

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

March 6, 2008

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

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

Announcements

The Empowering Women of Color Conference will be held on Saturday.

The speaker at the April GA meeting will be Graduate Dean Andrew Szeri and Associate Dean Susan Muller.

The Graduate Support Services Project will put on tax workshops.

The Graduate Minority Students Project put on Bridging the Gap, with 145 high school students, grads, undergrads, and community people. A pizza and beer event will occur on the 17th, for new students checking out the school.

The Budget Committee will meet on March 19 to write the GA's budget for next year. A budget survey was included on the feedback form.

A student fee referendum was being proposed for the spring ballot by a campus, undergrad-centered entertainment group, SUPERB. A portion of the fee was to have gone to grads, but the referendum authors took that out. Grads were encouraged to attend the upcoming ASUC Senate meeting and make an announcement to have that language returned.

Elections

The elections were for the 2008-9 school year. Positions were described in the agenda packet. Nominees didn't have to be a Delegate.

For the 08-09 school year, Mr. Daal was elected President; Ms. Abel was elected Campus Affairs Vice President; Mr. Ortega was elected External Affairs Vice President.

Presentation by the Chancellor

Chancellor Birgeneau said that generally, things were going very well for the University. The campus received \$113 million from the Hewlett Foundation to create 100 chairs, with 100 graduate fellowships. There was also a change to the financial model for chairs that was quite favorable to grads and was a new source of graduate fellowship funding in perpetuity. Funding for all new chairs will follow a model of a

two-to-one ratio between faculty and grads. This builds graduate fellowships into the core financial model of philanthropic support of the University and will result in 100s of graduate fellowships.

Regarding faculty, the Sloane Foundation names 20 Sloan Fellows, the best young faculty members in the country, in various disciplines. Over the last five years, Berkeley and MIT were tied for top in the country, each with 30 Sloan Fellows. So young faculty wanted to come to Berkeley, for the character of the University. The challenge the campus faced came ten years out. Faculty get tenure and then get phenomenal offers from other universities. Cal usually lost lose faculty because of spousal issues, with one spouse able to get a job there and not the other, while another place offered jobs to both. That was a problem the campus had to solve.

Regarding undergraduates, the total cost to attend Cal was about \$25,000. With scholarships, students had to provide \$8,000, through work and loans. The campus had an extraordinarily large percentage of undergrads from financially disadvantaged backgrounds, more Pell Grant recipients, 7,500, than all Ivy League schools combined. The problem was in ten years, when current self-help was projected to increase from \$8K to \$16,000, which was not acceptable.

Regarding the budget, the campus was worried. Any advocacy the GA could provide was really appreciated. UC's budget would go up about 6%, the amount needed to maintain an equilibrium, but the Governor reduced the operating budget by 10%. The campus was considering strategies in response. One was to sweep up carryover interest. The 10% cut was permanent.

Chancellor Birgeneau was asked questions regarding the Native American Repatriation Act; Assembly Bill 2372, which would tax UCs and CSUs; strengthening the accountability of Regents to California citizens; health insurance for student families; the campus' association with Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah University of Science and Technology; the challenge of Stanford offering full scholarships to students with a family income of under \$100,000; and raising people's awareness of these issues. The Chancellor told of his idea to solve the accessibility problem by having each Cal alum donate \$1,000, with the State to match. The Chancellor was also working hard for undocumented students, who could not receive financial aid.

Elections (cont'd)

Ms. Rivas was elected Project Coordinator Liaison; Mr. Rajan was elected Budget Chair; Mr. Armstrong was elected Rules Committee Chair; and elected for Graduate Council reps Mr. Work, Mr. Valladares, Ms. Berkeley, and Ms. Freedman, with Ms. Berkeley elected as Alternate. (Applause)

By voice-vote, the GA tabled until April the remaining elections: chairs of the Funding, Environmental Sustainability, International Student Affairs, and Technology Committees.

Funding Committee Report

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Funding Committee report on recommendations for Grants, Round 4, \$8,051.54.

Resolution Referrals

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA fast tracked and approved Resolution on a Budget Amendment to Modify the Graduate Assembly's Fiscal Year. It has the GA's fiscal year start on July 1, in line with the ASUC.

The Resolution on a Budget Amendment to Include New Revenue into the 2007-08 Budget, to incorporate Graduate Division funding, was referred to the Budget Committee.

Resolution

A question was raised as to whether the External Affairs Committee had discussed the same version of the next Resolution as it was being presented at the meeting, and a motion to refer the Resolution back to committee failed by voice-vote. By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved, as amended, the Resolution In Support of Increasing Underrepresented Minority Student Enrollment in the UC System and In Support of the BOARS Admissions Proposal.

It was determined that the meeting lacked a quorum, and the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting



This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Josh Daniels at 5:31 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daniels said he would like to welcome them to the sixth Delegates meeting of the year.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

A motion to approve the agenda for the meeting that evening and the minutes from the December and February GA meetings was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING AND THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER AND FEBRUARY MEETINGS WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daniels said the green form in the agenda packet was the feedback form, and he would ask them to please fill it out, front and back.

Ms. Sasser asked people to attend the Empowering Women of Color Conference on Saturday, from 9:30 to 5:00, in the Martin Luther King Student Union.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 4 -

Mr. Daniels said the speaker at the April GA meeting will be Graduate Dean Andrew Szeri, along with the Associate Dean, Susan Muller. The Chancellor will be at the meeting that evening.

Mr. Daniels said that unfortunately, Corey Ponder, the new Graduate Support Services Project Coordinator, was ill. He had wanted to introduce himself. There will be tax workshops, so people should keep their eyes peeled for that.

Funie Hsu introduced herself and said she was the Graduate Minority Students Project Coordinator. An event, Bridging the Gap, happened on Friday, February 22. A smaller number of participants showed up than in the previous year because they switched to a Friday, whereas the event had usually been held on Saturday. But they had a pretty good turnout, about 145 high school students, grads, undergrads, and community people. They had to hold it on Friday because the Oakland Unified School District had a policy regarding field trips and needed 30 days. Other than that, everything went very well. For their next event, they're hosting a pizza and beer event on Monday, March 17, at the GA. It will be for new students coming in to check out the school.

Ms. Anderson said the Budget Committee will meet on March 19, when they'll write the GA's budget for next year. People who were concerned about the budget were encouraged to attend. She would ask them to please e-mail her so she knew how many people to expect. If they didn't want to come to the budget meeting but still wanted their voice to be heard, there was a little budget survey on the feedback form so the GA could see what Delegates thought before the budget was put together.

With Mr. Daal chairing the meeting, Mr. Daniels said he was making this announcement not as GA President. A student fee referendum was being proposed for the spring ballot. The GA couldn't take a position for or against it officially, so he was speaking as an individual. An entertainment group on campus, SUPERB, was putting forward a student fee referendum to raise student fees to pay for entertainment activities SUPERB puts on, such as concerts. Mr. Daniels said that in his experience, graduate students hardly attend SUPERB events, and they're certainly not advertised to a graduate student audience. The GA has never had notices of SUPERB events on its Web site, or anything like that. A portion of this fee would have gone to graduate student groups, but the referendum authors recently took out that language. That portion for grads would have gone to the GA in order to fund to student groups through its funding process. As a result, they need to convince the ASUC Senate to vote that language back in. The Senate will meet next Wednesday and hopefully there will be a decent graduate student turnout to speak to the Senate about this. If people wanted more information, or if they couldn't attend but would like state an opinion, they could send an e-mails. People at the Senate meeting will sign up on the Guest Announcements list at the beginning of the meeting and they could talk for a bit on why they thought either the fee should be killed, should have language that would add on a grad student portion, or things like that. He would pass out sign-up sheets. And again, this was not him as GA President, but as Josh Daniels. He'll e-mail people from his personal account, not his GA account. The Senate meeting will be on Wednesday night, in the Senate Chamber, and started at 7:30.

Ms. Freedman asked if this was the referendum that was voted down last year. Mr. Daniels said it was a little different. Last year a lot of different things were covered in the fee referendum, and now it would only cover SUPERB.

ELECTIONS

Elections -- President

- 5 -

With Mr. Daniels chairing the meeting, he said they'd hold as many elections as possible before the Chancellor arrived. They'd follow the same procedure as they did for the elections last month. People could nominate themselves or anyone else. The GA would hear a short statement, and then they'd open the floor to questions. He called for any questions about the procedure.

A Delegate asked what the requirements were to win. Mr. Daniels said election required a plurality if there were multiple candidates.

Mr. Daniels said there was a description of the positions in the agenda, and the order in which elections would be held. The elections were for the 2008-9 school year. Anybody who will be a graduate student enrolled there in 08-09 could be a nominee, and they didn't have to be a Delegate.

Mr. Daniels said the first position up for consideration was for GA President. He called for nominations. Mr. Ortega nominated Triffid Abel, who respectfully declined. Ms. Abel nominated Miguel Daal. Ms. Anderson nominated Ms. Abel, who respectfully declined. Mr. Armstrong nominated Ms. Abel, who respectfully declined. Ms. Freedman nominated Ms. Abel, who respectfully declined. Mr. Wolgin nominated Ms. Abel, who respectfully declined. A Delegate nominated Ms. Abel, who respectfully declined. Mr. DeGrassi nominated Mr. Armstrong, who respectfully declined. Ms. Freedman nominated Mr. Begtrup. Mr. Begtrup said he was graduating. Mr. Daniels said that seeing no further nominations, nominations were closed.

Mr. Wolgin moved to go to an immediate vote. The motion was seconded. Objections were raised. Mr. Wolgin withdrew the motion.

Mr. Daniels asked for a statement from the nominee. Mr. Daal said he was interested in being GA President, and was passionate about it, and would like to be President for three reasons. He was qualified, he thought he was a good choice for the job, and he had ideas on how the GA could be improved upon next year and expanded, in the interests of serving graduate students better. He called for any questions.

Mr. Rheume asked how long he's been involved in the GA. Mr. Daal said this was his sixth year.

Mr. Work asked if he could briefly mention some of the things he thought he could improve upon in the GA. Mr. Daal said he had a list, and had three major categories. One was to work on increasing funding to the GA; two, to continue the Lower Sproul redevelopment project; and three, to look into ways to increase the relevance of and awareness of the GA to graduate students.

Ms. Anderson asked what he was proudest about in his year as Campus Affairs Vice President. Mr. Daal said he had a list. He was very proud of getting about \$1,000 from the Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion to support projects. He was also proud of expanding a transportation payroll deduction to graduate students. Very few graduate students had been eligible for this, and that number was now up to one-third of the population. He was very proud of the recommendation he put together on how to improve the Dean's Normative Time Fellowship. Another thing he was proud about was being a part of what they call the "housing grant," a \$4,000 supplement for students living in Albany Village, to help

them pay rent. And he was proud of his work in supporting graduate student involvement in faculty hiring, as well as for supporting and supervising research on the student-parent population through the graduate student-parent researcher position.

Elections -- President (cont'd)

- 6 -

Ms. Freedman asked if he would attend Executive Board meetings. Mr. Daal said he was in strong support of that.

Ms. Haynes asked if he was prepared to put in the time required. Mr. Daal said he was. He's talked to his adviser, who was very enthusiastic about him going out for this position.

Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Daal to step out of the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Daniels asked to have Mr. Daal brought back to the room and said he wanted to congratulate him for being elected GA President for next year. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said the next position up for election was the Campus Affairs Vice President. He called for any nominations. Mr. Daal nominated Triffid Abel. Mr. Daniels called for any other nominations, and seeing none, said nominations were closed. He asked Ms. Abel to make a statement on her candidacy.

Ms. Abel said she was running for Campus Affairs Vice President. She was External Affairs Vice President for that past year and it was really fun. She got to be involved in the UCSA, and they did some exciting things. But she discovered she was really a lot more interested in focusing on graduate students at Berkeley rather than at the Statewide level. So she would like to be Campus Affairs VP. She thought Mr. Daal did a lot of fantastic things, and had a big list of things he did, and she hoped that next year they could get as much done.

Mr. Daniels called for any questions, and seeing none, asked Ms. Abel to step out of the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After discussion and a vote, Mr. Daniels asked to have Ms. Abel brought back into the room and said he would like to congratulate her for being elected as the GA's Campus Affairs Vice President. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said the next position up for consideration was External Affairs Vice President. He called for nominations. A Delegate nominated Alberto Ortega. Mr. Wolgin nominated Mike Perry, who respectfully declined. Ms. Haynes nominated Ms. Anderson, who respectfully declined, and said she wouldn't be around for part of the fall.

Seeing no further nominations, Mr. Daniels asked Mr. Ortega to make a statement on his candidacy. Mr. Ortega said that for the past year he's been involved as External Affairs Chief-of-Staff, and he's been lucky to work with Ms. Abel and to divide the work between them. He really enjoyed much of what he did and meeting students at other UC campuses, and he would like to do that for next year.

A motion was made to come to a vote immediately. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Daniels said they would not go into a closed discussion. The motion to approve Mr. Ortega as External Affairs Vice President passed unanimously by voice-vote. Mr. Daniels said he would like to congratulate Mr. Ortega. (Applause)

Presentation by the Chancellor

Presentation by the Chancellor

- 7 -

Mr. Daniels said the Chancellor has been very courteous with his time. He initially had been scheduled to come in April, but he had a scheduling conflict. He has been able to rearrange his dinner schedule to come to the GA that evening to speak for about 30 minutes. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would mostly just take questions.

Chancellor Birgeneau said it was great to see all of them. If he had been this popular two months ago he would be slightly more optimistic than currently. But generally, things were going very well for the University. One thing he was particularly proud of was he thought all of them know about the two gifts the campus got from the Hewlett Foundation of \$113 million to create 100 chairs. One thing the campus accomplished with this chair program, where half the funds come from the Hewlett Foundation, was to change the financial model of how chairs were handled at Berkeley, in a way that frankly was quite favorable to graduate students. The model now was there are principally two kinds of chairs. There were disciplinary chairs, and they've already raised a couple in English, a couple in Physics, a couple in Public Policy, and many others. The disciplinary chairs were funded as \$2 million chairs. That meant they'd initially generate \$100,000. And then there are interdisciplinary chairs. They've actually had the most success with equity and inclusion studies, which were at the \$3 million level, although one was at \$5 million. A \$3 million chair generated \$150,000.

For \$100,000 chairs, the financial model was that the first \$25,000 would go to the chair holder, as a scholarly allowance and could be used in any way the chair holder wanted. The next \$25,000 would fund a graduate fellowship in the department, possibly in the chair holder's general area of research, although that wasn't required. And then the next \$50,000 would go to support faculty salaries. So this was a new source of graduate fellowship funding.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they've gotten a phenomenal response from this. When they produced this plan with the Hewlett Foundation, the campus thought that based on past history, it would take them seven years to raise 100 chairs. They announced this program six months ago and they're in the final stages of confirming the first 50. So that was 50 new chairs for faculty in a very short length of time; and that included 50 new graduate fellowships that were also created in that short length of time. And when the program was completed, there will be 100 new graduate fellowships. And because these are endowed funds, with a hopefully much better experience in the stock market than in the last few months, in general, as the principle grew, the model was that the amount for the faculty member would stay fixed at \$25,000 and new income would be shared between graduate students and faculty.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he has also unilaterally changed the rules for all of the chairs that are centrally controlled, changing them to a new model. For all secondary co-chairs, the first \$25,000 will go to the faculty members and the next \$25,000 to graduate students. All new chairs will follow this same model, with a split between graduate students and faculty in a two-to-one ratio. So they've basically built graduate fellowships into the core financial model of philanthropic support of the University. This will ultimately generate hundreds of new graduate fellowships, permanent fellowships endowed for eternity. Chancellor Birgeneau said they were quite pleased about that.

In Equity and Inclusion, Chancellor Birgeneau said they have their first \$5 million chair. That will result in \$200,000 to support graduate students and faculty. They'll start out with \$67,000 for graduate students and \$133,00 for faculty support. So if grads want to do research on the challenges faced in a multicultural society, they'll suddenly have new funding, which was quite significant. And he believed there was another fellowship coming in the area of equity and inclusion, the Berkeley Diversity Research

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 8 -

Initiative, at \$3 million. Both came in from the outside, almost unsolicited. People recognized the amount of energy Berkeley was put into diversity, not just in terms of people, but with scholarship and making funds available for scholarship.

In terms of faculty, Chancellor Birgeneau said that grads certainly come there because of outstanding faculty members, broadly. One thing the campus worried about continuously was their ability to pay comparative salaries and offer a competitive research scholarship environment for their faculty. This was especially the case given their financial challenges relative to universities they compete with, such as Yale and MIT. One thing really encouraged them. He was a quantitative person, so he was trying to benchmark their young faculty and how they hire young faculty. That was somewhat difficult to do broadly. But fortunately, the Sloan Foundation in several specific areas, offered a way to measure quantitative methods. He served on their committee in physics for several years. In seven different areas, the Sloan Foundation each year described the 20 best young faculty members in the country, naming them Sloan Fellows and giving them discretionary money. It's an extraordinarily competitive process, and serving on the committee was probably the most fun job he's ever had. It didn't pay much, but was intellectually rewarding. The Sloan Fellowships were in the fields of economics, neuroscience, microbiology, mathematics, physics, chemistry, and computer science. So it covered social sciences, neuroscience, cognitive science, and physical and life sciences. It was interesting to see how different universities in the country did, and for those fields, it was a pretty good measure of quality and how competitive schools were. Over the last five years, Berkeley and MIT were tied for top in the country, and each had 30 Sloan Fellows, and hired the best young faculty in the country. Next after Berkeley was Stanford, then Princeton, and then Harvard. But there was a gap. So that was pretty encouraging. It meant that people wanted to come to Berkeley rather than those other schools. And these young faculty usually have offers from those other schools as well. People come here because of the environment there, and because they are a public university, and a subset of people want to be at a public institution, and want the kind of undergraduate and graduate bodies they have at Cal. People come for the character of the University.

Chancellor Birgeneau said their challenge actually came ten years out. They hire terrific young people and mentor them in their early careers. They get tenure, do something terrific, and then get phenomenal offers from other universities. That was where Cal's biggest challenge was; and they've done pretty well in retaining faculty. Interestingly, when they lose faculty, it was usually because of spousal issues. That was the biggest variable. There will be a couple and one will be able to get a job at Berkeley and the other won't, and it just doesn't work out. And then some other place, usually not as highly ranked as Berkeley, will offer both of them jobs. So Berkeley loses more than 50% of the time, and that was the reason. So they had to solve that problem one way or another. He wouldn't say which gender it was that was usually the one they couldn't hire.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he would mention one thing he's been widely quoted on in the newspapers. They have a broad pathway of progressively increasing support for graduate students. As he said, when they complete the Hewlett Chairs, just by themselves that would be 100 new graduate fellowships, which

was quite substantial. And that will continue as they raise chairs. But his biggest worry was actually their ability to provide the level of financial aid that they need for their undergraduate students, especially undergraduate students from financially challenged backgrounds.

The total cost for an undergraduate to attend Cal was about \$25,000, and the campus provides scholarship of \$17,000. That left the student with having to provide an additional \$8,000, through a combination of

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 9 -

work and loans. They knew that worked well because as probably many in the GA knew, the campus had an extraordinarily large percentage of undergraduate students come from financially disadvantaged backgrounds. They actually have more Pell Grant recipients at Berkeley than all of the Ivy League schools put together. So when they see great financial aid packets from the Ivy Leagues, they could afford them. But those schools don't have any poor students. But Berkeley actually had 7,500 students on Pell Grants, which was extraordinary.

The challenge was that if they look at the current model for financial aid of undergraduates, the campus projected that in ten years, the current self-help of \$8,000 will be up to \$16,000. They could imagine a family with an income of \$30,000 a year getting a letter saying, "Congratulations, you've been admitted to Berkeley. We're going to do whatever we can to enable you to attend, but by the way, over the next four years, you're going to have to provide \$64,000 on your own." That was the situation the campus was projecting, and it was not acceptable.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he chaired a committee that has proposed to the Regents a number of strategies to address this. The first response was "let's fix fees." But if they fix fees, the \$64,000 goes up to \$72,000. So fixing fees increases student debt because of the great financial aid. So the worst thing they could do was to fix the whole fee specs, because that ended up putting a burden on the poorest students.

Chancellor Birgeneau said it's been an educational process to educate people on how the financial aid system worked in the State of California, and to recognize that a necessary part of their system was that people from privileged families had an obligation to support people from families that were not privileged. That was built into their financial model.

As for the budget, Chancellor Birgeneau said the campus was worried. And any advocacy the GA could provide in this regard would be really appreciated. The Governor's proposal was for UC to get the compact, which meant UC's budget would go up about 6%, the amount they needed to maintain an equilibrium. But then the Governor will take 10% off the operating budget, which paid staff and faculty salaries. It was a real 10%. The campus wasn't quite in a panic mode, but 10% off their operating budget was a lot.

He put together a group of people who were much cleverer than he was about finance, and they were looking at the budget comprehensively and trying to figure out how they could ameliorate or at least mitigate the effects of the cut. They have some strategies. One example was that there was quite a large carryover. When people have research funds that sit in accounts and collect interest at the rate of 5%, the campus will probably sweep that interest and use those funds in the budget. And there were some other strategies. But the 10% cut the Governor has proposed was permanent, and it wasn't 10% for one year. So this was really profoundly worrying to all of them. And this was at the same time that Stanford's endowment has gone from \$15 billion to \$17 billion. So next year, just at a 5% payout rate, income from

Stanford's endowment, with no other source of money, no fees, nothing else, will be \$300 million more than the State will give Berkeley to operate. At that point, they might be asking why he took this job as Chancellor. This was a huge challenge, and obviously, they were still doing pretty well, and were hiring outstanding junior faculty. So people still want to come there because of the nature of the institution. But it was going to be a challenge.

The Governor and his staff need to hear back loudly from all of them. Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought students could be particularly effective in that. Students were the future, and this was a very

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 10 -

unwise decision on the part of the State to disinvest in students, which was what they were doing, in effect.

As some of them know, Chancellor Birgeneau said he wrote an op-ed a little while ago in response to Tom Friedman's book, The World Is Flat. The title of the op-ed was "The World Is Round In Berkeley," and it basically explained that California was different and that their public universities were different. And if they were to compete effectively, it would be the products of public universities like Berkeley that would enable them to compete effectively. So they were the future of California. Chancellor Birgeneau said he actually believed that, and it wasn't just words. They need to convince the people in Sacramento that maybe they could cut a little further the number of people they send to prison. With 1 in 100 people currently in jail now in this country, there was something fundamentally wrong. They need to invest in education. At that point Chancellor Birgeneau said he would stop and answer questions.

Mr. Daniels said that because this was the Delegate Assembly, he would only take questions from Delegates.

Ms. Haynes said she really admired the Chancellor's commitment to making higher education affordable to students, especially since so many Berkeley students go on to serve underserved communities as well. Her question was about the Native American Repatriation Act, which has become a huge issue on campus. There have been complaints raised about how the University has chosen to carry it out and she was wondering how his office planned to address those issues.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they made very significant progress in the last nine months in this area. But it didn't function very well and there was a decision to reorganize, which they were in the middle of doing. He was in the process of putting together a Native American Advisory Board in order to get appropriate advice. He didn't know if people have actually looked at the law, but it was incredibly complicated. They may say they want to repatriate, but actually they can't, if they're going to obey the law. So the campus was trying to figure out strategies to do repatriation in a responsible way. Also, with the help of the Native American Advisory Board, he was having a meeting with Native American leaders in about a month, to talk about strategies and how to move forward. There's been a large amount of misinformation propagated deliberately by people whose purposes he didn't admire. Chancellor Birgeneau said his biggest concern was that they have an incredible challenge in terms of education for the Native American community, who were grossly underrepresented. The campus was making some significant progress and the obloquy that has been directed to the University by some extremists has really done serious damage to the progress the campus was making in education for Native Americans. He was aboriginal Canadian, so he had a particular interest in aboriginal peoples.

A Delegate said that on the financial aid issue, he asked if the Chancellor supported Assembly Bill 2372, which would tax UC and CSUs. Chancellor Birgeneau said if that was an additional source of income, he didn't know how much it would generate. And it would also depend on what the other conditions were. This was a possible proposition. He opposed fixed fees, which meant taking money from poor people and giving it to the rich. He didn't support that.

A Delegate asked if he would support efforts to reform Proposition 13. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would, absolutely. The Delegate said that in light of the controversies around the UC Regents, and the compensation scandals, and given that their positions were already somewhat politicized due to the nature of the Governor's budget, he asked if the Chancellor would be in support of efforts to strengthen the

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 11 -

accountability of Regents to the citizens of California. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would like to see some academics on the Board of Regents. He wasn't sophisticated enough about politics to know the best approach. He's made strong recommendations, but he didn't know if that reached the Governor. People have actually been appointed to the Regents who haven't actually worked at a university, and he would like someone who has actually run a large, complex organization. So he took personal umbrage at public statements made by the Regents that the problem with the University was that it was run by academics. He believed strongly that they need people on the Board who have excelled at research and education and in running universities, because that's what their values should be. And good business people could be hired. Even if they weren't not academics, he would like to see people on the Regents who have run large, complex organizations, so they understand the challenges. The current system wasn't generating such people. But he has not yet thought through a political strategy.

A Delegate asked about his position on health insurance for student families. Berkeley did not offer an option for dependent health insurance, which was a burden for parents at Berkeley. Among the top 20 universities in the US, 19 offered dependent health care insurance. The one that didn't was Stanford. He asked if the Chancellor would be in favor of forming a task force to study this issue. Chancellor Birgeneau said he wasn't aware of that, and would want to find out more before committing himself. He was a one-time married graduate student, although he was very fortunate, because the day after their first child was born, he completed his thesis. That was not a coincidence, and fit was very strong motivation. Obviously, he thought people should have adequate health care. He just didn't know the technical issue, and he wouldn't want to commit himself until he found out how they should proceed, and why this was the case. He asked the Delegate to e-mail him at chancellor.edu, and he would promise to follow up.

Mr. Rheume said that his Department, Mechanical Engineering, was about to receive \$25 million from the Saudi government, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology. Aside from the freedom of expression concerns in the Kingdom, Mr. Rheume said he personally saw this as an opportunity to influence Saudi Arabian culture from the inside. By that he meant that often, social reform began on campuses and spread out from there. But what he was concerned about was whole, in the Chancellor's opinion, the customers were for the services that academics provide, and if they were for students, or for anybody. Mr. Rheume said his second question was if the Chancellor thought that this arrangement would distract faculty from filling their goals and obligations to the University, teaching and research.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that as they might guess, he spent a lot of time thinking through this issue, and asked a lot of questions. In answering them, they thought this could be a helpful direction to go on. After that, it was a Mechanical Engineering decision, unless the campus thought there would be some serious violation of Berkeley values. Chancellor Birgeneau said he's been extremely concerned the last several

years about the horrendous relationship that currently existed between the US and predominantly Muslim countries. He's been in Indonesia and had friends who were Saudis, Berkeley graduates, and their relationships with Muslim countries has basically been destroyed by foreign policy. His view was that the single best mechanism for repairing those relationships was through universities. So he felt for some time that they should find avenues for Berkeley to interact with universities in Muslim countries, without doing what their government has been doing, which was unctuously saying "We know everything and you don't know anything. So either you accept our values or we're not going to partner with you." So he brought in this thinking about the partnership with Saudi Arabia, even though many aspects of Saudi society he didn't like. He felt nevertheless, it was much better, through a university mechanism, to connect with them than not to connect with them. He didn't see how they'd make any progress in their relationship with countries in the Middle East if they didn't attempt to establish relationships. But from that point on, it was up to Mechanical Engineering. Berkeley was a bottom-up, not top-down institution.

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 12 -

Chancellor Birgeneau said he was talking to one of his friends on Wednesday who was part of the founding group over there, and he described a seminar they had about two months ago. And he happened to be Jewish by the way. At the seminar were 100 males, all wearing white robes, and 40 females, wearing black robes, many with their faces covered. And halfway through the day, one of the women stood up, removed her veil, and said that in her entire life, this was the first time she was allowed to be in a lecture room with men. And then everybody stood up and cheered. That was actually an incredible breakthrough. So all of the students who are educated at this new University, especially the female students, will go off into Saudi society, and hopefully will make change, and the change will be for the better. Of course there were some risks to that, but if they don't stick to their part of the bargain, with the Kingdom environment, then they'd pull what they had there.

Mr. Begtrup said he originally heard that Stanford announced that they were going to start giving financial aid packages, full scholarships, to everyone whose family made under \$100,000. The newspapers were very concerned that that would be a serious brain drain from public universities. Berkeley has had the advantage, up until now, in what they could offer to poor students, while Stanford, in the past, just said they had to be rich. He asked if that was a real concern, or if that number was so small that it wouldn't make much of a difference.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that given that they currently have more Pell Grant students at Berkeley than all the Ivy League schools put together, he didn't expect the financial profile of the undergraduate body to change significantly. So he didn't think it will have a significant effect on them. On the other hand, his view got quoted a lot in newspapers about this. It was his view that if the universities used their money to support students, that was a good thing. It just raised the bar for Berkeley, and hopefully it will encourage the State to step up. One thing he's been advocating, as part of his strategy, was that the State should put up matching funds, as an add-on to the budget, and not a replacement, so that if they had an endowment for poor kids, \$100,000 for financial aid, then the State would match that with \$100,000. They would then progressively build up an endowment. Chancellor Birgeneau said he discussed that with a lot of people in Sacramento and one by one, the legislators agreed. But they haven't actually been able to get the money allocated. He came close last year, but for not very happy reasons it got eliminated from the budget at the last minute. But he thought they actually could see a positive effect out of this. It was great that Stanford actually did it. Their legislators will understand that their public universities had to be affordable. And they couldn't be affordable unless there were resources. And the State had to be part of the investment. But in this case, they were calling for investment very directly, including investment in student aid, with a public-private partnership.

There's a lot of private money out there. People who went to Berkeley when fees were \$300 a semester were now millionaires. They had an obligation to give back. He was serious about that. People who were there when fees were \$300 a semester, and who now made \$300,000 a year, should give back, and enable this generation of students to have an inexpensive education.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that in an op-ed, he pointed out the following. If every living Berkeley graduate one time only wrote out a check for \$1,000, and the State matched it, that would actually solve the accessibility problem not just for next year, but forever. For most people that wasn't a lot of money, although it now was for grads, at this stage in their lives. So this was not an insurmountable problem. This was a solvable problem, and it just took money; and not a crazy amount of money. The trouble was, that probably not more than 1% of Berkeley graduates will step up and write a check for \$1,000, even though they had a moral obligation to do so. So again, part of their challenge was how to communicate that in such a way that people actually do it, and then, how to get the State to step up as well.

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 13 -

Mr. Daniels said they had time for one more question.

Mr. McDougal said this has been an educational experience for him. Obviously the Chancellor was writing about these issues and talking to groups, and he asked what he saw as more possibilities for raising the level of consciousness on campus, among students, staff, and faculty, around their funding and around larger issues of public education. They're having a great conversation, and some small percentage of people read op-eds, but as Chancellor what role he had. Chancellor Birgeneau said he's been doing a lot. But the trouble was that students were all working really hard, or playing really hard. As for the financial aid issue and admissions, they had a Bear In Mind Program, which involved himself and the Director of Admissions, and Director for Undergraduate Admissions Walter Robinson and Associate Vice Chancellor for Admissions and Enrollment Susie Castillo-Robson, a half-hour program that had about 10,000 hits. There was an extensive interview with him in "The Berkeleyan," although nobody reads that. He's been writing op-eds like mad. The person who owns the Spanish newspaper, *La Opinion*, was a personal friend, so they've been getting them translated into Spanish for that paper. So they've been trying to get it out there, but it was a challenge. Any suggestions would be really welcomed for how they could get the message out. If he could get the message out to 420,000 living graduates to give the school \$1,000 once, and with the State matching those funds, they would solve the accessibility problem for undergraduates forever. That was a powerful statement. He actually suggested to their development people that the campus pay for newspaper advertisements that said that. But they predicted that they would raise less money than the cost of the advertisements.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that for the final political point, the other issue he's been working on hard, and was just in Washington working on, was undocumented students. Sadly, they're currently not allowed to provide financial aid to undocumented students, who were not eligible. He had a life experience that was extraordinary. He wouldn't say it was transformational, as he was too old to be transformed, where there was a young man he met, who came to his office, who had come to Berkeley as a transfer student. This student came from an extraordinarily poor family from Mexico, and applied for financial aid. And that was when he found out he was undocumented. He hadn't known. And he couldn't get the financial aid package the campus had promised him because he wasn't eligible for Pell Grants or State aid. So he had a \$25,000 bill when he thought it was going to be \$8,000, because he qualified for financial aid. He tried to manage on his own, and got a full-time job, and he had a family to support, and he was trying to meet the challenges of Berkeley's courses. He basically had a nervous breakdown and dropped out. But the final result was actually positive. There were two really nice young women in San Francisco who heard about him, and a few other students who came from well-to-do families, and they actually took up a collection

and collected enough money to support five undocumented students. So they were being supported. These were obviously wonderful people, but that wasn't a solution.

Sen. Cedillo had a bill that made its way through to allow the University to provide financial aid to undocumented students, but unfortunately, the Governor vetoed it at the last minute. So they need pressure on the Governor to talk to Sen. Cedillo. The bill will be coming back, so they need pressure on the Governor. At the national level, the corresponding act was the DREAM Act. Chancellor Birgeneau said he was part of a press conference with Sen. Durbin, who sponsored the DREAM Act. Just before the Senate vote, he needed 60 votes and it got 52. The interesting thing was that more Democrats voted against it than Republicans voted for it. So it was a bi-partisan rejection. So the illegal immigrant issue was very complicated, and it wasn't just Democrats who were the good guys and Republicans the bad guys. It didn't work that way. So they need again pressure, at least within the State, and on the Regents, to give them pathways. The University wasn't asking for anything special, or for new resources, because

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 14 -

pathways would allow them to provide financial aid at least to people who were brought to this country and had no idea they were illegal, having come here when they were five years old. And these are people who have overcome incredible barriers and would be great citizens one day.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he wanted to thank them. Mr. Daniels said he would like to thank the Chancellor. (Applause)

Mr. Armstrong moved to extend the meeting until 8 o'clock. The motion was seconded. The motion was withdrawn.

ELECTIONS (cont'd)

Mr. Daniels said the next position up for consideration was election of the Project Coordinator Liaison. He called for any nominations. Mr. Wolgin nominated Jessica LePak. Ms. Anderson nominated Zeli Rivas. Hodari Toure nominated himself. Seeing no further nominations, Mr. Daniels said nominations were closed. He called for statements from the nominees.

Ms. LePak said she would much rather have the GA hear the truth about what the Chancellor said than for her to win this election, only because it was something she's worked on for the past eight months. What the Chancellor said about the NAGPRA law was completely inaccurate in the way of repatriation. It was totally incorrect and there was nothing in the macro policy that precluded repatriation.

A Delegate asked what term she was using. Ms. LePak said it was the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990. The University holds over 13,000 remains of Native American people on campus. Ms. LePak said they have been fighting to get those remains back to where they belong, to the indigenous people in this country. She would suppose she was one of the extremists the Chancellor talked about, and she didn't appreciate that very much. But she obviously wasn't afraid to stand up to administrators. So that was one of her qualities in applying for this position.

Ms. Rivas said she was the current Women of Color Initiative Project Coordinator, organizing the Empowering Women of Color Conference that will occur on Saturday. Many have read about it in the Daily Cal. One of her qualities was organization. She's been working with the GA that year, so she's worked a lot with different GA members, both Delegates and the Executive Board. She was interested in this position for next year.

Mr. Toure said he actually started there as a Delegate about five years ago and has been on the Executive Board. He has been at the GA for over five years or so. He was a GMORR Coordinator. The position was pretty much created for him, and he held it for a couple of years. He actually helped to bring the Project Coordinator position to where it was now. He felt strangely enough that he was a GA insider. He loved the GA, an organization that has helped a lot of people do things that they wouldn't have otherwise been able to do, and allowed positions for people who advocate for things they wouldn't have previously. He was very familiar with almost all of the Coordinator positions and was familiar with the Exec Board, with the Delegate process, and with the Business Office.

Elections (cont'd)

- 15 -

Mr. McDougal asked the candidates about the one thing they would like to see that role help bring about that was not already being done. Ms. LePak said she wasn't sure if this was being done or not, but she would like to see more coordination among the projects, and maybe co-sponsorship, so there was less work for each of the groups, and more resources for the projects. Ms. Rivas said she thought one thing was that working on different projects that year, they talk to each other, and as Project Coordinators, they all have the same frustrations. And it was the little things. She thought some of the things Mr. Daniels has implemented that year helped, with pooling resources and pooling office supplies. They could simplify perhaps the paperwork, making little changes like that, such as having food at committee meetings. She thought it would help if they could work on things like that, and bring that over to the Exec Board, and communicate a little bit better what was happening with the projects, and what was available for everyone. Mr. Toure said he thought the position was created to serve both of those purposes. The PCs, for the last five or six years, have pretty much functioned like that, where they've all helped each other on projects. The thing that he would like to see more of was a more global approach to projects, especially with the budget cuts. With cuts, they're pressured to cut certain things, such as cutting services to different communities. People weren't getting served like they used to, so there needed to be a more inclusive way to outreach to those communities, like the GA used to do. He thought a lot of that was because a lot of Delegates didn't know too much about the Project Coordinators, and neither did the Exec Board. He's sure that has changed in the year that Ms. Sasser has been in the position, and he thought that needed to continue.

Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Toure what prevented him from doing this job. Mr. Toure said he was in the job for about a month or so and had to leave. But he helped to bring the job about. It was created for him to rectify some of those issues that were just brought up, a previous division between the Exec Board, the PCs, and the Business Office. The position was brought up to unify those different, discrete positions or programs inside the GA.

Seeing no further questions, Mr. Daniels asked the candidates to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Daniels asked to have the candidates brought back in and said he wanted to congratulate Zeli Rivas on her election as Project Coordinator Liaison.
(Applause)

Ms. Rivas said she would leave fliers for the Empowering Women of Color Conference on Saturday. She would ask them to please distribute them. It was free to UC Berkeley students. There will be amazing things happening. She wanted to thank them.

Mr. Daniels said the next position under consideration was election of the Budget Officer. He called for any nominations. Mr. Wolgin nominated Nish Rajan.

Ms. Ahrendt asked how many people might have been interested if these elections had been held last month. Mr. Daniels said people could move to table this election if they wished.

Mr. Begtrup moved to close nominations. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Rajan said that to paraphrase what another candidate has said, he thought a good Budget Officer just needed to be someone who cared enough about the GA and knew high school math. He thought a great Budget Officer would be someone who realized that the budget was more than just numbers and was

Elections (cont'd)

- 16 -

really about people in the GA. He couldn't really say that he was a great Budget Officer yet, but ever since he got to the GA he's always been in the Finance Committee or somehow related to it. He was the Finance Chair for one year and learned a lot from a lot of great people, from Sarah Tom and Meghan Anderson. So he would definitely try and do a good job.

Mr. Daniels called for any questions. Mr. Wolgin moved to come to a vote. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. After a vote, Mr. Daniels said he would like to congratulate Mr. Rajan for his election as Budget Chair.

Mr. Daniels said the next position to elect was the Rules Committee Chair. A Delegate nominated Scott Armstrong. Pam Berkeley nominated herself. Ms. Freedman moved to close nominations. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daniels called for statements. Mr. Armstrong said he wanted to be the Rules Chair because he liked rules; it was a hobby of his. He thought rules existed because when the shit hit the fan, people had to know what to do. Hopefully it never would, and people would never need them. But it was good to have somebody who knew the rules. He actually thought Ms. Berkeley would be a fine Rules Chair as well. They were both on the Committee and he thought they were both good candidates. Ms. Berkeley said she had to say that Mr. Armstrong had much more of an encyclopedic knowledge of the rules than she did. Her main goal as Rules Chair would be to make them more accessible to every member of the Graduate Assembly, so that newcomers to the Assembly and continuing students who weren't as familiar, could know the rules easier.

Mr. Daniels said he should have asked everyone before this, but he asked what year they were. Ms. Berkeley said she was a second-year PhD student in Mechanical Engineering. Mr. Armstrong said this would be his last year, in Math.

Mr. Wolgin asked how they felt about the current By-laws. Mr. Armstrong said he didn't like the current By-laws and he intended to rewrite them, whether or not he won the current election. Ms. Berkeley said they could be made so that people understood them better.

Mr. Daal said that if either of them did not win this position, he asked if there were other positions they'd run for. Mr. Armstrong said there weren't that many left, and he probably wouldn't. He would be on Ms. Berkeley's Committee. Ms. Berkeley said she would also probably run for the Grad Council. And should she not win as Chair, she would also serve on the Rules Committee again.

Mr. Daniels called for a quorum, and seeing none, asked the candidates to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, he asked the candidates to be brought in, and said he would like to congratulate Mr. Armstrong for being elected as Rules Committee Chair. (Applause)

Mr. Daniels said the next position up for election was Graduate Council representatives. A Delegate nominated Dan Work. Mr. Wolgin nominated Hagar Zohar. Mr. Armstrong nominated Meghan Anderson. Mr. Rajan nominated Pam Berkeley. Avi Valladares nominated himself. A Delegate nominated Scott Siera. Ms. Abel nominated Dana Freedman. Ms. Murphy nominated Aaron deGrassi. Mr. Podesta nominated Erin Molansky, who respectfully declined. A Delegate nominated Brandon Rees,

Elections -- Grad Council representatives (cont'd)

- 17 -

who respectfully declined. Jesse Murphy nominated herself. Ms. Abel nominated Jessica LePak. Tony D'Alessio nominated himself. A Delegate nominated Mr. Wolgin, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Daniels said that seeing no further nominations, nominations were closed. Delegates would get four votes. The top three would be Grad Council Representatives and the fourth would be the Alternate, unless people wanted to switch.

Mr. Work said he was a second-year PhD student in Civil Engineering. Next year will be his third year of serving in the GA, and he would like the opportunity to take the time to represent the GA on the Grad Council. For those who didn't know, the Grad Council was a committee of the Academic Senate that was in charge of maintaining the quality of graduate education. This was a position he felt very strongly about and thought it was a very important position for the GA since it was one of the few established avenues where they could have their voices heard by the campus. As for his experience, he's served on the Lower Sproul Redevelopment Committee with Mr. Daniels and Mr. Daal. He's had a lot of experience working with campus administrators and he's gotten to see a lot of things across campus, and he felt this experience will allow him to hear grads' voices, put that in the context of larger campus issues, and make those issues heard.

Ms. Zohar said she was second-year student in Chemical Engineering and in her time there has been impressed with the graduate students. She thought they were amazing people and deserved to have a good GA rep. She's like to change things that weren't already fantastic in the graduate experience.

Ms. Anderson said she was a fifth-year student in the Math Department. She was GA Budget Chair and was on the Grad Council the year before. She'll be away during November and December. She'd like to stay active in the GA, but because she wouldn't be there the whole year, she didn't feel she could take on being a committee chair. However, she could be the Grad Council Alternate, or the Alternate could fill in for a few months. She loved being on the Grad Council and thought she did a pretty good job.

Mr. Valladares said he was first-year PhD student in the Italian Department. Most people didn't know him, and experience there wasn't his strength. But he thought that would be strength in going to the Grad Council. For the GA to work well, continuity needed to be maintained, and people had to be there long enough and to pass on their knowledge. He's talked to people who served on the Grad Council in the past and currently and thought it would be a wonderful experience. He could learn in an accelerated rate how the University worked and it would give him a platform to apply that knowledge.

Ms. Berkeley said she already spoke for the Rules Committee position. She had no experience on the Grad Council, but for the past year she has been interfacing with the higher-ups in her Department, Mechanical Engineering, dealing with some issues in the Department, and she was fairly skilled at doing that. She was a second year.

Scot Siera said he was a sixth-year student in MCB. He was called up last time for the Grad Council election and he said he was graduating and leaving, but he will actually be around next year, in Law School. He thought what he'd bring to the Grad Council was the experience of having gone through an entire PhD program, so he knew what it was like. And he also knew what it was like in a different area, a professional department. Also, his wife was in the School of Social Welfare, so that was another Department, and a great program, that he was familiar with.

Elections -- Grad Council representatives (cont'd)

- 18 -

Ms. Freedman said she was a fifth-year student in Chemistry. Some of them might be under the impression that she was graduating next year, but her adviser took it back, so she'll be there. She's been on the Grad Council for the past two years. While there's been some turnover, there was a lot of continuity. She had a good rapport with the faculty and felt it would be good for the GA, Delegates and grad students, to have her continue, and to have some continuity.

Mr. deGrassi said he was a second-year student in Geography, which was quite an interdisciplinary Department and gave him knowledge of different departments on campus and their students, and gave him a well-rounded insight as well. As a GSI he has attended Academic Senate meetings. He was also an undergrad there, so he also had an undergrad perspective and knew the tensions and differences. He's sort of developed friendships with professors on the Academic Senate. He was interested in getting more involved in the GA. This was his second year, so he'll have time to continue on and help preserve the institutional memory.

Ms. Murphy said she was a first-year Social Welfare in the two-year Masters program. She was new to the Grad Council and to Berkeley and had no track record. But she was really interested in this, especially in the interdisciplinary approach. Her Department didn't have a lot of interaction with other departments and schools so she would really like to see more of that and be more involved in that process. She would also like to be more involved in how the core requirements were set for different sections.

Ms. LePak said she was a second-year in the School of Social Welfare. They heard from her twice in the past months. Last time she ran, Mr. Daal asked whether or not nominees would be willing to stand up to the Administration and that was something she talked about just a few moments ago. Although she hasn't attended any Grad Council meetings, because she was an Alternate, she looked forward to doing that next year and working with the Administration. Despite the fact that she didn't work well with the Chancellor, she did work well with other faculty and staff on campus.

Mr. D'Alessio said he was a fifth-year in Molecular and Cell Biology. He's only been a Delegate that year and got involved with the GA because he was dissatisfied with his grad experience and the lack of avenues with faculty to improve the quality of life and grads' experience, from an educational standpoint. He was very happy with how the GA was trying to deal with that. Based on his discussions with people, he thought the Grad Council position was the best opportunity to directly influence departments to improve the quality of graduate education in a way that he hasn't be able to do in his Department.

Mr. Daniels asked if people wanted to ask questions. Mr. Armstrong said the meeting time had ended and was out of order unless people wanted to extend it. Mr. Daniels said he would entertain a motion to extend the meeting by 30 minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Wolgin noted that the Grad Council met on Mondays between 2:00 and 4:30.

Mr. Daniels said it was the will of the GA to not ask questions of the candidates. He asked them to step outside for a discussion off the record and a vote.

After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Daniels asked the candidates to be brought back and said he would like to congratulate Mr. Work, Mr. Valladares, Ms. Berkeley, and Ms. Freedman, with Ms. Berkeley elected as Alternate. (Applause)

Elections -- Grad Council representatives (cont'd)
Funding Committee Report

- 19 -

Mr. Daniels said there were other ways to get involved for people who didn't get elected, and there were a number of issues to be worked on. So he would ask them to please consider that. For those who were elected, there will be a welcome for the newly elected members next Thursday, from 6:00 to 7:30. There will be food.

A Delegate moved to table the remaining elections until April. The motion was seconded. Mr. Daniels said that would table elections of the Funding Chair, the Environmental Sustainability Chair, International Student Affairs Chair, and Technology Committee Chair. **THE MOTION TO TABLE REMAINING ELECTIONS UNTIL THE APRIL MEETING PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.**

Mr. Daniels said that before he collapsed from being ill, he would leave, and would leave them in the capable hands of their next President, Mr. Daal. He wanted to congratulate everyone who won.

Funding Committee Report

With Mr. Daal chairing the meeting, Mr. Podesta said the Funding Committee report wasn't part of the agenda packet and was distributed late. It included recommendations for Grants, Round 4. The global cut was 0%, so every group got what it needed. Groups should be happy about that.

A motion to approve the Funding Committee Report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT, AND APPROVE THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GRANTS, ROUND 4, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Reporting as Funding Adviser, Mr. Tuchman said there will be a publications award for graduate and undergraduate publications, so if people were in a journal group, e.g., there was a form on which they could make nominations. If they had any questions, they could ask the ASUC Publications office.

RESOLUTION REFERRALS

Mr. Daal said the first Resolution was Resolution on a Budget Amendment to Modify the Graduate Assembly's Fiscal Year. Ms. Anderson said she submitted the Resolution, and would like to fast-track it. It would start the GA's fiscal year on July 1, to line it up with the ASUC. It wouldn't cost any money, but they had to get this change to the ASUC right away. She moved to fast-track it. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Wolgin moved to vote at that time. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

The following Resolution was authored by Ms. Anderson:

Resolution Referrals

- 20 -

Resolution for a Budget Amendment to Modify the Graduate Assembly's Fiscal Year

RESOLUTION FOR A BUDGET AMENDMENT TO MODIFY THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S FISCAL YEAR

WHEREAS, the current GA fiscal year is scheduled to end on May 31; and

WHEREAS, the ASUC Auxiliary fiscal year is scheduled to end on June 30; and

WHEREAS, there are sufficient funds in all relevant accounts to extend the GA 2007-2008 fiscal year by one month, provided the Business Manager is allowed to move funds freely between sub-accounts;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly's 2007-2008 fiscal year be extended to June 30th, 2008, and that the 2008 - 2009 and subsequent fiscal years begin on July 1st of the relevant year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Business Manager be granted the authority for the remainder of the 2007-2008 fiscal year to move funds between sub-accounts of the same budget unit with the oversight of the Budget Committee, but without further approval from the Delegate Assembly, for the purpose of extending the fiscal year only.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION FOR A BUDGET AMENDMENT TO MODIFY THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY'S FISCAL YEAR PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daal said the next Resolution, was Budget Amendment to Include New Revenue into the 2007-08 Budget, to incorporate Graduate Division funding. Mr. Daal said the bill would be referred to the Budget Committee.

RESOLUTION

The following Resolution was sponsored by Mr. Cruz:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INCREASING UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN THE UC SYSTEM AND IN SUPPORT OF THE BOARS ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, throughout its history, the Graduate Assembly has supported affirmative action and integration in the University of California. The Graduate Assembly raised its voice along with thousands of students in calling on the UC Regents to reverse their ban on affirmative action in the UC System, an effort which led to the Regents' unanimous reversal of the ban on May 16, 2001; and

WHEREAS, the UC faculty committee BOARS (Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools) has proposed a new UC eligibility policy that includes eliminating the SAT II subject test

Resolution In Support of Increasing Underrepresented Minority Student Enrollment In the UC System and In Support of the BOARS Admissions Proposal (cont'd)

- 21 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INCREASING UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN THE UC SYSTEM AND IN SUPPORT OF THE BOARS ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL (cont'd)

requirement and the rigid use of other admissions criteria. The aim of the BOARS proposal is to increase the opportunities of Latina/o, black, Native American, Filipina/o, rural, and low-income students of all races to attend UC Berkeley and other UCs. If passed and correctly implemented, this proposal could represent a step forward towards restoring the mission of the UC System to provide a first-class education to all of California's most promising young people, including those who have been denied equal educational opportunities because of institutional racism, segregation, and poverty; and

WHEREAS, a solid and growing body of research demonstrates that the SAT adds little value to the admissions process, while unfairly denying opportunities to underrepresented minority and poor students. The BOARS proposal states: "In quantitative studies, BOARS has repeatedly found that, while the predictive power of all standardized admissions test is quite modest, scores on [the SAT II] elective subject tests make a negligible contribution to predictions of initial academic performance at the University" (BOARS, "Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy"). An October 2001 quantitative study by the UC Office of the President found the SAT I to be an even less important indicator of college success than the SAT

II (Saul Geiser, "UC and the SAT: Predictive Validity and Differential Impact of the SAT I and SAT II at the University of California"); and

WHEREAS, UCLA's Ralph J. Bunche Center for African American Studies and the UC Latino Eligibility Task Force have called for elimination of the SAT in UC admissions. In 2001, a large number of faculty called for elimination of the SAT (see attached declaration); and

WHEREAS, in its current form, the BOARS proposal eliminates the guarantee of UC admission to the top 12.5% of California's high school graduates. The BOARS proposal must be amended to restore the 12.5%, both to prevent any counter-position of an increase in Latina(o) and black student enrollment to the maintenance of the 12.5% guarantee, and because the guarantee is a democratic gain that can be implemented to benefit all California students including its rapidly increasing Latina/o student population; and

WHEREAS, the BOARS proposal would be strengthened greatly, and more likely to achieve substantial rather than token increases in underrepresented student enrollment, if it is amended to eliminate the use of the SAT I and all standardized tests in the admissions process. The SAT and other standardized tests do not measure intellectual ability or potential. They do, however stigmatize minority and poor students and provide an unfair advantage to white students and students from privileged backgrounds. Eliminating use of the SAT is necessary to protect meaningful gains in underrepresented student enrollment from the threat of right-wing lawsuits and demagoguery;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that:

1. The Graduate Assembly supports the BOARS proposal to reform the UC admissions system;

Resolution In Support of Increasing Underrepresented Minority Student Enrollment In the UC System and In Support of the BOARS Admissions Proposal (cont'd) - 22 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INCREASING UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN THE UC SYSTEM AND IN SUPPORT OF THE BOARS ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL (cont'd)

2. The Graduate Assembly supports amending the BOARS proposal to maintain the guarantee of admission to the top 12.5% of California's high school graduates;
3. The Graduate Assembly supports amending the BOARS proposal to also eliminate the SAT I requirement to further increase underrepresented student enrollment;
4. The Graduate Assembly will send this Resolution to BOARS, the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate, the Academic Council, and the UC Regents; and
5. The Graduate Assembly endorses the March 13, 2008 rally to increase underrepresented minority student enrollment in the UC System.

Mr. Daal said the Resolution under consideration was a new version from what was in the agenda packet.

Mr. Cruz said the Resolution was time sensitive and dealt with the future of UC undergraduate admissions and graduate programs. The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, the UC System's faculty committee that made recommendations on admissions policy, has put forward a proposal to elimi

nate the SAT II subject test requirement for UC admission, and to also eliminate the rigid use of other admissions criteria. The purpose of the proposal was to increase the ability of campuses like UC Berkeley to increase underrepresented minority student enrollment and the enrollment of black, Latino, Native American, and Filipino students, as well as low-income students, who were normally invisible to the UC admissions process, many of whom were simply not aware of the UC admissions process and don't submit SAT II subject test scores.

Mr. Cruz said the Resolution supports the BOARS proposal and calls for two important amendments to the proposal. The faculty were currently considering this and the proposal will go to the UC Regents within the next three or four months. The first amendment proposed was to maintain the guarantee of admission to the top 12.5% of high school grads in California. The proposal currently did not have clear language maintaining those guaranteed admissions. That would put an obligation on the State to fund UC's expansion as the population grew. Secondly, the Resolution asks to restore the recommendation that was put forward by the previous UC President, Richard Atkinson, and has been called for by the ASUC, to eliminate the SAT I requirement. The SAT, like the GRE and other tests students have taken, was not a test for actual ability to graduate, and it had an established bias against racial minorities and low-income students. It did not correlate with actual college success and actual completion of college. From the notice on the back of the Resolution, people could see the widespread support that existed when the SAT I was up for elimination, and could see the long list of endorsements.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the substitute Resolution already went to committee. Mr. Cruz said it did. He believed it was adopted by the External Affairs Committee. Mr. Begtrup said the Committee's statement was on the back of the agenda packet. The Committee liked the Resolution. They worked through the changes. He didn't think this should be controversial.

Ms. Ahrendt said that in the fifth Whereas Clause, she didn't understand what the "counter-position" was. She didn't understand the wording, and thought it could be reworded to make it clearer. Mr. Cruz the

Resolution In Support of Increasing Underrepresented Minority Student Enrollment In the
UC System and In Support of the BOARS Admissions Proposal (cont'd)

- 23 -

original proposal made a guarantee, and its purpose was to increase underrepresented minorities. So people want to retain that guarantee. They're saying to not counter-pose that and to maintain the purpose of diversifying UC, and the 12.5% guarantee.

Mr. Wolgin said the last Whereas Clause, the last sentence, seemed ridiculous. Mr. Cruz said it happened. Mr. Wolgin asked what a "right-wing lawsuit" was, and if there was a specific group they were referring to. The language seemed very vague, and seemed like they might be attacking an entire segment of the population who may not be involved. Mr. Cruz said the former Chair of the UC Regent, John Moores, in the fall of 2003, pointed out how a number of students were being admitted to UC Berkeley with low SAT scores, below 1,000. A large number of them were black, Latino, and Native American. He threatened a lawsuit, using the SAT gap, saying preferences were being given to underqualified underrepresented minority students. These were students who the admissions process accepted. Mr. Moores was censured by the entire Board.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to amend the last Whereas Clause, and strike the last two words, "and demagoguery." Mr. Cruz said he would accept that amendment. THE AMENDMENT WAS ADOPTED BY THE SPONSOR.

Mr. Daal said it was 8 o'clock, and they needed to extend time again. Also, they were no longer certain that the Resolution as it was written was what was reviewed by the External Affairs Committee.

Mr. Armstrong said the Resolution that was distributed was not noticed in the agenda or, probably, on the Web site. That was a problem because people could have left the meeting thinking the GA was voting on the Resolution that was in the packet. Things had to be noticed correctly. There also was probably no quorum.

On a point of order, Mr. Armstrong asked what a quorum was. Mr. Rajan said it was half the Delegates plus one.

Mr. Daal said he would like to entertain a motion to extend the meeting time. Ms. Freedman moved to extend by five minutes, until 8:10. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Podesta moved to refer the Resolution back to committee.

Mr. Daal said that if the problem was that the Resolution was not what the External Affairs Committee looked at, then the GA would need to pass an amendment to change the Resolution to what was distributed, and then consider the substitute amendment. Mr. Cruz said he went to the External Affairs Committee with the Resolution that was distributed that evening. There may have been an error, with the wrong Resolution not included in the packet.

Mr. Daal said they needed at least 15 voting members present to have a quorum. He said they had a quorum.

The motion to refer the Resolution back to the External Affairs Committee was seconded.

Mr. Begtrup said the Resolution was considered by External Affairs and the issues people had were mostly grammatical, small issues that could be fixed on the floor.

Resolution In Support of Increasing Underrepresented Minority Student Enrollment In the UC System and In Support of the BOARS Admissions Proposal (cont'd) - 24 -

On a point of order, Mr. Armstrong said quorum was 25% of all Delegates in the GA, plus one, not 25% of Delegates who were present.

Mr. Podesta said that Mr. Cruz sat through elections and was at the GA with the Resolution for a second time.

The motion to refer the Resolution back to External Affairs failed by voice-vote.

Mr. Wolgin moved to call the question with Ms. Ahrendt's language. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Mr. Daal asked what the outcome was for quorum. Mr. Rajan said they had a quorum.

Ms. Ahrendt said the fifth Whereas Clause would be amended to strike “, both to prevent any counter-position of an increase in Latina(o) and black student enrollment to the maintenance of the 12.5% guarantee, and”, to read as follows:

"Whereas, in its current form, the BOARS proposal eliminates the guarantee of UC admission to the top 12.5% of California's high school graduates. The BOARS proposal must be amended to restore the 12.5% because the guarantee is a democratic gain that can be implemented to benefit all California students including its rapidly increasing Latina/o student population; and"

In the last Whereas Clause, the words the amendment would strike were "from the threat of right-wing lawsuits and demagoguery.", to read as follows:

"Whereas, the BOARS proposal would be strengthened greatly, and more likely to achieve substantial rather than token increases in underrepresented student enrollment, if it is amended to eliminate the use of the SAT I and all standardized tests in the admissions process. The SAT and other standardized tests do not measure intellectual ability or potential. They do, however stigmatize minority and poor students and provide an unfair advantage to white students and students from privileged backgrounds. Eliminating use of the SAT is necessary to protect meaningful gains in underrepresented student enrollment;"

Mr. Cruz said he would accept the amendments. THE AMENDMENTS WERE ADOPTED BY THE SPONSOR.

Mr. Daal said they'd vote on the Resolution, with the amendments as they were read out. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF INCREASING UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN THE UC SYSTEM AND IN SUPPORT OF THE BOARS ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL, AS AMENDED ON THE FLOOR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Rajan said they did not have a quorum. Mr. Daal said the meeting was adjourned.

This meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,
Steven I. Litwak, Recording Secretary

Amended Resolutions

- i -

Resolution In Support of Increasing Underrepresented Minority Student Enrollment in the UC System and In Support of the BOARS Admissions Proposal [as amended]

Whereas, throughout its history, the Graduate Assembly has supported affirmative action and integration in the University of California. The Graduate Assembly raised its voice along with thousands of students in calling on the UC Regents to reverse their ban on affirmative action in the UC System, an effort which led to the Regents' unanimous reversal of the ban on May 16, 2001; and

Whereas, the UC faculty committee BOARS (Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools) has proposed a new UC eligibility policy that includes eliminating the SAT II subject test requirement and the rigid use of other admissions criteria. The aim of the BOARS proposal is to increase the opportunities of Latina/o, black, Native American, Filipina/o, rural, and low-income students of all races to attend UC Berkeley and other UCs. If passed and correctly implemented, this proposal could represent a step forward towards restoring the mission of the UC System to provide a first-class education to all of California's most promising young people, including

those who have been denied equal educational opportunities because of institutional racism, segregation, and poverty; and

Whereas, a solid and growing body of research demonstrates that the SAT adds little value to the admissions process, while unfairly denying opportunities to underrepresented minority and poor students. The BOARS proposal states: "In quantitative studies, BOARS has repeatedly found that, while the predictive power of all standardized admissions test is quite modest, scores on [the SAT II] elective subject tests make a negligible contribution to predictions of initial academic performance at the University" (BOARS, "Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy"). An October 2001 quantitative study by the UC Office of the President found the SAT I to be an even less important indicator of college success than the SAT II (Saul Geiser, "UC and the SAT: Predictive Validity and Differential Impact of the SAT I and SAT II at the University of California"); and

Whereas, UCLA's Ralph J. Bunche Center for African American Studies and the UC Latino Eligibility Task Force have called for elimination of the SAT in UC admissions. In 2001, a large number of faculty called for elimination of the SAT (see attached declaration); and

Whereas, in its current form, the BOARS proposal eliminates the guarantee of UC admission to the top 12.5% of California's high school graduates. The BOARS proposal must be amended to restore the 12.5% because the guarantee is a democratic gain that can be implemented to benefit all California students including its rapidly increasing Latina/o student population; and

Whereas, the BOARS proposal would be strengthened greatly, and more likely to achieve substantial rather than token increases in underrepresented student enrollment, if it is amended to eliminate the use of the SAT I and all standardized tests in the admissions process. The SAT and other standardized tests do not measure intellectual ability or potential. They do, however stigmatize minority and poor students and provide an unfair advantage to white students and students from privileged backgrounds. Eliminating use of the SAT is necessary to protect meaningful gains in underrepresented student enrollment;

Amended Resolutions (cont'd)

- ii -

Resolution In Support of Increasing Underrepresented Minority Student Enrollment in the UC System and In Support of the BOARS Admissions Proposal [as amended] (cont'd)

Therefore Be It Resolved, that:

1. The Graduate Assembly supports the BOARS proposal to reform the UC admissions system;
2. The Graduate Assembly supports amending the BOARS proposal to maintain the guarantee of admission to the top 12.5% of California's high school graduates;
3. The Graduate Assembly supports amending the BOARS proposal to also eliminate the SAT I requirement to further increase underrepresented student enrollment;
4. The Graduate Assembly will send this Resolution to BOARS, the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate, the Academic Council, and the UC Regents; and
5. The Graduate Assembly endorses the March 13, 2008 rally to increase underrepresented minority student enrollment in the UC System

