

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

October 6, 2005

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The GA will sponsor the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture on October 27, with investigative journalist Seymour Hersh.

Committee Chairs were introduced: Ms. Tom, Finance Committee, which deals with the GA budget; Ms. Zahrt, Funding Committee, which recommends allocations to student groups for Grants, Grad Events, Travel Grants, and Projects and Services; Mr. Fairbrother, Foreign Student Affairs Committee.

Presentation by Dean Mary Ann Mason, Graduate Division:

The US News & World Report, in 2002, ranked Berkeley as having more doctoral programs ranked in the top five than any other university.

Fees have gone up relentlessly every year, and non-resident tuition has shot up. Her number one issue that fall was the loss, since 2000, of 27% of their international students. PIs were not willing to make offers to international students. International students also felt at risk, and that they'd be reported for something trivial, such as registering late. One response was to try to change the fee structure for international students. International students will no longer pay any non-resident tuition after advancing to candidacy. The difference in fees for non-resident international students will be phased out.

About \$27 million for endowments has been gained. Top-Off Awards were available, a couple of thousand dollars departments have to give to the most competitive students. A goal for the next capital campaign was to raise \$300 million, for endowments. International students are 40% at Stanford, 30% at Princeton and Harvard, and 17% at Berkeley, because they can't afford it. Only 30% of doctoral students were from California.

A faculty emeriti graduate fellowship fund for \$10,000 has been established for individual faculty. The campus has also tried to put all their services for grads in one place.

Another issue dealt with mental health services for students, as stress was the number one problem for grad students. Housing has also been a major goal, and that has greatly improved.

An ongoing research project of the Dean was "Do Babies Matter?", studying the effect of family formation on the career lives of PhDs. Women compromised 50% of PhDs. Men do very well if they're married and have children and women who have children do significantly worse, in terms of getting tenure. Two semesters of active service/modified duty for childbirth will be provided. And a \$6,000 student-parent grant

has been instituted.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 2 -

REPORTS

SOB:

The Store Operations Board was exploring a green, organic food café in MLK; replacing the Bearcade arcade with a lounge/café; and expanding the ASUC Art Studio. The GA gets approximately \$50,000 from commercial revenue from the ASUC Auxiliary and 1.5 full-time salaries.

GA Manager: The GA will have an open house on October 26.

Funding Advisor: Deadlines for Travel Fund grants were October 1, October 21, and November 18. Excessive cuts were made to Grad Events requests because there were so many requests. Smaller requests get a little more leeway and large requests will be cut by very large percents. There are eight funding rounds, and groups should apply throughout the year. Online funding applications will be available by December 1.

Graduate Women's Project:

The focus that year will be on women's health. They held a Fall Reception and a health stress management workshop.

The Grad Support Services Project Coordinator:

The Project seeks to address issues pertinent to all or most grads. They held workshops on debt management and credit counseling and on working with advisors. The next workshop will be on how to build community and break down departmental walls.

"The Berkeley Graduate":

An issue will come out every semester.

GA President:

The Chancellor will attend next month. They're working with quite ASUC on autonomy. They hope to come up with an MOU that would be approved by the GA, the ASUC Senate, the ASUC Judicial Council, and other entities. If all groups sign on to it, the Chancellor would agree to it, and the GA would be autonomous. Also, they hope use 434 Stephens Hall as a space for grads students to congregate. Ideas for the space were requested. Online funding requests will make it easier to apply for funding and for the Funding Committee. The President was also meeting with different student groups every month. There was also a mentorship program for students displaced due to Hurricane Katrina.

Academic Affairs Vice President:

Grads were being sought for about 100 committees of the faculty Senate and the campus Administration.

They're also working with the ASUC on student fee issues. A proposal was made to the Administration on student fee policy to govern how individual units charge fees. Feedback was also given to the Administration on new Bear Transit/Class Pass referendum. They got the vote delayed until late February. The Career Center was proposing a fee referendum that spring for students to fund moving the Career Center. The GA wants to make sure there are service improvements in response to an increase. The RSF and the Men's and Women's Faculty Clubs might open facilities on a particular evening just for grads.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

External Affairs Vice President:

The Regents will hold their November meeting on campus. Grads were encouraged to give public comment. They're also working on voter education for the November election. They're developing material to educate the students on campus. UCOP developed Systemwide policy prohibiting student governments from using student fees to take positions on ballot initiatives. Santa Barbara undergrads recently voted to sue the University about that.

Finance Committee:

The GA pays the UCSA a per-student fee. The number of grads that semester was larger than estimated, so with no objection, the GA increased its fee to UCSA by \$1,300, to total \$10,800.

Funding Committee:

Because Grad Events funding requests were so large, there were large cuts. Groups should reapply. Groups have to apply for matching funds in order to get GA funding. "Matching funds" had a broad definition, and could be charging a nominal fee. With no objection, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations for allocations.

ASUC Representative to the GA:

A lawsuit was pending in the Judicial Council regarding an allocation the ASUC made to the GA last year, stemming from the MOU being removed along with the ballot initiative. There should be a decision by the next GA meeting.

GA Representatives on the Graduate Council:

The new reps had their first meeting with the Grad Council.

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution In Support of a Living Wage for University Workers:

By voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution. It calls for a minimum wage of \$11 for all campus workers; for a study on implementing a living wage; and to devote GA resources to support a living wage.

Two Resolutions were mistakenly not included on the agenda. A motion to allocate time to discuss them passed with no objection.

Resolution To Oppose Proposition 75:

Approved by unanimous voice-vote. It called for the GA join with the UCSA in opposing Prop. 75.

Resolution To Oppose Proposition 76:

Approved unanimous voice-vote. It called for the GA to oppose Prop. 76.

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

[End Summary]



Announcements

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Lola Odusanya at 5:40 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Odusanya said she would like to welcome them to the second GA meeting of the year.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Odusanya said the minutes were online and people were supposed to read them. A motion to approve the minutes from the September meeting was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2005 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Valleé said that for at least the last five years, the Graduate Assembly has sponsored the Mario Savio Memorial Lecture. This year it's taking place on October 27. The speaker will be Seymour Hersh, an investigative journalist who broke the story on Abu Ghraib and broke the story in 1968 about the My Lai massacre. Mr. Valleé said he would distribute fliers and would ask if Delegates could be so kind as to post them in their departments, where people could see them. And hopefully some of them could make it to the lecture, which should be great.

Mr. Fisher said Delegates received e-mails from him, and if they haven't turned in a certification form, he was the one to give it to. He would also like to say something about the kind of power the GA has. He was looking over their certification forms, seeing what people were interested in, and it included diversity, funding, and GSI/SGR stuff. Some of them, especially the newer folks, may be wondering what they can actually do as a GA. Sometimes they write letters to the President, or whoever, representing the voice of the grad student voice. A subset of the GA, namely some Officers and Delegates, meet with administrators who actually have a lot of power over specific issues. And what Delegates say at the GA is what this subset says to administrators. So he would really encourage Delegates to speak up. Basically, these Officers and Delegates are the representatives of the representatives.

Mr. Fisher said people also keep talking about GA committees and campus committees that they want Delegates to be on. There were a bunch of committees, and some Delegates are chairs of committees. He wanted them to raise their hands, introduce themselves, and state what committee they chaired. Sarah Tom introduced herself and said she's Chair of the Finance Committee. Its biggest responsibility was the GA's budget. The Committee in the spring will start working on its proposal for the budget for fiscal year 2006-7. Their main responsibility in the Fall Semester is to be the first step in approving any

Announcements

- 5 -

changes in the current budget. For example, later on in her report, she'll propose a change to make to the budget. So those are two responsibilities of the Finance Committee. If people were interested in joining the Finance Committee, people could e-mail her at finance@ga.berkeley.edu.

Jenn Zahrt introduced herself and said she's Chair of the Funding Committee. This was different from the Finance Committee in that the Funding Committee is allocated a portion of the GA's budget to allocate for student group funding. That's the Committee's primary responsibility, to provide funding in such categories as Grants, Grad Events, Travel Grants, and Projects and Services, which is for office supplies, e.g. There are four categories of grants the GA allocates to help student life on campus. The Funding Committee has an amount of money to give to student groups.

Malcolm Fairbrother introduced himself and said that as of that week, he was the new Chair of the Foreign Student Affairs Committee. He believed it was currently a committee of one, so people were invited to join. It was a little awkward talking about it because most people there were from the United States, and this issue hits them much less personally. But for those who were foreign students, they probably feel, like he did, very happy and grateful to study at this wonderful University, and also simultaneously feel very challenged by the institutional challenges they face in a very unique way. He's been there for a number of years, and in his time there, tuition has gone up from \$15,000 to \$23,000, a \$8K increase, with an increase in fellowships of probably \$2-3K. So it was very difficult to be a foreign student. That's one reason he wanted to get involved in the GA, and this was his first year in it. If people would like to get involved, he would ask them to please get in touch with him. They could reach him at mfair@berkeley.edu. Even if they're not interested in being part of the Committee, if they're a Delegate and a foreign student, he'd appreciate getting an e-mail from them to let him know who they are. He'd like to get a list of foreign student Delegates, which would very useful in terms of soliciting input. His personal interest was the

tuition increase, but if other people had other ideas, he would be more than happy to work on those ideas.

Ms. Diaz-Herrera said that if Delegates know of grads who weren't Delegates but were interested in this topic, they can also participate, and Delegates can suggest that they contact Mr. Fairbrother.

Mr. Fisher said other committees were forming, and if people were interested in, e.g., affirmative action, diversity, and GSI/GSR issues, the GA's committees were on the Web. Committees were just now forming, so people could talk to him as they get these committees started.

Ms. Odusanya called for any questions. Also, if people were new Delegates, she would ask them to turn in their forms to Mr. Fisher, or ask him how to be officially certified as a Delegate.

Presentation by Dean Mary Ann Mason, Graduate Division

Ms. Odusanya said they would next hear a presentation from Dean Mary Ann Mason, of the Graduate Division, after which people could ask questions.

Ms. Mason asked how many people were new to the GA, and said it was most of them. If they were new to the GA, she would certainly welcome them to Berkeley. She's been the Dean of the Graduate Division since 2000 and wanted to discuss four different issues that come across her desk that were of importance.

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

- 6 -

She wanted to start with a little bragging rights for all of them. She'd pass around the US News & World Report from two months ago. She asked how many at the meeting were in doctoral programs, and noted that it was the vast majority. The US News & World Report ranks Berkeley, in 2002, as having more doctoral programs ranked in the top five than any other university, including PhDs in Education, Engineering, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Computer Science, Economics, English, History, Geology, Math, Applied Math, and Political Science. So those rankings were the good news. But the even better news was that on the reputational index, they're a hair above Stanford. (applause); and several hairs above Harvard. So they're really doing well.

But as they know, this wasn't without a huge struggle. Ms. Mason said that since she's been Dean, starting in 2000, fees have gone up relentlessly every year. As an international student mentioned, non-resident tuition has shot up. It's more expensive for a PI here to take on an international student than it is at Harvard, given the way Cal's fees are structured. That's especially true for those who are from out-of-State. Cal has a crazy fee structure that doesn't relent until there's advancement to candidacy.

Ms. Mason said the number one issue she's been involved with that fall was the loss, since 2000, of 27% of their international student population. She's on the Support Committee for Graduate Education and Marcy Greenwood, the UC Provost, just came that day and gave her a big earful about this. The campus did a

study of this. The results weren't surprising, but the data were good for the Office of the President to have since it's ammunition. Exactly related to the fee increases are the number of admissions. It's not that people don't come when admitted, but just that the PIs are not willing to make offers to international students any more. Added to that, Ms. Mason said she spent some time in China last spring and she was on a national committee working on this, and the country was beating up their international students at embassies across the world. In China they were lined up for two blocks for their two-minute interview, and people never make it the first time. It's criminal what was being done in terms of how they treat their international students. There was some progress on this nationally, and supposedly things were faster and better, and more visas were being given. But it's really been a blot on American education the way they've been handling this. A survey on climate was done on campus two years ago, and some international students who were present may have participated. Even on this campus, and maybe especially on this campus, for this is where the students are, these international students didn't feel particularly safe. International students felt that if they were late registering, or didn't return a library book, or did something very trivial, that their registration would be blocked, or something would be sent out, an alarm, and they'd be reported. So there were many issues with international students.

Ms. Mason said the one thing they could try to do more immediately was to try to change the fee structure so that it wasn't outrageously expensive for international students, both in professional schools and doctoral programs. In doctoral programs, somebody supports these students, but wouldn't support them if it was too expensive. Ms. Mason said that year they're lobbying the OP about this. There was a slight movement forward, and international students will no longer pay any non-resident tuition after advancing to candidacy. This will apply to doctoral students. It's a tiny step forward. And for everyone, the non-resident tuition for two years in a row, at least, will not increase. Ms. Mason said a Committee she's on was putting together a five-year plan to phase out entirely the difference in fees for non-resident international students, and then work on non-resident tuition.

Mr. Daal asked how much this was due to University policy versus budget problems. Ms. Mason said it was certainly combined. The fee increase didn't occur because somebody woke up and had a bad day, and the budget crisis certainly contributed to it. But increasing grad student fees was really quite counter-

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

- 7 -

productive because supposedly most of doctoral students are supported, and therefore it's supposed to wash through the System. But increases don't come back to the PI, the Department, or to the Graduate Division. So there's a real internal problem, as well as a general problem in the State. Everyone had their fees increased, including undergrads, and that will continue, but not for non-residents this next year, and or years to come. So there's a little bit of relief on this front, and this was an ongoing project.

In the meanwhile, Ms. Mason said she spends most of her time as Graduate Dean trying, in various ways, to increase support for grad students. They've actually gotten a lot of outside funding, far more than they did in 2000. She thought they gained about \$27 million in terms of funding for endowments. She asked if any of those present received a Top-Off Award when they came to Berkeley. They might have received it and not have known about it. It's small, but every department gets a couple of thousand dollars to give to the most competitive students. And some older endowments have come through as well. In the new campaign,

she talked to all the deans about what they needed to simply be even, competitive, with Harvard and Stanford, the schools that were really Cal's competitors. And they came up with a \$13 million a year gap in terms of the operating budget for grad student support. That's only \$300 million in terms of endowments. So that's their goal, \$300 million in the next capital campaign. So in small and large ways, they're certainly working on this issue. But the increases have been fairly devastating for the last couple of years, and it feels like a steamroller was coming through every year as they come out of the budget process. But that budget process was now a little alleviated, and it was time to relieve grads' education and international students' education. Among their competitors, Stanford had 40% of international students, Princeton had 30%, as did Harvard, and Berkeley had 17%. They're just not attracting the best and brightest globally because they can't afford it.

Ms. Mason asked how many people at the meeting were from out-of-State. She said non-residents were about 70%, including international students. So only 30% of their doctoral students were from California, or went through a California college. That number for the professional schools was much higher. But that was basically q situation for doctoral programs, which was one of the school's major missions.

Ms. Mason said that one thing she's doing, which faculty members will hear about soon, was to set up a faculty emeriti graduate fellowship fund for \$10,000. Any individual could endow a fund, not a whole chair, but can endow a fund for \$10,000. This will hopefully be a competition among faculty and the Grad Division will kick in the first endowment, with her being the first, and there will be a Mary Ann Mason Fellowship in Social Welfare. (Applause) Ms. Mason said she wanted to thank them. Hopefully by the end of this year they'll have a huge trickle. When it's actually announced, she might ask Ms. Odusanya, Ms. Medina, and Mr. Schechtman to announce this and shame their senior faculty. The exemption is if they have children in college. But aside from that, they have a lot of senior faculty. As grads have noticed, they have a fairly old faculty on this campus. So they are therefore in a position, many of them, to do this, over a period of years. They could do this in five years. Her goal was that faculty will make this contribution, and then get into the giving mode, make a payroll reduction, and then move on. And if they go to a higher place, they'd also leave a big chunk. This would be life-long giving. An emeriti should be able to do this immediately. So that's on the graduate fellowship front.

Ms. Mason said the other thing they've tried to do this year and over the last couple of years was to increase and put together all their services for grad students. This would include the Grad Division's own services and those of the Health Center, for instance, and the Career Center, and provide cohesive offerings. These are now all on the Web page, grant.berkeley.edu/academicservices. There are things that

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

- 8 -

grads may not know about, such as the fact that they have fellowship workshops, visitation workshops, the disabled students program, counseling services, and for GSIs, she was sure they know about the many trainings given in the summer to prepare future faculty.

Ms. Mason said she was also co-chairing a task force next year with Steve Lustig, the head of Tang, on mental health services for students, since it's been a real problem for the whole campus, but particularly for

grad students. According to surveys, something like 70% feel overwhelmed a lot of the time. She asked if that described people at the meeting. Stress was the number one problem for grad students. She thought it was less for undergrads because, frankly, they drink. Grads don't drink as much, at least according to surveys, and grads have gotten older and a little more tempered. And there's a serious depression on this campus among all graduate students, and international students actually have a higher rate, at least according to surveys, but were less likely to seek services. So they have a lot of work to do to make this community aware, and make their mentors aware. They should look for signs of extreme stress and arrange for students to get counseling. The campus was not good at doing this, as a community, and other universities do this better. That was one of the goals they have for counseling.

In terms of the GROW program, Ms. Mason said they've got some plans to expand and use 434 Stephens as a multipurpose room, and have some seminars from the GA's Grad Events there, as well as something from the Grad Division, since this was space that was controlled by the Grad Division. Ms. Mason said she wanted to get grads' ideas on what kinds of things they would like to see done by the Grad Division, or the central campus, for that matter. She asked what was lacking in their departments, because most of these kinds of services were better delivered at the local level, if they are delivered. But not all bases get touched, particularly in terms of job placement and those kinds of issues, and particularly if one was not going into the academic job world, which is one of the things the campus doesn't like to recognize. About 50% of doctoral students will not go into the academic world and will go into some other form of employment.

Ms. Mason said housing has been a major goal since she's become Dean. She asked how many present at the meeting were there in 2000, and asked if they recalled people sleeping on couches and in cars. People at the meeting may have been one of those. It was a really, really bad time when she first arrived, a crisis. So the first goal was to try to get more housing, and they did get housing dedicated to grads. The Ida Louise Jackson grad house on College and Durant, had been scheduled to be undergrad housing, but they got that dedicated to grad students. And recently, at a co-op house, after cutting the ribbon on Friday night, they'll have 60 beds dedicated to grad students on Hillegass. Ms. Mason said she had to confess that she's been working on this co-op for a long time, but this particular housing for grads was really a result of the neighbors bringing a lawsuit for noise. Part of the solution was to turn this housing over to grads, whom they believe, rightfully or wrongfully, were quieter and more peaceable than undergrads. They do have on the books, but haven't started the work, on a much larger facility on the periphery of San Pablo, facing University Village, the family student housing. This has been delayed for a number of reasons, including the fact that the housing market has actually eased up a lot, which was good for all of them. She asked if anybody present had any difficulties finding a house that year, and noted that nobody said they did. Housing was still very expensive, but it used to be cheap and dirty, and now it's just dirty. But at least housing does exist again for grads. She thought that probably most of them would like to live in private housing, if it were possible and affordable, relatively near to campus, etc. But at the moment, the situation has turned around. The more active Silicon Valley gets, the better their economy gets. And, regrettably, the more difficult it is to get housing. In 2000, they actually had a huge spillover when all the

20-somethings in the country came to San Francisco to get rich. Her son tried to do that too, and he actually

just finished law school. He didn't get rich and had to return to school. That might be the story of some of those present as well. Now, they have to work for it like everybody else, and that was hard.

Ms. Mason said the last issue she wanted to share with them before taking their questions, because she really wanted to hear from them, was an ongoing project that started out as her research project, "Do Babies Matter?" It studies the effect of family formation on the career lives of men and women PhDs, and that was all of them. She was inspired by this because in 2000, when she first became dean, the balance of grad students was slightly towards women, with the gender factor at 50.5% or so. For her, that was historic because when she got a PhD and then a law degree, it was between 10-12% of the class. And to have 50% of the class was incredible.

Ms. Mason said she's also studied these areas and knew there were problems along the way, particularly with the affect of family of students. They have a great database that included al PhDs from 1965, done by the NSF, and a cohort of 4% were followed until they were 76, and were past some of the issues related to childbirth. The bad news, not too surprisingly, was that men do very well if they're married and have children. They do better than anybody else. Women who have children do significantly worse than anybody else, almost twice as bad, in terms of getting tenure as a goal. And then they found out that the major league was something they're all approaching now, that little space between graduation, getting a PhD, and taking the first job. That's where women were not going for that academic tenure-type job. They're already discouraged, figure it's too hard, and more than that, as they probably already know, the average age of getting a PhD now was 34. It used to be about four years younger. The average age of incoming grad students that year was 28. That includes professional schools; and something like 26% were over 30. So the demographics of the cohort were sort of changing. And that's not good for the issue of reproduction, particularly for women. If they wait until they get their degree and get tenure, that pushes them up to 40ish. This is what the data show as well.

The goal of this family-friendly project was not to just expose the problem, but to do something about it. They've gotten a big Sloan Grant, and the good news was that UC was really changing. They've become something of a leader for the nation, although it's largely more hype at this point than reality. But this semester they're going to put in place two semesters of active service/modified duty for childbirth, and no one else in the country has that much. Men can take it for one semester if they are substantial caregivers. Women can take it for two semesters because they are the mothers. There is a difference in terms of their stress level. That's one thing. Also helpful was to have family-friendly packages which include real estate, housing relocation, and dual careers, because what actually happens more often than not is a dual career, and that women defer. So this project was ongoing, with lots of publications. They have a Web page called "ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu. They have all the press releases and UC initiatives. And Ms. Mason said she was actually doing a book, Mothers on the Fast Track, which compares PhDs to lawyers, doctors, and MBAs. Surprisingly, the patterns are not that much different, except PhDs were a little bit worse, because of the age factor, the timing, and the length of PhD programs. Women PhDs were also a little worse, regrettably, because of the money, because often one finds that women doctors and lawyers can hire professional help. So all of these things were problematical.

Ms. Mason said that what they're trying to do is make it easier for grads to be parents, both men and women. They have instituted on this campus \$6,000 student-parent grants to make it easier for student parents, if they have children. One-in-ten of them will have a child before they get their PhD. And even more importantly, one-in-five will marry each other, another graduate student at the university. So demographically, they're really an important audience for these activities.

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

- 10 -

Ms. Mason said those were the four of the things that were on her plate. The Grad Division seems like a remote place in Sproul Hall, but believe it or not, they're working for grads every day in important ways, particularly in supporting fee structure and housing. They really do put a lot of work into making grads' lives better. She knew it didn't always feel that way from the other end, and their departments were obviously their first line of defense and line of care. She called for any questions. She particularly wanted to know about what kinds of services they were not getting in their departments.

A Delegate asked if the year off for mothers was for grad students or faculty. Ms. Mason said it was for faculty. Grad students get a year extension on the normative time clock. The major thing she's done in the social sciences and humanities was normative time fellowships. The first thing she did when she became dean was to accommodate childbirth, and both fathers and mothers get a year off so they could have an extra year of normative time, or any other kind of normative time that might be attached to a grant. But it's not a paid leave. They're trying to encourage departments to have GSIs cooperate with each other so they don't lose a semester. They encourage, but can't force PIs to continue people on the payroll for a semester or a year, and most do that. But it's not so easy to convince all of them. There wasn't enough central funding to allow everyone to take a childbirth leave for all grads.

The Delegate said she's heard that University students often don't take that year, but it doesn't technically count against them. Ms. Mason said the culture was against it. This is a major thing they're working on in the System. They have had a stop-the-tenure clock in place since 1988, but they found when they surveyed in 2000 that it wasn't being used. So it's a concerted effort to get men to use it. If men use it as well as women, then of course it will be okay. And also, they'll absolutely breathe down chairs' necks and budget committees' necks about what it means to be reviewed, to make the culture family-friendly, not just the rules. They have a school for chairs. Because she's a lawyer, she thought one way to do this was with both the carrot and the stick, and to tell chairs about discrimination laws. When one mentions "lawsuit" to faculty, they grab their pockets, and it's sometimes a good way to run things.

Ms. Ahrendt said she would like to thank Ms. Mason for coming to address them and for the hard work she was doing. She didn't know if her Department was the only one in this situation, but they're having trouble getting grads at that time because they don't have enough faculty members. They're now in a situation where no grad student can actually go out on a fellowship because they don't have enough students to teach. Ms. Mason they're the best in the world, and not just the best public university in terms of graduate education. The reason it's hard to stay there is because of the faculty, and secondly, because of grad students; and they're intertwined. But the faculty problem is compounded by the budget crisis and again, in order for the school to attract the best faculty, they have to pay them a little more than their scale, and then have them take fewer faculty, to get the best quality. But that has its consequences. That was the major theme of the visit with the Provost that day as well. Part of what they're doing in that direction won't help current Delegates, she was afraid, but was fundraising for chairs that partially support faculty, as well as partially support students. Regrettably, in the long run, they'll have to do more and more. Berkeley could do it, because Berkeley was Berkeley. Others were probably less able to raise money of that nature. That is what all the other major publics have had to do as well. In this country, what actually was happening, which could be seen across State Legislatures was that the cost of health care, and of Medicare and MediCal, was

really bumping against free education. And Medicare wins, because they can't argue with Medicare, which was important as well. But that has been the case in a lot of states. The situation in California was with MediCal, but in other states, there are other forms of medical assistance that really are mandated, and it's very hard.

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

- 11 -

In this State, they also have a lot of prisons, which get a big chunk of the pie. The way the budget was set up, it's very, very hard for higher education to get more than it's getting now. So realistically, they have to find more outside sources over the long run. That's basically the direction they're moving in. If they can hang on, because they're still Berkeley, and great people still want to come there, if they give them something reasonable, people will come. But it's not reasonable to come and not have professors.

A Delegate said one of the big stresses and concerns of grads was that people have to teach, as much as every single semester, because there aren't other sources of funding. This is was the situation in Integrative Biology. She didn't know how unusual that was and she asked if that's something the campus was thinking about, the number of semesters people have to teach as part of their funding package. Ms. Mason said that if people get funding packages from Stanford and from Berkeley, and Stanford says they only have to teach a year, and Berkeley says three years, there was no question where one would go, and that was a major issue. In terms of funding, students in the humanities and social sciences in general say they're okay with two years of teaching, and the rest on fellowship. The sciences overall say they want one year of teaching and the rest of support as GSRs, etc. Many people don't work during those other years because many people do GSRs. That's the goal, in order to stay competitive.

Ms. Mason said she had to say something good about teaching. Too much was too much, but students at Cal come through, she thought, with teaching portfolios and were really ready for the market in a way that few others are. If they go to a place like Princeton or even Harvard, there are more grads than undergrads to teach. So grads don't have that much experience and although it looks great on paper, they don't have that much experience. If they go out to get a job or even think about whether they want to do this for the rest of their lives, having some really solid experience helps. As they know, the campus tried to make mentoring experience and the training better there. And although it's not what everyone would want, they to do have better support for GSIs at Cal than any of their competitors do, in terms of the kinds of services and support. She's done this a long time, and in the long run, the teaching was perhaps the most satisfying thing for a lot of people. Not for everybody, but teaching will be central for anybody following an academic center. That's one of the major draws, and a reason why people continue as opposed to working in industry or doing other things, where they don't have the contact with students who always put them on their toes and challenge people, and make them feel as old as they are. But it was good to have that every day.

A Delegate said she's on the Graduate Life Committee in the Chemistry Department, and one issue she was trying to fight about this was having people not teach their first semester there, because they have to teach three semesters, and just push that to the second semester. She's been met with an extreme lack of transparency on this issue, with people basically saying it can't be done, but not giving reasons besides not being able to afford it, because basically the department or somebody will pay their salary while they teach,

and then they need to have a PI for the next semester, and they might not have a PI yet. She's basically been told it's impossible. She asked if Ms. Mason could think of any way around this, because if it's just money, it seemed like one got paid the same. It didn't matter if it was a little more in the beginning, but it just didn't make any sense to her.

Ms. Mason said she hated to get into individual departments. There were 105 graduate programs, although not too many that make grads teach in the first year. But she knew Chemistry was very large, and had that practice. In her mind, she didn't think it was a good practice. The way around that was not to make their PI grant, because grants will not take first-year students. It's for fundraising and to support students on fellowships for at least the first year. And that was very possible. Most departments can do

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

- 12 -

something in that direction. She thought that really was the major solution for that particular problem; and she would speak to the Dean about that. She has actually talked to the former Dean and she'll talk to this Dean as well.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to extend time. A motion to extend speaking time by 15 minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Inkabi said he's in Civil Engineering and in their Department, because of the budget cutbacks, what the Department has started to do is reduce GSIs' time from a 20-hour appointment for the same class, same number of students, down to a 10-hour appointment, because that's the minimum to get a fee remission. So essentially, grads do the same amount of work but get compensated less for it. He asked if she had any suggestions to address that issue. This also relates to funding, because many PhD students who currently come into the Department do not have a space to work, and at other grad programs, such as at Cornell or Stanford, that's not the case. He asked if that was on the radar screen of the Grad Division in terms of support or not.

Ms. Mason said parking and space were perhaps the two major problems this University has. She was being facetious, and there were bigger problems. Regarding the space issue, she asked if the Department had a grad student organization within the Department. Mr. Inkabi said they did, and their organization was probably the only one, and he was the Delegate. Ms. Mason said that as they knew, the GA gives money to student organizations, and she would suggest he get their grad students organized and get them to think of creative solutions. She really couldn't, from Sproul Hall, tell the Department they had to make space for grad students, although certainly she would like to be able to do that. She can't create space, or figure out what to do about it. Even lockers might be better than nothing, which is probably what they have now. She would suggest getting a few people together. She asked how much it takes to fund a grad student organization. Ms. Odusanya said they could apply for grants up to \$3,000, she believed. But for a group itself, for an event, it depends on how many students were in the group. If it's a department-wide event, obviously a group could apply for a lot more.

Ms. Mason said that basically, action within would be the only way to handle something like this. As for 20-hours being knocked down to 10-hours for the same amount, Ms. Mason said that was actually a union

matter. Mr. Inkabi said it seemed that the 10-hour minimum was because departments were getting strained. Ms. Mason said it was in a way, but if they thought they were getting exploited, that was a union matter.

Mr. Schechtman said he thought it was mentioned last month that the Union will re-negotiate its contract starting in the spring, so now was a very good time for all of them as Delegates to get in contact with their union reps and raise these types of issues, which could then be put on the table for bargaining. He knew that Mr. Inkabi's Department was not alone in some of these issues.

Ms. Mason asked if people had any thoughts about services they would like, such as placement or career preparation. She asked if there was any need for that, or ideas about that. A Delegate said this was a question for everybody in her Department, Statistics. There's not much activity in terms of career placement, career preparation, but they're sort of unique. Everybody's department had unique goals on work after graduation. The GA was the right group to organize with for the Career Center. Ms. Mason said hopefully the Department will do something, but a lot of departments were not as good as they should be about this. She knew the Career Center had a couple of seminars or workshops. She believed they should

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

- 13 -

have many more, and many more workshops for different areas, particularly for people who were not going on to an academic career. Again, they don't serve people very well because they don't prepare them. Obviously, academia and research careers were their first priorities, but realistically, people need some job practice and some advice on what to do other than going into academic careers. That's one area she'd like to open up a bit, because she thought it was important. The Delegate asked if there were problems with career placement. Ms. Mason said that generally, career placement was one's mentor beating the bushes for them. It tends to be very individualized depending on the department. In the professional schools like Law and Business, they usually have very active placement because there's a lot of placement going on. That was probably the case with Engineering as well. Professional schools were more likely to invite the public in. But in addition to just finding one a job, which one's mentor does, it's preparing one for their job talk. What the Summer Institute does, but regrettably only for 30 people, but very intensively, was to help to prepare a teaching and research portfolio and help people with jobs and the job market, so that when grads go out there, they're not just first-time amateurs and they have some experience. She couldn't tell them how important the job interview was, and particularly the job talk was. Some departments were very good about preparing their PhD students and spend a lot of time preparing them, and other departments don't do much at all; and that's what she was really concerned about. Every time they offer something like dissertation writing or career development, they're inundated. So she knew there was a demand. But she would like to make it more specialized as well, and not just generic as it was now.

Ms. Odusanya said that to go off on that, she and Mr. Schechtman met with Tom Devlin, the Director of the Career Center, and they're discussing ways to better serve grad students. So she would ask Delegates to please talk to her afterwards. Ms. Odusanya said she would be glad to pass that comment on to him as to how best to serve grads on campus.

A Delegate said that one of the things that came up last year, towards the end of the year, was the computer

that was stolen from the Graduate Division, along with the theft of the Social Security numbers of a lot of students. She thought that happened towards the end of the year. People didn't know what would happen. She asked what steps would be taken to prevent that in the future. Ms. Mason said the laptop has been found, which was good news for those who had their names on it. This was a laptop stolen from an office in the Grad Division. It occurred at lunchtime, and a door that was supposed to be locked wasn't locked, and a series of events regrettably occurred. In July, she believed, someone in South Carolina called IBM and said they wanted technical assistance with the computer that had been stolen. This was an unwitting buyer who thought they were getting a different product. IBM alerted the campus and police took backward action. This was not guilty of anything, by the police actually located the fence. They didn't find the actual thief. The laptop had been passed over very quickly. They can't say for sure that the information was never copied, and the MO was exactly as they thought, because a lot of computers are stolen on campus all the time. This just had the kind of sensitive information that had to be reported. In terms of what the campus has done, Price Waterhouse came in and they've gone through procedures, and now one would have a hard time getting near the Grad Division these days because of all the security procedures they've undertaken. But more than that, it's caused the campus to look at what kind of information they have, because the information on campus was very distributed. Lots of people carry around information, particularly in e-mails, where they might get a list of people. They have to pay students, so they have Social Security Numbers for everybody. So it's not uncommon to have a lot of students' names. It was not good to have it stolen, and it was more information than other departments would have, because it was the aggregate. But there's an effort to see who has whose Social Security Numbers, and to see if they need them, or if that information could be wiped out, or if a password could be used, and to

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

- 14 -

determine how they'd monitor this. And there is ongoing campus activity in this area. The positive news is that it's very unlikely that anything happened with those particular names. They haven't heard any evidence that that has occurred. It was terrible for everybody involved in the identity theft end, but it was difficult for the campus as well. She was glad they found the laptop, which gave them a little sense of closure.

Ms. Brakora said that while responsible action on the part of all organizations to protect information was important, but she asked what the campus was doing to help decrease crime and theft, not just of computers, but of everything else, including violent crime and everything else. Ms. Mason said she could only speak on the computer side of it. On the other side, her daughter, who's a grad student, had her purse stolen in the library. Ms. Mason said she talked to the librarian. They can't prevent theft, so Ms. Mason said she would suggest that people not leave their purses unattended. This was a basic problem, and the issue has come up many times at the Cabinet. The problem is that they are an open University and they pride themselves in being open; and there's a huge price they pay for that. One solution was to make every unit far more protected and far more liable, so that they are responsible and there's some monitoring of their practices. For instance, in the library, if they want to have closed campus, they wouldn't let anybody wander around the library in the main reading room. It's hard to say they should have guards at the door, although that's something they could do. She thought it was probably a question of individual responsibility on the part of the departments and, to some extent, all of them. They live in a society where they learn to watch their purses and to be responsible. She didn't have any solutions and realized she wasn't being very comforting. Any major university, even if there in kind of obscure places, like Ann Arbor, which is not a major urban

center, always have a rate of violent crime. Universities were just magnets. That's no excuse, and she was just saying these are different issues and very problematical.

Ms. Mason called for any other questions and said it was great to talk to all of them. She hoped they have a good semester and she hoped they solve all the support and housing problems very soon. (Applause)

Report from the GA Representative on the Store Operations Board

Mr. Allen said that Sunny Lu was supposed to do the SOB report, and since she had to leave, he asked if they could hear her report at that time. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Sunny Lu introduced herself and said she was the GA representative to the Store Operations Board. She was entering her second year on the Board. Essentially, the SOB was the board of directors for ASUC commercial activities, which include the ASUC Bookstore, the vending machines, the family-run restaurants in the Bear's Lair, the Bearcade, and Pauley Ballroom. The commercial revenues from these ventures go to undergrads, the ASUC, as well as to the GA. A lot of activity they focused on that last year was on possible new commercial enterprises. For example, the Board was exploring the possibility of putting in a green café in MLK, serving primarily organic food. They were also considering possibly replacing the Bearcade arcade with a vendor that would make the space into more of a lounge/café type of place. They're also looking to expand the ASUC Art Studio, and exploring different possibilities for how the Art Studio could get more space. If people had any questions, she would ask them to feel free to contact her.

Mr. Daal asked what percentage of the revenues the GA gets from these commercial activities. Ms. Lu said that in terms of revenues, the GA gets approximately \$50,000 every year, money from Coca-Cola.

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

- 15 -

No one was happy to hear that, but that's money in the GA's pocket. She also believed the GA gets funded for 1.5 staffmembers. Mr. Daal asked what amount goes to the GA. Ms. Lu said she would have to get back to people for that answer.

Mr. Cantor asked what percentage of revenues they get from rent, and asked if there was profit-sharing. He asked what deal they had with the vendors. Ms. Odusanya said she would clarify how the Store Operations Board works. The SOB runs the Bookstore, and the GA gets a cut from the ASUC Bookstore, from the Bear's Lair, and from the different restaurants next to the Bear's Lair, as well as from the Bearcade, which was also in MLK. Out of all that income the GA got a fixed amount every year, which was the Coca-Cola money, \$50,000. In addition, they get Ms. Hsueh's salary paid, and half the salary for Ms. Moore paid. In terms of profit-sharing, they don't have any right now. So if the ASUC Auxiliary loses money, the GA would get its money anyway, even if the Auxiliary lost money. And if the Auxiliary made money, which doesn't happen very often, they get that amount. So it's a fine balance as to what the better strategy is.

Mr. Valleé asked when the Coke contract expires. Ms. Odusanya said it's in 2011.

Ms. Zahrt asked about expansion of the Art Studio, and said the last she heard, there was a threat that it was going to be completely done away with. Ms. Lu said she didn't believe that was currently being proposed. The Board, and certainly she, were very concerned about preserving it, and were thinking of actually expanding the Art Studio into the Bearcade space, which she voted for. That was still a possibility, especially if the plan falls through to put a vendor into that space. She didn't think there were any vendors on the table for the Bearcade space at that time, but if that plan fell through, they might explore expanding the Art Studio into that space. Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions and said she would like to thank Ms. Lu for attending.

REPORTS

Report from the GA Manager

Ms. Hsueh said she's been GA Manager two and a half months. Somebody mentioned international students, and before she came to the GA she was an International Student Advisor and worked with international students and scholars for 23 years. So she knew a lot about international students and scholars. It seemed that after September 11, things just went haywire. In the past they had to deal with immigration, and then they had to deal with Homeland Security and other policies. She was so glad they have international students join them at the GA.

Ms. Hsueh said the GA was having an open house on October 26 from 4:00 to 7:00, and she would like to invite everybody to attend. The GA was actually a student government and was run by the students. Only 1.5 staff were paid by the ASUC Auxiliary, and the rest of the salaries come from the GA. Regarding the ASUC, Ms. Hsueh said the ASUC supports her salary and the salary of one of the Funding Coordinators, and also supports half of the salaries of students in the Business Office, including Mr. Litwak, the note taker. So they do have support from the ASUC Auxiliary. But she also wanted to let Delegates know that the GA was a student government run by the students. She didn't know if any of them have

Report from the GA Manager (cont'd)

- 16 -

visited Anthony Hall, and asked people to raise their hands if they have. She noted that many have. For those who haven't, she would ask them to please stop by. The GA had a lot of programs. But before she explained anything else, four program Coordinators who were present would explain all the programs that they run. By next month they'll have additional Coordinators explain their programs. She would ask Delegates to please check the GA out and please come to the open house. If people have any suggestions, she would ask them to tell the GA. They're open from 9:00 to 5:00 Monday through Friday. Ms. Hsueh said she wanted to thank them.

Report from the Funding Advisor

Ms. Moore said she would send the Funding Advisor's report around. It contained a couple of spreadsheets, the allocations for Round 2, from the September 23 deadline. They had an overwhelming number of requests. Some requests were excessive. The actual funding allocations went out.

Ms. Moore said she had a couple of announcements. They had a Travel Fund deadline on October 1, and awards will be sent out no later than October 14. Also, there will be funding workshops for October that were listed on the Web site. There were two remaining deadlines for the fall, October 21 and November 18. All the other items were included in the report. She would ask Delegates to please look at the report. They had so many requests they had to make excessive cuts in the Grad Events category. They also allocated Projects and Services and Grants. The statistics were included in terms of how much was requested and how much they were able to give. They over-allocated in small increments, which meant they'll have to cut in other rounds as they come up. They received \$40-50,000 in requests and only had about \$10,000 to allocate. That's where they'll see a few applications that didn't get enough, and that was the reason why. If people have any questions, she would ask them to please e-mail her at ga_advisors@berkeley.edu. The e-mail address for the Funding Committee Chair, Ms. Zahrt, is gafunding.chair@gmail.com. If people have any specific questions, she would ask them to please take a look at the allocations.

Ms. Moore said that smaller requests got a little more leeway in the funding allocation. If people have a really large or excessive request, it will be cut by a very large percent. But they'll notice that for small requests, of \$1-200, they don't tend to get cut as much because those were a lot more reasonable to fund. She would ask Delegates to please keep that in mind when they apply, and try to keep requests reasonable. People try to over-request because they know that cuts will be made, but from what she understood from the Funding Committee and the Chair, they're a little more partial to funding more reasonable requests. So she would ask people to please keep that in mind.

Ms. Zahrt said that one reason why requesting more affected the cuts they make so much was because large requests make the \$48,000 in total requests for Grad Events, e.g., bigger. If the GA only had about \$10,000 to give out per round, anywhere from \$6-10-12,000, large requests will affect what was eventually cut. There are eight rounds that are spaced out over time. So if a group had meetings throughout the whole semester, there's a reason why there were eight rounds. People could apply for meetings this month, and then reapply for the next month, and that would mean there would be a lot more equal distribution. If people apply for everything all at once, they'll get cut, and they'll have to re-apply anyway. So she would ask them to please keep in mind the structure of the funding. There are eight rounds, and if people need a lot of money, they should apply eight times. If they just apply once, they could get, e.g., \$1,000 for the whole semester and drive a huge cut for the whole group.

Report from the GA Funding Advisor (cont'd)

- 17 -

Mr. Inkabi asked if there's \$10,000 limit for each round. Ms. Zahrt said that wasn't set. Mr. Inkabi asked if the amount available was constant, because what she was suggesting was that people should apply only for that round, for that period of time, for that amount of money. So there will be money left for the next round, and there would be a good chance they'd get funded later on. Ms. Zahrt said she had the budgets spread out across the year, so each round had a fixed amount that they'd be willing to spend, since she wanted people who apply in the spring to also get money. So she wouldn't spend all the money for student groups in one

round because that wouldn't be fair to people who have meetings in the spring. So allocations were spread evenly over the semester, based on how people apply. This was a huge round, and for Round 4-A, there's only one week of meetings available for that round. So that round wouldn't have as much allocated. She also had to factor in the entire spring. People shouldn't get over eager in the spring, and they were already a little over-allocated at this point any way. But there was definitely money out there, and it wasn't as if it dries up. People can apply in Round 3 and still get funding. It was just about being smart about how one applies. People can apply in November for their December meeting. She would ask them to please do that instead of thinking in October that the money will run out.

A Delegate asked how online funding applications were going. Ms. Moore said they just lost their two Web masters, who didn't have enough time to complete the process, which has been started over and over. Ms. Odusanya said she would talk about that in her report. Ms. Moore said they'll have a lot more and better staff support, and they expect to get online by the end of this semester, although it may not be launched until next term. Ms. Odusanya said it will be done by December 1. Ms. Moore said people could apply online in the January round.

A Delegate asked if they had an idea of what the deadlines will be in the spring. Ms. Moore said they're posted on the Web site and were also available if people come by the GA. Also, the list of dates to apply in the spring were listed on all the applications. In her report, she only gave them the dates for the fall, but the other dates were available. The Delegate asked if the GA wanted them to apply for the deadline that's closest to that event. Ms. Moore that was the case. There was a category where they could apply in the fall and have the money carry over into the spring, but what's happened is they're getting a large number of requests in the spring, and that's sort of overtaken the requests for the fall. They have to give priority to what's happening right now. On the spreadsheet they'll notice that states that groups should re-apply in the spring, or in a further round, if the event was in the spring, so the GA could better accommodate events that happen now. And that's also in part due to the large number of requests. So if people reduce their requests to something a little more reasonable, the GA would be able to fund them.

Mr. Rodrigo asked what the turnaround time was after people apply. Ms. Moore said it's two weeks. If the allocations were approved by the GA that evening, they'd send out the award letters on Friday.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to adjust the agenda. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Reporting for the Graduate Women's Project, Chrissy Arce introduced herself and said she's the Graduate Women's Project Coordinator. Part of the Project's goals for that semester and this year was to focus on women's health. They had a Fall Reception that went really well, with salsa dance classes. It was really well attended. That day they had the first women's health stress management workshop with lunch and massages, and two psychologists who were there to do a workshop on stress management. It went really

well. They got a high response, with over 180 people responding. They're going to host a second one on October 20. However, the budget wasn't such to allow for so many attendees, so they'll just allow for another 25. Unfortunately, it's not open and people will have to go on a waiting list.

Ms. Arce said that Dean Mason talked about a project, "Do Babies Matter." A power lunch was held last spring and as a result, a lot of women, including people present, expressed an interest in hearing from professors who have achieved academic tenure and who had families and different alternative family configurations. So they pulled together six professors from five different disciplines for an event to talk about this. Things weren't finalized, but they're looking at November 10 for the date. She'll send out more information. Ms. Arce said that because this was a really popular issue, there wouldn't be a minimum and they wouldn't have to RSVP, and they're looking at space for about 50 to 70, with a only a light lunch to be provided, due to student budget problems. This will occur at the end of the semester. If people have any suggestions for activities or any speakers, she would ask them to please e-mail her chrissy1@berkeley.edu. The address was on the GA Web site under GWP.

Anna Berg introduced herself and said she's the Grad Support Services Project Coordinator, formerly known as the Graduate Advocacy Project. She'd give a quick recap of what the Project was about. The Project seeks to address issues that are pertinent to all or most grad students, through things like workshops, individual consultation, a lot of resource connection, and information questions. So far that year they've had a small workshop on debt management and credit counseling and a recent workshop on working with advisors. Some of them may have gotten her e-mail about individual consultation times. The workshop was pretty well attended. The next event scheduled for that semester was October 17, a noon-time workshop, until 1:30, on isolation in graduate school, and how to build community and break down departmental walls that keep people isolated. The workshop will be about an hour and a half and they'll do a consultation after that. She was also working in collaboration with a couple of providers to set up some workshops dealing with taxes for grad students, and one-on-one workshops on taxation issues. Ms. Berg said she was available for individual consultation and meetings, or to answer questions. Hopefully they have a copy of the report she sent to Mr. Fisher, and her e-mail and contact information was included. It was good to see some people she knew, and for those she didn't know, she hoped to meet them more personally at some point. She called for any questions.

Reporting for "The Berkeley Graduate," Miriam Elnaggar introduced herself and said she does "The Berkeley Graduate" and puts out an issue every semester. She had some copies of their summer orientation issue that she could pass around. If people have any questions or comments on anything that's been previously published, they could send her an e-mail. Ms. Odusanya said that Ms. Elnaggar works very hard on the publication so she would ask Delegates to please read it and give suggestions on ways to improve it.

A Delegate asked how people can submit something for publication and asked how items were selected to be published. Ms. Elnaggar said that for the spring and fall issues, they look for reporters and send out e-mails. Hopefully people received that and forwarded it to their departments. She got a lot of responses and had to go through resumés and pick a staff. They'll do that again in the spring. So if people want to get involved, they were always looking. In the summer, they'll again send out an e-mail. She would thank people again for forwarding the e-mails to their departments, in which they'll ask for submissions. Their summer issue, which was being distributed to Delegates, included lots of things on what grad student life was like, advice, places to avoid, etc. More copies were available at Anthony Hall.

Officers' Reports

- 19 -

A motion to approve the above reports as presented was made and seconded. The motion to approve the reports passed with no objection.

Officers' Reports

Giving the President's report, Ms. Odusanya said the Chancellor was coming next month and people should prepare comments and questions. She wanted to thank everybody who asked Dean Mason questions. They appreciate it. Ms. Odusanya said she's been working on the Chancellor coming. They've had several working groups to get information from grad students as to how best to have a structure on campus to address the diversity issue. She asked if anybody present attended the focus group. The Chancellor was very much in support of having a vice chancellor position or something of that nature to coordinate the different offices around campus that work on diversity, and to just make things more effective, and to improve their numbers on this campus. That was going well.

Ms. Odusanya said she's also been working with ASUC Pres. Buenrostro on autonomy. The idea was to come up with an MOU that the GA and the Senate would approve, and also have the ASUC Judicial Council approve it, along with having other, different entities approve it also. The Chancellor was willing to sign such an MOU if all groups sign on to it. Once the Chancellor does that, then the GA would basically be autonomous. The question was to what extent the GA wanted to be autonomous from the ASUC. If Delegates have suggestions, they should let her know.

Mr. Daal asked if she could review the history of this issue, and said that the last time he checked on it was last year, around elections time. He asked what has happened since then. Ms. Odusanya said that if other people had information, they should jump in. The Graduate Assembly was under the ASUC, which was run by undergrads, which didn't make much sense for grads. Right now the ASUC is the GA's fiscal agent. It also has power in terms of being able to veto decisions the GA made, decisions made by this body. The GA was trying to get independent of them. The GA knows that it makes sense to work with the ASUC, and the GA was bound to them in some ways; so it made sense for both groups to work together. At the same time, they should be separate and equal, versus the unequal balance they have right now. To answer Mr. Daal's question, last year there was an initiative to put a referendum on the ballot to actually be autonomous from the ASUC, but at 11 p.m., the day before the elections, someone from the Judicial Council pulled the referendum from the ballot. There was a whole fiasco about that. A lawsuit was actually submitted to the J-Council over the summer. She believed that was still being reviewed, but it will probably not get very far. The idea for the GA this year was to move completely away from that type of autonomy and go the route of getting the Chancellor's approval. If both bodies approve this, and the Chancellor backs it up, they wouldn't have to go to the general student body and somebody wouldn't have the authority to say this was invalid, essentially.

Mr. Daal asked if they were trying to resurrect the plan as it was last year. Ms. Odusanya said they weren't, and they were starting over, and essentially working off of the Memorandum of Understanding that was

developed last year, although this year they're taking a completely different route. The ASUC President, Mr. Buenrostro, has been very cooperative, and Ms. Odusanya said she's been quite impressed with that. They have an ASUC representative present, Mr. Besbris, and they could ask him questions when he gives his report.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 20 -

Regarding 434 Stephens Hall they're trying to find a space for students to congregate and found a space in 434 Stephen's Hall. The Committee right now is composed of three members, Teresa Hernandez, Jeff Wolf, who is on the Executive Board, and Sharon, from the Dean's office. The idea was to meet regularly and figure out ways to make the best use of that space, make it much more open, advertise it, and make it available for students to meet and congregate. They might have pool tables or perhaps a coffee-type shop. They're getting ideas at that time, so if Delegates have suggestions as to what they would like to see in that space, she would ask them to please let her know.

Regarding online funding, Ms. Odusanya said a new Web programmer will work on this project and get it done by December 1. This will make it easier to apply for funding since people will be able to sign on wherever they are, and apply for money that way. The information would go to the Funding Committee, and would be in the database, and it would make it easier for the Committee to analyze asks and make decisions, and students would get a response back both online and on paper. This will make life easier for everyone involved. The idea was to have this done by December 1, and Ms. Odusanya said she would keep the GA posted. By the next couple of meetings, Delegates should have an update on the final product. But it was actually going well.

Ms. Odusanya said that one thing she was trying to do that year, which was quite new, was to meet with student groups every month. She's met with four so far. If people had any contacts or connections about how to best reach groups, she would ask them to let her know. And if they have suggestions as to what groups they think the GA should meet and talk to, they should let her know. She was very willing to meet with those groups and introduce the GA to them and encourage them to get involved in the Assembly.

As for Hurricane Katrina, at the last meeting she asked for volunteers and mentors for students who were here from New Orleans. If people received an e-mail from her office matching them up with a mentee, she would ask that they please contact them; and they'll contact Delegates as well. She would ask Delegates to try to be a resource for these students in terms of questions they might have as to how to get around Berkeley, where to get stuff, or to just help them get established on campus. She called for any questions.

Mr. Daal asked about the mentees. Ms. Odusanya said that last month she asked for people to serve as volunteers to help students from New Orleans. She had a list of students from New Orleans and matched them up the mentors who volunteered to have a mentor/mentee type of program. She would ask the volunteers to please contact these students and show that the GA was there to help them. She met with her counterpart from Tulane, the President of the Graduate Assembly at Tulane, Amanda Merkle. It was nice to meet her and talk to her as to how best to help her and her group.

A Delegate asked if there were enough mentors. Ms. Odusanya said they do, and mentees have two mentors. They're always willing to have more. Some mentees have one mentor, so perhaps he could serve as a second mentor. Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions.

Giving his report as Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said that for those who were new, the Academic Affairs Office is the office in the GA that coordinates policy with the Berkeley campus, both the Administration and the faculty Senate. They've been busy that month basically on campus community assignments, as he mentioned last month. For an overview of their structure, there are about 100

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 21 -

committees of the faculty Senate and the campus Administration. These committees debate everything from waste disposal to admissions policy. He had a list from last month of people who indicated interest in a committee. He'd like them to check to check that list and see if the committee they said they were interested in was correct, and if not, he'd ask them to change the name of the committee. If their name wasn't listed, he would ask them to please add their name to the list and indicate what committees they might be interested in. There was a list on the second page of available committees that they're seeking representatives for. If they don't have a committee assignment, they could look at this list. If they were interested in more than one, he would ask them to please indicate that.

Mr. Schechtman said they've been working very closely with the ASUC that month on student fee issues. They made a first proposal to the Administration on potential student fee policy that would govern not only how individual units charge fees, everything from transcripts to fees charged by the University Health Services or the Recreational Sports Facility, to also how student fee monies would be allocated. Right now students have very little voice in how their fee monies are allocated to student services. There's a huge discrepancy in some cases between very widely used student services that are relatively under funded and relatively small student services that happen to be very well funded. Some of those discrepancies can be traced to which administrator a certain service reports to. Mr. Schechtman said they're trying to increase student involvement across the board in fee allocation and service feedback. They also provided feedback to the Administration on the proposal for the new Bear Transit/Class Pass referendum. Everyone pays about \$37 a semester to get the bus ticket that gives them free transit on AC Transit and also on the campus buses. There was going to be a vote in November about increasing that fee. However, both the ASUC and the GA objected to the fact that the Administration was asking for more money for campus shuttles, but was not providing a clear service plan for what that money would do, leaving open the possibility of actual service reductions. After meeting with the Registrar, the Chancellor, and several campus committees, students got that vote delayed until late February; and the Administration has suddenly become very responsive about providing feedback.

Mr. Schechtman said they also met with the Career Center, which is proposing a fee referendum that spring to ask students to fund moving the Career Center from Bancroft, south of Oxford, to make it more accessible. Mr. Schechtman said he didn't know if anybody has been there, and he certainly hasn't. He'll host a meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee on Thursday, October 13, at 5:30 p.m. in Anthony Hall

and he would invite any and all of them to come, because he'll be actively seeking their input and feedback on what issues were important to them around transit services and career services. One thing they're saying to the Administration is that as students are asked to pay more money, they want to make sure there are service improvements in response to an increase. For example, they don't simply want the existing career service to move, with students paying the entire cost of the move, but rather, they're asking the University to pay its fair share, and asking for new services that would directly address graduate needs. So he needed to hear from Delegates about what grads consider to be their top needs. So he'll provide dinner for the meeting next Thursday, and if people could e-mail him if they're interested in coming, at academics@ga.berkeley.edu, he could get some idea of how much food to get.

Mr. Schechtman said the last issue was that they've been working with Dean Mason on 434 Stephens, but there's also an offer from the Recreational Sports Facility, the RSF, to open one Saturday night just for grads, after they normally close, for a graduate, social play night. It would include everything from pick-up basketball, to badminton, to ping pong, to possibly showing movies, having a dance, free yoga classes, back massages, etc. What the GA would need to do was put together a small program committee. The

Officers' Reports

- 22 -

RSF was willing to provide staff, but people were needed who were willing to help the Grad Social Club come up with programming ideas. If people were interested, he would ask them to please come next Thursday to the meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Mr. Schechtman said that one last thing that come up with their meeting with the Graduate Dean was the suggestion that the Graduate Dean's office would approach the two faculty clubs, the Men's and Women's Faculty Clubs, to see if they might open their facilities on a particular evening, one or two evenings month, just for grads. The feeling was that the Bear's Lair was not a universally acceptable social space and that grads might like to gather in a bar setting that had some food. He asked for a quick show of hands of people who would be interested, or who thought people in their departments would be interested in attending twice a month social evenings, from 6:00 to 8:00 or 9:00, at one of the faculty clubs, with perhaps drinks and light snacks. It would be pay-as-you-go, and the GA would provide a standing gathering for one or two nights a month for grads to attend and meet other grads. He asked for a show of hands of people who thought that would be worthwhile pursuing. After a show of hands, he noted that about half indicated an interest. He said the GA would therefore pursue that. He'd give them more details next month. If people have feedback from their department on grads' needs regarding transit, career services, or social ideas for all grads, he would ask them to please attend the Academic Affairs Committee meeting next Thursday. Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to extend speaking time. It was so moved and seconded to extend by three minutes and passed with no objection.

A Delegate asked if the University was asking for more money from the students because AC Transit recently hiked fees, or if something else was involved. Mr. Schechtman said there were two components to the transit fee. One component involved more money going to AC Transit because AC and the University vastly underestimated the number of students using the service. The GA recognized that AC Transit deserved more revenue. The GA was relatively comfortable with that part of the deal. The other part of the

deal dealt with the campus shuttle system. The Parking and Transportation Committee funds the shuttle system at that time, and the Committee wants to decrease their share of the funding as students pick up more funding. Mr. Schechtman said the GA agreed in principle that since students were the primary users, students could pick up more of the funding, but that they wanted to understand what they would get in return.

Mr. Daal asked what happened to the study on excessive fees that Mr. Schechtman was looking at. Mr. Schechtman said that was part of what the GA presented last Monday to the Administration. When they actually approached the Administration last year, the Provost and the Chancellor were not aware of many of the fees that students pay. What the GA presented was a list of all the mandatory fees students pay. Many of the top administrators were not aware of the fact that students, e.g., pay up to \$20 per transcript, or that they pay \$20 to set up a referral/recommendation letter service, or that until this year, students paid \$30 just for the rights to interview. The GA provided the Administration with a two-page list of those fees in order to make the campus aware of the extent of the fees that students pay and the burden those fees have on students. He would like to thank Delegates for their input with that. And through the year, Mr. Schechtman said he would encourage Delegates, if they run into circumstances where they have to pay the University something, to send him an e-mail, at "academics," because this was an ongoing list. They only learned about the interviewing fee by chance when they spoke to Career Services. Again, the Administration was really unaware of how much grads were being asked to pay.

Giving her report as External Affairs Vice President, Ms. Medina said they were working on a couple of things. As she mentioned last month, the Regents will hold their meeting on campus. This was pretty

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 23 -

historic, because in the past the Regents have tried to stay away from students as much as they could. They had some bad experiences at UCLA around Prop. 209. The Regents will be on campus next month, and she would really encourage grads to come out, if they could, and give public comment. She knew a lot of them were seeing in their departments the impacts that the budget crisis has had, whether their departments were admitting less students or giving less financial aid. The Regents will actually vote on increasing grad fees 10%. A lot of grads get their fees paid for by their departments, but when their departments have to pay more fees, that meant they could less students. Some departments don't even admit international students any more.

Ms. Medina said the other thing they're working on was voter education. They're developing material to educate the students on campus. To give a little background, some GA veterans might remember that three years ago, the GA allocated \$30,000 to oppose Prop. 54 because it would have had a detrimental impact on research and because students would not be able to collect data on race. So the Delegates voted to allocate \$30,000 to oppose that. The University said no and the GA said they were going to sue, and the University said they could fund it just for that one time. In response, UCOP developed a Systemwide policy that said that no student governments could use any student fees to take a position on a ballot initiative. So the GA found itself in a position where it could not advocate for or against anything. So if Prop. 209 got placed on the ballot to get repealed, grads would not be able to do anything about it, even though it would have an

impact on them. On Wednesday Santa Barbara undergrads voted to sue the University to enforce students' First Amendment rights. That's pretty big, because the outcome of that lawsuit would impact all students in the UC System. The GA was working on neutral material.

A Delegate said she was not familiar with the case. Ms. Medina said this deals with allocating money to take a position on a ballot initiative. She thought it was Prop. 76, dealing with the budget. This was the Governor's baby, to give the Governor power to cut the budget across the board. They're taking a position on that, and the University will tell them no, or they'll refuse to reimburse their costs. Students were going to sue to enforce students' free speech rights.

Mr. Daal said he thought students could get around that by passing around a list of people who want to get their 2¢ reimbursed. Ms. Medina said that what happens is kind of like how unions do it. Students opposed to having their student fees used for things could, in the past, opt out and request a refund. But after Prop. 54, the University simply said that students couldn't use student fees, period, at all. Ms. Odusanya said the GA could fund student groups to spend money, but the GA couldn't spend money itself. Ms. Medina said student groups could get \$1,000 per semester, if that, if they decide to have material to oppose or advocate ballot initiatives. But the GA could not allocate \$30,000 like it did a few years ago. Ms. Odusanya called for any other question and said she wanted to thank Ms. Medina.

Ms. Medina said she would send out an e-mail to the Delegates list for the Regents meeting so people could attend. If they could, it was possible to make statements during the public comment period. Her e-mail was medina@berkeley.edu.

Report from the Finance Committee

Giving her report as Finance Committee Chair, Ms. Tom said that the only item she was asking the Delegates' approval on was to increase the funding for the UCSA, is the UC-wide student organization, by

Report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- 24 -

\$1,300. Her written report was a little unclear, and she was asking for an increase from \$9,500 to a total of \$10,800. Ms. Odusanya called for any objection to that increase.

Mr. Inkabi asked why the increase was necessary. Ms. Tom said the figure that was currently in the projected budget was based on an estimate. The GA pays dues to the UCSA based on a per-student fee. The GA made a guess last year as to how many students they'd have, and there were more students than they estimated. Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions.

A motion to approve the change was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE INCREASE IN GA DUES FOR THE UCSA, BY \$1,300, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Giving her report as Chair of the Funding Committee, Ms. Zahrt said her report was what they heard from Ms. Moore earlier. It's an action item, with the GA to approve the allocations on the two sheets that were distributed. The Funding Committee met on Monday and they had a full room of people working to check the applications. It went really well. Unfortunately, because of the amount of requests, they had to make some decisions so the money could be spread out throughout the year. Even groups that got cut should reapply and hopefully, they'll still get money as time goes on. It's just that when requests were in such large chunks, it's hard to deal with because they have such a tight budget. Also, if there is a rollover, people could apply to Ms. Tom and make a case for requests. She called for any questions.

A Delegate asked about the priorities for allocating money. Ms. Zahrt said that first they make sure that applications were complete, and that's where most people usually go wrong. And then they look to see if there are group limits involved. Groups can only get \$1,000 per semester; so they check against that. And sometimes groups ask for things in the wrong category, things the GA can't fund. All these provisions are outlined in the funding workshop that groups attend. Usually, if groups go to a funding workshop, things are pretty clear as to what kinds of things get funded. The Funding Committee makes sure applications are complete and requests are reasonable and within the limits for each funding category.

Mr. Inkabi said that during their assessment, he asked if a lot of student groups applied that weren't given matching money by their departments. For example, in Civil Engineering, their response was that the Department will not fund graduate student groups. The Department will fund undergrad groups, but not grad groups. Ms. Zahrt said their policy on matching funding was that it didn't have to be a department that matched funds, but each group must list some matching funding. Professional groups can say that member dues would be used for that. It's just about being creative about how the matching funds work. It's unfortunate, but it's a condition of GA funding. In this round there were people who did not request matching funding and the Committee hasn't stressed that rule so forcefully, but it will be stressed from now on. Groups not applying for matching funds will not get funded. For this round, groups that had no intention of getting matching funding got cut in half. Because this rule was specified so strongly, the Committee recommended that based on eligibility of the funding application, that they cut that number in half, what they would receive for matching funds. Mr. Inkabi said it was, however, important for departments to support grad student groups. Ms. Zahrt said there might be other ways to work that out, and member dues was always a last resort.

A Delegate said he's one of the members of the Funding Committee, and one thing he learned on Monday was that "matching funds" had a very broad definition. So Delegates should emphasize to student groups in their departments that "matching funds" could mean simply asking people to pay a dollar or two at the

Report from the Funding Committee (cont'd)

- 25 -

door for an event. It doesn't necessarily mean they need to get a grant from an agency on campus, but that the group has identified some other revenue stream for an event. And it could be something as simple as a nominal fee.

A Delegate said that there was, then, no percentage matching, and groups just need to have some type of matching funds. Ms. Zahrt said if it's matching funds were underwhelming, as when a group requests \$900

from the GA and \$10 from someone else, the Committee would evaluate that Committee. So it was 50-50. If it's 99-to-1 they'd see that. Everyone was competing in each round for the pool of money, so it just depended on if a group's application was complete, whether they're being fair and reasonable with what's fundable. It gets kind of complicated because of the vast amount of different things that are requested.

Mr. Schechtman said the GA tries to fund all applications that were complete and were accurate. The percentage to which they can fund applications depends pretty much on how much money is available versus how much is requested. So, e.g., if twice as much is requested as is available, most groups will get around half of what they ask for, if that's all the money they have. That's why it's really important to stress to student groups that they should be reasonable in what they request, because the closer the total is to the money the GA has for that round, the bigger the percentage groups will get for what they ask for. They don't play political favorites with groups and they try to be fair. Ms. Zahrt said that's why there were eight rounds, so people could spread out their requests. Allocations were designed to be spread out evenly, so when groups apply for all the funding they need at once, they don't just hurt themselves, but they hurt everyone, and it means everyone's cuts would be higher.

Mr. Daal asked if there was any consideration given for funding as to how many people attend events and how many were involved, or for how many requests from certain departments were funded. Ms. Zahrt said that in the Grants category, this was a rule change last year in the Funding Committee. There could be two projects per semester in the Grants category. So that's a limitation on how many projects one group can make. So if a group like BAMN requested four projects, they would be asked to apply for two of them in the spring. Groups were eligible for \$1,000 per semester. If they apply for ten different projects in one semester, once they get up to a total of \$1,000, they're cut off from further funding no matter how many applications they put it. It's a financial constraint as far as what they're eligible for. As for applications from different departments, half of the requests were from the Law School, which has a lot of student groups. So a lot of money was sent to that School. If other schools weren't as active, or don't apply for money, they're obviously not going to get it. And if every department had ten groups and they all applied for money, the GA's ability to fund everybody in a substantial way would be less. As far as actual events, there was a per-person limit. All this information was funding workshop material. There was a limit for meetings of \$5 per person. So if a group says 30 people will attend an event and they have a budget of \$1,000, they wouldn't get that amount. Such a group would be eligible for \$150. That's a per-person limit, and that's how the Funding Committee cut the request.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions for Ms. Zahrt. She called for a motion to approve the report. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA

- 26 -

Max Besbris introduced himself and said he's an ASUC Senator. The Senate meets every week. He's a

second-year undergrad, a double major in Sociology and Linguistics. As for some of the things that they should know about that was going on in the ASUC, as Pres. Odusanya mentioned, a lawsuit was pending in the Judicial Council. The current Executive VP of the ASUC, who was a Senator last year, was suing last year's Senate because of an allocation the Senate made to the GA. Those funds have been frozen by the J-Council. The plaintiff was claiming that those funds should not be given to the GA because the allocation was in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding. But the MOU would only have gone into effect if the ballot initiative passed. But since the ballot initiative was removed and was never voted on, the claim was that the funds the ASUC delegated to the GA should not be given. The J-Council was currently hearing that case. There will probably be a decision by the GA's next meeting.

Ms. Odusanya asked about the amount of the funds that were involved. Mr. Besbris said he wasn't aware, but it was quite a bit. People could send him an e-mail and he could look up the figure. He asked if there were any questions about the relationship between the GA and the ASUC, or anything they wanted the ASUC to do, or asked if there were any questions people had.

A Delegate if the person who brought the suit was still a student. Mr. Besbris said he was, and he's the current Executive Vice President. He was a Senator last year. The Delegate asked if the suit was in civil court. Mr. Besbris said the suit was before the ASUC Judicial Council. This was not a federal case. To his knowledge there was only one time where a J-Council suit actually went to federal court, two years ago when a party, the Defend Affirmative Action Party got disqualified from the elections and sued the ASUC, taking the case to federal court. Otherwise, when he talks about lawsuits, he's talking about the Judicial Council. The Delegate asked who was on the Judicial Council. Mr. Besbris said there are six Justices, all undergrads. They're appointed by the ASUC President and confirmed by the ASUC Senate.

Ms. Zahrt asked where the money would go if the plaintiff wins the suit, and if he would get the money. Mr. Besbris said the ASUC gets to keep the money, and it wouldn't go to the GA.

Ms. Tom asked if grad students were eligible to be on the Judicial Council. Mr. Besbris said they were. Grads could also serve in the Senate and were even allowed to run for Executive Office. The only qualification is that the GA President could not also be the ASUC President.

Mr. Schechtman asked how members of the J-Council get nominated, and if Mr. Besbris knew of any instances at any time where a grad student has ever served on the J-Council. Mr. Besbris said to his knowledge, a grad student has never served on the Judicial Council. But he wouldn't say that was necessarily the ASUC's fault. People have to apply for a J-Council position, and that could be done by simply requesting an application from the ASUC President, Mr. Buenrostro, who would send one out. Mr. Besbris said he didn't know why grads don't want to serve on the Judicial Council. The J-Council's main function usually comes around election time, and it's a very serious commitment because a lot of people sue candidates for elections violations.

Ms. Odusanya said that just to note, Mr. Buenrostro, the ASUC President, picks three candidates for every J-Council position, and the Senate decides who actually gets appointed.

Mr. Besbris said he sits on the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee, where J-Council nominees come to first to get interviewed, and he personally would love to have a grad student sit on the J-Council, just because a lot of cases involve the GA. Mr. Schechtman said the GA constitutionally reports

Report from the ASUC Representative to the GA (cont'd)

- 27 -

to the ASUC, and the J-Council was a branch of the ASUC. The ASUC was structured differently than the GA, with a structure that was very much like the US federal government, with an Executive team, the Senate, and the Judicial Council. The three branches were relatively independent. That's unlike GA Executives, who come from the Delegates' body. So the J-Council, like the Supreme Court, has nominal judicial authority over the GA as a body and over their actions. So there was a consequence to representation on the J-Council for the GA.

Ms. Odusanya said the highest chance of having a grad on the J-Council would be for Mr. Buenrostro to select three grads. That would best increase the chances. If there are two undergrads and one undergrad, a grad could still not be nominated if the Senate decides to pick a non-grad student. So it's not just one step, but several steps.

A Delegate asked what an "MOU" was. Mr. Besbris said it's a Memorandum of Understanding. Ms. Odusanya said it's a legal document that binds whatever bodies sign up for the MOU. Mr. Besbris said there's a current MOU the GA and the ASUC have agreed to. The ballot initiative last year would have changed that MOU. Ms. Odusanya said the reason the initiative got pulled was because there was wording in proposed MOU was not constitutional. Mr. Besbris said last year it was a particular person, one undergrad, who was really responsible for pulling the initiative. That was not an action of the ASUC, but of a student who formerly served on the J-Council. Mr. Besbris said that in his personal opinion, that person had past grudges with the GA, especially about Prop. 54 funding. The gentleman was very conservative. So hopefully, despite the fact that it really screwed the GA, Mr. Besbris said he would ask the GA to please not think this was necessarily a reflection of what the ASUC was trying to do. Ms. Odusanya said that as she said earlier, Mr. Buenrostro was very cooperative in working with the GA. Nothing has passed yet, but Pres. Buenrostro was willing to work with the GA. They'll see how things go that year. She asked for any other questions.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve all Officers' reports. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE ALL OFFICERS' REPORTS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the GA's Representatives on the Graduate Council

Mr. Allen said the new set of Officers had their first meeting with the Grad Council on Monday. There's a question about their eligibility for the purposes of voting. He forwarded a message to the GA, and he wasn't sure, but would guess he and Mr. Schechtman should discuss this after the meeting. There were some paperwork issues involved to make them the GA's official delegates to the Grad Council so GA reps could vote on the Grad Council. Right now, the Grad Council was saying they're non-voting. Mr. Schechtman said that should be approved by Friday. Ms. Odusanya said that would mean they'd be voting members of the Grad Council by Monday. And even if they can't vote on policy issues, they can vote to accept a review. So they couldn't vote on all issues. Mr. Allen said that after their first meeting they'll report to the GA.

NEW BUSINESS

New Business

- 28 -

The following Resolution was authored by Ted McCombs and Wanda Hasadsri and was sponsored by the External Affairs Committee:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A LIVING WAGE FOR UNIVERSITY WORKERS

WHEREAS, the University of California, Berkeley is the State's preeminent public university with a fundamental mission to educate future leaders and citizens; and

WHEREAS, as a leading national, regional and local institution, it is imperative that UC Berkeley wield its power for the causes of justice and the improvement of society; and

WHEREAS, many of UC Berkeley's workers currently earn only \$9.11 per hour, a wage significantly below the amount necessary to sustain themselves and their families; and

WHEREAS, many campus workers are forced to work long hours at two jobs in their struggle to barely make ends meet; and

WHEREAS, the lowest paid campus workers, including custodians, food service workers and gardeners, are essential to the function of our University;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly urges the University as an employer to eliminate these poverty wages within our community.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly calls upon the University to immediately adopt an \$11/hour minimum wage for all campus workers.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly urges the University Administration, in cooperation with affected workers, to complete and implement a study setting a sustainable living wage for all campus workers within the next four months.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that as the elected representatives of 9,000 graduate and professional students, we will devote our resources to support our campus workers' struggle for a living wage.

Ms. Hasadsri said she's a third-year Law student and was one of the co-authors of the Resolution. She would pass out a fact sheet and defer her time to Debra Grabelle, one of the AFSCME service worker

organizers who works directly with the campus workers struggling to survive on these wages.

Debra Grabelle said the Resolution stemmed from a couple of things. A faculty committee recommended to the Chancellor in the spring of last year to implement an \$11 an hour minimum wage for campus workers. She was sure some Delegates could imagine what it was like to support a family on \$11, which they think was too low and was definitely not a living wage. But they're asking the Chancellor to implement that immediately and then look into having a living wage on campus, which a lot of campuses across the country have started to do. Right now, food service workers start at \$9.11 an hour, and they do not receive regular increases over time. So one could be a food service worker for five or ten years, supporting their families on that. Custodians receive \$10.22 an hour. There were approximately 130

New Business

- 29 -

workers supporting their families at these rates. So they're urging the University to look at what their priorities are and to make sure that paying a minimum wage is a priority. Most of the students theoretically support this. During the one-day strike last year, the Chancellor said he supported a living wage on campus. Ms. Grabelle said they're just asking the GA to stand behind this and do the right thing.

Ms. Odusanya asked people to please take some time to read the Resolution.

A Delegate said that according to the fact sheet, Cal was even behind State schools in its wages, and asked if there was any explanation for that. Ms. Grabelle said she wasn't the employer, and this hasn't happened over night. But she thought honestly Berkeley and other types of institutions like it have relied on the fact that they have a very prestigious reputation. This was just her opinion. Also, that they haven't paid attention to service workers, not in the way that the community college and the State University Systems have. Community colleges and State Universities are more State funded than the University was, so there were a lot of additional monies that UC doesn't have to use for these workers.

Mr. Daal said he was told that at least for his Department, Physics, custodial workers were employed by outside companies and not by UC Berkeley. Ms. Grabelle said some departments use outside contractors, but they're not the majority, and it was a very small number. Mr. Daal asked if the Resolution would have any impact on those workers. Ms. Grabelle said it's an \$11 an hour minimum wage for campus workers. So if people were employed by an outside company, it would have an affect. Mr. Daal asked if she knew how much the contractor pays. Ms. Grabelle said she didn't, and said it's within the contract range, in the mid-\$10; but she didn't know.

A Delegate asked if people get health insurance as part of their benefits. Ms. Grabelle said do have health insurance. And so do the employees who were compared in the fact sheet. The Delegate asked if that covered dependents or just themselves. Ms. Grabelle said it covered dependents, with a nominal fee. UC actually did a decent job on health benefit charges, such things if a worker makes more money, then they pay a little more for health benefits, and as they go down the scale, workers pay less; and that's taken into consideration.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to extend time for debate. A motion to extend speaking time by four

minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Schechtman said this Resolution was presented to the faculty Senate's Capital Allocations Committee last year, and in a remarkably fast response for Berkeley, within about six months they actually improved it and included this proposal as one of their top four funding recommendations to the Chancellor. It is taking longer to implement than anyone would like, but the faculty are backing this. Ms. Grabelle said part of the reason they wanted to come to the GA that evening was because they wanted to urge the Chancellor, as strongly as possible, to implement this. The more that he sees the student population was behind this, the more likely it will happen.

A Delegate asked if this applies to people employed by the campus or people who work on campus. Ms. Hasadsri said the Resolution is now for anybody who works on campus. That's the intention. It shows their support for a minimum wage. She wasn't clear on the University's control over the wages of people who were not University employees. Ms. Grabelle said Georgetown University just passed a living wage last spring that included outside contractors for their work force as well.

New Business (cont'd)

- 30 -

Ms. Odusanya asked if this was for full-time employers or part-time. Ms. Grabelle said it's the same hourly rate. It's for full-time and part-time wage positions. Food service positions, e.g., are part-time, ten months. But for custodians, there weren't that many part-time positions. UC doesn't like to do part-time positions because they're required to have health benefits for people; so they don't really get that much out of it in that way.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A LIVING WAGE FOR UNIVERSITY WORKERS PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.** Ms. Odusanya said she would like to thank them.

Ms. Hasadsri said she wanted to move to introduce two Resolutions, on Prop. 75 and Prop. 76. They didn't make it on the agenda because they were submitted on disabled software and didn't go through on time. Since these are Propositions that will be on the ballot in November, this was the only meeting the GA could consider them since they wouldn't meet before the election. So she would like to move to consider the two Resolutions. Ms. Odusanya said that next time, she would ask to be notified that this was being planned. Ms. Hasadsri she just realized they weren't on the agenda. Ms. Odusanya said she told Ms. Cementwala about this, and the proper procedure was to submit Resolutions before the meeting. For some reason, that did not happen. So this would be going against the grain, and could be a precedent for future Resolutions as well, which she would not like to impose.

Ms. Medina said she and Ms. Hasadsri were sent the Resolution and it was cc'd on Thursday.

A Delegate said he had no objection to the Resolutions, but didn't think the GA should consider them.

Mr. Allen asked if they were debating whether to add the Resolutions to the agenda. Ms. Odusanya said

they were.

Ms. Zahrt said she was worried about quorum and didn't think it was fair to talk about something that wasn't on the agenda before, when was no indication these items would be added. The Delegates could have heard about them at the beginning of the meeting if somebody had said something earlier and the Resolutions could have been passed around so Delegates could have read them. But at this hour, most Delegates were not present any longer. To talk about and pass something at that time wasn't fair.

Mr. Daal asked if they could hear about the Resolutions to be added. Ms. Medina said one Resolution would oppose Prop. 75, which would require all union members to sign a consent form before their dues could be used in a political campaign. It's something that directly affects many grads, as union members. It would call for union members to resubmit consent forms every year.

Ms. Hasadsri said the second Resolution would oppose Prop. 76, which would give the Governor the power to declare a fiscal emergency and just make cuts across the board, according to the University, without any legislative approval. She would apologize for just kind of springing this on them.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to hear the Resolutions.

Mr. Allen said he thought they should be able to bring motions to the floor during meetings. Ms. Odusanya said they could bring motions up, but not Resolutions, since she had to go through them and

New Business (cont'd)

- 31 -

discuss them with the author on whether they were valid, after which they would come before the Assembly. A Delegate asked if she got these on Friday. Ms. Odusanya said she did, but it was supposed to be received a week before. She was just trying to be consistent.

A motion to add the Resolutions to the agenda was made and seconded. Ms. Odusanya said it was 7:45 p.m. She asked for a motion to allocate time for this. A motion to allocate six minutes for the Resolutions was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Odusanya said they would discuss SB 75 first. She asked people to please take some time to read it.

The following Resolution was authored by Ms. Cementwala and Ms. Hasadsri:

RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE PROPOSITION 75

WHEREAS, union members already have the ability to "opt out" of having their union dues be used for political purposes; and

WHEREAS, requiring that nurses, teachers, firefighters, police and other public employees to sign a written form every year if they want their dues to be used for union political activities would greatly

increase administrative costs and delay the collection of dues for up to three months after members have signed consent forms; and

WHEREAS, public employee unions have been strong advocates for mobilizing public support for education, health care and public safety; and

WHEREAS, this Proposition was never proposed, developed, or endorsed by the public employees it is supposed to impact, but instead, was placed on the ballot by special private interests in order to obstruct public employees from exercising their political rights; and

WHEREAS, corporations, like the ones that are supporting this Proposition, do not have to ask for permission from their shareholders before spending corporation funds on political activities and already outspend unions 24-to-1;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the UC Berkeley Graduate Assembly joins with USCA to oppose Proposition 75.

Mr. Allen said union members already have the option to opt out of having their dues go to pay for political activities. This was really an initiative that was put on the ballot to try to reduce the ability of unions to have a political voice in a whole slew of major political issues coming before the State. Many of them were union members, and for people who care about labor and workers' rights, this was an important issue when it comes to justice for workers. He thought it was well worth voicing the GA's opposition. It didn't involve the commitment of any GA money or anything separate from what the UCSA was doing and would just put the GA on the record as opposing what most people feel is an antagonistic initiative that sought to emasculate unions.

Ms. Anu the student government, especially in the UC System, was much like a union in that students pay in for the betterment of students in general. One reason this Proposition was scary for student

New Business (cont'd)

- 32 -

government was because it might just be one step away from requiring every student to sign something every year to allow the GA, e.g., or groups, to spend money on advocacy. That's another reason they might consider opposing the Initiative.

A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded.

A Delegate said that currently, as a union member, he could opt out one time and be done.

Ms. Diaz-Herrera said it was currently illegal to use union dues for any political purposes at all. So in order for dues to be used for political purposes, people had to sign a card. For most unions this was an authorization card, and the Proposition would force union members to sign it every year. She used to work for a union that represented over 100,000 workers, and that was a lot of cards to chase every year. But right

now it wasn't necessarily opting out as much as it's opting in. People have the right to opt out, so this wasn't an issue.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other comments. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE PROPOSITION 75.**

The following Resolution was authored by Ms. Cementwala and Ms. Hasadsri,

RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE PROPOSITION 76

WHEREAS, Proposition 76 would give the Governor the power to declare a fiscal emergency and cut programs across the board without legislative deliberation and approval; and

WHEREAS, Prop. 76 also changes the requirements for school spending set up by Prop. 98 and eliminates the repayment requirement when the minimum funding is suspended (meaning that if this initiative passes, the Governor will never have to repay the \$2 billion the State borrowed from schools); and

WHEREAS, Prop. 76 eliminates the funding guarantee for education, which will lead to more overcrowded schools, teacher layoffs, and fewer textbooks and classroom materials; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 76 would cuts funding to schools and vital services; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 76 disempowers voters and circumvents our system of representative governance by eliminating checks and balances and giving the Governor new powers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly at UC Berkeley opposes Proposition 76.

Ms. Odusanya asked people to please read the Resolution. She called for a motion to extend time by five minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

New Business (cont'd)

- 33 -

Ms. Odusanya called for any debate. A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE PROPOSITION 76.**

Ms. Odusanya said she would entertain a motion to adjourn. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

This meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

- 34 -

Present at the October 6, 2005 GA Meeting

Name	Dept	Name	Dept
Abbaszadeh, Sahar	Architecture	Haynes, Erin	Linguistics
Agarwal, Harish	Physics	Hsueh, Susan	GA Manager
Ahrendt, Rebekah	Music	Huezo, Hector	Law
Al, Stefan	DCRP	Inkabi, Kofi	Civil & Env Engineering
Babel, Molly	Linguistics	Jimenez, Javier	Comp Lit
Bartlet, James	Anthro	Jones, Becca	MSE
Bartolone, Pauline	Journalism	Kasad, Roshni	MCB
Berlanga, Monique	Law	Levitan, Carmel	Bio E
Besbris, Max	ASUC Rep	Ling, Jennifer	Social Welfare
Botello, Elizabeth	Journalism	Lu, Sunny	Store Operations Board Rep
Brakora, Katie	IB	Odusanya, Lola	GA President
Buccitelli, Anthony	Folklore	Lutzy, Rebecca	IB
Cantor, Chris	Vision Science	Medina, Claudia	GA External Aff VP
Chakrabarti, Monami	Law	Mitman, Meghan	Transportation Engineering
Chanzit, Adam	East Asian Languages	Miyazaki, Karin	Optometry
Cobb, Corie	Mech Eng	Neuville, Jessica	Optometry
Cohon, Adam	Political Science	Patel, Seema	Law
Crosby, Joy	Performance Studies	Penn, Charli	Journalism
Daal, Miguel	Physics	Peterson, Elizabeth	DCRP
Davis, Edward	Afr Amer Stud	Purdy, David	Stats
Diaz-Herrera, Christine	Law	Quarles, Elizabeth	Art Hist
Egel, Daniel	Economics	Rajan, Nishanth	Haas PhD
Eswaran, Krishnan	EECS	Schechtman, Rob	GA Acad Aff VP
Fairbrother, Malcolm	Sociology	Salas, Luis	Art Hist
Fisher, Josh	GA Dept Liaison	Scales, Joyce	Public Policy
Franklin, Johanna	Logic	Moore, Shayla	Funding Advisor
Gross, Stephen	History	Litwak, Steve	GA Transcriber

Guan, Huan (Kandy)	Optometry	Tom, Sarah	Demography
Hagar, Loddie	Chem Eng	Trahey, Lynn	Chemistry
Hao, Andy	Anthro	Valleé, Manuel	Sociology
Harley, Gabriel	MSE	VanderSal, Nicole	ESPM
Hasadsri, Wanda	Law	Virgili, Justin	Chem Eng
Haubenreich, Jacon	German	Yu, Way	Optometry