

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 1, 2007

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:31 p.m.

Announcements

The GA open house reception will be on Thursday, November 8. It was for the entire graduate student body

The GA info session will be held Thursday, November 15.

The Health Care Action Agenda meeting will be on November 5, to strategize what the GA will do on this issue.

The Civil Engineering Department was doing an experiment with Nokia on using cell phone GPS to track traffic and predict highway traffic jams. The experiment needed 150 grads to drive cars for a couple of hours. They'd be paid \$250.

A group, Students for a Safer Southside, requested people to volunteer for a focus group on alcohol behavior and consumption.

The GA has a resource library for personal resources, such as how managing finances, dealing with taxes, with stress, etc.

Mr. Begtrup's band, "The Thrillionaires," was playing at The Starry Plough.

The Mario Savio Lecture, with a talk by Angela Davis, will be held that evening.

The GA will host a reception on December 13 to honor the Delegates. It was for Delegates and the GA family.

The fall "Berkeley Graduate" was out.

Guest Speaker

The GA was to have heard from Graduate Dean Szeri, but he didn't get the topics of discussion in time, and wouldn't be at the meeting that evening. His talk will be rescheduled.

Report from the ASUC Representative

The ASUC Senate passed a bill to re-examine the ASUC's relationship with the UCSA. Students fund the UCSA \$31,000 a year to lobby for them and the bill would examine whether that was the best way to lobby, how to improve the relationship, etc. The Senate also passed a Resolution in support of the Peace not Prejudice Coalition that was formed in response to Islamofascism Awareness Week.

Report from the Funding Committee

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee's recommendations for allocations for Grad Events Round 3 and Grants Round 2.

Officers' Reports

The GA last month approved a letter asking Associate Vice Chancellor Coley to go to the Chancellor to ask for a reduction \$1.50 in part of a mandatory student fee, for a service students weren't receiving. The Chancellor agreed to reduce the fee. So Mr. Daniels said he wanted to thank the Delegates the first time a fee has ever been reduced as a result of student lobbying. This will probably save students over \$150,000 over the next two years or so.

The Graduate Division decided to fund the GA money the Grad Division funded student groups, between \$10-15,000. The GA will receive that for '08-09.

The GA info session will be held on Thursday, the 15th, for people interested in being part of the GA next year. People could learn what the various positions in the GA did.

There were openings on campus committees, for the Dean's Normative Time Fellowship, for increasing student involvement on faculty searches, to buy BART tickets with pre-tax income, improving health resources at Berkeley, improving reimbursement and purchasing processes for research, the Rec Sports Advisory Committee, or the Graduate Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, and in preventing repetitive strain injuries.

The new Environmental Sustainability Chairs were introduced.

Delegates were requested to let a Grad Council rep know if their department was being reviewed.

Resolution Referral

Resolution on Budget Amendment to Correct Revenue Changes, Fully Support the PC Liaison, and Other Miscellaneous Changes was referred to the Budget Committee. Directed Action to Authorize the President to Sign a Letter Demonstrating GA Support for Lower Sproul Redevelopment, and asking for Vice Chancellors' Support was referred to the Campus Affairs Committee.

Resolution

By a hand-vote of 19-17-4, the GA approved, as amended, Resolution on Directed Action to Administer a Student Poll Regarding the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Resolution called for the Rules Committee to write, by its November meeting, as well as publicize and administer, a minimally biased student poll on the topic of the Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories' design of the Reliable Replacement Warhead program.

Henry Stern, GA Representative on EBI

GA representatives participated in consultations with the Administration that summer regarding the Energy Biosciences Institute, a \$500 million, ten-year research alliance with BP plc, formerly known as

British Petroleum. The EBI initially aroused a great deal of controversy. The GA passed a Resolution last year calling for student representation in the process. They asked a role at the negotiation table but compromised and took a kind of advisory position. They asked hard questions, got information, posted it publicly, and took back feedback from students.

Concerns about the proposal included having a corporate alliance; compromising academic freedom; and the way intellectual property was structured.

The Institute also included research. The EBI was basically about using biology to deal with energy. A large majority of the funding would be on biofuels.

A question was raised as to why two grads were selectively invited to participate. The University agreed that the GA and the ASUC had sole authority to appoint students to the committees even though this wasn't technically a committee, the Chancellor agreed he should have talked to them. Students made a strategic decision to go forward on the campus' terms. While students didn't get the seats at the negotiating table that they wanted, the Vice Chancellor went out of her way to solicit input from them.

A another question that was raised was to express concern that the revised contract be available for public comment before it was signed. That point was raised to the Chancellor. The compromise was that they would explicit learn a lot about contract details, and a memo about those details was written.

Another question was raised about the a previous study recommending that the University avoid these kinds of industry agreements. But the campus felt academic freedom was obviously a fundamental aspect of research

The meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting



This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:31 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank all of them for attending. This was the third Delegate meeting of the year. He asked for a show of hands of those for whom this was their first meeting, and said he'd like to welcome them. If a speaker used an acronym, a term, or a name that someone didn't understand, he would ask them to please raise their hand or otherwise make that known. The idea was that as a collective, they were only as good as their collective knowledge. So if one of them did not know, e.g., what the UCSA was, then they couldn't have an educated discussion about that subject. For the record, the "UCSA" was the UC Student Association, the Statewide association of student governments.

For those who have returned, he would ask them to please remember that their attendance was really important. The GA couldn't function without the Delegate Assembly. They also couldn't function

without GA committees. So if Delegates were assigned to a committee, he would ask them to please do their best to make it. If they couldn't, he would ask them to please send the committee chair an e-mail letting them know. That way, the GA would know that they were still interested in the GA, and they wouldn't be removed from the list. Also, he would ask them to please turn in their feedback forms whenever they leave. That's how they know Delegates were there, how attendance was kept, and helped them to serve Delegates better, from feedback Delegates write down. He called for any questions.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

GA Reception

Mr. Daniels said that each year they have a GA open house, a reception, and this year it will be on Thursday, November 8, from 6:00 to 8:00 in the Tilden Room of the MLK Student Union. It will be a lot fun. They'll have music, food from Rick and Ann's, and good company, and they were all invited. This wasn't just for Delegates, but for the entire graduate student body, and they could invite classmates and could bring spouses or partners. Ms. Hsueh said there will be wine and beer.

GA Information Session

Mr. Daniels said he'd talk more about the GA info session later. If people were interested in learning more about the GA or getting more involved for next semester or next year, he would ask them to please attend this if they could. It will be held Thursday, November 15, from 6:00 to 7:00.

Health Care Action Agenda Meeting

For those who were interested in health care, which was one of the GA's three Action Agenda Items they focus on, the first meeting will happen on Monday, November 5, from 6:00 to 7:00, at the GA, Anthony Hall. They'll strategize about what the GA will do on this issue.

Nokia Phone Cell Pilot Program

Dan Work introduced himself and said he was a Delegate in the Civil Engineering Department. He brought his advisor to the meeting, Prof. Alex Bayen, about a research project they're doing. Prof. Bayen introduced himself and said he was with the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department and worked in systems engineering. He first wanted to thank Mr. Daniels for giving him the opportunity to address the GA. Prof. Bayen said his research program was to work on the next generation of cell phones for Nokia. What they want to do was to use cell phones to predict traffic jams in order to help people reduce their travel time and help the California Department of Transportation to better manage the highway system. Currently, the equipment they have was very old.

The project would do take the last generation of cell phones, which had GPS, and use those phones to track people, without violating their privacy, and get that information to the California Department of Transportation at a very low cost. They have a bunch of algorithms for that. Prof. Bayen said he wanted to prove that this works. In order to do that, they want to recruit 150 drivers for the first worldwide prediction of highway traffic jams using cell phones. They'll probably need a lot of graduate students. Mr. Work would describe the experiment they want to do.

Mr. Work said that on Friday, February 8, they'll recruit 150 people, over 21, preferably graduate students, but open to any students. People will take the phones that experimenters give them, and put the phones in cars, that the experimenters will also give them. People will then drive around on highways for a couple of hours. Basically, what will happen is they'll pay people \$250 to participate. In addition, there will be an opportunity to win a \$650 N-95 phone. Nokia was helping to sponsor the project, and four phones will be given out.

Mr. Work said the experiment will be done in Union City, just south of Oakland, on highway 880. They'll drive around and have a big field station set up there for drivers to take breaks. If they send an e-mail to nextgencell@ce.berkeley.edu, people will get in contact with them. The entire research agenda was online, as well as more information about the experiment and what they were doing. They also had some fliers to pass around that people could take back to their departments.

Mr. Daniels said a PowerPoint about this was on the GA Web site. Mr. Work said he'll be around, and if people had questions they could talk to him. Mr. Daniels called for any questions.

Mr. Daniels asked what kind of cars people will drive. Mr. Work said they're renting 100 cars from rental agencies, and it will be whatever was sitting on the lots. Mr. Daniels asked if Delegates would get first pick of the cars. He said he was just joking.

A Delegate asked if it was first-come, first-served. Mr. Work said that as soon as they got 150 people who were qualified, had a drivers license, and didn't have a rich history of wrecking cars, they'd be eligible. They were just trying to get the word out at that time. If people were interested, they could send an e-mail. They'll start to compile a list and they'll have drivers hired within the next month. If Delegates were interested, now was the time to act, because once they get 150 people, they'll be done.

General Announcements

Mr. Daniels called for any other announcements.

Amber Woodburn introduced herself and said she was an undergraduate student there. She was with a group called "Students for a Safer Southside." They're doing research on alcohol behavior and consumption, specifically for UC Berkeley students. They received a grant from the University and they actually need Delegates' input. A focus group will be held next Wednesday and they're offering free dinner. If people found themselves on campus from 5:30 to 6:30 next week, Wednesday, the 7th, and wanted to take a break from their busy lives, they could talk about their experiences with alcohol. They'll try and find information about people's social structures, their consumption patterns, and how maybe they were affected by undergraduate students. She would ask people to please RSVP to safersouthside@gmail.com. She would ask Delegates to please spread the word to their friends who were also graduate students. That would be greatly appreciated. They'll have good food.

Ms. Sasser said she just wanted to give a reminder about a resource that was available to all of them at the GA, a resource library that people haven't been using. They have a number of books to could help as personal resources, such as how to manage finances, how to deal with taxes, how to deal stress, isolation, anxiety, dating, whatever. A lot of different books were available that people could check out for two

weeks. Also, because a lot of graduate students travel overseas for a variety of reasons, research related and otherwise, the GA had a series of travel guides that basically covered the whole world. So she would ask people to please come in and use the library.

Mr. Begtrup said he had an inappropriate announcement. His rock band, "The Thrillionaires" was playing at The Starry Plough that evening at 9:30. People should come there after the GA meeting ended.

Mr. Ramos Stierle said the Mario Savio Lecture will start at 7:00. A group of students, the Phoenix Coalition, has been involved in this for the last few weeks, and if people had the time, he would ask them to please attend. The lecture will be by Angela Davis, and it should be pretty exciting.

Ms. Hsueh said there were fliers for two receptions. The reception next week was for people in their departments and spouses. Everybody was invited. They also have a reception scheduled for Thursday, December 13, to especially honor all the Delegates. They appreciate their attendance and participation. This reception was exclusively for Delegates and the GA family. So she would ask them to take fliers and mark it on their calendars for December 13, a reception at Anthony Hall. The GA will serve dinner.

Ms. ElNaggar said the fall "Berkeley Graduate" was out, and there was a box of issues on the table. They should be at departments at the beginning of next week.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Daniels said the minutes from the October GA meeting were available on the Web site, as always, at ga.berkeley.edu. For those who were new, the GA operated by Robert's Rules, and they therefore needed a Delegate to make a motion to approve the minutes, followed by a second. He called for a motion to approve. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 1, 2007 MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Daniels called for a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Ramos Stierle said he would like to consider the Resolution on Nuclear Weapons closer to the beginning of the meeting, so people interested in it could also hear the Mario Savio Lecture. Mr. Daniels said that was a motion to hear item 7 before item 4. Mr. Daniels said the speaker they were going to have was unfortunately unable to attend, and that would be explained later. Amend the amendment the agenda was made and seconded.

Ms. Anderson objected, and said that because Resolutions always took the longest amount of time, moving it up would mean they wouldn't get to some business.

Mr. McDougal that one way to address the concern about time was to put a time limit at the beginning and say that if discussion went beyond a certain amount of time, they'd continue it after hearing other items. Mr. Daniels said there was a time limit, 40 minutes. However, a motion could be made to extend that. Unless the body agreed, there was nothing that could be done and discussion would end.

Mr. Begtrup asked if there would still be enough time to hear the lecture, if they didn't have a speaker. Mr. Ramos Stierle said that without the speaker, they'd be in good shape.

Mr. Wolgin said he didn't see to move the Resolution up if it would only take 40 minutes.

Mr. Daniels said they would vote on whether or not to amend the agenda so that number 7 went in front of number 4. Mr. Daniels said they would have a hand-vote. If people weren't Delegates, he would ask them to please not vote.

Ms. Anderson asked if Alternates could vote if the Delegate was not there. Mr. Daniels said they could. However, if the department's Delegate was present, the Alternate couldn't vote.

The motion to amend the agenda failed by hand-vote 22-23-0.

The motion to approve the agenda for the meeting that evening passed unanimously by voice-vote.

GUEST SPEAKER

Mr. Daniels said that very quickly, he took full responsibility for this. Because of stuff that was his own doing, not really, but his own stuff, they didn't get the topics of discussion to the Graduate Dean in time. Dean Szeri didn't feel he'd have time to prepare to give the GA an adequate presentation about the three Action Agenda items that the GA passed in September, and would like to attend again after having time to prepare. Mr. Daniels said he would apologize sincerely for his error in this, and hoped people could forgive him.

Mr. Daniels said he'd throw something out there. The GA could either try to have the Graduate Dean come in December, their next meeting, or in February. For the December meeting, they didn't have a speaker because they wanted to focus on Resolutions, people had finals, had to grade finals, etc. For the February meeting, they also had free time, but that was supposed to be for the new Delegates in the Spring Semester to orient them. He asked if people had a strong preference as to when to invite Dean Szeri.

Ms. Anderson said she thought February was probably the best time to invite the Dean. Most people would be there will have returned of the Fall Semester, and other people wouldn't want to sit through an orientation, for which they could produce a nice packet of information.

A Delegate asked if it would be better to have the Graduate Dean attend in December, since he'd be familiar with GA Resolutions. Otherwise, it would already be next semester in terms of being on the same page. They haven't really discussed any of the Resolutions at all.

A Delegate said she was in favor of having the Dean in February, because if they have new Delegates, in addition to not having people get bored, they'd engage all the Delegates even more, and put everybody on the same page.

Ms. ElNaggar said she believed Mr. Daniels talked with Dean Szeri on a regular basis. Mr. Daniels said they met once a month, but obviously the Delegates didn't.

Mr. Wolgin said that hearing from the Dean in February seemed to make the most sense just because their December meetings seem to be sparsely populated, and he wouldn't want to give the impression that the GA didn't care about his presence.

Ms. Freedman said she agreed. And February was a big spike in attendance.

Ms. Anderson said that if the GA wanted people to be familiar with their Resolutions, they should pass them and trust Mr. Daniels to pass on all the information.

Mr. Daniels said he wouldn't invite Dean Szeri formally, and would see what his schedule looked like for December and February. His guess was that this would work itself out and Dean Szeri would only be available one date or the other. But if not, Mr. Daniels said he'd relay to the Dean the concerns that Delegates had and see if he had a preference.

Mr. Daal said it would be good to indicate specific things they'd like Dean Szeri to talk about, which they didn't have that at that time, even though Delegates were asked for suggestions at the last meeting. Mr. Daniels said that at the bottom of the feedback form was space for additional comments, as well as things people would like the Chancellor to talk about. The Chancellor was coming in March. If people would rather use that space to write down things Dean Szeri could talk about, they should indicate that in that comment section.

REPORTS

Mr. Daniels said the agenda packet contained the reports that were submitted. A few people didn't submit written reports that the GA would hear from, and some GA people would also like to highlight their reports.

Report from the ASUC Representative

David Rhoads introduced himself and said he was the ASUC representative to the GA, and was an ASUC Senator. He didn't realize he could submit a report and would do so next time. He'd talk about a couple of things going on in the ASUC, at least in terms of the Senate. They just passed a bill last night that would re-examine the ASUC's relationship with the UCSA. That's the University of California Student Association, which represents all UC students to the UC Regents. The Senate would just like to see if they could improve the way the UCSA lobbied for them, or if there was a better organization or a better way to spend their money on for that. ASUC students fund the UCSA \$31,000 a year to lobby for them. The Senate just wanted to look at that to see if that was the best way to go about it, or if they wanted to figure out how to improve that relationship and get more things done for students. That was one of the main things coming out of the Senate.

Mr. Rhoads said that last week the Senate also passed a Resolution in support of the Peace not Prejudice Coalition, which people might have heard about, in terms of the events that happened on campus last week with Islamofascism Awareness Week. Those were the main issues. If people had questions, they

could send him an e-mail, Daverhodes@berkeley.edu, and he'd stay around for a few minutes. He'll submit a written report for the GA's next meeting.

Report from the Funding Committee

Mr. Law said there were a lot of details on the sheet that was distributed. If there was any particular question people had regarding the report, he would ask them to please let him know at that time.

Mr. McDougal asked if there was a way to quickly give them an orientation, not details, but to simply tell them what they should look for as they look through the report. Mr. Law said that if people had funding for either Round 3 Events or Round 2 Grants, then their group should be listed. The Grad Events report listed the amount that was requested for each event and the amount that was granted. For the most part, there was an across-the-board cut due to limited funding the GA had. A certain amount was allocated for Grad Events every year. Cuts should be the same for every single requested item, unless, of course, there was some sort of restriction that did not allow the GA to fund a group; and that should be listed on the comments portion as well.

Mr. Daniels said that for those who were new, the Funding Committee made recommendations to the Delegate body about how to allocate funds. But the Delegate Assembly, those present that evening, had to approve the specific allocations.

A motion to approve was made and seconded. Mr. Daniels called for any objection to voting. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ALLOCATIONS FOR GRAD EVENTS ROUND 3 AND GRANTS ROUND 2, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Report from the President

Mr. Daniels said that as his reports states, last month the Delegates approved a letter to Associate Vice Chancellor Ron Coley, who oversees Parking and Transportation, asking him to go to the Chancellor and have the Chancellor reduce a mandatory student fee. Mr. Coley went to the Chancellor, who said that since students were paying \$1.50 per semester for a service they weren't receiving, he would therefore reduce the fee. So Mr. Daniels said he wanted to thank the Delegates. This was actually the first time that a fee has ever been reduced as a result of student lobbying. (Applause) Mr. Daniels said they've been trying for a long time to reduce fees, so this wasn't insignificant. And actually, the student body as a whole will save probably over \$150,000 over the next two years or so. So it was actually a pretty meaningful step.

Mr. Daniels said the Graduate Division has expressed an interest in funneling the money it uses to fund student groups to the Graduate Assembly, adding to the pot from which the GA funds student groups. The Grad Division gave between \$10-15,000 to student groups, which it would give to the GA for '08-09. That money go through the typical process that Mr. Law just talked about. This was a positive development.

Mr. Daniels said the GA info session will be held on Thursday, the 15th. He really wanted to encourage all of them who were interested in being part of the GA next year to attend; and that didn't just apply to Delegates attend. The only way the GA functioned was by having graduate students willing to get involved and advocate for all graduate students as a whole. Some people at the GA got paid and some didn't. They have a good time at Anthony Hall and he thought it was a good community to be a part of. And people could get paid as much as \$12,000 a year, along with positions that got paid nothing. It depended on the position. If people were at all interested, attending would not commit them to anything. The idea for the info session was for people to come and talk to people one-on-one about what it would mean to be on the Graduate Council, e.g., or to chair the funding committee, or what it would mean to be president, or a project coordinator. If people were at all interested, he would ask them to please try and attend. If they couldn't attend, he would ask them to send him an e-mail, or anyone else in the GA, and they could make an individual appointment and talk more about it then. He called for any questions.

Ms. Hsueh asked when the reduction of the \$1.50 would take effect. Mr. Daniels said it will start Spring Semester. If they go to the registrar.berkeley.edu, they'd see a page listing all their fees. It will show the Class Pass, or Transit Fee. This semester it was \$58.50, and next semester it will be \$57.00. Ms. Hsueh said that since they haven't had the service and money has been collected for that service, she asked what would be done with that money. Mr. Daniels said it was being held in escrow by the University. It will either be allocated according to a student fee referendum that students could pass in the spring, as an entire campus student body, or, the body that oversees this Fee, the Class Pass Advisory Committee, could decide to allocate it differently, in the spirit of the service that was not provided.

Mr. Daal said he would like to add to his Campus Affairs Vice President's report. He asked for a show of hands of people have ever held the Dean's Normative Time Fellowship, and note that there weren't many people, and the item he would have reported would not be relevant. He had a couple of other things he wanted to mention from his report. If people were interested in increasing student involvement on faculty searches, if they were interested in buying BART tickets with pre-tax income, or interested in a subcommittee focused on improving health resources at Berkeley, or improving the reimbursement procedures and purchasing processes that they may have encountered during their research, or in being on the Rec Sports Advisory Committee, or the Graduate Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, or in preventing RSI on campus, or repetitive strain injury, he would ask them to please contact him.

Ms. Freedman said she had a comment on the Dean's Normative Time Fellowship. If he was looking for volunteers. Mr. Daal said they were looking for volunteers for focus groups. The volunteers need to have held the Fellowship. And only two people raised their hands. Maybe they've heard of a petition going around to change the funding process, or to change the restrictions that come along with the Fellowship. If people had friends who were interested in working on that issue, he would ask them to ask them to contact him.

Mr. Daniels said the floor was now open to questions on reports that have been submitted. They want to make sure that they're not just talking to Delegates, but to answer any question on a report that has been submitted.

Ms. Patel asked how graduate student nominations to the ASUC Judicial Council looked. Mr. Daniels said the Judicial Council was the judicial part of the ASUC, of which the GA was an autonomous entity. If there was anyone interested in serving in a judicial capacity, and they didn't have to be a Law student at all, they should let him know. There were two grad students on the Council, but there was always room for more interested people.

Ms. Freedman asked how many spots the GA had. Mr. Daniels said there was a minimum of three J-Council positions for grad students. There was one grad student on the Council, and two of those slots were open.

Ms. Anderson asked if he could introduce the new Environmental Sustainability Chairs. Mr. Daniels asked them to please stand up and introduce themselves. Brad Freyley, and Dan. Mr. Freyley said the Environmental Constantly Committee will meet Monday November 19, at 7 p.m. at Anthony Hall. People were more than welcome to come.

A Delegate asked if the transit initiative Mr. Daniels was working on, if they were still moving towards getting it in place now that the students were paying for it any more. Mr. Daniels said the delay was with the service provider, who did ERG. A meeting will either soon happen or did happen between the ERG technical staff and the Cal 1 Card technical staff to see how easy it would be to merge the two. Currently, they were all eligible to purchase that TransLink cards. But they'd be charged, so it made no sense. So the answer was yes, although ERG was delayed and it was unclear whether they'll still push for that.

Ms. Freedman said she had a comment. The Grad Council was thinking that if anyone became aware that their department or graduate group was being reviewed, they should try and contact one of the graduate students on the Grad Council about any comments they have, in case grad student input happened to be ignored in their review.

Mr. Daniels asked how a student would know when the department was being reviewed. Ms. Anderson said her department announced it. Ms. Freedman said that sometimes departments will announce it. In other department, a professor will hand-pick five students and tells them this was not confidential because the person told her, and he said "You five students were clearly happy with the department. Go talk to the review committee." Ms. Freedman said that was the process the GA reps were trying to bypass.

A Delegate asked how they could find out which departments were being reviewed. Ms. Freedman said Grad Council reps couldn't report that, because it was confidential. So students should see if there was a rumor in their department, or if someone made an announcement. Mr. Daal said that Grad Council reps could announce that department were being reviewed, not that the Grad Council was reviewing them. A general announcement could be issued to students saying in this time period, these department were being reviewed. It was public information. Ms. Freedman said if it was public information, they'd try and find that out. But someone would know. She would be nice to the people who were administrators in department.

A Delegate asked if she could explain what a "review" was. Ms. Freedman said it depends on whether the unit was a graduate group or a department. Departments have external reviews, which the Grad Council had no control over. The review was done by professors from other universities comparable to Berkeley. They come in and basically say what was wrong with the department and what was good about it. The other was Graduate Council which was a committee of the Academic Senate comes in and talks to professors, ideally talks to grad students, and notes the things that were good and the things that needed to be fixed. Basically, the consequence of this was that if the department wanted more faculty, it had to fix the problems that were cited by the Grad Council. So there was actually an enforcement mechanism.

Mr. Daniels said the gentleman doing the EBI, the Energy Biosciences Institute was the institute put together with a deal between British Petroleum and UC Berkeley deal that was currently being negotiated,

and last year it came up as an issue. The thing passed a Resolution about it. They have a representative who has been meeting with Vice Chancellor Beth Burnside and Associate Vice Chancellor Ann Jeffrey, the two primary administrators overseeing this on the UC Berkeley side. This representative has met with them over the past six months, since they passed the GA Resolution, and he was on his way.

Mr. Rajan asked if they should move up the Resolution and discussion if the speaker wasn't present. Ms. Freedman moved to move up Resolution Referral, so they wouldn't cut into the 40-minute discussion. Mr. Begtrup moved to postpone 5B until after item 7 on the agenda. The representative was coming from class and couldn't make his presentation, so if possible, he thought the rep would prefer after number 6. Ms. Freedman moved to hear the EBI report after Resolution Referral. The motion was seconded. Ms. Freedman said that it seemed that the 40-minute discussion would probably be long and involved. It would be nice if they didn't have to break it off.

Ms. Freedman called the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to move Henry Stern's report after Resolution Referral passed by voice-vote.

Resolution Referrals

Ms. Anderson said the Budget Committee wanted to do four things, and submitted Resolution on Budget Amendment to Correct Revenue Changes, Fully Support the PC Liaison, and Other Miscellaneous Changes. If people had any questions, they could talk to her. If they had any problems with one of the particular items, it could be possible to change the Resolution. But she would like to have debate on this. If people felt strongly there should be more than one Resolution, she would ask them to please contact her at budget@ga.berkeley.edu before the next meeting so they could figure out how to present it. Mr. Daniels said the current budget, and the budget as it would look if the Resolution was approved, was online at the Delegates' resource page.

Mr. Daniels said the Resolution would be referred to the Budget Committee. If anybody objected to the referrals, they could move to overrule him, which required a simple majority vote.

Mr. Daniels said the next referral, Directed Action to Authorize the President to Sign a Letter Demonstrating GA Support for Lower Sproul Redevelopment, and asking for Vice Chancellor support. Mr. Daniels said that Lower Sproul was an issue last year. They put forward a student fee to partially fund the planning phase. It would be to redevelopment the Lower Sproul area. The fee referendum failed, and then the campus failed on its own part to fund the redevelopment process as well. Mr. Daniels said they were attempting to reinvigorate the process by having the Delegate Assembly and the ASUC Senate, the undergrad legislative body, authorize their respective Presidents to write a letter to administrators saying they really need this. Last year they put together ten conditions, or requests, for Lower Sproul that the graduate student body as a whole wanted to see. They did a graduate student survey that kind of fed into those ten conditions. They also gave \$8,000 of GA money to the planning last year. So the Resolution was to motivate the Administration of the University to put forward approximately \$700,000 to do one year of planning for that redevelopment. Mr. Daniels said he was sure they all heard or felt the 5.6 earthquake on Tuesday night, in San Jose. He didn't mean to scare them, but the building they were in, Eshleman Hall, had the poorest seismic rating on campus. The Resolution would be referred to the Campus Affairs Committee. If there were any questions or comments, or if any other committee would like to see it, they should let him know.

Mr. McDougal asked what the base line was and what it meant to have the poorest seismic rating on campus. Mr. Daniels said it meant that if there was a 6.0 earthquake on the Hayward Fault, they'd all be dead. Mr. McDougal said that it wasn't just the poorest. Mr. Daniels said it was bad.

A Delegate said that the way the seismic review board worked on campus, it's a team of structural engineers, both internal and external to the University. The buildings that had a very poor ranking, and this was one of them, didn't even meet life safety requirements by the current code grandfathered in from old codes. Mr. Daniels said the Resolution would be referred to the Campus Affairs Committee.

A Delegate said it was probably worth noting that the Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate just decided to send a letter on this point as well.

A Delegate asked what the MCC was before. Mr. Daniels said that in 1999, there was an action by students to create an Ethnic Studies Department on campus. As part of that, they wanted to create a multicultural center that would serve all students on campus, but particularly it would foster and support a diverse student body. For example, UC Santa Barbara has a Multicultural Center to foster that that includes office space, study space, student group space, and performance space. It would improve student quality of life across the campus. So that's specifically what that would be list. That was ten years ago. There have been a number of memoranda of understanding between the ASUC and the Administration about when a multicultural center would go forward. And the hope has been with this most current effort to redevelop this area that a multicultural center will be included as part of that. Right now, the Multicultural Center was a large room in the MLK Student Union, and that was it. There was no office space, barely, there was no general student group space, and there was no performance space. It was one large room that students use to meet and where students hold events. But it's not really a center in the traditional sense of the word.

Resolution

The following Resolution was authored by Mr. Ramos Stierle:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ADMINISTER A STUDENT POLL REGARDING THE PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly supports the student voice by delivering proposals and messages to the University of California (UC) Administration; and

WHEREAS, UC is seen by many people in the world as a role model institution; and

WHEREAS, the Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories, which are administered by the UC Regents, just succeeded in designing a new nuclear weapon, the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW), and are preparing the manufacturing infrastructure for the production of RRW's plutonium bomb pits, its the core component; and

WHEREAS, this is the first official announcement (March 2007) promoting the proliferation of nuclear weapons since the end of the Cold War; and

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ADMINISTER A STUDENT POLL REGARDING THE PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the production of nuclear weapons increases their proliferation; and

WHEREAS, the United States is a signatory of the 1970 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which mandates that the nuclear powers work in good faith toward the cessation of the arms race and toward nuclear disarmament; and

WHEREAS, graduate students can work towards the goal of using UC's enormous political and intellectual weight to work toward nuclear disarmament; and

WHEREAS, the student community of Berkeley has been an important influence in the history of student movements; and

WHEREAS, our local actions have global impact; and

WHEREAS the UC Santa Cruz student community has already administered a poll on this issue; and

WHEREAS, the future of the human species and Earth's biodiversity is in danger;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the President, or other competent GA member, administer a student poll, titled "Nuclear Weapons at the University of California", which asks the following questions: (1) Should the University of California or its affiliate laboratories research, design, or produce nuclear weapons? (2) Should the University of California or its affiliate laboratories be dedicated completely to humanitarian purposes (constructive scientific research, awareness of the environmental and social consequences of likely applications)?

For both questions the three possible answers shall be "Yes", "No", and "Don't have enough information on the topic".

Ms. Anderson asked if there was a time limit on the introductory speakers. Mr. Daniels said it was requested that they be as brief as possible, so they could discuss it.

Mr. Ramos Stierle introduced himself and said he was a Delegate, a fourth-year graduate student in the Astronomy Department, in Astrophysics. The Resolution wasn't about politics, science, or religion, but was about the survival of their species. Last March, their University, the Bush Administration, and the Livermore and Los Alamos Labs decided to construct a new set of nuclear weapons. Just because students were there studying art, economics, engineering, or astrophysics, that didn't mean they had to be part of an institution that was developing atomic bombs.

Mr. Ramos Stierle said they already had this survey in Santa Cruz, with very positive results. Basically, the survey asks if the University of California should proliferate, design, and produce nuclear weapons, yes, no, or they didn't have enough information. And then they added the Berkeley touch to the survey, saying they were against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Mr. Ramos Stierle said this was not about national security. If it was, he'd ask why other countries wouldn't think about the same thing,

proliferating. This was about global security. And the Berkeley touch was that they were against nuclear weapons, but they were in favor of societies that were scientific, artistic, natural, and humanistic. That's why they ask the second question, which was whether the UC labs should be completely devoted to humanitarian pursuits. The last sentence says that the signers were not against science or against scientists, but that they were against the unethical applications of science.

Mr. Daniels said the floor was open to discussion.

Mr. Shelby said that as of October 1, the Lawrence Livermore National Labs were no longer managed by UC solely, but was managed by Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, a private company. So the Resolution should be changed to say that. UC did not solely manage the labs for DOE, and it was managed by a private company.

Mr. Ramos Stierle said they decided to have the same question asked at all campuses. They used this survey at Santa Cruz and they wanted to have the same questions across the UC System. Mr. Shelby said he didn't have a problem with "affiliate laboratories," but the Resolution stated that elements of the Lawrence Livermore Labs were "administered by UC Regents." They were no longer managed by UC, and were managed by Lawrence Livermore National Security.

Mr. Daniels asked if Mr. Ramos Stierle would take that as friendly amendment. Most amendments were voted on, but a friendly amendment meant the author simply accepted it.

Mr. Daniels said the amendment would be to the third Whereas Clause, to delete "administered" and have the clause read, "which are associated with the UC Regents."

Mr. Shelby said that Livermore Lab was managed by Lawrence Livermore National Security and Los Alamos was managed by a separate, private company. They underwent a contract change last year. So they were no longer managed by UC itself, but were managed by a separate company. So it just wasn't right to say they were both managed by Lawrence Livermore. They should change it to say, "the labs, which are affiliated with the University of California."

Mr. Daniels said the third Whereas Clause would be amended, to say "Whereas, the Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories, which are associated with the UC Regents,..." Mr. Shelby said that would be fine.

A Delegate asked if it would be more accurate to say "jointly administered," because it wasn't just an affiliation, and "jointly" captured the arrangement. Mr. Daniels said he was saying the wording would be "jointly administered"; but they got rid of the "administered" part. Mr. Shelby said that made it seem like UC solely managed the Labs, and it didn't. Lawrence Livermore was managed by a private company. The Delegate suggested amending it to say "which are jointly administered by the UC Regents."

Mr. Daniels said the amendment would have the third Whereas Clause read as follows:

"Whereas, the... Laboratories, which are *jointly* administered by the UC Regents...."

THE AMENDMENT WAS ADOPTED BY THE AUTHOR AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

A Delegate asked if they could say "and others." A Delegate said "jointly" meant there were others.

Mr. Daniels called for any other comments by non-Executive Board members.

Mr. Work said he had a lot of sympathy for the point of view that nuclear weapons were bad, a view he believed probably most of them held. But he didn't agree with the view that because of that, the University should therefore disassociate from the National Labs. That wouldn't help nukes go away at all and would just help the National Labs become more privatized. It meant people at the National Labs wouldn't work under as much public oversight, and it meant people who work in the National Labs would probably not work under union contracts. Also, a lot of good research happened at the National Labs. There were a lot of problems with the Resolution and he didn't understand how the poll would be conducted. He had a fundamental, philosophic disagreement with disassociation and would vote against the Resolution.

A Delegate said he was in favor of the GA taking some action on nuclear weapons design by their government through, or in affiliation with, the UC System. He thought there were concerns about oversight because the Labs were a federal government program whereas the University was an educational system. He thought it reflected poorly on the reputation of the UC as a whole.

A Delegate said that the Resolution was just to do a poll on whether the GA should support going out and getting students' opinions. He asked how that poll would be run. Mr. Ramos Stierle said the survey was ready to go and was online.

A Delegate asked how much the poll would cost. Mr. Ramos Stierle said it was free.

A Delegate asked how the poll would be used, what would be done with it. Mr. Ramos Stierle said they just wanted to know the percentage of students who support nuclear weapons and who would support the Labs and would have them dedicated completely to humanitarian pursuits.

A Delegate asked how students would be informed about the poll. Mr. Daniels said they'd put that information out on the GA Web site and have it in the "E-grad," which went out once a month.

Ms. Anderson said that if she recalled, this wasn't the Resolution that was brought in last time, which wasn't a poll and was just a condemnation. Mr. Daniels said it was the exact same one. Ms. Anderson said she thought there was some merit in polling students on this, but thought the poll asked ridiculously leading questions. If they were actually interested in what graduate students thought about nuclear weapons being associated with the University, then what should happen was that a poll should be written by the Campus Affairs Committee. Two blurbs should be written, pro and con, and the poll should be written, with the goal of not be leading, since it's sent out to be impartial. She didn't necessarily have a problem with a poll, but had a serious problem with this poll, which essentially asked, "Don't you agree with us? Nuclear weapons are bad, please check 'yes.'"

Ms. Freedman asked Mr. Ramos Stierle what the point was in finding out what people on the campus thought when 90% of the campus said it disapprove of nuclear weapons. She asked if the final goal was to disassociate from the National Labs. Mr. Ramos Stierle said the final goal would be to have a dialogue, and to say the majority of the students, a new generation, could not afford having the Labs develop nuclear weapons and would like to have the Labs devoted to science again. There were many wonderful

people at Los Alamos, and peaceful projects should be supported and expanded. The GA was a democratic body, and if 90% of the graduate students and other students support this change, then the GA should move towards that direction. This would send a clear message to the Administration that students were on the same frequency.

Mr. Shelby said there were a bunch of different issues here. One was the notion of doing some kind of scientific poll, and the other was the issue of the GA taking a visionary leadership stand and promoting and inciting a discussion and debate on campus, and putting something out there that actually got people talking. He thought the GA wasn't a scientific polling organization, and should leave that to scientific pollsters. But the GA was a leadership body, and if they were interested in actual leadership as opposed to bureaucratic management, they'd support actually doing something to get people to debate, talk, and question. The topic of the debate, about whether or not nuclear weapons were good or bad, wouldn't be at this meeting, but what people were saying was that would occur for the whole campus. If they're going to be visionary leaders they have to promote and encourage, whether through this particular strategy or some other, and he would like to see them take that role.

Mr. Wolgin said he certainly thought it was very important to do something on this, and they should start discussion. But his question was how time sensitive this was. If the GA as a group decided that maybe the survey wasn't going the right way, and they wanted to reword it, he asked if they could do that, or if it had to be passed that evening. He asked if they could send this back to committee, and bring it back. Mr. Ramos Stierle said he thought it was the case that the sooner they pass this, the better. He thought it was very important.

Ms. Anderson said they could do that in conference with her and Scott, and then maybe change the poll.

Mr. Shelby said they had to understand something about Lawrence Livermore. Its mission was to safeguard the security of the nation's nuclear stockpile. Replacement warheads were designed because nuclear weapons were ageing. Some were 50-plus years old, and they were becoming very unsafe and unstable. And because of the Test Ban Treaty, they couldn't be tested to make sure things were working properly. So the whole redesign was to actually make the nuclear weapons that they had safer. It wasn't to actually build new nuclear weapons, but to make them safer in the sense that they wouldn't accidentally detonate, because although there were safety mechanisms in place, they were ageing drastically. And secondly, he thought the title should be changed from "Directed Action," because the Resolution talks about proliferation of nuclear weapons, and that involves the sale, transfer, distribution, and constructing of nuclear weapons. The Reliable Replacement Warhead was not being designed to shift this technology to other countries, but to allow the country's nuclear stockpile that they currently have to be quote "safe." He agreed they should discuss nuclear weapons, thought they should limit the development of nuclear weapons, and thought the bill had the right idea, but was just slightly misguided. The bill made it seem as though more nuclear weapons would be built and delivered across the world, and that was not the case, particularly involving Reliable Replacement, which was just designed to replace the current stockpile and make it safer. That was the goal of the program. The nuclear material inside the warheads could possibly leak or become contaminated. The point was not to build new bombs and proliferate them, but to maintain the current stockpile. The title of the bill was misleading and didn't match up with the goals of the Reliable Replacement Warhead Program.

A Delegate said she thought maintaining the remaining bombs they had didn't lead to proliferation. Other countries had old bombs, such as China, India, and Israel, and this would not induce an arms race. Public

opinion polls were a standard policy, so that was a no-brainer. She didn't see where in the Resolution it said the campus should disassociate with the labs. And the polling seemed to be easy to do online, and there wouldn't be a cost. It seemed like people have done that before and could figure it out. This seemed like a particularly critical issue to grad students. Nuclear weapons were expensive.

Ms. Freedman said she wanted to offer an amendment to the Resolution. The first amendment was to strike the last Whereas Clause stating that the future of the human species was in danger. She thought it sounded crazy. It was possible there could be a World War 3, and that countries would all start to bomb each other, and she thought they were killing the environment. But that really wasn't the point. The Resolution would have a poll conducted, and they didn't need to start talking about World War 3 and everyone dying.

She would also like to strike the third from the last Whereas Clauses talking about having global impact. She didn't think that was in any way important to the bill and would like to eliminate it.

For the Resolved Clause, Ms. Freedman said the basic idea of what her amendment would be to have a committee, administered by the Rules Committee, allow anyone, even non-members of the Committee, to join in. The Resolved Clause would be deleted and replaced with the following: "Resolved, that the GA Rules Committee write the title and administer an unbiased student poll on the topic of Los Alamos and Livermore National Labs' design of the Reliable Replacement Warhead program." The Committee would select the title, administer the poll, and aim at the goal of being unbiased." She would also list to delete the last Whereas Clause.

Mr. Daniels said the amendment was to strike the ninth and the eleventh Whereas Clauses, as well as the Resolved Clause, and to add a Resolved Clause, to read, "Resolved, that the Rules Committee write, title, and administer an unbiased student poll on the topic of Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories' design of the RRW."

The motion to amend was seconded. Mr. Daniels called for discussion, on the amendment only. He would apologize if he was rude, but he'd cut off discussion if it didn't relate to the amendment.

A Delegate said he had trouble with the amendment. Maybe he's been in the social sciences for too long, but an unbiased poll didn't exist. The Rules Committee could change the wording, but it would never be unbiased, as such a poll didn't exist.

A Delegate said he thought it would be worthwhile to see if they could get something through at this meeting that administered a poll as close to being unbiased as possible. What might make it stronger was to that at the same time they write the poll, that they also put out an announcement, such as to the Daily Cal, saying the poll would be coming out. People could also, on their own or with the GA, solicit opinions for people to write op-eds, e.g., to help influence how students vote on the poll. From just the discussion that evening, people have brought up a lot of complexities. Regardless of what the poll question turned out to be, they'd get more informed responses from the students if they present a forum where people on both sides of the argument present opinions.

A Delegate said she agreed with the spirit of the bill, but she disagreed having the poll directed at Los Alamos and Livermore. She agreed with the spirit of polling about nuclear weapons, but not necessarily about the Labs in particular.

Mr. McDougal said one potential thing to worry about was selection bias, which for him meant that if they try to do too many things at once, they do them all badly. He asked if the poll would try to take a random sample to make sure they polled the right number of people at the school, from each year, etc. That would not be very interesting and would be difficult to do. What would be more interesting would be to actually promote campus-wide discussion about this issue. And one way to do that was to put something out and invite other people to put stuff out. But the GA shouldn't wait until getting something that was airtight. That was why he disagreed with the amendment. The amendment tried to make the bill into some kind of airtight mechanism that would never be built and would actually lead to nothing. But if they start with this bill, for all its imperfections, something interesting could happen.

Ms. Freedman said she was open to friendly amendments; and she would like to amend her amendment. She agreed that no poll could be unbiased. So she would change it to maybe be minimally biased. Also, she liked the publicity idea that someone had, so her amendment would be to "write, title, publicize, and administer a minimally biased student poll." Ms. Freedman said that was a friendly amendment.

Mr. Ramos Stierle said he thought that was a wonderful idea, to publicize this and get the word out. If people would like to get rid of some of the Whereas Clauses, that would be fine. He thought they disagree, but he respected other people's points of view, and deleting some of them would be fine. He thought it would be more efficient if they left the title as it was, because many students didn't know that the University was affiliated with the Labs and that they were developing nuclear weapons. There was a hunger strike in May, and it was amazing how many students didn't know about this.

Ms. ElNaggar asked if they needed to debate the amendment if the amendment was being accepted as a friendly amendment. Mr. Ramos Stierle said he wasn't accepting the change to the title, but would accept the other changes. Mr. Daniels said he was accepting the deletion of the ninth and eleventh Whereas Clauses, and the amendment to the Resolved Clause.

A Delegate said he was a Delegate from Mechanical Engineering and was researching nuclear weapons. He wanted to second the comment made about the title and objected to the way it was written. He understood Mr. Ramos Stierle's point, but the way the title was written was really misleading. He didn't think they want to start off any poll by misleading the audience, particularly if they were trying to make a poll that sought to be unbiased. It was misleading because the title specifically suggested that what was being done at UC dealt with the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and that was factually inaccurate, to the best of his knowledge; and he was 99% sure about that. He didn't know professors or grads at UC working on nuclear proliferation or on any nuclear weapons.

Mr. Daniels said time was up. Ms. Freedman moved to extend speaking time by ten minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Wolgin said one issue with the amendment seemed to be timing, especially what was brought up about getting something out quickly. Mr. Wolgin said that in his opinion, it was not a good idea to just throw something out there. If they send this to the Rules Committee, he would like to have this brought up at the next GA meeting and at the November 21 committee meeting, which meant this could be done before Thanksgiving. Ms. Freedman said that would be fine.

Ms. Freedman said she would amend her amendment to say "that the Rules Committee write and title, by its November meeting, as well as publicize and administer, a minimally biased student poll on the topic of the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories' design of the RRW."

Mr. Purdy said he was President of the Statistics Grad Student Association and was a Delegate, an Alternate. He would like to speak against not just this poll, but against polls like this which, practically speaking, would be completely meaningless. Without getting into it, it would be impossible to get any results from this. He thought a poll might be taken to, instead, get a sense of how the University felt, and if there would be interest in doing some of the more difficult tasks that were mentioned, such as sponsoring various discussions on campus. He thought that was the way towards having some kind of movement, rather than having meaningless numbers.

Ms. Anderson said a previous speaker said that they couldn't make this perfect, and unbiased, so they should just throw out a really biased poll to start a discussion. She would like to see was a poll that was as unbiased as possible, with a lot of really biased discussion going on all around it. She thought having a poll that tried to be unbiased was not saying they wouldn't have biased discussions. She thought the poll would be a good way to start discussion. While there would be a lot of self-selection among people going to the Web site, that's where all the bias and shouting would happen around the polls. People had to shout to get people to go to the poll. So the poll was unbiased and people would be biased and would shout and tell others to take the poll. She didn't think the Graduate Assembly should take a side on this until the graduate students have. She thought the GA should create a forum for graduate students to take a side.

A Delegate said that as a Delegate, he sent to e-mails his Department to find out things, and when he came to GA meetings, he tries to reflect those things. He felt he could actually reference his Department to some degree, so he didn't necessarily need a poll to go out to the entire school to represent his particular Department.

Mr. Daniels said that Robert's Rules states that if no more comments were stated on the issue, then they immediately move to a vote. He called for any other comments on the proposed amendment. The amendment they'd be voting on was to strike the ninth and eleventh Whereas Clauses and strike the Resolved Clause, to be replaced with the following:

“Resolved, that the Rules Committee write and title by its November meeting, as well as publicize and administer, a minimally biased student poll on the topic of the Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories' design of the RRW.”

A Delegate asked if the poll the Committee wrote would have to be approved again by the GA. Mr. Daniels said that would not be the case, as specified in the amendment.

Ms. Anderson said they were giving a lot for the Rules Committee, and asked if the Committee could write the poll, with the poll to be publicized and administered by the President or whomever. Mr. Rajan said it was okay, and they could handle it.

A Delegate said that if there already was a poll, and it was free, and it could serve as a point of discussion, she didn't see how that could hurt. Maybe later the GA could do something else.

Mr. Ramos Stierle asked if this meant it would be postponed. Mr. Daniels said the Rules Committee will meet November 21. They will write and title the poll at that meeting. Mr. Ramos Stierle asked if the GA,

then, was voting to postpone this to November 21 and delay the poll. Mr. Daniels said the poll would be written and titled on the 21st and publicized and administered after the 21st.

Mr. Daal said the poll would not go up on the 21st. Mr. Ramos Stierle said it would take more time to decide this. Mr. Daniels said that theoretically, it would take more time, but it wouldn't be done sooner than the 21st. Mr. Ramos Stierle said that was assuming people were okay with this amendment.

Mr. McDougal asked who was on the Rules Committee. Mr. Daniels said all committee meetings were public, and if people wanted to attend, they were always welcome to go. Mr. McDougal asked if anybody, then, who wanted to attend could participate. Mr. Rajan said that was correct. Ms. Freedman said that included Delegates and non-Delegates.

A Delegate asked why the GA couldn't do this sooner. Mr. Daniels said that's what the amendment said.

Mr. McDougal asked for a friendly amendment, to have an ad hoc committee, including the Rules Committee, to meet and work on this as soon as possible. A Delegate said it was hard to organize an ad hoc committee.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 20-16-2.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION TO ADMINISTER A STUDENT POLL REGARDING THE PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 19-17-4.

Mr. Shelby asked how he could submit factual information regarding the RRW program, and whom he could give it to. Mr. Rajan said he could send any information to rules@ga.berkeley.edu.

A Delegate said that since other people besides people on the Rules Committee were interested in this, she asked if an e-mail could be sent to all the Delegates on when and where the Rules Committee would meet, so everyone who was interested could attend.

Henry Stern, GA Representative on EBI

Henry Stern introduced himself and said he was a Law student. He was an official Delegate last year and now was an advisory member. He and Alexander Jones, a Plant and Molecular Biology graduate student, participated in consultations with the Administration that summer regarding the Energy Biosciences Institute. He asked how many people knew what the EBI was, and asked how many people hadn't heard of the EBI. He'd do a two-minute primer, and said he mostly wanted to mostly get their questions.

Mr. Stern said EBI was a \$500 million, ten-year research alliance with BP plc, formerly known as British Petroleum. They'll look at things like feedstocks, grasses, elephant grass, how these things would be broken down, and also look at the socioeconomic impacts of bioenergy. The EBI aroused a great deal of

controversy initially. There were a series of protests last year when the talks originated and a proposal was announced. A Resolution was passed by the Graduate Assembly calling for student representation in the process. They initially asked for an official role at the negotiation table. They compromised, and instead, took a kind of advisory position, without a yea or nay vote on the agreement. People from the GA who were involved were himself, Alexander Jones, John Rheume, and a gentleman named Nick Spicer, a Haas student. Mr. Rheume and Mr. Spicer were invited by the Administration, as well as two members of the ASUC. They all participated in two talks where they basically asked hard questions, got information, posted it publicly on the Web site, went back, took a bunch of feedback from students, pushed it back to the Administration, and just kept kind of a channel of communication going.

Mr. Stern said the roles he and Ms. Jones had were as official GA liaisons to the process, they were not advocating for or against the agreement and they were really there to be representatives, to take students' questions, and to lobby on their behalf, and just bring good information.

With that said, Mr. Stern said that what was being passed out was a memo that summarized the discussions. It was up at the GA Web site at that time. He authored it in August or July. The talks were coming up soon and it looked like the signing would be any day, as early as next week. There will be a final meeting between this consultation committee and the Administration before the contract was released. That meeting would not necessarily occur before the contract was signed, but would happen before the contract was released publicly.

Mr. Stern said it might be difficult for those who were not familiar with this, but they should feel free to ask questions if they had concerns. He asked if they had the bullet points he sent. Mr. Daniels said they did, in a document that each had. Mr. Stern said he was there to take questions, but mostly to get their input and take notes. The consultation committee will be going back to talk to Vice Chancellor of Research Beth Burnside, who has kind of been the architect for the deal. Mr. Stern said he would like to hear from Delegates as to what their thoughts were on this matter, and for them to outline some areas of concern.

Mr. Stern said that people have expressed various concerns about this proposal. Some of those concerns included having a corporate alliance; compromising academic freedom; and the way intellectual property was structured, in that inventions coming out of this would undermine research and that BP would basically get the skim off the top. Both those points had some validity.

A Delegate said he wanted to clarify something and said that Mr. Stern stated that the EBI was about bio-energy. It was not the "bioenergy institute," but the Energy Biosciences Institute. The difference was that the Institute also included research, not just on biofuels, but on fossil fuels, coal, and so on. Mr. Stern said that was correct, and said it concerned bioenergy. He would apologize, and said that was a good point. EBI will synthetically design microbes, for instance, that would potentially be able to sequester carbon dioxide and perhaps extract energy from the ground. The EBI was basically about using biology to deal with energy. Perhaps that was a better articulation. However, the Institute will spend a large majority of the funding on biofuels. That was BP's biggest interest in this, and that's where there was a lot of profit.

A speaker said Delegates probably got a sheet listing ten questions that he and a multitude of graduate students came up with. Some of those grad students were Delegates and some who were involved in

writing the Resolution that led to Mr. Stern coming that day. He was looking for answers to all these questions, and he could read them one-by-one, and Mr. Stern could respond to them at the end. Mr. Stern said these questions were sent to him, and he responded via e-mail, to anonymous people with the initials "ga." These were very familiar questions. The speaker said the responses weren't received. Mr. Stern said that wasn't accurate and said he had copies of the responses. The speaker said these questions dealt with communication from Mr. Stern to the graduate students, but there was also another part, which was how well Mr. Stern represented the Resolution that led to his being liaison. And there was a further part, asking him to actually go over some further, specific concerns that kept on coming up, as details of this very secretive contract were kind of pulled out from people anonymously. So there were three parts to it. Mr. Stern had a copy of the questions, and everybody in the room had a copy. He said that if Mr. Stern wanted to go over and answer them one-by-one, that would be very good.

Mr. Stern asked if he wanted to do that first, as opposed to the other two parts about him representing. The speaker said he could start with Number 1, and asked if that would be okay with people.

Mr. Wolgen said that if Mr. Stern has sent an e-mail in response, he asked if the e-mail could be sent to all Delegates.

Ms. Anderson asked where the e-mail was sent. Mr. Stern said someone anonymously sent him an e-mail. He tried to find out who it was in his responses, but he didn't learn that. Mr. Daniels said it was personalized e-mail. Ms. Anderson asked if it wasn't a GA committee. Mr. Daniels said it wasn't. It was an e-mail sent to him and to Mr. Stern. Mr. Daniels said that Mr. Stern answered it, as far as he knew, and that was the last thing Mr. Daniels said he knew about it.

Mr. Daniels said that since not everybody there was part of the e-mail, they could also send the text and his answers. But the question was asked, and that's why Mr. Stern was there. So he would propose that they go through the questions that were submitted. As this was a representative body, at any point someone could make a motion to end discussion and they would adjourn.

A Delegate said that since other people may also have questions, he asked if it was fair to go through ten questions that were distributed and maybe not be able to take questions from other people. He asked if they could take one or two of the speaker's favorite questions and see if other people had questions. Mr. Daniels said that at that point, the meeting was scheduled to continue for five more minutes. If no one made a motion to extend the time, they'd be done. If the speaker wanted to, on his own accord, ask only a few questions, he could. Mr. Daniels said he could not require anyone else to be quiet unless the Delegate body voted for that to happen.

The speaker said there was an e-mail controversy, but they didn't have to talk about that. But if Mr. Stern did respond to those, maybe he could send that out.

Mr. Stern said he hasn't read the text of the ten questions. The questions were two full pages, single-spaced, so he hasn't read everything. It was fairly cryptic. He didn't know the speaker sent the e-mail, but Mr. Stern said he would love some transparency. He'd get back to everyone very publicly about this. If the speaker wanted to hit the key questions, they could do that, and Mr. Stern said people could hear his responses.

Mr. McDougal asked if they could extend discussion, because it was really important that this body had people representing on these committees on campus and that there be some accountability. Mr. Daniels asked how long he wanted to extend the meeting.

A motion was made to extend the meeting by ten minutes. Mr. Daniels said that would mean they'd adjourn in 15 minutes. The motion was seconded. The motion to extend the meeting time passed by hand-vote 25-9-0.

The speaker said he would like question number 3 answered, and read the following:

- 3.) Would the liaison please explain exactly by which specific person, on which date, through which format (e-mail, conversation, etc), two graduate students, Nicolas Spicer and Jonathan Rheume, were selectively invited to the negotiations above and beyond the designated liaison to the negotiations, Henry Stern. If the liaison does not yet know these details, would he please explain why he has not investigated the matter after several rounds of questions asking him to do so. Did the liaison express concern that the Administration selectively invited a student (Nicolas Spicer) who was a former BP employee and had recently received money from oil companies, including BP?

Mr. Daniels said he raised this with the Chancellor directly, and he mentioned that meetings were not technically a committee. By University agreement, the GA and the ASUC had sole authority to appoint graduate and undergraduate students to the committees. Mr. Daniels said he made a point that even though it wasn't technically a committee, the Chancellor should have talked to them. The Chancellor agreed and said he would make sure to let people know that. But this was after the fact, and they had already been on the committee. So the summary was that the Chancellor acknowledged that if this were to ever happen in the future, or next time, that he would consult with the GA on this. But in this, the Chancellor did not. That may not be satisfy as to how they acted, but that was an accurate summary.

Mr. Stern said it was a point of contention when that happened, to some extent, because they wanted to debate the process. This was just a strategic decision students basically made, where students could have said no to the talks completely, or they could go forward on the campus' terms.

Mr. Daniels said that to follow-up, in terms of not withdrawing from the talks and going forward, that was made in his belief that Mr. Stern could dictate the terms of the talks by his presence there. Mr. Rheume was getting married at that time and probably wouldn't have been able to attend. The other two graduate students could attend. And the undergraduate was unrelated to this. Mr. Daniels said their thought was that there would probably be Mr. Stern, Ann Jeffrey, Beth Burnside, with Mr. Stern speaking on behalf of students. So Mr. Daniels said they felt they could put up with this decision by the Chancellor because it wouldn't affect Mr. Stern's ability to move the conversation forward in the way he was supposed to. Whether that was a good strategic decision or not, that was the thought process that they went through.

The speaker said there were other things people wanted to raise. He thought they should hear comments.

A speaker said the question wasn't about Mr. Daniels' judgment, but about who invited the other student. Mr. Daniels said that was Beth Burnside. Mr. Stern said it was via e-mail. He could look up the exact date. The original invitation was cc'd via e-mail to them, himself and the two ASUC folks, in late May.

Mr. Rheume said he was the individual who was named, and was selectively invited to this discussion; and he would like to point out that it was a discussion. The question states that they were invited to the "negotiations," but they weren't given the power to negotiate. Rather, the discussion he attended was for more of an intermediary. It was information dispersion. As to why he was invited, he thought it was because of his role with the British Petroleum Resolution last semester that was introduced at the March GA meeting. He recalled working on it during part of his Spring Break. The GA met the next month and had a reasonable Resolution. They ironed things out and got everyone's input. The outcome of that was that they got two know some of Vice Chancellor of Research Beth Burnside's some of her staff. Ann Jeffrey asked him to come in, and so he did. He was only able to attend one of those meetings because he got married.

Mr. Stern said the same was true for Nick Spicer being on the committee. Mr. Rheume said beyond that, he didn't have the impression that there was anything secretive, devious, or plotting the Administration was doing by inviting him. That seemed to be what some wording in the question seemed to imply. But he didn't think there was any manipulation going on.

Mr. McDougal asked if he was saying there was no manipulation, meaning that the bounds of the communication was that they were allowed to give their opinions. Mr. Rheume said they were allowed to give their opinions. Mr. McDougal asked if they had no weight, however. Mr. Stern said they were non-binding; and that was very important to clarify. This was not a negotiation. The students didn't have veto power. Rather, this was a consultation. And that frankly, was frustrating. They tried to figure out whether to completely boycott the meetings. Talking to staff of BP was a big part of that. And they were actually in talks with the GA and involved with the Resolution. Mr. Stern said they decided that it would be effective to have someone talking to them and that they should try and get information out officially, however compromised the forum was. Also, there was a very important role for protest. He wanted to make that extremely clear. He strongly supported that camp that wanted to act outside of this process. But that was the status of what these talks were about.

Mr. Rheume said that in the discussion, it was clear that they weren't being given the seats at the negotiating table that they wanted. But the Vice Chancellor went out of her way to solicit input from them. She was interested in hearing students' concerns, and that's what the students were there to do.

A speaker said that there was definitely input given by these students, but he would ask about output, which raised question number 1:

- 1) Has the liaison expressed concern to the Chancellor, President, and other parties that the newly revised contract be made available for public comment before it is considered for signing at the UC Office of the President in Oakland? If the liaison has not expressed such concern, would he please do so, and also remind the Chancellor of the Chancellor's explicitly stated belief of "the need for transparency" in relation to the proposed deal, published on April 29, 2007, in *The Sacramento Bee*.

Mr. Stern said that to the second question, yes, he will remind the Chancellor, and will push back in as persuasive way as he possibly could. And it was brought up especially in the second meeting about the public nature of the process and transparency. He couldn't get them to release the contract publicly. The compromise was that they were fairly explicit about a lot of details about the intellectual property

structure, about the governance board, about how the funding was going to work, approximations even for how proportionately things would be funded, such as approximately one-seventh going towards socioeconomic impact, etc. So that memo was very important. The memo that he put up on the Web had the outlines of the contract. It didn't have precise legal language, but he made every effort to make the memo as close to a kind of sketch of what the contract would be. He had a conversation last Friday with Ann Jeffrey, the Assistant to the Vice Chancellor of Research, and she told him that the contract would look very similar to what they went over. And in good faith, he'd take her word for that. What they do have, though, was the memo on the Web site. It will be a contract when that's publicly posted. If it looked a lot different in terms of the IP structure, or the governing structure, or the funding, there would be a real problem, because then these negotiations were in bad faith.

Mr. Daniels said the document that Mr. Stern wrote and posted on the Web site was sent to Beth Burnside and Ann Jeffrey, that office, to clarify what was discussed and stated in those meetings. So it wasn't just Mr. Stern's version on his own, or anybody else's. It was sent to them, so they knew about it. Mr. Stern said the language was really combed through. Mr. Daniels said he wouldn't say that they approved it in the sense that they approved what would be in the contract, but they said this was what they stated in the meeting. So people could trust that it was a fairly specific document that, depending on one's political viewpoint, they could use once the actual contract was made public. Mr. Stern said that was truly the purpose of that memo, and not to just have a totally informal, under-the-radar talk, but to really have something that gave students ground to stand on when the contract was released, because it was hard to get good ground to stand on. Students didn't have a veto, so this was as close as they could get to saying, "You told us this, so what about that." He would really encourage people to read through it. It was fairly detailed.

A Delegate said that it was mentioned that Mr. Stern has been unresponsive, and the Delegate just wanted to state that a month and a half ago or so, Mr. Stern had an info session in MLK which the Delegate said he attended. And before that info session, he had never met Mr. Stern. On several occasions he sent Mr. Stern an e-mail without identifying himself as a Delegate, and received replies. So his experience was very different from what has been expressed.

Mr. Stern said that to be fair, some questions were harder to get the answers to than others. And there was delay. He's had delayed responses, and it has not been as prompt as he was with the Delegate, because he didn't know everything, and he still didn't. This was really just about being good at trying to get information out and getting it to Delegates. He would sincerely apologize for any delay.

The speaker said his last question was number 10.

10. Would the liaison please report back whether he expressed the concern -- stated in the Graduate Assembly's April Resolution -- that the Administration was contradicting the recommendations of the independent review by Michigan State University of the Novartis deal, which recommended that the University "avoid industry agreements that involve complete academic units or large groups of researchers" and "encourage broad debate early in the process of developing new research agendas." If so, what was the response? If not, why not, and would the liaison please do so.

The speaker said he had one other question. He understood that Mr. Stern didn't know as much as the people at the top, but as much as he did, he asked if Mr. Stern knew if the agreement needed to be

approved by the UC Regents, and by what percentage. Mr. Daniels said that when he met with the Chancellor after the GA's April Resolution passed, he laid out in bullet point the concerns that the Resolution contained. He posted that on the EBI site, the GA Web site, the summaries that he wrote after every Chancellor's meeting about what he said, and what the Chancellor said. Mr. Daniels said he attempted to bold those sections. When the text converted to .pdf, it didn't work that well. So he would encourage people to go online. It was there, in terms of what he said. Mr. Daniels said the Chancellor's response was that this issue was already defined.

Mr. Stern said there was a study by Cornell done on the matter of industrial research alliances and the inherent tension that such a kind of partnership had with academic freedom. In the memo, the Cornell document was referenced. A lot of people thought the Cornell study was actually a little better of a study than the Novartis study. But with that said, the spirit of this concern, question number 10, was a huge issue. He definitely brought it up and it was actually explicit in the memo. They did not want to have any language in the contract that would state that the University would have its academic freedom compromised by a corporation, in so many words, and to avoid that at all costs. The Cornell document recommended having that language, that clause, put into a contract. Mr. Daniels said he pushed on that. He actually found it unnecessarily absent. There was no reason for it to not be in there because they were saying it was not going to be compromised. But it says in the memo on the GA site that the University did not put that in there because the campus did not feel it was necessary since it was such a fundamental aspect of research, and that it would also undermine the integrity of academic research and the good faith of their researchers to put that kind of clause in there. That stance could be attacked, supported, or whatever, but that was in that memo. So he would second this concern, and thought it was kind of lame that such wording wasn't in there. It was something he pushed for, but again, he didn't win everything. He just put down what people said. He sent that out to the *S.F. Chronicle* and all the rest.

Mr. Wolgin moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded and failed by hand-vote 12-15-2.

A Delegate moved to extend speaking time by five minutes. The motion was seconded and failed by hand-vote 10-18-0.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed by voice-vote.

Mr. Daniels said that just to remind people, the GA reception was next Thursday, November 8, and the GA info session was November 15. also, he would ask people to please turn in their feedback form.

This meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

The Resolution was amended to read as follows:

Resolution on Directed Action to Administer a Student Poll Regarding the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly supports the student voice by delivering proposals and messages to the University of California (UC) Administration; and

Whereas, UC is seen by many people in the world as a role model institution; and

Whereas, the Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories, which are jointly administered by the UC Regents, just succeeded in designing a new nuclear weapon, the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW), and are preparing the manufacturing infrastructure for the production of RRW's plutonium bomb pits, its the core component; and

Whereas, this is the first official announcement (March 2007) promoting the proliferation of nuclear weapons since the end of the Cold War; and

Whereas, the production of nuclear weapons increases their proliferation; and

Whereas, the United States is a signatory of the 1970 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which mandates that the nuclear powers work in good faith toward the cessation of the arms race and toward nuclear disarmament; and

Whereas, graduate students can work towards the goal of using UC's enormous political and intellectual weight to work toward nuclear disarmament; and

Whereas, the student community of Berkeley has been an important influence in the history of student movements; and

Whereas the UC Santa Cruz student community has already administered a poll on this issue; and

Resolved, that the Rules Committee write and title by its November meeting, as well as publicize and administer, a minimally biased student poll on the topic of the Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories' design of the RRW."