

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 5, 2009

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

This meeting commenced the Spring Semester. It was called to order at 5:33 p.m.

Announcements

As a result of feedback from the December GA meeting, the Chair will run the meeting with Robert's Rules relaxed, except for Resolutions.

The Graduate Social Club will hold the Spring Reception and Recruitment Night on February 19. Also, the GSC will put on the 2nd Annual Bay Cruise on Saturday, April 25. This sold out quickly last year. Tickets will go on sale March 1 on their Web site. Prices looked like \$55 for two tickets, \$30 for one.

The Spring Reception and Recruiting Night was good for people considering whether to run for a position in the GA.

Jesse Arreguín wanted to introduce himself to the GA. He was just elected to the Berkeley City Council, representing downtown Berkeley. He graduated from UC Berkeley in 2007 with a BA in Political Science and was as an undergrad, was the ASUC representative to the City of Berkeley. He was Chair of the Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board and was on the City Zoning Board. He really wanted to work on revitalizing downtown Berkeley. He'd like to hear ideas that grads have. He also wanted to work to keep affordable housing for students and the community, to improve transportation, and to increase diversity in City government. He makes appointments to various City commissions and would encourage people to apply. He looked forward to working with them.

Present to give the report from the ASUC Senate were Ms. Flores, Ms. Chen, Ms. Shah, and Ms. Cho. The Senate passed a bill in support of the federal DREAM Act and to sponsor travel by the External Affairs Office to US Student Association's Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C. and the UC Student Association's Student Lobby Conference in Sacramento.

The Senate allocated has allocated about \$98,000 that year. Their carryforward account has about \$300,000. The Senate will consider a bill supporting the Early Childhood Education Program, a Program that affects grads. Another bill coming up was to establish a 24-hour library in a section of Moffitt.

The recall election for an ASUC Senator was moved to February 26-27.

The ASUC has also been working very hard on UCPD transparency and accountability. A panel of students will talk to the UCPD about how they encounter the police on the campus and about climate. Tang Center Awareness Week the first week of March.

Members of Languages Now were present. Last year the Committee to Save East Asian Languages and Korean Studies was formed in response to disproportionate budget cuts that targeted API languages. A

petition drive at the end of last semester gathered about 8,000 signatures. In response to organizing, budget cuts were partially, temporarily reversed for last year. The problem persists. The group is now called "API Education and Languages Now." The curriculum should reflect having a 45% ethnic Asian student body.

Hundreds of students have been turned away from classes. Grads in various fields depend on language courses to fulfill their graduate education. The diversity of languages spoken in the State was being not represented at the University. An event will be held on February 19, "Language Matters: Strengthening Asian and Pacific Islander Language Education in Berkeley," with some fairly renowned participants. The group will create a task force of people from different sectors to work on this issue.

Associate Dean Muller, Student Life and Academic Program Reviews, said the Conference Travel Grant has been reinstated, a one-time grant of up to \$500 to attend a conference and present research. Also, the International Student Family Grant under subscribed last year.

Kortney McBride, from the ASUC External Affairs office, said they're organizing around the DREAM Act. A legislative conference will be held in Washington, D.C. on March 21-24.

The GSC will have a beer and pizza study on February 13 from 5:00 to 7:00 in Anthony Hall. The Empowering Women of Color Conference will be on Saturday, February 14. Responses were solicited to the Business Office survey, on the Web.

A list of all the campus committees with open positions was distributed.

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom

The GA heard from the Vice Chancellor of Administration and the Chief Financial Officer of UC Berkeley, Nathan Brostrom. He's been working on a long-term model for Cal's future. Cal's budgetary climate was "Solid, but not sustainable."

Revenue sources for the campus have shifted dramatically. General Funds (i.e. State funds) in 1977-78 were over half of the total revenue on campus. This last they're 27%. That's been made up largely by tuition fees, which have doubled as a percent from that time; and private support has grown. Spending has largely stayed the same, with 60% for instruction and research.

A slide show was presented concern the competitive environment Cal was in with the top private elites, Princeton, Stanford, Harvard, MIT, and Yale.

While State funding as a percent of their overall budget has fallen, 27% from 54%, on a per-student basis, it's about the same as 30 years ago, about \$500 million a year net from the State. The problem was that costs increase more than inflation.

Tuition fees on a percent basis have doubled in the last 30 years.

Their endowment was about \$3 billion. About 20 years ago nobody had even a \$10 billion endowment. But Harvard's was \$36 billion last year, with Yale at \$22 billion. Stanford, Princeton, and MIT have passed Cal as well. The money they got from the State represented an endowment of \$12 billion. So Cal

could compete for faculty and students. Looking forward ten years, with the endowments of other schools increasing, Cal would not be able to maintain its competitive excellence.

One study found a fairly close correlation between financial resources and academic rankings. Berkeley was the Number 1 institution academically and Number 5 in terms of financial resources. Their financial resources were falling dramatically, but they still were Number 2 in terms of academic rankings. This was not sustainable.

Cal was responding in four ways, financially: a new approach using activity-based budgeting; more aggressive debt strategies and new projects to use it on; looking more at their balance sheet and to manage assets and liabilities more effectively; and increasing and enhancing private philanthropy. They actually do quite well in private philanthropy, \$400 million last year. The Hewlett Foundation grant, \$110 million to endow 100 chairs, on a matching basis, was being managed to provide money for the researcher, to support their salary, and to fund grads.

A question was posed about Prop. 13, which limits the growth of annual property taxes and assessments. It's caused huge booms and busts in State revenue, while State obligations have grown.

Michigan and Virginia, to maintain their status, have taken a large number of out-of-State students, who are charged more.

For 09-10, the campus will have about a \$60 million shortfall, on a \$1.7 billion budget. They'll make that up a 9% fee increase, and taking a higher percentage of non-residents in the freshman class.

About 16% of their alumni give annually, quite high for publics. Berkeley has a living alumni base of 450,000.

One concept being floated was for UCLA and Berkeley to have higher tuition than other UCs.

Some programs had a competitive advantage in bringing in additional revenue, like the hard sciences, and there was a question of whether Berkeley could afford comprehensive excellence. Berkeley in the last NRC ranking had 34 of 35 departments in the top 10. The next highest school was Stanford, at 28, and Harvard at 26. The next public was UCLA, at 14. That's what really distinguished Berkeley.

Report from the Funding Committee

Group Resources, Round 2, had global cuts of 33.6%. For Grants, Round 3, there was a 27% cut for groups that received a grant in the first semester. The Funding Committee will meet on the 17th to consider policy changes. By unanimous voice-vote, the Assembly approved Grants, Round 3, \$15,003.80; and Group Resources, Round 2, \$5,747.61.

The External Affairs office will engage in local government more and will meet with members of the City Council.

The campus has a task force devoted to course evaluations. But it was focusing on the collection aspect, and not aspects of data presentation. Most departments and faculty like evaluations as they are. This

matter involved a lot of issues. Berkeley is extraordinarily decentralized. The task force was pushing an online option.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 4 -

Resolution Referral

By voice-vote, the Assembly voted to fast track Resolution 0901A, To Amend the GA Budget to Fund Participation in the Student Advocates for the Graduate Education Coalition. The bill allocates \$4,000 to the External Affairs Office, from the Contingency Fund, to attend a lobby event with the Coalition of Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE), to lobby at the federal level on behalf of graduate students at public graduate universities. By unanimous voice-vote, the Assembly approved Resolution 0901a.

By unanimous voice-vote, the Assembly approved Resolution 0812a, To Amend the Process for Final Consideration of Graduate Assembly (GA) By-laws. The bill institutes a practice the GA has been following, allowing the Assembly to make amendments to Resolutions without having the bill go back to committee.

The GA will hold elections at the March meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

[End Summary of the Meeting]

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:33 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daal said he would like to welcome them to semester two.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daal said he'd start out with a couple of announcements. First, he'd ask them to please fill out their feedback forms, which were very important. Secondly, the feedback forms from December's meeting indicated that people were interested in seeing how meetings would go if they were to relax Robert's Rules. So he would propose doing that, unless there were objections. He'll conduct the meeting in an orderly way, as best he could without them, until they come to the Resolution section, when they'll pick up Robert's Rules again.

Kate Williams introduced herself and said she was one of the Coordinators from the Graduate Social Club. She wanted to announce two events that evening. The first was the Spring Reception and Recruiting Night they'll host on Thursday, February 19, from 6:00 to 8 p.m. at the GA. They'll provide beer, wine, and appetizers. People should bring their IDs.

Ms. Williams said the second announcement was about the 2nd Annual Bay Cruise. The Grad Social Club hosted this event, and it completely sold out in a month. Tickets will go on sale March 1. The event

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

will be on Saturday, April 25. They'll leave at 6:30 from the Red & White Fleet dock in San Francisco. Ticket sales and information will be available on their Web site. They haven't finalized the cost yet, but at that point tickets will be \$55 for two, \$30 for one. It will include an all-you-can-drink beer and wine bar for two hours plus quote "party appetizers." They'll have a cruise out to the Golden Gate Bridge and then return to the dock. It takes about two hours, so they'll be back at 8:30. Last year the event was amazing, with beautiful weather. They saw the sunset under the Golden Gate Bridge and it was absolutely gorgeous. Similar companies sell tickets for \$75 to \$80. A PayPal link is attached to the Grad Social Club Web site. Ticket sales will start March 1 and will run until the cruise sells out. Last year they had 200 seats available and it sold out within three to four weeks. They're trying to get a larger boat this year, so the occupancy will be about 275. She'd ask people to please sign up. It will be really fun. She'll pass around fliers, and if people could leave them somewhere, that would be great.

Mr. Daal said that if people were interested in becoming more involved in the GA, i.e., running for office, the Spring Reception and Recruiting Night would be a good event to attend. Officers will be there and people could ask questions about what they do.

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was from Jesse Arreguín, a Berkeley City Council member. Mr. Arreguín introduced himself and said he represented downtown Berkeley. He wanted to introduce himself. He was just elected to the City Council in November and wanted to talk about his background and some of the issues he'll work on. He would really encourage grads to work with his office and with the City of Berkeley on any concerns they have.

Mr. Arreguín said he graduated from UC Berkeley in 2007 with a BA in Political Science. During his time at UC Berkeley he worked with the ASUC as its representative to the City of Berkeley. He worked with City Council members, served on City commissions, and was on campus committees, and has been very involved in trying to engage students in the City process.

He's done a lot of work in the City of Berkeley. He was the Chair of the Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board and tried to create more affordable housing and extend tenant protection. He was on the City Zoning Board and worked to try and create a new downtown plan. That plan will come to the City Council that spring. One issue he really wanted to work on was to revitalize downtown Berkeley. If grads had any ideas on how to improve downtown, improve transportation, increase housing, and improve security, the City Council would really like to hear their thoughts about these issues.

Mr. Arreguín said he wanted to work to keep affordable student housing and affordable housing for people in the community, and to improve transportation. More importantly, he wanted to try and increase the diversity within their City government, not only in terms of age, but in terms of ethnicity, sexual orientation, and perspectives on different issues. Despite Berkeley being an incredibly progressive community, their City government was not reflective of the diversity of their community. For example, he's the first Latino who has ever been elected to the City Council, and is the youngest Councilmember in the City's history. And with the majority of Councilmembers in their 50s and 60s, it was time for people in their 20s and 30s, people who represent different perspectives, to really have a voice in decisions the City was making.

Mr. Arreguín said that as a member of the City Council, he has an opportunity to appoint different residents to different commissions, from recycling to energy to the environment to affordable housing. He

Announcements -- City Council member Jesse Arreguín (cont'd)

- 6 -

would like to really encourage anyone, whether it was those present or their friends, who was interested in getting more directly involved in City government, to apply for City commissions. Their perspectives were really needed in the work the City does.

Mr. Arreguín said he would like to introduce Legislature Aide, Caro Jarregui, a recent graduate of UC Berkeley and an ex-ASUC Senator. She runs his office on a day-to-day basis. If people have any concerns, whether they wanted their trash picked up, or anything they need from the City, he would ask them to please contact his office, and either Ms. Jarregui or he would be happy to help.

Lastly, Mr. Arreguín said he looked forward to working with all of them in his new capacity. He would ask them to please not hesitate to contact him. He passed out some of his business cards and he would ask them to please feel free to give him a call. He looked forward to working with the GA to try and not only increase their representation in City government, but also work on issues like affordable housing, transportation, and safety. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Mr. Arreguín. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was the ASUC report.

Ms. Flores introduced herself and said she was one of the undergraduate Senators in the ASUC Senate. She wanted to let the GA know about some bills the Senate has passed in the last couple of weeks. One bill they passed was in support of the federal DREAM Act. They also passed a bill to help financially sponsor the External Affairs Office, to allow students to be able to go to the US Student Association's Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C. and the UC Student Association's Student Lobby Conference in Sacramento. During those Conferences students will be able to voice their concerns in terms of accessibility, tuition, fees, and responses to the overall budget cuts that UCs and the State of California will suffer in the coming months. The Senate has allocated a lot of money that year.

Ms. Shah introduced herself and said that last year's Senate actually allocated about \$50,000 in the Fall Semester, and so far, the Senate has already allocated \$98,000. So they've been spending a lot of money, about one-third of their budget. Right now they have in their carryforward account about \$300,000. So they're going to be much more fiscally responsible.

Ms. Cho introduced herself and said she was one of the five liaisons from the Senate to the GA. She wanted to talk about two bills that were coming up next week. One was in support of the Early Childhood Education Program. The Senate felt this would directly affect the graduate student body. They knew the GA has been very proactive in encouraging people to stand up for what they believe were their rights on this campus. The bill, which they'll vote on it next week, was to show that undergrads support the ECEP and also resolves to continue advocating for a childcare center on Lower Sproul. It also calls upon the ASUC President to write a letter to the Chancellor concerning students' concern for this.

Ms. Cho said that another bill coming up was in support of the 24-hour library. Two Senators in the ASUC have been working very hard last semester to secure a spot in Moffitt Library, hopefully, where a 24-hour study space will be implemented this semester as a temporary spot for the 24-hour library, before

the renovation of Moffitt is implemented next semester. They looked forward to that and will give the GA more updates as they find out about them.

Ms. Flores said she wanted to remind the GA that right after school started that semester, there was supposed to be a recall election on January 26 and 27. That recall election has been moved to February 26

Announcements -- ASUC (cont'd)

- 7 -

and 27. People were encouraged to think about what happened last semester and refresh their minds as to why the recall election was happening, and to educate themselves and then vote.

Ms. Shah said that some Senators and the ASUC President have also been working very hard on UCPD transparency and accountability. On February 11 and 24 there will be a very diverse panel of students that will talk to the UCPD about how they encounter the police on the campus and what the social and political climate is for them on the campus. Lastly, the Senate has three Advocacy Agenda Committees, one of which is dedicated to mental, spiritual, and student health. They'll have a Tang Center Awareness Week the first week of March. The point of the entire week was to encourage students to use the Tang Center much more often and to also know about the resources that were available to them. If people want to get a free T-shirt, they will be available.

Mr. Daal said that for those people who were interested in police accountability, there is an open slot for a graduate representative on the Police Review Board. People could indicate on the Delegate feedback form if they were interested in becoming a part of that.

Ms. Shah said the ASUC has had two meetings so far with Chief Victoria Harrison and a couple of Vice Chancellors. Ms. Shah said they really encourage the GA to pick somebody for this because the police oversight board hasn't met yet. It's how students basically hold police officers accountable if there are complaints made or appeals that aren't addressed, things that this oversight board could deal with. The PRB has not yet met this entire year, so she would ask the GA to please appoint somebody.

Mr. Rajan asked if the ASUC was talking about reducing election fees for the recall election from \$45,000 to something more manageable. Ms. Flores said they found out last night that the total budget for the Elections Council Chair was \$57,000, which was allocated for the spring elections. The ASUC Finance Officer was currently working closely with the Elections Council Chair to figure out a budget and to make cuts so the recall election wouldn't cost as much as the spring election. Ms. Cho said the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee was also working to amend the By-laws to have less polling stations, which would cost less money.

Mr. Rajan said that last year elections cost about \$100,000, or something like that. He asked if they didn't expect it to be that much for this year. Ms. Flores said it was around \$38,000. Mr. Daal said it was two years ago that the elections cost around \$100,000. Ms. Flores said it cost \$100,000 two years ago to do online voting, to have more polls, and to buy more laptops so that students could vote. Mr. Daal said he wanted to thank them for the report.

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was by Christine Hong, to talk about Languages Now. Ms. Hong said a number of people would speak. She wanted to thank the GA for giving them time to introduce themselves. They want to tell the GA about themselves and their organization, as well as to enlist the GA's support. She's a post-doctoral fellow and has been a post-doc for two years; and before that she was a graduate student there for seven years.

Ms. Hong said that many of them may know the group from its activism of last semester. Just to give them a brief rundown of their organization, last year they formed an ad hoc coalition, the Committee to Save East Asian Languages and Korean Studies. It was formed in response to the disproportionate, extreme budget cuts that targeted API languages and the Department of East Asian Languages and

Announcements -- Languages Now (cont'd)

- 8 -

Cultures and South and Southeast Asian Studies. Last semester, when this came down as a budget cut, they organized. It was very close to the end of the semester, so they sort of made advance contact with people from the GA. At the end of last semester they held a petition drive in the campus committee and the local community. They managed to get close to 8,000 signatures, which they submitted to Janet Broughtan and George Breslauer. They did an e-mail blast campaign and have anecdotal evidence that Ms. Broughtan got 700 e-mails in one morning alone. The group held two press conferences, one on the Berkeley campus and one in Los Angeles. They held a rally, and some of the people in the room probably signed the petition and came to their rally last semester. They also managed to get over 50 news reports in local and trans-Pacific ethnic, Asian media. They also fundraised for different programs and managed to raise \$25,000. And in response to their organizing, Ms. Broughton reversed the budget cuts, partially, for last year. But Ms. Hong said that was a temporary and non-structural solution.

Ms. Hong said one reason they were at the GA was to say that the problem they raised last year still persists. Last year they witnessed the opening of the C. V. Starr East Asian Library, which represents the University's commitment to Asian studies. What they don't see is a corresponding commitment to education, curricula, and Asian studies as subjects that were taught on campus. As an organization, they have developed, and they now are called "API Education and Languages Now." What they're looking for was a correspondence between the University and its follow-up commitment to Asian studies. The University counts itself as a major Pacific Rim University and often throws out a statistic, of having a 45% ethnic Asian student body. But those kinds of diversity statistics and diversity commitments were relatively shallow if they don't correspond to changes in terms of curriculum.

Ms. Hong said that graduate students were really impassioned by this. From the data she's gathered, she could state that as of the beginning of this academic year, Korean, Tagalog, and Chinese turned away hundreds of would-be students for lack of space. As of next year, Vietnamese will lose one of two lecturers. That person will not be renewed. Thai used to have three year-long levels, which would be reduced to one. And another language, if it doesn't receive external funding, will be obliterated.

Basically, these kinds of marginalized fields within API studies, in addition to major fields like Chinese and Japanese, were scrambling for external funding in very dire budgetary times.

Ben Lickly introduced himself and said he was a graduate student. One reason he came to Berkeley over other great schools was because of its excellent language program. The problem was that with these cuts, students who get cut were very much cut along departmental lines. Students who aren't majoring in these subjects, no matter how important it was for them and their careers, get deprioritized. Last semester, they cut all the non-L&S students. He went to one of the Engineering Deans to talk to her about this and basically she said there was nothing she could do. Since this wasn't his major, he would just have to go and find something else, even though languages was the reason he came there. Students may have very cross-disciplinary interests, but the hierarchy and the make-up of UC, in some ways, in these cases, prevents them from fulfilling those interests. The bureaucratic structure alleges that when there are budget cuts and programs are downsized or reduced in some way, that meant that people outside L&S and outside

Humanities, who weren't majors, minors, or graduate students within those particular departments, lose access. And that's what happened.

Amy Lee introduced herself and said she was a graduate student in the English Department. She just wanted to emphasize that it wasn't just graduate students within Asian Studies who were affected. She's a graduate student in the English Department and works on Asian American Studies. They depend on

Announcements -- Languages Now (cont'd)

- 9 -

language courses to fulfill their graduate education and Asian language wasn't just a service. For her, it was a hobby. And for her, to try and bridge the divide between Chinese culture and English, she had to learn another language. If people look at the MLA, they could see they're looking for people who could do transnational studies and work on globalization. So to cut language courses would be doing a great disservice to the University. Ms. Hong said the Library meant nothing if people couldn't read the books on the shelves.

Dave Malinowski introduced himself and said he was in the grad School of Education and just passed a GSI for Japanese. He's a student representative for the Berkeley Language Center and was a GSI in the past. That week there will be a world language proficiency colloquium with a California context, with all the UCs and with George Breslauer as a speaker. But a subtext to that was a sense of crisis among the foreign language community that the diversity of languages spoken in the State was being not represented at the University. The lecturer turn-around was such that a quality education as an intellectual language pursuit wasn't possible. It was also the deskilling of certain languages that was happening at the same time. So there was a real sense of crisis. They need to redefine what learning a language meant.

Mr. Malinowski said that in that context, their group will have an event he would ask Delegates to publicize and draw attention to. On February 19, in Heller Lounge, "Language Matters: Strengthening Asian and Pacific Islander Language Education in Berkeley" will occur. It will be attended by some fairly big-named individuals, including Assemblywoman Fiona Ma, Ling-chi Wang, who is a long-time professor of Asian-American Studies and an activist, as well as Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion Basri. Several community groups will attend, such as Filipinos for Affirmative Action, and Chinese for Affirmative Action, Vietnamese for the East Bay. Several departments and sectors on campus will also attend, and they're looking for a lot of support from the student body as well.

Ms. Hong said they have wonderful undergraduates, Ms. Flores and Ms. Cho, working with them all along the way. So this effort has really been across-the-board. One thing they want to do at that point was be able to build up a kind of collective support, beyond student activists, and to be able to bridge connections with people in the GA, administrators, and what have you, because the group sees this as a kind of collective interest on the part of the University. At the end of the February 19 forum, from 4:00 to 7:00, the group will announce the formation of a task force that will bring the concerned actors together from different centers so they can work together on this issue and preserve API language education on the campus, and build on that. She wanted to thank the GA very much. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank the speakers very much.

Dean Muller, Associate Dean for Student Life and Academic Program Reviews, introduced herself and said she was in the Graduate Division. She just wanted to stop in. She asked how many read the E-grad. Many of them read it, and the campus was delivering it directly to them through e-mail that semester, and going forward. She just wanted to bring to their attention that they have been able, despite the budget

cuts, to reinstate the Conference Travel Grant. She wanted to publicize that. Everyone was eligible for this one-time grant of up to \$500 to attend a conference and present their research.

Ms. Muller said she would also mention that the International Student Family Grant, which the Graduate Division sponsors, was under subscribed last year. People could learn more about this through the Berkeley International Office Web site. If they know of international students who qualify for this, she would ask them to please pass this information along. There's a similar grant for US residents, the Student-Parent Grant, although that seemed to be well publicized

Announcements (cont'd)

- 10 -

Lastly, Ms. Muller said she had a standing meeting with Campus Affairs Vice President Triffid Abel, so if grads have issues that they feel need advocacy but that might not rise to the level that they want to bring them to Mr. Daal's attention, or Dean Szeri's attention, Ms. Muller said she would be happy to get those through Ms. Abel.

Ms. Muller said that on Friday she, Ms. Abel, and Mr. Daal are meeting about some library issues. So if grads have had bad library experiences, she would encourage them to let them know.

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was about the DREAM Act. Kortney McBride introduced herself and said she worked in the External Affairs office of the ASUC. They wanted to update the GA on what they were doing. They'll organize around the DREAM Act. The first week of February they'll start collecting postcards to show support for the DREAM Act and then eventually send them to legislators. In the first week of March they'll hold some educational events and a rally on Thursday, March 5. They would love to have grads' support for the campaigns and will hopefully see them out there for these coming events. She'll send an e-mail through Mr. Ortega. Also, the US Student Association was having its Legislative Conference, and an extern in the office will talk about that.

Melissa introduced herself and said she also worked in the EAVP's office. On March 21-24 they're trying to gather students to attend a Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C. Some of them may have gone to the Lobby Conference in Sacramento. The Legislative Conference was essentially the same thing, but on a national level. The application for that is on the ASUC Web site and was due next week.

Mr. Daal said they would next hear a brief announcement from the Business Office. Ms. Hsueh said there will be a beer and pizza study break hosted by the Grad Social Club Project Coordinators on February 13 from 5:00 to 7:00 in Anthony Hall. A flier about this event was distributed. Also, they're sponsoring a one-day Empowering Women of Color Conference on Saturday, February 14. It's an all-day Conference and people could register at the GA Web site. It's free to all UC Berkeley students. Berkeley students should bring their ID. Also, Ms. Hsueh said she needed their help. They only got 21 responses for the Business Office survey about how the Business Office and the GA were doing in serving them. If they don't hear from grads, it meant the Business Office was doing a terrific job. The Business Office wants to see how they could serve grads better. The survey was on the GA Web site.

Ms. Abel said she would pass around a list of all the campus committees that were open. These positions fulfill Delegates' GA committee requirements, and the positions were also quite interesting. So she would ask them to please read through the brief description. It goes into when the committees meet, how often they meet, and contact information. The External Affairs will get it touch with them.

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

Mr. Daal called for a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting and the minutes from the December meeting. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2008 GA MEETING PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 11 -

SPEAKER -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom

Mr. Daal said he would like to introduce the Vice Chancellor of Administration and the Chief Financial Officer of UC Berkeley, Nathan Brostrom. (Applause)

Mr. Brostrom said it was great to be there that evening. He was, as Mr. Daal mentioned, the Vice Chancellor of Administration, which encompasses a large number of departments on the campus. He actually came from banking and finance and joined the campus about three years ago, to really focus on the budget and finance aspects of the job. What he didn't realize was that about 75% of his job was going to be spent on the administrative side, on human resources, parking, the police, and Athletics. So it's been quite an education for him.

Mr. Brostrom said he wanted to talk to the GA that evening about something he's been working on for the Chancellor, a long-term model for Cal's future and maintaining their history of excellence. Mr. Brostrom said that after his first year there, the Chancellor asked him what his impressions were of Cal's budgetary climate, and Mr. Brostrom said he came up with the term, "Solid, but not sustainable." What he'd focus on that evening were the reasons why they were both solid, but also not sustainable, and some of the measures they'll take to address that.

There's obviously been some major economic hiccups, with both the financial meltdown and the economic recession they find themselves in. He'll touch on that as he went through the slides. But what he really wanted to focus on was how to build a sustainable, long-term model to compete effectively in higher education.

Mr. Brostrom said that in looking at the revenue sources on the Berkeley campus over the last 30 years, as they could see from the slide, they've shifted quite dramatically. Back in 1977-78, General Funds, which were largely State funds, were over half of their total revenues on campus. This last year they're less than half, as a percentage, and were 27%. So revenue from General Funds has fallen by 50% during the last 30 years. That has been made up largely by tuition fees, which have doubled as a percent from that time. Private support, including endowment payout, private gift grants, and contracts, have also grown as a percent.

Mr. Brostrom said their spending, however, has largely stayed the same, with 60% for instruction and research.

Mr. Brostrom said that what he wanted to look at that day was the really competitive environment they're in with the top private elites. In large measure, the five top schools for faculty and graduates were

Princeton, Stanford, Harvard, MIT, and Yale. In some ways, Berkeley was probably the only public university that competes on a comprehensive basis with all of those schools. And yet, they have a very, very different funding model.

Mr. Brostrom said he wanted to go through the different revenue sources of that funding model and show why Berkeley was at a comparative disadvantage at that point, and how they could build themselves for a stronger future.

Mr. Brostrom said that one misperception out there was that the State has actually cut funding to UC. As they could see from the slide, as a percent of their overall budget, it's 27%, compared to 54%. So as a

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 12 -

percent of their budget, it's fallen dramatically. On a per-student basis, it's fallen quite dramatically. But in absolute dollars, it's about the same now as it was 30 years ago. They get about \$500 million a year net from the State of California. That was in real dollars, roughly what they got 30 years ago. The problem was that their costs are much greater than inflation. So as a percent, the blue line on the slide was what the State provided on a per-student basis, about 40% in the last 30 years. As they could see, tuition and fees have gone up at times when State funding has declined. But it hasn't kept pace with what they need to do as a System.

Similarly, everyone focuses on tuition fees. On a percent basis, they have doubled in the last 30 years, in real dollars. If they look at the five schools he was talking about, they've gone up per student by about \$15,000 per student. UC has gone up by about \$3,000 during that time. Boalt students who were listening might take this to their anti-trust class and have them look at collusion.

Mr. Brostrom said the next slide showed why they were solid at that time, but not sustainable. What he's done for the Chancellor was to take their State appropriation and basically roll it up into an endowment. If they get \$500 million from the State, that was roughly equivalent to about an \$11-12 billion endowment. If they have an endowment of \$12 billion and made 4.5%, they get \$500 million. As they could see, there have been ups and downs, with the booms and the busts of the State. But it's largely been constant for the last 30 years.

In addition, they have an endowment that, until recently has been growing. It's about \$3 billion. So all told, they have about \$15 billion in endowment-like support. If they look at it, that was a huge advantage about 20 years ago. Nobody had even a \$10 billion endowment. But that changed would the combination of the capital campaigns that the privates ran throughout the '90s and in this decade, as well as simply incredible returns on endowments. Yale has averaged 18% on endowment for the last 25 years. So Harvard passed Cal in the early '90s. They were at \$36 billion at year-end last year. Yale has passed Cal and was at \$22 billion. Stanford and Princeton have passed them as well, and MIT.

Mr. Brostrom said the slide being shown was, in one way, the silver lining of the financial meltdown. What's happened in the capital markets has been to give them a little bit of a cushion. Harvard has lost about \$10 billion and will probably come down to \$26 billion. Stanford, Princeton, and Yale have all lost between \$3-5 billion in the last eight months. While Cal has had losses in its endowment of up to 25%, when they start from a base of \$3 billion, it's much easier to weather that than with the privates.

One of their biggest budgetary battles was in the recruitment and retention of faculty and recruitment of graduate students. They're hoping there would be some relief from that, at least for the next two or three years. The way endowment payouts work, in order to make them a smoother funding source, they do

them on a lag basis. So payout is on a four-year running average. That meant that for the downturn that Harvard, Yale, and Stanford have experienced, even if the market starts to pick up again, currently levels will be in place for several years to come.

Mr. Brostrom said that when he was showing the Chancellor that Cal was “solid, but not sustainable,” what he meant was that they were at \$15 billion. So they were right in the ballpark and able to compete for the faculty, facilities, and students that they wanted. But these schools were all growing at double-digit rates in their endowments and in their tuition. And even in the best of times, the campus’ State support was growing at 3-4%. So when he looked forward ten years and projected this, he saw the wedge was going to become too inexorable, and the school would not be able to maintain the same competitive

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 13 -

excellence, especially in relation to their private peers. So the story still remains the same. He thought they have actually bought themselves a couple of years. If they think about it, they could actually push the lines back to maybe 2003, or so, but they still face the same situation. If they start another period of markets where they're growing at even 7-8%, and Cal's State support goes back to being 3%, which was a long shot at that point, they still could get this increasing wedge, making it difficult for Cal to compete on a comprehensive basis. He called for any questions on this.

Mr. Rheume asked what percent was used to do his calculations, and asked if he went out to ten years. Mr. Brostrom said he used 8.5% as a proxy for endowment. They're now using a slightly lower amount, 7.5%. But 8.5 was traditionally used for endowment.

Mr. Daal asked how their liquidity compared to Harvard. Harvard had a lot of money in its endowment, but asked if that money could be used. Mr. Brostrom some schools have more in illiquid investments. One thing they're facing at that time was some capital calls. A lot of these schools had very, very sophisticated endowment managers who put a lot into real estate funds, private equity, or other things that had no ready market. And they also would enter into funds where they were subject to capital calls at times when they basically had no liquidity. So that was an increasing strain on them. Because Cal didn't really have either the heft or sophistication in its fund, they were largely in liquid investments. He believed it was the University of Virginia that had only 21% of its endowment in liquid assets.

Mr. Rabkin asked if it was a little misleading to quote numbers from the last few years for investments whose prices have been shifting wildly. It seemed that if they ignore the last few years, the amounts were very close. Mr. Brostrom said he wasn't following the question. Mr. Rabkin said assets with prices that shift wildly suggests that the last two data points on the right, which was mostly what they were talking about, should be void. Mr. Brostrom said it would shift back a few years, but the curves would start up again, and have a projectory for growing at 8-9-10%. Mr. Rabkin said he was saying the market would recover and State funding won't. Mr. Brostrom said that even if markets recover, and even if the State recovers, in the best of times it pays the University 3-4%. He was hoping that State support was largely flat for 30 years. Mr. Rabkin said it was logical that it will stay that way. Mr. Brostrom said that was correct. And for the endowment increase, if they look at it over 30 years, it's reasonable to expect it to be at 7-8-9% growth.

Mr. Brostrom said that if they look at comparisons on a per-student basis, the disparity was even more dramatic. If they take away this last data point and look at 2000 or 2001, all the schools have between two and three times the revenue per student that Cal did on a real basis.

Mr. Brostrom said that what was interesting was that as he was doing this study, his counterpart at Stanford was doing something very, very similar. They're both in a national group, and when his counterpart did a presentation, Mr. Brostrom said he realized they were using very similar data. His counterpart's study looked at four funding sources, including endowment returns, fundraising, State support, and federal research, and looked at 21 schools over a little more than 30 years. There were 15 privates and six publics, with Cal and UCLA among the publics. So UC was well represented. The study stripped out five schools, the SHYMP schools, Stanford, Harvard, Yale, MIT, and Princeton, and the study showed that it has largely been a winner-take-all industry, similar to a lot of industries that they see in sectors across the economy. Back in 1984, the SHYMP schools had about 28% of those total resources from the four revenue streams he talked about. The six publics had 35%. The other privates, ten of them, had 36%. Over the last 23 years, largely fueled again by endowment growth, about 15 points has gone towards the SHYMP schools, i.e., their percentage has grown about 43% of the resources. That largely

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 14 -

happened at the expense of the publics. Maybe 12-13% happened there. But the other privates were hurt as well. They haven't maintained as much. So it really was a sector that was concentrated in a few small schools at the top.

Mr. Brostrom said his counterpart then did a direct comparison, just to spite him, between Stanford and Cal. What was interesting was that Mr. Brostrom said it gave him a lot of hope for the future. This is a fairly tight timeframe. Back in the mid-1980s, Cal was roughly at the same resources as Stanford. And even in the early 1990s they were similar. But again, largely because of their capital campaigns and endowment growth, Stanford was now at 8.5% of those total resources, while Cal dropped to 3.5%.

But then his counterpart did something that Mr. Brostrom said made him feel better. He did a correlation between financial resources and academic rankings of these schools. What was interesting was that it was a fairly close correlation. In the 1980s, with the criteria that were used, there were a number of strong disciplines that Berkeley had. Berkeley was the Number 1 institution, but it was also fairly strong in terms of financial resources, Number 5, he believed. And in 2007, the correlation was even tighter between financial resources and academic rankings. Berkeley was one of the few outliers, and actually an outlier they would like to be. Their financial resources were falling dramatically, but they still remained the Number 2 in terms of academic rankings of schools under the methodology that was used.

Mr. Brostrom said the concern he had was that this was not sustainable. And if they did this for 20 years out, he doubted that Cal would be able to keep losing its financial resources and still maintain those academic rankings. He thought that higher education was a lot stickier. It was slower to move than other industries, and there's a lot of loyalty and intangibles. But at some point the lack of financial resources would come back to deteriorate these rankings. He called for any questions.

Mr. Brostrom said the next question, which he'd like to spend a lot of time on, and get their feedback on, was how to respond to this. This clearly was a vexing problem they have, to maintain the twin pillars of access and excellence to Berkeley.

The screen showed four ways in the financial area that Cal was doing it. First of all, they're taking new approaches to budgeting. This may sound straightforward, but they're asking departments and all units to look at all activities with their budgets and look at all their funds. It used to be that budgeting on the Berkeley campus only happened with State funds and just a very, very small percentage of their total corpus budget of \$1.7 billion. The whole budget process, which consumes a lot of the Spring Semester, was

focused on the \$40-50 million of incremental funding that came in. And nothing was ever done to look at past activities or look at other fund sources, which are growing, such as private support or federal research or other growing sources of funds. So they're introducing activity-based budgeting. And they're also asking all units, academic and administrative, to look at all of their fund sources as they go through the budget process.

Mr. Brostrom said the second response to financial challenges was to look at more aggressive debt strategies. One thing that Berkeley and the whole UC System has basically never done was to take advantage and utilize the tax exempt status that Congress gives to universities. The whole UC System, when he first joined, probably had \$5 million of debt on an enterprise that was \$20 billion large. Just as a comparison, Harvard, which might have 8-10-12% the number of students in the whole UC System, had \$3 billion of debt. What Harvard, Stanford, and Princeton realized was that they were able to borrow at tax exempt rates, which were now about 3%, and were investing in their endowment and making what is called

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 15 -

“arbitrage.” That was one way they were actually leveraging their endowment and growing it. UC had never done that, and had always seen itself as a State-supported institution. So they looked at their income rather than at the balance sheet. But they had quite a large balance sheet.

So they're introducing both new approaches to debt, and also new projects to use it on. The new Stadium project will be done entirely with private fundraising. Historically, what UC would have done was to take the money it raised and would have built it on a pay-as-you go basis. So if the project cost \$100 million, they would have raised \$100 million, and maybe taken out a small bridge loan for any cash flow short-falls. And at the end of the day they would have had a building and nothing else to show for it. What they're doing in this case is that they're taking that \$100 million and putting it into an endowment. They'll borrow at the tax exempt markets to construct the building and then the endowment will be used to support the Athletics Department, pay the debt service, and yield a good yield, \$4-5 million in additional revenue that they hope will get rid of the structural deficit in Athletics.

This was even more powerful if they do it for buildings used for research. One of the other things that he found was that their indirect cost rate on campus, their overhead recovery rate, was much lower than their private peers, by 10 or 15 points. So if they get 53% overhead, MIT might get 67-68%. And the biggest single factor in that is that they don't take any interest in their buildings. What other schools do is take buildings and count that towards their indirect cost rate. And they're able to get the advantage of both tax exempt debt and also able to count it in their indirect cost rate, which comes back from the federal government.

The University has also been doing some things Systemwide. The debt is all issued at the OP, and they have a very conservative view on debt. They thought it, especially in tough times, was the wrong approach to take. Working across the System, Mr. Brostrom said they were able to convince the OP of the opposite. For a couple of examples, Berkeley has bought some buildings in Berkeley where previously they were the sole tenant and leased the whole building. By buying it with tax exempt debt, their debt service was lower than the lease cost they were paying on the building and they're building up equity. Previously, the school couldn't do that because of debt caps. This was better asset-liability management, and now they can issue debt like that.

In the same vein, they have also started to look much more at their balance sheet and ways they can manage that more effectively that asset-liability. One oddity of the campus was that even though they have a

tough budget time, they actually have fairly large operating reserves. In fact on a budget of \$1.7 billion, they have about \$600 million in what are called “carryforwards,” which basically are reserves. Two-thirds of them are restricted. Most of them are in academic units. They might be a professor’s research fund or start-up package or just an operating reserve being carried for maintenance in a building. Those are largely what they were entirely invested for liquidity. That meant that if they wanted to go and get all \$600 million out, in two or three days notice, they could go to the OP and do that. Mr. Brostrom said they did an analysis to figure out what their intraday or intraweek liquidity needs were on the campus and it turned out it was at any one given time to be as low as \$10-20 million. So working with the OP, they introduced a new portfolio, the Total Return Portfolio, which doesn't give up any of the safety and was still invested in similar instruments as a short-term product, but they’re just giving up on liquidity, and moved \$400 million of the \$600 million. From that, they anticipate that they will earn anywhere from 1.5-2% more than the liquid pool, which was \$6-8 million of discretionary revenue for the campus.

Mr. Brostrom said that people may have also heard that they're trying to start their own endowment management company. By and large, Berkeley and the Regents have done pretty well with investing. He

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 16 -

thought their long-term return, over the last 20 years, not counting this last year, was about a 14% compound annual growth rate. The best year was 18%. But if they take that 4% differential over that time, just using the power of compound interest, that adds up to billions of dollars in the endowment. Somebody did a study of Harvard’s endowment and found that if they had earned what the average endowment had earned during that time, its endowment would be down to about \$20 billion. So it really did matter a lot.

Mr. Brostrom said the campus has taken part of the money it got from the Hewlett grant and they're investing in their own professional, independent management company.

The final response to financial challenge was the need to increase private philanthropy. But they not only need to increase it, but to also enhance the way they do it. They're actually doing quite well in private philanthropy. Last year they had \$400 million and in the first six months of this year, they're at the second-highest six months of any one period. But it used to be that private philanthropy on a public campus was largely at the margins. So if a professor had a great idea and went to the Chancellor, the Chancellor would say, “That’s a great idea, but we don't have any central funds for it, so go and raise the money and you can do it.” But what they really want to do with a core philanthropy is use their core elements so they could go to a donor and say that this was really about the excellence of the faculty, and this was really about access to their students, and about the best graduate students in the country, and not shunt it off to marginal projects.

So in looking at the capital campaign they’ve launched, the \$3 billion for really the core of what made Berkeley great, the excellence of their faculty, world-class facilities, support for graduate students, and access for all undergraduates. That was probably no more epitomized than what they did with the Hewlett grant.

Mr. Brostrom said he was sure many of them heard about Hewlett grant. The Hewlett Foundation gave the campus \$110 million to endow 100 chairs across the campus, on a matching basis. So every chair would have to come up with a match of \$1 million, or \$1.5 million. There are a couple of things that are significant about that beyond the sheer amount. One was that they raised the amount of an endowed chair. It used to be that an endowed chair on the Berkeley campus was \$500,000. Now to do an endowed chair, it's \$2 million, or actually \$3 million for interdisciplinary chairs. But the second, and the real criti-

cal model they built in was that now these chairs will serve the common good as well as serve the individual chair holder. It used to be that with a \$500,000 chair, in rough numbers, the researcher got \$25,000 a year to use for their research. They could use \$25,000 for travel, writing, research, and it was probably what made Berkeley great. What they've done now is to increase it to a \$2 million chair, which meant a payout of about \$100,000 a year. The chair holder will still get their \$25,000 to use for their research; \$50,000 would go to support their salary, which will, in turn, relieve some of the financial stress at the department or Provost level; and \$25,000 will go to support graduate students within their department. That was \$75,000 of private support for things that enhance their central obligation. It really was a wonderful way of both melding a donor's interest, but also serving the core needs of the Berkeley campus.

Mr. Brostrom said those were just a few snapshots of some of the things they're doing. He'd be happy to take questions or also talk to them about this year's budget situation.

Mr. deGrassi said these sounded like interesting ideas, but it seemed like the elephant in the room was Prop. 13. It might not totally be Mr. Brostrom's area to address, but Mr. DeGrassi said he was really

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 17 -

surprised that wasn't mentioned. He asked if there were ways of talking about increasing State funding. Granted it was a difficult period for everybody at that time, but he didn't think that was an excuse to not work on the issue of longer-term public finance for all these problems. Pres. Dynes at least recognized that Prop. 13 was a key aspect of funding issues that didn't just apply to the University, but to other social and public sectors. The measures mentioned were interesting, particularly the reliance on private philanthropy, and they had potential, but he thought they had tradeoffs as well. To some extent it presents a go-it alone approach as opposed to working to improve the overall funding situation of their public government. This work could be done with other sectors of funding, including primary and secondary education, health, social services, fire fighting, whatever, so they're all part of the collective social good, which was part of their social contract. People pay taxes, it was a social contract that made the University public. People expect the University to research things like lead in food, gasoline, salmonella, and peanut butter, things like that. He was sure Mr. Brostrom worked in liaison with Government Relations, but he was curious why that wasn't mentioned.

Mr. Brostrom said he spent a lot of time in Sacramento himself and worked for the State Treasurer for four years. And the State of California was his biggest client as a banker. This was a huge problem, not only for the University System, but also for their society as a whole. Mr. Daal asked if he could explain Proposition 13. Mr. Brostrom said State functions in California rely on three main revenue sources: personal income tax, sales tax, and the corporate tax. Local governments and school districts rely on property tax and a portion of sales tax. The problem was that in 1978, a voter's initiative passed Prop. 13, which limited the annual rate of property tax growth and property assessments to 2%, unless the property was sold and then reassessed. So it dramatically reduced property tax as a funding source for municipal services. As a result, one thing that happened was that the State took over a much greater role in K-through-12 education and other city and municipal obligations, like redevelopment agencies. So the State really became sort of the funder of last resort. The problem is that the State's revenue sources were incredibly volatile. They actually have a very progressive income tax system, but as a result of this policy, they get huge booms and busts. He was actually with the Governor and Treasurer at the rating agencies in 1999 and 2000, when they had all these capital gains rolling in from Google and others. The rating agencies were saying that the State was putting those funds in permanent programs and was building itself up for a fall. The State sort of recognized that but went ahead and did it. So what Mr. deGrassi was saying was true, and the State did not have a stable funding source, and yet, had an increasing number of

obligations. He didn't mention that the biggest growth in the State has been in Corrections. That budget right now was actually higher than all of higher education combined in the State of California. And 20 years ago it was smaller than the UC budget. So they are working on all fronts. Actually, a lot of professors contributed a great deal in terms of tax analysis and other issues. Right now, Mr. Brostrom said he didn't hold out a lot of hope for this being changed, unless things just grind to a complete stalemate, and they have such a dysfunctional government. Right now his hope was to get back to what Pres. Dynes had, which was a compact that had them growing at 3-4%, and to return to the levels of funding they were at 20 years ago, which is what some people have called for. He just didn't see that as realistic in a five- or seven-year window.

A Delegate said it was interesting to see how Berkeley compared to the SHYMP schools in terms of other public universities, peer public institutions, how their funding processes compare. Mr. Brostrom said that UC actually does quite well. He's been talking about the deterioration in State funding, but the flip side was that this was far better off than a lot of other public universities, a lot of which have been forced to take measures that UC didn't want to take because they would be, he thought in contradiction to their public charter. Probably the two best examples are Michigan and Virginia, two very, very good schools.

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 18 -

Michigan hit the skids as a State a decade ago. They get maybe 13-14% in State support. What they were forced to do to maintain their status was to take a huge number of out-of-State students and charged them Ivy League tuition. What they have at Berkeley was between 10-15% out-of-State undergraduates and 90% in-State. Michigan now is over 40% out-of-State. The differential on the Berkeley campus was \$22,000. So to do that with a large number of students was a huge revenue source. Virginia was the same way. The other reason Berkeley doesn't choose to do that, and it was one of the things that most attracted him to Berkeley, was what Cal did with lower income in-State students. Berkeley has, second to UCLA, the largest percentage of Pell Grant undergrads, and 34% of undergrads are Pell Grant recipients. At Virginia and Michigan, that number was 12% and 14%. That was the tradeoff, and one that Berkeley didn't choose to make.

A Delegate said that this sounded very good for the long term, but asked if he could talk about the next year or two, since it seemed like things could get worse before they get better, and ask what the tradeoffs were for the immediate future. Mr. Brostrom said that was a good question. They find themselves in this coming year, the 09-10 budget year, with about a \$60 million shortfall on the campus. That was on a \$1.7 billion budget. That comes from three main sources: a temporary cut that the Governor imposed on them this budget year of \$15 million. Instead of passing that out to departments disrupting teaching activities, the campus chose to just take that centrally. The Governor then, in his January budget, asked UC to take a \$10 million permanent cut that will start in 09-10. And that doesn't take into account all the unfounded expenditures they have, the increase in utilities, academic merits, or the salaries of represented employees. And that was all bare bones, with no staff salary increases, with no salary getting any COLA increases. This was just the bare bones increases that they take to fund the University. That turns out to be about \$35 million. So the total shortfall was about \$60 million. They're going to make that up in the near term in two ways. One was revenue increases, which would be permanent. The Governor has proposed, and he'd guess the Regents were going to act on it, a 9% fee increase which will raise about \$20 million in incremental revenue. Again, related to what he was just saying, they're going to take a higher percentage of non-residents in their freshman class. They actually were way under, 8%. This was something the Chancellor started a while ago, when he saw the percentage of their international students among undergrads had dropped to 2%. The Chancellor thought that was just not right at a University of their level. So they're mostly doing that on the international side. They're doing an increase to what's

called "Administrative Full Costing." That's basically taking all of their Auxiliary units, like Athletics, Rec Sports, and Parking, and charging them a higher fee for their administrative services.

For the staff side, they're looking at mostly a lot of temporary measures, possibly a hiring freeze and maybe an early retirement program. They don't know yet. This hasn't been done Systemwide. And even the possibility of furloughs to get them some temporary savings. They have a number of revenue issues, some of which he talked about that evening, but also some restructuring they could do that would give them long-term, permanent savings. One thing that keeps him awake at night was what the depth and the length of this downturn might be. He thought Cal had the resources to do it over two or three years, but if it's longer than that, then they're going to have to look at other measures.

A delegate asked if there will be funds for faculty salaries or grad student support, and if this will be done in a way that was proportional to the total funding for core functions, and for all departments to remain the same, since some departments will have an easier time attracting external funds. She asked if there will be a re-equilibrium with the same sense of proportionally, even though some departments get more outside funding for their core functions. Mr. Brostrom said that units that have a hard time raising money will not be hurt by this. Units that do quite well on their own, not the Business School or the Law School,

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 19 -

even now get a lesser amount of central funds than other units. But the campus was finding that the Hewlett grant was hugely popular. One hundred chairs were just introduced last fall, and they were already hugely popular with their donors and supporters. He believed they already have 50 chairs actually in place, and they're in conversations with about 70. It has been fairly widespread across the University. People really like both the matching notion and also the fact that it was supporting the core functions of the University.

Mr. Rabkin asked if they will get killed trying to raise money by drawing down the endowment at the bottom of the market. He asked if they were in danger of sitting tight or if all will be well. Mr. Brostrom asked if he meant in terms of funding the development. Mr. Rabkin said he did. Mr. Brostrom said they weren't. The way it's done is that there's a percent on the return of endowment that goes to support and development functions.

Mr. Rajan asked what the structural shift was that the SHYMPs received that gave them the huge lead, and if Cal was playing follow the leader, or if they'll be ready for the next structural shift. Mr. Brostrom said there were a couple of things that were structural. First of all, they went to professional, outside management of their endowment. He believed Stanford made a management company in the late '80s, early '90s, that caused a huge delta between what Cal would see. Looking at the stock market returns at that time, they had huge returns above that. There used to be restrictions on the amount of debt they could have. He talked about Harvard having \$3 billion in debt. It used to be that a private university could only issue \$150 million in tax exempt debt. That came about because Harvard, in the mid-1980s, did what was purely an arbitrage fund. They issued \$1 billion of debt for nothing and then basically invested it. Congress said that's not what that was intended for, and then said it could only be used for capital projects. Because of that, the government said they would not let privates borrow more than \$150 million. Sen. Moynahan, in one of his last acts, in the mid- to late '90s, lifted that cap. So when they see Harvard at \$3 billion, Stanford at \$2 billion, that has all occurred in the last 10 years. And it was really done because the ability to leverage their endowments was recognized.

Mr. Brostrom said the other area where they weren't exactly playing catch-up, but had tremendous opportunity, was the fact that there has not been a culture of giving among public university alumni. About 16% of their alumni give on an annual basis. That was actually quite high for publics. But compared to privates, he believed Princeton was over 50%, and Stanford was over 40%. So one thing Cal needed to do was to get out their message that the State has been a generous and consistent supporter, but the margin of excellence to maintain Berkeley will come from private support. In some ways, he thought that was Berkeley's great untapped resource. They have a living alumni base of 450,000, and they probably have more net worth than any university in the world, given their size and the success of their alumni. If they start getting that, he thought that's where they could really catch up to the privates.

Mr. Rajan said it seemed all of a sudden, since 20 years ago, they had these changes. But they've been around hundreds of years. There seemed to be a new funding model they're all relying on. He asked if an even different funding model was anticipated that they'd start to rely on, or if everybody was now going to start to invest in the market. Mr. Brostrom said everyone was starting to realize that there had to be a hybrid. There could be lots of changes. One thing that was interesting was the level of research over 20 years, and who was funding that, and where that money came from. But it was a good question.

Ms. Hsueh said he talked about debt strategies. She asked if there was any way that Berkeley could come up with a debt strategy that would help Lower Sproul development without increasing student fees. Mr.

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 20 -

Brostrom said he thought debt will play a large role in funding Lower Sproul. He didn't think there was much in the way of doing it without some increase in student fees. He and Mr. Daal have talked about this, the way of structuring a student fee on a ramp-up basis, where they capture different projects over time. They're also leveraging enhanced retail and the potential for philanthropy for Lower Sproul. So he thought debt would play a role. They did a big study of debt capacity for the whole System and it turned out that the bankers thought they had \$11 billion in debt capacity. The Regents said to just go borrow it. But they need a revenue stream to pay it back. They're looking at creative ways of financing it. But there did have to be revenue sources.

Mr. Permaul said the Chancellor proposed earlier that year a concept in which UCLA and Berkeley would float their fees, because there's so much demand to come to those campuses. He thought in doing that, the Chancellor acknowledged what some people have asked about for decades, which was whether UC could sustain ten elite campuses when no other public university had more than one. So the idea was whether or not this was the opening salvo in a change of tiers of investment on the various campuses, and how he thought this would develop in the long term, in a three-to five-year interim. Mr. Brostrom said that Mr. Permaul raised a very interesting notion, of going to differential tuition across the UC System. Right now undergrads pay the same tuition fee whether they're at Berkeley or at Riverside. Actually, Berkeley pays lower fees, because they have lower add-on fees. Even the Chancellor has raised this question. But there's incredible opposition from the other campuses and from the Academic Senate. When they think about it, it would be an immediate revenue boost. It's something they'll probably continue to look at. But they are trying to introduce it to non-residents because Cal and UCLA were the only ones who come close to filing the 10% out-of-State quota for non-residents. A lot of schools were down at 2-3%. So the notion was that they'd charge much less and Cal would be able to charge more and still get the students. That would be good for the overall System. They're making some headway there. But he thought for differential fees, that was a longer and more political battle.

Mr. DeGrassi asked if this presentation was online, and if Mr. Brostrom could give Mr. Daal a copy to send out. Mr. Brostrom said he would.

Mr. St. Clair said he was a linguist, not a financial whiz. It seemed to him the programs that were not able to bring in private sources of revenue or philanthropy will somehow be endangered in the future. There seemed to be some programs that had a more competitive advantage in bringing in additional revenue, like the hard sciences. Mr. Brostrom said that was a valid concern, and has been raised by different people, the question of whether Berkeley could afford comprehensive excellence. He believed it could, and he believed that was really what distinguished Berkeley. A lot of public universities have very strong departments in several areas, but Berkeley was the only one, in the last NRC ranking, with 34 of their 35 departments in the top 10. The next highest school was Stanford, at 28, and then Harvard at 26. And the next public was UCLA, at 14. So this really did set apart a Berkeley education. He heard the announcement before from a young man in EECS, who came to Cal because he was also an East Asian language specialist. Mr. Brostrom said he thought that really was what distinguished Berkeley. He knew the Chancellor and the Provost held that position, and it was something their whole community held really strongly.

A Delegate asked what role he thought the proposition system could play in perhaps securing more public funds, or if it was illegal for the administration and the OP to pursue a strategy like that. Mr. Brostrom said that if it was his decision, he would abolish the proposition system. Anything that has come out of the initiative or proposition system has been bad. With that said, there are groups that have used it,

Speaker -- Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom (cont'd)

- 21 -

whether for mental health or for early childhood education. They siphoned a small revenue stream and used that to fund their specific programming. That certainly wouldn't be a possibility. All that K-through-12 did was to state that they'd get a percentage of State revenues. He had more belief in the ultimate benefactors of government that they'd do the right thing, because they just hate to get these kind of patchwork revenue systems. But it was a possibility. The Delegate said it seemed like the cost of the campaign was relatively small. Mr. Brostrom said it was. Mr. Daal called for any further questions.

Mr. Brostrom said he wanted to thank them so much. They have great leadership. He really enjoyed working with Mr. Daal. He wished them well in their studies. And if people had other questions, they should feel free to e-mail him or get it touch with him through Mr. Daal. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Mr. Brostrom very much. (Applause)

REPORTS

Report from the Funding Committee

Mr. Podesta said they have Group Resources, Round 2, with global cuts of 33.6%. The amount awarded was \$5,747.61. For Grants, Round 3, they actually did something new. They tried to be a little more fair and equitable. So there was a 27% cut for groups that received a grant in the first semester. Groups that didn't receive a grant in the first semester got a little bit more. Amounts depended on how much the first grant was, how much was awarded for that first grant.

Mr. Podesta said on Tuesday, February 17, the Funding Committee will get together and do a policy blowout and talk about policy changes, how to award funding, that type of thing, in the name of being fair and equitable. They invite any Delegate to let the Committee know about anything they'd like to voice, and if Delegates want to get the word out to representatives from their departments or student groups, everyone was welcome to come and give the Committee their ideas about how they could better serve student groups.

Mr. Daal called for a motion to approve the Funding Committee's allocation. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE'S REPORT AND ALLOCATIONS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, GRANTS, ROUND 3, \$15,003.80; AND GROUP RESOURCES, ROUND 2, \$5,747.61.

Mr. Daal said he wrote in his report about the directed action concerning the course evaluation guide. He wanted to give people a moment to ask questions if they'd like. He called for any questions about anybody's report.

Ms. Chavez said there was an interesting discussion they just had on committees. If Delegates were interested in talking more about fees and how they affect graduate and professional school students, they should feel free to join their committee or just talk to them afterward. Through the External Affairs Vice President's office they work with the UC Student Association. Affordability is one of their key issues and was something really being focused on at that time. Also, for those still interested in going to the Lobby Conference at the end of the month, she would ask them to please see her that evening.

Reports (cont'd)

- 22 -

Mr. Froehle said he heard that one of their Graduate Council representatives resigned. Mr. Daal said that was correct. Since they have an alternate, he thought they might just address that at the next meeting when they do elections. Somebody resigned after the seven-hour Saturday retreat. Mr. Daal said it was hours before. A Delegate asked if this came up last year, when people were elected. Mr. Daal said that if there were two resignations, that would be a problem. But there was one resignation, and they had an alternate.

Mr. Ortega said that also for External Affairs, one thing they'll do is engage the local government more. If people have any solutions they would like to bring up to the City Council, they're going to start making appointments with Councilmembers and meet at their offices, probably at the end of the semester. People should contact him.

Mr. Rheame said he had a question about the online course evaluation. He couldn't tell if the Administration was just losing this in the whole bureaucracy or if something will actually get done. Mr. Daal said that was a hard question to answer. The GA was impressed to find out that the campus had a task force devoted to it already. Curiously, when the GA started to look into this, the task force received a renewed push from the Provost to get it done. The task force leaders told the GA that they expect to get it done and to submit a recommendation to the Provost in the next month. But Mr. Daal said that as he mentioned in his report, the task force was focusing on the collection aspect, and not aspects of data presentation. He hoped to lobby the Provosts and the Chancellor effectively to enlarge the charge to encompass what the GA was asking for, which was to make that information available to students.

Mr. Rheame said there was very highly-level support for this. But it seemed like there was just difficulty in a simple implementation plan. Mr. Daal said it came from the differences between what the fac-

ulty and the Administration were thinking. The Administration can't tell the faculty what to do, and faculty and most departments like their evaluations the way they are. Mr. Rheume asked Mr. Daal if he could, when he talking to the Administration and to faculty, show them the Resolution the GA passed. Mr. Daal said they all have a copy of it. Mr. Rheume said they have California Public Access. Mr. Daal said they did.

Ms. Zohar said the evaluations would be by Scantron and she thought they could encourage the University to go in that direction. She asked if anyone has suggested a shift to Scantron evaluation. Mr. Rheume said that other schools use Scantrons, but every college had its own evaluation system. Mr. Daal said the English Department was one of the staunch outliers. All of their questions were short answer.

Ms. Berkeley asked if it was possible to do evaluations online in order for people to see their grades. She asked if people were against that. Mr. Basri said that FERPA prohibits forcing students to take an online evaluation after a course has ended. One problem of having an online course evaluation after the course was over was that participation drops drastically, according to studies that have been done. So it was a problem. There were a lot of problems, including centrality, visibility, and transparency. If there's an online central database, she asked how they would find several million dollars a year to fund it, when there's no money. So there were a lot of issues.

Mr. Kramer said that at the Law School, the course evaluation there was entirely online.

Mr. Daal said people weren't disagreeing. There are departments and schools that already do it, but those departments weren't the problems.

Reports (cont'd)
Resolutions

- 23 -

Mr. Basri said the University was infamous for being extraordinarily decentralized. He asked who would ask units and departments to do something. It wouldn't be the Chancellor or the Vice Chancellor, and departments would have to be persuaded to participate. That will be a slow process. What the task force was pushing at that time at was an online option. People would get to see it working, primarily faculty, but also students, and it would then start to become effective, proficient, and useful for everyone, and people would participate. But that will probably be the process that will be taken.

Mr. Daal said the fact that there was an Administration/ Academic Senate task was encouraging.

Resolution Referral

Mr. Daal said the only Resolution to refer that evening was 0901A, To Amend the GA By-laws to Fund Participation in the Student Advocates for the Graduate Education Coalition. Mr. Rabkin asked if this was actually amending the By-laws, because as written, it didn't do that. Mr. Daal said it was probably just mistitled, and that could be fixed. With no objection, the title of the bill was changed, deleting "By-laws" and replacing that with "Budget." He said he'd refer the bill to the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee.

Mr. Ortega asked if he could move to fast track the bill. Mr. Daal said he could, in which case the GA would consider it that evening. They need a three-quarter majority vote. The motion to fast track was seconded.

Mr. Ortega said that one new project they started that year was to belong to a national lobby group that comprises some of the top public universities in the nation. It started towards the end of last semester and the office didn't budget to do travel to lobby in Sacramento. They'll go probably the first or second week of April. They're pretty sure of getting a budget and seeing who they could and couldn't take and they're trying to get the funding as soon as possible.

Mr. Wolgin asked what line item this would come out of, and if the money was there. Mr. Ortega said it would be out of the Contingency Fund, and Mr. Rajan would have a better idea of how much money they have. There's enough money, and they'd best representing Cal Berkeley. Mr. Rajan said there's about \$9,000 in the Contingency Fund. Last year there was \$30,000 in the Contingency Fund, most of which was taken out of that line item and given back to funding. He didn't anticipate any major problems. Mr. Wolgin asked if he supported it. Mr. Rajan said he took no position.

Ms. Anderson asked how much was budgeted and if they have used up any of it. Mr. Rajan said it started at \$12,000, so they've used about \$3,000. Ms. Anderson asked what they've spent money on. Mr. Rajan said it's been for salaries, paying invoices, things like that.

A Delegate asked if the money would be returned to the fund if not all of the \$4,000 was used. Mr. Rajan said it would.

Mr. Rheame asked how he came up with the figure of \$4,000, because he believed the event was for one day. He asked how many people will go. Mr. Ortega said they estimate it to be \$1,000 to \$1,300 per

Reports (cont'd)

- 24 -

person. They thought it was going to be more, but they'll be able to stay at UC housing in Washington. It was for travel, and they'd be there for three nights. It was part of a conference, and then a day to lobby legislators.

Mr. Rheame asked how many people will go. Mr. Ortega said it will be as many as they could take. They currently only have funding for a few. Another \$4,000 would add another three to four people.

Mr. Daal said they're supported by the Chancellor in this, although in spirit and not in funding. The Chancellor very quickly declined the funding request and at the same time, the Grad Division Dean was able to find \$1,000 for them.

Mr. Kramer asked if this will be an annual event. Mr. Ortega said it will be. They hope to continue this as part of what the External Affairs office does.

A motion to call the question to fast track 0901a was made and seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote. Mr. Basri said a three-fourths vote was required to fast track a bill. The motion to fast track the Resolution passed by voice-vote. Mr. Daal said that in the opinion of the Chair, the vote got the three-quarters majority that's needed. He said they would consider the Resolution.

The following Resolution, 0901a, was authored by Mr. Ortega:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO FUND PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDENT ADVOCATES FOR THE GRADUATE EDUCATION COALITION

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly's Mission states: "The Graduate Assembly's vision is to engage and empower graduate students to work together for academic, political, and social change -- both inside and outside the UC Berkeley community. As a graduate student government, we are actively engaged in pinpointing graduate student needs, providing resources, and advocating for graduate students through campus and community activism"; and

WHEREAS, lobbying on behalf of graduate students to federal, State and local governments to increase access, affordability, and quality of education, as well as quality of life for graduate students, is an important component of the GA to satisfy its mission; and

WHEREAS, in the fall of 2008, representatives from the UC Berkeley graduate students participated in a summit of pre-eminent public universities hosted by the University of Texas at Austin, with the intent to strategize how best to serve our constituents; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley was one of ten founding institutions of the Coalition of Student Advocates for Graduate Education (SAGE), which has the intent of being a national advocacy group to lobby at the federal level on behalf of graduate students at public graduate universities to increase access, affordability, and quality of education, as well as quality of life at public graduate universities; and

WHEREAS, SAGE is organizing a Day on Capitol Hill (DOH) in Washington, D.C. this April to lobby the legislature on graduate student issues that include loan forgiveness programs, in which UCB Graduate Assembly representatives wish to participate; and

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 25 -

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO FUND PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDENT ADVOCATES FOR THE GRADUATE EDUCATION COALITION

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly's fiscal year 2008-2009 budget did not account for these expenses and currently does not have sufficient monies to participate in the SAGE DOH; and

WHEREAS, we are currently seeking external funding from the Chancellor's Office and the Graduate Division, which if received, will help cover some of the costs. But we do not believe we will receive adequate support from these avenues alone;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA budget be amended to increase the travel budget of the External Affairs Committee by \$4,000 to supplement funding, as needed, for the travel of UCB GA representatives to attend the SAGE DOH.

A Delegate asked how the people who get to go would be chosen. Mr. Ortega said they have a number of students who have expressed an interest. So depending on availability of who could go and how much money was available, they'd decide who goes. It also depended on how much time people had to help with doing some of the research. The Delegate asked who would be helping with the research. Mr.

Ortega said it would be the External Affairs office and the Coalition that was working with other universities.

A Delegate asked what the Contingency Fund was usually used for, and what else it might be necessary for. Mr. Rajan there wasn't any one thing in particular, and the Contingency Fund was used for non-real time budgeting, which was different from normal budgeting, where people predict a budget. The GA has apparently been quite bad at predicting budgets. What they do is predict a very small baseline budget for next year and try to match that and stay within it as properly as they could. But there are always things they are unexpected. For example, just the other day the Grad Social Club was stuck with a bill for about \$890 from 2007, which wasn't collected. Of course, the GSC has a budget, but they hadn't known the bill existed. So that money had to come out of something, and there's no real flexibility or liquidity in the budget, except for the Contingency Fund. It gives them enough of a buffer to pay expenses, and the amount in it was total guesswork. The only thing that would throw a serious monkey wrench into these plans was the recall election. If it costs \$45,000 and the GA was responsible for 12% of that, which was the GA's agreement with the ASUC, then it would be a pain. On the flip side, the ASUC seems willing to negotiate and weren't like a creditor, per se, and wouldn't force the issue. And even if they did, the GA would just pay next year, or something like that. So there are ways to fudge around it. There was nothing hard and fast, and they wouldn't lose a line of credit or be sued, or anything like that.

Ms. Weinbaum asked if the budget wasn't carried over to the following year. Mr. Rajan said that anything unspent that year will be budgeted in two years. They won't know what was unspent until October, and he didn't want to forecast budgets that weren't spent. Ms. Weinbaum said she thought it was a great idea to send people to lobby for grad students, but she was worried and asked if they could have the numbers, have a scoping mission, budget \$2,000 for people, and then find out after the meeting how many others went.

Ms. Anderson said the Contingency Fund was for things like this, every day things that come up. If the GA had some sort of budget crisis, they also have a reserve. So if for some reason they did have creditors chasing after them and trying to shut down the Graduate Assembly, there was more money available. Mr. Rajan said they had a lot of money in reserves.

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 26 -

Mr. Marchand said the Contingency Fund was \$12,000. he asked when the budget year ends. Mr. Rajan said he would give them a broad overview. The GA brings in about \$500,000 in revenue every year; and in spending, they try to match that number as closely as possible. There was some fudge in there. Mr. Tuchman said the fiscal year starts in July and ends June 30. Everything the GA will spend that year has already been budgeted.

Mr. Rajan said that everything they expect to spend that year should already be budgeted. So the Contingency Fund just takes care of day-to-day things and maybe even things like the Resolution. The GA has reserves of almost \$400,000, which was almost their operating budget for the year. So if anything was to actually be in question, they could draw on that if needed.

Ms. Parrish asked if they were aware of how many other schools were sending people, and how much, e.g., UT Austin was spending, and if it was comparable, and if Berkeley was sending as many students, and if they'd be as well represented. Mr. Ortega said he thought everybody was sending from two to five students, depending on how many they could fund.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no further questions or discussion, without objection, they would move to a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 0901a, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO FUND PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDENT ADVOCATES FOR THE GRADUATE EDUCATION COALITION, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

The following Resolution, 0812a, was authored by Ms. Pannu:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE PROCESS FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION OF GRADUATE ASSEMBLY (GA) BY-LAWS

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly's By-laws ("By-laws") require committee analysis of all resolutions under consideration; and

WHEREAS, adequate notice of resolutions is required by a one-month deliberation process (By-laws 6.4.2.3-5) and resolution analysis is required by a one-week notice period between a Committee Report and Delegate Assembly meeting (4.12 and 3.6); and

WHEREAS, the 2008-2009 Rules Committee has found it is appropriate to amend resolutions that are properly noticed and referred to committee at the Delegate Assembly meeting in which the resolution is considered for a vote; and

WHEREAS, the Delegate Assembly should not be limited in its ability to improve upon, or tailor, a resolution to accurately reflect the will of the graduate student body;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Section 6.4.2.5 (Resolutions. Process. Final Consideration) of the GA By-laws be amended as follows:

6.4.2.5. Final Consideration. The Delegate Assembly will consider passage of the Resolution at the meeting following the meeting in which the Resolution was introduced. *This*

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 27 -

provision should not be interpreted to restrict or limit the ability of the Delegate Assembly to amend or revise a proposed resolution by majority vote during final consideration.

A Delegate said they're closing a technical loophole. Right now, the By-laws are vague on whether or not the GA can amend Resolutions on the floor before they come to a vote. Basically, all 0812a does was to close that loophole and say that they don't have to amend Resolutions on the floor, but that the By-laws do not prohibit amending bills on the floor. If there's some technicality in a Resolution, a little glitch, and the bill would pass except for that glitch, 0812a would allow the GA to fix the glitch. It would make things faster.

Mr. Rabkin said the GA has actually been following this procedure for that past year, and the Rules Committee believes the GA could do this. But rather than just crossing their fingers and hoping nobody raised an objection, the bill would just codify current practice rather than making a material change to the By-laws.

Mr. Rheaume asked if this meant the GA could or could not amend things on the floor. Mr. Rabkin said the bill would clarify that they could. Mr. Rheaume said that if he wanted to amend a Resolution, he could pose the amendment, which could be adopted on the spot. A Delegate said the GA would debate the amendment and then vote on it. Mr. Rabkin said that would be as opposed to waiting a month for the bill to go back to committee.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no discussion, without objection they'd move to a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE 0812a, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE PROCESS FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION OF GRADUATE ASSEMBLY (GA) BY-LAWS, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Daal said that their next meeting they'd hold GA elections.

Mr. Rajan said a list of committee openings was going around, and he would like to make a pitch for one he just had to resign from, CAPRA. It meets Wednesday mornings from 9:00 to 11:00. It's a fantastic committee, one of the most important in the Academic Senate. It basically does allocations of the University's budget, and considers a whole bunch of things. It was very important for grads to have representation on this Committee, and if he could attend, he would. Last year Mr. Basri was on it, which was fortunate, because he was able to identify something of crucial importance to grad students that might have had a role in keeping travel funds the way they were currently formulated. It's really important that grads know what's going on in CAPRA. For any grads interested in interacting with the faculty at that level, he would ask them to please consider serving on CAPRA.

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

This meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

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