

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

April 5, 2007

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:32 p.m.

Remarks from the President

Proposed new By-laws were distributed, to be voted on in May.

Positions in the GA were open, both stipended and volunteer.

Approval of Funding Allocations

In response to a question, it was noted that funding totals groups could request in a semester was based on how much the group requested, not how much was spent.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations, as amended, on Graduate Events I and II.

Announcements

A survey for students' thoughts on People's Park was distributed by a representative of a firm the campus hired to do a needs assessment and planning for the Park.

Carmen Mitchell, new Graduate Women's Project Coordinator, introduced herself.

New graduate student members of the ASUC Judicial Council introduced themselves, Josh Templet, Law; Sikina Jinnah, Environmental Design, Policy, and Management; and Rachel Smith, ESPM.

The new Departmental Liaison, Dan Leahy, introduced himself.

The GA had a number of job openings that were currently open or would be shortly, including for the Women of Color Conference; the Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project; "The Berkeley Graduate"; possibly a Chief-of-Staff to the President; and the Departmental Liaison.

A new issue of "The Berkeley Graduate" will be out soon.

The ceremony for the Faculty Mentoring Award will be Thursday, April 26, from 2:00 to 5:00, in the Student Union.

The GA's Foreign Student Affairs Committee and Services for International Students and Scholars will hold a meeting for international students.

Academic Affairs will organize a family picnic at Strawberry Canyon.

A new Funding Advisor has been selected, Natan Tuchman, who will start May 1.

Dmitri Garcia introduced himself as a candidate for President in the ASUC election.

The International Students Committee and the Environmental Science, Policy, and Management Department will hold a one-day student conference on "Global Change."

Travis Garcia and Ilana Nankin introduced themselves as candidates for president in the ASUC election.

Mr. Rajan agreed to serve as the GA rep on the Chancellor's Community Service Award Committee.

Discussion of ASUC Ballot Referenda

The Student Union Complex Fee Referendum was a four-year fee, \$9.00 per semester the first and second years, and then \$12.00, and then \$15.00. It was a four-year fee that would go towards funding the planning, design, redevelopment, and some fundraising, for the Lower Sproul area. The campus will likely commit \$4.1 million to this project. Over the lifetime of the Fee, \$1.9 million would come from students for planning and design. The Chancellor had the authority to raise Life Safety Fees on his own in order to deal with Eshleman and MLK, which were seismically unsafe.

The Green Initiative Fund Fee Referendum would have a \$5 per semester and continue for ten years. A grant-making committee, with a majority of students, would accept applications for use of the Fund, emphasizing what would have the most impact on UC Berkeley and on the environment in general. Around \$300,000 yearly would be raised.

The Student Life Fee Referendum would fund SUPERB \$250,000-plus per year for on-campus events and entertainment; fund UC Jazz and UC Chorale Ensembles about \$34,000 a year; and fund the Cal Band about \$100,000 a year. The GA would receive about \$126,000 and the ASUC would no longer fund SUPERB at \$116,000 a year.

"The Squelch" Fee Referendum would be \$1.50 per semester per student. The GA would receive about \$17,000 and a half-page ad in each issue of "The Squelch." Student groups would also receive discounted advertising. "The Squelch" was part of a campus institution that went back over 100 years.

Tang Center Presentation

Steve Lustig, Associate Vice Chancellor of Health and Human Services, Claudia Covello, Executive Director of University Health Services, presented. A question was raised about the availability of specialty clinics. The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Mental Health has been launched.

Questions were raised on students not being covered for all appointments, such as end of semesters; about after-hours care; the affordability of making appointments; outreach for depression awareness.

Additional money in Reg Fees for mental health might be used for counseling in-house and outreach.

Health insurance for dependents had no easy answers. The Tang Center helps families with health insurance options. There were only 3-800 dependents on campus.

Questions were raised about Tang services being oriented towards undergrads, e.g., wanted pregnancies; about weekend/after-hours care; and insurance at UCSF due to tropical diseases from fieldwork.

Guest Speakers -- ASUC President Oren Gabriel and ASUC Auxiliary Director Nadesan Permaul

Mr. Gabriel, ASUC President, introduced himself. The ASUC was divided into five Executive Offices and a Senate with 20 students. The five Executives were the President, Executive VP, Academic Affairs VP, External Affairs VP, and the Student Advocate.

Mr. Permaul, Auxiliary Director, introduced himself. The Auxiliary was created in 1999, to operate the ASUC's businesses.

Resolution

The Assembly discussed and by unanimous voice-vote, approved as amended by substitution and on the floor, the Resolution Calling for the Review of the BP-UC Berkeley EBI Deal. A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

Remarks from the President

Mr. Daniels said he just wanted to make some remarks and clarify what the meeting would encompass. As they've been reporting over the semester, they re-did the By-laws. He'd distribute the new By-laws and a list of the substantive changes and a brief justification for the changes. That list might not be complete. They tried to shrink 30 pages down to 15, and it wasn't easy. If anybody found a change they thought was substantive but wasn't on the list, he would ask them to send him an e-mail.

Mr. Dillon asked if the Assembly had to vote to approve them. Mr. Daniels said that's why they were distributing the proposed changes. If people had the time and interest to read them over, that would be great. They'll discuss them and vote on them in May.

If people had specific questions or things they didn't like, there will be two information sessions to talk about the proposed By-law changes, on Monday April 16, from 6:45 to 7:45, and Thursday, April 19, from 5:30 to 6:30. If people couldn't make those dates, they should let him know and he'd find time to meet with them individually.

Secondly, Mr. Daniels said that for those interested in getting more involved in the GA, there were a number of ways to do that. Some people were leaving and there might be new positions opening,

depending on whether the new By-laws were approved. The GA had stipended positions and volunteer sessions. They'll have two information sessions on various GA positions, and provide snacks/food. They'll have job descriptions and they could answer any questions people might have. These information sessions will be April right before and right after the By-law info sessions, on the 16th and 19th.

Mr. Daniels said he forgot to do this last time, but he would ask people to please fill out the feedback form. They want to know what kind of food people like and if they were interested in any of the open positions. Finally, ASUC elections were coming up, and it was important to know how to get the word out in their departments.

Approval of Funding Allocations

Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to approve the recommendations from the Funding Committee. It was so moved and seconded. Mr. Daniels asked if there were any objections to coming to a vote, or if there were any questions or changes people would like to make. An objection was raised.

Mr. Daniels said they would move to discussion and questions about the recommendations.

Mr. Purdy said his group, the Statistics Grad Student Association, ran into a strange anomaly in the By-laws of the GA. When a group requested funds and didn't actually submit receipts for reimbursement, the By-laws do not say that the funds would be unavailable later on. As it turned out, somebody in the group screwed up and didn't submit the receipts. But then the group was still eligible for those funds. So one change he might move for was along those lines of having those funds for the group. In addition, the group had a request on the budget it submitted. There will be a seminar and a picnic, and the group would like to emphasize the request for the picnic. Holding the picnic for the entire Department was the group's responsibility, whereas the seminar was minor for the group. So at a minimum, Mr. Purdy said he would like to move to swap the funding for the two.

Ms. Franklin said that as for the first complaint, the funding total for a semester was based on how much a group requested, rather than how much it spent. Basing funding totals on how much a group spent was impractical. If the rounds were entirely separate, that might be possible. But if a group was granted money in the last round, they really couldn't figure out what the semester limit might be based on how much a group spent simply because they be approving future allocations. Making decisions based on how much has been allocated seemed to be the only reasonable way to make allocations, given the way things were set up at the moment. As for the second point, Ms. Franklin said she was reasonably sure that the group could swap the money back and forth between the two events. She thought that sort of change was something the GA could approve. If the group would like to request more money for the picnic instead of the seminar, she was pretty sure the Funding Committee would approve that change, as long as the total was whatever the total had to be. Mr. Daniels said the Assembly could make whatever changes people decided to the Funding Committee's recommendations. Ms. Franklin said she was guessing that Mr. Purdy probably didn't know how much he wanted to allocate to each event at that time. Mr. Purdy said he appreciated that. For the first point, that probably affected every group. Mr. Daniels he was more than happy to have this conversation, but they were currently discussing this specific allocation. He thought this was a very important issue, dealing with groups' reimbursements, and something they'd need to this. But such a discussion wasn't timely given how packed the meeting was that evening.

Mr. Purdy said he would move to swap the requests. Mr. Daniels said the motion was to swap items, the amounts on lines 59 and 60 of the Funding Committee's report, so that the final for 59 would be \$86.24, and the final for line 60 would read \$240. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Purdy said it was. Mr. Daniels called for a second to the motion. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO MAKE TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT, SWAPPING LINES 59 AND 60, TO HAVE #59 AT \$86.24 AND #60 AT \$240, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the funding allocations, as amended. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON GRADUATE EVENTS I AND II, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the minutes from the March meeting. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 1, 2007 GA MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Daniels said they'll have a discussion on referenda that evening. There were four referenda on the ASUC ballot that affect graduate students, meaning if they were approved or if they weren't. So it was very important to educate themselves about them. The GA would hear speakers on those referenda. He would ask to switch the presentation on the Tang Center with the guest speakers, to hear the Tang presentation at 6:45 and then, at 7:05, to hear guest speakers from the ASUC. The GA will also consider the BP Resolution that was tabled last month. To do all of that, Mr. Daniels said he would request a 15-minute extension. GA meetings usually end at 7:30, and he really hoped that instead, they could end at 7:45.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the agenda, with the additional 15 minutes of meeting time and switching the order of guest speakers and the Tang presentation. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Bart Taylor introduced himself and said he was with a firm that has been hired to do needs assessment and planning for People's Park. The University wanted to get student reactions, responses, thoughts, with regard to People's Park, their ideas for that particular space. So he had a questionnaire available. People have been asking about the process, and this was the first phase, just to collect data. The questionnaire really just asked for their thoughts and ideas about activities and how they saw that space. The campus was not doing this to plan anything or discuss what the space would look like, how it might be transformed, or where enhancements may occur. They're really just interested in getting thoughts and

comments with regard to the Park. The People's Park Advisory Committee met the first Monday of the month. The schedule was different for April, and they'll meet that coming Monday at 7 o'clock at Trinity United Methodist Church. It was an open meeting, and if people were interested in getting more involved in the process, they should feel free to join them. They'll also engage other departments on campus, including Agriculture and Ecology, as they move into the planning of People's Park. He called for any questions. Mr. Taylor said there will be other opportunities to provide feedback, and a series of public forums will be held throughout the summer so they could get community involvement in response to what may happen to this space. He would like to thank the GA for its time. If people could fill out the survey, he would collect them.

Mr. Daniels said the GA has hired a new Graduate Women's Project Coordinator. Carmen Mitchell introduced herself and said she was a first-year in the African Diaspora Studies Program. She was originally from Ohio and has been in and out of school in different fields. She was interested in continuing the work that Chrissie has been working on, but also incorporating more resources and more work with international students on campus, and also queer, lesbian, gay, and bisexual, and transgender women. She was glad to be there, and if people had any questions, they should feel free to e-mail her at gwp@ga. Mr. Daniels asked if it was correct that this was officially her first week. Ms. Mitchell said it was. Mr. Daniels said that if people wanted to talk about any events they have been to, or if they had ideas, or just wanted to chat with Ms. Mitchell, they should feel free to do so.

Mr. Daniels said there were three new graduate student members of the ASUC Judicial Council, and he would ask them to please introduce themselves. Introducing themselves were Josh Templet, from the Law School; Sikina Jinnah, a fourth-year student in Environmental Design, Policy, and Management; and Rachel Smith, a first-year student in ESPM.

Mr. Daniels said that Ms. Jones left the GA as Departmental Liaison to go on to bigger and better things, but they had a new Departmental Liaison, Dan Leahy, who provided the wonderful pizza that evening. Unfortunately, he will not continue next year, so he'll be there for too brief a time, that meeting and the next. He asked Mr. Leahy to introduce himself. Mr. Leahy said he was a second-year at the Law School. He's been sending Delegates a lot of e-mails. If people had any suggestions, or knew of anybody else would like to get involved, he would ask people to please contact him.

Mr. Daniels said the GA had a number of job openings, both currently and for next year. There were openings for the Women of Color Conference, the Graduate Minority Outreach Recruitment and Retention Project, "The Berkeley Graduate," and hopefully for a Chief-of-Staff to the President, depending on whether the proposed By-laws were approved. In addition, the position of Departmental Liaison will be open. If people were interested in any of those positions, he would ask them to please indicate that on the feedback form, or attend the information sessions on getting more involved in the GA that would happen in a few weeks. These were all paid positions. If people wanted more details about the pay, they could learn more. The amounts were not huge, but they were substantial. He called for any questions.

Ms. ElNaggar said issues of "The Berkeley Graduate" were available, and a new issue will be coming to their departments pretty soon.

Mr. Daniels said that regarding the Faculty Mentoring Award, he hoped people submitted their nominations. The ceremony will be Thursday, April 26, from 2:00 to 5:00, in the Tilden Room, 5th floor of the

MLK Student Union. It's a great ceremony and a lot of fun. This was something the GA was putting on with the Graduate Division. There will be food.

Mr. Stavrinides said that to try to bring solutions to problems faced by international grad students, there will be a meeting aimed at international student organizations on campus. It will be a chance for them to meet the Foreign Student Affairs Committee of the GA, soon to be "International Student Affairs." Mr. Stavrinides said it will also be a chance for people to make a list of the most important issues people faced, and the best ways to go about finding solutions to them. The meeting was being organized by the GA and by Services for International Students and Scholars. It's mostly intended for international students, but if people felt they knew about these issues, people were free to participate. He would ask them to send him an e-mail, which was on the GA Web site. The meeting will be held in the grad student lounge, 440 Stephen's Hall.

Mr. Daniels there's been a little confusion on his part regarding announcements for ASUC presidential candidates. As some of them may know, the ASUC was the overarching student government, primarily serving undergrads. The ASUC was holding its elections, which were campus-wide. All students, grad as well as undergrad, could vote. In the past, primarily undergrads have run in ASUC elections, and grad students haven't really cared. Mr. Daniels said he thought it might be nice to invite the candidates for president to come in and say a few words about their candidacy. It turned out for various reasons that they couldn't do that. It was unclear what candidates could and could not do say, according to ASUC election rules. People could find out candidates' information on election.asuc.org. If any candidates would like to introduce themselves, they could do so, speaking at their own risk, so the GA was not responsible for any sort of censures. He wanted to make that clear.

Mr. Daniels called for any general announcements people wanted to make.

Ms. Cementwala said the working group on student families, under Academic Affairs, was organizing a first-ever student family picnic at the Strawberry Canyon facility of the RSF. Although they're not clear yet when it will be held, they hope to have it sometime that month. There were some weather issues, but it will be sometime in the next few weeks. So people should look for that e-mail and pass it on to their departments and their SAOs. It was important to get student families networking. There was a whole cohort of people working on student-family issues.

Ms. Hsueh said that after extensive search, they finally found a new Funding Advisor, Natan Tuchman. She wanted to thank those who sat on the Selection Committee. They had 48 applications, and finally found someone. Mr. Tuchman was moving from Florida to the Bay Area and wouldn't start until May 1. He graduated from UC Santa Cruz with a Bachelor's degree and had a Master's degree from NYU. People will meet him at the May meeting. Secondly, Ms. Hsueh said she would ask Delegates to please tell their departments that the deadline for Round 6 of Grad Events I and II was coming up on Monday, at 5 o'clock. It was very important for people to get reimbursed.

Dmitri Garcia introduced himself and said he was one of the candidates that Mr. Daniels was talking about, for ASUC president. He thought this was a good opportunity to come and visit, despite the limitations on what he could say. It was good to see everyone and to visit the GA.

Mr. Stavrinides said that International Students and the Environmental Science, Policy, and Management Department were organizing a one-day student conference with a theme of "Global Change," namely

climate change and related issues. Everybody was welcome to join them. There was no registration fee, but people needed to register if they wanted to attend. If they just wanted to come and watch, they could do that. They'll be seeing things about this on the Delegates' mailing list.

Travis Garcia introduced himself and said he wasn't going to talk about his campaign for ASUC president as much as how important he felt it was that graduate students come out and vote. Part of the reason the ASUC didn't pay attention to issues that affected grad students was because grad students usually didn't vote. The GA was kind of like the big brothers and big sisters of the campus. They all came there to Cal because it was a special place. It was one of the best universities in the country, if not the best, and it was important for grads to be role models to the undergraduates and look past all the minutiae of who was popular and who wasn't, and to really make good decisions. If they want change on the campus and they want everyone to live up to what Cal stands for, graduate students needed to vote for whoever they wanted and to get involved in the elections, and to get their friends involved. Because if not everyone came out and voted, they'd never have change and would never truly live up to what Berkeley stood for. There were tons of candidates out on Sproul and he would encourage grads to go and meet them. And he would encourage them to tell their friends. Mr. T. Garcia said Delegates were the leaders of the graduate student body, so he would ask them to reach out to people and let them know about this. He wanted to thank them.

Ilana Nankin introduced herself and she was running for ASUC president as well. Like Mr. T. Garcia said, she thought it was extremely important for GA to be involved in the ASUC elections. She thought it was essential that the leaders of the GA and the ASUC work together next year to continue the work that has already been done, especially with Lower Sproul. She knew that Pres. Gabriel and Pres. Daniels have been worked extremely hard that year to ensure that Lower Sproul will become more developed in the future. Ms. Nankin said she would strongly urge Delegates to share this with their friends and with people in their colleges, and encourage them to get to know the candidates and to get involved in the election. The more students voicing their opinion, the better the election would be. She wanted to thank them very much.

Mr. Daniels called for any other announcements.

Mr. Daniels said the GA has been asked to place a person on the Chancellor's Community Service Award Committee. This is an award given to students who do good work in the community. A bunch of nominations have been made and the GA has been asked to place a student on Award Committee to help sort through and select the recipients of the Award. The Committee will meet from 9:00 to 11:00 on Monday, the 16th. He asked if anybody was interested and available to do this. This meeting has been extended so he could make this announcement, and it was a big award. The meeting will probably be held in California Hall, which was right near Doe Library. Mr. Rajan said he would attend. (Applause)

DISCUSSION OF ASUC BALLOT REFERENDA

Mr. Daniels said there were four referenda on the ballot and they'd take about ten minutes to discuss each one. The GA talked about three of them at the March meeting and since then, another was placed on the ballot. This really wasn't a time to talk to Delegates as much as it was a time for them to ask questions. The more graduate students to vote, the more influence they'd have, and the more benefits they could

gain from this. He'd ask people to think about questions they think their department or friends might care about.

A Delegate asked if the renovation of Lower Sproul would still occur if they vote no on the fee. Mr. Daniels said they would begin with the Student Union Complex Fee Referendum. It was a \$9.00 fee per semester for the first and second years, and then \$12.00, and then \$15.00. It was a four-year fee. It would go towards funding the planning, design, redevelopment, and some fundraising, for the Lower Sproul area. There was no guarantee that it would get redeveloped if they passed the fee, and no guarantee that it would not get redeveloped if they didn't pass the fee. Mr. Daniels said he should move out of his position as GA President because in his official capacity as President, he was not allowed to campaign for or against an ASUC referendum. So he would remove himself as President. People might laugh, but it was important, and it may not be a good thing for grad students to pass this. So he was giving them his individual perspective, not as the head of the Graduate Assembly, but as a single graduate student on campus. It was important to be clear on that.

Mr. Daniels said he thought the University wanted to go forward with this. The campus has been very receptive. Vice Provost Cathy Koshland recently submitted a request for \$4.1 million over four years to do the planning and design for this redevelopment; and Ms. Koshland has yet to be denied a request for money. So that meant that the campus was looking at committing \$4.1 million to this project. So it seemed the odds were that it was going forward. He thought the Referendum was so important because it was whether or not the students could be a crucial, fundamental, and vocal part of the process. He didn't know whether, without money, students would have any "hook" to take away in case the Administration didn't listen to them. It was an incentive for the University to listen to the students in this process, and for the Administration to really let the students lead the process. So far, they have. The GA and the ASUC have contributed funds to this and in February, passed \$8,000 for the initial first-year planning. And students have been very vocal and have had a voice at the table. As a result, people were talking about a graduate student center, perhaps childcare, a graduate lounge, a more mature area, say, that catered to the more relaxed crowd. So there was no guarantee, but there was protection for students. If the University backed out, a vote by the ASUC Senate and by the Graduate Assembly could discontinue this Fee. So if the Provost didn't approve the \$4.1 million in May, e.g., then Mr. Daniels said he might come back to the GA, in his job as President, assuming the Referendum passed, and say they need a vote to revoke the Referendum because the campus wasn't committing itself to the redevelopment.

Ms. Cementwala asked if he was speaking at that time as President. Mr. Daniels said he wasn't. Ms. Cementwala asked if she should chair the meeting. Mr. Daniels asked her to please do so.

With Ms. Cementwala chairing the meeting, Mr. Daniels said he asked somebody to attend, if they were in the room, who was not a fan of this Referendum, for various reasons. Ms. Cementwala called for any questions.

Mr. Purdy asked if he knew the numbers in terms of how much money in total people anticipated to receive, from the number of students who would pay the fee. Mr. Daniels said that all students would pay the Fee. Mr. Purdy asked if he was aware of the numbers of graduates and undergraduates. Mr. Daniels said there were about 33,000 students on campus each semester, and 11,000 in the summer. The summer portion of this Fee was 50% of the fall Fee that the summer preceded. So the summer '08 Fee would be 50% of the Fee from fall '08. A little bit less than \$1.9 million would go towards the actual redevelopment, planning, and design. But they had to add 50% on to that for return to financial aid. So the total amount of the Fee he'd estimate at about \$2.8 million. It would be 71,000 times \$9, per year.

Mr. Daniels said he would say a few words about reasons to oppose this, since that needed to be said and no one was there to say it. Of if anyone wanted to say words against this he would ask them to do so.

Mr. Harley said 71,000 times \$9 had nothing to do with \$2.8 million. Ms. Ahrendt said the total came from the Fee per year for four years. Mr. Daniels said he would apologize. Over the lifetime of the Fee, \$1.9 million would come from students for planning and design.

A Delegate said she felt they could put their money towards things that were more directly helpful to graduate students, their fee money as well as their GA money. But she didn't hang out on campus.

Mr. Purdy asked if there were any comments on how this would affect development of Lower Sproul in terms of people working there, and what issues there were with funding, and if business would slow down or be impeded in the area, and what their participation in Lower Sproul redevelopment be. Ms. Ahrendt said that was what this was about. Mr. Purdy asked if all of this, then, was about Lower Sproul. Mr. Daniels said he should have mentioned this before. The packet was purely informational and was not, in any way, intended to sway people one way or another. It was simply to provide them information on what the Referendum said. This was about Lower Sproul. It was called "the Student Union Complex" to emphasize the fact that it was focused on redeveloping the Student Union complex. Lower Sproul was just an area on campus, but it was this area that would be redeveloped as part of the Student Union complex.

Ms. Freedman asked if the percent of campus that had to vote on this to pass applied to grads or undergrads, or to the whole campus together. Mr. Daniels said it was of the entire campus. Twenty percent of the student body had to vote.

Ms. Cementwala asked how the undergrads were doing in terms of ratcheting support. Mr. Daniels said he was unclear about that. The ASUC itself could not support or oppose it.

Mr. Daniels said he would continue with other reasons to oppose this Fee. Other students feel that students should not pay for this and that it should be the Administration that pays. And therefore they would vote against it because it should not be students who support the redevelopment of their student center, and that should be the responsible of the campus.

Mr. Harley said that if we students pay to renovate the Student Union, it that meant they didn't need to have Army recruiting in MLK in the future, and if they could include that in any agreement, since students would pay for part of it. Mr. Daniels said he had no idea. Ms. Ahrendt said they couldn't do that. Ms. Cementwala said that for any property that was State funded, they probably couldn't stop the Army from recruitment. Ms. Cementwala called for any other questions or comments.

Mr. Daniels said he was going to revert to himself, and his personal view on whether students should or should not fund something like this. His opinion was simply based on self-centeredness and a lack of trust in the process. He just didn't think that the student voice could be guaranteed to be heard unless they had some sort of hook, and unless they had organized students and organized money. Without that, he didn't think they could get the Administration, or any bureaucracy for that matter, to move. Again, students were busy. They were able to organize students for focus groups, but only got about 60 graduate students; and that took a lot of work. So that's why he thought having money, and having the ability to take it away if necessary, was the hook that students needed to get their voices heard.

Mr. Harley said that if one was going to be self-centered, he asked why one would pay money for something they would never see. He was personally for this Fee, but if one were thinking about themselves only, that was the position they would take.

Ms. Wells said that as a member of the Environmental Committee for the GA, she wanted to rebut the rebuttal Mr. Daniels used on himself. She called up and talked for around 45 minutes with a woman who was in charge of capital projects, she believed, one of the top people in charge of the redevelopment. It sounded like she was on board with almost everything the students were going after. And there were a lot of like-minded people work on this project. So maybe they didn't need a lot of student involvement to achieve what they want to see happen.

A Delegate said she realized people put a lot of work into this, but if only 60 graduate students attended focus groups, something the GA put a lot of effort into that, she asked if grads on this campus really cared. She would just throw that out there.

Mr. Work said he would like to address that concern. As for graduate students not attending focus groups, first of all, 60 people did attend, which was a considerable amount given the amount of time people had and how busy people were. One thing that came out of the focus groups was that many graduate students don't visit this area, and it may not necessarily express their needs. So if grads fund the planning phase of the project, that would give them a voice as to what would happen with the project. So the graduate student body could get services and facilities that they actually use. Also, Eshleman Hall needed to come down, because of seismic issues. If people didn't support the Fee at that time, and have an active involvement, they wouldn't know what would happen with the GA when the fee did get established. Grads wouldn't have any real voice to get another location. The campus could kick them off-campus and let them sit there for 15 or 20 years while they found their own funds to get a project going. Obviously that was the plan if the fee wasn't passed. But if grads support this now, it would give them the opportunity to actively be involved in planning and what happens when they do get funds and when these buildings were replaced.

Mr. Daniels said they also did a grad student survey about Lower Sproul and got a 50% response rate. They sampled 2,000 students. He thought there was potential interest. His discussion with grad students, around focus groups, was that once they start getting to think about the benefits that could be in this area for them, like a grad student center, or a lounge on campus, it could really improve grad life on campus, even outside their departments. Some people loved their department and were satisfied with what their department gave them. Being in both Law and Policy, he was not. He thought those departments provide him with something, but he needed more. He liked to meet folks from other departments. Also, he should mention that grads' fees would go up at some point in order to do a redevelopment. The Chancellor had the authority to raise Life Safety Fees on his own. And because Eshleman and MLK were hazardous and unsafe, he could raise fees for that purpose, to tear down, redesign, and rebuild those buildings without grad student input. The Chancellor could do that on his own, and grads could protest all they want. So this Fee was a way to kind of get ahead of the ball. They'd give money voluntarily, but would need a say in what happened.

Ms. Cementwala said that would be the last comment, since they had three other referenda to get through.

With Mr. Daniels chairing the meeting, he said the next item to consider was The Green Initiative Fund Fee Referendum. Ms. Jones and Mr. Aprons would talk about this. Essentially, they were following the

lead of a couple of other UC schools and universities to raise money on campus for environmental sustainability and to do things like purchase green power, and promote energy conservation and student internships. That Fee would be \$5 per student, per semester, and would continue for ten years. The ballot language and a one-page information sheet was available. She called for any questions.

Ms. Ahrendt asked who would make up the Fund's grant approval committee, and how they were selected. Ms. Jones said the grant-making committee would accept applications for the Fund. It would be made up of four students and three faculty or staff. Three of the students would come from appointed positions, from the GA, the ASUC, and from the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability. The Academic Senate would appoint one faculty member, and Facilities would appoint a staffperson, and the administrative body would appoint another staffperson. Those six would appoint the seventh member, a student. Those would all be voting members of the committee. There was also representation from the ASUC and from the Committee on Student Fees, which would be there as sort of overseeing bodies.

Mr. Rajan said the projects seem laudable, but very vague. He asked if there was a guideline they currently had that might guide this. Ms. Jones said there was a set of guidelines that were written that would govern the grant-making body. The guidelines were vague and would basically emphasize what would have the most impact on UC Berkeley and on the environment in general. In proposals people submit, they would need to say things like what the carbon offset would be, what the overall impact would be. The committee would make a choice of what to actually fund, or several.

Mr. Rajan asked about a goal of promoting local and organic food, and bringing that to the Golden Bear Café. Mr. Harley said that was an example of what could be funded. UC Santa Cruz just bought 100% green power with the money. Some projects wouldn't cost that much to do, and others would cost more. But this would be the best bang for the buck.

Mr. Arons said a different word to use was that it was "flexible," not "vague." It was flexible because he didn't think it was reasonable to have a group of seven people figure out all the things that should be done with \$300,000. Also, anybody who was a campus community member, student, faculty, or staff, could propose any project they were an expert in and that they knew how to do. That way, if somebody knew who to get organic food into the dining halls, or whatever, they could make a proposal. If the committee thought that was a good idea, that could be funded. If somebody knew how to do research about energy savings in a building, and could do that, they could apply. So it was intentionally left open because they haven't decided what they want to do since they don't know all the ideas that would be available.

Mr. Rajan asked if there were matching funds being provided by the campus, and asked why they were giving staff and faculty representation if the students were paying for everything. Mr. Harley said people weren't interested in having only students. But more importantly, one condition in the By-laws about this was that if they save the Administration money in a facility, e.g., some of the money would go to retrofit lighting, that would save a certain amount of money, the requirement for the initial investment would be that the allocation from the Fund would be paid back out of savings. The buildings on campus were really old, and a lot of things like that could be funded. As a result, they would want someone from Facilities on the Committee who would know what would be best in terms of buildings and efficiency. Mr. Arons students might not be experts in power and capital projects and might not know how the budget process works. So having a staffmember from Facilities and from the Administration would be valuable for their input, for things that students might not realize. That was the intention of adding those members.

Mr. Purdy how this would affect GA autonomy with the University and the ASUC. Mr. Harley said the GA was already under the ASUC Auxiliary, so this would just be an add structure put in place. Mr. Daniels said the Auxiliary was the fiscal agent for both the GA and the ASUC. The GA was part of the ASUC. If the GA completely separated, the Auxiliary might remain their fiscal agent, and he had no reason to think of why that wouldn't be the case. Mr. Purdy said he was just wondering about the fees coming from graduate students, and that they should therefore have a voice. Mr. Harley said most fees go through the ASUC Auxiliary, including fees going to graduate services.

Mr. Daniels said the next referendum was the Student Life Fee Referendum. Vishal Gupta introduced himself and said he spoke about this at the last GA meeting. He introduced Freon Billimoria. In considering this Referendum, it was important to realize that students need to fund their own activities on campus. For the two years he's been in the ASUC, they've faced problems in allocating enough funds for students to do activities, pursue programs and projects, and enjoy life outside the classroom. They sat down at the beginning of the Fall Semester to talk about how they could improve that. It basically came down to students paying for their activities. They brought a few groups together about this.

ASUC SUPERB was part of the ASUC and was funded by the ASUC. It started at about \$200,000, almost five years ago, and has been cut \$80,000 over the course of four years. That made it very difficult to do the things students expect of them and to provide the kind of entertainment students expect. To accommodate other student groups, the ASUC has had to cut SUPERB about \$80K. SUPERB was now on the brink of being able to function as a professional entertainment service to the campus.

In addition, the Cal Band faced about \$100,000 in deficit. They funded that through its members, who pay \$4-500 a year to be a fully activist participant. But they were required to perform for the University at football games, orientation events, and campus events, and had to pay for that. So the Band came to the ASUC and also asked for money. In addition, UC Jazz last year needed \$34,000, and the ASUC had no way to fund that, and the group walked out of the room with \$250, the best the ASUC could do. UC Chorale faced the same budget cuts. UC Band, UC Jazz, and UC Chorale all faced cuts of 20% from four years ago, and the groups' members were paying more. And there was less money to provide services. Last semester UC Jazz turned away 25 students who wanted to participate.

Mr. Gupta said the ASUC will actually have less money to budget this year than it had last year. And they have new student groups and have cut SUPERB. So if passed, the Fee would fund SUPERB \$250,000-plus per year for on-campus events and entertainment; UC Jazz and UC Chorale Ensembles would each receive about \$34,000 a year; and the Cal Band would receive approximately \$100,000 a year. This money would allow groups to continue their activities.

Mr. Gupta said the GA retained all the money in fees that grad students contribute. In the Referendum, the allocation to the GA would be second largest, after SUPERB, and the GA would receive approximately \$126,000 a year for its activities. With 10,000 graduate students on campus, and the Fee starting at \$12 per semester, in any given year, grads would receive not \$120,000, but \$126,000, and technically, the GA would get more money than what grads contributed, which was really great for grads.

Mr. Gupta said the Referendum was exciting for the student body, and he could guarantee that next year, people would see changes on the campus that would improve student life.

Mr. Daniels called for any questions or comments. Ms. Franklin said that last month there were questions about whether a fee already covered certain musical activities. Mr. Gupta said there was no voluntary fee on the campus for musical activities. Ms. Ahrendt said she had raised that question, and had a vague recollection of an involuntary fee for Cal Performances that was supposed to be split, as far as she knew, between Cal Performances and student musical activities. Mr. Gupta said that Cal Performances was the umbrella activity, and they all receive funding from the campus. Ms. Ahrendt asked if the budget, then, has simply been cut. Mr. Gupta said that was correct.

Mr. Gupta said that one thing he failed to note was that not only would the GA receive \$126,000, but because of this Referendum, the ASUC would be relieved from supporting SUPERB financially, and thus would have about \$116,000 to give to undergraduate student organizations.

Ms. Billimoria said that from what she has seen, graduate students do actually attend SUPERB events. That was a small point, but she just wanted to make that known. Having worked in the box office, she knew that large numbers of grad students attend all the time. So these services go straight back to grad students as well.

Mr. Rajan asked what percentage of the ASUC budget currently went to all the activities that were mentioned, and other entertainment. Mr. Gupta said he couldn't give a percentage. The ASUC budget was \$1.2 to \$1.3 million. The graduate student contribution would go directly back to the GA, and ASUC SUPERB would get about \$116,000. The Cal Band and the UC Jazz and Chorale Ensembles did not have a large stake in the budget, as the ASUC couldn't find the money to give them. So this was their solution.

A Delegate asked if all that money the GA gained would go to graduate student groups. Mr. Daniels said it would be allocated through the GA's funding process.

Mr. Purdy asked how the Executive Board of the GA felt it would deal with such a massive infusion of cash. Mr. Daniels said this money was restricted to the purposes of student group funding. They will hopefully know by the May GA meeting whether or not the Referendum passed, in which case they would have to re-evaluate their budget.

Mr. Rajan asked if it wouldn't be necessary for the GA to only increase student group funding by that increase, since Delegates approve a budget that had a lot of components. So he'd assume this particular money could be put to wherever the GA thought it should go. Mr. Begtrup said that at the beginning of the year, \$150,000 was their target for funding. So if \$120,000 came in, realistically, they could keep it at \$150K and spend \$120K elsewhere, or increase it if they wanted. Mr. Gupta said that all the referenda had a built-in mechanism for oversight. So what voters read in the referenda had to be followed. An oversight board could actually take money back, that part out of the fee, and restrict money from going into the GA. It was a nine-member committee, three of whom were graduate students.

A Delegate said it sounded like an incredible deal, paying \$120K and getting \$126K. She thought it was even a better deal that so many grad students were funded and their fees were covered, meaning many of them would pay nothing.

Ms. Ahrendt said that while grads don't pay fees, their departments pay, and that diminished pools for departments for needy students. So there was a kind of negative effect. Mr. Begtrup said that departments only get a certain amount of money, and if fees went up, they would have less money. Ms.

Ahrendt said that could affect summer scholarships, e.g., or the ability for departments to take in non-resident students, etc.

Mr. Gupta said that within every student fee referendum, 33% of students' contribution goes back to financial aid to cover those students who couldn't afford to pay. Mr. Daniels said fellowship money grants the Graduate Division the return-to-aid portion.

Mr. Daniels said the next referendum up for discussion was "The Squelch" Fee Referendum. Ben Narodick introduced himself and said he would like to thank the GA for its time. He was the Publicity Coordinator and ASUC Liaison for The Heuristic Squelch. Also present were Simon Ganz, Coordinator of "The Squelch," and David Wasserman, a Senator on the ASUC Finance Committee. Mr. Daniels said they were all present as individual students. Mr. Narodick said that was correct.

Mr. Narodick said this fee would be \$1.50 per semester per student, a very minimal amount. Of that, .24¢ would go to the Graduate Assembly, raising approximately \$17,000 for the GA's use. As with the other referenda, 33% of the fee must go back to financial aid, and the rest would go to The Heuristic Squelch for the continuation of its activities. "The Squelch's" activities go way beyond publishing, as he would address in moment.

As for benefits of the fee for the GA, besides the \$17,000 going directly to the GA, a provision of the Referendum would also require the GA to gain a half-page advertisement in each issue of "The Squelch." This benefit reaches in the value somewhere in the thousands of dollars. Additionally, the magazine will give discounted advertising to student groups, both undergraduate and graduate. It was important to note that The Heuristic Squelch was an important outlet for graduate students and alumni who pursue comedic writing. They have had a healthy contribution level from graduate students in the past, particularly Law students who felt they needed to claim the last vestiges of their sense of humor. It was also important to remember that like the Student Life Fee Referendum this would free a lot of funding for ASUC student groups, many of which include graduate students.

Finally, Mr. Narodick said he wanted to address a very big concern that some of them might have, why all this money would be given to a comedy magazine. "The Squelch" was not just a comedy magazine, but a campus institution. Comedy magazines have been on campus for over the past 100 years, dating back to the 1890s, with "Smiles," "Josh," and "The California Pelican," which existed for 80 years before it was suspended. If people have ever wondered about the big pelican statue in front of Anthony Hall, "The California Pelican" was more or less responsible for construction of that building.

"The Squelch" also served as a popular artifact of culture and served grad student research on the campus, as well as elsewhere. Part of the money from the Fee would go to a project to create a digital archive of not just the last 16 years of "The Squelch," but also the previous years 80 years of "The Pelican," "Smiles," and "Josh," to be kept at the Bancroft Library. This was priceless for studies of popular culture. Students would volunteer to do this service themselves. The value of this work would be, in his opinion, priceless, and that would be the case for many scholars as well.

Finally, Mr. Narodick said they would construct publication racks for all ASUC and GA publications throughout the campus. That would not only make "The Squelch" more accessible to graduate students, but it would also make grad student publications more accessible to the undergrad population, should grads choose to target them as an audience.

Mr. Narodick said he felt there were a lot of common bonds there, especially with certain academic issues that he thought enhanced communication could really benefit from.

To talk about where The Heuristic Squelch stood nationally with other comedy publications, and why this was a dire issues that needed to be addressed by this measure, he would turn the floor over to Simon Ganz, the Editor. Mr. Ganz said for any publication, the primary cost was obviously printing, and those costs go up every year. They've gone up thousands of dollars in the last several years and the magazine's funding has been cut thousands of dollars in the last few years. Basically, at this point in time it will be impossible to reach a significant level of the student population.

As for how Berkeley compares to other universities, Harvard, Stanford, Penn, all the major universities had a significant humor magazine as part of their culture. Some were 100-year institutions. There's a significant effect in tying people together in a community, especially with writers. Many Squelch writers go on to try and work in Hollywood, and that happened with every major publication. It's an excellent way to get connected with outside writers. It was a good opportunity for graduate students as well, and "The Squelch" has definitely had members go on.

Mr. Narodick said that one last question people might ask was why "The Squelch" should get fee money and not other student groups on the campus. First, this Fee would basically return value to student fees, and for every \$1.50 invested in this, they feel they were going to return \$3 in value to the students. He felt this was a unique opportunity and an investment that should be recognized. Additionally, they're a very important publicity tool, not just for the ASUC, and potentially for the GA, but for many other student groups on the campus that need access to the large distribution "The Squelch" had. They publish 11,000 issues per run, six runs a year, and it was the second largest publication on the campus. These were urgent, time-sensitive issues. As costs went up and their funding went down, their ability to publish the quality and the number of issues per year dramatically decreases. Finally, "The Heuristic Squelch" was a campus institution that they felt deserved protection. And the cost was nominal.

Mr. Daniels said they reached the end of time for the discussion. Someone could move to extend discussion, which would mean they'd be there past 7:45. A motion to extend speaking time by two minutes was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Begtrup asked where money for "The Squelch" currently came from, and if the Fee would supplement or replace that money. Mr. Narodick said they would no longer be eligible to receive ASUC funding of any kind. The term for this Fee would run for ten years, after which they hoped to be financially independent from all student fees and funding. Mr. Begtrup asked if "The Squelch" was funnier than the Stanford publication. Mr. Nguyen said it was much better.

Ms. Freedman asked why they thought their publication should get on the Referendum as opposed to other publications. Mr. Narodick said they felt that all publications deserved more funding than they currently receive. They were dramatically under-funded by the ASUC, proportionately, for what they did, and felt there was a need for a student fee increase for them. But at the same time, they felt that "The Squelch" was such a promotional tool for many different groups, and because it returned such a high value on the investment to student groups, that they were in a unique position and needed this Referendum.

Mr. Wasserman said The Heuristic Squelch was the largest ASUC-funded publication on the campus, and one of the largest circulated around the campus. So it actually was an institution on the campus.

Ms. Ahrendt said that if it really was such a huge institution and a dramatically historic publication, she asked why she hasn't heard of it until that day; and she's been there for four years.

A Delegate asked why they couldn't charge for ad space if they had such good circulation. Mr. Ganz said they did charge. The Delegate asked about charging for the magazine, and said people might be willing to give .25¢. Mr. Narodick said they have found that other publications on campus have failed when they started to charge students. No comedy magazine has ever charged on the campus, and they felt that was an important tradition, having free access to the magazine. They don't have stipends and don't charge people for it. They do charge businesses to advertise and they give student groups, publications, and events heavily discounted advertising. As far as not having ever heard of "The Squelch," Mr. Narodick said he hoped Ms. Ahrendt was in the minority. And they certainly hope that given the service they claim to provide, that a minority on campus that hasn't heard of them decreased significantly.

Mr. Daniels asked Delegates to please go back to their departments and to their friends, no matter how they felt, yea or nay, to please spread the word that grads could vote on this and have an important say. The language of all referenda was on the GA's home page.

Tang Center Presentation

Mr. Daniels said they had wonderful presenters from the Tang Center who were at the meeting much past their normal work time. Steve Lustig introduced himself and said he was Associate Vice Chancellor of Health and Human Services. One of the areas he was responsible for was University Health Services. Claudia Covello introduced herself and said she was the Executive Director of University Health Services.

Mr. Lustig said he knew they had a limited amount of time. They had a brochure to distribute reminding people about the broad set of services available at Health Services. They wanted to focus on three areas the GA prioritized at the beginning of the year: mental health, dependent care, and travel. Before they start, he asked if there was anything else.

Ms. Ahrendt said she's heard a lot of comments from students lately about the availability of specialty clinics, and also certain specialties that were not represented by specialty clinics on campus.

Mr. Lustig said he'd talk a little about mental health, and knew there has been some discussion about that. There's been a lot of development around mental health and when they met with people from the GA, and Erin, who worked with them on the Health Committee, there were two pieces: access to actual counseling and workshops that specifically address grad student issues. They've had a large prevention campaign going at that time through the National Institute of Health, especially around suicide. So there was some education going on. They're working with graduate students, directors, and faculty, and they hope to expand that educational effort.

Mr. Lustig said another issue was the launching of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Mental Health. It's Co-Chaired by the Graduate Dean and had a large representation of students on it. The third piece, which he'd like to spend some time on that evening, had to do with the new increase in Registration Fees for mental health. That could unfold in a number of different areas. Under Student

Services and the Graduate Division, they'll work together try to figure out how best to direct this funding, which was supposed to go towards direct access to care.

Mr. Lustig asked if they could spend a few minutes on what some of their thoughts were on how to most effectively direct that. The money originally was recommended from the Student Affairs Vice Chancellors as a 25% increase in Registration Fees. It was approved at a 7% increase in Registration Fees, primarily focused on access. But none of them in any of the student services area thought that needed to be direct, meaning appointments at the Tang Center, and that having mental health professionals in areas that would really make a difference. He didn't know if that triggered any thinking, but he would like to open the floor up.

Ms. Ahrendt said she's heard from some students that not all appointments were currently covered. For example, students might be covered during the semester, but as soon as the semester was over, they no longer had access to care. That was a big issue because for students, who dealt with these kinds of issues really on a year-round basis. So she would like to make sure people had the number of appointments they needed. Ms. Ahrendt said there was also people who could only get biweekly meetings with a counselor, or every three weeks, when they really needed one every week. So that has kind of been an issue.

Mr. Lustig said one issue, then, was the number of appointments, and the other was the fee for appointments that kicked in.

Ms. Freedman asked about after-hours mental care, and if someone with a problem who was depressed after 5 p.m. would have to go to the hospital. The other question she had was how many appointments health insurance covered. If a person went to the Tang Center ten times, she asked if they would all be covered, and asked how that worked. Mr. Lustig said that right now, it worked the same way as a medical condition, where the condition was reviewed after so many visits, and then approved internally for so many more. So someone could go for an extended period for what their need was. They may not all be at the Tang Center, and that was one of the problems. The focus of Health Services at that time was to get people in the door and through short-term therapy. Sometimes people could stay there, sometimes for longer, where they're referred to the community on insurance.

Ms. Freedman said that from her perspective, if she knew someone was depressed and knew they'd get three appointments and then would be sent away, she would never send people to the Tang Center. Mr. Lustig asked if, even with coordination of care, she would want to keep them there, if she could. Ms. Freedman said she would want to make sure that people could get an appointment and that they wouldn't have to pay for it. She wasn't sure about the situation where someone would get three appointments and then would have to pay. Some people had to pay 80%, and 80% of a psychological appointment was much more than she could afford. Mr. Lustig said they charge slightly differently, but that was good information she provided.

A Delegate said that another issue she's heard about from her department was that when somebody went to the Tang Center, they were generally referred to a group session, and not referred to someone from the outside. She's heard it was more and more difficult for somebody to request an outside therapist to talk to. She thought that was probably not a good thing because if somebody was in distress, they probably weren't going to go to a group session; and that wouldn't be good for everybody.

Ms. Covello said that to have this discussion, they need to know what mental health policy was to make informed decisions. The Delegate said that insurance paid 80%, but people could only go every other

week. It was difficult to find a therapy every other week because generally, therapists want to see people more regularly; and she couldn't afford to pay 100% of the second visit. Mr. Lustig said they could come back and do a more thorough assessment so students were generally informed about this.

Mr. Daniels said he heard there were lower caps on prescription drugs, particularly psychiatric drugs. Mr. Lustig said that wasn't true. Ms. Covello said there was a cap for the pharmacy benefit from SHIP, but it hasn't changed. Mr. Daniels said that given the increase in prescription costs, however, it has, in effect, gotten more. Ms. Ahrendt said it was becoming a big problem. Mr. Daniels said that if someone got half and then went off of meds, they were kind of struck; and that tended to happen at the end of the semester, when finals hit and things were more and more stressful, right at the time when they need those drugs. Mr. Lustig said that was a good point.

Mr. Purdy said that just as there were fliers asking grad students to look for early warning for undergraduates, he asked if this has been discussed with faculty advisors and faculty, so they knew what was happening with grad students and might notice depression and other problems students might be having. Mr. Lustig said they did, and said the faculty were asking for not only training to recognize symptoms, but how to call people. So part of the move next year, especially for student mental health, was faculty training and classroom management issues, since issues come up there as well. But GSIs were the loudest call for help, so that's where they started.

A Delegate said she would be happy to see more outreach. She's now in her third year and has talked to many people in her Department, and it was amazing how many people said they experienced a great deal of depression their first year. They didn't recognize what was going on and didn't realize it was normal when going to grad school. She knew Health Services did a lot of outreach, but she was thinking more of a mandatory class for first-years, saying this was a normal thing, helping people to recognize it and how to get help.

A Delegate asked about the way in which appointments were set up in the Center, with other institutions providing for more of them. Mr. Lustig said it was all about money. Over the years, since he's been involved in the counseling program, the number of visits available has shrunk. Other issues included staffing cuts and increased demand. Their policy has been to try to not create too many wait lists. Everything used to be wait listed. The average number of sessions students have was four and a half. The need was longer for some students, and most of these were referred out. UHS was slowly adjusting this, as they get more funding, to keep people on campus longer and eliminate some of the fee services. But this was financially driven.

A Delegate said that if someone was looking for a summer internship and had a life crisis and felt depressed, they have to deal with that and with the internship. UHS might want to keep people for two or three visits and then refer them out, as the Tang Center wasn't equipped to do long-term counseling. Running out of visits was very bad. If a student was referred to the community and didn't match up and needed a new therapist, they couldn't get a referral because they've run out of visits.

Ms. Covello said that argued for using most of that money for more counseling in-house. She thought that's what people were weighing, directing money more in-house, or for outreach. Mr. Lustig said this input was great, and they'd keep checking back with the GA about how well utilized the resources were, and how they could leverage them in the best way for most of the students.

Mr. Lustig said the other two issues that they wanted to bring up were dependent care and travel, particularly post-travel care. Ms. Covello said dependent health insurance dealt with the ability to find or obtain health insurance for their children or spouse. This question was brought to Health Services from the Graduate Division after the GA brought it to Dean Mason to ask to look at this subject again. It was complicated, with no easy answers.

Ms. Covello said she would talk about the role they were taking at that time. The Tang Center had a person dedicated to coordinating the needs of students with families in order to obtain health insurance. They've studied the market to find out the health insurance options, for both private and State-subsidized health insurance. There were a variety of options, and any one who had those needs could go to the Tang Center, meet with this person, and get help in navigating through the options and getting connected with health insurance. But the question still remained, whether that was good enough, and if they could get one health insurance plan for all dependents. UHS went through a complete review process and met back with Dean Mason and representatives of the GA to review their findings. They found that it was very difficult for private insurers to cover just dependents, which actually weren't interested in providing a health insurance plan with only dependents in it. They can and will get health insurance for any family that needed it, but it was best resolved on a case-by-case basis, because they can also match that up with affordability, and whether people could afford private insurance, or if not, could receive State subsidized programs. A lot of people were unaware that State programs, MediCal and Healthy Families and Healthy Kids, bought private health insurance, like Blue Cross or Kaiser, and subsidized 90% of the premium. This was the exact same health insurance as private insurance, not a different health plan, and it was just a question of who was paying for it.

Mr. Purdy said he was amazed that the Tang Center could do what, in his opinion, was little more than hand out fliers to students, when there was such a large population that somebody negotiate for, thousands of potential customers. Ms. Covello said it was shocking, and that's been the experience of staff as well. It's a mystery as to how large this group actually was because the University didn't track well on how many dependents there were, and as far as they could figure out, in terms of insurance, it was somewhere between 3-800 family members. It wasn't a huge number. Mr. Lustig said it wasn't as though they couldn't get health insurance plans, but plans they could get were not any cheaper than what people could get otherwise. The campus was getting cheaper and cheaper insurance for students by eliminating the premium they used to carry, which was more expensive, and enrolled them in plans. So they had more students enrolled now than they did when they before. It was bizarre.

Mr. Purdy said there was a huge array. Ms. Covello said they put it out on the market, with the employer pre-funding. Mr. Purdy said it didn't seem right that people coming together to negotiate could end up with a better rate as individuals. Mr. Lustig said they can't use employee plans because the campus wasn't students' employer. Health Services has done this about every year and they're still looking for a solution. The numbers were too small. Also, the System was trying do something Systemwide. The problem of what to do for health, for both undergrad and grad student dependents, was huge Systemwide and nationwide.

Mr. Purdy asked if they worked with the grad parents network. Mr. Lustig said they have.

Ms. Cementwala said they recently did a survey about travel and asked for comments. A feedback form that Academic Affairs distributed to departments only had 250 responses.

Mr. Daniels said that when they passed the agenda, they agreed to time limits. He asked if there was a motion to extend speaking time by five minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Ms. Cementwala said informal feedback they got back included interesting comments, not only about travel, but about the care that planned pregnancies received when grad students planned their families. There were lots of options and counseling available for unplanned, unwanted pregnancies, and options on how to deal with that and prepare. But when a grad student in their late 20s or early 30s comes to the Tang Center wanting to be pregnant, and planned on it, and wanted services and care, she asked how that was addressed and how the GA could help Tang become more family friendly. One comment was about comments made by a nurse practitioner, such as not drinking or doing certain other things, and the student said they wanted the pregnancy and that of course they planned to stay healthy. Comments were not necessarily age-appropriate.

Ms. Covello said this issue for grads has come up before. There were also too many procedures and steps to get care, counseling, and referral. They eliminated one procedure that semester, so the student's comment might have been from an earlier experience. Pregnant students had to get a counseling visit, but if the pregnancy was desired, they didn't need that, so it's been eliminated. This was a good dialogue to have, and feedback for the Tang Center, the subject of services being oriented towards undergrads. Ms. Covello said she was thinking about this and about ways to have some educational seminars with clinical staff around differentiating the services. So this was something they've really heard.

A Delegate said that for after-hours care, beyond 6 p.m. and on the weekends, people had to go to Alta Bates emergency room, which was actually much worse than anything she's seen in any Third World country she's been to. Everybody she's heard from had horror stories. She asked if that was the only option and if anything was being done about that. Mr. Lustig said what they lack other than 24-hour care on campus was the urgent care center in the whole county. About every three years, people get fed up and try to start an urgent care center collectively, which are hard to keep going. So everything spilled into the ER. As to whether anything was being done, it was, somewhat. They had a problem locally in that they were captive to one hospital. They're one of the few cities in the whole Sutter system that only had one hospital. So they're trying to work with the County. They're working with a health task force on access. A lot of populations were being cared for, students being one of them. He's been working for a couple of years on this, and he really heard them on this subject. Ms. Covello said primary care access was an option on the weekend, at an urgent care/primary care clinic located in the old Merritt Hospital, on Dwight and Milvia. It's open on the weekends.

Mr. Lustig he realized the GA just did a survey regarding travel. One way Health Services learned was from feedback like the GA was giving that evening, and it was very useful. They've that in the rare cases that happen, diagnosis took a long time. They split things up and made the care better because of complaints. For instance, they have a very thorough complaint procedure. It was very important that they know what went on. They had to really review these case-by-case, and they do result in educational programs for the staff and changes in their procedures.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to extend speaking time by two minutes. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

A Delegate said he was from the Anthropology Department, and they do fieldwork at some pretty ugly places. A colleague contracted malaria in Tanzania, came back, and was misdiagnosed by the Tang

Center, with the malaria going to a second and third stage. He didn't assume the Tang Center had specialists familiar with tropical medicine. Students in Medical Anthropology could go to UCSF and see tropical specialists, but others were confined to the Tang Center. He would like to see if there was a way Anthropology students could also get insurance at UCSF. Other departments dealing with international travel were concerned, such as Public Health or International Development. Malaria was a serious illness, and to have it misdiagnosed was frankly inexcusable.

Mr. Lustig said the case in question was reviewed, one of the five or six cases that came up for that. He thought they'd rather talk about how to get a tropical specialist to Berkeley so people didn't have to go to San Francisco. And there were ways to do that. It was a question someone else raised, how to decide what specialists were on campus and which ones were in the community. A lot of that dealt with cost ratios, and he would rather figure out how to provide access to more people.

Ms. Cementwala said out of the 251 people who responded to the survey, 195 didn't know about the complaints mechanism. So one thing to consider might be how to get the outreach about that. Mr. Lustig said that perhaps they could have that information in their brochure. Ms. Cementwala said clinicians seemed to adopt with a wait-and-see approach to diseases that might be contracted during travel, or tropical diseases they were not familiar with. While that seemed reasonable, it didn't seem to be working and seemed to exacerbate people's medical conditions. She asked what could be done to address that. Mr. Lustig said they've talked about an accredited, continuing medical education program for clinical staff on the campus and for the Tang Center. Some students and faculty who travel would come and meet with clinical staff. That has been a very useful way to move these things along, and learn from experiences and what could be changed. Some things evolve slower, but there were always things they could improve upon. They're thinking of doing this in the fall.

Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank Mr. Lustig and Ms. Covello for attending. (Applause) Ms. Covello said that if people had suggestions, complaints, or suggestions, they could send them to uhs.berkeley.edu.

GUEST SPEAKERS -- ASUC President Oren Gabriel and ASUC Auxiliary Director Nadesan Permaul

Oren Gabriel introduced himself and said he was the ASUC President. He would like to thank the GA for having him there, and he'd give people a quick background on the ASUC, what it did, and how it was structured. The ASUC was divided into five Executive Offices and a Senate with 20 students. The five Executives were the President, Executive VP, Academic Affairs VP, External Affairs VP, and the Student Advocate, kind of like the student Ombudsperson. The President's office had about 75 students, including directors and interns. It was divided into Development, which worked on things like the Cal Lodge, the only building entirely owned by the ASUC, at Lake Tahoe, where Cal students could stay for \$20 a night, with reservations made at callodge.org. The Development Department also worked on the Student Union and short-term and long-term developments for Lower Sproul Plaza. The Projects Department ran the majority of projects coming out of the ASUC. They worked on the Spring Concert, April 14th, featuring Yellow Card. The concert would be at the Greek Theatre and cost \$5, with the money going to benefit Darfur. They also have alumni networking events. These events were not just to bring alumni back to campus to give, but to interact and mentor students, and help them on their way. Delegates were welcome to be involved in that. The OP also had an Outreach Department, which did the survey, and finally, there was an Internal Department.

ASUC-GA relationships have been shaky in the past, Mr. Gabriel said it's been a pleasure working with Mr. Daniels and others that year, such as Dan Leahy. He thought continuing to do socials between Delegates and Senators would be a foundation. When issues arise with the campus and the students act as one, it made both grads and undergrads a lot stronger.

Mr. Permaul said he'd explain the Auxiliary's role. When he was a grad student at Cal, there wasn't a graduate student government. The ASUC President at the time appointed him to a committee, along with an undergraduate student in the History Department, who is now a faculty member at UC Santa Barbara. At the time, they were representing students' concerns about gaining access to recreational exercise in the gymnasiums on campus. That led to a referendum that brought the Recreational Sports Facility to the campus, for which he felt very proud. The referendum that Rob Schechtman and Dan Work, of the GA, worked on last year, improved access to the RSF.

Mr. Permaul said he's had a wonderful career there at Berkeley. This was almost his 30th year as an employee. He taught in the Rhetoric and Political Science Departments, but he also had the privilege of being the Director of the ASUC Auxiliary, and as such, an advisor to undergraduate and graduate student government. It's been his pleasure to work with student government, both Mr. Daniels and Mr. Gabriel, and the Assembly and the Senate. He wanted to apologize for not being more visible at the GA, as Ms. Hsueh has often asked him to be, but he hoped to correct that as soon as he hired some people. He had five vacancies currently in the senior staff of his organization that he was trying to fill.

Mr. Permaul said the Auxiliary was created in 1999, after almost 100 years of strictly student government management of their own operations. The ASUC was formed in 1887, when a student group, the Cal Football team, had a non-student playing on it. The faculty objected and the students did not have an organization that could present, in a structured way, a response to the faculty. So the students in the College of L&S formed the Associated Students of the College of L&S, which later became the ASUC. That student government then took over the student store, hired its first employee, the Executive Director, and began to spread out. At one time, the ASUC owned Intercollegiate Athletics, and didn't sell it to the University until 1960. The ASUC also owned buildings such as Memorial Stadium, the gymnasium, the track stadium, the baseball field, and Eshleman, and was a huge business.

There was a question earlier when the GA was discussing a referendum as to why students would invest in operations, and why the campus didn't do it. In the 19th Century, students understood that if they wanted a place at the table and control of their destiny, they had to do things themselves. Unfortunately, in the late 1970s, the complexity of running these businesses overcame their capacity to operate them, especially with student government changing year after year. So in 1999, it became necessary for the ASUC and the campus to come to a negotiated agreement. The students agreed to delegate to the campus the responsibility of having its business operations run by the campus on behalf of students; and that's what his job was.

Mr. Permaul said he was a student there from his undergraduate years to his PhD, and has participated broadly in student life. He believed fundamentally that students were capable of managing their affairs if treated with respect and dealt with in an upfront and aboveboard manner. He hoped that's the way their relationships have been. He would encourage them to come to him if they had issues Mr. Daniels couldn't deal with, or if they were just interested in finding out the Auxiliary operated. Mr. Permaul said he was upstairs in 411 Eshleman. But he thought the GA was in capable hands, and it was his pleasure to be associated with them. (Applause)

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE BP-UC BERKELEY EBI DEAL¹

WHEREAS, BP (formerly British Petroleum) chose the University of California, Berkeley to share in a \$500 million research grant with the Lawrence Berkeley Lab (LBL) and the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign to create an Energy Biosciences Institute (EBI);² and this proposal would be the largest agreement between a public university and single private corporation in university history, thus setting a precedent for future private-public partnerships; and

WHEREAS, the announcement of this proposed ten-year contract on February 1, 2007 coincided with the February 2, 2007 release of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report calling on all nations to begin serious carbon emissions cuts in the next ten years to avoid further climate catastrophe; and

WHEREAS, the graduate students at UC Berkeley ultimately share an interest in climate stability and net carbon emissions in the coming decades; we hope to fulfill our responsibility as educated members of the most carbon emission-intensive and most politically powerful nation in the world and thus need to examine these issues and to determine how well this deal will further our common public interest; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley, LBL, and BP, through this agreement, are all working to develop alternative energy resources in the face of global climate change, but as a public-land grant institution, the University's mission to serve the public interest potentially differs from BP's profit-seeking interests and share-holder accountability; and

WHEREAS, the proposal to BP pushes for the development of new biofuel technologies and, while scientific understanding of critical environmental issues surrounding biofuels is still limited, a growing body of research indicates that there have been and could be more negative environmental impacts.³ Studies have also argued that large-scale development of biofuels along the current model would damage food security, especially for the poor in developing countries, yet these environmental and social issues may be insufficiently addressed in the UC Berkeley proposal to BP; and

WHEREAS, the proposal as it now stands grants BP exclusive license options over UC Berkeley intellectual property rights, and unclear control over the content and direction of research; this presents an urgent need for proper review in order to align research choices and intellectual property rights with the interest of the researchers involved and the University of California; and

WHEREAS, the BP contract has prompted UC administrators to bypass the Academic Senate in making high-level hiring decisions, threatening the long-standing principle of shared governance; and the contract gives BP a strong presence on the Governance Board of the EBI and allows BP to play an important role in University hiring and firing decisions; and

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE BP-UC BERKELEY EBI DEAL (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the details of the BP contract allow BP researchers to develop academic curricula, which is an unprecedented relationship with few controls to protect students against corporate biases and to ensure that this curricula fits our mission as a public university; and

WHEREAS, for similar reasons, an independent review by Michigan State University (MSU) of the University of California, Berkeley-Novartis deal recommended that the University "[a]void industry agreements that involve complete academic units or large groups of researchers" and "[r]eassess in a comprehensive fashion the implications of non-financial and institutional conflicts of interest";⁴

WHEREAS, the University of California currently bars stock ownership in drug companies paying for professors' research due to concerns about conflicts of interest;

WHEREAS, although some funding for research into the ethical, geopolitical, and environmental impacts of biofuels may be provided in the BP contract, researchers in the appropriate fields may feel discriminated against by the funding process or may find a conflict of interest due to the source of the funding; however, such research is necessary and deserves alternate funding sources;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly bring forth these concerns to the Chancellor, specifically asking for a redress of the BP contract concerning the following: increased flexibility in licensing rights of new technologies including a time-limitation on first-right right refusal by BP, removal of any control by BP on hiring and firing decisions of faculty, removal of any control over curricula by BP, increased representation of the University of California, Berkeley on the governance board such that we possess more votes than BP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request that the BP contract be rewritten to include a completely open and transparent research project selection process that involves independent peer review.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly ask the Chancellor to create a funding pool completely separate from the BP contract for funding of research into the ethical, geopolitical, and environmental impacts of biofuels, and that a body be formed separate from the EBI to distribute these funds.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request that the Chancellor pursue a policy similar to that applied to pharmaceutical research, such that researchers involved in the EBI be restricted from owning stock in BP due to conflicts of interest.

¹ This Resolution is a modification by Gavi Begtrup of the original drafted by graduate students from relevant disciplines and Graduate Assembly delegates, including Jennifer Casolo, Eugenio Urquiza Fernández, Kamal Kapadia, Jonathan Rheaume, Kathryn Schild, Bradley Voytek, and Jennifer Wells.

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE BP-UC BERKELEY EBI DEAL
(cont'd)

² Robert Sanders, UC Berkeley Press Release, "BP selects UC Berkeley to lead \$500 million energy research consortium with partners Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, University of Illinois." Accessed on 03/27/2007 from http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2007/02/01_ebi.shtml.

³ Patzek, Lucas and Tad. "The Disastrous Local and Global Impacts of Tropical Biofuel Production," pp. 19-22, in *The Energy Tribune*, March 2007; Monbiot, George. "A Lethal Solution," March 27th, 2007, the Guardian.

⁴ Lawrence Busch, Richard Allison, Craig Harris, Alan Rudy, Bradley T. Shaw, Toby Ten Eyck, Dawn Coppin, Jason Konefal, Christopher Oliver, and James Fairweather, "External Review of the Collaborative Research Agreement between Novartis Agricultural Discovery Institute, Inc. and The Regents of the University of California," July 13, 2004, p. 13. Accessed on 3/27/2007 from http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2004/07/external_novartis_review.pdf.

Mr. Daniels said the Resolution was rewritten by a very hard-working group of students, of Delegates. He would ask people to keep their comments as brief as possible.

Mr. Rheume introduced himself and said he was from the Department of Mechanical Engineering. A month ago at its meeting, he urged the GA to oppose the Resolution that was presented at that time, and that evening, he was speaking more in the center, because over that past month he had an opportunity to work with some of the authors of the original Resolution, and they found some points they could agree upon. Last month he thought the Resolution was a little harshly worded and didn't serve as a good starting point for a dialogue with Administration. People got together and found they had a lot in common, such as the process by which the Administration drafted the proposal, which could have been more transparent. There could also be improved attention to governance. He was also the author of "FAQs on BP Grant," which he primarily did for his Spring Break. He really delved into the issues.

Mr. Rheume said there were two things he would like to bring to their attention. In 2005, in BP's annual filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission, it announced \$8 billion for alternative energy research, 1/16th of the company's overall commitment. He thought that represented a true commitment to R&D and alternative energy. Secondly, if they look at where Berkeley got its research funds, the federal government accounted for 60%, and the BP deal would be 2%. With all the wars, violations, and abuses brought by the federal government, in comparison, BP maybe wasn't so bad. BP was affiliated with some groups that have massacred innocent people for extracting oil on their soil. He didn't want to make light of that. But the real debate on campus should be who the campus received money from. BP was a small bit of that. The Resolution was a child of compromise provides a pathway to tell the Administration that the GA hoped it improved the process, with the graduate community and the community at-large having more of a say.

Ms. Wells she was very excited to talk to Mr. Rheume over Spring Break and learning a lot more about this extremely complex issue. Faculty were up in arms about no one having direct involvement, in a position of responsibility, to represent the ideas and needs of the social, ethical, and geopolitical aspects of the deal, and how that could be ensured. She was excited to have a revised draft. Mechanisms on dealing with conflict of interest was something the six people who worked on the Resolution didn't agree

upon. Some of them thought there could be clear conflicts of interest. For example, two innovations come out of this. One was maybe not so good for climate change but might be really profitable, and the other was really good for climate change but not so profitable. The question was who would decide which innovation went forward. That was one possible scenario. Ms. Wells said she thought the alternative draft was excellent and much more thorough in the Resolved Clauses and better explained the issues.

Mr. Daniels said it was late, and he would ask people to please restrict comments and questions to the actual wording of the Resolution and less to the merits of the BP deal, or on corporate funding. He called for any con speakers.

Ms. Franklin said she liked the Whereas Clauses and was very impressed by the bill. The Resolved Clause seemed to be resolving things they couldn't actually influence. Mr. Daniels said they were just talking about the amended Resolution. Mr. Begtrup said he had the same qualms with the first Resolution, with a few problems with the Whereas Clauses, but mostly with the Resolved Clauses. He thought they could agree that getting past any discussion of whether BP or corporate funding was evil, was irrelevant, and like it or not, the contract will go through. But they'd like to make sure graduate student interests were looked after. That would involve conflicts of interest, hiring and firing processes, and intellectual property rights. These were things they wanted to make sure the contract addressed. In the original Resolution, the Resolved Clauses reached beyond the grasp of the GA.

Mr. Begtrup said that UC Administration appointed a Blue-Ribbon Committee of faculty from the Academic Senate to look through the proposal and address some of these concerns. He thought a compromise they could live with was to push for graduate student representation on the committee that has been formed, instead of creating a new committee. Grads will be strongly influenced by the terms of the contract and will, in fact, do most of the research. He was proposing the following amendments:

“Whereas, graduate students of the University of California will perform the majority of the research under this collaboration and will be greatly impacted by the terms of the contract;

“Further Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request two graduate student representatives support on the Blue-Panel Committee to voice graduate student concerns.”

Mr. Begtrup said that what he tried to do with these amendments was to take the concerns people had and put them in a form where they could actually do something, and go to the Chancellor with these concerns.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the amended version of the Resolution, to substitute the version that was distributed that evening. It was so moved and seconded. An objection was raised. A motion to call the question and end debate was made and died for lack of a second.

Mr. Purdy said the third from the bottom paragraph on the amended version, says the contract should be rewritten to include a completely open and transparent research project to review. To his knowledge, most project selection, including the NSF, was not completely open and transparent, and decisions were made behind closed doors. The motivation in the Resolution was good, but it wasn't feasible.

A Delegate said this wasn't a demand, but something they'd tell the Chancellor that they wanted. Ms. Ahrendt said it was a request, not a demand.

Ms. Wells said a concern people initially had was that there was supposed to be a signing in June. She asked if there was anything in the Resolution that would have someone around, after May 15, when the students have left, to ask the Administration not to sign. Mr. Begtrup said that not all graduate students leave. And if they have people on the committee, they could voice any concerns.

Ms. Kapadia asked if they would be saying "Please don't sign until all these concerns have been addressed." Ms. Ahrendt said she thought the intention was to bring this up at the next Chancellor's meeting. Ms. Kapadia said it was to prevent them from signing until these things were considered. Mr. Begtrup said they couldn't prevent them from signing it. He thought the University would look bad if a committee was formed and then didn't have time to discuss it, and to then sign a contract any way. Mr. Rheaume said he thought the faculty generally supported the process as it was going forward. A Delegate said faculty were already going in this direction, and for the GA to join them would provide a much stronger position.

Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to extend discussion by ten minutes. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE. Mr. Daniels said they were considering the Resolution that was submitted that evening.

Mr. Purdy moved to amend the second Resolved Clause, to remove "completely" and replace it with "an." Mr. Daniels asked to include in the amendment replacing "rewritten" to "written," with the clause to read:

"Further Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request that the BP contract be written to include an open and transparent research project selection process that involves independent peer review."

The motion to amend was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Stern said there were a couple of minor inaccuracies. There was a reference in the sixth Whereas Clause to "intellectual property rights," and it was a little more nuanced to that. If they put this up to the Chancellor, he would recognize these kinds of inaccuracies immediately and the GA would render itself irrelevant. It was not an exclusive intellectual property right. Mr. Rheaume said they were aware of that concern, which was why they worded it as "exclusive license options." Mr. Stern said he would like to see specific reference to the Blue-Ribbon Committee and to graduate student representatives. He had another issue with the title of the Resolution, and it didn't seem like the GA would be requesting a revision, but asserting what they want to see in the process. He thought the word "review" in the title stood alone, and thought it was a little presumptuous to assert that they could revise this deal when they were just trying to get a seat at the table.

Mr. Stern moved to amend the title of the Resolution to "Resolution Calling for the Review of the BP-UC Berkeley EBI Deal."

A motion to extend discussion for five minutes was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Stern said he would propose an amendment to insert the following as the second-to-last Whereas Clause, to read as follows:

“Whereas, the University of California Administration has appointed four professors who chair Senate Committees -- Calvin Moore, Patrick Kirch, Christopher Kutz, and J. Miguel Villas-Boas -- to participate in the negotiations as part of a Blue-Ribbon Committee that does not include graduate student representation;”

Mr. Stern said he would also ask to have a new first Resolved Clause, to read as follows:

"Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request two graduate student representatives serve on the Blue-Ribbon Committee to voice graduate student concerns.”

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Daniels said the amendment also included adding a Whereas Clause, to read as follows:

“Whereas, graduate students of the University of California will perform the majority of the research under this collaboration and will be greatly impacted by the terms of the contract;

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to extend speaking time by five minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Stern said there were researchers involved in EBI who have stock with BP and other, related proprietary interests, and there was no objection to that mentioned in the Resolution. Instead of owning stock in BP, there were other, proprietary interests involved with the deal. He would propose an amendment to the last Resolved Clause, as the bill was amended, to add “and other proprietary interests related to EBI,” to read as follows:

“Finally Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request that the Chancellor pursue a policy similar to that applied to pharmaceutical research, such that researchers involved in the EBI be restricted from owning stock in BP and other proprietary interests involved or related to EBI, due to conflicts of interest.

Mr. Stern said he would like to add a final amendment, addressing issues of public relations concerns. In BP ads appearing in “The Wall Street Journal,” Berkeley’s name was used. The language of the current proposal expressly promotes the deal through all resources available to BP and to Berkeley, and to basically put all the PR weight behind the pushing of this deal. The University’s name was used in a proprietary manner without acknowledging it, so he would propose a further amendment to re-examine the public relations language within the current EBI proposal to account for the proprietary nature of such acts. This was also an issue the Academic Senate was considering, and it was important to give this concern some weight and unite with the Academic Senate.

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to extend speaking time. It was so moved and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Daniels suggested amending the second Resolved Clause, to add “, and that the Blue-Ribbon Committee re-examine the public relations provisions of the EBI proposal,” to read as follows:

Be It Further Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly bring forth these concerns to the Chancellor, specifically asking for a redress of the BP contract concerning the following: increased flexibility in licensing rights of new technologies including a time-limitation on first-right right refusal by BP, removal of any control by BP on hiring and firing decisions of faculty, removal of any control over curricula by BP, increased representation of the University of California, Berkeley on the governance board such that we possess more votes than BP, and that the Blue-Ribbon Committee re-examine the public relations provisions of the EBI proposal.

THE AMENDMENT WAS ADOPTED AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE REVIEW OF THE BP-UC BERKELEY EBI DEAL, AS AMENDED BY SUBSTITUTION AND ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daniels asked people to please vote online April 11-13, and to get their friends and classmates to vote. The GA’s next meeting will be May 3. He would like to thank people for staying late and working hard.

This meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

Resolution Calling for the Review of the BP-UC Berkeley EBI Deal¹
[as amended by substitution and on the floor]

Whereas, BP (formerly British Petroleum) chose the University of California, Berkeley to share in a \$500 million research grant with the Lawrence Berkeley Lab (LBL) and the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign to create an Energy Biosciences Institute (EBI);² and this proposal would be the largest agreement between a public university and single private corporation in university history, thus setting a precedent for future private-public partnerships; and

Whereas, the announcement of this proposed ten-year contract on February 1, 2007 coincided with the February 2, 2007 release of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report calling on all nations to begin serious carbon emissions cuts in the next ten years to avoid further climate catastrophe; and

Whereas, the graduate students at UC Berkeley ultimately share an interest in climate stability and net carbon emissions in the coming decades; we hope to fulfill our responsibility as educated members of the most carbon emission-intensive and most politically powerful nation in the world and thus need to examine these issues and to determine how well this deal will further our common public interest; and

Whereas, UC Berkeley, LBL, and BP, through this agreement, are all working to develop alternative energy resources in the face of global climate change, but as a public-land grant institution, the University's mission to serve the public interest potentially differs from BP's profit-seeking interests and share-holder accountability; and

Whereas, the proposal to BP pushes for the development of new biofuel technologies and, while scientific understanding of critical environmental issues surrounding biofuels is still limited, a growing body of research indicates that there have been and could be more negative environmental impacts.³ Studies have also argued that large-scale development of biofuels along the current model would damage food security, especially for the poor in developing countries, yet these environmental and social issues may be insufficiently addressed in the UC Berkeley proposal to BP; and

Whereas, the proposal as it now stands grants BP exclusive license options over UC Berkeley intellectual property rights, and unclear control over the content and direction of research; this presents an urgent need for proper review in order to align research choices and intellectual property rights with the interest of the researchers involved and the University of California; and

Whereas, the BP contract has prompted UC administrators to bypass the Academic Senate in making high-level hiring decisions, threatening the long-standing principle of shared governance; and the contract gives BP a strong presence on the Governance Board of the EBI and allows BP to play an important role in University hiring and firing decisions; and

Whereas, the details of the BP contract allow BP researchers to develop academic curricula, which is an unprecedented relationship with few controls to protect students against corporate biases and to ensure that this curricula fits our mission as a public university; and

Resolution Calling for the Review of the BP-UC Berkeley EBI Deal¹ (cont'd)
[as amended by substitution and on the floor]

Whereas, for similar reasons, an independent review by Michigan State University (MSU) of the University of California, Berkeley-Novartis deal recommended that the University "[a]void industry agreements that involve complete academic units or large groups of researchers" and "[r]eassess in a comprehensive fashion the implications of non-financial and institutional conflicts of interest";⁴

Whereas, the University of California currently bars stock ownership in drug companies paying for professors' research due to concerns about conflicts of interest;

Whereas, the University of California Administration has appointed four professors who chair Senate Committees, Calvin More, Patrick Gouch, Christopher Kutz, and Jay Migueel Wheelas-Boas, to participate in the negotiations as part of a blue-ribbon committee that does not include graduate student representation; and

Whereas, although some funding for research into the ethical, geopolitical, and environmental impacts of biofuels may be provided in the BP contract, researchers in the appropriate fields may feel discriminated against by the funding process or may find a conflict of interest due to the source of the funding; however, such research is necessary and deserves alternate funding sources; and

Whereas, graduate students of the University of California will perform the majority of the research under this collaboration and will be greatly impacted by the terms of the contract;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request two graduate student representatives serve on the blue-ribbon committee to voice graduate student concerns.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly bring forth these concerns to the Chancellor, specifically asking for a redress of the BP contract concerning the following: increased flexibility in licensing rights of new technologies including a time-limitation on first-right right refusal by BP, removal of any control by BP on hiring and firing decisions of faculty, removal of any control over curricula by BP, increased representation of the University of California, Berkeley on the governance board such that we possess more votes than BP, and that the Blue-Ribbon Committee re-examine the public relations provisions of the EBI proposal.

Be it Further Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request that the BP contract be written to include an open and transparent research project selection process that involves independent peer review.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly ask the Chancellor to create a funding pool completely separate from the BP contract for funding of research into the ethical, geopolitical, and environmental impacts of biofuels, and that a body be formed separate from the EBI to distribute these funds.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Officers of the Graduate Assembly request that the Chancellor pursue a policy similar to that applied to pharmaceutical research, such that researchers involved in the

Resolution Calling for the Review of the BP-UC Berkeley EBI Deal¹ (cont'd)
[as amended by substitution and on the floor]

EBI be restricted from owning stock in BP or other proprietary interests involved or related to EBI, due to conflicts of interest.

¹ This Resolution is a modification by Gavi Begtrup of the original drafted by graduate students from relevant disciplines and Graduate Assembly delegates, including Jennifer Casolo, Eugenio Urquiza Fernández, Kamal Kapadia, Jonathan Rheaume, Kathryn Schild, Bradley Voytek, and Jennifer Wells.

² Robert Sanders, UC Berkeley Press Release, "BP selects UC Berkeley to lead \$500 million energy research consortium with partners Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, University of Illinois." Accessed on 03/27/2007 from http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2007/02/01_ebi.shtml.

³ Patzek, Lucas and Tad. "The Disastrous Local and Global Impacts of Tropical Biofuel Production," pp. 19-22, in *The Energy Tribune*, March 2007; Monbiot, George. "A Lethal Solution," March 27th, 2007, the Guardian.

⁴ Lawrence Busch, Richard Allison, Craig Harris, Alan Rudy, Bradley T. Shaw, Toby Ten Eyck, Dawn Coppin, Jason Konefal, Christopher Oliver, and James Fairweather, "External Review of the Collaborative Research Agreement between Novartis Agricultural Discovery Institute, Inc. and The Regents of the University of California," July 13, 2004, p. 13. Accessed on 3/27/2007 from http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2004/07/external_novartis_review.pdf.