote at the next meeting.)

A. **GSHIP Option Requests**: (3 min presentation by Alan Levy, 7 min discussion) Now is the time for option requests to be included in the quotes that we then use to select both a provider and the plan options. We send our current plan out for bid. The "base" plan will be our current plan. As we have been duly warned, we can probably expect a 20-50% increase in premium to keep the same benefits for 2003-2004. Please e-mail your suggestions to gship@gsa.csb.edu, or fill out a suggestion form, found in Appendix 5. A list of requests as of Tuesday is attached in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 has a list of cost cutting plan reduction ideas as of Tuesday.

Stu Levenbach asked about pricing – when will we be able to get it, specifically if we cut options.

Alan Levy responds: theoretically, we could get the prices for deleting some/all of these things, but we don't want to ask for everything we can think of, as each option will add significant discussion time (30 min to 2 hours, each). So please choose options that are reasonable and worth considering.

George Fujii asks: is everything in appendix 1 and 2 going to be priced? How many packages will come from these suggestions?

Alan Levy responds: these are from emails that he's received over the last month; cuts are his suggestions based on past results. Right now, we have about 14 options to consider (there are about 10-20 options for discussion each year). When we get prices back, the GSHIP committee may edit out some options based on results. Furthermore, some of these suggestions may not make it to proposal stage, depending on how these can be turned in to proposable options.

Casey asks: Why does physical therapy need to be increased?

Alan Levy responds: we're gathering data on usage now, and will have more to say in a month. We received an email from someone needing PT, who said that $500 is not enough—it only gets you 5-6 visits, which is not enough for recovery from surgery. Though we have PT here, it's limited, and some PT must be referred out.

Casey states: More information would be helpful—it doesn't seem like the jump in PT fees is reasonable, given the fact that some percentage of PT is done through SHS.

Edward Collins responds: We'll get this information and factor it into the decision.

Alan Levy responds: Nothing is certain—just because something's on the list, we won't necessarily do it. This is a very early stage of information gathering, more of a wish list.

Edward Collins notes: The next GSHIP meeting (spring quarter) will have pricing information, which will allow better cost/benefit information. The third meeting is the one at which we vote, after you have had time to take this information to your constituents.

Valerie asks: The benefit reductions affect everybody, but the wish list seems very specific—can't we balance this out a bit more?

Alan Levy responds: We're open to suggestions of a broad-based nature, but haven't received any. It turns out that 75% of health spending fall into 5 very broad categories; the planned cuts are aimed at these 5 categories, to allow maximal savings. Hence, cutting little-used benefits won't save us much money. Furthermore, the wish list items, while specific, are important to those who need it, and again these won't cost us much if they aren't widely used; trying to improve things that the majority of people use is going to be more expensive.

Daniel Mandrell asks: Regarding the parity act/non-parity act split, aren't non-serious conditions more likely to affect people?

Alan Levy responds: We don't know, and we need to gather data on this, specifically which ailments must be treated with same level of treatment as debilitating physical conditions.

At 15 minutes discussion, Andrea Haupt motions to extend time by 5 minutes. Kathy Meyer seconds. Motion approved by unanimous consent.

Daniel Mandrell asks: How much are these increases in coverage likely to cost?

Alan Levy responds: Last increases were around $2-$5 per quarter.

Edward Collins responds: All decisions for additions were very conservative, as will be decisions for reductions. If you have a suggestion for a reduction, please submit it, but consider the need basis of these options, and the potential for crippling debt if an option is or is not included.

Casey asks: I know there are problems with providing GSHIP for spouses and children, but it's still in appendix 1—are we still proposing this?

Alan Levy responds: We don't know right now, and we don't have any options to consider how to make it more reasonable; there are some structural problems with the current plan that makes it nearly impossible to solve through insurance.

George Fujii asks: What percent increase is the GSHIP committee looking for?

Alan Levy responds: Historically, we've wanted to stay within 10%, and have usually met this or come in very close. We can't think about monies going to departments, but we can think about grad-wide money. That said, 10% might not be reasonable this round, so we may be looking at closer to 15%.

Edward Collins responds: If the governor gets his way, cost of education will go up 20%. It's already gone up 10%, so now we need to balance where we're going to hit our pocketbooks. So, for instance, if the insurance increase is 18%, this is more difficult given our fee increases.

At 5 minutes, Andrea Haupt motions to extend time. There is no second. Motion not approved.

Edward: Please email gship@gsa.ucsb.edu with questions and suggestions.

B. **Fee Increase:** (15 min) In a special session during Dead Week, the UC Regents, (anticipating pending cuts by the State of California), have increased fees by $150 per quarter starting next quarter. The Chancellor has asked me about the impact on graduate students. (It will likely happen again.)

From the Mercury News: "College students should also brace for another hit. While leaders of the University of California and California State University systems this week voted to raise student fees by about 10 percent, the governor's plan assumes that they will push the costs up another 20 percent next year." http://www.bayarea.com/mld/mercurynews/news/4780949.htm

Stu Levenbach motions to table this discussion. Matthew Allen seconds. Motion approved by unanimous consent.

Edward Collins asks: Please email me if you have problems or information regarding these fee increases.

C. **U.C. Policy Change Discussion**: (5 min): Final comments are requested for a GSA response to a UCOP Policy change affecting students and student organizations.

Edward Collins notes: we have discussed this in the past; refer to prior emails, and I will email it again.

VII. Action Items: (A motion, second, is necessary, and then consent / vote / table of the motion is required.)

A. **Arts and Lectures Election Petition:** (Handout by A&L) Through a straw poll, the GSA gave a strong indication of willingness to put an A&L funding initiative on the ballot. Wording must be developed, and a motion is required. Amendments are appropriate, but require consent of the authorized representative. (They need to be willing and able to provide services.)

Edward Collins: We need a plan, and it would be good to get it done today. We need to say "for X amount of fee increase, A&L will provide Y."

Jess Barrie motions to propose the plan as included in Appendix VII and VIII. Mark Yeary seconds. Motion approved by unanimous consent.

George Fujii: the two sections under "fiscal crisis": to clarify, is the $2 fee going to cover both student subsidies and maintain non-student prices?

Celesta Billeca: This is our goal, but we're not sure if $2 is enough.

A student asks: What is your annual operating budget?

Celesta: between $1.3 and $1.4 million.

Casey: Why a four-year proposal?

Celesta: This is what we went to undergrads with. It's not firm, and can be changed, but 4 years builds more of a relationship with grad students; however, we're not tied to it.

Stu Levenbach: What was total event attendance last year?

Celesta: We are in process of getting this information, and will have it from the MSO soon.

Stu Levenbach: We still need to know what percentage of students attend.

Celesta: Also, we don't currently track grad versus undergrad, but we can estimate that 7500 out of 30000

(25%) are grad students.

Matt Andrews: I asked about 50 grad students if they attended at least one lecture, and nearly everyone said yes, so percentage of attendance is probably high.

Andrea Haupt: Agreed, and for the price of a Starbucks coffee, it's worth it.

Edward Collins: Regarding this measure, do we want stopgap or long-term solution? And if it's a long-term solution, do we want it applied toward work-study (internships) or ticket sales?

Daniel Mandrell: Have you heard any interest in these internships?

Celesta: I have heard informal requests, but did not follow up in the past due to lack of funding. Past experience shows me that this is valuable hands-on experience in a performing arts organization.

Matthew Armstrong: Will the internships be open to all, or just to performing arts?

Celesta: Open to all; furthermore, we can target internships that would benefit various departments, and we would have an advisory board when selecting internships?

George Fujii: The advisory board isn't in the ballot language, and it would be useful to add it.

George Fujii: From your experience, what's the breakout of performing vs. non-perf internships?

Celesta: About 50/50

Matthew Armstrong motions to add the following language to ballot: "Define the role and nature of student oversight committee in selecting internships." George Fujii seconds. Motion approved by unanimous consent.

George Fujii: we need to work out how the $2 is being spent. It's not clear if the benefits listed are guaranteed, or if they would be cut if these turn out to cost more than the proposed increase.

Celesta: every show is budgeted to the penny, and if less students show up than planned, we eat the difference. It would not be fiscally responsible.

Casey: so in the future, you may need to ask for a further increase?

Celesta: it's certainly possible, but unlikely, and this is the first increase we've asked for in our 44 years.

Matthew Armstrong: as long as we get a vote on it, it's not an issue.

Edward: this returns to the questions regarding oversight that have not yet been resolved.

Celesta: we're professionally trained to select and bring a well-balanced program. We're open to all suggestions, but creating an oversight committee won't help program selection.

Edward: putting it on the ballot means the people you represent can decide on it. But we want this to be good, so that the voters can make the best possible decision.

Jess: is this task better done in a smaller group?

Alan: we're trying to get ideas from people so that the exec committee can work on this.

Edward: we've spent 4-6 hours with A&L to produce as viable a package as possible, and it's here in the appendices. Now we need you to provide suggestions to improve.

Daniel Mandrell motions to leave the added language to the exec committee. Matthew Armstrong seconds. Motion approved by unanimous consent. Note that this tables the original motion to propose the plan as outlined in Appendix VII and VIII.

George: with the oversight committee, the exec committee needs to work out just what they'll do – oversee programming, funding, and such.

Valerie: I support you, but I have a serious problem with unqualified people affecting programming.

Celesta: I agree—through experience at UCLA, we had a similar problem, and eventually we went to the model that's in place here at UCSB.

Alan: how do you decide what to subsidize?

Celesta: if it comes to a split vote, grad/undergrad, then the grads will get discount and undergrads won't.

Alan: how did oversight committee work at UCLA?

Celesta: it was in an advisory function, discussing how A&L can best serve campus.

Edward: any oversight committee is subject to special interests, so use caution here. For instance, they can influence where the money goes.

Alan: similar functional committee in student health, so take note.

Stu Levenbach calls to question, and Matthew Armstrong seconds. No objection to consent.

B. **Constitution and Bylaws:** We discussed this at the last meeting, and could put things to a vote. I recommend tabling this until the next meeting, as I expect enough work from the A&L Petition and any remaining GSHIP suggestions.

Mark Yeary motions to table this item. Daniel Mandrell seconds. Motion approved by unanimous consent.

VIII. **Officer Reports**: (2 minutes) (Key points may be announced. The remainder is not read.)

A. **President**: Most key information ended up on the agenda**. <u>We need committee representatives</u>**, <u>particularly for IV-PAC. (VP-External assignment) The individual needs to live IN I.V., (not in adjacent campus-owned housing.)</u>

B. **VP Internal Affairs**: 3 points
Budget and planning meeting: we have a mid-year fee increase, but should anticipate another fee increase at beginning of next year.
We do have cuts, first affecting research projects, then agriculture and outreach programs.
Let's have another bagel hour, Tuesday 10 to 11:30, in addition to Wed. budget impact, about $100 per.
But since there's been more attendance, two bagel hours make sense.
Kathy proposes a trial period for Tuesday bagels – trial won't affect the budget.

C. **VP Academic Affairs**: not here

D. **VP Graduate Student Affairs**: nothing committee-wise since last meeting

E. **VP Budget and Finance:** There are no changes to the budget this month. Attached are the Fall 2002-2003 Committee Reports -- 11 committee reports for a total stipend payout of $1,175.00. If you served on a committee in the fall and would like to receive your stipend, please send in your report right away so it can be included at the next meeting. Departmental Rebates: GSA departments with a complete petition and a representative who has attended at least 2 General Assembly meetings, will have .50 per FTE transferred to their departmental GSA account within 10 days. Kathy Meyer, vp-budget@gsa.ucsb.edu

F. **VP Communications and Records**: Watch the GSA Web page and announcements.

G. **VP External Affairs**: we need someone for IV-PAC! It's a committee that's designed to make Isla Vista a better community: parking, housing, good stuff. It meets once or twice a month. Talk to me if you're interested! Also, we're interviewing for a new UC president, and they need students to serve on a committee to advise the search committee—it's a big commitment, but an important one as well. It requires travel, which would be funded (by them or by us).

IX. **Adjournment.** (A motion, second, is necessary, and then consent / vote is required.)

Daniel Mandrell motions to adjourn. Kathy Meyer seconds. Motion approved by unanimous consent. Meeting is adjourned at 7:45pm.