

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

December 4, 2008

### SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting concluded the Fall Semester. It was called to order at 5:31 p.m.

#### Announcements

Ms. Flores, ASUC Senator and Senate rep to the GA, said the Senate hasn't been able to conduct official business for the past several weeks because they didn't appoint an Elections Council Chair on time. That appointment has been made, and grads were encouraged to serve on the Elections Council. The Students of Color Conference was held that weekend and a few grad students went. The Academic Affairs Vice President, wanted to encourage grads to participate in the Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program. An ASUC Senator, Mr. Moghtader, was facing a recall election as a result of a petition signed by students saying they believed he hadn't followed campus principles of community. The election will be expensive.

The GA was still in need of Judicial Council members.

Mr. Poullard, Dean of Students said there will be an online portal next semester for students to get liability insurance paid for by the campus for on-campus events. Off-campus coverage will be available at some point. Grads' reps and staff in Risk Management, CLL, and the OP, were working on this. Regarding the events of November 13, there were some concerns around/ a perceived cover-up by the University. But people weren't clear about FERPA processes and the Student Conduct process. A process was underway. They will exceed the \$10,000 they allotted for last semester.

Delegates were asked to take the Business Office survey on the Web.

Nominations were open for the 2009 Faculty Mentorship Awards.

The UCSA Lobby Conference will be February 28 - March 2.

### REPORTS

The Budget Committee started work on next year's GA budget, and people heading up GA units will be contacted for their input. The Committee was also looking into investing GA savings with the UC Berkeley Foundation endowment.

With no objection, the Assembly approved the Funding Committee's report, approving Graduate Events Round 4, \$22,919.73.

#### Motion to Revisit 0810c

The GA last month passed 0810c, Resolution on Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics. A proposal to amend the Resolution by exempting GSIs failed by voice-vote.

### Resolutions

By unanimous voice-vote, the Assembly passed 0811a, as amended, Resolution on a Graduate Assembly Action Item 2008: Graduate Student Mental Healthcare, to form a committee to monitor the campus' Reg Fee increase of \$1.3 million for student mental health and ensure grad interests were met. Kristen Parrish was elected as the Coordinator.

### Address by Chancellor Birgeneau

Chancellor Birgeneau noted that he met monthly, with GA Executives and has had very good relationships with the GA.

On Election Day, about 400 students occupied the lawn and the parking lot and called upon him to give a speech. An African American running for President and a woman running for Vice President was extraordinary in the history of the US.

A large number of searches were authorized last year, before the current financial situation, and so far they have hired over 80 faculty, with a significant number of Asian, African American, and Chicano/Latino faculty.

At an incredible rate, faculty receive outside offers. The campus can compete in salaries and their retention rate that year was over 80%, which was phenomenal. The Shaw Prize, the Nobel Prize of astrophysics, has been awarded to Berkeley faculty three of the Prize's first four. Sloan Foundation Fellowships are given to the top 20 young faculty in eight areas, and over the last five years, MIT and Berkeley were tied for 1st. And as for graduate students, 1,000 National Science Foundation Fellowships are awarded to the best undergrads entering grad school, and last year 1 out of 9 NSF Fellows gave Berkeley as their University of choice.

The Chancellor wrote a paper, "Accessing Excellence." That sets a goal of funding graduate students \$250 million over the next five years, driven by Graduate Dean Szeri. The campus received a Hewlett Foundation for faculty chairs of \$110 million for 100 faculty chairs, to be matched by donors. Chairs will be structured to spin off \$25,000 grads every year.

The financial situation was not such good news. The campus was absorbing mid-year cuts, \$5 million, and maybe that much or more the rest of the year. They borrowed \$5 million so they wouldn't cancel classes. And fellowships would certainly not be affected. They anticipate 5-7% cuts next year, and probably the year after. Every single university in the country was in this situation. Their intention is to protect core academic programs, good news for graduate instructors. They'll guarantee TA budgets. Fees were slated to go up 9.4%.

They're moving ahead on Lower Sproul redevelopment, and moving ahead aggressively with equity and inclusion initiatives. The campus also continues support student mental health and has taken a number of measures to increase campus safety, such as the WarnMe system.

The Chancellor has proposed that UC campuses have flexibility in fees, something done at other systems. The increase in fees would be used for financial aid and faculty salaries. The full-fee increase would be for undergrads in families whose income was more than \$130,000. Grads would be looked at separately.

It was noted that recycling wasn't done old buildings. The Chancellor he hasn't looked at that and would raise that point with the relevant Vice Chancellor. It was noted that there was a lack of bike parking and the Chancellor said he'd look into it.

In response to a question about grads planning to go into faculty positions the Chancellor that especially since they over-hired that past year, they'll probably under-hire for the next two years. He thought the job market will be fine in two years.

In response to a question about restructuring and reorganizing in light of the financial situation, the Chancellor noted that making drastic changes in the University didn't have huge inertia.

In response to a question about the possibility of enrollment going down in response to the economic situation, the Chancellor said he believed the number of PhD students was rather insensitive to economic fluctuations. The number was determined by the faculty's capacity to supervise them. Professional and Masters degrees were a different story.

In response to a question about retaining the number of GSIs, the Chancellor said individual departments determined that.

In response to a question, the Chancellor said West Coast institutions tended to do less government relations less than schools on the East Coast. Berkeley people needed to play more of a role in major studies and policies in Washington.

In response to a question about female who were faculty concerned with biases towards their advancement and being under-appreciated and receiving outside offers. Chancellor Birgeneau said a study showed that was a myth and that there were more retention offers, percentage wise, for female faculty than for male faculty.

#### Resolutions (cont'd)

By unanimous voice-vote, the Assembly approved 0811b, Resolution to Create a Lower Sproul Redevelopment Action Agenda Item, creating a committee to ensure that a grad student center and gradate student programming were key elements of a redeveloped Lower Sproul. Dan Work will serve as Coordinator.

By hand-vote, 24-13-0, the Assembly approved 0811c, Resolution to Promote Fairness and Transparency In Funding Allocations. The Resolution would prioritize departmental equity in the distribution of funds among student organizations. It eliminates the dollar limit on funding a specific student group and asks the Funding Committee to include in its reports the proportion of funds each department has applied for in each funding round and for the year.

The Resolution addressed the issue of funding equity. Some departments might have 30 student organizations and some might have one, which could currently run into funding limits any one group could receive. The Resolution gives the GA flexibility. Current policy limits funding to \$1,000 per group.

The meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

[End Summary of the Meeting]

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Fall Semester, was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:31 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daal said the first announcement was from the ASUC representative to the GA. Mary June Flores and Kifah Shah introduced themselves. Ms. Flores said they were Senators in the ASUC. Ms. Flores said the Senate could finally conduct New Business officially. They haven't be able to conduct official business for the past three or four weeks because they didn't appoint an Elections Council Chair on time. But on Wednesday they finally appointed Emily Leidblad for that position. If any graduates were interested in being on her staff and making sure the elections process for the ASUC was transparent and efficient, they should contact her. Ms. Flores said she'd forward Ms. Leidblad's contact information.

On Wednesday the passed about 25 bills, since they hadn't been able to pass bills for the past few weeks. They spent about \$40,000 from their carryforward fund for student groups and for grants. A lot of students have been applying for grants.

Ms. Flores said that last weekend was the Students of Color Conference, and a few grad students went. There was an amazing turnout, with about 1,000 students from all over the UC campuses. At the end of the conference there was a press conference and a protest that was all over the news, with the idea of UC students really holding the University accountable to lowering student fees and establishing procedures for fees in the coming years.

Lastly, from the Academic Affairs Vice President, he wanted to encourage them to participate in the Undergraduate/Graduate Mentorship Program if they have not yet done so. Ms. Flores said she would highly encourage them to do so.

Ms. Shah said that lastly, one Senator, John Moghtader, was facing a recall election. In less than two days, more than 1,000 students signed a petition to recall him because they believed he hadn't followed the campus' principles of community. The petition had a Web site. So the ASUC was facing a really expensive recall election in either the next two weeks or in January. She would ask them to please ask any questions they had.

Mr. St. Clair asked if they could be more specific about what the Senator did. Ms. Flores said they couldn't be specific about what he did, but it was in terms of his conduct, and that elected officials were held to a higher standard. He breached that. The petition was actually created by Law students, Delegates' colleagues. So they were the first to definitely make sure the petition was legitimate. Ms. Shah said four students at Boalt Law started it. Their main purpose was not only to uphold the principles of community the campus had, but to protect free speech, since the Senator had infringed a lot of people's free speech.

Mr. Daal said that if the question was about the incident that caused the recall election, perhaps Mr. Poullard will say more about that.

A Delegate Mr. Rabkin asked how much the recall will cost. Ms. Flores said they were estimating between \$30-50,000. That would be with polls, instead of having an online election. Ms. Shah said the

Announcements -- ASUC Representatives (cont'd)  
-- Dean Poullard

- 5 -

Elections Council Chair was just appointed and was proposing to hold an online election, without polls. So hopefully the election will be much more cost efficient than with having polls.

Mr. Rabkin asked about a challenge to the vote and who the Senator's constituents were. Ms. Flores said it was under the Judicial Council's review, and it was looking at the language of the Constitution. Ms. Shah said an Advisory Opinion has been filed before the Judicial Council as of that day. The Council will tell the ASUC within three or four days who exactly the constituents are. That part of the By-laws had to be amended because it has not been updated. Mr. Rabkin said he was asking generally. He said Mr. Moghtader must have been on the ballot under some name and asked what the Senator's party was. Ms. Shah said he was affiliated with The Squelch Party. So maybe The Squelch Party was his constituents. But the Party disaffiliated itself from him after November 13.

Mr. Daal said that as an additional point of information, the GA was still in need of Judicial Council members. The GA gets to appoint some and hasn't yet done so. So if any Delegate's interest was piqued by this issue, maybe they'd be interested in sitting on the J-Council. If they were, they should write that on their feedback form and he would happily nominate them.

Ms. Flores said that lastly, in terms of how the recall election affects graduate students, the ASUC Senate was in charge of student fees, and part of grads' fees go into money that the Senate was in charge of. They were also in charge of passing bills that affect students on campus, whether grads or undergrads. A lot of grad students have asked why they should care, because this was an undergraduate student. But this affected grads' University as well. So she thought it was imperative and important, in that sense. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank them.

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was Jonathan Poullard, the Dean of Students. Mr. Poullard said work on behalf of both the Graduate Assembly and the ASUC was going on regarding the issue of liability insurance for student organizations. Luckily, Berkeley and UCLA will be the guinea pig campuses for an online portal for students who need insurance for their events on campus, both graduate student and undergrad events. At some point they'll get to the point of having off-campus coverage as well for things like internships, externships, travel, and what else. But currently, the concern was about events that take place on campus. This especially dealt with grads, since they have the most expensive events since they always involve alcohol. So grads need to take care that whenever students hold an event on campus, it was covered from a liability standpoint. And hopefully by January, they'll have a portal where folks could go online, fill out the information needed, get the authorization, and print it out right there, showing they're covered for that specific event. This will make it much easier for students to access and to make sure that events were sound, safe, and secure. But this was ongoing. Grads' representatives were working with the Office of Risk Management, staff in his office, staff in Student Leadership, as well as the OP, to make sure this happens.

Mr. Poullard said the other big piece of news he wanted to talk about briefly was the issue of campus climate, which impacts both grads and undergrads. Pres. Daal talked to him about some concerns around what was perceived to be a University cover-up for what took place on November 13. People weren't clear about what was going on, or what the FERPA processes were, the Family Rights and Privacy Act,

which protects all students' records, including Student Conduct records. So people didn't know what was going on, and they weren't going to know in great detail. A process was happening, and the general

Announcements -- Dean Poullard (cont'd)

- 6 -

student population won't know what the outcome was. Only the folks involved will know the outcome. But that creates a feeling of whether people could trust the process. He thought part of that was actually not knowing how the process worked. So if people have additional questions, he could answer them at that time. But this will also be explicated in his letter that will appear in the Daily Cal on Monday. It will give all this information in an ongoing way, so people knew that this wasn't being pushed under the rug and wasn't being treated lightly. It was actually a very serious issue. Mr. Poullard said that in his 21 years of being an administrator and an educator, he has never had students go to physical blows to one another. It's simply never happened. So for him, this was a really unfortunate and very serious situation.

Mr. Daal asked called for any questions.

Ms. Rivas asked if there will be an informational meeting with regard to liability, and if so, for it to not conflict with a GA Delegates meeting. Mr. Poullard asked what information she was referring to. Ms. Rivas said it would be information about the new portal. Mr. Poullard said the GA had a representative at that meeting. They were currently having a conference call between UC Berkeley and UCLA. The actual portal was being produced by an off-campus site through the Office of the President. Students will be informed in terms of how the portal will work. He didn't think they'd really want to be at this meeting, but could attend if they'd like. It was sort of the behind the scenes. They'll talk about what needs to happen to make the portal accessible, easily explained, and very intuitive, making it very, very simple for folks to get the insurance that they need.

A Delegate asked how the November 13 incident will affect future events on campus, and if there will be any changes in policy. Mr. Poullard said their policies were fine. This involved behavior and wasn't about policy. They had more than enough policy on the campus, and in fact, had too much policy on this campus. This was about the "how" of engaging each other, not the "what." And the "how" was harder than the "what." So for him, this was about reconciliation and a new form of activism. They love to teach students how to be activists, and that was a good thing. And how to use that anger, and that information, and how to think about their information in a way that was very powerful. But the new form of activism for him was about reconciliation, empathy, and healing. That took a lot of more work. That's the "how," and "how" they were connected. What happened at Mumbai just last week was just a symptom of what happened on the 13th of November. For him, it was all very interconnected. And people weren't doing a very good job thinking about how they were interconnected. Because what happens to him, happens to them. So he would ask them to think about how they want to have discourse on this campus. He was now working, for example, with the San Francisco Mosque, the Anti-Defamation League, the East Bay Jewish Coalition, Hillel, with as many people as he could. Mr. Poullard said he was not invested from an ego place in being the mediator. He was invested in making sure whatever they do from this place forward that they think about how to have community at Cal. They are but a microcosm of what happens in a larger world context. They all have responsibility for what that looked like.

Ms. Hsueh asked if his office or the Student Affairs Associate Dean's office will continue to pay for liability insurance for student group activities until the end of spring, 2009. Mr. Poullard said that was correct. And that office reported to him, as Dean of Students. They were all in the area of Campus Life and Leadership, reporting to the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. But they're paying for the insurance. He got a call that day from campus Risk Management, which oversees all of these requests. They've

already spent \$9,800 to cover student events, and they're going to go over the \$10,000 that they allotted for this semester. So Mr. Poullard said he and Harry LeGrande will figure out how to cover the fall. In the spring, this portal will kick in and the OP will pay for that. General Risk Management will pay for all of the risk management, the same as the campus covered it this semester.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 7 -

Mr. Daal said they were running a little low on time and asked if there was one more brief question.

Ms. Rivas asked when the portal will start. Mr. Poullard said it will start the beginning of the Spring Semester, when people come back from the break and start having events. Ms. Rivas said events were already being planned, and asked if students should register them as soon as they come back from the break. Mr. Poullard said that was correct. He wanted to thank them all very much.

Mr. Daal said that for his announcement, he would ask them to fill out their feedback forms and return them. They're very valuable to the GA and let people know what graduate students think. It helps the GA when administrators ask the GA what grads think about things, and it also guides how they conduct themselves with policies in the GA.

Secondly, Mr. Daal said that with no objection, he'd like the GA to move directly to the Chancellor when he arrived as he's a busy man. He would also like to fast track consideration of 0812a. Mr. Armstrong said they can't fast track an amendment to the By-laws.

Ms. Hsueh asked people to please take a look at the reports in the agenda packet, and the report from the GA Business Office. She'd ask them to please tell their departments and student groups that December 8 was the deadline for Graduate Events Round 3 and Group Resources Round 1. If people want to get reimbursed they should file by December 1. Otherwise, the Business Office will probably not be able to get to it until January. Secondly, she would ask students, by Friday, to please go the [ga.berkeley.edu](http://ga.berkeley.edu) Web site and give their feedback with the Business Office survey. This announcement was also made in November and they need more people to participate in order to see how the Business Office could serve them better. So she would ask people who have used the Business Office to go to the GA Web site and give them their feedback.

Ms. Abel said she was announcing the FMA, the Faculty Mentorship Awards for 2009. Nominations were now open. Delegates could nominate their faculty advisor, e.g., for being an outstanding mentor, and were being asked to forward around the information about this award. There will be three winners. It was quite competitive, with each winner getting a \$1,000 cash prize as well as plaque. The award is presented in March with the Sahlear Awards that the Graduate Division hands out. The e-mail for the award was [fma@GA.berkeley.edu](mailto:fma@GA.berkeley.edu). Or they could e-mail her and she'll give them the link. This will also go out on the E-grad and "The Source" and will go out to GSAs by Friday morning. Mr. Daal said the FMA started four or five years ago and was fast becoming a very prestigious award. The last time there were 36 nominations and they only chose three. It was starting to be used in tenure cases. He would encourage grads to nominate their outstanding mentors, people who have gone above and beyond the call of duty in mentoring. He called for any other announcements.

Mr. Ortega said he wanted to give people a heads-up about the Lobby Conference the UC Student Association holds every year. The UCSA is the coalition of all students in the UC System. It will occur February 28 - March 2. They'll go to Sacramento to lobby on student issues. Everything was paid for, and if people were interested in attending they just had to send him an e-mail.

## APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Reports

- 8 -

Mr. Daal said he would entertain a motion to approve the agenda. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Daal said the minutes from the last GA meeting were posted online earlier that week. He called for a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 6, 2008 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

## REPORTS

Mr. Daal said reports were distributed. Questions people had about any report could be asked at the end of Reports.

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Mr. Podesta said people should have picked up the Committee's report. They only did Grad Events Round 4, for the beginning of next semester. A lot of money was requested so they had a global cut of 38.2%. He called for any questions.

Reporting for the Budget Committee, Mr. Rajan said he would like to draw attention to this report. There were two major items. The Budget Committee was now starting to make up next year's GA budget. People who head up one of the GA's many units will be contacted by somebody on the Budget Committee as a liaison to their unit. He would ask them to please indicate all their hopes and dreams so the Budget Committee could make them come true. The second item was probably most important, from at least a monetary point of view. The Committee was looking into investing GA savings with the UC Berkeley Foundation endowment. It's an endowment fund that consists of actively and passively managed funds that get better rates than the Bank of America CD that the funds were currently in. There were a lot of considerations that would go into this. Hopefully by February they'll have a solid proposal as to why this was a good idea, why nothing could go wrong, and why it was a sound investment. And of course, this would be a textured, layered process. Delegates might not get all of those layers at the February and March meetings, when ideally, this discussion will happen. If people wanted to be involved at an earlier stage, he would ask them to please e-mail him at [budget@ga.berkeley.edu](mailto:budget@ga.berkeley.edu).

Mr. Daal said that seeing no questions, he would like to approve the Funding Committee report. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT, APPROVING GRADUATE EVENTS ROUND 4 ALLOCATIONS, \$22,919.73, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.



Mr. Daal called for any questions for any Committee Chairs or Officers. Seeing none, he said they would move on in the agenda.

## RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Resolution Referral

- 9 -

Motion to Revisit 0810c -- Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics

Mr. Daal said he would refer 0812a, Resolution to Amend the Process for Final Consideration of Graduate Assembly By-laws, to the Rules Committee.

### Motion to Revisit 0810c

The following amendments to 0810c were proposed: (~~strike through to delete~~, *italicize to add*)

Resolution on Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics

Whereas, UC Berkeley is the top ranked public American research university; and

Whereas, the Mission Statement of the University of California lists its fundamental responsibilities as teaching, research and public service, with teaching appearing first and foremost; and

Whereas, US News and World Report does not include teaching as a criteria in its rankings of top public national universities; and

Whereas, the overwhelming majority of undergraduates and the professional students who do not perform any research are poorly served by policies that focus on research at the expense of teaching; and

Whereas, course evaluations are a rich source of information and the only reliable summary of the quality of teaching; and

Whereas, course evaluations are used for faculty tenure and promotion cases; and

Whereas, UC Berkeley students provide a free service to the University by filling out course evaluations; and

Whereas, student access to course evaluations will ease the advising load of faculty members; and

Whereas, access to course evaluations will assist students to make more informed decisions about their class selections; and

Whereas, access to course evaluations will obviate the need for third-party sources of information that provide incomplete and sometimes emotionally charged feedback; and

Whereas, the policy of tenure and the lifelong job security afforded by it removes some motivational tools that are present in other professions; and

Whereas, a policy of transparency in the form of access to summary statistics of course evaluations is intended to be a motivational tool for faculty members to improve teaching; and

Motion to Revisit 0810c -- Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd) - 10 -

Resolution on Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd)

Whereas, several of UC Berkeley's peer universities offer students access to the student-generated course evaluation data, including the University of Michigan, the University of Virginia, Stanford, MIT, Harvard, Yale, and Carnegie Mellon; and

Whereas, the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at UC Berkeley does already share summary statistics from course evaluations online, and these statistics are available to all students to help them select their courses; and

~~Whereas, the University of California is a State-run institution that is subject to the California Public Records Act, which proclaims access to State records as a "fundamental and necessary right of every person in this State;" and~~

~~Whereas, the current practice at UC Berkeley of withholding course evaluation information from the citizens of California—and particularly from the student body—is out of compliance with State law. Universities are not exempt from the California Public Records Act;~~

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly President work with the UC Berkeley Chancellor to implement authenticated Internet access to summary statistics (but not individual written comments) from course evaluations spanning at least the past five years for members of the UC Berkeley community. *Nothing in this Resolution shall be apply or be construed to apply to summary statistics from evaluations of courses or sections taught by Graduate Student Instructors.*

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly review progress on the accessibility of course evaluations in March of the Spring 2009 Semester to determine if further actions are necessary.

Mr. Daal asked if anybody would like to give background on why there was a motion to revisit this Resolution. Mr. Armstrong the bill was in the agenda packet. If they recall, 0810c a Directed Action to encourage better teaching by increased access to course evaluation summary statistics. If he remembered correctly, he believed it was passed at the end of their last meeting with almost no debate. However, there were people who wanted to get in on the debate, which was cut off before they could. The GA heard back from a lot of people who were concerned about this, some who were anonymous, and some who identified themselves, who felt this would adversely affect graduate student instructors. If a grad was teaching maybe one time in their graduate career, or four times, they were probably going to have teaching evaluations, and that could put people at a competitive disadvantage when applying for jobs. People who were GSIs might not, in general, want their teaching evaluations made public.

Mr. Armstrong said that in the seventh or eighth Whereas Clause on the second page, there was something about the EECS Department having already done this, with evaluations online. He went to a page that was cited and tried to look for grad student instructor evaluations, but it turned out there weren't any because there's an opt-in policy. The concern was that if they put graduate student instructor teaching evaluations online, it would violate FERPA, the Family Rights and Privacy Act, something the GA just heard about earlier. So the Department has an opt-in policy. The GA took all these factors into consideration and made a motion to amend, as indicated.

Motion to Revisit 0810c -- Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd) - 11 -

Resolution on Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd)

Mr. Armstrong said the motion to amend would make it clear that none of this applied to graduate student instructors and would delete the final two Whereas Clauses. Those clauses indicate that these evaluations were sort of public records, which the GA didn't believe was correct. The amendment, if it was correct, would seem to mean that there was a violation of FERPA. So after they heard feedback, they wanted to present the motion to amend this Resolution.

Mr. Daal said they weren't exactly certain if these evaluations would violate FERPA. So the GA was just taking precautions. He called for any discussion.

Ms. Hubbard said she understood the hesitation with having teaching evaluations online, and she would be willing to amend the Resolution, on legal grounds only. She really didn't believe it was in the GA's best interests to essentially publicize something that, in her opinion, would be a double standard. If they expect faculty to have their evaluations publicly available, then grads should not have different expectations of themselves. She understood that some people may have bad course evaluations perhaps because of the nature of the course they taught, and there were always bad evaluations. But that was something that was explainable in any letter of recommendation from an instructor. So in terms of negatively impacting jobs, if one was going after an academic job, it was her opinion that they should be a good instructor. And people could spend quite a bit of time becoming a good instructor while a graduate student. If there were legal issues that needed to be considered, such as with FERPA and with California laws and public access to university information, they should definitely explore that so the GA wasn't putting itself in a legal situation. But if the issue was GSIs simply just not wanting their evaluations to be made public, she didn't think that was a good enough reason to amend the Resolution.

Mr. St. Clair said that at the University of Colorado, his teaching evaluation was posted online and that actually caused a lot of problems. It redefined the employee-employer relationship with his supervisors. And instead of it being an opportunity for them to mentor him, it became a concern whether or not the Department would lose money or lose face. For that reason, he was very much opposed to the amendment. He thought an instructor's performance was between the instructor and the next level supervisor. It was not something that should be posted on the Internet.

Ms. Berkeley said that as far as GSI evaluations go, she thought it was possibly more significant that GSIs do not repeat as instructors for a course. That makes the information far less useful to students, and could possibly clutter up the system. So rather than being a double standard to not include these, it would simply be a better prioritizing of resources.

Mr. Sylak said there was nothing in the Resolution that could be construed to apply to summary statistics with evaluation courses taught by graduate student instructors. He asked if ratings wouldn't be posted but comments could be, and wondered if comments and qualitative evaluations counted as summary statistics. That might be a reason to delay this, in addition to seeing whether there are qualifiers to not publish these evaluations.

Mr. Daal said that just to clarify, if the GA chose not to adopt this amendment, then the Resolution was still passed, and there was no unpassing it.

Motion to Revisit 0810c -- Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd) - 12 -

Mr. Marchand said that regarding the last comment, it was clear the Resolution only talked about making summary statistics public. It was clear from the rest of the Resolution that comments were not included. He wanted to deal with the issue of double standards. He didn't think it was a double standard in the sense that for graduate students are GSIs for economic reasons. It was basically a kind of scholarship for being a GSI. It was part of their funding package. It was different than a situation with a professor, especially a tenured professor who had job security. Professors are hired because they already are supposed to be professional teachers and professional researchers. He didn't think it was a double standard because the positions were very different to start with.

Mr. Rheume said he was one of the authors of the original Resolution. One thing in the proposed amendment that troubled him a little was to cut the last two Whereas Clauses. If they turn to the second page they'd see that the language of those two Whereas Clauses was the same as the public records act in the State of California, and these academic records, the teaching evaluations, fall under those provisions. In his opinion, the two Whereas Clauses proposed to be deleted were the most powerful Whereas Clauses in the document. He really understood the concerns about graduate students. But nowhere else in the Resolution did it mention "graduate students." If they look at it, it states that these course evaluations are used for faculty tenure, promotion cases, etc. But there was no mention in it of graduate students. He thought it might be somewhat impractical to include graduate students in an online course evaluation. For example, he TA'd two semesters of for introductory physics, Physics 8A, which has were 15 or 20 graduate student instructors for every class. So it would be a lot of work to put grad students' evaluations on there, and the University would struggle just to include the bare minimum number of classes. So he hoped the GA doesn't gut the Resolution. If they want to discuss the graduate student aspect, perhaps they could do that next month, once the wording has been cleaned up.

Mr. Basri said she thought the last two Whereas Clauses did concern, or potentially could concern, the legality of whether certain issues could be made public. If those data were graduate student-affiliated, he was slightly troubled with the idea of the GA passing a Resolution that a small population of graduate students thought would be injurious to them. He felt that it was the task of this organization to do nothing but advocate for grad students. There was a set of graduate students, albeit a minority, who felt like they'd be personally affected in negative ways. If that was the case, that was a potential problem, and he thought the GA should not just look out for the majority's rights.

Mr. Rabkin said he actually thought they should take out the last two clauses. He didn't think this body had any particular legal training and he didn't think they wanted to make claims about what California did and did not require, because it might come back to bite them. He didn't want to get into a fight about this.

Ms. Abel said that Mr. Rheume said that language would be finalized next month and asked for clarification about that. Mr. Rheume said the Resolution has already been passed, but he thought that for this amendment, the wording could be improved. He thought that should be investigated outside the meeting.

Ms. Abel said it seemed like they didn't know legally whether graduate student information will be allowed to be published, or whether that wasn't allowed to be published. She thought they should find that out before they pass the amendment to the Resolution. It seemed silly to sit around and talk about this if the law prohibited UC Berkeley from publishing any GSI information, in which case it's moot. And it seemed like they wouldn't be able to find that out until their next meeting. So that would mean another month.

Motion to Revisit 0810c -- Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd) - 13 -

Mr. Daal said that perhaps somebody will think about an amendment which conditions the Resolutions based on their legality.

Mr. Froehle said he thought they could agree that the spirit of this Resolution was good, especially as it's applied to their professors good. He thought they should let this document stand as it was and not reconsider it at all, and then at a future time, if needed, they could go back and pass another Resolution stating that they only meant full professors, and weren't including graduate students. Mr. Froehle said that was a subject they could leave until a later date. But right now, he thought this was wasting their time.

Dean Poullard said that just to offer from the FERB standpoint, if they act in accordance with a role in which they are an employee, that would not be an educational record. So if you are acting as a GSI as a function of employment, that was not covered by FERPA. FERPA covers educational records, including such things as health records, conduct records, grades, etc. Employment was not protected by FERPA. He was saying that just so people were clear.

Mr. Podesta said he thought they should take a wait-and-see approach to this. They have had a lot of pronouncements that evening as to whether this was or wasn't covered.

Ms. Abel said their "wait and see" was what Dean Poullard said.

Ms. Hubbard said she had a quick comment to Mr. Basri's comments. She understood what he was saying about anything that negatively impacted graduate students, but she wanted everyone to consider how bad teaching they've received from anyone, be it a graduate student or a faculty member, has negatively impacted them at some point during their education. She thought the weight of that experience, in her opinion, outweighed a select, small body of students.

Mr. Daal said he would ask people to make sure they don't start to repeat themselves; and he wasn't saying anybody has. He would ask people to think about alternate motions or about calling the question.

Mr. Froehle said he wanted to reiterate that point but phrase differently. He thought that if these teaching evaluations were made public, it would perhaps actually encourage people to try harder in their teaching responsibilities instead of just letting them go, knowing that it didn't really make any difference.

Mr. Rajan said that just as a point of information, he was not clear from reading the Resolution and being involved on the Executive Board what the directed action was that the Resolution asks for, and how it

would be affected by the amendment. For instance, he asked if they would, by including the amendment, draw attention to the fact that grads were asking to be exempt when people might not have been thinking about that anyway, or if people were thinking of drafting a letter to Dean Szeri, or something like that. He was wondering what the implications of this Resolution would be, and maybe Delegates would find that information useful in judging whether or not this was worth discussing more.

Mr. Daal said the way he goes about doing this was to speak with the people responsible, the people who could make this happen, the online course evaluation summaries, and negotiate terms about how they would be presented. So if it says that it's not going to apply to GSIs, then he wouldn't ask for that part.

Mr. Rajan asked how specific Mr. Daal needed the charge to be before he could make a judgment call on what the spirit of the Resolution was. He said that Mr. Rheume seemed to say there was no mention of

Motion to Revisit 0810c -- Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to - 14 -  
Course Evaluation Summary Statistics (cont'd)

GSIs in the Resolution whatsoever, and it seemed to be very targeted towards faculty. If the GA didn't bring it up, it might not be a problem. If it did get brought up, Mr. Daal could say it wasn't the charge of the Resolution.

Mr. deGrassi said he had a question about this being online. Mr. Daal said the Resolution would have it password protected on CalNet.

On a point of information, Ms. Abel said anybody could paste the data and then publish it. So it could still be made public.

Mr. Basri said he thought it was important to keep in mind that in most GSI contacts, at least in his Department, there was a process of teaching graduate students how to teach. He thought the assumption was that it was an apprenticeship program. And if there are grad students who weren't doing well, it was usually the responsibility of the department to help grad students for their own professional sake, to become better teachers. It shouldn't be the responsibility of the Graduate Assembly to say, "Well, if you're not a good teacher, people will know not to take their class." The GA didn't want additional punitive measures. Departments would do that themselves.

Mr. St. Clair moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded by Mr. Rabkin. Mr. Daal noted that a two-thirds vote was required for approval of the motion. The motion to end debate passed by voice-vote.

The motion to amend Resolution 0810c, as indicated, failed by voice-vote, Resolution on Directed Action to Encourage Better Teaching by Increased Access to Course Evaluation Summary Statistics.

## RESOLUTION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

Mr. Daal said the first Resolution they'd consider was 0811a.

The following Resolution, 0811a, was authored by Ms. Parrish and Ms. Hubbard:

RESOLUTION ON A GRADUATE ASSEMBLY ACTION ITEM 2008: GRADUATE STUDENT MENTAL HEALTHCARE

WHEREAS, the Regents of the University of California, Berkeley have approved a Registration Fee increase for 2008-09 that will provide an estimated \$1.3 million in additional funding dedicated to addressing student mental health issues on campus in the second year of a three-year funding system; and

WHEREAS, the University of California, Berkeley's Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Mental Health, in collaboration with University Health Services' Counseling and Psychological Services, the University of California Police Department, the Graduate Assembly (GA), and

0811a, Resolution on a Graduate Assembly Action Item 2008: Graduate Student Mental Healthcare - 15 -

RESOLUTION ON A GRADUATE ASSEMBLY ACTION ITEM 2008: GRADUATE STUDENT MENTAL HEALTHCARE (cont'd)

the Associated Students of the University of California leadership, developed a proposal to outline how these funds would be spent; and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the GA to advocate for graduate student mental health resources; and

WHEREAS, the GA should take an active role in monitoring the spending of the \$ 1.3 million to ensure graduate student interests are protected;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Graduate Student Mental Healthcare will be a GA action item for the 2008-2009 school year as outlined below:

Coordinators: Sarah Hubbard and Kristen Parrish

Goal: Ensure the percentage of the \$1.3 million allocation for mental health issues on campus is given to graduate students according to their population relative to the campus population. Assist in the execution of the Tier 2 funding proposal with UHS, CPS, the ASUC, and the UCPD.

Membership: Graduate Student Mental Health Committee (GSMHC) members will automatically be members of this GA Action Item committee.

Plan: Attend GSMHC meetings to advocate GA interests in this arena (1x1.5 hr. meeting/month, free lunch provided).

Meet periodically (minimum of twice each semester) with University Health Services (UHS) administration and others to review the spending of the allocated funds and assist in new program creation and report back to GA delegates (2x1 hr per semester).

Be actively involved in the development of the Tier 3 budget and goals.

Ms. Parrish said they wrote this Resolution to make graduate student mental health care an action item of the GA and to support that. They have an actionable goal, to ensure that a percentage of the money allocated go to grads. She'd give a brief background. Money was allocated out of student fees for suicide prevention and mental health care on campus. They would like to make sure that as a part of that, an officer was hired in the University of California Police Department, in the Threat Management Unit. With this step, the GA would oversee this and make sure money was being spent in a way that was actually serving the graduate student population. Their actionable goal was to actually watch how that money was being spent, and track it. Beyond that, in what may be more of a personal statement, Ms. Parrish said she thought that mental health care was really very important, and Berkeley actually provided pretty great access to such care. But the graduate student population, from her experience, was not very aware that it was out there for them. She would just like to see that the GA really do what it could to not only increase awareness of the fact that mental health care is available, but to also make sure that this money was used for graduate student mental health care.

0811a, Resolution on a GA Action Item 2008: Graduate Student Mental Healthcare (cont'd)

- 16 -

Ms. Hubbard said that to follow-up on that, the money that Ms. Parrish mentioned was \$1.3 million. It's already been specifically designated as to what that money will be used for. For example, there will be a new counselor hired whose entire job will be focused on graduate students. There will be an additional hire focused on international students. So a lot of these positions were already clearly defined. So really, the role of the GA was to make sure that the people who are hired were appropriate and that the proposal was carried out as it was originally designed to be.

Mr. Daal said that just to give a little background, a couple of years ago, in response to a couple of events, the Regents decided to raise a mental health fee on students in the form of a student fee. That's where that \$1.3 million came from.

Ms. Parrish said she was curious. The agenda packet stated that the Rules Committee was in favor of this, provided that lines 35 and 36 be struck. Mr. Rabkin said that was a typo, and that was changed because of tabulation. They meant to say lines 38 and 39, deleting "Membership."

Mr. Rabkin said he would like to introduce the amendment the Rules Committee recommended, to delete "Membership: Graduate Student Mental Health Committee (GSMHC) members will automatically be members of this GA Action Item Committee." There's no such thing as a "GA Action Item Committee," and therefore the Rules Committee thought those lines would be best left out. He so moved.

Ms. Parrish said that change would be fine.

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no debate they'd move to a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO STRIKE THE "MEMBERSHIP:" WORDING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Daal asked if there was additional discussion to the bill as amended.

Ms. Able said she would speak on behalf of the Campus Affairs Committee. One thing they noticed in the last Resolved Clause, in "Goal:", was the mention of assisting the funding proposal, in very specific language. They assumed that most people weren't familiar with the Tier 2 funding proposal and what that meant. So if people were going to vote on it, they wanted everyone to know exactly what they were vot-



ing on. So they should either clarify that or just that they “Assist in the execution of the Tier 2 funding proposal.”

Ms. Parrish said grammatical changes could be made without a motion.

Ms. Hubbard said she could quickly explain Tier 2. Basically, the student Registration Fee was increased the year before. With Tier 1 funding, money in approximately this amount was taken out of student Reg Fees last year and used, and now they're in the second year of that funding being used. Tier 2 just focused on targeting vulnerable student populations. In theory there will be a Tier 3, which addresses campus climate issues that are specifically related to mental health and improving more “global” changes, if they will. So this year was more about targeting specific populations. If people had any other questions about what Tier 2 means, that’s really all it was. They're in year two of what the Office of the President designated as a three-year system.

0811a, Resolution on a GA Action Item 2008: Graduate Student Mental Healthcare (cont'd)

- 17 -

Mr. Daal called for any further discussion.

Ms. LePak asked if Graduate Student Mental Health was part of the Tang Center mental health advisory group. Ms. Hubbard said there were a number of different health groups, including the Student Health Advisory Committee (SHAC), the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Student Mental Health, and the Graduate Student Mental Health Committee. There are three separate bodies, but there are links between all three, either on the student level or on the administrative level. So the Graduate Student Mental Health Committee is a separate body from those, but they do actually talk to each other.

A Delegate said he didn't really understand Action Agenda Items and how they work relative to each other, and what it meant when something was an Action Agenda Item as compared to something else. Mr. Rabkin said an Action Item was a priority for the GA. People spend an amount of time on the Action Item and report back on what’s being done, what progress was being made. It's something they devote some of their time and attention to. Mr. Daal said there was also a greater response from people they work with, and they tell administrators that this was an Action Item of the Graduate Assembly. If he went to the Chancellor and said the GA wanted something because it was the GA’s action item, administrators easily respond with more interest.

A Delegate said she didn't understand why the GA had to take this position if the other student health organizations filled this type of role. She asked why this was being brought up as something that the GA should do. Mr. Rabkin said they're pushing hard to grab a big slice of the pie because they're crazy and therefore they need it.

Ms. Hubbard said that basically it was really an check on administrators. They're given a checkbook and no one watches them and watches how they spend the money in that checkbook, and they sometimes tend to do what they’d like, and not necessarily what students would like them to do. The money for all of these new positions, and any new programs that came out of it, came directly, 100 percent, from student Registration Fees. So even though other groups, with some students on them, were loosely involved with this, it's really been graduate students in particular who have been the watchdogs for this funding; and the GA would like to continue to do so.

A Delegate asked if there were other Action Agenda Items that have already been proposed, or if this was a new one would displace another Item. He asked how Action Agenda Items come up and what the time-

frame was. Mr. Daal said the GA adopted a Resolution earlier that year to change their policy on Action Agenda Items. They have, at most, three Action Agenda Items, and currently don't have any. This would be first of three.

Mr. Rabkin called the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0811A PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE,  
RESOLUTION ON A GRADUATE ASSEMBLY ACTION ITEM 2008: GRADUATE STUDENT  
MENTAL HEALTHCARE

Mr. Froehle said he believed they now had to vote on the Coordinators for the Action Agenda Items. Mr. Daal said that was correct.

0811a, Resolution on a GA Action Item 2008: Graduate Student Mental Healthcare (cont'd) - 18 -  
Address by Chancellor Birgeneau

Mr. Daal said the nominees for Coordinators for the Graduate Student Mental Healthcare Action Agenda Items were Sarah Hubbard and Kristen Parrish. Mr. Daal called for any other nominations, and seeing none, said nominations were closed.

With Mr. Armstrong chairing the meeting, he said he thought they needed to have debate on the vote. Since the Chancellor was present, he thought they should stop at that point, and without objection, hear the Chancellor speak, and then vote when he was done.

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau

With Mr. Daal chairing the meeting, he said they would like to welcome Chancellor Birgeneau to the December Graduate Assembly meeting. The floor was his.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he recognized many of them by now, although that might mean getting their degrees was taking too long. But it was great to see all of them. He thought, as all of them knew, that he met regularly, monthly, with Graduate Assembly Executives, with Mr. Daal, and last year, with Josh Daniels. In his entire time at Berkeley they've had very good, collegial, productive, and professional relationships between the Administration and the Graduate Assembly. Even when they disagree on issues it's been a professional and collegial discussion. Of course, they rarely disagree, and he was really pleased about that.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that needless to say, it's been an exciting autumn, and that was continuing. He's been an academic for 42 years since he taught his first course, not counting when he was a graduate student and half-time research assistant. So it's been for quite a few years. He thought that autumn he had the single best event of his time as an academic, and that happened early in November, on a Tuesday. He was watching the election results come in and it got to the point where the results were very clear. He listened to John McCain's concession speech. With all due respect to the 50% of the people who are Republicans, Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought to himself that if Mr. McCain conducted his campaign the way he conducted his concession speech, the election might have come out differently. But

Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought it was great. Unfortunately, he fell asleep before he could hear Obama's acceptance speech because he worked so hard during the day. So at 11 o'clock, his wife woke him up on the sofa in the living room. He was still groggy, and heard a tremendous clamor. He went outside, on to the balcony, and there were about 400 students occupying the lawn and the parking lot, and they wanted him to give a speech, so he did. It was great, and they were astounded and cheered. And then he couldn't go back to sleep because he was so excited. No matter what their political leanings were, they had both an African American running for President and a woman running for Vice President on the other side, so this was an extraordinary event in the history of the United States, and he thought it was really transformational. Some of them know that he moved to Canada in 2000 and came back in 2004, so he missed some excitement. If he had been told when he came back after four years that this would have happened, he would have said he wouldn't have moved so far. But it has happened, and it was pretty extraordinary.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he had dinner with Chris Edley, who's on Obama's transition team, and talked to him about all kinds of things. It's unfortunate this new Administration will begin taking over at a pretty

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 19 -

difficult time, not just for the entire country in particular, but the world. They're in a situation where they have different financial constraints, which unfortunately have an impact on every single person in the room and at the University. Much of his responsibility as Chancellor, as it was for all of them, was to ensure that Berkeley maintained its pre-eminence through what was going to be a difficult transition period for the next couple of years. He wasn't going to include conclude by telling them how they're going to solve all these problems, but they're working continuously on trying to figure out strategy.

As a sort of "State of the Union," Chancellor Birgeneau said he'd mention some things that were especially relevant to graduate students. First, before they realized the financial challenges they were going to be facing, last year they authorized across the University an extraordinarily large number of searches in all areas in order to restrengthen their faculty, something that was very dear to graduate students. And those searches ended up being very successful, with extraordinary and talented people. This year so far they have hired over 80 faculty and anticipate possibly as many as 20 more, mostly relatively young faculty. So they're really having a tremendous evolution of the faculty. And fortunately, there were quite a significant number of Asian, African American, and Chicano/Latino faculty, and the campus was quite pleased with having more representative younger faculty coming into the University.

In addition to the successful faculty hiring, Chancellor Birgeneau said they were in a situation where their faculty, at a really quite incredible rate, receive offers from mostly private universities around the country, often with extraordinary circumstances. The record for an housed offer was one of their faculty being offered a job and to be given \$100 million at his disposal to develop a new research program at one of the private universities. Berkeley couldn't match that, and it was an all-time record. The University this year was probably not in a position to act on that. But that was rather atypical, although their faculty have a lot offers.

In the short run for individuals, they can compete in salaries. But despite the fact that, frankly, their funding cannot, at the highest level, match fully competitive salaries, their retention rate that year was over 80%, which was a phenomenally high retention rate for any university. So faculty like it at Berkeley and love to stay here, which he thought was really a good sign. And faculty at both senior and junior levels continue to do well. His favorite example, which has actually not gotten that much attention in the Berkeley community, probably because they haven't publicized it enough, was a prize in astrophysics, the

Shaw Prize, awarded to one of their faculty, Reinhard Genzel. It comes out of Hong Kong, funded by the Hong Kong billionaire Run Run Shaw and gives a million dollars to the top research in astrophysics. In many ways it's the Nobel Prize of astrophysics. This prize has only existed for four years, and three out of the first four years Berkeley faculty have won it. That's the equivalent of winning the Nobel Prize in the first three of the four years it was given. And just looking at the research, it was elegant and beautiful, and really advanced knowledge at its most fundamental level. In addition to all the applied stuff they do, that's something they must preserve at the University, the ability to pursue unrelentingly knowledge for its own sake, and not just on the practical side.

The other measure for their very young faculty, quantifying the quality of their very young faculty, was a little bit more difficult. But at least in social science and engineering there was actually one way to benchmark their younger faculty. He personally chaired for six years a committee of the Sloan Foundation, of New York City. In eight different areas, including economics, math, physics, chemistry, computer science, cognitive science, integrative biology, and one other, Sloan Fellowships are given to the top approximately 20 faculty each year. Universities across Canada and the United States nominate their best young faculty. He served on the committee for physics, chairing it for two years, determining who were

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 20 -

the winners of the Sloan Fellowships in physics. So he knew the process very well, and knew that it was completely based on the best faculty. The committee really functioned well, and was actually the most fun committee he's ever served on, because they get to read the research ambitions of the 100 most talented people in their field. So that by itself was intellectually stimulating exercise. From first-hand experience, he knew it was a measure of the best young people in various fields in the country, junior faculty, assistant professors.

Over the last five years, MIT and Berkeley were tied for 1st for the best young faculty. And he was agape at the next one, also on the West Coast, which they could guess. Chancellor Birgeneau said he didn't have a similar quantitative measure in humanities, but he's told that young humanities professors were just as strong. So they really have a terrific faculty there. He thought the important thing was the observation that this was a measure from within the past five years. So in spite of the financial challenges they face as a public University, relative especially to private universities they compete with, Berkeley was still a very attractive place.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that where they stand out most, however, in a quantitative measure, is with graduate students. One of the primary sources of finding the best undergraduates coming into graduate school was National Science Foundation Fellowships. This was, again, science and engineering oriented because it was much easier to do quantitative measures there. There's 1,000 every year, and last year, 1 out of 9 NSF Fellows gave Berkeley as their University of choice. So that meant that out of the 1,000 for the entire country, 117 ended up coming to Berkeley. And 2nd in this case was MIT, again, which got 76, while Stanford got 67. So Berkeley was almost a factor of two over Stanford in terms of attracting top graduate students. So people in the GA were all to be congratulated.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he wanted talk about how they're thinking about Berkeley, looking forward. He posted on the Web a little over a week ago a paper entitled, "Accessing Excellence." It was written largely before the financial crunch, so it's an aspirational document. It's not something from a committee, so it's not documented through two years of committee work. That may happen later. But because he was asked for it from a large number of sources, he decided to write down what was essentially his own thoughts about an aspirational vision for Berkeley, in all aspects. It wasn't a finished document, but was

more than a draft. He did a lot of consultation on it. He would encourage people to read it, and he honestly welcomed any feedback, positive or negative. He's gotten a lot of constructive negative comment, and he would urge people read it and send him an e-mail of their thoughts on it, to chancellor@berkeley.edu. At some stage they'll produce a final version.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they'll see in that document that they set a campaign goal to fund graduate students \$250 million over the next five years. That was an aspirational figure. He had to say that Andrew Szeri was the driver for this, and they're at least hopeful. Mr. Daal knew this, as did a few others, but one of the other things the campus has tried to do was to build support for graduate students into this in other venues. Many of them know this, but it's worth repeating anyway, but the most successful of these was the tremendous success of having the Hewlett Foundation give them a grant for faculty chairs of \$113 million, with \$110 million for 100 chairs. The other \$3 million was to invest their money better than they have been, although he didn't know what that meant after these past few months. These chairs are to be matched. Eighty chairs are disciplinary, in whatever field, whether computer science, physics, or English, and are funded at the \$2 million level, \$1 million from Hewlett and \$1 million from a donor. There are another 20 chairs that are interdisciplinary, funded at the \$2 million level. As to how they set up the funding for the \$2 million chairs, that \$2 million chair will spin off, in good time, about \$100,000. So the

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 21 -

funding model has \$25,000 going to the chair holder for his or her research scholarship. The next \$25,000 goes to support graduate students, and the next \$50,000 goes to support faculty salaries, so the school could pay competitive salaries. Just so they appreciate this, in previous times, the entire \$100,000 would have gone to faculty members for their purposes. So the campus built into the model a requirement that these kinds of chairs have money that must go to graduate students. And that was, going forward.

To their incredible surprise, the Hewlett Foundation allowed them seven years to raise 100 chairs. In Berkeley's entire history they raised about 300 chairs. So they had no real guidelines or benchmarks to know how this would go. But in fact, in a year and two months, they closed, co-signed with money coming in, 46 out of 100 chairs. Of those, 36 are disciplinary and 10 are multidisciplinary. And they have oral commitments for another six; and they're in discussion for another 25. So that was terrific. There will soon be 100 new graduate fellowships when they've completed this.

Slightly more controversially from the faculty perspective, and something that will not be popular, Chancellor Birgeneau said that he's decided they like this model so much that they're now doing it retroactively. So when they have new appointments to previously funded chairs, they're now applying the Hewlett model, and requiring that \$25,000 go to graduate students. For new chairs, professors were actually asked to decide whether or not to keep all the money for themselves or agree to the Hewlett model; and 80% of the faculty said this was a really good idea, with the thought that they need to institutionalize the funding of graduate students. And he agreed. They might have been spending it anyway for grads, but now it wasn't optional any more. So as they ran through this with every single chair, that would mean that ultimately Berkeley will have a component to support graduate students. This will turn out to be probably in the end the equivalent of about \$100 million of the \$350 million that Dean Szeri wanted to raise for graduate students. So Chancellor Birgeneau said he was pretty pleased about that. And even the GA has put up \$25,000 for this purpose, which the campus, by the way, was matching.

Chancellor Birgeneau said this so far has been good news. The financial situation was not such good news for Berkeley, or for any other university in the country. As they knew, the State already this year

cut their budget significantly, and the campus was now absorbing mid-year cuts. They've already taken the first \$5 million, and there's maybe that much or more coming that year. They made a decision because they're in the middle of the year to effectively borrow the \$5 million, to be paid back later. They just couldn't see canceling classes. And they're absolutely, certainly not going to take away grads' fellowships, or anything like that. But those funds will have to be paid back at some stage. And they don't know what the budget situation will be next year. But they anticipate that there will be cuts on the scale of 5-7% next year, and probably the year after. They're now looking at the budget comprehensively to see what their mechanisms are for dealing with these budget cuts, which will be pretty close to unprecedented. Stanford just announced it's cutting its budget 15% over the next few years, news that just came out that day. Every single university in the country will be in this situation. So in terms of the competitive landscape, it's not going to change much. But for all of them, it's going to be a difficult transition time.

Chancellor Birgeneau said the intention of the campus was to be as consultive of this as possible. But ultimately, they'll have to make some hard decisions. One thing they have said to all of the deans is that their intention was to protect core academic programs. That's good news for graduate instructors. Everybody will make sure there are as many sections as possible, etc. So they'll guarantee TA budgets. Beyond that they have not yet worked out a comprehensive financial model. There's no doubt that fees

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 22 -

will go up. In the preliminary budget, fees are slated to go up by 9.4%. With a little bit of trickery, which he personally didn't like because he thought it was better to be upfront, they'll zero that out and asking the State for money. He didn't see that as being very realistic and would have just left it at 9.4%, because that's almost certainly what it will end up. Increasing fees never makes anybody happy, but that was the reality of the financial situation today.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they're moving ahead on other items, and were moving ahead on Lower Sproul. He knew the ASUC and the GA were going to use their communication tactics to raise money, and may even be successful, which he was really happy to hear about. The campus was excited about that, but ultimately, it was be resource limited.

They're also moving ahead aggressively with various equity and inclusion initiatives. If the GA hasn't had the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion to a meeting, he was sure the Vice Chancellor would attend. The Vice Chancellor was preparing a ten-year strategic plan for their efforts on equity, diversity, and inclusion. Along with the plan was an ambitious proposal for funding by a foundation, which indicated a very strong interest in supporting the campus' efforts in this area.

The campus also continues to support its student mental health support, which he knew has been a concern of graduate students. The campus has also taken a number of measures to increase campus safety. That includes the WarnMe system, which he hoped all of them have signed up for. That probably completes the list. He'd take any questions people might have.

Mr. deGrassi said he would like to thank the Chancellor for coming and sharing this. He wanted to respond to the "Assessing" statements, which he had a chance to read. His main concern was that it emphasized private support more than public. For instance, private support was mentioned 22 times in the 30-page paper. It seemed to him it presented some difficulties and contradictions. For example, clean energy was mentioned on one hand, but there were also some tensions there. Clean energy was empha-

sized, but then they're taking money from a company that does tire sales and extraction; and they're facing a major financial crisis, but they're naming the library after AIG's founder.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he was absolutely right, and tensions do exist. But they were on the record. Mr. Daal said he could ask to speak off the record if he wished. Discussion occurred off the record.

Mr. deGrassi said one proposal discussed was to increase Berkeley's fees relative to the other campuses, since it was sort of a high-echelon University, and in the UC System. He asked if the Chancellor could guarantee that only undergrad fees would be raised, and not grad fees. Chancellor Birgeneau said he wouldn't be prepared to guarantee that. He liked to be 100% honest. But they'd have separate considerations for grads and undergrads. And it wasn't just specifically Berkeley. What he actually proposed was to have a range of fees. So rather than having single numbers for every single university in the UC System, that campuses be given some flexibility. That wasn't unique to ask for and that was done at many other systems. It's been proposed in Texas and New York. It wasn't even his idea, but it's an idea he liked. Somebody suggested they put on the table the possibility of the Regents fixing a mean fee, but allowing campuses some flexibility. What he said specifically for Berkeley was that if they were to increase fees, the increase in fees would be used exclusively for financial aid for financially challenged people and for faculty salaries. He thought that was an issue the community as a whole should address. The full-fee increase for undergrads would only be paid by people who come from families whose family income was more than \$130,000. And they would look at undergraduate and graduate students separately, since there are separate issues involved and they were also funded differently.

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 23 -

Mr. deGrassi said that also mentioned was the campus' Government Relations Committee, and he asked if the Chancellor could give more detail about what that entailed. Chancellor Birgeneau said they need to do government relations at Berkeley much better than they do. Coming here from the outside, relative to MIT and the University of Toronto, he thought the campus fell far short on that. Obviously, government relations are important, and government was a significant part of their total funding. At UC that's traditionally been done through the Office of the President. However, Chancellor Birgeneau said that because he had a lot of federal experience from his time at UT, and a lot of state experience from his time in Toronto, he knew that as a campus they needed to communicate with people who make decisions that affect their lives, both in Sacramento and in Washington. So they have a government relations group that he moved from Development to now reporting directly to him; and they've done some amount of work. But they need much better, organized advocacy, both at the State and federal levels.

Mr. Daal asked if there were any members of the press in the audience.

Mr. Marchand said that for a bit of background, there were a lot of graduate students in Environmental Science who were concerned that recycling wasn't done in their buildings. That was ironic because Berkeley had a reputation as making policy. In new buildings there's a attention paid to that, but in old buildings it's not taken as seriously, and it was mostly whoever the staff did there. The University would have an advantage of being more systematic for recycling, so students wouldn't have to do so much. Also, he asked if they could have standards for all buildings, and not just new ones, so the campus as a whole could improve its performance in this aspect.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he hasn't looked at recycling at all, but he thought it was really a good point that was being made. His wife was a fanatical recycler, so University House was perfect in that regard. She yells at him if he put anything in the wrong bin. He'd ask the relevant Vice Chancellor about recy-

cling and why there was an unevenness. It would be helpful if he received an e-mail about this, so he had something he could show.

Ms. Ritterman said she was part of the Environmental Sustainability Committee at the GA and recycling was one of their concerns. The other was bike parking on the campus. There was some sort of bike plan that never got implemented that they just kind of learned about. But the concern was a lack of bike parking on campus. Chancellor Birgeneau said that sounded terrific and he'd look into it.

Ms. Parrish said that with the financial market being what it was, globally, nationally, and at Berkeley, she was curious if he had advice for graduate students planning to go into faculty positions and if they will be harder to come by, and if he was aware of cuts across the nation in new hires. Chancellor Birgeneau said the reality was that if they just look at what they're doing, the next two years will be difficult. That's just the facts, and he was sorry to say that. But in two years he thought there will be a lot of openings because they've looked at their model and they cannot let their faculty get much smaller than it is. But also, especially since they over-hired in that past year, the reality is that they'll probably under-hire for the next two years. But they can't let that continue because otherwise they couldn't meet their teaching obligations. So they must hire faculty. So their plan was to ramp up after two years. For people just about to get their degrees, he was sorry to say this. But it's better that they know it than not know it. He thought the job market will be fine in two years. But that will vary by field. Obviously they're going to keep hiring faculty, but they're just not going to hire at a replacement rate, and it will probably be half the replacement rate for two years, and then they'll over-correct and hire more. And by the way, something many of them may or may not know, when hiring people in various different fields, a lot of their

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 24 -

challenge was actually not salaries, but start-up costs. In many fields now they have less competition in salaries, and Berkeley can meet the salary for begin assistant professors. But there was a dramatic case in the Physics Department, where the combined start-up costs for four young faculty was \$10.3 million. Chancellor Birgeneau said he was in shock. One of the four accounted for an important part of that, and that person went to a private university because the campus just couldn't come up with the many millions of dollars that person needed for their lab. So start-up costs were actually more than salaries.

Mr. Rheume said his question had to do with the ever-worsening economic situation. In reading the newspaper, they see the big three carmakers have plans to restructure and reorganize, and have plans to effect operational improvements and trim budgets. He asked if there was anything in Berkeley that was being talked about to improve the efficiency by which the place was run. Chancellor Birgeneau said they're comprehensively looking at all that. They just had a daylong retreat that week to go over everything that they do. On the other hand, universities were more complicated to change. General Motors could just get rid of a division, and a university doesn't do that. But he had to admit that making drastic changes in the University didn't have a huge inertia there.

Mr. Rheume asked if, somewhere down the road, as a cost-saving measure, they might see lectures being videotaped and then put online. Chancellor Birgeneau said a lot of them are online. Mr. Rheume said he was taking about using them for subsequent semesters. Chancellor Birgeneau said they have been doing that. On the other hand, he was probably too much from the previous generation, but someone once asked him how to make them green, and more efficient, and the question in response was whether to have three instruments rather than four in a string quartet. He didn't know any way to save money on a string quartet. They can't make that more efficient. There are many aspects of education that were similar. When he interacts with post-doc graduate students one-on-one, whether unfortunately or fortunately,



he couldn't be outsourced. The personal interaction really mattered. He thought the classroom experience and the interaction with fellow students was important. He thought that was one of the things that made places like Berkeley special. He'd guess that showed how old fashioned he was. For the lectures, like Alex Filippenko's lectures, people could just watch it on the Internet rather than being in his classes, but a lot of freshmen kids come to his class anyway because they want to be there. So the campus could do some of those things more efficiently, but he would hate to give up the human aspect of institutions like Berkeley. He thought there were limits in efficiencies that can be achieved in certain kinds of endeavors, and he thought education was one of those.

Mr. Klein said that in light of the economic troubles with funding not being what was expected, he asked if construction projects will be delayed in order to save money. He was thinking specifically of Campbell Hall. Chancellor Birgeneau said they just got a big grant to help with Campbell Hall, and another grant. So that happened to be one project in particular that they're going to push very hard. But that was up to the State government. Mr. Klein asked how that worked. Chancellor Birgeneau said the new funding they got closes the gap. But 80% of Campbell Hall's funding was supposed to be in the revenue bond issued on November 4, and the Governor removed it. In fact, talking about government relations, there was also \$57 million for a building that was on its way up, and two weeks before the election, the campus was informed that it was removed from the budget. And then they were told that was a clerical mistake. He got on the phone, got it back in the budget, but then the budget came out and it wasn't there again. And on the last day, they got it back. This has really been unprecedentedly difficult. This was also an example of how private money cannot solve all the problems associated with government money, and how unreliable the government was as a sponsor.

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 25 -

Mr. Sylak asked if the economic situation had any affect on the number of undergraduate students expected and whether they'll see enrollment going down at UC Berkeley. Chancellor Birgeneau he once did a study on this at MIT, and at least at MIT, PhD, Master's, and professional programs, there was a strong interaction between the economy and the number of graduate students. If one was going to do an MBA or law degree, where they expect to take a lot of money and take out large loans, that could be very heavily dependent on the economy. He believed the number of PhD students was remarkably insensitive to fluctuations in the economy. He did a study over a 30-year time period. The Delegate asked if budget concerns wouldn't limit that. Chancellor Birgeneau said that empirically they haven't, at least in the study he did. It turned out the number of PhD students was determined by the faculty's capacity to supervise them. So the campus may see some minor fluctuation, but barring a drastic change in federal grants, he didn't expect a significant change in the number of slots available for PhD students. But as he said, professional, Masters, or law degrees were a different story.

A Delegate asked if there was a concern with budget cuts and fewer classes. He mentioned that the campus was retaining the amount of places for GSIs. She asked if there's been talk about that. Chancellor Birgeneau said he had to be careful. Technically, they're going to sustain GSI budgets. He didn't make the decision at the Cabinet level of how the individual departments use their GSIs. That was one of the sources of GSI funding.

The Delegate asked if there was a concern about being able to support graduate students throughout their tenure. Chancellor Birgeneau said he hoped there wasn't. He felt lucky with the Hewlett model. They incorporated that just this year and money was coming in. So they have a new stream of funds for graduate students that was quite signature that didn't exist before. So he was hopeful that will offset some of

the other problems. If people knew anybody who wanted to give \$100 million to support graduate students, Chancellor Birgeneau said he'd become a genius at raising matching funds.

Mr. Ortega asked if he could talk a little more about what he perceived campus government relations to be, since he mentioned that MIT did a lot more. He asked what the differences were. Chancellor Birgeneau said that MIT has a full-time person at the Vice President level who lives in Washington and has deans and people coming down there regularly, people who meet with members of Congress, and especially with their staffs. When he was at MIT he had a number of major national government studies. It gets their faculty and administrators in key positions to end up determining policy. West Coast institutions generally do that much less. So the campus needed to increase that significantly, and they needed to get Berkeley people playing more of a role in major studies and policies in Washington. It helped them with Christina Romer and the Obama Administration. The campus may be better off than they have been in the past. But that's really at the national level. At the State level, students could do tremendous things going to Sacramento to meet with legislators. It was nice to meet with legislators, but actually, their staff mattered more, and they're younger in Sacramento, many of them about the age of students. Doing work in Sacramento and having a presence there, and meeting with staff, was really a good thing to do.

Ms. Zohar said he's talked that evening, and last year, about the retention of faculty members. It brought to mind the practice that a lot of faculty members felt under-appreciated with retention practices and getting offers from other schools. She felt that some female faculty were concerned with those kinds of biases towards their advancement. She asked if there was any awareness of that. Chancellor Birgeneau said they did a study of that and it turned out it was a myth. It turned out there were more retention offers, percentage wise, for female faculty than for male faculty. So they shouldn't underestimate the talent of female faculty in figuring out how to work the system. The result surprised him because he

Address by Chancellor Birgeneau (cont'd)

- 26 -

0811b, Resolution to Create a Lower Sproul Redevelopment Action Agenda Item

believed the same thing, but it was empirically not true. Ms. Zohar asked if it really made sense for faculty to have to get an offer. Chancellor Birgeneau said it was a terrible system. Ms. Zohar asked if there was anything happening to improve it. Chancellor Birgeneau said he tried to change it, but it was too deep in the culture. He couldn't agree with her more, and it made no sense. Personally, in his own career, he never accepted an outside offer unless he thought he might actually take it. He hate to admit that it was Stanford. But in the end, he didn't go there. But he had a phenomenal offer from Stanford, where they would have made him a chair and increased his salary. He didn't do it because of that, and because there was research he wouldn't have been able to do there. So it was entirely driven by his research. But it's also true that there are some faculty who encourage outside offers. In his first couple of years at Berkeley, he advocated not responding to those offers. But since individual departments can, it was built into the system there. Maybe the next Chancellor will be more effective than he's been in changing it. He's been vocal about it and he couldn't agree with her more.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Chancellor Birgeneau for attending. (Applause) Mr. Daal said they appreciated it. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would like to thank them.

RESOLUTIONS (cont'd)

Mr. Daal said they'd resume where they left off, with the election of an Action Item Coordinator. They had just closed nominations for the Mental Health Action Agenda Item. There were two people nominated. Ms. Hubbard had to leave but told him she would accept the nomination.

Ms. Parrish said she was more than happy to be Coordinator, but both she and Ms. Hubbard were graduating in May and were looking for people interested in this. Even if they weren't willing to be Coordinator this year, they could at least come on to the Committee and join them. That was a plea for help.

Mr. Daal asked Ms. Parrish to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. Mr. Daal said they would vote for either Ms. Hubbard or Ms. Parrish. Mr. Rabkin said he thought they were voting for two people. Mr. Daal said the GA could vote for an individual, and the two of them could have an agreement.

After a vote, Mr. Daal said that the GA elected Ms. Parrish as Action Agenda Item Coordinator for Mental Health. Ms. Parrish asked if it was just she who was elected, or if Ms. Hubbard was also elected as Co-Chairs. Mr. Daal said it was just her.

The following Resolution, 0811b, was authored by Dan Work and Bradley Froehle:

#### RESOLUTION TO CREATE A LOWER SPROUL REDEVELOPMENT ACTION AGENDA ITEM

WHEREAS, the Lower Sproul area consists of a plaza and four surrounding buildings: Eshleman Hall, Martin Luther King Jr. Student Union, Cesar E. Chavez Student Center, and Zellerbach Hall; and

0811b, Resolution to Create a Lower Sproul Redevelopment Action Agenda Item (cont'd)

- 27 -

#### RESOLUTION TO CREATE A LOWER SPROUL REDEVELOPMENT ACTION AGENDA ITEM (cont'd)

WHEREAS, Lower Sproul serves as a major hub for student life in the University; and

WHEREAS, seismic deficiencies in Eshleman Hall and Martin Luther King Jr. Student Union require immediate and significant renovations to the existing facilities, or demolition; and

WHEREAS, the Vice Chancellor's Administrative Council approved \$750,000 to hire an architect to develop a Lower Sproul Plaza Master Plan & Feasibility Study, to be completed by June 1, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Moore Ruble Yudell was selected as the architect by a committee of undergraduate students, graduate students, and campus administrators, and the firm began work in September of 2008; and

WHEREAS, the architects should look to graduate students to help create and carry out an integrated vision for a Lower Sproul area, which meets the needs of the graduate student community as well as the campus community at large; and

WHEREAS, a Fall 2006 survey of more than 1,000 graduate students identified a significant need for a centralized graduate student center which fosters a pan-graduate community and caters specifically to the needs of graduate students; and

WHEREAS, the inclusion of a graduate student center has been identified as a key element in obtaining graduate student support for a redeveloped Lower Sproul Area; and

WHEREAS, a portion of the expected \$400 million cost of the project will come from revenue generated by a student fee referendum; and

WHEREAS, key decisions about the project's future, including its scope, long-term management, and funding sources, will be made this year, and it is important for graduate students to have strong and unified voice on the campus committees charged with making them; and

WHEREAS, a Lower Sproul Sustainable Design Workshop was held on November 7th, 2008 to identify sustainable strategies and establish performance goals for green buildings for the Lower Sproul redevelopment project; and

WHEREAS, Dan Work has agreed to be a coordinator;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that an Action Agenda Item be created:

Goal: Ensure that the June 2009 Lower Sproul Plaza Master Plan & Feasibility Study specifically identifies a graduate student center and graduate student programming as key elements of a redeveloped Lower Sproul, or contains other recommendations as determined by the Graduate Assembly.

0811b, Resolution to Create a Lower Sproul Redevelopment Action Agenda Item (cont'd)

- 28 -

#### RESOLUTION TO CREATE A LOWER SPROUL REDEVELOPMENT ACTION AGENDA ITEM (cont'd)

Membership: The coordinator shall be in charge of convening an ad-hoc Lower Sproul Student Council that shall consist of representatives from both the Graduate Assembly (GA) and the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC).

Mr. Work said the Action Agenda Item was to create a committee for Lower Sproul redevelopment. They had a presentation at the last GA meeting by Beth Piatnitza, who ran the project. He thought the reason it was important to make this a formal Action Agenda Item for the GA was because a lot of important decisions will be made that year based on funding that was allocated last year. There's been a lot of student involvement so far and they'd like that to continue. The main goal of the Action Agenda Item would be to make sure that a graduate student center was included in the feasibility report that was happening, or anything else that the GA collectively decided. By passing the Resolution, the GA would be integrated into that document. He'd be happy to take questions, but he didn't think they needed to spend a lot of time discussing this.

Ms. Pannu said Action Agenda Items also guide their actions. She asked if he could talk about what he was working on. She was trying to figure out how this went beyond a committee and how much

resources would be needed. Mr. Work said it's currently already taking a lot of resources from the GA. There were four or five committees already discussing this, whether it was funding, programmatic aspects, environmental sustainability, etc. So just making sure that there was representation by graduate students on these committees alone will be very difficult. They're trying to make sure there's a coordinated effort between University Administration, grads, and undergrads, to get something that actually fits all of their objectives. It wasn't just one person.

Mr. Hogan said the last Action Agenda Item said it was for 2008-2009. This Resolution says it was 2009. He asked about having Action Agenda Items spread over two years. Mr. Daal said the other Resolution probably wasn't titled well and probably referred to the fact that they were electing it in 2008. The GA's policy on Action Agenda Items was that they end when the job was done or when there was no longer a chair, or when the Delegate Assembly chose to remove the Action Agenda Item. Mr. Hogan said this would therefore end when it was completed.

Ms. Abel said that on behalf of Campus Affairs, they had a couple of grammatical changes they'd like to make. Grammatical things would be taken care of by the recorder. Also, they just saw out that in the other Resolution the Coordinator's was in a Resolved Clause, and in this it was in a Whereas Clause. So they would like to make that a Resolved Clause to make more sense. But she didn't know if people felt strongly about that. Mr. Daal said there are no friendly amendments, so they'd have to amend the Resolution if they wanted to make changes. He called for any motion.

**THE MOTION TO APPROVE 0811B, RESOLUTION TO CREATE A LOWER SPROUL REDEVELOPMENT ACTION AGENDA, ITEM PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Daal said they would move on to a selection of a chair for the Action Agenda Item committee. He called for any nominations. Mr. Rabkin nominated Mr. Work. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Rabkin moved to extend the meeting time by ten minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Parrish and passed by voice-vote.

0811b, Resolution to Create a Lower Sproul Redevelopment Action Agenda Item (cont'd)  
0811c, Resolution to Promote Fairness and Transparency In Funding Allocations

- 29 -

Mr. Daal called for any other nominations. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE DAN WORK AS THE CHAIR OF THE ACTION AGENDA ITEM COMMITTEE ON LOWER SPROUL REDEVELOPMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. (Applause)**

The following Resolution, 0811c, was authored by Andy Konwinski, Camille Pannu, Ari Rabkin, and Maria Schindler:

**RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE FAIRNESS AND TRANSPARENCY IN FUNDING ALLOCATIONS**

**WHEREAS, fairness and transparency in the allocation of funding to graduate student groups is critical;  
and**

**WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of a student government to make its best effort to be fair and equitable to all of its constituents; and**

WHEREAS, the primary goal of student group funding is to further the Graduate Assembly (GA)'s mission as stated in its Charter; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary for the funding allocation process to accommodate the diverse ways in which different graduate departments and groups organize their efforts; and

WHEREAS, the funding guidelines are currently silent on principles for allocating funding to graduate student groups; and

WHEREAS, the lack of guiding principles may lead to the unfair distribution of funds or to the allocation of funding for purposes that do not further the Charter and other major principles of the Graduate Assembly;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Funding Committee shall adopt the following recommendations for the fair and equitable allocation of funds:

The Funding Committee will adopt guidelines for the allocation of funds to student organizations that:

1. Prioritize requests for funding that further the mission of the Graduate Assembly as articulated in the GA Charter ("The Graduate Assembly's mission is to serve the interests of all graduate and professional students at the University of California at Berkeley, and to advocate on their behalf."); and
2. Prioritize departmental equity in its distribution of funds among student organizations.

To ease the implementation of the above principles, the Funding Committee also shall:

RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE FAIRNESS AND TRANSPARENCY IN FUNDING ALLOCATIONS  
(cont'd)

1. Eliminate the current dollar limit on funding for any specific student group, so that funding cuts will not arbitrarily affect all organizations, but will be consistent with the rationale for fairness and equity in the distribution of funds.
2. Include, to the best of its ability, in its regular report to the Delegate Assembly:
  - A) The proportion of funds each department has applied for
    - i) in each funding round, and
    - ii) for the funding year.
  - B) The proportion of funds each department has been granted

- i) in each funding round, and
  - ii) for the funding year.
- C) For groups that span departments, this information should be reported separately (as "joint-ventures"), and for groups that do not have a department-specific identity, this information should be reported separately as well (as "unallocated").
3. Outline this rationale in the next editions of the Graduate Assembly Funding Guidelines in a clear and concise fashion; and
  4. Distribute the revised Funding Guidelines in a timely manner to the graduate student population of UC Berkeley.

Ms. Pannu said they've seen a lot of funding Resolutions come up in the last two meetings and she thought a lot of it was because there's a longstanding problem with how funding was working. It wasn't the fault of anyone in the room and was just because departments organize differently and they're having a difficult time accessing resources in a way they thought was fair. There have been a lot of broad and sweeping measures to change the By-laws that deal with how the GA does funding. The Rules Committee talked to people in many different departments and spoke to a few stakeholders who were upset with people who were okay with what was happening. They tried to find a kind of moderate compromise that was middle of the road that would speak to the issue that the GA did have a real problem in terms of how departments felt the representation in funding with the GA funding was working, while still respecting the fact that the GA trusts the Funding Committee and thought it had more skills and experience in actually dealing with this. So they presented this Resolution to give some guidance as to what they felt was missing in the funding process at the moment that has been frustrating for people.

The big issue, from what she understood, has been the sense of funding equity. People didn't feel that funding was getting apportioned across departments in a fair way. Some people felt that should happen by population and others felt that should happen by the fact that they have a lot of departments and the

GA represents everyone and that everyone should have access to applying for funds. Part of it was that different departments are organized in different ways. Some departments might have 30 student organizations and some might have one that represents most students as a whole. Currently, student groups have a funding cap. That meant that a large department with only one student group to represent might have a difficult time accessing funds, whereas another department that might organize many student organizations could receive much more funding because they were eligible to apply for more. That was the problem, as she understood it.

Ms. Pannu said she was from the Law School and understood that people have had issues with how a lot of departments do their funding. So what they tried to do was to come up with something they felt across departments would be helpful. They worked with departments that were winning under the current rubric. The Resolution gives the Funding Committee some parameters for what they thought might be helpful to the Delegate Assembly to feel better about and give a lot of room to work on, because the Funding Committee knew best. But they also know the issue of equity has come up over and over. It's been almost a year and a half and the problem was not going away. And in the process, they're losing departments. She might be speaking personally, but she thought the GA should be a place where people

come and feel they could do what they want to do. It should be an empowering experience for all graduate departments. She knew it was frustrating and crowded, but it shouldn't be a space where people couldn't even get access. She didn't think that was the message the GA wanted to send to small departments or departments that organize differently. They want to say this was a fair and rational place for everyone to be.

The Resolution gives the GA that flexibility. It wasn't a huge By-law overall and was just a set of directions to the Funding Committee, and a request for the Committee to let the GA know a little bit more in the funding report. Those reports already talk about who gets funding. The Resolution also asks who applied and how the money was getting sent out. And they're asking the Funding Committee to figure out the balance of funding across departments. It's understood they don't always get requests from all departments, and that was an issue too. But the Resolution just asks for information from them. It increases the Committee's workload, but the Committee already gives the GA a lot of information. So it was just having one more step for the GA as a whole. She called for any questions.

Mr. Rabkin said the Resolution was not intended to be the last word in funding policy or a grand solution, but was just the first step. It says they want to be fair to different departments and doesn't say there's a quota, but to try and do things that further their mission and advance everyone's interests. It's just a statement of what he thought were uncontroversial principles. Also, they ask for various pieces of information. He understood that accounting was hard and they weren't saying the Funding Committee must do this or else. They're just saying that the GA would like this information. Particularly as they move to computerized submission of applications, this was something they could do. It puts them on record as saying the GA would like this information. The last thing the Resolution does was to remove the fixed dollar amounts. He didn't think this was harmful. Right now it's \$1,000. Instead of being a flat, arbitrary \$1,000, the Resolution says they can't have one arbitrary number across every organization. In some ways he thought this was reasonable safe to approve.

Ms. Berkeley said that in reading over the analyses, the one concern that was raised, which was a good point, was that funding groups should get some clue as to what they could expect to get for the year. But other than that, she thought the Resolution was good.

Ms. Abel said she was on the Campus Affairs Committee, which analyzes nearly all the Resolutions coming before the GA. They had a couple of concerns in the language in section 1), which prioritizes requests and in 2), which prioritizes departmental equity. They were unsure whether "prioritizing requests" that further the GA's mission was saying the GA should fund things that were clearly in their mission or whether it was specifically meant to focus funding on groups that aim to do events that catered towards the largest number of graduate Students. They'd like to see clarification of what it meant to focus the Funding Committee's allocations on these two specific things, advocacy and serving the interests of all graduate and professional students, or whether it was just a blanket statement.

Ms. Pannu said the intent of the authors was not to focus this, so it was broadest. The language quoted in the Resolution was from the GA Charter. They wanted to state that the first priority of the Funding Committee should be further the mission of the GA. And the second item of importance was equity and balance. The intent was not to focus or limit funding, but to reaffirm that they support funding to graduate groups that further the GA's mission.



Ms. Abel said the second part, 2), prioritizing departmental equity, left the definition of “equity” in the hands of the Funding Committee, and the Campus Affairs Committee felt uncomfortable with that because there was no agreement as to what that would mean, and if it was by population, need, etc. Ms. Pannu said the authors left that open because they felt all those factors were important and didn't think one should be more important than the other. They don't think people should get funding based on population.

Mr. St. Clair moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed by voice-vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 0811C, RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE FAIRNESS AND TRANSPARENCY IN FUNDING ALLOCATIONS PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 24-13-0.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

This meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary

The following Resolution, 0811a, as amended, was authored by Ms. Parrish and Ms. Hubbard:

Resolution on a Graduate Assembly Action Item 2008: Graduate Student Mental Healthcare

Whereas, the Regents of the University of California, Berkeley have approved a Registration Fee increase for 2008-09 that will provide an estimated \$1.3 million in additional funding dedicated to addressing student mental health issues on campus in the second year of a three-year funding system; and

Whereas, the University of California, Berkeley's Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Mental Health, in collaboration with University Health Services' Counseling and Psychological Services, the University of California Police Department, the Graduate Assembly (GA), and the Associated Students of the University of California leadership, developed a proposal to outline how these funds would be spent; and

Whereas, it is the responsibility of the GA to advocate for graduate student mental health resources; and

Whereas, the GA should take an active role in monitoring the spending of the \$ 1.3 million to ensure graduate student interests are protected;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that Graduate Student Mental Healthcare will be a GA action item for the 2008-2009 school year as outlined below:

Coordinators: Sarah Hubbard and Kristen Parrish

Goal: Ensure the percentage of the \$1.3 million allocation for mental health issues on campus is given to graduate students according to their population relative to the campus population. Assist in the execution of the Tier 2 funding proposal with UHS, CPS, the ASUC, and the UCPD.

Plan: Attend GSMHC meetings to advocate GA interests in this arena (1x1.5 hr. meeting/month, free lunch provided).

Meet periodically (minimum of twice each semester) with University Health Services (UHS) administration and others to review the spending of the allocated funds and assist in new program creation and report back to GA delegates (2x1 hr per semester).

Be actively involved in the development of the Tier 3 budget and goals.