

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 5, 2004

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- Considered the report from the Funding Committee and approved the Committee's recommendations for Round 2 of Projects and Services, Round 3 of Grants, and Round 5 of Grad Events funding.
- Heard reports from GA Committees.
- Heard a presentation from Graduate Division Dean Mary Ann Mason
- Approved a Resolution Requesting University to Ensure Affordable Student Family Housing Before Initiating Demolition of UC Village "Section B."
- Approved a Resolution In Support of Affordable Textbooks.
- Heard a report on the GA Autonomy Committee and a petition for an initiative on the ASUC ballot.
- Approved Resolution Endorsing Proposition 56.
- Approved recommendations of the Finance Committee.
- Approved a Resolution to Support the Reinstatement of Affirmative Action In Washington State
- Approved a Resolution for a New Chancellor Who Is an Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Advocate.
- Approved a Resolution In Support of the English Language Program At UC Berkeley Extension
- Approved a Resolution In Opposition to Proposed Hikes In Graduate Student Fees.
- Approved a Resolution In Support of a Faculty Mentoring Task Force.
- Approved a proposal to establish GA Mentoring Awards to faculty.
- Heard a report from the Executive Board.
- Referred the Issue Of Fulbright Fellowships to the Academic Affairs Committee.
- Heard Officers' reports.

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing Spring Semester, was called to order by Jessica Quindel at 5:33 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Quindel said she would like to thank them for being there, and said they had a great

turnout. She hoped Delegates tell their departments what was going on in the GA and that they keep the GA informed on the big issues going on in their departments.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Quindel said the agenda printed in the packet was an older copy, so she needed a motion to add reports from the Executive Board and the Finance Committee under New Business. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. She called for any other changes to the agenda.

A Delegate moved to consider Funding Committee recommendations first. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Quindel called for a motion to approve the agenda, as amended. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Quindel said the GA's Web site was down, so next month they'd approve the minutes of the last meeting. A motion to table was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Report from the Funding Committee

Ms. Day moved to approve the recommendations of the Funding Committee. Ms. Quindel said they would give people two minutes to look through the recommendations.

Ms. Day said she had one clarification on the Grad Events recommendations. There were some blank spaces in the column "Comments/Restrictions." Groups that applied for more than one event were given a total amount, and had some flexibility on how the amount was distributed. If groups have any questions about them, they could send her an e-mail.

A motion to approve the Funding Committee recommendations was made and seconded.

Mr. Akiba asked about the discrepancies between the requested amounts and the final amounts awarded. Ms. Day said the Committee had to cut 75%. They had almost \$50,000 in requests and their budget was approximately \$9,000; and they went above that. So everybody received a 75% across-the-board cut. A Delegate noted that for a group that applied for multiple things, the group could spread out the allocation as it wished, and could get help with that from Shayla Moore.

Ms. Quindel called for any objection to approving the Funding Committee recommendations. THE FUNDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ROUND 2 OF PROJECTS AND SERVICES, ROUND 3 OF GRANTS, AND ROUND 5 OF GRAD EVENTS FUNDING, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

GA Announcements

Ms. Quindel said the Office of the Chancellor and the Academic Senate are really concerned about diversity on the campus and will hold a diversity roundtable. They want the participation of grads from different departments, with different opinions. They want to discover what diversity means to the campus community and how to accomplish the campus' pledge, "Excellence through Diversity." There will be three undergrad roundtables and six Academic Senate roundtables, with staff, alumni, and grads. So the GA can take about 15 people. A sign-up sheet and information was going around. The date is March 1.

Ms. Quindel said she got a call from the Daily Cal about the situation with Fulbright Fellowships. The paper wanted the GA's opinion on this. However, it wasn't on their agenda for that evening, so if people wanted to make a motion to discuss it as an urgent manner, that was a possibility. It was really unfortunate that these grads, in a time of budget cuts and fee increases, were denied these scholarships because the deadline was missed.

A motion to consider the question of Fulbright Fellowships under New Business was made and seconded. Mr. Sharma asked if this qualified as an emergency matter. A Delegate asked if there was anything the GA could do

about this. Mr. Akiba said this question wasn't publicized beforehand, and a two-thirds vote was needed to consider it. It was up to the Assembly to decide if this was an emergency matter to add to the agenda at that time.

Mr. Bailey asked if they'd just vote whether to discuss this under New Business or if there would be a discussion. Ms. Quindel said they would vote on adding it to the agenda. Mr. Bailey said the issue was having an immediate effect on people in his department and affected grads at-large. The GA should come up with a Resolution and investigate what they can do about this, since it concerns grads in general.

A Delegate said she thought this qualified as an emergency and was in favor of adding this to New Business. If they wait until March there might be nothing they can do. This was the GA's only opportunity to see if there's something they can do.

Ms. Quindel said that Dean Mason will be present at 6 o'clock and she might have some ideas on what they can do. Mr. Sharma said he would withdraw his point of order.

A motion to add the issue of Fulbright Fellowships to New Business was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Ms. Quindel called for any other GA announcements. Mr. Sharma said he hoped people received the request for they need writers and others to be affiliated with The Berkeley Graduate.

Ms. Madon said the National Labs and UC Affiliation Subcommittee met in January and they're asking everybody interested to send their recommendations for speakers or topics to be addressed at the spring forum regarding the University and the national labs. The deadline was in two weeks.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Valleé said that in his free time, he's done research on different organic restaurants in the East Bay area and compiled a list. People should be interested in this for their own health, since a lot of pesticides have been traced to neurological damage. They should also care for their children's health, since a lot of pesticides have never been tested on kids. And

third, they should care because of the health of the future generations, since it's been shown that soils contaminated with pesticides get burned, and with decreased yield. Fourth, they should care for the sake of the minority workers who work in the fields, where these pesticides are used, and their kids. That was just food for thought.

Ms. Khanjari introduced herself and said she was the ASUC representative to the Graduate Assembly, and it was nice to be there. She was there on behalf of student government, which is putting on the 4th Annual Women's Rights Conference on February 28, in Wheeler. She would pass around a list of workshops and speakers. The event is free and includes a free lunch and breakfast. No registration was required. Topics include reproductive freedom, health care, the feminization of poverty, and women's work in a transnational world. If people have any questions about this, they should let her know. They would love grads to turn out.

Ms. Madon said that on February 18, from 6:00 to 7:00, the GA was sponsoring peer mentoring and problem solving in their relationships, including research, career needs, interacting with collaborators, or communicating with their faculty advisors. People can meet with other grads with the same academic interests and form a grad problem-solving group. They'll e-mail out an announcement. This is a great opportunity to meet colleagues in their fields.

Ms. Gomez introduced herself and said she was Chair of the ASUC Senate. Next week "The Vagina Monologues" will be performed on the 12th and 13th on campus. Tickets will be sold on Sproul. There will be a show on the 11th for staff, faculty, and GSIs. Ms. Quindel said that Ms. Gomez was performing in the show.

REPORTS

Ms. Quindel said that all of their Standing Committees were functioning.

Reporting for the Organization and Rules Committee, Mr. Akiba he wanted to compliment and thank all the Delegates for participating in committees. His report wasn't included in the packet and he'd circulate it by e-mail. They have a very important task that semester, revising the GA's Charter and By-laws. They have had some troubles the GA wants to resolve, and they also have some external pressures, as with decisions by the ASUC's Judicial Council and by policies from the UC Office of the President. The Committee will meet on February 11 and if people were interested, they should contact

him. He'd promise he wouldn't pressure them to attend every single future meeting, but he wanted as much input as possible, so he would ask them to please contact him if they were interested, particularly in structure and organizations. This is a great way to shape the direction of their organization.

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Mr. Sharma said they met for the first time on Thursday, the 29th, and Delegates will get a fuller report on the action item to be considered later that evening.

Reporting for the Affirmative Action Committee, Mr. Fisher said he's Chair and the Committee met and discussed various problems people have in their departments, and in general. During the year they'll focus on the numbers of underrepresented minorities and women among students and faculty. They also represent the disabled and people of various sexual preferences. They outlined some goals and what the GA could do to help affirmative action. They have a Resolution on the table and have plans in the works. If people want to become involved, they are welcome to do so. Ms. Quindel said they'll probably send out an e-mail about the next meeting.

Reporting for the GSI/GSR Committee, Mr. Astoria they're a couple of members short of a quorum. If people have any ideas they'd like to implement, they could bring them to him for the Committee to work on.

Reporting for the Foreign Student Affairs Committee, Mr. Wang said he's Chair of the Committee and he wanted to thank the Committee for its excellent service last semester. They did a lot, and people could find everything on the Committee Web site on the GA Web site. Some 20% of grads at Berkeley are international students, a large population that's hidden from regular GA meetings.

Reporting for the Publications Committee, Ms. Madon said she convened the first meeting and there was one person there, Mr. Hsu, and he was asked to be interim Chair. Mr. Hsu said they're looking to eventually have the publication come out more than once a semester, but they need staff. If anybody would like to volunteer, they're going to feature point-counterpoint columns and are looking for people to write about academic freedom, which the GA discussed at its last meeting. If people want to write, they should contact him or Ms. Madon.

Mr. Akiba noted that both Delegates and alternative Delegates can serve on committees.

Reporting for the Academic Affairs Committee, Ms. Madon said they met last month and have three items under New Business, including one on the GA Faculty Mentoring Award. If people were interested in participating in the selection process, she would encourage them to join.

Ms. Williams said they need people for the External Affairs Committee. Fee increases affect them all. They need representation since they deal with budget issues, education not incarceration, cutting prison spending and putting money into education, outreach,

and sustainability. If this interests them, she would ask them to please come to the GA on Monday at 7 p.m. They were all invited.

Reporting for the Graduate Advocacy Committee, Ms. Quindel said they talked about budget cuts. They were asking people to start thinking about two things. They're asking Delegates to find out the impact of budget cuts in their departments, programs, or schools, such as services that have been cut, or cuts in fellowships. When they lobby the Legislature, they want to give them stories about what's happening in departments. Secondly, they're trying to figure out the current ratios of students on fellowships to total students, and for international students to the total number of students. An increase in fees would reduce the number of international students. She would ask Delegates to please go to their deans or program coordinators and find out what will happen in their departments. The Graduate Assembly can do real advocacy, and help the External Affairs Committee try to fight the budget cuts, and help with the burden of replacing the car tax with the grad tax. They also talked about revising mandatory student fee policy, which dealt with Prop. 54 and what lobbying really meant. They also talked about revisions to the Code of Conduct. They have a number of topics on the table. If people were interested in these issues, or others they want to advocate, she would ask them to please come to their meetings. She'd send an e-mail about this.

PRESENTATION BY DEAN MARY ANN MASON

A motion to go to item V was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Quindel said she would like to welcome Dean Mason, one of the few women Deans, among 19 of them. Dean Mason said she was now the second, as of last week. Ms. Quindel said that Dean Mason has done excellent research on issues of parenting and how babies matter in academia. They would like to give her a warm welcome, and were lucky to have her. (Applause)

Dean Mason said she would like to thank them. She was going to give a slide show about the research they're doing about what men and women can expect when they have children, but she thought the crisis the University was facing was more important than anything else, and it pertained to grad education. Cal has the number one grad program in the world, by all standards, collectively, among their departments, and she thought they were really in danger of losing that status in the next couple of years if they don't guard it. She knew Ms. Quindel and the GA have talked about that and she wanted to give them her perspective, talk about what would happen, the problems they have, and to seek their advice and help. She thought this was a moment in history, literally, that would change Berkeley; and Delegates were there at this moment.

The issue right now was fee increases and cutting off outreach. They have to take these in hand, and things were happening now, and in the next few weeks, largely by May, in terms of fee increases and what happens to non-resident tuition.

Dean Mason asked how many people there started out as non-residents. Seventy percent of their students come to Berkeley as non-residents, twice as many as any other campuses. So the 50% hike in non-resident tuition, which is really what it's been in the last two years, in some ways singled Berkeley out even more than other universities. So they have Systemwide issues and Berkeley issues. And they're critical.

If the 40% increase goes through, resident tuition will rise 85% in two years. She didn't think any other major university has had to take that kind of increase over such a short period of time. Non-resident tuition will have increased 50% over two years. Fees for professional schools will have gone up 50-60%. This was outrageous and unconscionable.

Why is this happening? When this Administration came in to Sacramento, the Governor had no understanding and no concern for the UC System, and didn't understand or care about the purpose of research universities. The Governor's Budget Director came from Florida to advise the Governor on how to make the University of California like the University of Florida, literally, and that was by yanking out State support from grad education. They said grad education costs 50% more than for undergrads, although the State never paid 50% more, and in one fell swoop, changed this into the University of Florida. It's a frightening prospect to think they could go downhill so quickly, and it could happen.

Dean Mason said the reason the UC, and Berkeley in particular, was so strong, is because they have enjoyed good State support, compared with other state universities. The University of Oregon gets 13% support from the State, and Michigan 19-20%. UC has been getting about 35%, and that gave them a position to compete with Stanford, Yale, and Harvard. Without that, she didn't know what they'd do, and it would be very difficult.

Dean Mason said there were three different pots, as she saw them. She asked how many students there were in doctoral programs, and how many were in professional/masters programs. She said they were a little over represented, because, Ph.D. students are the about 60% of grads, with 40% professional/masters programs. For the most part, they count on the University for their support, working as GSIs/GSRs. All of those pots are severely hit by this 85% increase. One thing they've done as a campus that year is that she, the Chancellor, and Paul Gray put their heads together and decided things for the next recruiting cycle would continue as is, and they'd make sure departments have money for fellowships. It will be the second year that things will happen. They're counting on the fact that Delegates and others will get out there and make sure the Legislature doesn't do damage.

She asked how many people in the room were from "rich" professional schools, such as Business and Law, and asked how this would affect them. A Delegate said she was from out-of-State and didn't know if she'll have residency next year. But the large increase that will occur, particularly to her professional fees, will make it really hard for Boalt to

compete with Ivy League schools. Berkeley is one of the only public institutions, one of the top ten, where recruiting from out-of-State was really important. And it would be hard to do that if they don't have resources for outreach and to keep tuition down. Part of the reason people choose this school, aside from Ivy League institutions, is because they get the best education for the amount of money they're willing to pay, and it made a difference when that amount is what it would cost to go to the other schools.

Dean Mason said that gives the Business and Law Schools a competitive edge, and otherwise they become second-tier schools, and that would, in many ways, tarnish reputations they carry through life.

Dean Mason asked about the "poor" professional schools, such as Education, Social Welfare, Public Health, Journalism, and Public Policy. She asked what would happen to those schools with the proposed fee increases. A Delegate said his Dean stated that the school wouldn't be able to recruit the top 10% of their applicants, and they'd go to second-tier applicants, because they compete against Princeton and Harvard. Dean Mason said the way the system was set up, the University supports research and doctoral students more than masters students. The immediate support will go to research units rather than the others.

Dean Mason asked what will happen in Education. Ms. Quindel said she was in teacher education and teachers don't get paid much, and have to take out more loans. It makes it more difficult to recruit people to give back to K through 12 education and get a top-notch, two-year masters credential. Dean Mason asked if people would go to Berkeley or just not go. Ms. Quindel said they might go to an emergency credential program.

Dean Mason asked about Social Welfare. A Delegate said recruitment will be difficult. She came from the East Coast and they're used to paying higher fees, so it was nicer at Cal. But the increases were a major concern. They expect that people won't apply. Their competition is with the University of Michigan and Columbia, which are more expensive. The School assumes it will see lower rates each consecutive year.

Dean Mason asked about other professional schools, such as City and Regional Planning. Mr. Stagi said it was already really dicey. The only people who get money are in transportation, and everybody else was really low, and slowly getting less and less diverse, since people with any type of diversity go to schools with money, particularly in planning. It's important to have diverse communities of color and without that, they lack some credibility. Dean Mason said they were thinking, then, of the lack of diversity as the second effect. Most of the people in professional/masters programs pay their own tuition. The University pays doctoral students and they wouldn't be able to. She asked if anybody else had any other notions from their department of how things were going. This was important for her to know, because she deals with the Office of the President, grad deans, and vice chancellors.

A Delegate said he was from the Business School and there's a general sense of outrage that fees have been raised and that none of that money was going back into the

program. It's felt that relative to other business schools, like Stanford, Cal lacks resources and other things that top-tier schools have. There are also concerns about diversity and the relationship between the Business School and technology.

Dean Mason said the three schools with deep professional fees, Law, Business, and Optometry and health sciences, for the first time would get nothing back. They need to get something back for services, and now the way the fee system would be structured was totally different, and totally injurious to departments.

Dean Mason asked about doctoral students. Mr. Akiba said he feared that his department, and humanities and social sciences, will stop admitting international students all together. Berkeley has a world-class status, with students from all over the world coming there, and that could lead to a vicious spiral where Cal loses world-class status and the private foundations begin to place Berkeley in a second-class status, causing Berkeley to lose additional funds from other sources.

Dean Mason said it does have a ripple effect. The one thing that wasn't mentioned was recruiting new faculty, a problem they're already experiencing. Faculty are afraid to come to Berkeley because they're afraid they won't have grads to work with. They're trying to keep faculty salaries competitive, and unless they have grads to work with, faculty can't do cutting-edge research and they won't come. That's the first test, when they miss two cycles and try to recruit new faculty who are afraid of what the grad population will look like. So it will have ripple effects. International students are really a serious problem because of non-resident tuition. For the Law School, the tuition for non-residents is more than Stanford's. And for international students, it's equivalent if not more than Ivy League schools. They could deal with this over a number of years, but they've had two increases in a year.

A Delegate said he was in the German Department, ranked number one by the National Research Council. They're one year away from being reranked, and the Chair already said they could barely afford to admit international students before, and now, wouldn't be able to. Their competition is Harvard, Cornell, and Princeton, and students consider the solid endowments and steady revenue streams of so the schools, and consider what they're reading in the press. It raises doubt in students' minds, and the Department might start losing students they used to routinely attract. Dean Mason said the National Research Council in 1995 ranked Berkeley allover number 1, which is why they're able to say they're the number 1 grad school in the country. She just learned yesterday that rankings will be postponed a year.

Mr. Bailey said he was from African American Studies, the Department with the highest ratio in the Humanities of students of African descent. They are one of only four programs in the country, and the only African Diaspora Ph.D. program in the country. Last year they admitted eight students, out of ten offers. This year he was told they're only able to admit five.

Dean Mason said the hand-out she distributed shows diversity in historically underrepresented groups in the grad population. In 1993 there were about 300 and then there was a huge dip after Prop. 209, in 1997, with the lowest number in 1999. They put together a very big package of outreach money, and have diversity coordinators, fellowships, and Diversity Day in the spring. They do a lot with outreach money. That amount was cut 50% and is likely to be cut another 50%, and destroyed that year, so the grad population could plummet. It wouldn't affect fellowships immediately, but would affect going out to fairs, having diversity coordinators visit colleges, and summer programs. For instance, the summer Research Opportunity Program tries to get undergrads interested in research, and a lot of them came to Berkeley. Such programs will likely be wiped out.

Dean Mason said the best kind of outreach is student-to-student. The GA has done a lot in this area and she hoped they take it up next year. The campus needs help with grads going back to their undergrad colleges and talking to their friends. She would like ideas on what they might be able to do. Ms. Quindel said they'll start an outreach project in the next couple of weeks and will ask Delegates and others to join that committee.

A Delegate said the idea of prisons versus education already has a foothold. Gov. Schwarzenegger has received pressure on this, although it wouldn't solve the whole problem.

A Delegate said that after people have applied, the impression they get when they visit was all important, and the incoming grads in her Department last year came there because they felt the environment and cooperation that Berkeley students had was so much more appealing than the competitive nature of other schools. Dean Mason said that was correct, and when students are asked why they came to Cal it almost always was because of how the department treated them when they visited, and if faculty and other students talk to them, are friendly, and spend time. The problem is just getting diversity students to even apply. After 1997, the representation of Berkeley was so low people didn't apply. Once one is there, the campus sells itself. Going out to high schools and colleges and getting students to think about Berkeley and apply was, she thought, all important.

A Delegate said he was in Bioengineering and they don't have a good representative committee. Some students started a diversity initiative to send students to conferences to target different groups to try and recruit. They're also working on a special Web page, not just for diversity students, but to highlight diversity at Berkeley, Oakland, and the surrounding areas, to show that this is a place that welcomes people, and where people would enjoy living. Dean Mason said there are 105 grad programs, and 83 give Ph.Ds. Everyone really has a different story and audience, which is why the professional societies are the best places to recruit.

Mr. Stagi said that in his Department they have "Diversity Day," with several other departments, that students of color and a number of other groups within their department plan. They work on mentoring and communicating with other students. So they try hard to keep diversity, but it's difficult because there's not enough money. Dean Mason said

money is important, but the actual willingness of students and faculty to really greet new students is what sells it. The campus has done surveys of people who do and do not come to Cal, and money was number one, and number two was love, whether somebody paid attention to them, knew their name, and called them back. That meant an enormous amount. She could not overestimate how important it is to for grads to meet these new students and reach out. The GA will be extraordinarily important because the campus doesn't have outreach money any more.

The other issue is how they tell the Legislature that they can't accept these fees. There are lots of arguments, including research, teaching, and the social infrastructure, which is something people might not think about. Most of their professional masters students are educational, social people, and without them, social infrastructure would diminish. People don't think about that contribution. The most important argument is that they can't tolerate the double whammy in such a short period of time. It's impossible. Eventually, that might be reduced in the spring, but it won't be to nothing, so the case has to be made as to why grad professional education was important. That afternoon the Chancellor said he wanted to get them all involved. This is his last semester and he wants to go out with a bang, and will try to organize grads to go to Sacramento. So there might be an opportunity to do something very strong politically with the Chancellor and faculty. There will be a lot of opportunity, and this is the semester, if they have any time, to take some time to be active. She called for any questions.

A Delegate said one group that could have a lot of leverage that hasn't been mentioned is alumni. There are senior alumni who have founded law firms and engineering companies and have contacts. Dean Mason said that most alumni are undergrads, and they've developed another database for grads. It often works better through departments to do that, since they keep track of grads. Undergrads can also make this case since the stature of the grad program contributes to the school's reputation. The campus will work with all different groups and the Alumni House. She thought the suggestion made was good.

A Delegate said people in her department just came from a career fair, and among the recruiters for Public Policy was the Legislative Analyst's office. It was ironic that the State was soliciting grads' labor, but wasn't funding their education. She didn't know who would work in State offices next year with the caliber of education to makes Cal grads employable. She worked in Oregon, which faced a huge budget crisis that caused the State to cut the school year one month. One tactic that worked was to make it a financial issue, and why companies would want to stay there if there's no one to hire. Statistics show that people tend to stay at the place they go to grad school. Dean Mason said that was a good argument. She asked if they could send Ms. Quindel these suggestions so they could be shared. Ms. Quindel said she would send out an e-mail and would compile that.

A Delegate asked if there would be any positive effects from the proposed \$15 billion bond. Dean Mason said that would be survival. If it's defeated, it would be devastating. The Delegate asked if the bad consequences they heard were with a \$15-

billion bond. Dean Mason said projections they're making, like the 40% cut, are dependant on that bond measure succeeding.

A Delegate said he was aware of one group that was suing the Governor. Mr. Kashmiri said that the UCSA was suing the Governor over taking money from the cities and reapportioning it, and there was a separate lawsuit he had against the University. Dean Mason said that unfortunately, K-through-12 funding was mandated, but not higher education. Prisons were mandated, and higher education was in the discretionary budget.

A Delegate said she would like to see a document that lists the types of trickle-down consequences that were brought up. Dean Mason said that was a very good suggestion and she'd get people to work on that. Ms. Quindel said the Advocacy Committee was trying to work on that.

Mr. Kashmiri said his frustration was that people have been talking about this for over two years, lobbying the Legislature and initiating two different lawsuits, and they haven't seen the receptivity that was now being shown. Dean Mason said the "giant" was no longer sleeping, but was kicked twice. Last year people weren't willing to speak up, but this year they are. Mr. Kashmiri said he hoped the Administration will work with the UCSA to develop a creative, long-term solution to the budget. These groups should have a sit-down session. Mr. Stagi said it seemed there were a number of ways to quantify how this will be detrimental to the State, and they have the resources in departments to do that. Dean Mason said they have to do that for a number of different audiences. Economic arguments were always strongest. There are good, cogent economic arguments they have not made as a campus or System.

Mr. Valleé asked how these arguments would be disseminated to educate people. Politicians will listen to public pressure. Dean Mason said the Chancellor has hired a PR person to do that.

A Delegate said faculty members were talking to each other and they need students and alumni to do that as well, with different people.

A Delegate said there's a radical idea some of them have talked about. Much of the bind the State was in was based on a number of ballot propositions. Perhaps it was time to draft a ballot proposition that would alter the balance of funding to education as a whole. Given the number of teachers, students, administrators, and employees in the UC System and other education in California, it would seem like they could get such a proposition on the ballot. He asked if they were going to take that concrete of a step and asked if the Administration has discussed that. Dean Mason said that K through 12 did that, and it's been such a burden for the Legislature that they're unlikely to consider it. The people can consider it, but no one has brought that up. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Dean Mason said she wanted to bring up the Fulbright situation, which was the saddest experience she's had in her whole career. For the last many weeks, she's been back and

forth on the phone, and the Chancellor went to Washington. They had any number of friends of Berkeley, politicians and lawyers. The Fulbright competition was put online that year and apparently the software wasn't working too well. So the students requested paper applications and the campus asked for a waiver. That was fine, but because of that, students didn't get their applications readily. The package was ready to go and they called Federal Express to confirm for Monday morning and called on Monday morning. But FedEx. didn't show up. By 4:30 they learned there was a software glitch. It was picked up the next day, and the company said it would post-date the packing bill. The assistant made the mistake of contacting Washington and explaining the problem with FedEx. They went back and forth any number of times, and called to find out what was going. They didn't hear definitely for almost a month, and got their UC lobbyist group involved. Many, many people were involved, and the Chancellor went last week. This was at the Department of Education and General Counsel levels and the Secretary of Education level. But they were told the applications would not be accepted. And their parting shot was that if the campus hadn't contacted Washington, they wouldn't have known that it was late because the packing bill had the 20th listed. It was a sad, troubled tale, and she was greatly saddened. It has been very difficult for many people, mostly for students. The campus will try to help each of them pursue their plans in whatever way it can.

Ms. Williams asked if there was any possibility of administrators having cuts from the top salaries. Dean Mason said she didn't think anybody has had a raise in many, many years. She asked what Ms. Williams was thinking about. Ms. Williams asked about giving up part of their salaries. Dean Mason said they haven't talked about that yet. Students would be surprised that most campus administration, deans and chairs, get very little for it. It's public service and they feel it's important to do. They're all professors who put in their time in administration and to be honest, don't get paid enough, as opposed to being a faculty member, which is a lovely life.

A Delegate asked what Dean Mason would suggest to the Assembly as a possible action on the Fulbright Scholarship situation. Dean Mason said that FedEx was talking to them and might come through with something.

Mr. Bailey asked about students losing the prestige of the Fulbright. Dean Mason said there was nothing she could do about that. That's the tragic part. Many students can apply again and almost all have applied for other fellowships. They may still get a Fulbright that year. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Bailey asked if this was an attack by the Department of Education, since it seemed like Berkeley was targeted. Dean Mason said that when being paranoid, it probably was.

A Delegate asked if contacting California's Congressional representation would have any affect with regard to the Fulbright. Dean Mason said that if people were willing to do that, she was sure it would help. The campus has chosen to not ask students to get involved because the campus didn't think it would come to this. They thought they had legal and moral grounds on this, and were shocked it came to this.

Ms. Quindel called for any other questions and said she would like to thank Dean Mason for attending. (Applause)

ANNOUNCEMENTS (cont'd)

A motion to go back to Announcements was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Karen Lam said she had petitions to distribute for the Mental Health Initiative, to be on the State ballot in November 2004. She was wondering if Delegates would be willing to sign it and help out with this. She'd write her e-mail address on the Board if people were interested in helping out.

Ms. Quindel said they would postpone the election of a GA Grad Council representative since there was no notice of the vacancy. The Web site wasn't up, and they'd send out notification of the opening.

RESOLUTIONS

Ms. Quindel said that since they have so many Resolutions, they'd consider each for five minutes. She would ask people to please keep their comments short and to the point.

The following Resolution was authored and sponsored by the VRA (UC Village Residents Association)

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE UNIVERSITY TO ENSURE AFFORDABLE STUDENT FAMILY HOUSING BEFORE INITIATING DEMOLITION OF UC VILLAGE "SECTION B"

WHEREAS, the University Village Redevelopment Project will demolish all remaining affordable family housing at UC Village, leaving only a few units at the Symth-Fernwald complex. The University plans to demolish approximately half of Section B during summer year 2004

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE UNIVERSITY TO ENSURE AFFORDABLE STUDENT FAMILY HOUSING BEFORE INITIATING DEMOLITION OF UC VILLAGE "SECTION B" (cont'd)

(referred to as Step 2), and shortly thereafter, demolish all Section A housing (Step 3). The remainder of Section B is scheduled for demolition in summer 2006; and

WHEREAS, as of January 2004 affordable housing was terminated for all incoming students. The University has placed a moratorium on new tenants to Section B and Symth-Fernwald, and is squeezing existing residents into the remaining affordable units; many prospective graduate and undergraduate students will not choose to come to UC Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, the project is discriminatory. Higher rents will disproportionately effect vulnerable populations, including low income, single-parent families, and ethnic minorities; higher rents will effectively dissuade many students from attending UC Berkeley to the detriment of maintaining a diverse student body that enriches the university environment; and

WHEREAS, the projected rents for the new units are approximately 100% higher than present section A or B rents, equivalent to the totality of a GSI or research assistant salary. The rents for Section B at present are \$750/mo. for a two-bedroom apartment. The projected rent for new two bedroom apartments in 2006 is nearly \$1,400.00, and the existing new units are now approximately at that price. This is in violation of State and county norms that rate one-income student-type families at extremely low income levels, and indicate that such families should pay no more than 30% of their income in rent; and

WHEREAS, the prior Environmental Impact Report on the UC Village Redevelopment is incomplete and excludes reference to social-economic impacts. The University has intentionally excluded impacts to the student population given the higher rents generated by the project. State of California EIR guidelines require descriptions of impacts to communities, sections which the University leaves in blank; and

WHEREAS, the University ignores that increased rents present significant impact on student budgets and academic performance. The University is increasing new building rents 6% yearly. The rents of new units are becoming an increasing burden for all residents. Many students in the new East Village section are moving out to cheaper units in the Berkeley area. The project is simply not viable for a large fraction of intended users: low-income UC family students; and

WHEREAS, University Village Redevelopment Project was approved by the UC Regents in November 2003 without notification of resident's concerns. The University justified construction of the project to the Regents because, in the words of the University President's Office, existing units are "currently renting at extremely low rates". In the same document the University only considered financial impacts to its own cash flow. (Document 2-GF Office of the President November 6, 2003, attached); and

WHEREAS, for years the University has ignored requests that an affordable rent policy be implemented. After considerable pressure, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor Padilla have agreed to hold an affordable rent round table starting in February. No results are guaranteed for this round table;

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE UNIVERSITY TO ENSURE AFFORDABLE STUDENT FAMILY HOUSING BEFORE INITIATING DEMOLITION OF UC VILLAGE "SECTION B" (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly of the University of California at Berkeley here assembled requests that the University implement widely publicized and sufficient measures to guarantee affordable housing for all future and present student families, before demolition of Section B initiates in June 2004.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly requests that the University include appropriate studies and mitigation measures on the social, economic and academic impacts of increased rent on the University community in the Environmental Impact Report and as part of the upcoming "Affordable Rent Roundtable".

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly requests that the round table include participation from all sectors of the University affected by increased housing costs, as enumerated by the President of the GA in communication to the Chancellor on November 26, 2003.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly will participate in the Affordable Rent Roundtable to ensure affordable rent for students and will support this issue in all ways possible and through inclusion in all appropriate committees and initiatives.

A Delegate said that for the last couple of years, the University has wanted to demolish existing, affordable housing, and to replace it with units that cost twice as much. People have tried to push the University to do something about affordable rents, but the campus hasn't budged. This particularly hits vulnerable populations, such as single parents and low-income populations. These populations will not be able to attend the University in the future because of rents. The University paid no heed and issued an EIR statement stating that there were no social impacts from a rent increase. And even if there is an impact, the campus interprets a specific law to say the University was not required to follow certain local regulations and was ignoring the problem. Albany Village residents are contacting newspapers and having demonstrations, and hoped to get the support of the GA. This will affect present and future grad students.

Mr. Akiba said the GA has already provided moral support in the form of Resolutions, and it looked like the University didn't respond. He asked what else the GA could

do. Ms. Quindel said the previous Resolution the GA passed was to support a rally on Sproul, and the current Resolution would take a stand on the issue itself.

Mr. Akiba said one idea was to add a provision referring this to a particular committee in the GA, to work on it as a GA issue. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate asked about the impact of Berkeley rent control, since it was pretty strict. A speaker said the campus was increasing rents 6% a year at Albany Village, more than Berkeley rents. But the University was exempt from rent control. The campus plans to finance the project by increasing rents. Most people in the new section of the Village with higher rents were trying to figure out whether or not it was cheaper to live there.

Mr. Stagi asked if rent was the only funding mechanism, or if there were any other financial outlays initially, such as a bond for construction, and if so, if there was some way to note the financial crisis and have the GA advocate for resources. A speaker said that all Housing and Dining operations are operated through revenues. They're not supposed to spend money on this that the campus gets from the Legislature. The proposal is to fund this entirely through bonds. A strong political argument could be made that it didn't make sense to double housing costs for student families when the University can leave existing housing there, which didn't cost a cent. They assume rents will cover the bond. The reality is that that money is on the University's books and they can't borrow that for other things. A speaker said that as far as they know, there are affordable housing measures in bonds and other options haven't been considered.

A Delegate said housing to be demolished has asbestos and lead paint. A speaker said the existing housing wasn't the most wonderful and people live there because it's cheap. The units haven't been maintained and the campus wants them to look bad. There was also a suit dealing with a problem with mold.

A speaker said the residents would appreciate having this issue included on a GA committee, in order to push the issue.

Mr. Akiba moved to amend, by adding a Resolved Clause, to read, "Resolved, that this issue be referred to the Graduate Assembly Advocacy Committee." The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Ms. Quindel said the time for discussion had elapsed. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, THE RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE UNIVERSITY TO ENSURE AFFORDABLE STUDENT FAMILY HOUSING BEFORE INITIATING DEMOLITION OF UC VILLAGE "SECTION B," PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.** A speaker said the residents would like to thank the GA, and would be in touch.

The following Resolution was authored by Claudia Media, GA Legislative Liaison, and was sponsored by GA External Affairs Vice President Dawn Williams:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AFFORDABLE TEXTBOOKS

WHEREAS, according to a survey by the California Student Public Interest Research Group (CALPIRG), students will spend an average of \$898 per year on textbooks in the 2003-04 school year, or almost 20 percent of the cost of in-State fees, and;

WHEREAS, in contrast, a 1997 University of California survey found that students paid an average of \$642 on textbooks in 1996-97, and;

WHEREAS textbook publishers use gimmicks to increase the price of textbooks, and;

WHEREAS, textbook publishers put new editions on the market frequently -- often with few content changes -- making the less expensive used editions obsolete and unavailable, and;

WHEREAS, over 59% of students surveyed who searched for a used book for the fall 2003 quarter/semester were unable to find even one used book for their classes, and;

WHEREAS, textbook publishers are gouging students at a time when tuition and other college costs are rising;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Graduate Assembly calls upon college textbook publishers to cease price gouging and adopt the following practices:

To keep the cost of textbooks as low as possible without sacrificing educational content;

To give faculty and students the option of buying textbooks separately, without additional bells and whistles;

To keep textbook editions on the market as long as possible without sacrificing the educational content.

To give preference to paper or on-line supplements to current editions over producing entirely new editions.

To pass on cost-savings to students once purely on-line textbooks are on the market.

To disclose to faculty members all of the different products they sell -- including both bundled and unbundled options, list how much each of these

products costs, the length of time they intend to produce the current edition, and how the newest edition is different from the previous edition;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Graduate Assembly calls upon faculty to both give preference to the least cost textbook option when the educational content is equal and to press publishers to adopt the above practices.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that Graduate Assembly calls upon the University to encourage as many forums for students to purchase as many used books as possible, including rental programs and book swaps.

Ms. Williams said CALPIRG came up with this Resolution because students are spending \$898 per year on textbooks. The costs keep increasing because publishers add CDs and other bells and whistles. Ms. Quindel called for any questions.

A Delegate said that publishers won't change unless there's a demand, and it's the faculty that should look at cheaper alternatives. She's purchased books from the Student Store and spent \$100 and found them for \$50 online. She asked if this could be addressed to faculty and the Student Store. Ms. Williams said the Resolution is addressed to faculty. Ms. Quindel said the GA has members on the Store Operations Board and the Store goes by the publishers. That's not the case for books bought online. The Delegate said the cheaper books were from Borders and weren't used. That wasn't an isolated case for her.

A Delegate said a lot of language was a little vague, such as references to "bells and whistles" "purely online textbooks," and "bundled and unbundled options."

Ms. Quindel said the speaking time had elapsed. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AFFORDABLE TEXTBOOKS PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 20-15-8.

Report from the GA Autonomy Committee

-

Mr. Hsu moved to go to the report from the GA Autonomy Committee. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Reporting for the GA autonomy Committee, Ms. Ahn said she wanted to pass out contact sheets. She developed a flier and a petition and met with the Chancellor. Everything seemed to be cool but she talked to the ASUC Attorney General, Ryan Powell, and he informed her he was very confused and could no longer authorize the GA's language, and needed a week to do more research. Ms. Ahn said she protested and said that every day he doesn't authorize the language is one more day they can't gather signatures. He'll try to get authorization by Wednesday. However, that would leave the GA in a quandary because they can't get signatures for a petition that doesn't yet exist. If people could fill

out the sheets, she could send them the petitions to hand out. The Executive Board finalized the petition language. The GA designated the power to do that at the last meeting. To get this on the ballot, they need to have it approved by the ASUC Senate, or they have to get 1,000 signatures. They're shooting for between 1,500 to 2,000 signatures in case not all signatures get validated. For 1,500, each Delegate would have to get 50 signatures, which wasn't that much. She didn't think grads in general believe that undergrads should control their funds or have veto power over GA decisions, but most grads don't know and don't care. So having a petition process was a great way to get information out. They need 1,500 signatures by May 5, and hopefully by the next meeting, they'll have 50 signatures per Delegate. Each member of the Autonomy Committee is a point person for several departments. People could put a petition up in the grad student lounge, or go to groups with petitions, and make announcements at their lectures and discussions. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. They could bring the petition to group meetings they attend, or could make announcements in their lectures and bring it to any talks or discussions they attend.

A Delegate asked if only grads could sign the petition. Ms. Ahn said undergrads can sign it as well. They want to get information to grads, so that's who they're focusing on.

Ms. Williams asked about anything that was outrageous. Ms. Ahn said there's a possibility that according to ASUC By-laws and fiscal rules, the GA was not allowed to fund its own campaign that's partisan, going back to the court issue of whether students can lobby. But if it's informational, the GA can spend money. So the GA has to take a line between making sure grads get information and not being biased, so they can spend grad money on it. The flier lays out the facts that are inflammatory enough to bring up a sense of injustice. And they might set up other Web sites without GA money. But the official GA language had to be unbiased. If Delegates could sign the contact sheet, they'd be called and mailed a petition by Thursday.

Ms. Quindel said that on Wednesday night, Mr. Powell, the ASUC Attorney General, said it sounded fine. She'll meet with Tom Cordi, the Director of the ASUC Auxiliary. Mr. Powell's later statement surprised her as well. Ms. Ahn said she wanted to thank them.

The following Resolution was authored by Claudia Media, GA Legislative Liaison and was sponsored by GA External Affairs Vice President Dawn Williams:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING PROPOSITION 56

WHEREAS, California has not passed a budget on time since 1986; and

WHEREAS, legislators can work on other bills or even go on vacation while California's budget remains unresolved; and

WHEREAS, lack of an adopted State budget results in severe financial and organizational consequences to State businesses and vendors, State services such as healthcare and education, and millions of working Californians; and

WHEREAS, the two-thirds vote requirement to pass a state budget and related taxes has failed to keep spending in check and presents a significant stumbling block to passing an on-time and responsible budget; and

WHEREAS, legislators are currently threatened and punished if they do not bend to partisan pressures; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 56, the Budget Accountability Act, will enact a comprehensive report of the State budget process that will hold the Governor and the Legislature more accountable to the people of California; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Accountability Act will force legislatures to permanently forfeit their salary, per diem and car allowance, for every day that the budget is late; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Accountability Act establishes a real budget reserve in good times so that extreme budget cuts and taxes will be less likely in a weak economy; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Accountability Act changes the vote requirement for the budget and related taxes from two-thirds to 55%, which will end budget gridlock while still requiring a broad consensus to pass the budget; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Accountability Act will force legislatures to stay in session and only work on the budget when the budget is late; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Accountability Act gives the Assembly and Senate Legislative Ethics Committees the authority to censure party leaders who bully legislators to vote the party line rather than their conscience; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Accountability Act fully protects the property tax limitations of Proposition 13; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Accountability Act gives voters the information they need on how their taxes are spent and how their legislators voted on the budget so voters can keep legislators accountable on Election Day;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of California at Berkeley Graduate Assembly supports Proposition 56 on the March 2,2004 ballot.

Ms. Williams said it takes a two-thirds vote of the Legislature to pass the budget, and Prop. 56 would penalize legislators who don't pass the budget on time. It would require

approval at 55%. California is one of three states that does not have a 55% vote needed to pass the budget, along with Arkansas and Rhode Island. Prop. 56 would also give voters a pamphlet showing how legislators voted, which would be useful. It would help in their endeavors to change the budget. She called for any questions.

A Delegate asked how penalizing legislators for not passing a budget quickly would ameliorate the budget problems the University has. Ms. Williams said that with the two-thirds majority currently needed to pass the budget, they have a majority of Democrats and a minority of Republicans, so there's coercion trying to get five Republicans to sign on.

A Delegate asked what organizations have expressed support and opposition to Prop. 56. Ms. Williams said supporters include the League of Women Voters, firefighters, parents, and Californians for Budget Accountability. Opponents include the Governor.

A Delegate asked how the Proposition would solve the problem of coercion. Ms. Williams said the Proposition would require 55%, so people would vote the way they want, instead of voting with the party, since their votes would be documented in a pamphlet, and they'd basically be representing themselves.

Mr. Akiba asked if lowering the voting requirement might possibly affect students negatively. Ms. Williams said that with a two-thirds vote, they're one of three states that work in that way. Californians Against Higher Taxes was against Prop. 56.

Mr. Stagi said that in the last budget process, they had better than 55% Democrats, with the Republicans holding the balance of power. By having the balance of power, and needing votes for a two-thirds vote, they could jam things up and nothing would be taken care of. Democrats hold better than 55% and would be students' allies, and more likely to get a more favorable budget out of the Legislature. That's why Gov. Schwarzenegger was against it.

Mr. Kashmiri said that last semester the Democrats were saying they should cut \$50 million from UC and Republicans were saying \$400 million. They block vote to hold up the process and not have new taxes, and the reason they don't have taxes is because they're taking it out of student fees.

A Delegate asked what would happen when there's a Republican majority. Having read the language of the Proposition, it's extremely vague and untenable.

A Delegate moved to amend, by dropping the Whereas Clause that refers to Prop. 13. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE BILL BY DELETING THE NEXT-TO-LAST WHEREAS CLAUSE PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION ENDORSING PROPOSITION 56,
AS AMENDED, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 26-8-5.

Finance Committee Recommendations

Mr. Sharma moved to go to the Finance Committee recommendations. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Sharma said he submitted the report from the Finance Committee, with amendments to the report. The report had three parts. The first is mid-year adjustments and line item transfers. Every November, February, and April, the Finance Committee gives a report. The quarter ends and they reconcile their books. The report provides a line item description of the GA's budget for this fiscal year, which includes adjustments made through the last year to date and expenditures in the first two quarters of the fiscal year, July 1 to June 30.

Mr. Sharma said the GA was in great financial shape and no in danger of insolvency. He called for any questions about the budget.

The second part of the report was the Finance Committee's actual report. For the first time in most people's memory, the Committee met, on January 29, and considered several things, primarily mid-year budget adjustments and transfers, moving funds in the budget passed last May and modified last semester. The budget report indicates what they did. There was an amendment to the Committee report. Mr. Sharma said the report was as approved by the Finance Committee, and there were four changes afterwards, including an adjustment of the line item from the CRECNO campaign, a reduction in the line item for UCSA dues, a change that reflects changes in the totals, and a mistake with a date. He moved to amend the report.

Mr. Akiba asked about the significance of the changes. Mr. Sharma said the GA had lower program costs, vacancies that meant that they didn't use money that had been budgeted for salaries. For the childcare voucher, the GA wouldn't get to it that year. Allocating \$5,000 for childcare wouldn't go far, so the Committee thought it would be a better use of the money to re-allocate it to current priorities. For The Berkeley Graduate, the new editor asked to shift money without an increase or decrease. Number 3 is supplemental appropriations in the existing budget for the Funding Committee, which includes travel funds for the External Affairs VP, since that's her job, and UCSA dues, which were amended out.

Mr. Akiba asked if there was any plan to reallocate more money. Mr. Sharma said that when they deal with mid-year adjustments, they have a budget that's in place. People are spending their money and there isn't too much to play around with.

Ms. Dugas said the reconciliation process takes quite a while, and the GA has minimum staff to do that. They've already started this process and have preliminary numbers. Funding that was not spent was allocated in Projects and Services and Grad Events. There was \$20,000 that wasn't spent in the last semester, so over 25 groups did not spend their money. That will be re-allocated into next semester. That amount was alarming and was pretty high. Some of that will be re-allocated in funding rounds, but there will be a huge amount left after they finish reconciliation to go into this year's Grad Events and Projects and Services.

Mr. Sharma said they're also recommending another \$3,000 to allow the Business Office staff to increase or maintain hours for reimbursements.

A Delegate asked about the childcare voucher and if that was voted on at a previous meeting. Mr. Sharma said the \$5,000 was part of last year's budget process. It was pretty vague as to what it was for, and it was his sense it was put in to fill out the budget, and perhaps for political reasons. There was never a Delegate committee or a program, so the money was just kind of sitting there. There was never a developed, ongoing program. Ms. Dugas said the original idea was to research a childcare voucher program or a childcare site on campus. They did that study, and there was no site that could be utilized for childcare. So the other idea was to have a voucher, where grads would get vouchers to offset daycare costs. But \$5,000 was not enough to cover vouchers for students, and it would take a lot of administration. So the money that was budgeted was sitting there. To have a valid childcare voucher program would cost more than \$100,000.

A Delegate asked if carry forward was money that was just sitting there. Mr. Sharma said the re-allocation took care of that and there wasn't much of a carry forward left. Everything has been allocated and the deficit was taken care of. There's no money short of slashing current line items.

In response to a question, Ms. Dugas said some applications didn't get included by the time the Funding Committee met. Since the Delegates were not in session, those items went to the Executive Board. They wanted to see how much money was left after reconciliation. That just occurred, so those applications have been funded, and although it was a nightmare, people can start putting in receipts.

Mr. Lanting said he's a member of the Funding Committee and they appreciate the extra \$4,000. He asked if there was anything left in carry forward they could apply to student groups. Mr. Sharma said there wasn't. Carry forward is \$1,500 and there's no money left short of slashing existing line items. Ms. Dugas said they could add unspent money to this funding round. Mr. Sharma said they'll have more discussion on that as the budget process for next year comes into play. Mr. Kashmiri said they don't have infrastructure to deal with it when Delegates add more money. They're running a million-dollar organization with two full-time employees, which is not necessarily sustainable.

A Delegate asked about the line item in the GA's operating budget, solar panels at \$50,000. Mr. Sharma said that was added last year and was spent, and the solar panels

are in place. A motion to extend speaking time by three minutes was made and seconded and with no objection. Ms. Quindel said the GA committed to three years of \$50,000 per year, for solar panels for the roof of MLK. The panels went up that summer. The GA is in the second year of the three years for this allocation, and had one more year.

A Delegate asked about the financial nightmare Ms. Dugas mentioned. Ms. Dugas said they had Round 4 and there were a stack of applications that the front desk filed that weren't included in the Funding Committee's binder, requests that the Committee didn't consider. They realized that situation during the Winter Break, so students didn't get their applications considered. Because groups were in the process of spending their money, or waiting, the Executive Board considered those applications and approved them, but only if there was a surplus in the fall of unspent money; and there was. Once they found that surplus, they'd cover those applications. The financial nightmare is that they have applications they have to retroactively deal with, and don't have the infrastructure. But that's a responsibility of the Business Office, who filed those applications without them being in the binder. All those groups will be covered.

A Delegate asked what it would take to have another full-time or part-time employee. Ms. Quindel said the Executive Board looked at that and they'll make recommendations in the next few months. Ms. Dugas said students, grads and undergrads, run the entire office, and do a darn good job to get what Delegates need, and they have to say "thank you." Undergrads come into the office and process hundreds and hundreds of requests for over 150 groups the GA gives money to, and it's a lot of work. Her staff were trying hard to do a good job.

A motion to approve the amendment to the Finance Committee report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Begin written report, as amended, from the Finance Committee

Finance Committee
February 5th, 2004

The Finance Committee met for the first time this academic year on Thursday, January 29th at 2:00 p.m. in Anthony Hall. Six voting committee members and one ex-officio staff member were present: Rishi Sharma (Law), David Garcia (Chemistry), Fumni Olorunnipa (Law), Vivian Hwa (Economics), Duane De Witt (City & Regional Planning), Eric Munoz (Law), S. Nzingha Dugas (GA Manager & Finance Officer).

The following delegates will become full committee members at their first meeting: Marion Bailey (African Diaspora Studies), Mayan Greene (Social Welfare), and Robert Ricketts (Business).

Committee members spent most of their time reviewing the role of the Finance Committee and the overall GA budget process. The following action items, however, were approved by consensus and are now forwarded for consideration by the full Assembly:

1. Mid-year Adjustments and Line-item Transfers

The Finance Committee considered, approved and now forward the following line item cuts because of lower than expected program costs, program non-feasibility, or lack of personnel.

	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Savings</u>
Advertising	\$ 1,300	\$ 550	\$ 750
Security	\$13,500	\$10,000	\$ 3,500
CRECNO Campaign	\$35,000	\$32,000	\$ 3,000
Child Care Voucher	\$ 5,000	\$ 0	\$ 5,000

Finance Committee Recommendations
(cont'd)

- 23 -

Written report, as amended, from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

GA Resource Initiative	\$ 750	\$ 350	\$ 400
Student-Parent Advocate	\$ 5,342.50	\$2,342.50	\$ 3,000
Legislative Liaison	\$11,416	\$9,416	\$ 2,000
TOTALS	\$72,308.50	\$54,659	\$17,650

2. The Berkeley Graduate Budget Realignment

At the request of the new Editor of The Berkeley Graduate a \$1,000 transfer from the Coordinator's stipend line item was transferred to the PSA Support line item. There was no Editor during the Fall Semester, so the full budgeted amount is now excessive

and TBG has articulated a need for more money in getting staff writers and photographers.

3. Mid-year Supplemental Appropriations

Funding Committee (Graduate Events): \$4,000

Graduate Events is consistently under-funded compared to student group funding demand. The committee allocated what was left of the projected surplus to alleviate some of the committee's burden in choosing between programs or paltry funding.

External Affairs VP Travel Fund: \$5,000

EAVP has been very active this year in doing her job at UCSA and UC Regents meetings and this money is all spent. This supplemental appropriation is critical to the continued success of the EAVP's program.

4. New Appropriations

Business Office Staff Support: \$3,000

It is essential that we maintain the hours of Business Office staff because of the increased demands placed on the office with increased student funding and the plethora of programs the GA funds. This money will be used to increase staff hours to continue daily operations and hopefully undertake new measures designed to improve fiscal efficiency.

The total of supplemental and new appropriations is \$12,000. This essentially allocates the remaining surplus.

Respectfully Submitted, Rishi Sharma, Chair, GA Finance Committee, 29 January 2004

End written report, as amended, from the Finance Committee

The following Resolution was authored by Ronald Cruz (Education) and was sponsored by the GA Affirmative Action Committee:

RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT THE REINSTATEMENT OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN WASHINGTON STATE

WHEREAS, on June 23, 2003, the United States Supreme Court upheld the use of affirmative action for the purpose of achieving diversity in *Grutter v. Bollinger*; and

WHEREAS, in Washington State, the passage of Initiative 200 has led to a dramatic drop in underrepresented minority enrollment at the University of Washington. In the year 2000, Latino, black, and Native American people comprised about 7.5%, 3.2%, and 1.6% of Washington's population, respectively. [2000 U.S. Census] However in 2003, Latino, black, and Native American students comprised only 3.2%, 2.4% and 1% of all undergraduates. [University of Washington website] Latino enrollment in the University of Washington's graduate and professional programs is only 2.9 percent. [January 23, 2004 Seattle Post-Intelligencer Bill would allow universities to consider race in admissions.]; and

WHEREAS, in Washington State, Washington Governor Gary Locke has called for the amendment of Initiative 200 to allow for the use of affirmative action again. A bipartisan group of Democratic and Republican State Legislators are sponsoring Senate Bill 6268, which would amend Initiative 200 to allow the reinstatement of affirmative action in higher education; and

WHEREAS, the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly has repeatedly supported the use of affirmative action policies to achieve integration and diversity within higher education; and

WHEREAS, the reinstatement of affirmative action in Washington State would be a tremendous, positive impetus for the State of California to reinstate equal opportunities for Latino, black, and Native American people;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly will write a letter supporting the reinstatement of affirmative action in Washington and send this letter to Washington Governor Gary Locke and the Washington State Legislature.

Mr. Cruz said the Supreme Court ruling last June, in Bollinger, has ramifications for the whole nation. The standard set for affirmative action policy, that race could be used as one of several factors, for the purpose of diversity, means that UT restored a affirmative action policy. Washington Governor Gary Locke proposed last month that the Legislature amend the State's ban passed by the voters, supported by Ward Connerly, after Prop. 209 passed in 1998. This would allow the restoration of affirmative action. The GA has supported the principles of affirmative action and diversity and integration and it's important to endorse the move made by these legislators in Washington State to restore affirmative action.

A Delegate said the Resolution calls for the "GA" to write a letter. Mr. Cruz asked to amend the bill to have the "GA President" write a letter. The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE RESOLVED CLAUSE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

A Delegate asked why Washington State legislators should listen to the GA, and if their activism should cross State lines. Mr. Cruz said everything was connected. The ban of affirmative action in California had a negative impact on Washington State and minority people. California set a bad example and should repair the damage.

A Delegate said it would be interesting to see if they could get the rest of the UCs to go along with this. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Quindel said they could add having a letter written to the UCSA. A motion to amend the Resolution was made, to add a Resolved clause, to read as follows:

"Resolved, that the External Affairs Vice President will seek support from the UCSA."

The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT THE REINSTATEMENT OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN WASHINGTON STATE, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was co-authored by Joshua Fisher (Environmental Science Policy Management), Ronald Cruz (Education), and Kira Blaisdell-Sloan (Anthropology) and was sponsored by the GA Affirmative Action Committee:

RESOLUTION FOR A NEW CHANCELLOR WHO IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ADVOCATE

WHEREAS, a primary goal of the California Master Plan for Education is to supply resources and authority to every public education institution to provide quality education for all students; and

WHEREAS, although minority freshmen have increased in enrollment every year since 1998, from 11-15%, underrepresented minorities contributed to only 13.5% of the fall 2003 total student body (10% of the graduate student body), and this percentage is significantly lower than the 25.3% figure in 1997, when affirmative action was still legal; and

WHEREAS, female graduate enrollment has lagged behind male enrollment, though female undergraduate enrollment has exceeded male enrollment since 2002; and

WHEREAS, the previous Chancellor was committed to improving faculty diversity, the overall composition of the tenure-track faculty has remained approximately 76% male and 84% white over the past decade, and although UC Berkeley

made 11 offers to African American candidates in the past two years, only five accepted; and

WHEREAS, out of 21 academic deans in the senior administration there is one female and one minority, and out of 63 departmental chairs, 16 are female and five are minorities; and

RESOLUTION FOR A NEW CHANCELLOR WHO IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ADVOCATE (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the US Supreme Court, in Grutter V. Bollinger (2003), upheld the use of affirmative action, the University of Texas has reinstated affirmative action in its admissions policies, and the Governor of Washington has called for an amendment against his State's ban on affirmative action;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley, that it encourages the hiring of a Chancellor who supports and plans to increase recruitment, admission, and retention of underrepresented minority students, and increase recruitment, hiring, and promotion of women and minority faculty and administrators.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly encourages the hiring of a Chancellor with a proven record from his or her previous institution of support for women and minorities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly encourages the selection of cabinet members to the new Chancellor to include at least one woman and one underrepresented minority;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly encourages the hiring of a Chancellor who supports the re-instatement of affirmative action at the Statewide level.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly will voice and represent the views stated here in our representative to the search committee for the new Chancellor.

Sources: Office of Undergraduate Admissions, AVC Admissions & Enrollment, Office of Student Research; Angelica Stacy, the campus Associate Vice Provost for faculty equity.

Mr. Cruz said Chancellor Berdahl is leaving and a process has started to seek a new Chancellor for Berkeley. Grads wanted to weigh in and say they want someone who will be outspoken for the restoration of affirmative action in California, someone who will be committed to taking more proactive measures to repair the damage the ban on affirmative action has done. Before coming to Berkeley, Chancellor Berdahl was Chancellor at the

University of Texas, Austin, and implemented a ban on affirmative action there. It could be said that that was a factor for his being chosen for Berkeley. There are statistics in the bill showing that poor record of diversity of faculty in his Administration. They want to add have a Chancellor who supports outreach and affirmative action.

A Delegate said it bothered him that they're putting many qualifications on what they want rather than seeing a proven record and evaluating people.

A Delegate said this was important, especially in light of cuts to outreach. If outreach disappears, they need a Chancellor who will pick up the slack.

Mr. Bailey said he strongly supported the Resolution. because of proof that Bollinger's outspoken on support for affirmative action at the University of Michigan is what contributed largely to the outcome of the case. It showed the importance of somebody who was very strong in support of affirmative action and articulate in how it worked and it's importance. So it was imperative to choose someone who would be a primary spokesperson and was very committed and articulate in the need for affirmative action, and not in support of the current ban.

Mr. Stagi asked if there was any way to start with affirmative action and recommend they have diversity in the choice of the person chosen as Chancellor. A speaker said they talked about that in committee. In the pool they'd draw from for the Chancellor, they thought the potential for underrepresented minorities and women would be small. Mr. Cruz said he would oppose an amendment because the Administration may choose someone specifically from an underrepresented minority group who would not implement progressive policies. So they should be focused on what the person would do instead of who they are.

Mr. Cruz moved to amend the Resolution, to two female deans, in the fifth Whereas Clause. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

A motion to extend speaking time by three minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Cruz moved to amend the first four Resolved Clauses, he moved to amend "encourages" to "calls for". He and the Committee discussed that. The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Cruz moved to amend the fourth Whereas Clause. Instead of saying "the previous Chancellor was committed" say "the previous Chancellor stated he was committed." The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Seeing no further debate, Ms. Quindel said the question was automatically called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION FOR A NEW CHANCELLOR WHO IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ADVOCATE, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was sponsored by Takeshi Akiba (Jurisprudence and Social Policy) and Kai Wang (Chemical Engineering):

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM AT UC BERKELEY EXTENSION

WHEREAS, the University will terminate the UC Extension English Language Program in May 2004 because the program is not considered to meet the University strategic plan and mission; and

WHEREAS, the University mission statement specifies, "The vision of the University of California, Berkeley is to be the world's leading university in the creation, dissemination, and application of knowledge. Through the continuous pursuit of excellence in all of its endeavors, the University will advance the frontiers of knowledge in the traditional disciplines and open new frontiers in and between new and old realms of knowledge. As a University committed

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM AT UC BERKELEY EXTENSION (cont'd)

to fulfilling its public trust, it will endeavor to educate citizens for the global responsibility of enlarging understanding, promoting justice, reducing suffering, and enriching the human experience"; and

WHEREAS, large increases in fees and tuition for non-resident students already deter many qualified international students from enrolling at UC Berkeley, and the closure of an English Language Program will only further discourage international students from enrolling here; and

WHEREAS, the English Language Program enrolled nearly 3,000 students from more than 50 countries last year, suggesting that it is a valuable resource to the world's student community, and it generated more than \$4.6 million in revenues for the University last year, suggesting that it is a valuable source of income for the University; and

WHEREAS, it is important, particularly in the wake of the USA Patriot Act and other policies that limit foreign scholars' access to US universities, to make every possible effort to include and accommodate students from other countries,

both because international students contribute diversity of experience and ideas of the campus community and because, for many of these students, the English Language Program at UC Berkeley Extension is an important beginning to their academic careers in the United States; and

WHEREAS, many University faculty, editorial boards of scholarly and academic journals, and leaders of industry have been concerned by the effect of the USA Patriot Act on immigration to the US, suggesting that our excessively harsh visa and immigration procedures may result in a 'brain drain' of international talent away from the United States; and

WHEREAS, the excellence of our University is built upon the diversity of its scholars, researchers, and students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly voice its opposition to the closure of the English Language Program at the UC Berkeley Extension, by directing the Foreign Student Affairs Committee to write a letter to the UC Berkeley Chancellor and other University officials on behalf of the GA.

Mr. Akiba said UC Berkeley Extension announced it was cutting the English Language Program, and that was devastating. There are 3,000 students in the Program from 50 different countries and this decision came out of nowhere. For the sake of the presence of international students and the reputation UC Berkeley achieved over three decades, they can't take that away. They're asking that the GA voice its opposition to the cut.

Mr. Akiba said one Resolved Clause was cut, and he would like to amend the bill to add the following:

"Resolved, that the Foreign Student Advocacy Committee advance recommendations to the Assembly and the University as a whole on the alternatives of an English language program on the UC Berkeley campus."

Ms. Quindel said they would accept that addition as a mistake and would apologize.

Mr. Wang said people should have another packet of information on the Program. He contacted Dean Sherwood for a formal response which didn't convince him of the motivation for cutting the Program. It's not coming from the Strategic Plan of the University, which was vague. The economics of this move didn't work out. It's a profitable program and this seemed to be a bad time to cut a program that made money for the University.

Ms. Quindel said that seeing no debate the question was automatically called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM AT UC BERKELEY EXTENSION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was authored by Temina Madon, Academic Affairs Committee Chair, and Brian Milch:

RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED HIKES IN GRADUATE STUDENT FEES

WHEREAS, increasing the number of Californians with graduate and professional degrees is vital for California to maintain its leadership role in the global economy; and

WHEREAS, a 40% increase in UC graduate student fees and an average \$5,000 increase in UC professional school fees would reduce access to graduate education for lower-income Californians; and

WHEREAS, an increase in graduate and professional student fees would prevent some current students, particularly those with family obligations and without other sources of funds, from completing their degree programs; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley will experience a considerable budget deficit if the cost of retaining GSIs and GSRs increases significantly, because full or partial fee remission is offered to most Berkeley graduate students appointed as GSIs and GSRs; and

WHEREAS, graduate students shoulder many of the undergraduate teaching duties on UC campuses, acting as vital links between an overworked faculty and a burgeoning undergraduate student body; and

WHEREAS, increasing the cost of Graduate Student Instructors on some UC campuses could reduce the number of graduate students our University can afford to enroll, thus reducing the available pool of graduate student instructors and the quality and diversity of courses offered to undergraduates; and

WHEREAS, graduate students on UC campuses carry out the advanced research that brings federal and private grant monies into the University; and

RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED HIKES IN GRADUATE STUDENT FEES (cont'd)

WHEREAS, raising the cost of Graduate Student Researchers on some UC campuses could compromise the quality and quantity of scholarly research, and might eventually compromise the quality of new faculty recruits (who will be drawn to universities with larger pools of talented graduate students); and

WHEREAS, a rise in graduate fees may reduce the quality of the graduate students who choose to enroll in the UC system by making it difficult for UC campuses to compete with private universities for the world's best and brightest scholars; and

WHEREAS, a rise in UC professional school fees resulting from reduced State support for these programs will reduce access to the University of California's professional degree programs, thereby reducing the number of highly skilled workers that can contribute to the flagging California economy;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly strongly opposes the 40% hike in UC graduate student fees and the reduced State support for UC professional schools proposed by Governor Schwarzenegger, because it undermines the teaching and research mission of the University, it makes the University of California less competitive with other public and private universities, and it will have a negative impact on the California economy, long-term.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a letter will be drafted by the Academic Affairs Committee on behalf of the Graduate Assembly, addressed to the UC Regents and copied to the UC Office of the President and Governor Schwarzenegger, explaining why we strongly oppose the Governor's proposed graduate fee structure for 2004-2005 and beyond.

Ms. Madon said the Resolution allows the GA to take a unified voice in the media and elsewhere in opposing these proposed fee hikes Gov. Schwarzenegger was trying to levy. She would propose an amendment in the first Whereas Clause, to add "in the State's social infrastructure and," to read:

"Whereas, increasing the number of Californians with graduate and professional degrees is vital for California to maintain its leadership role in the State's social infrastructure and in the global economy; and"

Ms. Madon she's heard professors talk about what they'll do that year with admissions and budgets being shrunk. They want to take out-of-State students but they can't foot the bill and they get in-State students two for the price of one, so they'd take students not on the basis of merit, but on the basis of residency or nationality.

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

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED HIKES IN GRADUATE STUDENT FEES, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution was submitted by Temina Madon, Academic Affairs Committee Chair:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A FACULTY MENTORING TASK FORCE

WHEREAS, faculty members and administrators at the University of California, Berkeley have worked over the past year to develop an excellent set of mentoring guidelines and programs to improve support and training of Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs); and

WHEREAS, these efforts not only aim to ensure the best pedagogical training of GSIs, but they also assert the critical role that faculty mentoring plays in the quality of graduate student instruction; and

WHEREAS, the Academic Affairs Committee believes that a parallel set of guidelines outlining expectations for faculty advising and mentoring of graduate students would greatly benefit the graduate community and enhance the quality of graduate education at UCB; and

WHEREAS, faculty mentoring is an important component of scholarly training, enabling graduate students to successfully meet academic milestones and contribute to existing bodies of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, recent studies suggest that students with positive mentoring relationships experience greater productivity, a higher level of involvement with their departments, and greater satisfaction with their graduate programs ^[1];

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly request the Graduate Division and the Academic Senate to jointly convene a Task Force on Faculty Mentoring of Graduate Student Researchers by the end of this semester.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a proposal for the charge and goals of this Task Force be submitted by the Academic Affairs Committee, on behalf of the entire Graduate Assembly, to Graduate Division Dean Mary Ann Mason.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Academic Affairs Committee will follow up on the progress of this Task Force and will report back to the Graduate Assembly by the end of the Spring 2004 semester.

^[1] Green, S.G. & Bauer, T.N. (1995) *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 537-561.

Ms. Madon said the Resolution was put together by the Academic Affairs Committee. Faculty and administrators came together last year to come up with GSI mentoring guidelines and expectation. They like to meet with GSIs once a semester.

Mr. Akiba said that in the first Resolved Clause, he suggested having words to call on the Grad Division to convene a task force with equal representation of grads, or words to that effect. Ms. Madon asked if that needed to be in the Resolution. Mr. Akiba said it's better to have that come from the GA. Ms. Quindel said the amendment would be to add "with a majority of graduate students," to read:

Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly request the Graduate Division and the Academic Senate to jointly convene a Task Force Faculty Mentoring of Graduate Student Researchers, with a majority of graduate students, by the end of this semester.

A motion to approve the amendment was made and seconded.

Mr. Sharma said it was almost laughable to have a majority of grads, and he asked why they were asking them. Ms. Madon said they're working with Paul Gray and the Chancellor to get a declaration to have all committees include student membership. The motion to approve the amendment failed unanimously by voice-vote.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A FACULTY MENTORING TASK FORCE UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

GA ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MENTORING AWARD PROPOSAL

Ms. Madon said in 2003 Delegates approved an award to go to distinguished members of the faculty who mentor grads in research groups and at the doctoral and professional levels. The award is \$1,000, an all members of the Academic Senate are eligible. Selection is by grad students from the GA supplemented by two members of the Academic Senate. Sample selection criteria and a timeline were included in the proposal that was submitted. One caveat is that the \$1,000 cash award would need to be approved by the Chancellor if it's given to a faculty member, since faculty are prohibited from receiving compensation beyond faculty salaries. But there are a number of awards of this ilk, so it's possible the Chancellor will grant this exception.

Ms. Ahn asked about the rationale to limiting the award to the Academic Senate, since it's not very diverse and includes only ladder-rank faculty, and lecturers and people who interact with students would not be eligible. Ms. Ahn moved to amend to eliminate the language limiting the award to members of the Academic Senate, and to instead, have faculty and teaching staff of the UC Berkeley campus eligible. Ms. Madon said that any member of the faculty and teaching staff affiliated with a graduate degree granting program could be nominated. That's in the criteria. The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Sharma asked what back-up plan they had if the Chancellor doesn't approve this. Ms. Madon said the Academic Affairs Committee came up with a number of proposals. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Madon said one possibility was a grant to faculty members for use in their mentoring and research activities.

Mr. Akiba said the Selection Committee should be diverse. It would probably be more objective if people who set criteria and people who do the selection are diversified.

Mr. Kashmiri asked if this was the best use of the GA's money, and if they wanted to set a precedent of grads giving grad fees to faculty members in a time of budget cuts. Ms. Madon said they spend a lot of money for things like beer and pizza, and things that support their social needs. This expenditure has the potential to change views of structural inequality among faculty, since women and underrepresented minorities spend more work time mentoring grads, taking away from their academic work. And when they go up for merit and tenure reviews, they don't necessarily have the same publications or work that a faculty who doesn't spend mentoring have. This could potentially have a lasting effect.

Mr. Sharma moved to extend speaking time by two minutes. The motion was seconded and passed by hand-vote 10-9-3.

Mr. Sharma moved to amend, to attach a note that to the extent, possible the GA would spend non-mandatory of the money for the Mentoring Award. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Akiba said the issue of mandatory student fees was controversial, and commercial fees weren't controversial. They don't want to make a decision at that point and this was in the process of negotiations with the University.

Mr. Sharma said he wasn't making the motion from a policy consideration, but consideration of credentials. They should use commercial money.

A Delegate asked where this would come from. Ms. Quindel said this amount was already allocated in the budget.

The motion to approve Mr. Sharma's amendment failed by voice-vote. Roll call was taken. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MENTORING AWARDS PROPOSAL 22-0-1.

REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Ms. Quindel said she had an additional item. Round 4 for applications funding was approved at the same level as others. A timeline for the semester was included in the agenda packet, based on their vision, as outlined at the retreat. The motion to approve the

Executive Board report was made by Ms. Ahn and was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Begin written report from the Executive Board

Executive Board Report

February 5, 2004

- Made Cintya's official resignation date December 31st, and thus Dawn's official start date January 1st. Approved with no objections.
- Allocated \$500 for a Research Assistant to be managed by the President to research other student government constitutions and incorporate Executive Board & Autonomy Committee feedback in order to create a draft of a GA Constitution by January 13th, to be presented to the Executive Board at their retreat.
- The autonomy petition language below was approved.

The Graduate Assembly (GA) is the only graduate student government in the UC System lacking independence from the general or undergraduate student body governments (such as the ASUC),

Written report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

and although it holds its own elections, allocates its own budget, and maintains a separate governing system, the GA does not have final authority over fiscal & legislative matters and autonomy. To ensure that the Graduate Assembly have legislative and fiscal autonomy and equitable space rights, should the GA be constituted separately from the ASUC?

- Approved adjusted Graduate Division budget request below.

Graduate Division request budget adjustment that reflect decreased funding of coordinator stipends (some were only recently hired), some events did not take place, office expenses. The overall request decreased from \$68,000 to \$49,201.04.
- The Board recommended that the Executive Officers seek outside mediation and report back to the Board on the outcome of that process.
- See attached vision/goals timeline for an outline of our Spring 2004 plan.

End written report from the Executive Board

A Delegate moved to table discussion on the Fulbright Fellowship issue. The motion was withdrawn. A motion to refer the Fulbright Fellowship issue to the Academic Affairs Committee was made by Mr. Sharma and was seconded. THE MOTION PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Akiba said he would like to amend the motion, to authorize the Academic Affairs Committee to write letters to relevant parties in support of the Fulbright Fellowship applicants on behalf of the Assembly. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

THE MOTION TO REFER THE ISSUE OF FULBRIGHT FELLOWSHIPS TO THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, TO WRITE LETTERS, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Officers' Reports

Ms. Quindel asked people to read her report and send her an e-mail if they have any questions.

Ms. Madon said they have a survey written by Mr. Furmanski, a Grad Council representative, and got 50 or 60 responses before the server went down. It will impact grad student participation in faculty hiring committees. The agenda packet also had an overview of the UC budget. The budget for academic programs is \$336 million for the school, and that covers GSIs, stipends, and fee remissions. So when the fee comes up, that comes out of Berkeley's budget and doesn't impact students as much as it does quality of instruction on the campus. There's also a call for a Graduate Affairs Director. Also, if Delegates know anybody in the Law School or the School of Public Policy interested in working with students having problems, such as civil disobedience, conflict with administrators, academic dishonesty, charges of misconduct, there was an opening for Grad Affairs Director of the Student Advocate Office. This is the first year for the position and it's a great opportunity to learn about policy.

Ms. Williams said that in her External Vice President's report, she outlined things they'd like to work on. They don't have an External Affairs Committee and need people to join. The next meeting is Monday at 7 p.m. in the GA. They have a lot of issues regarding the budget, and they want to schedule trips to Sacramento to visit legislators, as well as and work on voter registration. They're working on a Web site, like "Move On," so grads can get letters sent out to legislators easily. The UCSA is suing Gov. Schwarzenegger over the vehicle license tax. The External Affairs Committee didn't meet last semester, and there are issues of no Delegates and they have issues that affect all of them.

Ms. Quindel said she wanted to highlight some things that weren't in her report. Pres. Dynes responded to the GA's letter, in a long letter, and said he was on the same page. She wasn't sure what UC will do, but Pres. Dynes mentioned some things. She'll include that in the next agenda packet. Secondly, regarding the Department of Energy and the LBNL, she was still working on that issue, trying to get the Director to come to the GA's April meeting.

Mr. Cantor said he wanted to mention some things. He did the bookkeeping for the GA, and unfortunately, he was addressing the wrong people, those who were there. There are some important rules concerning the GA and being an active Delegate, and he hasn't found time or been careful about maintaining those rules; but he'll start. Committees were not an option for some of them. He needs Delegates to be proactive about fulfilling their responsibilities. Keeping track of 100 people was Herculean. There are rules concerning committees and attendance. One person per department needs to attend at least one committee. And they can't miss more than two consecutive meetings. The same applies to Delegate meetings. Otherwise they're marked as being inactive. This would have repercussions with student groups that seek funding. So they may find unpleasant results if their department doesn't have proper representation. There are rules about how many committees one can sit on, and they shouldn't sit on more than two committees. Committee chairs should make sure membership is within proper limits and that a quorum was present.

Ms. Williams said the External Affairs Office of the ASUC was also working on grad student fees. Also, the two grad student nominees for the ASUC Judicial Council were rejected by the ASUC Senate.

Ms. Quindel said she'd like to thank everybody and encourage them to be active in committees, which make the Assembly function. She would ask them to check their e-mails for information on autonomy and to help gather petitions. They want to make sure they inform the public about this initiative. Lastly, it wasn't all talk, and they needed action. Dean Mason and Chancellor Berdahl talked to her and really want people to protest in the State Capitol. They don't think there was anything more effective than all of them coming together to protest. So if a call comes out, she would ask them to please try to participate. They need to mobilize around these issues. It will affect their lives, and those who come after them. She wanted to thank them being there.

This meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

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

Present at the GA meeting of February 5, 2004

Bioengineering, Carmel Levitan	Business Admin , Regina Eberhart
City & Regional Planning , Jay Stagi	
ESPM, Josh Fisher	
History, Matthew Sargent	History of Art,
Sherri Ehya	
Integrative Biology , Christine Petersen	
Music , Rebekah Ahrendt	
African Diaspora Studies, Marlon Bailey	Anthropology,
David Cohen	
Anthropology, Kira Blaisdell-Sloan	Architecture ,
Sahar Fard	
Astronomy, Jesse	
Leaman	Bioengineering, Matt Eckerle
Business Admin ., Rob Ricketts	Chemical
Engineering, Kai Wang	
Chemical Engineering, Lola Odusanya	Chemistry , David
Garcia	
Civil and Environmental Engineering , Emily Berkeley	
East Asian Languages & Cult. , Orna Shaugnessy	
Economics, Vivian Hwa	
Education, Ronald Cruz	
Energy & Resources , Fanta Kamakate	
ESPM, Peter Oboyski	
Ethnic Studies, Iyko Day	Folklore , Will
Collins	
Geography, Jason Strange	German , Robert
Schechtman	
History, Candace Chen	
IEOR Deborah Pedersen	
Journalism, Chad Heeter	Jurisprudence &
Social Policy , Takeshi Akiba	
Law, Catherine Ahn	
Law, Funmi Olorunnipa	
Law, Mo Kashmiri	Law, Rishi
Sharma	
Law, Ross Astoria	Linguistics Marc
Ettlinger	
Logic & the Methodology of Science , Johanna Franklin	Mathematics Peter
Gerdes	

MCB, Andro Hsu
McElroy
MCB, Susan Mashiyama
[Engineering](#) Jessica Preciado
[Nuclear Engineering](#), David Barnes
[Philosophy](#) Benjamin Boudreaux
[Physics](#), Matthijs
Randsdorp
[Physics](#), Trevor Lanting
Peter Coppinger
Public Policy, Allison Cole
Anat Shenker
[Rhetoric](#), Richard Quang-Ahn Tran
[Welfare](#) Maayan Greene
[Social Welfare](#), Sarah
Ortega
[Sociology](#), Maria Hollowell-Fuentes
[Statistics](#) Richard Bourgon
[Vision Science](#), Paul Macneilage
Officer - President Jessica Quindel
Officer - VPAA Temina Madon
Representative Bahar Khanjari
Officer - VPEA Dawn Williams
Staff - Bus. Director Nzingha Dugas
Staff - Dept Liaison Chris Cantor
Staff - Funding Shayla Moore
Staff - Media Relations Robeson Taj Frazier

MCB Kathryn

[Mechanical](#)

[Physics](#) Miguel Daal

[Plant and Microbial Biology](#) J.

Public Policy

[Social](#)

[Sociology](#) Manuel Vallee

ASUC

Amended Version of Resolutions That Were Approved

Resolution Requesting the University to Ensure Affordable Student Family Housing Before Initiating Demolition of UC Village "Section B"

Whereas, the University Village Redevelopment Project will demolish all remaining affordable family housing at UC Village, leaving only a few units at the Symth-Fernwald complex. The University plans to demolish approximately half of Section B during summer year 2004 (referred to as Step 2), and shortly thereafter, demolish all Section A housing (Step 3). The remainder of Section B is scheduled for demolition in summer 2006; and

Whereas, as of January 2004 affordable housing was terminated for all incoming students. The University has placed a moratorium on new tenants to Section B and Symth-Fernwald, and is squeezing existing residents into the remaining affordable units; many prospective graduate and undergraduate students will not choose to come to UC Berkeley; and

Whereas, the project is discriminatory. Higher rents will disproportionately effect vulnerable populations, including low income, single-parent families, and ethnic minorities; higher rents will effectively dissuade many students from attending UC Berkeley to the detriment of maintaining a diverse student body that enriches the university environment; and

Whereas, the projected rents for the new units are approximately 100% higher than present section A or B rents, equivalent to the totality of a GSI or research assistant salary. The rents for Section B at present are \$750/mo. for a two-bedroom apartment. The projected rent for new two bedroom apartments in 2006 is nearly \$1,400.00, and the existing new units are now approximately at that price. This is in violation of State and county norms that rate one-income student-type families at extremely low income levels, and indicate that such families should pay no more than 30% of their income in rent; and

Whereas, the prior Environmental Impact Report on the UC Village Redevelopment is incomplete and excludes reference to social-economic impacts. The University has intentionally excluded impacts to the student population given the higher rents generated by the project. State of California EIR guidelines require descriptions of impacts to communities, sections which the University leaves in blank; and

Whereas, the University ignores that increased rents present significant impact on student budgets and academic performance. The University is increasing new building rents 6% yearly. The rents of new units are becoming an increasing burden for all residents. Many students in the new East Village section are moving out to

cheaper units in the Berkeley area. The project is simply not viable for a large fraction of intended users: low-income UC family students; and

Whereas, University Village Redevelopment Project was approved by the UC Regents in November 2003 without notification of resident's concerns. The University justified construction of the project to the Regents because, in the words of the University President's Office, existing units are "currently renting at extremely low rates". In the same document the University only considered financial impacts to its own cash flow. (Document 2-GF Office of the President November 6, 2003, attached); and

Whereas, for years the University has ignored requests that an affordable rent policy be implemented. After considerable pressure, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor Padilla have agreed to hold an affordable rent round table starting in February. No results are guaranteed for this round table;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly of the University of California at Berkeley here assembled requests that the University implement widely publicized and sufficient measures to guarantee affordable housing for all future and present student families, before demolition of Section B initiates in June 2004.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly requests that the University include appropriate studies and mitigation measures on the social, economic and academic impacts of increased rent on the University community in the Environmental Impact Report and as part of the upcoming "Affordable Rent Roundtable".

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly requests that the round table include participation from all sectors of the University affected by increased housing costs, as enumerated by the President of the GA in communication to the Chancellor on November 26, 2003.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly will participate in the Affordable Rent Roundtable to ensure affordable rent for students and will support this issue in all ways possible and through inclusion in all appropriate committees and initiatives.

Be It Finally Resolved, that this issue be referred to the Graduate Assembly Advocacy Committee.

Resolution Endorsing Proposition 56

Whereas, California has not passed a budget on time since 1986; and

Whereas, legislators can work on other bills or even go on vacation while California's budget remains unresolved; and

Whereas, lack of an adopted State budget results in severe financial and organizational consequences to State businesses and vendors, State services such as healthcare and education, and millions of working Californians; and

Whereas, the two-thirds vote requirement to pass a state budget and related taxes has failed to keep spending in check and presents a significant stumbling block to passing an on-time and responsible budget; and

Whereas, legislators are currently threatened and punished if they do not bend to partisan pressures; and

Whereas, Proposition 56, the Budget Accountability Act, will enact a comprehensive report of the State budget process that will hold the Governor and the Legislature more accountable to the people of California; and

Whereas, the Budget Accountability Act will force legislatures to permanently forfeit their salary, per diem and car allowance, for every day that the budget is late; and

Whereas, the Budget Accountability Act establishes a real budget reserve in good times so that extreme budget cuts and taxes will be less likely in a weak economy; and

Whereas, the Budget Accountability Act changes the vote requirement for the budget and related taxes from two-thirds to 55%, which will end budget gridlock while still requiring a broad consensus to pass the budget; and

Whereas, the Budget Accountability Act will force legislatures to stay in session and only work on the budget when the budget is late; and

Whereas, the Budget Accountability Act gives the Assembly and Senate Legislative Ethics Committees the authority to censure party leaders who bully legislators to vote the party line rather than their conscience; and

Whereas, the Budget Accountability Act gives voters the information they need on how their taxes are spent and how their legislators voted on the budget so voters can keep legislators accountable on Election Day;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the University of California at Berkeley Graduate Assembly supports Proposition 56 on the March 2,2004 ballot.

Resolution to Support the Reinstatement of Affirmative Action In Washington State

Whereas, on June 23, 2003, the United States Supreme Court upheld the use of affirmative action for the purpose of achieving diversity in *Grutter v. Bollinger*; and

Whereas, in Washington State, the passage of Initiative 200 has led to a dramatic drop in underrepresented minority enrollment at the University of Washington. In the year 2000, Latino, black, and Native American people comprised about 7.5%, 3.2%, and 1.6% of Washington's population, respectively. [2000 U.S. Census] However in 2003, Latino, black, and Native American students comprised only 3.2%, 2.4% and 1% of all undergraduates. [University of Washington website] Latino enrollment in the University of Washington's graduate and professional programs is only 2.9 percent. [January 23, 2004 Seattle Post-Intelligencer Bill would allow universities to consider race in admissions.]; and

Whereas, in Washington State, Washington Governor Gary Locke has called for the amendment of Initiative 200 to allow for the use of affirmative action again. A bipartisan group of Democratic and Republican State Legislators are sponsoring Senate Bill 6268, which would amend Initiative 200 to allow the reinstatement of affirmative action in higher education; and

Whereas, the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly has repeatedly supported the use of affirmative action policies to achieve integration and diversity within higher education; and

Whereas, the reinstatement of affirmative action in Washington State would be a tremendous, positive impetus for the State of California to reinstate equal opportunities for Latino, black, and Native American people;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly President will write a letter supporting the reinstatement of affirmative action in Washington and send this letter to Washington Governor Gary Locke and the Washington State Legislature.

Be It Further Resolved, that the External Affairs Vice President will seek support from the UCSA.

Resolution for a New Chancellor Who Is an Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Advocate

Whereas, a primary goal of the California Master Plan for Education is to supply resources and authority to every public education institution to provide quality education for all students; and

Whereas, although minority freshmen have increased in enrollment every year since 1998, from 11-15%, underrepresented minorities contributed to only 13.5% of the fall 2003 total student body (10% of the graduate student body), and this percentage is significantly lower than the 25.3% figure in 1997, when affirmative action was still legal; and

Whereas, female graduate enrollment has lagged behind male enrollment, though female undergraduate enrollment has exceeded male enrollment since 2002; and

Whereas, the previous Chancellor stated he was committed to improving faculty diversity, the overall composition of the tenure-track faculty has remained approximately 76% male and 84% white over the past decade, and although UC Berkeley made 11 offers to African American candidates in the past two years, only five accepted; and

Whereas, out of 21 academic deans in the senior administration there are two females and one minority, and out of 63 departmental chairs, 16 are female and five are minorities; and

Whereas, the US Supreme Court, in *Grutter V. Bollinger* (2003), upheld the use of affirmative action, the University of Texas has reinstated affirmative action in its admissions policies, and the Governor of Washington has called for an amendment against his State's ban on affirmative action;

Therefore Be It Resolved, by the Graduate Assembly of the University of California, Berkeley, that it calls for the hiring of a Chancellor who supports and plans to increase recruitment, admission, and retention of underrepresented minority students, and increase recruitment, hiring, and promotion of women and minority faculty and administrators.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls for the hiring of a Chancellor with a proven record from his or her previous institution of support for women and minorities.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls for the selection of cabinet members to the new Chancellor to include at least one woman and one underrepresented minority;

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls for the hiring of a Chancellor who supports the re-instatement of affirmative action at the Statewide level.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly will voice and represent the views stated here in our representative to the search committee for the new Chancellor.

Sources: Office of Undergraduate Admissions, AVC Admissions & Enrollment, Office of Student Research; Angelica Stacy, the campus Associate Vice Provost for faculty equity.

Resolution in Support of the English Language Program At UC Berkeley Extension

Whereas, the University will terminate the UC Extension English Language Program in May 2004 because the program is not considered to meet the University strategic plan and mission; and

Whereas, the University mission statement specifies "The vision of the University of California, Berkeley is to be the world's leading university in the creation, dissemination, and application of knowledge. Through the continuous pursuit of excellence in all of its endeavors, the University will advance the frontiers of knowledge in the traditional disciplines and open new frontiers in and between new and old realms of knowledge. As a University committed to fulfilling its public trust, it will endeavor to educate citizens for the global responsibility of enlarging understanding, promoting justice, reducing suffering, and enriching the human experience"; and

Whereas, large increases in fees and tuition for non-resident students already deter many qualified international students from enrolling at UC Berkeley, and the closure of an English Language Program will only further discourage international students from enrolling here; and

Whereas, the English Language Program enrolled nearly 3,000 students from more than 50 countries last year, suggesting that it is a valuable resource to the world's student community, and it generated more than \$4.6 million in revenues for the University last year, suggesting that it is a valuable source of income for the University; and

Whereas, it is important, particularly in the wake of the USA Patriot Act and other policies that limit foreign scholars' access to US universities, to make every possible effort to include and accommodate students from other countries, both because international students contribute diversity of experience and ideas of the campus community and because, for many of these students, the English Language Program at UC Berkeley Extension is an important beginning to their academic careers in the United States; and

Whereas, many University faculty, editorial boards of scholarly and academic journals, and leaders of industry have been concerned by the effect of the USA Patriot Act on immigration to the US, suggesting that our excessively harsh visa and

immigration procedures may result in a 'brain drain' of international talent away from the United States; and

Whereas, the excellence of our University is built upon the diversity of its scholars, researchers, and students;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly voice its opposition to the closure of the English Language Program at the UC Berkeley Extension, by directing the Foreign Student Affairs Committee to write a letter to the UC Berkeley Chancellor and other University officials on behalf of the GA.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Foreign Student Advocacy Committee advance recommendations to the Assembly and the University as a whole on the alternatives of an English language program on the UC Berkeley campus."

Resolution in Opposition to Proposed Hikes In Graduate Student Fees

Whereas, increasing the number of Californians with graduate and professional degrees is vital for California to maintain its leadership role in the State's social infrastructure and in the global economy; and

Whereas, a 40% increase in UC graduate student fees and an average \$5,000 increase in UC professional school fees would reduce access to graduate education for lower-income Californians; and

Whereas, an increase in graduate and professional student fees would prevent some current students, particularly those with family obligations and without other sources of funds, from completing their degree programs; and

Whereas, UC Berkeley will experience a considerable budget deficit if the cost of retaining GSIs and GSRs increases significantly, because full or partial fee remission is offered to most Berkeley graduate students appointed as GSIs and GSRs; and

Whereas, graduate students shoulder many of the undergraduate teaching duties on UC campuses, acting as vital links between an overworked faculty and a burgeoning undergraduate student body; and

Whereas, increasing the cost of Graduate Student Instructors on some UC campuses could reduce the number of graduate students our University can afford to enroll, thus reducing the available pool of graduate student instructors and the quality and diversity of courses offered to undergraduates; and

Whereas, graduate students on UC campuses carry out the advanced research that brings federal and private grant monies into the University; and

Whereas, raising the cost of Graduate Student Researchers on some UC campuses could compromise the quality and quantity of scholarly research, and might eventually compromise the quality of new faculty recruits (who will be drawn to universities with larger pools of talented graduate students); and

Whereas, a rise in graduate fees may reduce the quality of the graduate students who choose to enroll in the UC system by making it difficult for UC campuses to compete with private universities for the world's best and brightest scholars; and

Whereas, a rise in UC professional school fees resulting from reduced State support for these programs will reduce access to the University of California's professional degree programs, thereby reducing the number of highly skilled workers that can contribute to the flagging California economy;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly strongly opposes the 40% hike in UC graduate student fees and the reduced State support for UC professional schools proposed by Governor Schwarzenegger, because it undermines the teaching and research mission of the University, it makes the University of California less competitive with other public and private universities, and it will have a negative impact on the California economy, long-term.

Be It Further Resolved, that a letter will be drafted by the Academic Affairs Committee on behalf of the Graduate Assembly, addressed to the UC Regents and copied to the UC Office of the President and Governor Schwarzenegger, explaining why we strongly oppose the Governor's proposed graduate fee structure for 2004-2005 and beyond.