

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

December 2, 2004

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- [Heard general announcements.](#)
- [Heard from Chancellor Birgeneau and had a question and answer session.](#)
- [Heard a report from Ms. Dugas, who announced her resignation as GA Manager/Advisor.](#)
- [Heard a presentation from Mr. Lustig, Vice Chancellor, BAS, on the campus' proposed Principles of Community, and had a discussion on the Principles.](#)
- [Elected Jessica Preciado, Law, as Academic Affairs Vice President.](#)
- [Heard reports from Executive Officers.](#)
- [Heard reports from the Executive Board and GA committees.](#)
- [Heard a report from the Funding Committee and approved the Committee's recommended allocations for Grad Events grants for Rounds 4 and 4-A.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA's Graduate Council representatives.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA's Store Operations Board representative.](#)

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Fall Semester, was called to order by Rishi Sharma at 5:35 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Sharma said that before they get started, they have three special guests present that evening, the Chancellor, who will archive shortly, as well as Vice Chancellor Lustig, and Elizabeth Gillis, to talk about the Principles of Community Initiative. While they wait for the Chancellor to arrive, they could do their first orders of business.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Sharma called for any comments, questions, or concerns about the agenda, and said he would entertain a motion to approve. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Sharma called for any corrections or questions about the minutes to the minutes from the November

meeting. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 4, 2004 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Announcements

- 2 -

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Sharma said that while waiting for the Chancellor, without objection, they'd bounce around the agenda a bit.

GA Announcements

Ms. Olorunnipa introduced herself and said she was the Grad Community and Activities Project Coordinator. The GCAP will hold a grad student holiday mixer, and she would ask Delegates to please tell people in their departments. It will be on Friday at 3 p.m. in the Tilden Room, in the MLK Student Union. She hoped they come out and participate. There will be food, music and holiday games. Also, in line with their community projects, they're going to collect non-perishable food items for the Harrison House, a homeless shelter for families. So she would encourage Delegates to come, eat, and bring something for people who have less than they do.

Ms. Moore said the Graduate Women's Project was having a reception next Wednesday, December 8, from 4:30 to 7:00, she believed, at Anthony Hall, on the patio. She would ask people to please try and come out.

Ms. ElNaggar said the Berkeley Graduate was printed and there were a whole bunch sitting by the front door. If people could take about ten back to their department, that would be great. Mr. Sharma said they should commend Ms. ElNaggar for her work on what was a very lovely issue of the Berkeley Grad. Ms. ElNaggar said she believed it will be her last issue. Ms. Dugas said Ms. ElNaggar was leaving them soon, and they had been able to keep her for one extra semester. So they're interviewing for the position, and if anybody was interested in being the head editor, interviews will occur in the next couple of weeks. They could stop by the GA or send an e-mail. They would like to thank Ms. ElNaggar for all her hard work, and for agreeing to stay on for an extra semester. She asked for one more round of applause for Ms. ElNaggar (Applause)

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY -- Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau

-

-

Mr. Sharma said the Chancellor had arrived. He could only stay until 6:00, so they hoped to have an introduction, and to hear any comments he might like to make, after which there could be some questions and answers, if the Chancellor would indulge them.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he would first like to thank Mr. Sharma for inviting him. It was a pleasure to be there. Since everything was being recorded, he would choose his words very carefully. Reporters usually love him because he doesn't choose his words very carefully, and says what he thinks, resulting in a lot of media

attention. If they go on Google, they might not believe the Chancellor said some of the statements there, but he did.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he would sound obsequious by saying how important grads are, specifically during his MIT days, when he was department head, or dean. When they tried to recruit faculty, and the

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 3 -

first thing considered was the quality of grad students, because for a research-oriented faculty, they want to know that when they come to the University, they'll have outstanding grads to work with, grads they'll have the pleasure of developing as researchers, scholars, and teachers, people who will then enable what the professors were doing to live on.

Obviously, by any objective statistic, Berkeley attracts among the very best grads, not just in the country, but in the world. So grads are a fundamentally important part of the life at Berkeley and its attractiveness to faculty. Grads are also very important for undergrads, at least in his experience. First of all, a number of grads spend part of their time teaching, as grad instructors, and often they are the real interface between the faculty and undergrad students.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that in the days when all he did was teach and do research, he always had a moderately large research group, seven or eight Ph.D. students, typically. And he always insisted that they spend part of their time teaching. So he would encourage them to actually teach. One of his great prides was that his grads would get better scores than the faculty did in the courses they taught, and that experience served them very well later in their careers.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he knew that grads face many challenges at any university, and perhaps the most productive way for him to use his time at the meeting was for him to listen to them and hear what they think are the issues for grads at Berkeley that he, as the new Chancellor, ought to know about. Some they may be able to solve, and some they may not be able to solve.

Mr. Sharma said that one issue that was presented dealt with international students. In the past, the GA worked hand-in-hand with Chancellor Berdahl on international students' issues, and one that continues to pop up was residency, for tuition purposes. International students were not eligible for residency, even though many technically are residents in California, staying there for an average of five years. The fact that students have to pay out-of-State tuition for five years makes it difficult for students to subsist. He asked if that issue has been discussed with the Chancellor and if he had any plans to deal with that. He noted that the question was from the Sociology Department.

Chancellor Birgeneau said it has been discussed with him. Since he was an international grad student himself, when he was in grad school, he was actually cognizant of this issue. He had a fellowship in Canada that didn't come close to covering Yale's tuition. So he knew very much about the issue first hand, and obviously, increases in grad tuition have exacerbated that in Berkeley. This affects the faculty's decision on who they choose to support. He's been in discussions with a number of people about this issue. One thing they've talked about is trying to raise money for grad fellowships, but not fellowships that would cover the whole cost, but cover the redress, the balance between in-State students and those from out-of-State, or, more importantly, international students, and then international and domestic students would then be on an equal footing from the point of view of research groups that they work in. Actually, it had nothing to do with coming to Berkeley. He actually talked

to a donor in New York about this issue recently, for a commitment for some amount of money, although not enough to solve the issue for the whole campus. There were obviously issue broader issues for international students, which were quite egregious. The President of Cal Tech, David Baltimore, a long-time friend of his, met with Tom Ridge to re-discuss this issue with him just last month. Politics being what they are, Tom Ridge promised to do something, but now was gone. Clearly, this is a very important issue, which, in his opinion, the treatment of international students and scholars at the border was an embarrassment to the United States and was doing more to generate anti-Americanism than anything else he knew of.

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 4 -

Mr. Sharma said another question, from the Sociology Department, dealt with affordable housing, and whether the Chancellor might be willing to meet with Family Housing to discuss their concerns affordability of the new units being built, and potential plans for pooling funds for development that would make units affordable before the demolition of the next phase begins.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that to the extent his schedule allows him to meet with anybody, he'd say as a matter of principle that he'd be willing to meet. He didn't know the rules, but at other universities, they operate under constraints as to what rent can be charged, because they can't undercut the local housing market. He asked if that was true of Berkeley. Mr. Lustig said the campus can undercut prices, but can't use tax-supported payment to compete with local businesses. But housing was a separate issue. Chancellor Birgeneau said he didn't know, then, totally what the constraints are. So people know, if they subsidize housing, that money would not be available for stipends. Mr. Lustig said the issue with housing is that they can't use State money to support housing, and it had to be self-supporting.

Mr. Schechtman said they're preparing a report which will hopefully land in the Chancellor's office in the next month or two, and they'd like to disagree with some conclusions. The State does not bar the University from using State funds to subsidize student housing, but that doesn't mean how things had to be self-sustaining inherently. Living in the second most expensive area in the United States, grads had an average income of \$14-20,000 a year. The campus needs to creatively look for other sources of income to ensure that families, especially, have affordable housing, because the University is demolishing the last units of affordable housing in the area, which as he understood, were almost unlivable. Mr. Schechtman said they need to be demolished, but the problem was that rents were doubling, and the University was saying residents must be the only source of income, which was incorrect. It's just that student funds cannot be used to subsidize certain projects. They need to be more creative than the University has been to date.

Mr. Sharma said the remaining questions deal with underrepresented minority enrollment at Berkeley. The first question was that college and grad schools were hard enough without feeling that one was not meant to be there, which is the effect if not seeing brown and black faces. They really need the Administration to take radical stands to put into place effective policies. Mr. Sharma asked what policy measures the Chancellor was perhaps planning to directly address this issue. Chancellor Birgeneau said that to date, his focus has been largely at the undergrad level. He's talked with representatives of the African American community he happened, by coincidence, to meet that morning, and with a cross-section of Latinos, students, staff, and faculty, who have sort of banded together with the hope of working out some strategies. He's also had some discussions with the Office of the President, trying to figure out what he was prepared to do, what the limits were, and has talked about this publicly, many times. It's a question of what they can do.

Mr. Sharma said that similarly to that, regarding faculty diversity issues, he asked if there were any sorts of policy plans or proposals. Chancellor Birgeneau said that again, obviously, in looking at the faculty, they're relatively homogeneous. He actually doesn't know what the constraints were in terms of faculty hiring, or if there were any constraints.

Mr. Lustig said it depends on FTE. There's federal funding they can use to bypass some State affirmative action policies.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that what they did at MIT, was to have opportunity appointments, which were moderately successful. He hasn't been at Berkeley long enough to understand the faculty issue, but his

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 5 -

hope was that they'll be able to use mechanisms like opportunity appointments. He just heard of a woman who was supposed to be an opportunity appointment, but it didn't go through, and he heard the downside of when that doesn't go through. So it needs careful attention to make sure they don't have what looks like a position at the faculty level and making commitments, and then not have it work out because something went goes wrong.

Mr. DeWitt introduced himself and said he was from the Department of City and Regional Planning. Severe enrollment constraints keep lots of folks out of that School who would like to be there, and it kept him out for a while. He looked at the enrollment number for 2004 and only 109 admits were African Americans, down from 149 last year. If that pattern follows through, it could get really bad. So he asked how, especially because of community development that the Chancellor talked about, they were trying to make things better for disadvantaged folks. One suggestion was for the Chancellor to hold more town halls with students, and perhaps have some discussion with people from throughout the school community, not just the folks who make it down to the GA meeting. At these town hall meetings, people could talk about how to get more people of a diverse background there to study; and not just at the undergrad level, but especially at the grad level. There were only a couple of black guys in his entire Department, and that was just not right. They're talking about planning for the communities those folks live in, which he lives in as well.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he agreed with Mr. DeWitt completely and said it wasn't right. He didn't know whether or not town hall meetings were the best mechanisms. Mr. DeWitt said he thought they could be if they talked about this issue, and learned, and got with the Chancellor and learned from him, as he learns from them, how to get this going, so that next year is better than this past year. Chancellor Birgeneau said that was for undergrads and everybody. Mr. DeWitt said one doesn't get to be a grad unless they get in there as an undergrad. Chancellor Birgeneau said he agreed completely with that, and obviously, they have to reverse this situation. Mr. DeWitt asked if he would be interested in a town hall meeting with people from City and Regional Planning, perhaps. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would be. Mr. DeWitt said they're good guys.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he's used to meeting with everybody, but whether or not such meetings actually generate change and allowed them to move forward was a question. Mr. DeWitt said they have a saying in the Department, "Plan or replan."

Ms. Felarca introduced herself and said she's in the School of Education and was also representing BAMN, By Any Means Necessary. Regarding the continued drop in underrepresented minority enrollment of undergrads as well as grads, by his own words, the outgoing Chancellor said his great failure was to have overseen the real degeneration of this University as a leader in resegregation rather than a leader in integration and progress that it used to be. There was a positive Supreme Court Decision, Grutter v. Bollinger, that upheld the right of

universities to use race-conscious admission policy in affirmative action. Prop. 209 has not yet been tested since that Decision came out. She asked if the Chancellor would pledge to do everything he could to make sure this drop was reversed, and reversed in a real way, not a nominal way, and to work in partnership with students, who would do everything in their power to defend this Administration if the success of that effort drew the ire of Ward Connerly or John Morres. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would, and said this was not just a high priority, but probably the highest. However, he wouldn't do it without understanding what they're doing, and being confident that whatever strategy they follow will actually work. Ms. Felarca said the legal sanction was there, and the moral sanction was more than there. Chancellor Birgeneau said he understood fully.

Ms. Levitan said that among the many disturbing things in the State budget and the UC budget, two things stood out to her. One was the percent of education actually funded by the State, which has been

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 6 -

dropping, and the other was the statement that Gov. Schwarzenegger made that he believed grad tuition should be 50% more than undergrad tuition, with no justification for increasing their tuition. Both those trends, as a grad, were very disturbing to see. She asked what action he would take to improve the direction of the budget. Chancellor Birgeneau said that's an educational process for Gov. Schwarzenegger. The Governor fortunately has a new head of the budget, from Berkeley, who understands grad tuition, and that's one reason Chancellor Birgeneau said he encouraged taking the job to be taken, so the University has input. There was a complication in the California system in that he didn't have the control there that he had in Toronto, where he had a very democratic process, and he reported to grads, among others. Mr. Sharma said they could adopt that system at Berkeley. Chancellor Birgeneau said some members of the union were included, in a highly democratized process. So he didn't have that control.

Ms. Levitan asked if he had any ways to influence greater understanding, and if there was a chance for a positive turnabout, and to realize that education was an investment. Chancellor Birgeneau said there were ways, and he's talked about this with his boss, the UC President. In part, it's an educational process in Sacramento. Ms. Levitan asked if it will get better. Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought it will get better. At least he was optimistic about it.

Ms. Olorunnipa said that to go back to what Mr. DeWitt said, it seemed that the Chancellor was a little skeptical about meetings or holding town hall meetings. She would encourage him to consider that. The reason is because before they can implement programs that affect people, they have to hear from those people, and she thought that a town hall meeting was an effective way to do that. Secondly, dealing with professional student fees, she's a professional student, and in doing research into increases of professional fees, she understood that the increases weren't going to enhance those particular professional schools, but into a larger pool, to support the budget of the University as a whole. She wanted to find out the Chancellor's take on that. She asked if he saw it such that if students pay for additional monies for things, they should receive some sort of reward for that, such as increases in programs and other things that would support their particular schools.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he agreed with that. Whether or not her statement of what happened to the money was true or not, he would need to see a detailed budget analysis. He was at a University where similar statements were made, but it turned out that undergrads were subsidizing professional schools, despite the fact that students in professional schools were paying much higher fees. So one can't assume that because one is paying higher tuition that they're subsidizing another area, because there are a greater number of students with lower tuitions. So they need a detailed cash model. There are a lot more students who pay lower tuition. They

have to be careful in analyzing budgets to know who was paying for what. But he agreed with Ms. Olorunnipa's basic point completely and entirely. The justification for paying higher tuition is that people get a higher quality program. That should be the justification, and it shouldn't be that they charge students higher tuition because they could afford it, and bleed money off, and use it for something else.

Mr. Schechtman said Toronto unions were mentioned, and there are a number of unions on campus. He asked the Chancellor's stance towards the UAW, and employees' unions, and if there was a strike, if he would encourage people to cross the picket lines, or cross them himself. Chancellor Birgeneau said that Toronto had 23 unions, and he put a fair amount of energy when he arrived there in the relationship between the Administration and the unions, which was difficult at the time because the unions felt they were disrespected. He put a fair amount of energy into making sure that union leaders felt respected, and they did that quite successfully. That didn't mean they didn't have difficulties, because quite naturally,

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 7 -

strong unions get whatever they can get for their employees and the Administration has the responsibility to make sure resources are spread fairly, which for grads, could mean there's adequate money for support, e.g. So they worked very hard in types of relations with the unions, and he probably get that benefit more from union leaders and the workers than he did with the faculty. He did better with the workers than the faculty, which might be seen as a bad sign for the university. His only experience with the clerical workers in Toronto was with US Steel, which was, quite frankly, easier to deal with than the smaller unions, as they had professional actuaries. When he talked about pensions, US Steel understood those issues better than he did, so they were easier to deal with than a smaller union that couldn't afford professional support that comes with big unions. As to whether he would encourage the faculty to unionize, he wouldn't. Grads are unionized as well. He didn't think that was good for grads because they get into complicated issues. For instance, he wanted to enhance their program to teach grads how to teach, because he thought it would be good for their careers later. But they ended up getting into squabbles with union heads as to whether or not that was the right thing to do, and who would pay for that. So there were complications, and it prevented them from treating the grad student teachers as colleagues. He would have liked to have been able to do that. He knew different people have different opinions on this.

Ms. Cementwala said she wanted to thank the Chancellor so much for being there, and said they certainly appreciate his time. That said, there's an issue from the past that she wanted to touch upon. During Chancellor Berdahl's time, change was made in policies in the Student Code of Conduct that left students with no option in terms of having public hearings. She understood the rationale behind that was because Chancellor Berdahl wished to have a change that would lead to a more educational process, rather than a punitive process. But from the vantage point of time, and as a Law student at Boalt, and the vantage point both of due process and of having a more educational process, she asked if he would be willing to engage in discussions to reconsider that decision or even, if she may dare suggest, look at reversing that decision, so they're in line with Berkeley's heritage of being an open society with respect to free speech and transparency that they would gain from having open, public hearings.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that again, Chancellors never make decisions in isolation. He suspected the decision Chancellor Berdahl made occurred after extensive collective decision making. So before giving an answer, Chancellor Birgeneau said he would need to understand the two sides, and why Chancellor Berdahl and staffpeople came to that decision. As for whether he was open to reversing decisions that have been made in the

past, he was. But again, he wouldn't do that casually and would only do so after understanding all the things that contributed to the decision in the first place.

Ms. Cementwala said that given his investigation of the situation, she asked if he would be willing to engage in discussion. And she was not suggesting town halls. Chancellor Birgeneau said he might be.

Mr. Sharma said they had one more question. A Delegate said he wanted to applaud the Chancellor for saying that diversity was his highest priority, and understanding in California that he's constrained by Prop. 209, which bans preference based on race, gender, and ethnicity. What it doesn't ban is the consideration of those factors. It bans some sort of illegal quota system, or something which was being deemed illegal by *Grutter v. Bollinger*. There was a bill that passed through the California Legislature and was vetoed by Gov. Schwarzenegger that would have allowed the consideration of those factors in Cal State and UC operations. He would apologize for this not being so much a question, but a statement. The biggest roadblock that was encountered was UC lawyers who did not oppose the bill, but stayed cool, and very detached, and did not come to bat for diversity when it counted. In the end, Gov. Schwarzenegger vetoed the bill because he felt that Prop. 209 was the will of the people. And when the representatives of

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 8 -

the people, and the representatives of the educational system tried to get passed, UC did not come to bat for diversity, and there was a large failure of the process. So he would really encourage the Chancellor to discuss this with not only his colleagues, but also University lawyers, because there had to be education among the ranks for this diversity to truly happen. Chancellor Birgeneau said he agreed, and was doing exactly what the speaker suggested.

Mr. DeWitt said they applaud the Chancellor for this session. Mr. Sharma said he would like to thank Chancellor Birgeneau for attending the meeting. (Applause) He hoped the Chancellor enjoyed it as much as the GA did. Chancellor Birgeneau said they have to make progress on the diversity front, they simply had to. And he didn't have to convince the GA, as they were the converted. Mr. Schechtman said he would like to thank the Chancellor for attending. (Applause)

Report from the GA Manager/Advisor

Mr. Sharma said they would hear their Manager's report from Ms. Dugas. He was sorry to get in front of two wonderful speakers, Ms. Gillis and Mr. Lustig, and but he would ask them to bear with them. Ms. Dugas had another engagement and wanted to make a special announcement as part of her report.

Ms. Dugas said she would try to maintain herself because it would be difficult to make this announcement. Ms. Dugas said she was submitting her resignation as of January 12, 2005. But she wasn't leaving the University and will become Academic Coordinator/Director of African American Student Development. As they heard from some of their colleagues that evening, this was a critical time for African American students, and she has been watching this position for a long time, and wanted to pick the right time to go for it. The position came up a couple of times during her tenure. For not only undergrads, but grads who are African American, they have both a challenge and an opportunity to make a real difference in terms of how welcome those students feel, and not

just black students, but all students of diversity. When students say they come to Cal, they say they want to attend because of the diversity and the activism, and the campus should be ashamed that they're having that diversity and activism diminished, because they make for a very strong University.

Ms. Dugas said this will be her 12th year at the GA, and she hoped she's given as much to the GA as they have given to her. (Applause) It's been really, really great. She's been able to go back to school and her graduate education, which was a challenge, and she's been able to bring her daughter to the GA. When she told her daughter she was leaving the GA, she didn't quite have it clear. She told her daughter she would still be at the University. Her daughter said they just wouldn't be at the GA, and Ms. Dugas said she told her daughter they could still visit, and her daughter said they wouldn't feel the spirit of the GA. They need to make the transition, because 12 years was a long time. She'll be there for the GA and she'll make sure Mr. Sharma has everything he needs, as well as the other Executive Officers. Ms. Dugas said she wanted to thank the GA tremendously. (Applause and standing ovation)

Mr. Sharma said he believed several people in the GA wanted to make laudatory statements to Ms. Dugas. She's been at the GA for 12 years and hoped the GA could give her a fitting tribute that rewards her for the wonderful service she's given to the GA. They'll miss her very much and they'll be calling her a lot.

Report from the GA Manager/Advisor (cont'd)

- 9 -

Mr. Schechtman said he would like to say that for those there who haven't worked with Ms. Dugas, they may not realize how much of an advocate she is for them. Last year, as a Delegate, he didn't know all that Ms. Dugas did for the GA. She's been the collective memory of the organization, their connection with the Administration, and their biggest advocate, all the way up the line, really speaking up for grads' interests and their rights. She has worked very, very long hours while doing her grad work and raising a family. This was a tremendous opportunity for her and will be a tremendous loss to the GA. They could not express enough their gratitude. Ms. Dugas said she would like to thank him.

Mr. DeWitt said he wanted to wish her good luck. Ms. Dugas said she wanted to thank him. (Applause)

SPECIAL ORDER -- Presentation Steve Lustig, Vice Chancellor, BAS, on the proposed Principles of Community

Mr. Sharma said the next presentation was by Acting Vice Chancellor of BAS, Steve Lustig, soon to change to another title, and Elizabeth Gillis, the campus Coordinator of the Principles of Community Initiative.

Mr. Lustig said he knew some of them through the Tang Center, where he's a Director. He's met with the GA's Executive Board once, and got a lot of help with the Principles. He wanted to spend about five or ten minutes talking about where this proposal came from, what it is, what they need that evening, and squeeze in some questions and comments, because that was really why he and Ms. Gillis were there.

Mr. Lustig said that about three years ago the campus launched a Community Initiative. This was not the only campus doing this, and it's a national movement, to try to re-balance serving communities on the campus. But

that, he didn't mean a Pres. Bush type of community, where everybody was the same, but where they could bridge communities and with each other, and strengthen people's feeling of connection to what they're doing. There have not been a lot of specific projects in this area. What the campus doesn't have, which most campuses do, is a statement of principles or values. Other campuses also primarily focused their statement of principles in the student arena, and at Cal, they've been trying to also include faculty, staff and alumni. The structure of the program was that Vice Provost for Undergrad Education Maslach was the main link to the Chancellor for the project. Mr. Lustig said he's the Director and Ms. Gillis is the Coordinator.

Last year it came out that people were unhappy with the Code of Conduct revision. There's a piece that has principles of community, and he thought people thought that's what this was. But what they're looking at were student codes, faculty codes, and also staff and alumni issues. Anything on campus where the University talked about values or principles, they tried to incorporate in this statement. Last spring they put this online, and some people present that evening might have answered, since they got 3,600 responses, which was astounding, with probably about 900 from students. Mr. Lustig said he wanted to talk about the student focus and what the concerns were. They have redrafted the statement and have met with the GA's Executive Board, which was extremely helpful. The biggest issues to students was to differentiate this from the judicial issue. These Principles were not an actionable statement, but a statement of principles and values, and not the Code of Conduct. How to make that clear was difficult, that this was an overriding statement of principles. Free speech was the second issue that people wanted to be articulated clearer, that people were varied freedom of expression and speech was major, and communities

Presentation by Vice Chancellor Lustig, BAS, on the Principles of Community (cont'd)

- 10 -

versus communities. This was an attempt to bridge community, or not eliminate community. So they tried to redraft it with those issues in mind. This fall, before Chancellor Birgeneau finalizes it, they're meeting with groups, especially students and faculty, which both have a few issues. They met with the Executive group of the GA about a month ago, which was very useful. As they go through the process, language gets more and more watered down. So one request was to get more specific, and to break things out again in bullets, and state what it is they're trying to focus on, as well as emphasize the terms of community and make free speech a clear issue. And when they talked about participation and leadership, it was to really invite people to participate in the community. So they went back, and from those and other comments, redrafted the Principle. One reason they were at the GA meeting that evening, again, was to run it past students and listen to their comments. He didn't want to get into word-smithing, and they're more interested in concepts. They have a couple of more meetings to go, and then they'll collapse everything, get the Chancellor's approval, and issue the Statement. He didn't know if anybody on the Executive Board who met with the group would like to comment. The Statement has gone through a bit of a revision since they last met. He called for any comments or questions.

With Mr. Schechtman chairing the meeting, he asked to give people a half a minute to read through the document. Mr. Lustig said they should think of this as applying to all 50,000 people on campus, everybody there.

With Mr. Sharma chairing the meeting, Mr. Garcia said that having read the Statement, he didn't disagree with anything that was written, although if he sat long enough, he perhaps could come up with some things. He read the little part at the bottom. His question was what the document was going to be used for. It all sounded great, but if it's not going to influence policy in some way, or change anything, it was nice in theory, but didn't do anything. Mr. Lustig said that was a good question. First of all, they hope it will be used for the mission of the

University. Years ago, for those who were on campus, when ever they saw anything about the University and its mission, it was "excellence and diversity." And then it changed, and morphed, and they're trying to get back to diversity, and equity, those kinds of issues, as guiding statements. So a hope of a principle statement is for it to begin to guide decision making and policy setting. So not only will it show up under vision and mission kinds of statements, wherever the University publishes that, but it will be actionable. This Chancellor came here for the challenge of diversity and equity issues, and he wanted to take that on head first and strengthen the language. So the Statement may not look like this. After group processes, it had gotten weaker and it was a question of pushing the language back.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if the goal of open access and equity in society meant society at-large or society within the University. It was a little unclear. If they indeed have this goal of open access of opportunity to all of society, meaning the world, then she would hope that would have some impact on future policy decisions as far as admissions and fees. Mr. Lustig said they hoped so too. The alumni were very involved in helping draft this, so they wanted people to feel, as they leave the University, that they were a citizen of the University, and that part of their challenge was to serve society broadly. So they'll take those values out and influence the Legislature and policy. Ms. Ahrendt said that perhaps it could be clarified by saying "society as a whole," or "the world community," or something like that.

Mr. DeWitt said he was once at a school that had a number of problems, and people lost their jobs, and some things were a little uncomfortable. The school came up with a Magna Carta which they framed. It looked like a proclamation, and they put it on the wall, and the school felt better. But other folks didn't feel more comfortable. He was really concerned. Although they polished it, and word-smithed it, and

Presentation by Vice Chancellor Lustig, BAS, on the Principles of Community (cont'd)

- 11 -

were getting it out, he asked how people would be able, as students, to come forward and hold anybody accountable, and make sure they were getting all the things that were mentioned in the Statement. He asked who they would go to. "Society" was nebulous. When he tried to be part of the society at City Hall, they say "Thank you, Mr. DeWitt, your time is up."

Mr. Lustig said "the campus" was also pretty nebulous. Another issue that came up with the ASUC was how this would be a living document. If it's not effective, it's changeable. So another question was how it could be changed. He thought they would come back and work with the GA on how to make it alive. The hope is that this stimulation and passion doesn't just become a filed item.

Mr. Stange said he thought the document was good. He asked if there was anything in it that was distinctively Berkeley. If they were at another school, he asked if the Statement would look the same. Mr. Lustig said that if they go to the Web sites of other UC campuses, they could see differences in these Statements across those campuses. Cal is the only one that doesn't have such a Statement. This is designed to embrace the whole campus, and there are things that might be relative to staff and faculty that they may not notice. There's also a model put out by the Association of University Presidents, an organization that included bullets that talked about civility, justice, truth, and beauty, those kinds of things; and nationally, about 80% of such statements reflect that model. So it doesn't show much of a process. By now, over 4,000 people have been involved in developing this, and it has people thinking about how it might be useful. But part will look similar to other campuses.

Mr. Valleé said that with regard to the timeline, it was mentioned that the next step was to implement the

Statement. He asked if Mr. Lustig would be coming back to the GA, and how they would be able to engage with him. He asked about the timeline. Mr. Lustig said it partly depends on the Chancellor. The inauguration will happen on Charter Day, April 15. It might be that it doesn't come out until then, and it becomes part of his Statement of Community. Otherwise, they'll try to have it out by the beginning of next semester. But part of the role of grads is how it's used, where it will show up, what people's participation in it will be. They're not quite there, but he might know in the next four months. They're putting it together and it could be that the print part comes out first, after which they'd meet on how to make it useful. Mr. Valleé said that they might see Mr. Lustig, then, by the end of next semester. Mr. Lustig said it would be before they finish their degrees.

Mr. Schechtman said he would like to make a statement. He very much respected the work that's gone into this, and there has been a lot of work. But he personally very strongly opposed the document. This was based on both his dissertation research in German history, on the politicization of the term "community," leading to exclusionary policies, as well as based on his experience as GA Vice President, which has taught him that this University was anything but a community. Rather, the University is a hierarchical corporation, and student input was welcomed until it clashes with what the faculty and the Administration want. The Student Code of Conduct was probably the most visible example of that, where students gave ample feedback to the University, and the outgoing Chancellor, in his last two weeks in office, unilaterally ignored students' input and removed students' right to representation, in certain cases. Also, the faculty were recently quite rude to their grad representatives on a Parking and Transportation committee, when they challenged the faculty's desire for 2,300 new parking spaces. Students tried to compromise, and the response from the faculty was to ask him, as VP, to replace their representatives with students who drove to campus. Mr. Schechtman said he was not saying that this was an across-the-board reaction, but he thought they had to remember that "community" was a very appealing term. However, this was not a community. He drafted a letter for the Executive Board which was considered so strong

Presentation by Vice Chancellor Lustig, BAS, on the Principles of Community (cont'd)

- 12 -

that they extracted items from it. He will comply with the group, but he personally had to oppose the document because it was not clear what it was going to be used for. As Vice Chancellor Lustig said, if the GA adopts the Statement, people should be able to be called to the fact that they're not respecting the community. But it's not at all clear how students could ever call the Chancellor, the Regents, or the UC President, on not respecting them as a community, since they're basically employees of the State. He would like to read a brief statement on the subject.

Mr. Schechtman said he opposes any attempt to constitute a single campus community by decree or fiat. "Community," while very appealing as a term, remained completely undefined by the document. Indeed, sociology literature shows this term is impossible to define at all. More disturbing is the assumption that all who study or work at Berkeley must share a common set of values. They're a public institution of research and learning, in a democratic, multi-racial, multi-ethnic, multi-faith, multi-generational State, and Berkeley must tolerate dissent, including the right to question the values held by others, and even the values of the institution itself. While the Statement does not specify the ends to which it will be used, in "The Berkeleyan," published by the Administration, it stated that these Principles would likely be used as a benchmark for a more formal code of conduct, and for administrative and personnel policies. He believed existing codes and policies adequately govern their campus, and any attempt to constitute this campus as a community held future dangers for repression that far outweigh its present appeal. If this campus was constituted as a true community, then all groups on campus, students, faculty, staff, and administration, should be equally included, represented, and empowered, and held equally responsible. That was clearly not the case. In even the broadest sense, a university

was a cross-section between a supposedly egalitarian educational institution and a clearly hierarchical corporate entity. Secondly, staff and students would say who held power on this campus. This campus was, politically, not anything like a community, and ignoring that reality was dangerously naive. Mr. Schechtman said that with due respect, that was his statement. This group has incorporated a lot of feedback, and he remained very strongly opposed to the document.

Mr. Lustig said it was worth the struggle. It was also very important for them to grab the word "community" before Republicans do, since they've already taken "values," "family," and everything else. So they can't give them "community" too.

Mr. Lanting asked Mr. Schechtman about his statement, and said it mentioned that they can't define community, and that they also don't resemble something they haven't defined. Mr. Schechtman said he didn't mean to derail the discussion. A famous sociological work defined the term as people who live together, work together, share common values, and know each other. Anything beyond that was considered an "association." No one at Berkeley know w everybody there. About 70 years after that, in the mid-50s, someone published an article looking at different definitions of "community," and found nothing in common among those definitions except for the word "community." So if they ask someone what they think of when they hear the word "community," it's generally a very positive reaction. But it's one of those terms, like "family values" that sound good, but was really hard to define.

Mr. Lanting said that when he sees Berkeley, it's not a community. Mr. Schechtman said when most people hear "community," they think of a group of people relatively homogeneous, working together, and Berkeley was more like a community of communities. There were many different communities on the campus, and groups that share interests. And that has been recognized and adopted by this group. It was very hard to say that everyone at Berkeley shares any one, common value, e.g.

Presentation by Vice Chancellor Lustig, BAS, on the Principles of Community (cont'd)

- 13 -

Mr. Sharma said that hopefully, they can keep the discussion centered on the speakers, and after they leave, could comment on Mr. Schechtman's statements.

Mr. Smith said he thought Mr. Schechtman really raised some interesting issues that he hadn't thought of in reading the draft. So he would applaud Mr. Schechtman.

Ms. Felarca said she very much agreed with the concerns expressed by Mr. Schechtman. She wanted to give an example of a problem, and how a line in the statement can be very problematic. The wording about civility in personal interactions was very vague, and she would ask what that meant. She would reserve her right to be extremely rude and uncivil to people who were the extremely rude and uncivil to her. She saw that as a basic self-defense and survival skill that she's learned, especially on a campus where there is a lot of hostility, particularly to minority and underrepresented minorities, and given the level of sexual harassment that women face, which is greater than ever. So she would reserve the right to say "fuck off" to somebody who deserves it. She asked if, in doing that, she would break these basic principles. She was raising this question because it's become a principle even with the ASUC and student government. Delegates may or may not be aware of the lawsuit she brought against the student government for having possibly cussed at some members of student government when, in reality, that was part of her challenging a ruling that was unjust. She used her due process

and free speech rights to challenge that, and suddenly she was labeled as being uncivil, which is grounds for disqualifying people from the election. This question was separate and dealt with student government, but at the same time, now some things were coming from the University that were broad and vague. She asked what else the principles would be used for and if they were a pre-requisite in moving towards some code. She would ask the statement to be silent on that entirely, and to let free speech continue to be the operative function of the campus. There's a reason that Berkeley was the only campus that doesn't have these principles, and it may be because of the school's history of free speech, and free speech rights, and perhaps concerns from the past. She was for nixing the whole Statement, despite people's hard work. She thought this was maybe well intentioned, but it was unknown what will happen later, and she was not willing to take that risk.

Mr. Lustig said that in order for something to be actionable, it would need to be in the Student Code of Conduct. What Berkeley does is have free speech, time, place, and manner rules. The issue of civility was most important to the staff who work there. Staff had a key desire for the word "civility" because of the incivility which they feel treated, so if she asked where it came from, they looked at desires of students, faculty, staff, and alumni. They've gone back to staff groups, and focus groups, and feedback about the word "civility" was key. As far as students go, what's uncivil is already defined in the Code of Conduct. But he understood the point being made.

A Delegate said the GA was being told this was probably not going to be used, could shape Conduct, but it had to be put in the Code of Conduct before anybody could be punished for something in it. Mr. Lustig said that was correct. And if they look at the Code of Conduct, the changes that were most troubling to people, which happened last year, he thought needed to be aired. But they keep not releasing it, so it's never getting aired. That's where the debate came from, and where most of the worry about how the Principles will be used came from. So they're trying to figure out ways to suggest that this was a statement of values and not something that would bring a student before the Student Judicial Council. A Delegate said that something in the statement making that clearer would help students, something included about not being judged, or something about punitive measures not being taken. Mr. Lustig said they could also just say this was not a code of conduct. But that was a good idea. The Delegate said that was especially

Presentation by Vice Chancellor Lustig, BAS, on the Principles of Community (cont'd)

- 14 -

relevant with the issues regarding the Code of Conduct that they've been hearing about lately. It's easy to associate the two, and perhaps they weren't associated.

Ms. Felarca asked if he could specify what the concerns and conflicts were that staff had. Mr. Lustig said what was important to faculty and staff were relationships in the workplace. Ms. Felarca said she would think, then, that this was something that should be dealt with independent of the Administration, and worked out through either unions or associations between faculty and staff. She knew students could be very uncivil, and treat staff very poorly, and if there were problems with students, that could be worked out with student government. But her concern, and the concern she thought other people were raising, is that the Principles were a statement from the Administration and carried with it implications that allow for potential abuse of power and the inhibiting of free speech and the democratic process.

A Delegate asked how this could be used to inhibit free speech. Ms. Felarca said the Statement contradicts itself. On the one hand it states that the campus supports free speech and the freedom of expression, and on the other hand, it calls for civility in all interactions. If a situation occurs that was quite serious, there could be a clash between two different sides, and somebody claiming something happened, or there could be some ugly

words exchanged, and the next thing they'd know, people could be kicked out of school or brought up on charges when they shouldn't be. Often, there are also concerns with the right wing, and she had a problem with The Squelch magazine, and the magazine always cries about free speech. Ms. Felarca said she's in favor of free speech and would not call on the Administration to shut down student publications, even when they're offensive. However, she also had a right to directly confront those who offend her, and the way the Statement was written, these Principles could be used against her, and against her confronting others, and used to shout down her free speech and to not allow her to state her opinions and views as to what people were doing.

Mr. Sharma said that if people have questions or comments geared towards the document, this would be the time to state those.

Ms. Medina asked if there was going to be a motion. Mr. Sharma said this was just a discussion. Ms. Medina said they're just interested, then, in having feedback. Mr. Lustig said they're collecting thoughts, and the spring response was the biggest one they're after, on whether to go forward or not. He would say that the strongest support was from staff, because there was no statement of anything regarding students or faculty. Even among the faculty, who have faculty codes of conduct and they don't need this, about 68% totally support going forward, as he understood. So there's a vote on that already. Mr. Lustig says that with the Principles, they're trying to circle around, such as with the discussion of civility, and come up with some final concept of things, put everything together, and see where they are, take it to the Chancellor, and see where they take it from there.

Mr. Stange said there's a diversity of views on this document among grads. He thought it was great as it stood. Given the comments that people have raised, he was not worried about this.

Mr. Noonan said he wanted to voice support for the Principles. Listening to comments he respected, Mr. Schechtman was persuasive with regard to the term community. But Mr. Noonan said he thought very often what they do there is worry about how the Administration could use this against them, as opposed to working on these ideas as goals. He didn't think this would cause a homogeneous community. If anything, it respects everybody's views and holds at its highest the question of diversity. He thought to get things done, they need to work with the Administration and faculty, and if they constantly question or

Presentation by Vice Chancellor Lustig, BAS, on the Principles of Community (cont'd)

- 15 -

wonder whether everything in there was an attempt to hold students back, he didn't think as a group they would accomplish much. This was not part of the Code of Conduct, and to ask for civility and respect among students and the whole campus was not too much to ask for, in his opinion. He wanted to voice his support for the Principles.

A Delegate said he didn't see how civility and respect was opposed to freedom of expression in any way. They could engage in a civil dialogue and express themselves freely. He liked a lot of the ideas expressed in the Statement, but he felt some were on the vague side, and he'd appreciate more specifics.

Mr. Lustig said that as a personal comment, he was a Free Speech Movement arrestee. (Applause) He spent years in his current role challenging the Administration even though he is one. So he understood the debate people were talking about, and he thought that it was just this kind of dialogue that wouldn't have happened without the document to talk about. Even when they protest and organize the campus or community, whether who about civil rights or the war, the idea was to protest and build community. That's what they're trying to

figure out, how to mesh those things, because without them, it's a very fragmented value system, and they need to bring it back together somehow. He wanted to thank the GA for its time and input. Mr. Sharma said he would like to thank Mr. Lustig and Ms. Gillis for their time. (Applause)

Mr. Sharma said that if people had more comments or questions about the Principles, Ms. Gillis or Mr. Lustig would be happy to get e-mails from them.

NEW BUSINESS

-
-

A Delegate said that since they were losing Delegates, he moved to go to New Business. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Election of the Academic Affairs Vice President

Mr. Sharma said he would open the floor to nominations for the Academic Affairs Vice President.

Ms. Cementwala moved to table the elections to the next meeting so Delegates could have more time to think about the responsibilities of the position and their personal commitments. She said this was a surprise to her and a few other people, and thought tabling would lead to a more productive outcome in the end. The motion to table was seconded.

Mr. Cantor asked if the motion to table was constitutional since the GA's By-laws state that they're required to elect certain positions at the next meeting if there's a resignation. That's something they should check. Mr. Sharma said he would rule the motion in order at that point, pending a report from their specialists. He called for any objection to tabling. An objection was raised. Mr. Sharma called for debate.

Ms. Cementwala asked if Mr. Schechtman could give them an outline of the duties and responsibilities of the position, along with the time commitment that was necessary. With a more informed process,

Election of the Academic Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

- 16 -

Delegates could decide whether they want to run for the position and whether they have the time. Mr. Schechtman said he would like to say that he submitted his resignation to the Executive Board with a lot of regret, and did it for personal meetings. He had to pass his qualifying exams, and wouldn't do so if he stayed in the position. He was resigning at that time because there will be another Board retreat in January to make plans for the rest of the year. With that in mind, he thought the timing it would be good. He would work with the Vice President for the rest of the month and they could attend the planning session. As for the role of the Academic Affairs VP, his primary responsibility was to coordinate GA representation to Berkeley faculty and Administration, which involved finding people to fill about 100 campus committees, representatives to the faculty Senate and the Administration. The position also works with those representatives and with the Executive Board to push the Action Agenda. The VP meets monthly with the Provost and head of the faculty Senate and the Graduate Dean, and serves on a number of campus committees as well. Ms. Medina is their channel to the Statewide Student Association, in Sacramento, and Mr. Schechtman said he was sort of the GA

channel to the Berkeley campus. The time commitment was the major reason he had to resign. The time commitment was more than 20 hours a week to do the job well. And the GA had such influence and respect that this was a position that should be done well. So he did not feel he could give it the time and effort it required.

Mr. Sharma said they read the By-laws, and he would interpret them as allowing the GA to table the election. The By-laws say that the position had to be considered as the first order of business, but doesn't require them to decide with an election. People could overrule his interpretation by a majority vote if they wish.

A Delegate moved to call the question on the motion to table. The motion to end debate was seconded and failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Aguilar said he opposed tabling this. There's a retreat in January and it's important that the new person attend. They have a month, and since the position entails so much, it was critical that the person taking this position gain from Mr. Schechtman's experience and be part of the retreat.

Mr. Garcia said the person holding this position also has to go to Executive Board meetings. Mr. Schechtman said the Executive Board meets the Thursday before and the Thursday after GA meetings.

Mr. Sharma said this position also attends Executive Office meetings.

Ms. Odusanya said this was a paid position, so they do get some money for the work.

The motion to table the election of the Academic Affairs VP to the February 3 GA meeting failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Sharma said they were back to consideration of the position, and called for any nominations.

Ms. Sharma nominated Anu Joshi. A Delegate nominated Jenn Zahrt. Ms. Odusanya nominated Jessica Preciado.

Mr. Sharma called for any other nominations, and hearing none, said they would hear two-minute speeches from the candidates.

Election of the Academic Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

- 17 -

Ms. C'Reda asked if it was better to ask the candidates to leave in order to hear what they had to say on their own without hearing statements from the other candidates. Mr. Sharma said he recalled people previously staying for statements.

Joshi Anu said she's a first-year in the School of Social Welfare, in the Master's program, and will be done in two years. She is the Legislative Liaison for the GA, which means she works under Ms. Medina, and with Ms. C'Reda in the External Affairs Committee, and office. She was an undergrad at Berkeley and served as the ASUC's External Affairs Vice President. So she's had a lot of experience working with Systemwide and University issues, and also working with on-campus stuff to the extent that she worked with the President last year, and worked with the GA before on campus policies. She's on the Student Code of Conduct Committee and worked with Chancellor Berdahl and Vice Chancellor Mitchel, who was no longer at the school. She knew a lot

about the inner workings of the University because this was her fifth year there. In terms of priorities, she knew that faculty diversity was really important to the GA, and it's been something that's been on the agenda for a long time. Also, the Mentorship Program was something that was really important, and something she wanted to work on. Her biggest priority was just to try to bring together grads on all the committees and try to help them, on each committee, push an agenda rather than just be the voice that the faculty listen to. They had some success with that last year, in actually pushing agendas in committees that were important to grads.

Mr. Sharma said they would have two minutes for questions. A Delegate asked Ms. Joshi if, as a first-year grad, she would have the time for the position. Ms. Joshi said she currently already works 20 hours a week as Legislative Liaison. She would step down from that position.

Ms. C'Reda asked if she was still going to come to External Affairs meetings. Ms. Joshi said she would.

Ms. Abbaszadeh said something was mentioned about pushing agendas to committees, and asked what was meant by that. Ms. Joshi said it involved helping grads who sit on committees, looking at the GA's agenda, whether the three goals the GA voted for at their first meeting, and helping them figure out ways they can push specific items through their committees, whether programs, policies, or whatever they decide to do, rather than just be reactive to stuff.

Mr. Garcia said regarding her past experience in the ASUC, since she was pretty involved, he asked if she understood that this was a GA position, and if no one would try to use her, or that she wouldn't become a vessel for the ASUC to push its policies on the GA, because a lot of times, they disagree on stuff. Ms. Joshi said that wouldn't happen.

Jenn Zahrt introduced herself and said she's a first-year grad in the German Department and was running for this position because she was really passionate about being involved with this. She's worked with Mr. Schechtman in the German Department and heard him talk about his involvement in the GA, and that he'd be leaving. She felt it was a worthwhile thing he's been doing, and he ignited her interest in this. She was new to Berkeley and was sort of unfamiliar with the things that were going on, but she was eager to learn. Being new might be a good thing because she was willing to listen to views, as she didn't have prior experience to color the last four years of what's gone on there. So she would be receptive to taking any input and not let prior prejudices, whatever those might have been in the past, color how she ran the office. So she would ask for their confidence in her ability to represent them.

Ms. Levitan asked if she had 30 hours a week for this, with classes. Ms. Zahrt said she wasn't TA'g and she would be willing to dedicate herself to this.

Election of the Academic Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

- 18 -

Ms. Olorunnipa asked if she had priorities, interests, or areas she'd like to work on. Ms. Zahrt said student fee issues and housing were on the Advocacy Agenda, so that would be something she would work on. Being new there, she was shocked at the cost of housing. She was also open to learning about what the issues have been in the past that were really pressing. Those two would be the first two areas to work on.

Ms. Odusanya asked if she's had experience in student government. Ms. Zahrt said that as a freshman at NYU, she was the Operations Coordinator for the Student Union, and that's at an Executive Board position. In subsequent years she was Secretary of the Executive Council there. The year after that she was an all-purpose

volunteer, across all committees, but not tied to an Executive position because she lost the election.

Ms. Franklin asked what committees she was on at the moment. Ms. Zahrt said she's currently on the Funding Committee.

Jessica Preciado introduced herself and said she's a fourth year in Mechanical Engineering. This was her second year in the GA, as a Delegate in her Department. Last year she was on the Academic Affairs Committee, as well as other committees. The reason she would like to be the Academic Affairs VP is because there's a potential to make a lot of change in a variety of ways, since there were so many committees. She was an undergrad at Berkeley, so she's been there since 1996, and has seen a lot of the changes occur, some that were good and some that were bad. There's very much a need to have a graduate voice and a student choice on many of these issues, such as on student fees and the Code of Conduct. She felt she was very qualified for the position. She's held a lot of positions while working mainly in the Engineering area, with the Center for Underrepresented Engineering Students, recruiting and helping with evaluations so the College could determine how to better meet the needs of students. With Mechanical Engineering, they did a survey and are now implementing some new courses. The way in which the teachers decide on courses needs to reflect the needs of students. She was President of the Association of Latino Students in Engineering and Science, working with recruitment and retention, and with underrepresented students, of which there were not too many, although Berkeley has the most in the nation. She was pretty proud of what they've done, and she thought she could hold the VP position, despite its many hours. She thought she'd have more time to do it because she could do research and write when she wanted, and had no other deadlines.

Ms. Levitan asked how she felt about her other time commitments, and what her other obligations might be. Ms. Preciado said she was President last year, and this year she had no official title and was President Emeritus, to tell people in the group what worked in the past. She didn't have an actual position. She wanted to do dissertation work and was just giving advice. So she had open time.

Ms. C'Reda said it was mentioned that she worked as a Latino in diversity groups, and asked what kind of diversity agenda she would push. Ms. Preciado said she thought it was a multi-pronged approach to diversity at Berkeley. Obviously the numbers don't represent the State. But she also thought they had a problem with faculty in particular, with not just recruitment, but retention. It's very easy for other universities to say that school has that great guy, steal him away, and increasing faculty numbers will help increase the number of grads there, which will hopefully have a trickle-down effect.

Mr. Garcia asked if her Department had any other Delegates or alternates to represent it. Ms. Preciado said she thought they had plenty of people. They're all new, except for her, as far as she knew.

Election of the Academic Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

- 19 -

Ms. Olorunnipa asked if she had a Board exam. Ms. Preciado said she was all done with everything except for writing the piece of paper.

Ms. Abbaszadeh said that last year, in running for a position, she thought she was involved in some advocacy work in Sacramento. Ms. Preciado said there was a faculty mentoring award and something she wrote that didn't work with what the Chancellor wanted. She was fairly active with the Academic Affairs Committee.

Mr. Sharma asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion. A discussion was held off the record and votes were cast.

A motion to extend discussion was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Garcia moved to suspend the rules so they could have a runoff election instead of simply voting by plurality. Mr. Sharma said he would accept that motion. The way elections have been done was more a process they've historically followed, so this was a motion to clarify the practice for this time. In the past, if there were more than two candidates, whoever got the most votes would win. They would do the election and low vote getters would drop, and they'd re-vote if no one had the majority. He asked if there was a second on the motion to clarify the procedure. The motion was seconded. **THE MOTION TO CLARIFY THE VOTING PROCEDURE FOR THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS VP, TO HAVE A RUNOFF, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.** Mr. Sharma said that's how they would proceed.

Mr. Cantor said they could just have people number preferences one and two. An objection was raised.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded. The motion to end debate passed by hand-vote 9-5-13. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. GARCIA'S AMENDMENT, TO HAVE AN INSTANT RUN-OFF SYSTEM FOR THAT ELECTION, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Cantor said he needed someone to verify the results with him. Mr. Sharma said that Ms. C'Reda would do that with him. He noted that staff don't vote. He said people should number their preferences 1, 2, and 3. Mr. Sharma said he would call for a recess while people vote. With no objection, this meeting was recessed.

Project Coordinator's Reports

Back in session, Ms. ElNaggar asked people to take a bunch of "Berkeley Graduates" when they leave.

Officers' Reports

Mr. Sharma said his report was included in the agenda packet. He called for any questions and hearing none, called for a motion to accept the report. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 20 -

Reporting as the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said his report was in the agenda packet and dealt with what he's worked on that month. They were still looking for representatives for a number of campus committees. Among them, they need right away two representatives for a Student Health Fee Committee. There's a potential student referendum for a mandatory health fee to help fund the Tang Center, and this Committee will last through the spring. Also, there are openings on the Recreational Sports Oversight and

Course Materials Fee Committee. The mandatory fee students already pay for course materials was being revisited. There was a list of committee openings in the report. If people were interested, positions were usually about two hours a month, and sometimes as much as four. He would ask Delegates to spread the word in their departments.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions and called for a motion to accept the report. It was so moved and seconded.

Ms. Abbaszadeh asked about the representative in the committee who was refused. Mr. Schechtman said a formal policy with the Administration was started last year, thanks to the GA, dealing with how committee members are appointed. The chair of this committee violated that policy. The GA had a right to send representatives even if those reps disagree with the chair. So that request was denied.

THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Reporting as the External Affairs Vice President, Ms. Medina said her report was very short. Ms. Joshi had some letters she wanted to send out. They've also started lobby visits and legislative outreach, and they want Delegates' help, especially if they're originally from California. They'd like home address information in case they have to do specific outreach and target certain legislators. It helps to have constituents from that person's district.

Ms. Joshi said she distributed a letter and hoped they read it and were okay with it. She could send it to their representatives on their behalf. If they put their name and address on the back, she could do that for them. If they're from California originally, it would be great if they could write their home address. Bay Area representatives were not necessarily their biggest targets, and they're especially interested in Central California addresses. Ms. Joshi said what would be better was personalized letters with personal stories. She made a bunch of copies she distributed, leaving room for people to write any good personal stories to share, and she would type it up and send it to their legislators. If they could do that before they leave the meeting, that would be appreciated. In their departments, if they have friends, parents, or relatives and could get their permission to do this, she would send the letters out on their behalf as well.

Mr. Sharma called for any questions for Ms. Medina, and hearing none, called for a motion to accept the report. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Report from the Executive Board

Mr. Sharma said the report from the Executive Board was in the packet, and called for any questions. He called for a motion to accept the report. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

- 21 -

Begin written report from the Executive Board
Executive Board Report

2 December 2004

The Executive Board met once since the last Delegates meeting.

The members of the Executive Board are: Nzingha Dugas (GA Manager), Matt Eckerle (Bioengineering), David Garcia (Chemistry), Trevor Lanting (Physics), Claudia Medina (Law), Josh Daniels (Law), Lola Odusanya, (Chemical Engineering), Romola Sanyal (Architecture), Robert Schechtman (German), Rishi N. Sharma (Law), and Jay Stagi (City and Regional Planning). Members serve by virtue of their official positions in the Graduate Assembly.

The purpose of the Executive Board is to coordinate the advocacy side of the Graduate Assembly between the three Executive Officers, the three standing committees, and the representatives to the Graduate Council.

The Executive Board took the following actions in addition to the general coordination and planning assigned to the Board by the By-laws:

Funding and Grants Reform

The Board reviewed proposals for how best to re-structure the Graduate Assembly's funding and grants program. Trevor Lanting presented a proposal developed by the Funding Committee that would both collapse the current Social Development Grant into Graduate Events II and fold the remaining grants into a new category, Projects and Services II. The Business Office presented substantially similar proposals, and the Board agreed with the compromise position and asked the Organization and Rules Committee to implement a proposed By-law change.

Organization and Rules

The Board provided some direction for the efforts of the Organization and Rules Committee.

End written report from the Executive Board

Committee Reports

Reporting for the Academic Affairs Committee, Mr. Schechtman said the Committee was working on a report to the Administration on affordable housing. He wanted to make a correction to the printed report, and said they weren't going to meet on Tuesday, December 7, but will meet that coming Monday, December 6, at 5:30. They'll have a draft of the report, if anybody was interested in reading what they're going to write about to the Administration regarding the doubling of rents at Albany Village. He would ask them to please come by Anthony Hall at 5:30 on Monday. There will be food.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 22 -

Mr. Sharma called for any questions, and hearing none, called for a motion to accept the report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Reporting for the External Affairs Committee, Ms. Medina said they're looking at Statewide fee policy at comparable universities to see how other states dealt with fee increases in times of budgetary constraints. Mr. Sharma said there was no action to be taken on the report.

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Mr. Garcia said there was one request they didn't have enough information to act on, so it was denied, and everything stayed the same.

Begin written report from the Finance Committee

Finance Committee Report

Delegates Meeting: Thursday, November 4, 2004

Presented by David E. Garcia, Finance Committee Chair

The Executive Office (EO) requested that the Finance Committee (FC) increase the GSHIP remission line item in the EO budget from \$1,668.00 to \$6,000.00, an increase of \$4,332.00. Reasons for this large increase were given as follows:

1. The actual cost of GSHIP increased from the prior fiscal year.
2. The EO expected to lose personnel through the consolidation of EO positions. This turned out to be unrealistic, and the eliminated positions were reinstated.

Through communications with the Graduate Assembly's Business Manager, the FC learned that in prior years the GA has only paid GSHIP remission for the Executive Officers. Given that knowledge, it is unclear to the FC why the increase should be so large and, therefore, denied the request. The FC will happily reconsider the request should the EO provide the committee with the following information:

1. The names and positions of the people for whom the EO is requesting GSHIP remission.
2. The number of semesters GSHIP remission is being requested for each of the people listed in item one.
3. The cost per person, per semester, of GSHIP.

End written report from the Finance Committee

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Mr. Lanting said he would call their attention to the report of the Fund Advisor, Ms. Moore. The deadline to submit receipts for reimbursements for the Fall Semester was on Friday. So if Delegates have contacts with grad group members in charge of that, they should make sure receipts get in by Friday at 5:00, to the GA business office. Also, the next funding deadline, for Round 5, is January 21. It funds events from February on. Delegates should save that date and get their applications in on time. Mr. Lanting said he would make one more plug, and said he needs more members on the Funding Committee. So if they were interested, he would ask them to please send him an

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 23 -

e-mail. If they haven't sat on a funding committee for two years, they have to go through a very short orientation, and he was flexible as to when that would happen. Finally, allocations for Rounds 4 and 4-A were included in the agenda packet. Round 4 funds events for next week only, and 4-A funds events in January. They funded a very high level, 80% of what people requested, and didn't cut any group that asked for \$100 or less. So the Funding Committee was very happy about that. He called for any questions.

Mr. Cantor asked if it was correct that if they don't have quorum, no one would get any money. Mr. Lanting said it was. That wasn't a problem at that time, but that's why he wanted more members. Mr. Sharma said the Executive Board would have to do it.

A motion to accept the report, including the funding allocations recommended by the Funding Committee, was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, AND APPROVE THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDED ALLOCATIONS FOR ROUNDS 4 AND 4-A PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the GA'S Graduate Council Representatives

Ms. Sanyal said the report was in the packet. She wanted to remind Delegates that the Grad Council was one of the most powerful ways to get their points across, through herself, Ms. Odusanya, and Mr. Stagi. Some departments came under review at the October meeting, and one thing that came out of that was a discussion of interdisciplinary work on campus. Concerns were raised about the fact that this has been an ongoing problem, with not enough funding of space for the programs on campus. She wanted to bring that to the GA's attention. The only other thing that was brought up at the meeting was a discussion of the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism Subcommittee. A lot of issues that were raised on that particular issue were mainly about co-authored work, meaning grads and their professors. The question was how to go about doing research and the fact that a lot of grads' work has overlap with their instructors' and trying to figure out students' rights over their work. That's something she wanted to bring to their attention. There's been quite a bit of discussion about it and the campus has an extensive report. But Grad Council members got the feeling that a lot of this had to do with cheating, while grads have other concerns. If there's something Delegates want the reps to go back to them about it, the reps would appreciate it Delegates could tell them and they'll get it to the Grad Council.

Report from the Store Operations Board Representative

Reporting as the GA's Store Operations Board representative, Mr. Sharma said the Store Operations Board met in November and there might be a meeting in December. The undergrads passed out a survey to learn more about the Student Union. If Delegates get a survey, they'd get a free PowerBar. They call it the "thousand bar survey." The questions deal with improving the Student Union, which grads, as students, collectively own, along with the MLK building across the way. Among the things the survey asks about was bringing in new restaurants, e.g., and moving out the family-owned businesses that currently operate there, and perhaps bringing in regionally or nationally branded food. In the past, the GA has adamantly supported the use of family-owned businesses. Mr. Sharma said he continues to represent that position and will do so until the GA changes its official position. That was not necessarily the position of everyone on the Store Operations Board at the moment. As things

progress, he'll let the GA know

Report from the Store Operations Board Representative (cont'd)

- 24 -

Mr. Sharma said the Store Operations Board also renewed the lease for the Taqueria and for Healthy Heavenly Foods, so those two restaurants in the Bear's Lair have another two years. There's also ongoing discussion with the other two restaurants. He called for any questions.

Mr. Sharma said that was their last item of business. He said Mr. Cantor would announce the winner of the election. Mr. Cantor said he would like to congratulate Ms. Preciado, the new Academic Affairs Vice President. Mr. Cantor said it was a very close election.

Mr. Sharma said that with no other business, and hearing no objection, the meeting was adjourned.

This meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

Present at the December 2, 2004 GA Meeting

German, Robert Schechtman
Law, Rishi Sharma
Chemical Engineering, Lola Odusanya
Physics, Trevor Lanting
Architecture, Sahar Abbaszadeh
Chemistry, Lynn Trahey
East Asian Languages & Cult, Patrick Noonan
Economics, Kevin Stange
ESPM, Josh Fisher
Geography, Jason Strange
Information Management & Systems ,Bruce Rinehart
Law, Daniel Aguilar
Law, Hollie Sawyers
Law, Mariyam Cementwala
Logic & the Methodology of Science, Johanna Franklin
Physics, Miguel Daal
Public Policy, Bryan Queuedo
Social Welfare, Maayan Greene

Law, Claudia Medina
Architecture, Romi Sanyal
Chemistry, David Garcia
African Diaspora Studies, Zoe Franklin
Bioengineering, Matt Eckerle
Civil&Envmtl. Eng'ering, Geetika Maheshwari
Economics, Andrew Hayashi
ESPM, Ainsley Seago
Folklore, Anthony Buccitelli
German, Jenn Zahrt
Law, C'Reda Weeden
Law, Deepika Sharma
Law, Joshua Daniels
Law, Yael Livny
Music, Rebekah Ahrendt
Political Science, Darius Omston
Social Welfare, Lawrence Smith
Social Welfare, Sara Ortega

African Diaspora Studies, Edward Davis
Integrative Biology, Christine Petersen
Staff - Berkeley Grad, Mariam ElNaggar
Staff - Dept. Liaison, Chris Cantor
Logic & the Methodology of Science, John Goodrick

Bioengineering, Carmel Levitan
Sociology, Manuel Vallée
Staff - Bus. Director, Nzingha Dugas
Staff - Leg. Liaison, Anu Joshi