

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

March 10, 2005

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- Heard GA announcements.
- Heard a presentation by Dean Mary Ann Mason, Dean of the Graduate Division.
- Heard reports from GA Officers. The President reported on ASUC elections and the GA chose Delegates to participate in the Selection Committee for the new Business Manager.
- Heard committee reports.
- Heard and approved the report from the Executive Board, and discussed the proposed OSL fee for student groups to register.
- Heard and approved the report from the Finance Committee.
- Heard and approved the report from the Funding Committee, approving the Committee's recommendations on Round 6 of Grad Events funding and Round 4 of grants funding.
- Heard and approved the report from the Executive Board, acting as the Organization and Rules Committee, amending the By-laws regarding the Grad Social Club.
- Heard a report from the GA's Grad Council representatives.
- Discussed and approved Resolution In Support of AFSCME Local 3299 at the UC Campuses.
- Discussed and approved the Resolution to Modify the Social Development Grant.
- Discussed and failed the Resolution to Send a Letter Complaining about RSF Policies, Inefficiencies, and Inconsistencies Which Negatively Affect Graduate Students.

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Rishi Sharma at 5:42 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Sharma said people should have picked up an agenda packet. He called for any changes. A motion to approve was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Sharma called for any changes to the February minutes. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 3, 2005 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

GA Announcements

- 2 -

ANNOUNCEMENTS

GA Announcements

Mr. Sharma called for any GA announcements. Ms. Olorunnipa introduced herself and said she's the Grad Community and Activities Project Coordinator. The GCAP will do a community service project at Emeryville High School starting March 15. They're looking for people who are interested in meeting and working on projects with some very young middle school and high school children, after school, on Thursday afternoons, for four weeks. If people were interested in participating, she would ask them to please send her an e-mail.

A Delegate Nick said the Graduate Social Club will have a meeting next Thursday at 5:30 at the Triple Rock. He would encourage anybody who has never come to a meeting to please attend. They always appreciate new members. They have a lot of events coming up that spring, including an Ides of March party and activities in May, a pool night, and beer and pizza events.

Presentation by Dean Mary Ann Mason, Graduate Division

Mr. Sharma said the first presentation would be given by Dean Mary Ann Mason, Dean of the Graduate Division. Ms. Mason said it was good to see them. She asked how many people were there last year, and said there were a lot of familiar faces. She asked how many people came from, broadly conceived, the humanities and social sciences; from science and engineering; and from professional schools. She noted that the GA was representative. To start off, she'd tell her one and only joke: How many Ph.Ds. does it take to screw in a light bulb? One, but it takes them nine years.

Ms. Mason said they would talk on many different topics, and leave time for questions, since the Grad Division covers a lot of aspects of education, students' welfare, and financial structures. The first slide presented what they know about the grads there. The data was from a survey some Delegates probably filled out, from the class that entered in 2004. They were asked what made a difference as to why they came there. The interesting data was from people who weren't there, who didn't come to Berkeley, and who also responded. The data give a sense of what grads, particularly going into doctoral programs, thinks is important, and what the school does and does not have to offer. For some background, at Berkeley there are different doctoral programs, joint programs, 42 academic masters programs, and 17 master's programs, each with their own admissions committee. That's lots of faculty looking at lots of records. Decisions are made locally and were very decentralized.

As for the breakdown demographically, 90% of grads and undergrads are California residents. That's not by State law as much as by policy. Seven percent of their students are out-of-State and 3% are international. For Master's students, the majority, 56%, are California residents, but a much larger percentage, 29%, are from out-of-State, and a significant number are international students. International students are important and are a major issue she'll talk about, in terms of their decline. In doctoral programs, the majority of students are domestic, non-residents from other States who have found their way to California. Only 28% are from California, and 17% are international. This is significant because

Presentation by Dean Mason, Graduate Division (cont'd)

- 3 -

although they love students in great numbers, out-of-Staters were expensive compared to in-Staters, and international students are even more expensive. The University very strange fee structure has international students pay out-of-State tuition until they're advanced to candidacy, and then pay one-quarter of it. So they're charged between \$22-26,000 depending on which program they're in. Those who come to California certainly save their utility receipts and get driver's licenses and become residents the second year, and then become relatively cheap for doctoral programs. Most tuition and fees are paid by somebody, the University or a grant, although some grads do pay it themselves. The difference in demographics was very important in terms of how people are funded and how the campus supports them.

Ms. Mason said the survey was of almost 2,000 UCB admits in 82 majors. They were surveyed about their support and their enrollment choices, and they got a huge response rate, 71%. These were students who wanted people to know what they like and what they do. A 71% response rate was something they just never get, so this was a very dedicated group. She asked how many people present filled it out. They got answers from almost half of those who didn't go there. Of all people offered admission to Berkeley, 47% decide to come there. So they admit twice as many and get half. Some departments were higher and some lower, but that figure was very good, from being part of many national associations. There aren't many programs that are much better, many a couple, perhaps, but across the board, Cal was quite spectacular.

If they didn't come here, where did they go? Their competitors are Stanford, Harvard, MIT, Princeton, and Cal Tech. As to what those schools have in common, they're private and they started their endowments in the 17th Century. Harvard definitely did, and Princeton probably started at that time as well. Stanford has recently aggrandized itself on the back of some Silicon Valley money, but before that, they were the robber barons, and big railroads were among the founders of Stanford. So it's had a big endowment since the 19th Century. Being a State University, people at UC didn't think about private fundraising until about 20 years ago. So Cal's endowment started at about 1980. All of their competitors are private, and are the top universities, and Cal was really in a different league from any of the other UC schools in terms of where the students go who don't go to Berkeley. The important part is that these other schools do tend to offer more money, and that's something that was difficult for the campus.

Reasons that students thought were the most important reasons for choosing a grad school included specialization and high quality, the survey showed that these students really cared about academics. Opportunity to work with particular faculty was a factor as well. But 72% believed the multi-year offer was important, as was a caring and friendly environment. So the campus can provide love if they can't provide money, as she tells faculty. As a result, every year in recruitment, they encourage more personal contact to be made, with

faculty. Only 64% said financial support was that important. Location of the campus was a reason for 58%, and thank heaven for that, as it was something they couldn't screw up. Reasonable time to degree of program was a concern for a lot of students.

As for factors that favor UCB, which they do better at than their competitors, one was program reputation. The National Research Council, in 1995, said Cal was the best grad school across the board, and this year, "Der Spiegel," the voice of Germany, said Cal was the number 1 University in the world. "The London Times" ranked Harvard, and then Berkeley, although some of Cal's programs were rated number 1. So internationally, Berkeley was really up there. She would say that given "Der Spiegel's" ranking, Cal was actually number 1 in Europe.

Ms. Mason said that regarding job placement, the campus does well with that. Diversity of the campus was another reason for attending, and diversity of the students. This was perhaps the most important

Presentation by Dean Mason, Graduate Division (cont'd)

- 4 -

issue for the University, but in terms of grad schools, they actually do better than all their competitors. About 10% of the doctoral population are underrepresented minorities. That's a lot of better than the number in the undergrad population, and the campus worked very hard on that. They have a lot of diversity coordinators that try to give as much support as they can, and they work in lots of ways. So they're better than Stanford, Harvard, Princeton, and MIT. As for diverse faculty, they're not very good, but somehow must become better than others.

As far as factors that hurt, Ms. Mason said the first, second, and third reasons were money, with financial support, multi-year offers, and time-to-support. As for time to degree, that's something the campus should pay more attention to; and some departments do that. It was on her agenda. Availability and affordability of housing, and local cost of living, were tough categories. She's given presentations on housing, but that night she would talk about financial support and international students.

Ms. Mason said the next slide was interesting. For those who care about money, if UCB offered about the same amount, 58% of people would come to Cal. And if the offer was less by just a difference of \$1-5,000, they only get 29%. And if they offer a little more, it's 81%. They use this for fundraising, because donors could see that a little extra gets to make a huge difference in getting the best and brightest students there. It's the \$1,000 difference. And because of this, she's raised some money, and now each department has what's called the "Power Top-Off Award." This is from Mr. Powers, who passed away, and left a lot of money to the University, with one vision to be grad education fellowship support. So every department now has a couple of two or three of these small, \$2,000 awards to give on top of what they offer, and that helps. It's only a beginning, and Cal didn't start in the 17th Century, but they're working on it.

Ms. Mason said the next slide shows some quotes. "I probably would have gone to Berkeley rather than Cal Tech, but Cal's funding offer was too low." "At the University of Washington, I met with five faculty members privately, half to one hour each. At Berkeley, I had no private interaction." "At other schools, I was encouraged to meet faculty. At Berkeley I didn't feel that personal touch." Ms. Mason asked how many people feel they were given the personal touch when they were recruited, and how many felt the school was deficient in that regard. She noted that more people probably felt the school was deficient. That's something that was possible to work on and didn't necessarily cost money. "The housing situation was really the biggest concern."

"Although Berkeley has resources available, it's still intimidating." "The buzz was that Berkeley's finances were in shambles." Ms. Mason said they're better this year, and she didn't think people feel California is the basket case that it was last year. The housing situation was still a concern. A survey students regularly and faithfully fill out shows there's more satisfaction with housing than there has been in the past. Fifty-seven percent think it's fine, however the price of housing has gone up, and even though the situation was worse, people's conception of it was better.

Ms. Mason said the next slide she's given in presentations to deans and chairs, on what they do and what they can do with fundraising, and they've really have tried to raise University fellowships, and to do a number of things. Delegates probably got letters from other universities that said the school would make them a millionaire. They offer \$150,000, but if they break that down, it's almost all tuition, and the stipend really wasn't very big, probably no bigger than Berkeley's. But perspective students open the letters and think they're rich. So they'll have \$35,000 tuition that's waived and that's \$150,000 right there, but they don't realize it may be packaged that way. So she tells chairs to package offers so students know how rich they'll be, and that the other schools were misleading. They did manage a coup, and have Ida Louise Jackson Apartments, totally dedicated to grad apartment housing. They're filled, about 140 beds, she believed. Ms. Jackson was one of the first African American women in California to get a teaching

Presentation by Dean Mason, Graduate Division (cont'd)

- 5 -

credential, in 1921, and she had a splendid career. In her estate she was very foresightful, and she left money for graduate fellowships, and they have an Ida Louise Fellow. Also, the National Research Council will supposedly start that year and Cal will try once again to be the big winner in that. It's a challenge because the methodology was changed.

Ms. Mason said the next slide deals with money as well, and fee structure. The international doctoral student enrollment has been declining at Berkeley, a 20% decline from 2003, and a 36% decline from 2000. Delegates may not notice it so much because they just see their little part of the world, but their international student population has been shrinking, something that's true for all California. In science and engineering, the decline was 34% from 2000. And those numbers are bigger, a 41% decline, in the humanities and non-science professional schools. That was really serious. Grads in the humanities and social sciences know that the school would love to have more international students, but those departments really can't afford them. And the school was becoming less affordable in the sciences and engineering as well.

The next slide shows clearly that the enrollment of international students was really geared to price. There was a 24% decrease in the early '90s, when UC went through another boom-bust budget cycle, and was busted in the early '90s, the number of international students went way down. There was then a brief moment when there were negotiations, and international students, rather than paying the full fee for their whole experience there, were reduced to one-quarter of the expense when advanced to candidacy, and that made it much more attractive. And because it was a flat-fee era, it went up rapidly, and now it's been 52% for fees and student tuition increase for international students, and it has caused a precipitous decline. For other students, there has not been as much of a decline, but still a decline, 15% from 2000.

Ms. Mason said the next slide shows that the situation looks very similar in all other UC campuses. The chilly climate for international students was a factor, and the fact that it took forever to get a visa and that

international students didn't feel America wanted them. But for California, the situation was really much more due to money because their applications were still very high. She was going to China next month to talk about these issues to the Chinese government. Unless the government gives the school some help in terms of sending money with their students, they'll take no Chinese students any longer because they usually don't come with any funding at all.

Ms. Mason said there were a lot of ideas afloat. This has become a crisis for many departments on campus, as it should be. The idea she's pushing to UCOP is to treat all students who are GSIs in their second year, and beyond, as if they were California residents, for the purposes of fees and tuition, which a lot of states do. Once they're working, they're considered a State resident and not out-of-State. The good part of that is it wouldn't tell the Legislature that this was aimed at international students because most other domestic, non-residents, are already California residents in their second year. They can't do it in the first year because everybody would be out of the plane and into the classroom, which was not great to do, to have GSIs in the classroom the first day. She hesitates to say that because some Delegates have probably taught their first semester as a GSI. That's not good, but it happens, and that's what departments do to be able to afford to bring in new grads. So there are many ideas afloat, and she was eager to hear Delegates' ideas on these issues and on anything else, and open up a Pandora's box.

Mr. DeWitt said there's are severe enrollment constraints that keep the number of students out of not just grad school, but the University of California. He was kind of troubled when he sees that they're going to bend over to try to help international students get an opportunity to be there while at the same time

Presentation by Dean Mason, Graduate Division (cont'd)

- 6 -

Californians were being denied the opportunity to study there. He could understand that she felt this was a dilemma, that other people were having difficulties being able to be educated at this very good University System, but he thought there were more than enough people in a State of 35 million to make up for the loss of not having those students come from other places. They talk about it perhaps being a loss of diversity, but he had to say that among the 35 million people of the State, almost every nation in the world was represented. So they could get their diversity right from the State. He knew that many people who want to get into his grad program didn't get in. So he looked at this and understood it was difficult for some folks, but he didn't want to see people get fee waivers or get opportunities and become considered a resident while others weren't getting the opportunity to be there. This was very problematic, especially in an ethical sense. It took him four years to get there as an undergrad, and he had to fight to get into grad school. So when he sees somebody who got there and basically got a free ride right away, while a kid in south Berkeley can't get in, that didn't play with him. He pays taxes for Californians to get educated at UC. He understood others might think that's harsh, but he paid taxes for 30 years and he believed UC should serve Californians first, Americans next, and then deal with who would like to get in, if there's an opening, without cheating somebody else out of a spot.

Ms. Mason said she appreciated his viewpoint, and said it was shared by many in California. The counterarguments are that they are the best research university, perhaps in the world, because they attract the most talented from around the world, and it's a question of looking at the international pool, not just the national pool. For some of these fields more than others, she thought the faculty pretty much believed, as she did as well, that at the grad level, they had to get the people who were most likely to be the most important researchers and scholars of the next generation. In some of these fields, it's not like there's somebody on every

block, these students were very special and had to go through many hoops. So there weren't necessarily Californians available for the positions. And when they are, she agreed it's very competitive.

Ms. Ahrendt said she thought they had to remember that in some departments there, if the department faculty committee sees an application is from an international student, they may not even look at the application. So people have to consider how they'd feel if somebody saw their in an application that a student came from south Berkeley and wouldn't even look at it as a result of that. Regarding the other question about the push to re-classify international students, she thought the reason international students had to pay fees throughout their term there was because they were not, by law, allowed to get California residency, and it had something to do with visas. Ms. Mason said that California residency, in some ways, was a fiction in that they're California residents after their first year in the sense that all of them pay taxes and drive. So it's a fiction in the sense you are actually not any more or less a California resident in many ways than international students. The system was set up for reasons Mr. DeWitt mentioned, to keep foreign students from taking advantage of the education and then taking it home again, and she thought that really was the concern. However, they've done studies of this and more than 50% will stay, and will stay in California. In fact, the Silicon Valley was built, in pretty good part, by international students from Berkeley and Stanford, who stayed, as well as students from the rest of the country who came here. So in terms of economic contribution, having out-of-State students was a good investment because they've already gotten the best four-year educations that someone else paid for, and the school takes advantage of those skills and coming here. But the position of Mr. Dewitt suggested was one that is certainly widely held.

A Delegate asked what would constitute an optimal level of international students, and asked what the goal was. Ms. Mason said that among almost all of their competitors, Cal is by far the lowest. That

Presentation by Dean Mason, Graduate Division (cont'd)

- 7 -

doesn't mean that what they're doing is right, and that would probably take some larger discourse than they've had on it. It's so low it has come up as an issue. The issue has been raised across the board, except for some departments in Engineering, although that School was so unlike other departments. For instance, in the German Department they have no Germans because they can't afford international students. It's important in the German Department to have people from Germany, and the most important thing about that is other German departments that are of similar caliber, like Princeton, will have those students. It's partly an issue that has to be decided by each discipline.

The Delegate asked against what measure the decline of international students was problem, and if it's just that it was less than previously. Ms. Mason said it's always less than their competitors and less than what faculty think is healthy for research programs. The Delegate asked if there were numbers for this. Ms. Mason said that for each discipline, they know the percentage of international students at all of their competitors, and Cal was way below.

A Delegate said another way concern is it's harder to get there, and people in departments who are fantastic researchers are so worried about the fees, and worried about loans to pay those fees, with people going back to their countries who owe a ton of money compared to where they come from. In her Department they had to miss out on some of the best grads if they didn't have international students. Ms. Mason said the world has become very global in terms of research, and it's a problem not just in the sciences, but for social sciences and

humanities.

Mr. Stagi said that in terms of comments about how they measure against their competitors, those other schools she was talking about were private institutions. Ms. Mason said Cal was way below other State institutions, such as Michigan and Illinois, in international students, schools they consider in the top tier of universities. Mr. Stagi asked if she would center on GSRs as a departure point for international students, since they make research possible. Ms. Mason said that's trickier because many GSRs are supported by the federal government, which means the school was losing an important stream that they have for SGRs. Grants has been the accepted way for federal government to support grad education.

Mr. Stagi said that in terms of diversity, particularly among grads, it was noted that there was a large cohort of international students within grad students, and he would assume, since they're international, there was some level of diversity within that cohort. If they subtract that level of diversity of international students from the overall figure, and just look at diversity of people from California, he asked how diverse that body would be. Ms. Mason said that when they look at diversity of grad programs, they're talking about diversity of domestic students, either Californian or non-Californian. International students were not part of that. They're another 17%, so between underrepresented minorities and international students, close to 30% of the population is of that nature. But international students are counted separately for those purposes.

A Delegate said she's an international student and there's been no free ride in any sense in any step of the way, and fees were certainly a big issue. She felt that her hands were tied. She had to work 20 hours a week to have fee remission, and that certainly had an affect on her academic performance. They talked last year about having all international students, also who pay taxes, who have non-resident tuition removed after their first year of residency, so she would pray that they do that. Ms. Mason said the good part is it really is now on the radar screen with everyone, including the Office of the President, Pres. Dynes. He's in physics, so he understands international students in that area, which is useful. She hoped they'll be able to do something. Moving the System was worse than trying to shove an elephant, and was

Presentation by Dean Mason, Graduate Division (cont'd)

- 8 -

very frustrating. The UC System as a whole is a model to the world. They have nine campuses and one that's almost virtual, and those almost ten campuses, are a model for public universities, education and research, but being part of the System was always very frustrating because it's very hard to act independently even if their situation was somewhat different.

Mr. Birgeneau said he wanted to discuss the professional endowment fees for Public Policy and Social Welfare. Ms. Mason said it was only Public Policy and Public Health. Mr. Birgeneau said Public Health and Social Welfare were on the bubble. Ms. Mason said they're not going to do it. Mr. Birgeneau said he's a Public Policy student and was speaking about diversity. He was on the phone all last March, and will be on the phone that month, talking to students of every color, who have been accepted to their program. From Cal's competitors, these students look at Woodrow Wilsons, which gives everybody a free ride, and a stipend, and Harvard, which charges an arm and a leg, but not if one is a students of color, and Cal was at such a disadvantage to begin with. Social Welfare and Social Health share the same situation. There's an income bump as a result of getting a piece of paper, so they feel very hamstrung as a Department at that time. There are zero Latinos in this year's class in the Goldman School of Public Policy, and in California that was, to him,

unconscionable. They also have Prop. 209 limiting recruitment efforts. He understood the lawyers have them try to follow the rules to the best of their abilities, and they recruited, talked on the phone, sent e-mails, and did everything but send a basket of fruit to these people. But at the end of the day, the school doesn't pay their tuition. The response they've gotten from their Administration at the Policy school with regard to what the PDF will go towards has been okay, and the School is saying not all of it will leave the campus. But at the same time, they're completely at a loss with what to do with people, even in-State, from drawing on resources they have in the State to fulfill their PDF.

Ms. Mason said she's acutely aware of this issue. Public Policy and Public Health are charging a PDF, and Social Welfare and Education are not. There's a lot of controversy about it, and she's been involved in that as well. What his Dean will tell him is that part of the motivation for this was to be able to offer more fellowships for people of diversity, and others, who can't afford it. That means they charge the rich to pay for the poor, which is the way tuition often works; and one-third had to be dedicated to aid to students. The only thing she could recommend, and something she thought was really important to do, was to keep pressure on the schools so costs come back in the form of support that students receive. Mr. Birgeneau said they' do that. They called all seven of their alumni of color, and they were receptive. He noted that it was a small School. They have 1,100 alumni in total, so they can't form the Berkeley Policy Foundation and hold a banquet because they don't have the resources. Their Dean hasn't been too clear on this, or whether departments getting PDF have been talking to each other about what they'll do with that extra pot of money. Ms. Mason said this is an evolving topic. They just put it on the table, and there were still a lot of conversations needed, and each school has a little different story. She asked what the Law School would say about the PDF. Mr. Sharma said it's easier at the Law School because 85% of their grads will get an income bump, and PDF is used for financial aid purposes. So they don't feel virulent in their opposition to it.

Mr. Birgeneau said he heard that a good chunk of the PDF at Boalt goes to the campus at-large. Ms. Mason said the PDF will go back to the department. That's been part of the controversy. And at least one-third must be used for financial aid. Many of the schools expect to use more than that, and she thought that's the responsible way to use this money. But every school had a rather different story about this. Optometry and Business have PDFs, professional schools, with people who make a lot of money. It's not quite as unconscionable, but it forces people to make a lot of money, so they can't go into public law, for instance. Mr. Sharma said part of the PDF will go to loan programs, they hope, and merit-based scholarships for people interested in public law.

Presentation by Dean Mason, Graduate Division (cont'd)

- 9 -

Mr. Smith said he's in the School of Social Welfare, and if they come up with a fee like that, it would make it very expensive. But he didn't see any deans, or leadership, going out and meeting with people like Bill Gates, and forming partnerships with some fields that are monied, such as Engineering. There were some models there, but it's as if some administrators were still in the '50s in their approach to administering programs. One hears talk about the free market economy, but it's never applied to places where it matters. Ms. Mason said Social Welfare won't have a fee increase and has done a good job raising money for scholarships, but not so much with professional connections. That happens in the sciences, although they then the situation with the Novartis Co., a partnership that was formed on campus that caused walls to be created. So it's not straightforward. Hopefully, they'll have a campaign which she hoped they'll begin in the very near future, as it was a little unclear, and raising money for grad support will be a major part of it. That would help. Her goal was \$300 million. That would only produce an endowment of \$13 million a year. That's what they'd need,

although it's not like having an additional \$300 million. Even though it sounds astronomic, it would not fill the need they have. As they know, in the Grad Division, to some extent, she tried to help departments. They're like a family, and it's not like that they rob from the rich, but they help the departments that need more. Their Dean Fellowship, e.g., was aimed at departments that had more difficulty supporting students to do their dissertations. All these things help. When she was at the GA meeting last year, when they went through a hideous roller coaster of fee raises, she was out of her mind with despair. The only good thing is that it's slowed down, and there's no State tuition raise that year. That will continue because it's aimed at a large pool of undergrads. The State was also giving the school a little more return to aid. There are a lot of negotiations with that. Things have improved because the economy has improved, largely, and the Governor was more willing to not cut this year like he was last year.

Mr. Schechtman said he would like to put a structural change on the table that he's not heard discussed at the University. It's important to note that the two units that have just imposed these new Professional Development Fees are also two of the smallest units on campus. Last year, when the College of Chemistry went through a very expensive process of hiring a new dean, the GA's Office of Academic Affairs asked a simple question: Why do we have a Department of Chemistry. There are historic reasons, but they don't have, e.g., a "college of physics," or a "department of German." That led to an analysis, and if they take a ratio of the instructional budget versus the administrative budget of the different colleges on campus, the best bang for the buck, with the lowest overhead, is the College of Letters and Science. That's not surprising since it's the largest college, with about 33% overall in terms of all students. About 33% of the budget of that unit is spent on non-instructional items. How the University defines that was rather nebulous, but using the University's classification, if they go to the small professional schools, it's almost 60%. Basically, that says that small schools, from a student perspective, were very top heavy. They have a dean, with a dean's salary, and an assistant dean, administrative staff, and assistants to the deans, overseeing very small programs. He asked if the University was willing to consider basically creating larger schools, with smaller overhead, so that more money would go to instruction and student support, and less to the these deans, who earn six-figure salaries. (Applause) Ms. Mason said she was one dean who was not that rich. That was a good point, administrative efficiency. The real problem with this is that all the different research projects have de-centralized administrative structures. So when they talk about the "College of Engineering," there are four different organized research units, each with its own administrative staff. That's inefficiency in administrative research grants. It's a huge grant of what administration does at this University, and changing that would actually be more immediate and make more sense. There are efforts to do that, but it's like moving an elephant. In terms of college structure, the Men's Faculty Club, e.g., has carpeting from the 1920s that's shabby, but faculty love it because it's Berkeley and there's nothing more conservative, and alumni want to make sure they come back to the

Presentation by Dean Mason, Graduate Division (cont'd)

- 10 -

College of Chemistry, not to some massive unit. She was not justifying it in terms of administrative efficiencies, but she's saying there are other things that go into why things aren't changed, and administrative efficiencies is more complicated than looking on it at the outside, and that a lot of it had to do with registering grants. But she could certainly grant that there are administrative inefficiencies. Mr. Schechtman said it seems that if they look at Public Policy and perhaps Social Welfare, they could put those together under and reconstitute a "public service school." Ms. Mason said that's been considered. There are many problems with that. Physically, these units work only when they're together, and there are space issues. They can't get all

those people together in one building. Public Health is already in six buildings. What makes the University its concentration density. If the College of Chemistry were in six different buildings, it wouldn't seem like the same college. So there's something to be said about units being relatively small, but in one building, as opposed to combining them. That's the other side of the story. It doesn't mean there couldn't be a lot of savings at many levels. She was not sure combining the College of Chemistry with anything else would necessarily be the answer.

A Delegate asked why they don't take the School of Public Policy out of the Department grant on the basis of average salaries leaving school. Ms. Mason said that was an important argument. The Delegate said it's been made before. Ms. Mason said the counter argument is to attract the students they want, which is students of color. They need to pay more than they get, and they get very little in terms of outside money, and because it's a professional Master's program, they're not eligible for University fellowships. So they're on their own. They give some money for block grants for them, to do what they want, but they need money to come from someplace.

Dean Mason said she wanted to thank them. (Applause) Mr. Sharma suggested a recess. With no objection, this meeting was recessed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

-

-

GA Announcements (cont'd)

Back in session, Ms. Joshi said she's one of the grad student reps on the Student Health Advisory Committee, the ones who are doing the Health Fee Referendum, which will happen next week, with voting to occur on March 8-10, on BearFACTS. So people could vote online. It's important for people to vote because they need a vote of 20% of the campus in order for the votes to be counted; and obviously, they need 50%+1 of yes votes. So no matter how people vote on the question, it's important that they do so, because otherwise the votes might not count. Mr. Sharma handed out information that's been created, and if people have any place for them, there are big posters available for their departments or housing areas, and if they could put them up in common areas in their departments, that would really be appreciated. The GA voted to endorse the Health Fee. People have sheets explaining the fee and there are a bunch of non-partisan Web sites, as well as Web sites that advocate yes and no votes that people could go to. She called for any questions.

Mr. Sharma said that if anyone was available on Monday at noon, the proponents were doing guerilla theater at Sather Gate, and if people promised to go, he had a T-shirt for them to take, if they promise to wear them at the event. He also had pins saying, "Vote Health."

GA Announcements (cont'd)

- 11 -

Mr. Sharma said he serves on the Class Pass Committee, which met, and they're looking at numbers for the renewal of the Class Pass. It will probably be something like \$52. The Class Pass will expire next year, and the year after, the tentative number for the Class Pass looked like it will be \$52 per semester. That would apply the

year after, not next semester, with a slight escalator for each year.

Mr. Valleé asked what the cost was currently. Mr. Sharma said it's \$37.50. Mr. Valleé asked about AC Transit's justification for the increase. Mr. Sharma said AC Transit is asking for an additional \$5 per student per semester. AC Transit looks at the number of rides that Cal students take, and the cost per ride for the money they get, and they peg that cost to the price of a youth, 31-day pass, and peg Cal's pass to that. If they do that, it's about a \$5 increase. Mr. Valleé asked if the University was trying to chip in, because it saves not having to set up parking. And maybe the City of Berkeley could chip in, because that would mean there would be less pollution. Different agents benefit from this. He sat on the Class Pass Committee a few years back, when it was \$21. So it keeps escalating, and he's never seen concrete justification for the increases. Mr. Sharma said a suggestion was floated, primarily through the undergrad representatives, that the Class Pass should include a BART component. The BART pass would not be like the Class Pass where people would flash a card and get unlimited BART usage, but it would be an institutionalized discount program. The University would perhaps charge \$9 a student, and hold that money in a fund, and guarantee that BART's revenues would not drop, they'd ask for it to lower the fares for Berkeley students by 40%, and they'd use that fund as a guarantee to BART that revenues wouldn't fall. But people would have to buy the BART ticket at the Parking and Transportation office, at specific hours. So it's very different from the Class Pass. The sentiment of the Committee was that they like the core Class Pass program as it is, and don't want to jeopardize it with this very different BART program. If students travel on a Saturday night and they don't have a discount ticket, they have to pay the regular fare. The Parking Office isn't open to buy a discount ticket. So because it's so different, they decided to put it on hold and do these separately. He called for any other questions.

Regarding the report from the Business Office, Mr. Sharma said Lavonia Wade is Acting Manager of the GA while they search for a replacement for Ms. Dugas, and Ms. Wade's report was included in the agenda packet.

Regarding the report from the Funding Advisor, Mr. Sharma said Ms. More's report was in the agenda packet. He called for any questions.

Mr. Sharma asked if there were any Project Coordinators who wanted to speak, and called for any questions on their reports. He said the GA supports four or five projects, depending on how they count them. These are in-house services the GA does. One that Delegates might be most familiar with is "The Berkeley Graduate," with Ms. El Naggar as the Editor, perhaps always to be Editor. Delegates might also be familiar with the Graduate Minority Students Project, which does diversity outreach and retention with underrepresented minorities; the Graduate Women's Project, which works on women's issues and holds an annual Empowering Women of Color Conference, which began that day; the GA Support Services Project, which puts on dissertation workshops, one of their more popular ones, and an income tax workshop, and Anna Berg spoke last week; and the Events Project, which does the GA Open House. They also talked about the Community Service Project and the Graduate Social Club, which holds social gatherings. He called for any questions about projects.

Officers' Reports

- 12 -

Officers' reports

Reporting as the GA President, Mr. Sharma said his report was in the agenda packet. There was one thing he wanted to add to the first item, relating to the ASUC. He met with Mr. Leybovich that day, his counterpart in the ASUC, and he and Mr. Leybovich have tentatively reached an agreement on new language to formalize the GA's autonomous status within the ASUC. He distributed copies of the proposed language. What's different between this proposal and the proposal that was floated by the Autonomy Committee is that the GA would be autonomous, but would continue to be within the ASUC. So the GA would continue to have that sort of quasi-subsidiary status within the ASUC, but a formalized right to autonomy that was spelled out. This would amend an Article of the ASUC Constitution that deals with the GA. It formalizes their status quo. It recognizes the GA as an autonomous agency, to speak for grads, giving them associational status, and allowing the GA to, e.g., sue in its own name, rather than having the ASUC sue for them. It adds a section relating to the judiciary. The ASUC has a judicial brochure, the Judicial Council, which is fun for Law students to deal with, and this proposal would try to keep the Judicial Council out of GA business. As for financial autonomy, it would codify what's there now. The GA gets every penny that any grad pays in mandatory student fees, and the GA would be responsible, and have complete power. The proposal also formalizes the representation model they have now, with the GA appointing all grad student members to all campus and Systemwide committees, including the Store Operations Board. As Delegates might recall from last year, the GA had problems getting grads on the SOB. The proposal also adds a section that gives the GA explicit authority over Anthony Hall, and a replacement building if Anthony Hall was ever taken.

Mr. Sharma said those were the major changes. He called for any questions. Mr. Daal asked about Bookstore profits and revenue from soda machines. Mr. Sharma said the ASUC was not budging on that and doesn't want to give that to the GA. The choice the GA faced was a question between continuing with the ambiguity they currently have and hoping one day they'll get that money, or giving it up in the short-term, formalizing an autonomous status, and leaving that fight for another day. There's not a single mention of commercial fees in the document. It leaves it unresolved. He called for any other questions.

A Delegate asked what the GA planned on last year. She didn't recall if what they arrived at was something else or something along same lines. Mr. Sharma said that as he recalled, Catherine Ahn and the Autonomy Committee were trying to push through the ASUC an amendment to the ASUC Constitution that would have thrown the GA out of the ASUC. The GA would have become an autonomous government. The proposal would have given the GA equitable rights to money and space, things like that. However, it stalled at the ASUC level. The GA tried to get it on the ASUC ballot last year, and it stalled at that point, and essentially has been dead in the water. It hasn't gone anywhere in the year. He thought the current proposal was an attempt to resuscitate the major components of that plan, but leaving out the more radical component, i.e., complete separation, and leaving unresolved issues of what happens to profits.

Mr. Smith asked if all UC students were part of the ASUC. Mr. Sharma said that was correct. Mr. Smith if the GA being totally autonomous would change the status of grads or the form of government they would have. Mr. Sharma said the other proposal would have taken grads out of the GA and put them into an independent association. Mr. Smith asked about the status of grads Systemwide. Mr. Sharma said this was the only campus in the System where grads are members of the same ASUC as undergrads. UCLA was different, but at every other campus, there are separate Associations. At UCLA, the ASUC is an

umbrella group that encompasses two different Associations, for grads and undergrads. Mr. Smith asked if that would affect their status. Mr. Sharma said it wouldn't. Every student would continue to pay the Student Activities Fee, which he believed was \$27.50. Currently, the GA gets every penny paid by grads and professional students.

Mr. Fisher asked what it would take to change the language. Mr. Sharma said that for this to pass, or to change the language after it was passed, would require an amendment to the ASUC Constitution, and would require the change to be on the ASUC's yearly spring ballot. In theory, an amendment would be proposed next year, and be on the ballot to be voted on. If 60% of students voted in favor of it, it would be approved.

Mr. Birgeneau said the proposal states that the GA will recognize that the ASUC could speak for the GA externally. He asked about speaking for them internally, and about grads still falling under the ASUC even though the GA was separate. Mr. Sharma said the functional way it has worked is that internally, the GA has always had an autonomous vote. He meets monthly with the Chancellor in his own meeting, as Mr. Leybovich meets with the Chancellor, and Mr. Schechtman meets with the Chancellor. They have independent meetings with the Administration, and are treated differently. And as for Academic Senate committees, the GA makes the appointments to all committees that have a grad representative on them, and the ASUC makes the appointments for undergrads. That wouldn't change at all. If anything, he thought this conception on representation codifies that status quo. But internally, they represent themselves.

Mr. Birgeneau said the grads would still, however, be part of the ASUC. Mr. Sharma said they would still be members of the ASUC. Mr. Birgeneau asked if the ASUC speaks for the GA, even though the GA was not technically part of the ASUC. Mr. Sharma said the ASUC would speak for all students. Mr. Birgeneau asked if grads would speak for grads, since it has direct lines to grads. Mr. Sharma said it would. Mr. Birgeneau asked if there was any indication that that may be a problem. Mr. Sharma said it hasn't been. The fact that they're all members of the Association hasn't, in the past, affected the GA speaking for grads. There hasn't been that question. Everybody recognizes that the GA better represents grads than the Senate does, where there's only grad member. It hasn't been an issue.

Ms. Levitan asked what happened with the controversy about elections money. Mr. Sharma said that was the second part of the proposal. The price for this proposal was \$25,000. The way they came to that price was a complicated formula. In 2002-3, the ASUC had an election fiasco and its election cost around \$80,000. Since then, the ASUC has been demanding that the GA pay one-third of that. In 2003-4, the elections cost about \$50,000, and the ASUC was demanding that the GA pay its proportional share of that. Obviously, the GA, in his opinion, should not pay one-third of the \$80,000 if the ASUC screwed it up. So one compromise they reached had two parts, the first two divisions with surparts. First, the ASUC would give up complaining about years prior to 2002-2003, and for the 2003 bill, they'd take the proportionate number of grads on campus as a whole, and the proportional number of grads in the electoral body, and take the median number of those two, and multiply that across the cost. As for 2003-4, the GA would pay 29% of \$50,000. Those together total about \$25,000. The second part of that is for future elections. In the future, the GA will only be obligated to pay the three-year average of elections costs divided by the three-year average votes. For any additional funding the Elections Council might seek from both the GA and the ASUC, there was a formula that would apply. From 2000 on, one, the GA will pay a percentage of costs of the election based on the percentage of voters who are grads; and two, the GA would set aside an annual budget based on the average number of voters, to the extent that's available;

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 14 -

and 3, if the Elections Council seeks additional funding for elections, they only get guaranteed funding from the ASUC. The ASUC would have to ask for the money, and the GA could tell them no, and a formula would determine the extra amount from the GA, if it agreed.

Mr. Schechtman said that on the one hand, he thought this document solved most of their problems without creating enormous new problems that a battle for autonomy would create. On the other hand, there's a real structural disconnect, and elections were really a key point. The elections process, for those who don't know, is run by undergrads, and the voters were overwhelmingly undergrads. The elections were for the ASUC Senate, which is perceived as an undergrad body. The election is run by hiring computers and putting them at various places on campus. This is an enormously expensive process, and there's no sign that it will change or get cheaper. And for this expense, the ASUC wants the GA to pay a proportionate share of the expenses. The benefit there is that they used to say the GA should pay one-third, because grads were one-third of the student body. This current proposal was a little better, but they still end up paying more than their fair share. On the other hand, commercial profits from the ASUC Store and restaurants go 100% to the undergrads, and the undergrads have not been willing to give grads any percentage of those profits. For an even simpler case that doesn't involve money, the ASUC is allocated a full page in the Daily Cal every week for student government. In the past, there's been a gentlemen's agreement, if they will, that the GA would get access to that. But this year the ASUC said they couldn't, and said it was the ASUC's page. The GA doesn't even have proportionate access to the student newspaper. So the ASUC was asking the GA to sort of pay some proportion of the expenses without giving them any proportion of access to other ASUC resources. He thought that was still a problem. However, he did think that Mr. Leybovich's willingness to look at the percentage of students voting was a major improvement.

Mr. Daal said he would suggest that perhaps including in the deal a handicap for the GA that would take into consideration the amount of money they don't get, and the amount of money the ASUC was getting from the beverage contract and from the Bookstore. Also, he asked about the GA's projected payment for the elections that current year, under this plan, and how much money the GA gets each year to pay it. He asked about the GA's income and the percentage of income that goes to elections. Mr. Sharma said that assuming the elections cost \$50,000, as they did last year, and grads are 11% of the voting population, the GA's cost for the elections would be \$5,555 out of a budget of \$450,000. So it would be about 1%. Mr. Daal said that was probably not worth arguing about. Mr. Sharma said that in terms of commercial profits last year, the ASUC Store handed the ASUC a check for \$100,000 in commercial profits. Under the Coke agreement, the Auxiliary handed them \$50,000. So they could assume that's the status quo. Mr. Daal said that's not too much of a deficit. Mr. Sharma said the Coke deal might also be over. Mr. Daal said he would recommend letting it go. Mr. Sharma said UCOP was suggesting a systematic cutting out of all Coke deals. That would affect the GA's bottom line. UCOP finally got a conscience, because Coke has been funding human rights violations in Colombia. Mr. Cantor said it has to do with trade unionists at Coke's bottling plants in Colombia, who had a habit of turning up dead, with the management of Coke complicit in these murders. It's not generic "human rights," but murdering people. That's why Coke was being boycotted.

Ms. El Naggar asked about the possibility of online elections. Mr. Sharma said that's an issue the GA brings up every year, and every year a faction of the ASUC is against it for purely political reasons. Ms. El Naggar asked what the reasons were. Mr. Sharma said the factions change from year to year, but the fear is for the

same reason people oppose the motor-voter bill, because they're afraid too many people might vote and that their constituency would be diluted in a higher voter turnout, and therefore they might

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 15-

not win the seats. If there's more voter turnout, constituencies would become diluted as a result of online voting in ASUC elections.

Mr. Garcia said he was told last year that people were afraid that students would bully others into voting, and if that people could force students to go online if people could vote in their rooms.

Mr. Birgeneau asked if the Health Fee was an online vote. Mr. Sharma said the campus doesn't have the same concerns.

Mr. Cantor said another problem is people setting up a laptop in front of a keg at a frat house.

Mr. Sharma said this wasn't an action item and he wasn't presenting anything for approval in his report. The report was before them as an action item. People could direct him to do things related to it.

Mr. Daal said he would suggest that they forget about income and disparity of payments, and perhaps ask the ASUC nicely, or give them a little pressure to allow the GA to be on the voting board, or whatever governing body was involved for the elections. Mr. Sharma said the original language also called on the GA to put two people on the ASUC Elections Council. But it was his perception that they wouldn't be able to find two grads to sit on the Elections Council. He was quite sure Mr. Leybovich would have had no objection to having grad members, and Mr. Sharma said he was the one who cut that out. If people feel they could find two grads who are patient enough to sit on an Elections Council with seven undergrads, he would be happy to add that language in. They could make it optionable.

Ms. Odusanya said that if they have two grads out of seven members on the Elections Council, she asked how much influence they would have, and asked if the Elections Council operated by majority vote. Mr. Sharma said the Elections Council doesn't vote and was more like a working group, where each member had a function. What he and Mr. Leybovich thought of was having one grad member on the Elections Council as grad outreach coordinator. That person's sole job would be to do outreach to grads and get them to vote in ASUC elections, and work specifically with the grad population. Mr. Daal said that could also include placement of polling stations. Mr. Sharma said he questioned whether they could find a grad to sit on the Elections Council. Mr. Daal said he would recommend making it optional. Mr. Sharma said that if people had any questions or concerns, he would ask them to please send him an e-mail.

Continuing his report, Mr. Sharma said that as part of the search for a new manager, the GA was forming a search committee. In his report he listed the people already appointed to that committee, but they need Delegates at-large. In the past, when appointing Delegates at-large, it's been whoever wanted to do it. But if there were more than two people interested, they could go into a nomination and selection process. The job opening was posted last Wednesday and the application deadline was coming up in a week or so. The Committee would be responsible for going through the applications, selecting a shorter list of those to interview, and winnowing that to a shorter list to do in-depth interviews. Mr. Sharma said that he and Mr. Cordi would make

the selection, and they'd try to find someone who was mutually acceptable to fill that position. It was very important as to who the manager would be. The GA manager was more important than the GA President, from his experience. He asked if anybody was interested in being on the search committee.

A Delegate asked about the commitment involved and how many meetings would be held. Mr. Sharma said meetings would probably be on Fridays, mid-morning. At the most, it would be a weekly commitment between late March and late April. They would review applications and help conduct interviews.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 16 -

Mr. Schechtman said the GA manager was actually the GA's liaison to the University, and in filling this position, Ms. Dugas not only brought an enormous amount of institutional memory, since she served there for 12 years, but she was also behind the scenes in a way Delegates never saw, and was one of their most effective advocates in the University. Even though she was effectively a University employee, she almost always took the GA's side. This is their chance to find someone with Ms. Dugas' passion for student causes, because the university could otherwise hire an employee who viewed it as their job to manage student government rather than to be an activist on behalf of student government.

Mr. DeWitt asked how long the commitment was for. Mr. Sharma said that depending on how many candidates apply, it could be six to ten weeks. Mr. DeWitt said he was leaving in May and could do it until then.

Mr. Daal asked if they've asked Ms. Dugas if she would be willing to help. Mr. Sharma said they have, and she was willing. People don't usually sit on committees to hire their successor, so it would be behind the scenes.

Jennifer said she was interested.

Mr. Cantor said a question has been raised from a Delegate as to whether this would count as their committee requirement. Mr. Sharma said it would, if the Organization and Rules Committee report passes as submitted.

A Delegate said she had a class from 9:00 to 10:00 and asked about meeting "mid-mornings." Mr. Sharma said that should be fine.

A Delegate asked how much time it would take per week. Mr. Sharma said it depends on how many candidates they get. People will discuss applications and winnow them down to a manageable size.

Ms. El Naggat asked how many people were needed. Mr. Sharma said there are two positions for Delegates at-large. Other members of the search committee include himself, Ms. Medina, Luisa Leija, Kofi Turner, Shannon Duncan, from the front desk, Mr. Garcia, and Jan Crowder, Director of Office of Student Affairs, and Lena Wang, Director of Accounting, from the ASUC Auxiliary.

Mr. Daal said it would be helpful if they mediate a resolution to create space for Ms. Dugas on the committee. Mr. Sharma said that could be done administratively, and he didn't know if a Resolution was necessary.

Mr. Smith asked who had the final decision on the selection of the manager. Mr. Sharma said that was a

complicated question. The GA manager is an employee of the ASUC Auxiliary, which is a unit of the University. But the money that funds these positions comes from the commercial operations of the Store, which is managed by the Store Operations Board, which has a majority of students on it. Tom Cordi is the pinnacle of all that. Mr. Cordi is the person the GA manager reports to, so if they asked him, he'd say final hiring lay with him, as Director of the Auxiliary. But Mr. Sharma said he and Mr. Cordi have a gentlemen's agreement, if they will, that the hiree will be acceptable to both Mr. Cordi and the students. Mr. Smith asked if Mr. Cordi answers to the ASUC Senate. Mr. Sharma said he doesn't, and said he answers to the Store Operations Board and to an Associate Vice Chancellor. Mr. Sharma said he had three Delegates interested in the search committee, Jennifer, Hollie, and Mr. DeWitt.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 17 -

Mr. Sharma said that if there were no other questions, he would call for a motion to accept the report. It was so moved and seconded by. **THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Reporting as the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said his report was included in the agenda packet, and contained about a dozen different points. Assuming that the Organization and Rules Committee report will be approved, they're changing committee requirements so that serving on a campus committee will satisfy Delegates' requirement for the GA. They have a couple of campus committees they're looking to add grad representatives to. If grads teach and are interested in GSI affairs, that committee was looking for a representative. He was not able to get the meeting times. Darius agreed to serve on the Regents Professorships Committee, but they have openings on the Space Assignments and Capital Improvements Committee, as well as the Registration Fee Working Group, which wasn't listed. It meets on Wednesday, from 10:00 to 11:00, once a month, with the first meeting next month. Mr. Daal asked if the Committee looks at the excessive fees. Mr. Schechtman said no committee on campus looks at all of the fees, but this Committee will look at fees around the registration process. This is the Committee that instituted online registration through Tele-BEARS a couple of years ago.

Mr. Schechtman said that as many of them know, a class action suit was filed on behalf of professional students, with an Executive Board member a party to the suit, suing UC for breach of contract. In certain professional schools, grads were told in writing that their fees would not increase during the time they were there, and yet, they were hit with back-to-back increases in fees. The GA was informed by the University that while a decision has not been reached, University counsel thinks that the University would lose the lawsuit, and that the student would win. (Applause) That was great news for students. Unfortunately, it was bad news for Berkeley, because it meant they need to come up with \$11 million to reimburse the fees these groups paid. And in a very interesting move, the University turned to student governments and asked them for help in coming up with this money. Mr. Schechtman said he didn't want to debate this issue that evening, but he wanted Delegates to think about this because the GA needs to be creative and needs to respond. It's something they'd debate next month. No decision has been reached. It may still be a year, or two years, before it hits, but there's an \$11 million boulder rolling their way.

Mr. Schechtman said his last item was the Health Fee Referendum that will be held next week. The GA will send out an e-mail to Delegates on the list, but they're really begging Delegates to speak with their fellow

grads and get them to turn out and vote. This Fee was drawn up by students and was presented to the GA, and was endorsed by the GA and the ASUC. It's the most cost-effective way to maintain universal access to health services on campus.

Mr. Schechtman asked if there were any volunteers for the Space Allocation Committee or the Registration Fee Working Group, and said he would send out an e-mail.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

A Delegate moved to amend the orders of the day to go to Academic Affairs Committee Reports. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 18 -

With Mr. Schechtman chairing the meeting, reporting for the Academic Affairs Committee, Ms. Sanyal said the Academic Affairs Committee has been meeting the last few weeks and got quite a bit of work done. This year's goal was to look at the hiring practices of faculty members across the campus. The main issue was that different departments have different hiring practices, and student participation in these departments varies. The Committee wanted to do an evaluation campus-wide, or one done as widely as possible, take data, and propose a comprehensive policy towards student representation on hiring and retention of faculty members. This was partly something the Executive Board was interested in doing, and was also requested of them by the Graduate Council last year. Delegates on the Council last year get back on this. The Academic Affairs Committee was to come up with a questionnaire to facilitate the first part of this process. They realize Delegates were all busy and not particularly interested in taking time out of their very busy schedules to go and chat with people, but it would really help them. There are five or six of them on the Committee, and for them to hope to tackle the entire campus was absurd. So they're hoping to solicit Delegates' help to take the questionnaire and possibly talk to either staff or faculty members who would be willing and able to talk to them about hiring practices. It would really not take more than an hour out of their entire semester to do this. The Committee really needs to compile this data as soon as possible because the last Grad Council meeting will be in April or May, and she would like to present them with a report before then. So they really need Delegates' help. She's learned this would fulfill Delegates' committee requirement. She called for any questions.

A Delegate asked if it was possible for everybody to take one to their own department. Ms. Sanyal said that's what they're trying to do.

Mr. Fisher asked how much professors and administrative staff would be willing to reveal this information. Ms. Sanyal said another option was that a lot of departments have students who serve on faculty search committees and who might have a different perspective. They'd like to talk to staff, faculty, and heads of student groups, because that's how they envisioned it in the Committee. Given people's time constraints, they can't run around to three different groups. But if they could talk to more than one group, that would be great. She had five copies of the questionnaire and if people were interested, she would ask them to please let her know. They'll send it out to everybody, and if Delegates want, hard copies were available as well. Once

they're done with the survey they could e-mail it back, or just bring it to the GA, and she would collect the data. All they're doing is writing answers, and all the questions were listed.

Reporting for the External Affairs Committee, Ms. Medina said they had their Lobby Conference on February 7. Students from all nine UC campuses gathered in Sacramento. They had a rally and demonstration, and some students got escorted out of the Capitol building. They also got to meet a lot of legislators. They also had a delegation of grads go to Washington, D.C. to lobby on visa reform, and this weekend they're having the UCSA Joint Budget Summit Meeting, with Cal State institutions and their Statewide organizing body, at the newly constructed Cal State Channel Islands. Ms. Medina said they've been doing legislative lobbying, and if people were interested in that, they she would ask them to please let her know.

Mr. Smith asked if they have to request funds from their departments if students tag along with her. Ms. Medina said they should just let her know if they're interested. The office has a budget for the student lobby.

Report from the Executive Board

Report from the Executive Board

- 19 -

Mr. Sharma said the Executive Board was now doing its normal job as well as the job of the Organization and Rules Committee, so the report was split up for that month between them. For the Executive Board in particular, the report was in the agenda packet. They're working on dealing with the OSL registration fee, which the OSL is threatening to impose again. That was the most important item, and the other important items will show up at the Organization and Rules report.

Mr. Schechtman called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. A motion to approve was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Begin written report from the Executive Board

Executive Board has met twice since the last Delegates meeting.

The members of the Executive Board are: Lavonia Wade (GA Manager), Matt Eckerle (Bioengineering), David Garcia (Chemistry), Trevor Lanting (Physics), Claudia Medina (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

Trevor Lanting, Chair of the Funding Committee, presented a draft resolution for modifications in the Graduate Assembly By-laws to reorganize the Social Development Grant as part of a larger reform proposal concerning the Graduate Social Club (see below). The By-law changes are included as a separate Resolution this meeting.

Chair of Organization and Rules Committee

The Executive Board accepted the resignation of Josh Daniels (Law) from his position as Chair of the Organization and Rules Committee. Josh is now working in the GA Office of Academic Affairs with Vice President Robert Schechtman.

Graduate Social Club

The Executive Board approved draft language now included in the Organization and Rules report to formalize the status of the Graduate Social Club as a project of the Graduate Assembly. GSC will be held to the same formal financial requirements of other projects, but will continue to enjoy its programmatic autonomy.

Report from the Executive Board

- 20 -

Written report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

Project Administration

The Executive Board approved a plan to pare down the operations of the Events Project (aka the Graduate Community and Activities Project) to include the Faculty Mentoring Award, the New Graduate Student Orientation, and other minor programs in an effort at costs savings. The plan is included in the Organization and Rules report.

Office of Student Life Registration Fee

The Executive Board discussed the re-imposition of this \$40 registration fee.

End written report from the Executive Board

Mr. Schechtman said he would ask for a straw poll on the OSL registration fee. Any student group that receives money from the GA or the ASUC, or that wants to reserve a room on campus, including tabling on Sproul, has to register with the University, with the Office of Student Life. To date, this has been free. The University has proposed charging every student group, regardless of size, \$40 a year for the right to register. That means groups would have to pay \$40 for the right to use a room, or to receive their own funds, since the funds that the GA disburses are Student Activities funds, not University funds. The GA and the ASUC teamed up that year and got a one-year deferral on this fee, but the fee was again being proposed in the OSL budget

for next year. Mr. Schechtman said he would like to take a straw poll on the fee, and asked how many students would approve of this fee, how many would oppose it, and asked for abstentions. He called for any abstentions. He noted that opposition was unanimous, except for two abstentions. He asked for any comments or feedback they would like the GA to take back to the OSL.

Mr. Smith asked why it was that every time the University had a budget crisis, they wanted to balance it on the heads of students. Meeting was part of students being there and being able to use the facilities. The fee would ask people to pay extra because they come together as a group. He understood registering groups was problematic, there was a need to know who's on campus. But he could use any room to meet with other grads or friends. If he did that legally, he would have to pay \$40 every nine months, and he'd ask the rationale for that. The amount they expect to raise from student groups with this fee was a little over \$30,000, so it's nickel-and-dime stuff, not even enough for a position at OSL.

Mr. Schechtman said that in their budget, OSL anticipates a 25% drop in the number of student groups, once this fee is imposed. And this is the office that's responsible for promoting student groups on campus.

Mr. Daal asked what the money raised by the fee would go towards. If they have to pay this, he asked if students would be on the budgeting committee for this organization and have taxation with representation. Also, the thesis for the fee, if he recalled correctly, was that last year it was more of an extension and they brought this on students without any warning. The GA and the ASUC teamed up and got an extension from OSL, but the OSL told students right then that this would be on the books for next year unless they found some other way of raising the money. Students didn't raise the money, and now they have to pay it.

Report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

- 21 -

Mr. Schechtman said that was an accurate characterization of the situation. The party line from the OSL was that, like all administrative units, they had to take budget cuts. The information students had was that the Dean of Student Life volunteered this particular budget cut, although she has never shared that with them directly. The fee was designed to fund half an FTE position in OSL's office in Sproul Hall, the office that manages student group registrations. One thing OSL currently does is to offer seminars on leadership development and other topics. The OSL feels it's underutilized by students, and if students recognized its value, they'd understand the value of this \$40 fee.

Mr. Lanting said the Executive Board talked about how student groups that want to take these seminars could pay to do so. The mandatory registering of student groups was already in place, and he couldn't imagine needing \$40 per group for it. He could understand student groups going to OSL and paying to take a course, but 90% of GA groups will not go to OSL.

Mr. Schechtman asked if anybody was in a student group that was involved with the registration process or attended anything the OSL put on, beyond the mandatory one-hour orientation. He noted that one person responded. The Delegate said he attended a funding workshop and it was useless, really bad, a waste of time. It was a workshop on how to raise funds, and people didn't learn anything.

Mr. Schechtman asked how many Delegates have gone through the OSL to register a room on campus, and noted that four students responded. A Delegate said Students for a Greener Berkeley used Pauley Ballroom for

three days.

Mr. Daal asked about grad groups that use Sproul Plaza and if anybody registered for that. He noted that one person responded. A Delegate said it was Queer Grads.

Mr. Cantor said the only reason grads would register with OSL is because they have to get the money the GA gives them, even though that money came from the ASUC. Registering with the OSL to get money from the ASUC was an obscure rule, and the OSL wanted to add a fee for service to grads. So it would take this money by force because this rule was in place, and the GA's budget process can't go forward without the OSL's stamp of approval.

Ms. El Naggat asked about the rationale for the OSL's existence and if that office was for grads. Mr. Schechtman said it's responsible for enforcing the Code of Conduct for all students and provides liability coverage. When groups go through the registration process, they receive coverage under the campus' umbrella policy. Not many student groups know that, and fewer use it. But it's of some value if something happens. Mr. Cantor said that historically, that function, the Code of Conduct function, was performed by the ASUC. So this body used to mete out conduct for the student body, not the OSL.

Ms. El Naggat asked how OSL came to take over or co-opt ASUC jurisdiction. Mr. Cantor said he didn't know, but thought it was a gradual process. The ASUC was doing too much business and was doing really well. It started the football program, for instance, and the University wanted to get its fingers into it student life was big business.

A Delegate said her group did take advantage of the liability coverage, so OSL was useful and knew what they were doing.

Report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

- 22 -

Mr. Daal said one thing to take back was to explore the possibility of canceling the rule requiring groups to register. Mr. Sharma said that was in the GA's By-laws. Mr. Garcia said that if the GA didn't want to have groups register with OSL, all it would have to do would be to pass a Resolution.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

With Mr. Sharma chairing the meeting, reporting for the Academic Affairs Committee, Mr. Schechtman said that thanks to the work of several dedicated individuals, announcements will go out on Friday for the 2nd Annual Faculty Research Mentoring Awards, which is funded and hosted by the GA. They'll send out an e-mail to the Delegate mailing list and he would ask them to please forward it to members of their departments. Not all students on campus get e-Grad. They'll need more people to review the applications, which are due on April 7. They have three weeks in April to select the winners, and then they'll host a big party. If people were interested in helping with that process, he would ask them to let him know or Mr. Stagi, who's heading this up.

A Delegate asked how many seats and committee jobs there are relative to how many Delegates there are. Mr. Sharma said there are about 80 Delegates and a million committees. The Delegate said it seemed that having Delegates sit on one committee wasn't enough to get everything done. Mr. Schechtman said there are a half-dozen committees in the GA, and almost 100 campus committees. They have never in the past drawn on GA Delegates to serve on campus committees, but they thought the change in committee requirements would increase links between campus committees and the GA, which was very important, and give all Delegates more ways to solve their committee requirements than the committees the GA had to offer, such as if they're interested in bicycle safety or recycling.

Mr. Schechtman said that as part of the Academic Affairs Committee report, if anybody in Public Health, Public Policy, or Social Welfare, was interested in potentially drafting a resolution to suggest to the Administration that they can to reduce their administrative overhead and increase money going to instruction if they entertain the possibility of consolidation. The campus budgeting process is going on and will continue until May. He and Mr. Sharma sit on several committees that can bring these resolutions forward. The University was facing a multimillion dollar shortfall but wasn't willing to make cuts anywhere. So this may be something to consider with these three schools, and if Delegates would like to pursue this they should let him know.

Reporting for the External Affairs Committee, Ms. Medina said they're meeting that coming week.

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Mr. Garcia said the Committee met last week and did four things. The Executive Board requested that \$10,000 be put into the GSI trustee account, and the Finance Committee approved it. They're moving \$4,000 from the General Fund and \$6,000 from the Social Development Grant. The EWOC Conference was given \$4,500 to cover programmatic expenses. The Graduate Women's Project was given \$3,000 to cover shortfalls in their stipend and PSA line items. The Outreach Project had no additional money allocated, but the Finance Committee shifted money from one line item to another in the stipend categories. He called for any questions.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 23 -

A motion to approve the report from the Finance Committee was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Begin written report from the Finance Committee

Delegates Meeting: Thursday, March 3, 2005

Presented by David E. Garcia, Finance Committee Chair

Finance Committee action:

1. The Executive Board requested that the \$6,000.00 allocated for the Social Development Grant and an additional \$4,000.00 be transferred into the Graduate Social Club trustee account. This request was approved.
2. The Empowering Women of Color Conference (EWOC) was given \$4,500.00 to cover programmatic expenses that could not be covered by the Funding Committee or Registration Fees.
3. The Graduate Women's Project was given \$3,000 to cover shortfalls in the stipend and PSA line items.
4. The following line item transfers were approved for the Outreach project:

End written report from the Finance Committee

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Mr. Lanting said Shayla Moore, the Funding Advisor, wanted him to give people a heads-up on the March 18 deadline for the next funding round, round 7, the second-to-last round of the academic year. People should get applications in on time.

Mr. Lanting said the allocations for Round 6 of Graduate Events funding allocations were in the agenda packet. The Funding Committee met on Monday and allocated 100% of the requested amounts under Grants and 73% under Grad Events, which was very good. So they're doing well with that. There are two more rounds, Rounds 7 and 8 for Grad Events, and Grants and Projects and Services were closed for the year.

Mr. Lanting said he would speak about some of the funding restructuring when the Resolution comes up that the Funding Committee sponsored. They didn't cut any Grad Events line items that were below \$100, and where groups were cut below \$100, they topped it up to \$100. So groups that requested under \$100 got the full request.

A motion to approve the report from the Funding Committee was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, APPROVING THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON ROUND 6 OF GRADUATE EVENTS AND ROUND 4 OF GRANTS FUNDING, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 24 -

Reporting for the Organization and Rules Committee, Mr. Sharma said the Executive Board, sitting as the O&R Committee, considered, and was now recommending, three changes to the By-laws. The first would add a new section to the title that would clarify Delegates' committee requirement, 10.6.1 and 10.6.2. It would expand the means by which a Delegate or Alternate could satisfy that requirement. It would include any committee in the GA, whether it's academic, campus, Systemwide, or project. So being on the Standing Committee of the EWOC Conference would satisfy committee requirements.

A Delegate asked about requirements for Delegates and Alternates. Mr. Sharma said it's a separate requirement for each individual.

Mr. Sharma said Title 17 deals with the Grad Social Club and recognizes it as a project of the GA, which will provide administrative support and set up the Grad Social Club Committee to exist as a project. Committee membership would satisfy the committee requirement.

Lastly, they have an Events Project, and the proposal would bring it into the By-laws, narrowing its scope to have the Events Project next year administer the Faculty Mentoring Award, the Grad Student Orientation in the fall, and the GA open house, at some point in the year. Ms. Levitan asked if they would be in charge of the reception or the whole process for the Award. Mr. Sharma said it was for all of the administrative process. There would be a selection committee. What they would lose from the Events Project is the holiday party from the end of the year, and tutoring. The coordinator position would be for ten hours a week over the whole year. Mr. Garcia said they may lose the holiday party, but they have the Grad Social Club to throw parties for them.

A Delegate said she didn't understand the third item on 10.6.2, not having more than two Delegates satisfy the requirement for a single project or committee or advisory board. Mr. Sharma said that meant that with the Social Club Committee, there could be an infinite number of Delegates, but only two could use that to satisfy the committee requirement. They don't want every Delegate to sit on any one committee and have others with nobody on them. Delegates could still sit a committee, but only two would get credit.

Ms. El Naggar asked how it would be determined which two get credit. Mr. Sharma said was another section dealt with committee appointments that the Departmental Liaison would manage. There are equitable methods of picking who gets credit, and it's never been an issue.

Mr. Daal asked if this would change the rule of having the committee requirement satisfied if only one Delegate in a department was on a committee to now saying every Delegate must be on some committee. Mr. Sharma said it would. They would have to be on a committee, a project, or sit on an academic campus committee. Mr. Schechtman said this would be an extension of the committee requirement. Right now there's a lot of confusion from large departments about who is doing what, and the Executive Board felt that given that they've expanded the number of committee choices people have, it became relatively easy to satisfy. They've also opened up for the first time Delegate participation in project steering committees. The GA funds a number of autonomous projects, and the change in the By-laws would allow Delegates to provide input and bring information back from projects to the GA in a more organized way than has happened before.

Mr. Smith asked if this was on the Web. Mr. Sharma said it was. Mr. Schechtman said they were trying to improve the process.

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 25 -

Ms. Levitan asked about academic and campus committees. Mr. Sharma said campus committees are the ones Mr. Schechtman makes appointments to. Systemwide committees are those Ms. Medina makes nominations to.

A Delegate asked if there was a location on the Web that contained information on campus-wide committees. Mr. Sharma said there is, and in a month or so Mr. Schechtman will advertise to fill those committees.

A Delegate said that given that Alternates don't attend meetings, she asked about the rationale of them serving

on committees as they're sort of out of the loop most of the time. Mr. Sharma said that depending on the department, that was true. But some departments have Alternates present all the time. It depends on the ratio of Delegates to Alternates. They want the GA, the Delegates, to be cued into what the projects are doing, and what's happening on campus as a whole, and on this like developing their funding, making the budget, and being part of the process. So they need people to fill those positions.

A Delegate asked who checks on this. Mr. Sharma said it's the Departmental Liaison.

Mr. Fisher asked if being on a committee that never meets counts towards the requirement. Mr. Sharma said it does.

A motion to adopt the report and approve the By-law changes was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD, SITTING AS THE ORGANIZATION AND RULES COMMITTEE, APPROVING BY-LAW CHANGES, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Begin written report from the Organization and Rules Committee

The Executive Board, sitting as the Organization and Rules Committee, adopted the following recommendations for changes to the By-laws and forwards them to the Graduate Assembly for consideration.

Title 10, Section 6 is added to the Graduate Assembly By-laws and shall read as follows:

10.6 Committee Requirement

10.6.1 Every Delegate and Alternate Delegate shall satisfy the Committee Requirement in accordance with these By-laws.

10.6.2 To satisfy the Committee Requirement, every Delegate and Alternate Delegate must serve as an active and participating member of: (1) an Executive, Charter, Standing, or Ad-hoc Committee of the Graduate Assembly; (2) an Academic, Campus, or System-wide Committee; or (3) an advisory board or project committee of a Graduate Assembly Project as established in Title 17 of these By-laws; provided, however, that no more than two Delegates or Alternate Delegates may satisfy the requirement through a single project committee or advisory board.

Title 17, Section 5 is added to the Graduate Assembly By-laws and shall read as follows:

17.5 Graduate Social Club

Committee Reports (cont'd)

- 26 -

Written report from the Organization and Rules Committee (cont'd)

17.5.1 The Graduate Social Club (GSC) is recognized as an autonomous project of the Graduate Assembly

whose aim is to improve the opportunities for socialization among graduate students among various backgrounds and disciplines.

17.5.2 The Graduate Assembly shall provide a sufficient level of administrative support to ensure the continuing programmatic vitality of the Graduate Social Club, including:

17.5.2.1 internet space;

17.5.2.2 assistance with campus units such as UCPD and the ASUC Auxiliary;

17.5.2.3 physical space on campus for social events; and

17.5.2.4 funding.

17.5.3 The Graduate Social Club may continue to pursue independent sources of revenue.

17.5.4 The Graduate Social Club shall abide by appropriate regulations of the Graduate Assembly in regards to financial control and accountability, including the provision of receipts, regular financial reports, and annual budget accounting for purposes of continued funding.

17.5.5 The Graduate Social Club Committee shall govern the Graduate Social club. Membership in the Committee shall be open to every graduate student on the Berkeley campus. The Committee shall elect Co-Chairs who shall make a written or oral report to the Graduate Assembly each month.

Title 17, Section 6 is added to the Graduate Assembly By-laws and shall read as follows:

17.6 Events Project

17.6.1 The Events Project is recognized as an autonomous project of the Graduate Assembly whose aim is to coordinate and plan large events.

17.6.2 The Events Project shall be responsible for:

17.6.2.1 The Faculty Mentoring Award each spring;

17.6.2.2 The New Graduate Student Orientation each fall; and

17.6.2.3 The Graduate Assembly Open House once per year.

End written report from the Organization and Rules Committee

Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

Ms. Odusanya said the Grad Council met for the first time that semester. The Chair, a professor in Chemical Engineering, nominated a Delegate, who volunteered, to participate in the review of the

Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives Reports (cont'd)

- 27 -

Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research. Every year the Grad Council reviews departments and nominates professors to the committee doing the review. At the meeting, Dean Mason also gave the presentation that the GA heard that evening. SIMS, the School of Information Management Systems, used to be the School of Library Information Studies and there were some issues as to the language and diversity regulations regarding that Department, so the Grad Council made changes to rules for that School. In addition, there was an update on TA mentoring. The Grad Council is trying to develop a document that was open to all professors and provide useful information and links to mentoring, and ways to better mentor grads. There was also a discussion on the application process. Applicants have to turn in their financial letter by paper, and the Grad Council discussed moving that online.

Ms. Odusanya said that if Delegates have any issues they want the GA representatives to take to the Grad Council, she would ask them to please let her know. Monday is the next meeting.

Regarding the report from the GA's Store Operations Board representative, Mr. Sharma said the next meeting will be on Tuesday.

NEW BUSINESS

The following Resolution was submitted by Mr. Fuentes:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AFSCME LOCAL 3299 AT THE UC CAMPUSES

WHEREAS, currently a majority of University of California (UC) service workers earn less than the living wage, defined by the California Budget Project as \$16.88 per hour, and wages for UC service workers have not been increased for the past two years; and

WHEREAS, AFSCME Local 3299 is a democratic, member-run organization that promotes collective action to solve problems and empower employees; and

WHEREAS, the more than 7,000 University of California service workers represented by AFSCME Local 3299 -- custodians, food service workers, cooks, bus drivers, and other service employees -- who make it possible for students throughout the University to learn, work, and live on campus, are at the forefront of a larger struggle for social and economic justice and accountability in the UC System; and

WHEREAS, AFSCME Local 3299 workers encounter the following problems at work: discrimination and favoritism; short-staffing that prevents them from performing their duties effectively and safely; the hiring of outside workers instead of promoting workers from within; low wages; difficulties in receiving pay raises; low-quality employee patient care and services; and disproportionate pay for duties performed; and

WHEREAS, "Berkeley's Betrayal: Wages and Working Conditions at Cal," and "High Ideals, Low Pay: A Wage Analysis of University of California Service Workers," both document an array of problems that UC Berkeley's low-wage workers have systematically encountered; and

Resolution In Support of AFSCME Local 3299 at the UC Campuses (cont'd)

- 28 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AFSCME LOCAL 3299 AT THE UC CAMPUSES (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the six figure salaries of UC administrators continue to grow while the pay of those who teach and make it possible for the University to run each day remains stagnant, even as student tuition and fees increase and qualified students are being turned away; and

WHEREAS, the average salary of a UC Chancellor is \$290,490 per year while nearly 1,000 service workers across the UC system make less than \$20,000 per year and 59% of UC service workers across the UC System make less than \$30,000 per year;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that students and workers stand in solidarity for an affordable education and quality living wage jobs at the University of California.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that to show our solidarity, we pledge that we will find every viable alternative so that we do not need to cross picket lines to work or study in the event of a strike.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly urge the University of California to pay UC workers a living wage, as defined by the California Budget Project, provide a "chance to advance" career opportunities program, and to reform the University of California policy of granting big bonuses and hefty raises to a handful of executives while enrollment is capped, student fees are increasing, services are cut back and employees get little or no raises.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the President of the Graduate Assembly write a letter to the Chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, and to the President of the University of California, stating the Graduate Assembly's unequivocal support for AFSCME's goals in the ongoing contract negotiations, making a specific demand that the University pay UC workers a living wage, as defined by the California Budget Project.

BE FINALLY RESOLVED that as the elected representatives of 9,000 graduate and professional students, we will devote our resources to educate the students about workers' struggles for justice and fight for all of our members to stand in solidarity with the workers of the University of California.

Mr. Fuentes said he's a representative from the Law School and the Resolution was a result of the fact that most low-wage workers at the University, cooks, service workers, bus drivers, and janitors, are paid about \$7-8 an hour, while it's estimated that the living wage to survive in the Bay Area is \$16 an hour. Their contract expired in September and they've been involved in negotiations. They've proposed over 1,000 changes to the contract, and all of them have been rejected. They've been getting a lot of support from students, not so much from undergrads, but a lot from grads. There are efforts at the Law School to organize and mobilize support. Right now there's a vote on March 8 on whether or not to strike. Based on State labor regulations, it would take 50 days before they could have a picket line. If they do end up in a situation where they have to picket, that would be very problematic for them, and it looks like they'll vote to strike. So there's a little gap in between the time they vote and the time they picket. If they picket, they'll stop receiving their wages and probably run the risk of losing their homes. What the Resolution tries to do is gather enough grad student support to send a message to the University that they're not just going to go away and forget about these

employees' demands. That will be shown by a

Resolution In Support of AFSCME Local 3299 at the UC Campuses (cont'd)

- 29 -

combination of writing letters and passing resolutions that don't take that much time, but send a powerful message to the decision makers there.

Mr. Fuentes said the Resolution goes into the problems the workers face and their demands, and documents the problems. The objective is to provide student support to give workers leverage in their current negotiations so they won't have to take a drastic step like picketing. Hopefully, what they're aiming for realistically, was \$11-15 an hour, which still makes it very difficult to live in the Bay Area, although it would be a substantial improvement. Employees haven't received a pay increase in the last two years, and therefore qualify for over nine government assistance programs. A lot say that UC Berkeley is like the Wal-Mart of public institution. In terms of their commitment as a public institution and for greater social justice and diversity, he drafted the Resolution.

Mr. Daal asked what was meant by "every viable alternative to not cross picket lines." Mr. Fuentes said that if they picket a cafeteria, the workers wouldn't go to work and would set up a barbecue outside and feed students, but just without going in. Mr. Daal asked if departments will be picketed. Mr. Fuentes said he wouldn't ask anyone not to go to class, but if they send this message, that they'll respect the picket line, it's more powerful. Mr. Daal said he wanted to send a powerful message, but he didn't want to be contradictory.

A Delegate said a viable alternative was to not go to classes.

Mr. Garcia asked what was meant by "devote our resources to educate students," and asked if the GA was supposed to put together some educational drive. Mr. Fuentes said he was thinking that the External Affairs Committee could put a person in charge of organizing other students and groups on campus interested in supporting this effort.

Mr. Fisher asked how clerical workers at Berkeley compare to UCSB. Mr. Fuentes said that at the union level, there's no differentiation between UC campuses. So with the 7,000 workers across the UC System, there's no specific comparison to other UCs and Berkeley. But in the second report he mentioned, "High Ideals, Low Pay," they compare the current salary of UCB low-wage workers with that of Cal State schools, and UCB workers are paid far below them.

Mr. Smith said it was his understanding that the reason they're paid less is because the campus uses a high temp pool. He asked if the low-wage workers were permanent employees. Mr. Fuentes said they are. The first report documents workers, employed as long as 20 years, were not receiving substantial pay increases. At other universities, like UCSD, a lot of contracting and subcontracting is done.

Ms. Odusanya asked what was expected of the GA if they support this. Mr. Fuentes said that if the GA supports the Resolution, the GA President would write a letter to the Chancellor and the UC President, and the External Affairs Committee would have more leverage to do work with more grads. And they could mention it at their press conference and motivate workers by having grad student support, because the GA represents 9,000 grads at Cal.

A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded.

A Delegate asked about the political ramifications. Mr. Fuentes said the principle is that supporting a union on campus was relevant to students and was a matter of economic justice, something the GA stands

Resolution In Support of AFSCME Local 3299 at the UC Campuses (cont'd)

- 30 -

for. He was concerned about what's expected of them. But it doesn't sound like this requires anything from them, other asking the President to do something and giving power to the External Affairs Committee. The Delegate asked what the political ramifications were if the GA supports this. Mr. Sharma said there are no political implications for the GA. He didn't think anybody would be surprised that they support this.

Mr. Smith said that historically, students and unions have had an historical alliance, and this was a reminder to remember that history; and if they don't know about it, to learn about it. There's a lot of history as a result of those types of alliances.

Mr. Schechtman said the Capital Allocations Committee of the faculty Senate recommended a vote in favor of a living wage, particularly for this group of workers on campus. To that extent, it looked like the faculty Senate would be in line with the GA's support. The GA's Resolution goes a step further for those who are UAW members and GSIs. One problem on campus is that unions do not support each other, and if the union were to picket entrances to the campus and grads went to teach a class on campus, they'd technically be crossing a picket line. In the past some GSIs have held class off-campus to address this, but it's worth thinking that one way the University gives such low pay increases, including to the UAW, is that unions do not support each other.

Mr. Sharma said that seeing no further debate, the question was automatically called. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AFSCME LOCAL 3299 AT THE UC CAMPUSES PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

The following Resolution was submitted by the Funding Committee:

RESOLUTION TO MODIFY THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT GRANT

WHEREAS, adding the Social Development Grant in the Fall 2004 semester overburdened the already over-subscribed Graduate Assembly Business Office and Grants Advisor; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly Funding Committee is in the process of re-structuring its Standing Rules to allow student groups that would have applied to this new Social Development Grant to instead apply to Graduate Events II; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly is committed to promoting graduate student quality of life and academic success through social opportunities:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Title 16 Section 16.7.3.4 (establishing the Social Development Grant) be removed from the Graduate Assembly By-laws.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that student groups seeking funds for campus-wide social events be allowed to apply under Graduate Events II.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly Funding Committee modify the Graduate Events II application to clarify this funding opportunity.

Resolution to Modify the Social Development Grant (cont'd)

- 31 -

Mr. Lanting said the Funding Committee is re-structuring how it administers some of its money. Specifically, what they're doing is consolidating all four of the Grant applications into one application. This will simplify the administration of the funds, from the Funding Committee's point of view, and would greatly simplify administering this process by the Business Office. In September or October, the GA adopted a Resolution that established a Social Development Grant, in the By-laws, and money for the Grad Social Club will come from other sources. Grad Events II, which had a \$1,000-per-semester limit, will be lifted for groups, such as for the Grad Social Club or other groups that put on campus-wide events, if they meet the Funding Committee criteria, including a number they'll determine in the next couple of months. This removes the responsibility from the Funding Committee of allocating and administering Social Development Grants and permits the Committee to basically re-work Grad Events II and Grants applications so it's clear and less burdensome for everybody involved.

A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO MODIFY THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT GRANT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

The following Resolution was submitted by Mr. Daal (Physics):

RESOLUTION TO SEND A LETTER COMPLAINING ABOUT RSF POLICIES, INEFFICIENCIES, AND INCONSISTENCIES WHICH NEGATIVELY AFFECT GRADUATE STUDENTS

WHEREAS, every day, hundreds of graduate students utilize the Recreational Sports Facility (RSF) in pursuit of their fitness goals; and

WHEREAS, a significant fraction of graduate students' registration fees go toward the Department of Recreational Sports and, in particular, to the maintenance of the RSF; and

WHEREAS, it can thus be argued that UC Berkeley graduate students have a vested interest in and a certain ownership of the RSF; and

WHEREAS, any RSF policies, inefficiencies and inconsistencies which result in widespread graduate student dissatisfaction are, therefore, issues that ought to be addressed by the Graduate Assembly (GA);

and

WHEREAS, a letter outlining such points of dissatisfaction coming from the whole of the GA rather than individual graduate students would be a prudent way for the GA to address these issues and is likely to bear more weight and facilitate monitoring response to the letter; and

WHEREAS, it is important to direct such a letter to the people who can effect change at the RSF, or who can tell others in the RSF management structure to deal with the issues it raises;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA convene an ad hoc committee charged with composing a letter outlining points of graduate student dissatisfaction with RSF policies, inefficiencies and inconsistencies.

Resolution to Send a Letter Complaining About RSF Policies, Inefficiencies, and Inconsistencies - 32 -
Which Negatively Affect Graduate Students (cont'd)

RESOLUTION TO SEND A LETTER COMPLAINING ABOUT RSF POLICIES, INEFFICIENCIES, AND INCONSISTENCIES WHICH NEGATIVELY AFFECT GRADUATE STUDENTS (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ad hoc committee determine who the appropriate people in the RSF management to receive said letter will be, based on the committee's judgment that these people can effect positive changes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this ad hoc committee send its letter, on behalf of the GA, to said addressees, within 31 days of ratification of this Resolution.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the GA Academic Affairs Vice President chair this ad hoc committee.

Mr. Sharma said he did for this Resolution what he'll do for all of them, as a big fan of subjunctives. When they say "Further Resolved," the verb should be in the subjunctive and if it's not, he'll change it. Mr. Daal said he would express major apologies for the grammatical error and noted he was a physicist.

Mr. Daal said the Resolution intends to increase grads as a faction within the RSF. It grew out of his frustration over something that happened to him in the RSF. There was inconsistent policy enforcement, and after he started talking to people, telling him why he was frustrated, they would come back to him and say they also had frustrations. He was talking to Delegates and it seemed that grads had frustrations about the policies and inconsistencies at the RSF. In the Resolution, he proposes that they form an ad hoc committee to look into, catalogue, and make a list of grads' complaints about these matters, and write letters to the RSF, asking them nicely for changes. He wanted to do this in a constructive way and not anger them or approach them with an accusatory tone. Mr. Daal said he would change the wording of the title of the Resolution and moved to change the title to "Resolution to Send a Letter Describing Grad Students' Dissatisfaction with the RSF's Policies, Inefficiencies, and Inconsistencies." So the major change is just dissatisfaction rather than complaint. This letter should also offer some solutions. Grads want to work with the RSF, not against it, so they could be effective.

A Delegate asked if he tried to talk to the people who work there. Also, she believed the GA has a committee that looks over the operations of the RSF, and thought a better channel to pursue this was through that committee rather than a Resolution. Mr. Daal said the GA doesn't don't have someone on that committee. Mr. Schechtman said there's a committee composed of both grads and undergrads who report to the Director of the Recreational Sports Facility. The GA did not make a nomination that year, but the Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services, which owns the RSF, nominated two students. So there is a student committee in place for the RSF to address student concerns about the facility.

Mr. Daal said the Resolution would get the ball rolling to prod the RSF to make changes. He didn't see a reason for not sending a letter, even in light of that committee. And for the first question, his experience, and that of people he's talked to, is that the RSF staff doesn't know about policies and can't affect policy, and if one talks to staff, one gets different answers.

Mr. Fisher said that one problem grads on the official RSF committee have is that they might not represent the GA or grads in general. He tried to be one of the representatives and failed, and they nominated their own grads. A Delegate asked if that was legal. Mr. Schechtman said that if the GA doesn't respond

Resolution to Send a Letter Complaining About RSF Policies, Inefficiencies, and Inconsistencies - 33 - Which Negatively Affect Graduate Students (cont'd)

fast enough to a request for committee members, others can bring forward their own nominees. The GA, in general, doesn't respond fast enough to those committee requests, so it's common that this occurs.

A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded.

Mr. Schechtman said that Mr. Daal did contact the Academic Affairs Office about this, and Mr. Schechtman said he was willing to chair this ad hoc committee. He had some reservations about this. Number one, if he took this to the head of the RSF, or higher, the first question would be whether they took it up the chain; so they would have to do that, and would have to take it to the committee. If the GA votes on this, the GA was representing 10,000 grads, and he got approached quite often by grads who were dissatisfied with services in various parts of the University, and generally, his office only gets involved in something if the situation cannot be resolved through the normal channels. And if it's systemic enough, they have the weight of 10,000 grads behind something if needed. He uses the RSF and he knew there are student employees with various degrees of training. He would need to be convinced that the GA student body as a whole had enough specifics. He could not go and talk about "inconsistencies" and "inefficiencies" and they need to be very specific about things that need to be changed, and make a case that they affect grads as a whole. That was his only concern, and if they could do that, they'd have a strong case to make. If they don't, they risk wasting their time.

A Delegate moved to amend, so that instead of sending a letter, to send an interpretative dance performance. She moved to change that in all Resolutions that mention letters. The motion to amend was seconded. The motion to approve the amendment failed by voice-vote.

A Delegate said she thought they had to take it to the chain. If that didn't work out and they have specific issues, they could move to send a letter. She moved to amend, to have this issue addressed through the

committee. Mr. Daal said this does not identify the specific person they would send the letter to. The committee can decide where they send it, and that decision will probably be to go through channels, because they believe that's the most effective way to effect change, which is the wording of the Resolution. He wouldn't be opposed to considering that in the ad hoc committee.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded. The motion to end debate passed with no objection. The motion to approve the Resolution failed by hand-vote, 3-13-4, Resolution to Send a Letter Complaining About RSF Policies, Inefficiencies, and Inconsistencies Which Negatively Affect Graduate Students.

Mr. Sharma said there were no other items of business. A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Fisher asked if they could invite the RSF grad student representatives to the next GA meeting to voice their complaints.

This meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak, Recording Secretary

Present at the March 10, 2005 GA Meeting

Architecture, Aditi Rao
 Jurisprudence & Social Policy, Alexander Rosas
 Folklore, Anthony Buccitelli
 Materials Science & Engineering, Becca Jones
 Near Eastern Studies, Brian Brown
 Public Policy, Bryan Quevedo
 Bioengineering, Carmel Levitan
 Staff, Dept Liaison, Chris Cantor
 Integrative Biology, Christine Petersen
 Chemistry, David Garcia
 Mechanical Engineering, Eugenio Urquiza
 Civil & Environmental Engineering, Geetika Maheshwari
 Astronomy, Jason Wright
 City & Regional Planning, Jay Stagi
 German, Jenn Zahrt
 Mechanical Engineering, Jessica Preciado
 ESPM, Josh Fisher
 Law, Kiyana Davis,
 Chemical Engineering, Lola Odusanya
 Sociology, Manuel Valleé
 Italian Studies, Marisa Escolar
 Psychology, Melissa Adams

ESPM, Ainsley Seago
 Comparative Literature, Amelia Borrego
 Staff, Leg. Liaison, Anu Joshi
 Bioengineering, Brian Games
 Info. Management & Systems, Bruce Rinehart
 History, Candace Chen
 Education, Charles Hammond
 Linguistics, Christian Dicanio
 Political Science, Darius Ornston
 City & Regional Planning, Duane De Witt
 Materials Science & Engineering, Gabriel Harley
 Law, Hollie Sawyers
 Geography, Jason Strange
 Philosophy, Jeffrey Wolf
 Integrative Biology, Jenny McGuire
 Logic&Methodology of Science, Johanna Franklin
 Anthropology, Juan Thomas Ordonez
 Social Welfare, Lawrence Smith
 Chemistry, Lynn Trahey
 Staff, Berkeley Grad, Mariam Elnaggar
 Anthropology, Meg Stalcup
 Physics, Miguel Daal

Classics, Nandini Pandey
Integrative Biology, Rebecca Lutzy
Law, Rishi Sharma
Social Welfare, Bethany Cagen
IEOR, Stella So
Physics, Trevor Lanting

East Asian Languages & Cult., Patrick Noonan
Music, Rebekah Ahrendt
Architecture, Sahar Abbaszadeh
Demography, Sarah Tom
Staff, GSC, Nick Rosenstock
African Diaspora Studies, Zoe Franklin