

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

March 1, 2007

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

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

Announcements

Announcements were made about the GA's major conference of the year, The Women of Color Conference; the ASUC Senate/GA Delegate mixer; the GA open house; the Big Ideas Contest, won last year by all grads.

The Chancellor's Advisory Committee for LGBT issues was available to any issues people raise.

The Parent's Advisory Council was working on the issue of cutting childcare off for students 24 units after the completion of a Bachelors. The GA's assistance was requested.

The GA's Faculty Mentoring Awards was accepting nominations.

The GA was co-sponsoring a Conference, "Changing the Culture of the Academy," also sponsored by the Chancellor, and the OP.

John Edwards was coming to campus.

The new Campus Committee Liaison/Chief-of-Staff in Academic Affairs was introduced, Yenhoa Ching.

The UCSA will hold had a Student Lobby Conference in Sacramento. External Affairs will also work with the ASUC in sending people to Sacramento to lobby legislators. The March Regents meeting will be at UCLA.

A conference on the WTO and international trade law will be held at Boalt.

Presentation By Chancellor Birgeneau

Chancellor Birgeneau talked about the Energy Biosciences Institute. Graduate student work would be fully guaranteed from beginning to end. For undirected research, which would be most of the research, intellectual property would belong to the University.

For the Named Fund Initiative, donations to graduate student support will be matched. The Diversity Forum on March 22 will focus on graduate students, with the theme, "Challenging the Culture of the Academy Toward a More Inclusive Practice." The search for the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion was moving forward.

The Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative (DRI) will deal with diversity and health disparities; in educational policy; and in democracy.

A search was underway for the new grad student Dean as Dean Mason was leaving the Graduate Division.

An issue has been raised regarding the new fee for mental health. Flexibility for different campuses was needed, and Berkeley already had a health fee, part of which went to mental health.

Grad students have made a huge investment Lower Sproul redevelopment. The Administration was anxious to work with students on this, and everybody understood it will be a financial challenge. The campus has been fundraising aggressively. They will have the highest rated building and capital expenditures in Berkeley's history. The State provides little if any funding for capital construction projects.

The Chancellor was asked about the oak grove; creating a new position, a director for sustainability; redistributing resources to schools that had less; childcare and maternity leave; improving teaching; the overhead rate that came into the University; interdisciplinary research; research to be done with the British Petroleum deal.

Remarks from the GAG President

There was an opening for a grad on the ASUC Elections Council and on the Judicial Council. The GA was redoing its By-laws for next year. The GA will write a letter to the search committee for the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion indicating the qualifications and experiences they'd like to see. GA elections will probably happen in May.

Approval Of Funding Allocations

Semester limits were not taken into account on the spreadsheet from the Funding Committee, and the Committee sought permission to alter the allocations in no other way except to follow the semester limit. It was just a mistake when inputting figures into the spreadsheet. E-mails about the correct awards will be sent to groups. With no objection, the allocation recommendations for Grad Events Round 6 and Grants Round 4 passed with no objection, with the amounts to be corrected.

Of the money allocated, approximately half was spent, so Delegates were encouraged to tell their groups to spend the money they were allocated.

Presentations on Possible Student Fee Referenda

The Green Initiative Fund would raise student fees, to fund sustainable projects on campus. Fees would be increased \$5, raising \$200,000 a year. These fees have been instituted at other schools. An oversight committee would determine allocations. The fee would be for ten years.

The Student Quality of Life Referendum would be a \$12 student fee to support the Cal Marching Band, the UC Jazz and Chorale Ensembles, at about \$150,000; ASUC SUPERB, at about \$125,000; and grad groups at about \$120,000.

On the Referendum on Lower Sproul redevelopment, if students didn't do something about Eshleman, the Chancellor would use student fees to tear it down and rebuild it. The fee would initially be \$9, graduated

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

up, to go towards planning and for a principle gift officer to do fundraising. If the campus didn't proceed properly, the students could vote to end the fee. The fee would probably continue for four years.

Neither the GA nor the ASUC could endorse or support any of these referenda.

British Petroleum Resolution

The Resolution dealt with serious concerns about the proposed British Petroleum research proposal.

A motion to table discussion on the Resolution passed with no objection. An online forum would be created to debate this.

Ms. Jones was recognized for serving the GA as Departmental Liaison. Ms. Franklin was recognize for her work on the Funding Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 7:39 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.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Daniels said everybody should have a copy of the agenda, as well as a feedback form and the Resolution they'd discuss that evening. A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daniels said they had a lot of announcements. First, the Women of Color Conference, the GA's major Conference of the year, will be held on Saturday, from 9:00 to 4:00, in the MLK Student Union. It's for women of color, women, men, and allies of women of color. It was a great Conference and he would encourage grads to attend. Also, last semester an ASUC Senate/GA Delegate mixer was held, and while the turnout was a little low, it was a lot of fun. Another mixer will be held on Tuesday, March 20.

People could get to mingle with undergraduates in a non-classroom setting and he would encourage people to attend, and grads were encouraged to attend. The following Tuesday, March 20, the GA will have

Announcements (cont'd)

- 4 -

an open house. It should be fun. It will be like last semester, with some sort of entertainment and music. It will be a chance for people to get to know each other. And there will be delicious food, as always.

Mr. Daniels said that some of them might have heard about the Big Ideas Contest going on. It occurred last year and one of the GA's own, Gavi Begtrup, actually won a contest. There will be a discussion about this contest on Thursday, March 15 from 6:00 to 8:00. If people care about getting more information, they could go to contest.berkeley.edu. There were a variety of prizes, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place. He believed that last year, all grad students won it. It was pretty exciting, and he would encourage people to check it out.

Juan Ito introduced himself and said he sat on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee for LGBT transgender, bisexual issues on campus. This was a Standing Committee that met on a monthly basis. He was present to encourage any of them, if they had any issues in this arena, to please relay them to the Committee. He'd send them to the Committee and pass them on to Chancellor Birgeneau. To get in contact with him, he said his e-mail was juanito.oso@hotmail.com. Ms. Ahrendt asked if that was the best way to get issues to him. Mr. Ito said they just started, so he had to figure out what kinds of communication mechanisms would work best. If there were issues the GA wanted to bring up, they could work on those. He would be in contact with Mr. Daniels. Also, they encourage people in the future, if they were interested in being the grad rep on this Committee, to please keep that in mind, and they could work on that in the future.

Ms. Martin-Anderson introduced herself and said she was a Public Policy graduate student and was also the Chair of the Parent's Advisory Council, which was like the PTA of the UC Berkeley childcare system, but a little more policy wonkish. She was also a parent of two. Basically, the State was taking away subsidized childcare for graduate students, cutting students off at 24 units after the completion of a Bachelors degree. That was a year. She was in a two-year program, so that was only half of her program. And other programs were usually longer than that. So this was a huge issue. The State was did this through the regulatory process, through an amendment, and the flier had the contact information for people in charge who really needed to hear students' voices. This was not an intended consequence of the amendment, which was to push people off the welfare rolls. But it was affected higher education greatly, and people were really fearful. She couldn't be more dramatic about this, and it will ruin people's lives. She's a GSR and a reader and she still didn't make enough to pay for childcare. If it didn't continue to be subsidized, her kids wouldn't be able to go to childcare and she wouldn't be able to continue in school. She would ask Delegates to please take five minutes to shoot off a letter. She had a draft e-mail they could use that she'd give to Mr. Daniels. Anything they could do to help would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Begtrup asked if her contact information was included. Ms. Martin-Anderson said it was. The Parent's Advisory Council was organizing a group to have an open hearing where they'd bring their children. They'd fill the public hearing with loud kids, saying this was what happens when their childcare was taken away. Hopefully, things will work out. She wanted to thank them.

Ms. Freedman asked about the current status of childcare and how much the subsidy was. Ms. Martin-Anderson said it was a sliding scale, and basically as long as one was in school, they had access to it if they qualified. But income levels were just increased, so people could make up to \$4,000 a month and

still be partially subsidized. They all know that an academic appointment doesn't pay that much, so they all qualify, and the majority of students with kids in childcare qualified. But they would no longer qualify after 24 units.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

Mr. Daniels said another notice was distributed, about the Faculty Mentoring Awards the GA has put on for the past four years, he believed. Ms. Cementwala said the Faculty Mentorship Awards recognize distinguished faculty who go above and beyond the call of duty for a variety of things they do for students, as their formal or informal mentors or advisors. They gave out three awards last year. The prize was a plaque and money. They'll do something a little bit differently, in that all who make a nomination will go into a pool and at least two, and potentially three people, will win some sort of prize, maybe cash or a pass to one of Berkeley's fine dining establishments. That was incentive to get the word out to their departments to nominate faculty. The only faculty not eligible to win were the winners of 2005-6. They'll be posted on the Web site, and hopefully, some of them will be part of the selection committee. If Delegates would like to be a part of this process, they should attend the next Academic Affairs Committee meeting. They could send her an e-mail. A speaker said there were more details in the March e-Grad.

Mr. Daniels said they're working on this with the Graduate Division and since they'll put together a joint awards ceremony, it should be a fairly big event.

Mr. Voitek asked about the concern that giving prizes to nominators was biased. Ms. Cementwala said it wasn't, because the applications were long, and people wouldn't want to go through the process unless they cared about the faculty member. They'd have to submit between two and eight letters of recommendation, each about 1,000 words long. So the whole process would take some effort. What they really wanted to do was to help recognize faculty who had excellent best practices, and who encourage a practice of collegiality and mentorship on the campus. By ratcheting up encouragement for people to fill out the application, it would give a little boost to make nominations. Most likely, it wouldn't make a difference, but if it did, that was great. She didn't see a problem with incentivizing it a little.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if there were nomination forms. Ms. Cementwala said it was posted on the GA Web site. For the first time they're doing electronic nominations. The Web site should have a downloadable Microsoft Word application.

A Delegate said the application called for summations, and joint summations could be done as well. But the application also called for between two and eight letters. She asked if they should submit additional recommendation letters. Ms. Cementwala said a lot of people send 10 to 20 different letters from students saying the same thing. Some know each other and some don't. For the process, they want between two and eight letters; and each letter could have up to three people join the letter. A joint letter with, say three colleagues writing about the same faculty, would count as one letter, if it's one piece of paper with 1,000 words or less. If it's two different pieces of paper with two different sets of comments, with, 2,000 words, then that would be two letters. They didn't want 15 people saying the same things about faculty members, but wanted at least two people attesting to how great the faculty member was. So they could have up to three people contribute to one letter and up to three signatures on one letter. But the caveat was that all three nominees had to put work into the letters.

Ms. Ahrendt said the application called for a list of graduate student mentored by nominees over the past five years. She asked how complete that list needed to be. Ms. Cementwala said it was to the best of

their ability. This was the honor system, and they hope people do the most thorough job possible. But if people have left, or contact has been lost, they should do their best.

Mr. Daniels said the Graduate Assembly, was co-sponsoring a Conference, "Changing the Culture of the Academy," also sponsored by the Chancellor, the Office of the President, by a lot of different people. It

Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

will be March 22. The schedule could be seen at the Web site. Registration was required. He didn't believe it cost anything for Berkeley students. Lastly, John Edwards was coming to campus on Sunday, at the YWCA on Bancroft, and a sheet with more information was distributed.

Ms. Cementwala said she wanted to introduce the new Campus Committee Liaison/Chief-of-Staff in Academic Affairs, Yenhoa Ching. Every Delegate who didn't have a committee assignment should talk to Ms. Ching. Ms. Ching said she was new to the GA and to the position. As she's trained, it would be nice to get to know some of them. She was a first-year doctoral student in the Education Department.

Mr. Begtrup introduced himself and said he was the External Affairs Vice President. That weekend they sent people to the UC Student Association Board meeting, the overall student organization the GA was a member of. The UCSA had a Student Lobby Conference in Sacramento and the GA sent people to Sacramento for a weekend-long conference to learn about the issues affecting students, how Sacramento worked and the UC System worked, and then on Monday, they lobbied legislators. He believed the GA sent nine people, which roughly was proportionately represented them out of the entire UC System, so it was successful. He wanted to thank the people who actually went, most of who were in the room.

Mr. Begtrup said there were upcoming events in External Affairs that any Delegate could get involved with. If they would like to go to Sacramento to tell legislators how they feel about the education system and about fees going up, Cal Lobby Day was being held, and Berkeley was sending people to Sacramento. The undergrads were setting this up, and the GA will work with them. In order to prepare people, there will be short workshops to explain the system to people. They'll take buses up, or people could drive up separately. They'll be in Sacramento for the day, March 15. If people had an interest, they could send him an e-mail, cod@ga.berkeley.edu.

Mr. Begtrup said the UC Regents meet every other month to discuss everything regarding the UC System. The External Affairs office will send people down to the meeting, to be held March 13-15 at UCLA. It's in the middle of the week. But if people would like to go down, they should let him know. If they want, they could write a letter, and share a personal story about how fees affected them, or just see how things worked. Meetings will also be held in the future. Two things happen at Regents meetings to allow people to have their voices heard. One section of the agenda was for public comment, where anybody could get a microphone and for two minutes tell the Regents their story about how Regents' actions affected them. That could concern things like things. The other way was to "white lining," and hang out and wait for when the Regents to get coffee and harass them. That's actually how it worked. If people were interested, they should send an e-mail.

Ms. Gomez asked if he was working with the person who spoke earlier about subsidized childcare. Mr. Begtrup said he wasn't, but he was very interested in talking with her. Ms. Gomez asked if that was something they could talk about during Cal Lobby Day. Mr. Begtrup said this hasn't come up before and this was the first he's heard of this issue.

A Delegate said there was a good conference the WTO and international trade law on Friday at Boalt, in Booth Auditorium.

PRESENTATION BY CHANCELLOR BIRGENEAU

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau

- 7 -

Mr. Daniels said it was his pleasure to introduce their distinguished Chancellor, present that evening as their guest speaker. He would like to welcome Chancellor Birgeneau. (Applause)

Chancellor Birgeneau said that Mr. Daniels asked him to say a few things, after which he'd be happy to answer a few questions. Mr. Daniels earlier talked briefly about the Energy Biosciences Institute, which was an unparalleled opportunity for Berkeley to be a world leader in energy research, an opportunity that came once in a generation. It was an extraordinarily educational opportunity, and a significant fraction of the funds will be used to support new, young faculty and graduate students. Specifically, Berkeley will be training the next generation in the field of energy self-sufficiency, whether that was biofuels or, as was attached to the EBI, solar energy research, nanoscience etc., as well as further development in the field of synthetic biology.

In addition, Chancellor Birgeneau said that one aspect that he made very clear to their partners from the beginning was that graduate student work would be fully protected. So students will be guaranteed that they will be supported from the beginning to the end. And if undirected research was being done, which would be the case for most research, the intellectual property would belong to the University, not to the Department of Energy, or to the Laboratory, or to British Petroleum, or to other partners that may come in. People were lining up because they saw that this was such an extraordinary opportunity for solving what was probably the single most important social problem that their planet faced, which was global climate change; and economically, for California and the US, for energy self-sufficiency. So he was very excited about this.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he would talk about a couple of other subjects. First of all, he didn't have to tell anybody in the room about the importance of graduate student support and the importance graduate students play in the life of the University. As some of them knew, he has, for his entire faculty career, depended upon having really smart graduate students who actually did the research. So he was particularly pleased with and appreciative of graduate students. Of course, they get rewards. Former graduate students of his were now professors at Harvard, MIT, Brown, Penn, Cornell, Stony Brook, John Hopkins, Rutgers, UC Santa Barbara, and Cambridge. Graduate student support will be a very high priority for the campaign. He thought some of them already knew about an initiative for the faculty called the "Named Fund Initiative," which has so far been very successful, with 80 faculty and administrators, BART including the Chancellor, giving funds which were then matched by the graduate school. The endowment for the Named Fund, the core endowment, was \$20,000, which generated \$1,000. That might not seem like a lot, but if it was added on to what people get, it could be very important. And as soon as they get some details straightened out, they'll make an announcement that some of the Chancellor's funds, which were donated to the Chancellor to be used at his discretion, will be redirected in order to match Named Funds up to the level of \$250,000. It was decided on Wednesday that donations to graduate student support by any members of their community, anybody who wanted to step up and make a donation, would be matched on the spot. It's only for members of their community, students, faculty, and staff, and they'll

have it in place for five years, unless his bank of funds got exhausted, at which time they'd try to refill the fund.

The Named Fund Initiative had a cap of \$10,000. They thought it actually would be possible to build up a really significant pool of funds. Unfortunately, the resources available to him were not such that he could match outside donations, but they could match all donations by the community. This will also apply to need-based scholarships for undergraduates. As many grads were merit-based scholarships, he thought that money should go to poor people, and he didn't believe in giving children of the Rockefeller

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 8 -

family huge amounts of money, no matter how smart they were. If the campus had limited resources, they should be directed towards those who genuinely need the money in order to come to Berkeley and live a dignified life. So they will only match for undergraduates those donations that were explicitly directed towards needs-based students, i.e., students from financially challenged backgrounds. They decided not to put in such a restriction for graduate students, but he was assuming all graduate students were financial challenged. In any case, it was impossible to monitor.

Chancellor Birgeneau said the campus was continuing with a variety of diversity initiatives. This year's Diversity Forum will be held on March 22 and was focused around graduate students. The theme was, "Challenging the Culture of the Academy Toward a More Inclusive Practice." There was a graduate seminar on that subject that he actually participated in. Students leaving Berkeley were very engaged and very engaging. He's participated in a lot of seminars, usually with freshmen, but sometimes with graduate students, and this was one of the most interesting seminars he's participated in. The graduate student keynote speaker will be Maria Ledesma, who was an undergraduate at Cal and was UC Student Regent. She's a doctoral candidate in Education at UCLA. And she may well come to Berkeley as a post-doctoral fellow to work with them on diversity initiatives. She has played a really important role in focusing the Regents' attention on diversity issues and has been an extraordinarily successful Student Regent in terms of proving that students really can matter, and be listened to. And she's done it by being very intelligent and very persuasive in the way she made her arguments.

Chancellor Birgeneau said the panel discussions during the forum will include many graduate students in discussions with faculty from across the UC System. This will be a UC-wide forum, and he would encourage everyone to attend. He thought it will be an exciting event that may actually really define how they go forward.

Chancellor Birgeneau said the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion search was moving forward. Maxine McKinney was the graduate student representative on the committee, and they were now compiling a list of candidates. They had some really extraordinary people, from both inside and outside of Berkeley, who have expressed interest in taking on this challenge. The campus was very optimistic that they will have in place a person who will give them the kind of cohesion and holistic approach that was needed if they were really going to see progress in terms of equity and inclusion on the campus as a whole.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that some of them have heard him speak about this before, and he was a very strong believer that one only made progress by drafting these kinds of inclusion issues holistically, i.e., by looking at issues for undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and for staff, and looking at them in a comprehensive way. That will be the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion.

On the research front, there was something he would presume some of them would end up being involved in. The campus believed that in addition to all the different kinds of expertise they have on campus in scholarship among their faculty and graduate students, as the flagship University in the State of California, which was in the most multicultural and, in many different ways, the most diverse state in the Union, that they should treat the understanding of multicultural societies as a subject of academic research, on an equal standing with other fields, whether in his field of quantum materials and physics, or any other field. So they created the Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative (DRI), and there's been an extraordinary amount of interest in it. They've received proposals from 20 different research and educational programs connected with multiculturalism and they winnowed those down to eight. And then they had an external

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 9 -

panel of people who were leaders in the country to give the campus advice, and they ended up narrowing it down to three initiatives. One initiative dealt with diversity and health disparities, and will try to understand how a society like California could address disparities in health care and look at health statistics. There were shocking differences between different ethnic groups in the State of California. Another Diversity Research Initiative was diversity in educational policy; and the third was diversity in democracy, and how different communities in the State got to participate in the democratic process, and what forces militated against certain groups expressing their democratic views in a way that they go at it.

There was also diversity on the organization of graduate students. As they knew, Dean Mary Ann Mason, after seven years, announced she wanted to step down and was leaving the Graduate Division. So a new search has been launched, chaired by Provost George Breslauer. It included Ms. Cementwala. Nominations were just closed recently, and there was no doubt that the Provost will find a dean who was just as committed as Dean Mason.

Chancellor Birgeneau said some issues have been raised. One issue was the new fee for mental health. Mr. Daniels would like him to make a stronger statement than he was going to make, but Chancellor Birgeneau said they could put it in writing for him to sign. He's had the discussion with Rory Hume and he basically, at a certain level, delivered Mr. Daniels' message. One element was that they must have flexibility for different campuses, because different campuses were in different situations in terms of their fees. Chancellor Birgeneau said he'd be surprised if many grads disagreed Mr. Daniels' argument, which was that they already have a health fee at Berkeley. Part of it went to mental health, and Berkeley should have some flexibility in how they credit that. The second thing that Chancellor Birgeneau said he'd like to see, which he'd understand if grads disagreed with, was the idea that the campus should implement the mental health fee progressively over the next several years instead of doing it in one, huge jump, all at once. One of Mr. Daniels' worries, that probably all grads shared, was that if they had a huge jump in their fees in one year, then students would never vote for any other fee. And there were other, important things they want to do. Furthermore, instead of putting in a huge chunk at once, people would spend the money no matter what. But if it went up progressively over a two or three-year time period, they could see how it progressed and to what extent student needs in the mental health area were being met. Chancellor Birgeneau said that was basically where he left it. He thought they would be able to converge on that after he heard back from Rory Hume, the Provost of the system, about what actually will happen. But he certainly did agree, and there was no argument, that they couldn't apply exactly the same rules to every campus. So he thought they will end up with Mr. Daniels' proposal and will be flexible.

Regarding Lower Sproul, Chancellor Birgeneau said that graduate students made a huge investment in it, and he was excited about it as grads were. He thought they could do great things for the graduate student body. So the Administration was anxious to work with students on this. Every person understood that

that this will be a financial challenge, but they won't know what that challenge will be until they have the dollars. So it was a chicken-and-egg situation. So they need to invest a little money to get to the point of having a design of what Lower Sproul would look like, including a significant graduate presence. And at that stage, they'd work on strategy for funding.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought that all of them knew that the campus was in a five-phase campaign in which they've been fundraising pretty aggressively, and very successfully, he thought, at least until he saw Stanford's numbers for that year. But relative to almost all other institutions, Cal has actually been quite successful in fundraising, with a lot of it being raised for capital projects of various sorts they're actually doing at Berkeley at the present time. This would be projected over the next several years, and

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 10 -

they'd have the highest rated building and capital expenditures in Berkeley's history. People could just walk around and see all the projects going on, and all the ones that were planned. Unfortunately, they were now in a situation where the State provides very little funding, if any, for any of the campus' capital construction projects. The State was providing nothing for the Stadium or for the Health Science Building, which will cost about \$300 million. They're providing \$60 million, so the campus had to raise the remainder privately. So the campus was in a total different kind of situation than the University has ever been in, and it was different than what most public universities were in at most other states. It made constructing new buildings particularly challenging.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that was all he had to report to report. Mr. Daniels called for any questions.

A Delegate said she was from the Center for the Study of Law and Society, directly across from the oak grove. She used to study there, but now couldn't any more because she was told to leave. She was curious what was happening with the injunction against development and whether the Chancellor was involved in how the University was responding to the City. Chancellor Birgeneau said he certainly was involved. This was a very important project for the safety of their students, as he was sure they understood. The campus gave a very high priority to getting their student athletes out of the Stadium and into a safe setting. That was a lot of work, and the optimal design was the one people have seen. So in the interest of protecting their students, that unfortunately required cutting down a few trees. Just to normalize this, by the way, in order to protect the residents in the hills, altogether 20,000 eucalyptus trees were being cut down because of fire danger. And the campus received letters every day urging them to cut down trees. So one needed to have a perspective on this.

Ms. Jones said she's been working with students on campus on sustainability issues and there's been talk with various administrators about administrative positions, such as a director to work on environmental sustainability. She asked if the Chancellor was in support of a position like that and what his thinking was. Chancellor Birgeneau said that obviously, with the huge investment they're making in energy self-sufficiency, it was clear he was a firm believer in holistic approaches. So obviously, in addition to creating new, renewable, sources of energy, they also need to use less energy progressively. So he was a very strong supporter of sustainability, and in his home they use compact fluorescent bulbs and not incandescent bulbs, etc. He also funded student projects every year for sustainability, which was actually the most cost-effective money he ever spends. With small amounts of money, students come up with incredibly creative projects. He actually didn't know the details of that sustainability position or how it was supposed to be paid for. Ms. Jones asked if that was a position he supported. Chancellor Birgeneau said that if they actually require a new person, a whole new position, then certainly, he would support it.

Ms. LePak, School of Social Welfare, said that going back to the issue of the oak trees, she was Native American and would like to advocate for other Native people. She knew some Ohlone people were upset because apparently there were some remains in the area of the oaks. Chancellor Birgeneau said that turned out to be a false rumor. It just wasn't true. There was one skull found, and actually not where the oaks grew, but at a landfill. And nearby the skull were some Mexican coins. So it was almost certainly a Mexican person. Chancellor Birgeneau said he also had Native Canadian roots, so he paid special attention to Native American issues as well.

A Delegate said she was a doctoral student in Education and had a comment about the Diversity Research Initiatives. Coming from a School that had severe issues in practices surrounding diversity in hiring, she understood how DRIs were one of the first steps in getting the campus and graduate school climates to

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 11 -

head toward a direction that was more in line with the ideology and the discussions of diversity on campus. But at the same time, there was an extreme urgency for a more structural analysis of the hiring practices at the core of different schools to see if they really were creating more of an institutional environment to create a critical mass of people who were raising discussions of diversity, and in that sense, also looking at how they could restructure and redistribute resources among the different schools. The School of Education was one of the poorest schools. It wasn't one of the pretty buildings. She thought the BDR was a good way to accomplish that at a certain level, but felt that issues of diversity were much deeper than that.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he agreed with her completely. He wasn't sure about redistributing resources, and wasn't committed to that since people who would lose resources would yell at him, and there was only a certain amount of resources. If they increase resources in one area, they had to take it away from another. But he agreed with everything she said up to that point. His hope was that the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion will play a leadership role and take very hard looks at hiring practices, and where it has failed to produce, at the minimum, a diverse set of candidates when an opening exists. Chancellor Birgeneau said he was the driving force behind creating this position and saw it as one mechanism to address these kinds of issues. Everybody loved diversity and it was so politically correct, until it started to impact people individually. The most far-left person could become remarkably conservative. So it's an incredible barrier and difficult to get there. Everybody said the right words, but actually getting there was the challenge. The BDRI was one of the new interdisciplinary research ventures, along with nanoscience and now, energy self-sufficiency.

Ms. Cementwala said this was a comment and a preview of a forthcoming request. On the GA's Action Agenda last semester, student families was at the top of their list. They came last semester with two requests. The first, which Delegates knew about, concerned the Smyth-Fernwald housing facility, one of the few facilities that housed student families. Residents were assessed a parking fee that started out at \$92 per month for new residents, and then went down to \$15 a month for all residents. And that was in addition to the rent. Many graduate students with families were affected, and she wanted to thank him for his efforts in eliminating that fee. She thought the GA was extremely grateful. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would like to thank her. He didn't want to generalize and he had different reasons why he decided to deal with that. It didn't mean every time he would do something they like when they come to him. But in this case, when he looked into it, he decided it was really the right thing to do.

Ms. Cementwala said the second issue was that of maternity leave for graduate student researchers, instructors, and those on fellowships. They really appreciated his efforts in finally getting together a

cohesive maternity policy that made sense. For the first time, there will be six weeks of maternity leave for GSIs, GSRs, and those on fellowship. They really wanted to thank him for that and for his attention to graduate students and their families. Chancellor Birgeneau said that costs money, of course, and the money they spend on that was not available for other things. It was very important to understand that they had a fixed budget. So for everything they do, that meant there was something else they weren't doing. And they try to be as fair as possible. And he was going to come to how graduate students behave on student fees, and would be watching them.

Ms. Cementwala said she would give a quick preview of a forthcoming request, which she was sure the GA would talk more about. They hope the Chancellor will be as generous and pay as much attention to summer childcare issues for graduate students as he has on the other two issues. Chancellor Birgeneau said that was a different kind of challenge. He had to make a comment on student fees, which he's made

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 12 -

the undergraduates. They got really mad at him, as might the GA. And Mr. Daniels already knew this. Chancellor Birgeneau said that one concern he had at Berkeley was something he frankly didn't agree with in terms of how they've handled it. He actually agreed that they need to increase the salaries of their lowest paid workers, who were overwhelmingly underrepresented minority people. And in the contract that was negotiated with the Union, salary increases were currently fixed, equal to increased funding that comes from the government in the State compact. So the only source of funds for the campus to start paying their lowest paid workers fairer wages was student fee increases. People could advocate against student fee increases, but they had to know that they were advocating in favor of paying their custodians and food service workers minimal wages. And that was just the fact. People were free to do what they wanted, but they had to understand how the budget worked and the way the two were connected.

Mr. Rayon, Mechanical Engineering, and said he would like the Chancellor to address the role of teaching in the University's mission. Everyone knew that Berkeley had world-class research, and he was wondering what could be done to incentivize professors to improve their teaching. Chancellor Birgeneau said they could appeal to professors' pride. All tenured professors had huge egos. No one ever believed it, but in the promotion process, and the process to increase salaries, teaching performance actually played an important role. When he gets cases that actually include students' personal comments, he often reads them. When he first came to Berkeley, by the time a salary increase or promotion got kicked up to the Chancellor's level, for him to sign off, he'd wonder why it was so thick. And the majority of the packet was actually teaching evaluations. So they do take teaching seriously there.

Mr. Daniels said they would take three more questions.

Mr. Begtrup said he wanted to follow-up on what the Chancellor said about fees. Something that's come to light a few times was that the UCSA's Charter contained a policy of being against all fee increases of any kind. He didn't think that was reasonable and or that it made any sense, because it actually weakened their bargaining point. It was something that's been coming up and that they're starting to discuss. Next month he'll possibly bring up a change to the Charter to. So instead of being against all fees, they'd be against fee increases that were unreasonable, unpredictable, and those that were not matched with increased services. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would back him 100% on that. He thought fee increases should be reasonable.

Mr. Inkabi, Civil Engineering, said he had two questions. He asked what the overhead rate was on BP money that came into the University for turning on the lights, as such. His second question dealt with

interdisciplinary research. A number of universities have responded to the requests of funding agencies to do innovative work that required multiple disciplines working together. He asked what the Chancellor was doing to help facilitate that on the Berkeley campus, where traditionally, research has been discipline-specific. Chancellor Birgeneau said both of those were excellent questions. First of all, the federal government's overhead rate was too low. The campus didn't get enough money from the federal government to cover their real costs. One advantage he had in coming there from MIT, which got more money from the government to support its structure, as a key to negotiating with the government. So he understood that they were not getting, in his opinion, nor were other public universities, a fair shake. The government treated private universities better than public universities. Ironically, in overhead recovery, private schools were more covered than Berkeley was. That was actually true. That rate for Berkeley was 55%, and for all of the research that was funded, by BP or anybody else. As for the question on interdisciplinary search, they had a huge number of research initiatives at Berkeley. The one he was probably most proud of, because he put in the money, was the Center for Economic Development. This was a huge

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 13 -

initiative, and they now have an undergraduate minor. So in two years, they've gone from getting funding research to having a full minor in Poverty in Third World Countries. If they look at interdisciplinary studies, obviously that would be connected with energy self-sufficiency, and they now have a major initiative with British Petroleum. Actually, Chancellor Birgeneau said he should have mentioned that BP, over the next ten years, was providing \$500 million. The aim of the campus, what they hoped, was to also have at least that amount as well, aiming for \$1 billion, a lot of which will be spent on graduate students. And that spanned all the way from policy, economic policy, to basic molecular biology on plants.

Another initiative that started when he got there, that he was actively involved in, was stem cell research. People may not realize it, but at Berkeley they not only have great developmental biologists and chemists, like Carolyn Bertozzi, but they play a leading role in ethical issues in embryonic stem cell research, which was more complicated. People had to recognize that, and the role of women, etc. So a couple of the leaders of that were at Berkeley as well. So these were model ID programs, and they actually had a lot of them.

Mr. Perry, Integrative Biology, said he was going to submit a Resolution later that evening addressing British Petroleum issues and initiatives. The Chancellor mentioned earlier that a lot of the money, or all of it, would be for undirected research. Chancellor Birgeneau said a significant percentage of it would be. All the research done by their faculty will be undirected. No research funded by anybody was "undirected," and had to be moving towards meaningful strategies that would work to achieve energy self-sufficiency and solve global problems. The research will not be supported if there were just whimsical ideas.

Mr. Perry said the concern that they'll address later were things like who would decide what research was done. Chancellor Birgeneau said the faculty will decide what research they'll do. That's how federal funding worked as well. A faculty member decides whether or not they want to do research and sees whether or not an agency will support it. And he'd add a little to this. He was outraged over the Regents' suggestion that they would disallow anybody at Berkeley from taking money, because that was a fundamental right at the University, to protect the right of students and faculty to pursue research that they thought was important and would help the country. Just because some person, for their own reasons or for political reasons, didn't like the source of money, in the matter of academic freedom, in the same way, they had no right to do that. He thought that would be an outrage, actually. He's probably been pretty clear on that.

Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank Chancellor Birgeneau for attending. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said they'd return to their agenda. He wanted to thank Delegates for their questions. They would probably have additional questions, and if they did, people meet with the Chancellor once a month, so if they had a question, Mr. Daniels said they could shoot him an e-mail and he'd bring up whatever issue they'd like.

Remarks from the GAG President

Mr. Daniels said he would give himself five minutes for remarks, since they were already behind on their meeting schedule. First, the feedback forms were really important for the GA. Also, there will be fee referenda on the ballot in the upcoming ASUC election, and if the GA didn't have any graduate students

Remarks from the GA President (cont'd)

- 14 -

on the Elections Council to make sure that the referenda were advertised in graduate student areas, then their voices and votes would not be heard. So they really need someone to sign up for this. He didn't want to lie and say it would take no time commitment, but it wouldn't be something that took over their life. If they had a few hours a week, he would ask them to please check the box. They wouldn't be committing themselves to anything and would just be saying they were interested in working on it. It was really important, because the fee referenda, as they'll find out later that evening, really affected a lot of graduate students. Unfortunately, Carmel Levitan a graduate student who was a Judicial Council member, who had one seat out of three that grads held of the nine members, for various reasons had to step down from her post. So there was one position open for a graduate student. He'd send this notice out to the graduate student body, but he wanted to let the Delegates know that this was available. There's a confirmation process that went through the ASUC Senate, who weren't too harsh on grads. So if people were interested, they should check that on the feedback form.

Again, Mr. Daniels said that people heard Mr. Begtrup talk about Cal Lobby Day. If people would like to join, it's a free bus trip to Sacramento just for the day. People think that Sacramento and Washington, D.C. were so removed, but they'll meet face to face with legislators, or their top staff, and students can be influential if enough of them go. So he would really encourage them to, again, check yes on that box.

Since it was March already, Mr. Daniels said they were starting to look towards next year. That will involve a lot of different things, one of which was recruitment for various positions at the GA. If people were interested in getting more involved, there were many, many levels of involvement. Some were paid and some weren't, and some would take over their life and some wouldn't. But either way, they'd work with a good group of people. They have a good time and they have short meetings that end on time, so they wouldn't make their lives any more hectic than they had to. If people were interested, there will be some information sessions, and he would ask people to please sign up.

Mr. Daniels said they're redoing their By-laws for next year. They've heard that discussed at various points online, and if people would care to read through 32 pages of notes, that was fine. If not, that was fine. If Delegates would like some concrete changes to them, he would ask them to please write them down. It could be something that has been discussed at a meeting or something they haven't discussed. Any suggestions would be much appreciated.

Lastly, Mr. Daniels said the Chancellor mentioned the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion. The GA will write a letter to the search committee indicating the kinds of qualifications and experiences they would like this person to have. It was really important that they get the perspective of all graduate students on this issue. As representatives of their departments, he would ask Delegates to please fill out whatever sort of information they would like the GA to pass along to the search committee, so students' voices were heard. Lastly, Mr. Daniels asked people to please make sure they circled on the feedback form how they liked the food, so people knew. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked about the elections. Mr. Daniels said the elections in April will have referenda on the ballot and candidates running for positions in the ASUC, such as for Senators. Elections in the GA will probably happen at the May meeting. Last year it was April, but this year, because of ballot changes, they were forced back to May.

APPROVAL OF FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

Approval of Funding Allocations

- 15 -

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Ms. Franklin said the first thing she would like to do was to make a request. One step in the process was not done that past time. What they do is assign how much money groups were asking for they were actually eligible to receive. If a group made a request for a Diversity Grant and the Funding Committee didn't think the program was actually diversity, they'd see how much money could be given if the Funding Committee had all the money in the world. But they had to also make sure no group went over the semester limit. Each group got no more than \$800 per semester. For Grad Events, that was standard. They just noticed that some of the semester limits were not taken into account on the spreadsheet. For instance, at least one group was eligible for around \$30, but according to the spreadsheet, got \$300. That was a problem. So if possible, they'd like to ask that evening for the GA to approve these allocations and essentially give the Funding Committee permission to alter the allocations in no other way except to follow the semester limit. There were mistakes because groups will be coming in with less than was indicated on the spreadsheet. She asked if that was possible.

Ms. Ahrendt said that sounded good. She asked about the EIGP. Ms. Franklin said that was the Educational Improvement Grants Project. Ms. Ahrendt said she knew the Funding Committee had various standards, but there were a number of groups that seemed to her to support diversity or education that were not funded at all, and the spreadsheet showed nothing more than a comment saying the group wasn't a diversity project, or that they should seek a Campus Diversity Grant. She asked how that was done. Ms. Franklin said they don't say that since a group was doing education, they could obviously get EIGP funding. Rather, the Funding Committee had to look at individual projects and ask if the project would do what the EIGP grant asked to be done. If a group had an issue with that, they could send an e-mail to the Funding Committee Chair at the GA. If people had questions about this, they could e-mail her or talk to her after the meeting.

Mr. Daal asked why the Committee overlooked the funding limits. Ms. Franklin said it was just a mistake. It seemed some of it just wasn't entered into the spreadsheet properly. It was just a mistake of entering into the spreadsheet.

A Delegate asked if the groups were e-mailed out the correct amounts. Ms. Franklin said e-mails would not be sent until the GA approved the funding allocations, because theoretically, the GA could take everything the Funding Committee has done and toss it. Ms. Hsueh said that any adjustment they make will

be done on Friday morning and e-mail will be sent out with the correct awards, which will also be posted at the GA Web site on Monday. They'll go through all the corrections and people would see the corrections by Monday.

Ms. Franklin said she would like to make some other comments about applications.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the funding allocations recommended by the Funding Committee, but within the GA's funding cap, and to approve funding allocations in the document up to that limit. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS, UP TO THE LIMIT OF THE GA'S FUNDING CAP, GRAD EVENTS ROUND 6 AND GRANTS ROUND 4, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Ms. Franklin said she would ask people to not ask for more money than they're eligible for in the first place. Secondly, they've looked at the numbers recently, and of the money they allocate, approximately half of it got spent. So she would ask Delegates to please tell their groups to spend the money they were allocated. They should get receipts to the GA so the GA could give them the money. Members sit at

Approval of Funding Allocations (cont'd)

- 16 -

Funding Committee meetings for a number of hours each month to decide how much funding groups should get, and then no one spent it. So she would ask groups to spend the money they're allocated.

PRESENTATIONS ON POSSIBLE STUDENT FEE REFERENDA

Mr. Daniels said three fee referenda will potentially be on the ASUC ballot, and they have speakers from each one to talk to the GA. Each will have about ten minutes. This should not be a time to debate as much as to ask general informational questions. They'll have a longer time to debate in April. But right now, they were just disseminating information and asking for Delegates' general questions.

Mr. Daniels said the first referendum was The Green Initiative Fund. They'll hear from a proponent, and then have five minutes for questions.

Mr. Harley said he was the Chair of the GA Environmental Sustainability Committee, but was there that evening representing the TGIF Steering Committee. They were proposing to put The Green Initiative Fund on the April ASUC ballot. It would raise student fees, with the money gained to go towards funding sustainable types of projects on campus, to those that had the most impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving the campus' impact on the environment and on climate change.

Mr. Harley said that with him that evening were Joel Ledford, Rebecca Jones, and Jane Park, who were also there working on this, and were also part of the Steering Committee. The reason they felt it was necessary to put on this on the ballot was essentially for environmental sustainability, and the campus falling far short of its obligations, reputation, and desire to improve environmental sustainability. There was a sense of urgency about this, and they couldn't just sort of sit back and wait for the Administration to do something, because that could take an awfully long time. And it wasn't just that, but because Berkeley should be leaders of sustainability. A lot of people think Berkeley was a leader, and that wasn't the case. To give some examples, he was sure many of them have noticed that probably 90% of the buildings around campus don't have any can or bottle recycling. They purchase very little green power on campus,

and most of their buildings were old and inefficient in terms of energy use, heating, and water conservation. To put that in perspective, the campus actually used as much power in one year as did Cambodia, with 13 million people. But it wasn't just because their infrastructure was old and out of date, but if when there was any sort of green design of a new building, by the time the new building was actually built, almost 100% of the time those green designs were phased out. And that's essentially because there's just not enough funding on the campus. So by creating a student-controlled green fund, they'd be able to have more control over the direction of environmental sustainability on the campus and they wouldn't just have to sit back and wait for these things to happen.

Mr. Harley said they were proposing to raise \$200,000 a year, which would equate to about \$5 per person per semester, to come from student fees. By doing this, they would not only show the Administration that students were dedicated to sustainability, but it would give students a voice and power to choose the direction they head in. And it would ultimately frame this question so they're closer to achieving their goals.

To give some background, similar types of fees have been passed at about 20 different universities, including UC Santa Barbara and UC Santa Cruz. As an example of what UCSC did with this money last

Presentation on Possible Student Fee Referenda (cont'd)

- 17 -

year, they voted to essentially buy certificates of green power. So now they offset 100% of their energy use by buying green energy, and they are now the sixth largest buyer of green energy in the nation. And there were a lot of other ideas. At Berkeley they could put have can and bottle recycling in all buildings, buy more solar panels, get an electrical vehicle fleet, and have composting for dorms. The money could go to student internships, retrofits for lighting exchange programs, things like that. So the potential environmental and financial impact was huge on this campus.

Mr. Harley said he would like to point out that unlike other student fee increases, where the money sort of goes into a "black box" over which students have no control, this fee would be managed by a student-majority committee. The money would be housed in the ASUC Auxiliary, and it would be available for all students, student groups, staff, and faculty. The way it would work was that people would apply for funding and then the projects that were determined to have the most impact would be funded. He would note that if an administrative body on campus, such as Facilities Management, applied for funding to, e.g., retrofit a building, where financial savings would be accrued, the money granted would be a loan to the Administration which would then have to be paid back to the fund. So it wouldn't be as though they'd give money to the Administration from student fees, and that money would have to be paid back.

Mr. Harley said they've been working with UC Santa Barbara, which passed this last year, and they definitely needed grad student support. So he would ask them to please vote on this on April 8, when this comes up, and to vote yes on TGIF. Mr. Ledford asked people to spread the word and to please vote yes in April. He called for any questions.

Ms. Anderson said it was mentioned that loans could be made to the campus, and asked if there was anything in the fee to prevent students from paying things the University paid for. She asked if the campus could say that it had places to install recycling, but wouldn't pay for that because the students had this fund and would say the students could pay for it. Mr. Harley said the University would be obligated to meet certain criteria for what this fee would fund. The fee wouldn't fund things the University was mandated or obligated to fund. At the same time, preference for use of this fund would be decided by a stu-

dent-majority committee, which would decide where funding from this would go. He didn't see the University saying it wouldn't fund something because students could fund that.

Ms. Ahrendt said it was mentioned that this would be allocated by a governing body. She asked who would determine the members who would decide on allocations. Mr. Harley said By-laws have been written to manage the allocation of the entire fund. People have worked on this since the end of last summer. The committee was pretty diverse. There were currently seven people on it, four students and three administrators. The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability would appoint one student; the GA would appoint one student; the ASUC would appoint one student; those three students would appoint one student; there would be a staffmember; and the Academic Senate would appoint a faculty. Ms. Jones said that two staff would come from Facilities and Administration, units that had the most relation to this fund.

A Delegate asked if, essentially, this would be a student fund, with an oversight committee to be appointed by some administrators and some student bodies. Mr. Harley said that was correct.

Mr. Daniels asked if there was a sunset provision. Mr. Harley said there was. He believed it was proposed to be a ten-year fee, with inflation built in.

Presentation on Possible Student Fee Referenda (cont'd)

- 18 -

A Delegate asked if they had numbers on CALPIRG, which asked for \$5. He didn't know how that related to the school or how many people actually fund it. It seemed like the same amount of money. Mr. Harley said he didn't have the numbers on CALPIRG. Mr. Luther said it was \$6. But TGIF would deal specifically with the physical campus. CALPIRG didn't operate with just things on campus.

Mr. Daniels called for any other questions. He asked how the representatives could be reached if people had other questions. Mr. Harley said they could go to votetgif.com. There was more extensive source of information on the referendum, along with contact information.

Mr. Daniels said the next agenda item was the Student Quality of Life Referendum. Vishal Gupta, the Executive VP of the ASUC, was present to talk about this.

Mr. Gupta said he brought them pens for Bears Breaking Boundaries. It was unrelated to the fee referendum, but free pens were always good. People could apply for grants in this contest.

Mr. Gupta said that he, Mr. Daniels, and other Executives in the ASUC have been working on the Student Life Referendum, actually a few. To give some background, groups like the California Marching Band, the UC Chorale Ensemble, and the UC Jazz Ensemble, have come to the ASUC in the past to ask for more funding because these groups were required to provide certain services on campus. For example, the Marching Band was required to be at every home football game. But their members end up paying about \$400 to \$450 out of pocket every semester to be part of the Cal Band and to participate in everything the Band had to offer. This year was the first year that the Cal Band actually had the problem of potentially breaking tradition and not attending one of the away games to perform there. So the Band came to the ASUC and said it was running out of funding. This was a bigger issue than coming to the ASUC to get a few thousand dollars. It was about finding out if they could help students on the campus

who choose to participate in different activities other than the classroom and make those activities accessible and affordable.

Mr. Gupta said the proposal was very comprehensive. It would establish a \$12 student fee to support the Cal Marching Band, the UC Jazz and Chorale Ensembles, ASUC SUPERB, and graduate student organizations. There would be a 33% return to financial aid, per UC requirements. In its first year it will provide about \$150,000 to the first three groups and about \$250,000 to SUPERB. One unique thing about this was that SUPERB would become a self-sustained organization. SUPERB was the entertainment division of the ASUC that provided entertainment to about 22,000 students last year. Since a large majority of the campus got some kind of services from SUPERB, it only made sense for the campus itself to directly support it. The Referendum would also free up the \$125,000 the Senate funded to SUPERB in the spring budget, and that amount could go to other student organizations the Senate allocated. And that would be a big thing for a lot of organizations on this campus that were also faced with limited financial resources. Finally, graduate student groups would, in the first year of the Referendum, receive about \$120,000 as well.

Mr. Gupta said that with the support of the ASUC and the GA, they could potentially pass a fee that fully supported independent student musical activities on the campus and support more funding for GA and ASUC student organizations.

Mr. Gupta said people have been working on this for almost the entire academic year, and he'd like to commend Mr. Daniels' work on this, and he's done a lot that hasn't been seen.

Presentation on Possible Student Fee Referenda (cont'd)

- 19 -

Mr. Gupta said people were familiar with the Class Pass and the RSF Referenda from last year. They're raising student fees, which wasn't good, and they wanted to make sure their voluntary student fees were as low as possible. At the same time, they also want to scrutinize their student fees, and how they work, and hold people accountable. For example, the Department of Parking and Transportation held the Class Pass Fee, and there was currently consideration to potentially review some services that should have been offered, based on the Referendum, that were not being offered. The question was where the money students paid was going. So aside from student fees, there was also talk about how to make sure student fees stayed in the hands of students.

Ms. Ahrendt said Student Musical Activities were supposed to be supported by a fee that was passed many years ago, theoretically controlled by the same people as Cal Performances. She asked where that money was going, since it was a big fee that students were still paying. When people worked on the RSF, she recalled being at a presentation where the fees students paid were broken out, and there was a ridiculously high amount of money going towards this to supposedly support not only Cal Performances, but Student Musical Activities. She had a feeling Cal Performances was sucking that money up without returning it to students, which was why the fee was passed in the first place. She was wondering if this Referendum would not, in fact, double something that was already being paid. That was her one reservation to supporting this. Mr. Gupta said in all the research he's done, he could guarantee that there was no specific voluntary student fee that went to support student musical activities on the campus. If fees went to musical activities and Cal Performances, they would most likely be discretionary fees coming from the Chancellor and from the administrative budget. Ms. Ahrendt said she mentioned this proposed fee to a Music professor who was on the Academic Senate, and the professor asked her what happened to all the money musical activities was supposed to get from the same fund as Cal Performances. Mr. Gupta said they would look into it. The fee would supplement the funding the Cal Band already got from the University to continue its operations.

Ms. Allbright said Ms. Ahrendt might be taking about something that was in the Reg Fee, but that wasn't something students vote on and instead, was controlled by the campus. Mr. Daniels said they would find out. Mr. Gupta said the Cal Band did get funding, but it just wasn't enough.

Ms. Jones asked why graduate student groups would be funded along with the other groups, and if that was so the fee would go to all students. Mr. Gupta said Mr. Daniels advocated having a specific line item to support grad students, for a very legitimate reason. All students pay a fee every semester and graduate students retain their portion of the fees. So it made sense to have grad students fee go directly to the GA. When they think about how much was allocated to SUPERB, e.g., and other activities on the campus, very generally speaking, it was catered to undergraduates. He said that Mr. Daniels felt it could be important to look at the proportions grads would pay, and what utility they'd gain from this fee. So they actually distributed a specific amount of the fee increase so grads could support their groups. The reason an undergraduate fee wasn't introduced was because about 10% of the ASUC Senate's annual budget would be returned to them if the Referendum passed, money that would have gone to SUPERB. That would be discretionary funds the ASUC could allocate to student organizations. So it was a very fair proposal.

Ms. Anderson asked how much in total the Fee would bring in, and what fraction would go to grad student groups. Mr. Gupta said that in the \$12 assessment, \$792,000 would be raised per year in the first two years. After return to financial aid, grad students would receive \$120,000, about 30% of the fee. As a reminder, if a \$12 fee was passed, \$8 went to the specific need and \$4 would go to financial aid. So

Presentation on Possible Student Fee Referenda (cont'd)

- 20 -

about 30% of that \$8 would go directly to grad student organizations. The reason grads would get 30% was because grads made up about 30% of the student population.

Mr. Gupta said that when they look at these Referenda, he would strongly urge them to not look at them in competition with each other. They were being proposed for different reasons and needs of the campus. There were three on the ballot, and he would ask people to look at each of them specifically. He strongly supported all three. He realized they raise fees, but they also increase opportunities for students on campus.

Mr. Daniels said that regarding the Referendum on Lower Sproul redevelopment, as the Chancellor mentioned, and as the GA has talked about, if students didn't do something about Eshleman, the Chancellor will tear it down and rebuild it, and the money to do that would come from students' fees. The one campus-based fee that the Chancellor had discretion to raise on his own was the Life Safety Fee. So what would happen is the Chancellor would tear down Eshleman, raise fees, and put up a replacement. And students would have pretty much no way to influence that process. That meant that if students wanted influence, they'd have to pay for it. That's where the Lower Sproul planning fee applied. Over the next two, three, or four years, there will be a planning process. The GA allotted \$9,000 to Lower Sproul planning in February, he believed, and that went to an architectural firm. There was no exact estimate on the cost to plan, but it would be in the \$4 million range, plus or minus \$2 million. The planning process and the fee for it would go up to the construction phase of Lower Sproul, up to the demolition of the building and the construction of a replacement. So they'd have programming done and the architectural design.

Mr. Daniels said this would be a partnership between the Chancellor and student government, the students, in this effort. The Program Committee would have three grads and three undergrads, and the working group had three grads and three administrators. So grads were actually more represented in the working group than on the Program Committee, and they'd have a lot of influence on the design process. So they're asking students to contribute their part. That would be an initial fee of \$9, graduated up at a certain rate, to go towards planning. It would also go towards a principle gift officer who would do the fundraising, with the alumni, once this project was part of the capital campaign, as the Chancellor mentioned.

Mr. Daniels said there would be some caveats, as in any partnership or contract, if either the campus or the students didn't fulfill their half. If this redevelopment did not go on the capital campaign, the students would take their money away. If GA Delegates and ASUC Senators voted that the project didn't represent student needs and concerns, the students could take their money back. If the campus didn't step up with its own money for planning, the students would take their money away. If there's a sense that the campus would not use Life Safety Fee to tear down Eshleman, the students would take their money away. So the students weren't forcing the campus to commit to anything. They couldn't do that, and wouldn't want to. But the students also did not want to put themselves at the whim of the Administration if it decided it had different priorities, or if this Chancellor left and someone new came in. It wouldn't make sense for students to be at that person's will. So that was the basic process.

Mr. Daniels said the way they'd show all students that they had results was through a Web site detailing what the new building and the new Plaza would look like. In addition, once they have the details set up they'll have a scale model in the lobby of MLK probably, and maybe in the lobby of Anthony Hall as well. That way, students would know that this money wasn't going into a black box but was actually being used for something real. He called for any questions.

Presentation on Possible Student Fee Referenda (cont'd)

- 21 -

Ms. LePak said that the Berkeley seismic lab said there was a 67% chance of having a debilitating earthquake in this area by 2033. She asked what would happen if that occurred before or during construction of a building. Mr. Daniels said his guess was that the demolition would be done for them. That's why the Chancellor would do it on his own, if the students didn't take the initiative. The new building will be seismically sound. Ms. Lepak said that was a concern, an earthquake happening faster than they anticipated.

Ms. Freedman asked what would happen to the money. Mr. Daniels said that Lower Sproul was already underutilized, particularly for graduate students. If this planning process resulted in a graduate student center, that would be a big boon, he thought, for graduate students. So theoretically, if there was a big earthquake that damaged only Eshleman, it would still come down, either by nature or by decision, and the other aspects of the planning process would go forward. The only thing he could imagine being complicated was finding places, when Eshleman came down, one way or another, for everything that was in Eshleman, including the Daily Cal, the ASUC, the Senate Chamber, the Library on the 7th floor, the Auxiliary, etc. All would need to be placed somewhere. So that will be a concern whenever it came down. But the question was good, and Mr. Daniels said he'd make sure to bring that up at the next work group meeting, and they'd be sure to work that out, so if, for some reason, the project was stalled, students would not keep paying money for something that wasn't going forward.

Ms. Hsueh said the ASUC, starting in the summer of 2008, will receive money for a seismic retrofit for Pauley Ballroom. That will be done, so they'd get some money from the campus for doing a little retrofit

of MLK. But so far they haven't had any money for Eshleman. But beginning in 2008, MLK and Pauley Ballroom will be safe.

A Delegate asked how much money the fee was. Mr. Daniels said it was \$9.

Mr. Rayon asked how long the fee would last. Mr. Daniels said it would probably be four years. If nothing has happened, the fee would be capped at that timeframe.

Mr. Daniels said he had one last note about referenda. The GA and the ASUC could not endorse or support, financially or otherwise, any referenda. So his approach, and what he thought the GA's approach has been as well, was that they want to offer students what they thought was a good choice. So generally speaking, he was not telling the GA that these were good or bad ideas. He was saying that this was a good choice, a fair choice, and students would decide if the referenda were worthwhile and benefited them. It was an even trade, as best as they could make it. He certainly didn't mean to tell Delegates that this was something they had to do, or should do. He was trying to inform them as best as possible about the various options on the ballot. And that way they could make an educated decision. When they have further debates next month, that would be the GA's approach. They wouldn't say they support this or don't support that, and it would be for Delegates to determine what they think, given the information they're provided, and to let the GA know what information was needed to make a decision, and to talk to their classmates, friends, colleagues, on how to vote.

BRITISH PETROLEUM RESOLUTION

Jenny Wells introduced herself and said she submitted the Resolution Concerning the \$500 Million Research Agreement between British Petroleum and UC Berkeley. She was doing her dissertation on

British Petroleum Resolution (cont'd)

- 22 -

climate change, and she thought this particular contract with BP, a half billion dollars, was very substantial and would have a great deal of influence, and thought it merited careful consideration. Since Chancellor Birgeneau talked about it, she would and some others would like to say a few things in response to what he said. She really liked Chancellor Birgeneau, and there were lots of nice people involved in BP. No one wanted to rain on anyone's parade, but there were some issues to examine.

Ms. Wells said the Chancellor started out by saying that this would allow for new, young faculty hires and provide funding for graduate students, and for research in biofuels, solar energy, nanoscience, synthetic biology, all oriented towards having renewal, non-fossil fuel energy. The Chancellor stressed the fact that graduate work would be fully protected, with guaranteed support from beginning to end of individual graduate careers, and said intellectual property would belong to the University, and not to BP, an issue she'd address. The Chancellor ended up by saying it was an extraordinary opportunity to solve one of the truly important issues faced by the planted. She agreed with him on that last point. However, she disagreed on all his previous points.

Ms. Wells said there were serious concerns that should be examined about all these points. The Chancellor didn't mention a governing board, but as far as the contract that she's seen, and examined with an intellectual property lawyer, there were some concerns. There was very vague, brief language in that particular document. It was not, obviously, the final, legal contract. It would include three BP staffmembers, and as far as the contract was written, it seemed to her that it was possible that these BP employees

would have total control over the choice of new hires. That was just one example of the many influences BP would have. Being at Berkeley, they've heard of other instances of private, corporate funding of public universities, and there were many possibilities of influence.

Secondly, the Chancellor mentioned solar, nano, and synthetic biology. As far as the contract she saw, Ms. Wells said solar wasn't emphasized, as was nano and synthetic biology. Ms. Wells said she specialized in researching ethics and social dimensions of such research. There were a lot of concerns about both nano and synthetic biology, and there were lots of unknowns, lots of risks. She didn't know if they just wanted to throw money at them.

Ms. Wells said the third issue, which was key to her, was whether intellectual property belonged to UC and to BP. Again, she examined a document with an intellectual property lawyer, and it seemed that was just untrue. The way the contract stood at that time, it looked like there were bits of it written by UC Berkeley lawyers and bits of it that were written by BP lawyers, and they're both still in there. What would happen is they'd keep negotiating, and at some point, things would shake out. And historically, the precedent was that it would shake out in favor of the party that was wealthier and had more power. In this case, that would certainly be BP.

The Chancellor said they would lead research in law in ethics, and Ms. Wells said she would disagree with that, but didn't have time to go into it. Quickly, the way the wording was now, even with the little information that they have, as vague as it was, it clearly, according to the lawyer who looked at this, yielded the most power to BP and did not disclose important documents, such as option agreements on exercising licenses and details of how to do this.

Ms. Kapadia said she, Ms. Wells, and others, were part of a campaign opposing the agreement. It was really important to study biofuels on the campus, but they should do so in ways that were in the public interest. That should be their role as a public research institution. Secondly, she didn't think this deal

British Petroleum Resolution (cont'd)

- 23 -

would be in the public's interest. The agreement would enable research in BP's interest. With biofuels, it was quite likely that corporate interest and public interest did not overlap. Third, this was not just about the proposal, but the process by which such an agreement was reached, and the precedent it would set for future corporate deals.

Ms. Kapadia said they had a petition on the Web site, and the demand was for some sort of democratic process for policy and procedure when they even consider such deals. BP will provide \$500 million over ten years, she believed \$400 million to Berkeley and LBL together, would \$100 million going to another part of the consortium. That would double corporate funding on the campus, which last year was \$43 million. So this was large-scale corporate money from one company. The State itself would also be paying for this, over \$40 million, through \$15 million in private donations and \$30 million in UC and other revenue bonds. So a lot of State money would go into this. She found the intellectual property rights issues, and the wording around that, to be weird. From the proposal, BP would have an exclusive, time-limited first right to exercise options to obtain an exclusive license to any inventions made by UCB, LBNL, or UI U-C projects fully funded by BP. So it sounded like BP got the first right of refusal.

Ms. Kapadia said people say this was about sustainability and climate change, but there were two labs about fossil fuel recovery. The biofuel processing lab will explore the possibility of using microbes to convert coal into fuel, because of the inevitability of large-scale coal use. And the other was a recovery

lab, on how to engineer microbes to get more oil out of the ground. Those two labs were part of 24 that would be part of this deal. So in terms of sustainability, they proposal was pushing biofuels, and on the other hand, they're also going to deal with fossil fuel.

Ms. Kapadia said the other interesting thing was that there was previously a big corporate funding deal on the campus with Novartis. Just to put the BP in perspective, Novartis gave \$25 million, and pretty much succeeded in buying an entire department for five years. She wasn't there when that happened. There was an external review of the Novartis deal by the University of Michigan, which was commissioned by Berkeley, and all the recommendations that came out of that have been entirely ignored. The first recommendation was to avoid industrial agreements that involved complete academic units. The second recommendation was, in a comprehensive fashion, to avoid institutional conflicts of interest. And the third was to have broad debate, and to make organizations supported by student research transparent to the public. Ms. Kapadia said it was almost impossible to get the BP proposal. They really had to fight to even look at it. And the last point was to begin the task of determining what role, in the 21st Century, a public, land grant university should play. In addition, it's been said that there was tremendous promise in biofuels, but there was also a real danger. The division was that if they look at it from a technology perspective versus how the technology was actually going to be used. Right now, it was being used very unsustainably, especially in developing countries. They're seeing unprecedented deforestation in Indonesia, Brazil, and Colombia, because they're growing palm oil to feed the biodiesel demands of Europe and corn for the US. The price of tortillas in Mexico has gone up by 400% because there was such a high demand for corn for ethanol production. What she found really problematic was that the social, economic side of it was so pre-compromised. She was a social scientist, and if she were to propose something like this, her advisor would throw it away.

Ms. Kapadia said there were four labs on social impacts. And one lab was environmental impact, which was fine. Another lab was on how to develop the markets. It would examine the information, needs, policies, and incentives to enhance the adoption, strength, and acceptance of new biofuels technology. The social interactions and risks lab would provide relevant information and to have a chance to

British Petroleum Resolution (cont'd)

- 24 -

participate in the decision-making process, and dealt with compensating mechanisms. So they were already saying they'll compensate people, who didn't even have an option to opt out. That was the way it was framed.

Again, Ms. Kapadia said the basic idea of the proposal was that the answer was with genetically modified crops, and with large, state, corporate agriculture. If they look at science and social science, that was not a given, and was heavily debated and contested in both these fields. But this was the way the proposal has been worded. So she'd ask how they could be convinced that this would serve the public interest.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to extend speaking time by six minutes. Mr. Daniels said it was 7:30. This was clearly a very complicated issue and a lot of details have been mentioned. He thought they should take time to understand this. He was more than happy to extend time and debate, have questions, and have a debate. Another option was that someone could make a motion to table the issue until next month. He felt those were their two options.

A motion to table discussion was made and seconded.

On a point of information, a Delegate asked when the contract would be signed. Ms. Kapadia said they were told by the Administration that it would be signed in June. The proposal she was referring to was made available to her department and it wasn't the actual agreement, something they don't know about at all. talk to their classmate, friends, colleagues, on how to vote.

Mr. Rajan asked if they'll have elections next month. Mr. Daniels said they wouldn't.

Mr. Daniels said GA meetings end at 7:30. They could, every meeting, go over by 30 minutes. What they'd probably need to do was set up an online forum to debate this, or have some other way for people to research this for a month, if they care about it. And then, when they come back, people could be more educated and ask better questions, and they wouldn't educate and debate at the same time. Ms. Kapadia said there was a Web site on the board that had lots of information available. Mr. Daniels said they'll ask for input and find a good way to make that debate happen, assuming they table discussion.

Mr. Gupta said this issue will be addressed by the ASUC Senate on Wednesday at 7:00, and it looked like they'll have present a representatives from both sides. So they should have a pretty good presentation.

A Delegate asked if they could have a few minutes for someone who was in favor of contract to talk at that meeting so people could hear both sides. Mr. Daniels said that would mean that they'd debate.

A motion to call the question to end discussion and vote to table was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to table consideration was withdrawn.

Mr. Daniels asked if Mr. Begtrup could talk for two minutes on this. He noted that the Chancellor was in favor of the contract and spoke about it. He said they'd hear two minutes on the pro side and then they'd entertain a motion to table.

Mr. Voitek asked about a situation where someone agreed with the end result and with the Resolution but strongly disagreed with some of the wording. Mr. Daniels said people could submit other Resolutions.

British Petroleum Resolution (cont'd)

- 25 -

Mr. Rheume said he was in the Mechanical Engineering Department and worked for about five years in alternative energy before coming to graduate school. He's studied alternative energy as a Fulbright Scholar in Germany. So he knew a little more than the average person about renewable energy, alternative resources, and things of that nature. When he read through the Resolution, a couple of things really caught his eye. The wording in many cases was somewhat vitriolic, and not everything in it was actually true. There were some factual inaccuracies that led him to believe that the Resolution demanded at least a rewrite before it was approved.

The Resolution started off by saying that Berkeley was given \$500 million, but it really was \$400 million, with \$100 million going to Illinois. And some of the money coming to the campus was also going to the LBNL. The Resolution also stated that BP was the world's second largest oil company, which wasn't correct. It turns out that BP was the fifth largest, although it may have been second largest by other criteria. There was also a segment in the Resolution about using crops as biofuels. But what was ignored was the only solution that scientifically made sense for BP to invest in, cellulosic ethanol action, where they take the enzyme out of termites that digests wood and figure out a way to add to fuel. It seemed the Resolu-

tion needed more work. The arguments weren't completely accurate, so he would urge them to vote against this specific Resolution.

Ms. Kapadia said that in response to the previous speaker giving credentials, she wanted to note that she was a PhD in the Energy and Resources Group and has put years into the industry, and wanted to note that she was qualified as well.

A motion to table the Resolution was made and seconded. The motion to table the Resolution to the April meeting passed with no objection.

Mr. Daniels said that before they adjourn, Ms. Jones has served the GA excellently for the past nine months and was leaving for bigger and better things, and they would like to thank her with some flowers. Ms. Hsueh and they had to thank Ms. Jones for thinking about and getting the delicious food every month. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said there was also an opening for the GA Funding Committee Chair, and they'd like to thank Ms. Franklin for courageously stepping in to fill that, and he'd like to show their appreciation for her work and help. Ms. Hsueh said Ms. Franklin has served the Committee for many years and was graduating, and she wanted to congratulate her. (Applause)

This meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary