

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

April 1, 2004

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- [Heard announcements.](#)
- [Heard a report from the Executive Board and approved its report.](#)
- [Adopted the Finance Committee report and approved the GA's 2004-2005 budget.](#)
- [Approved the Funding Committee report, and approved the Committee's recommendations for this round of Graduate Events allocations.](#)
- [Approved the report from the Academic Affairs Committee and approved the Committee's proposal for the GA Distinguished Faculty Mentors Award.](#)
- [Approved the report from the Organization and Rules Committee.](#)
- [Approved the report from the Mental Health Task Force.](#)
- [Approved establishment of the Statute for Creation of Judicial Review.](#)
- [Heard Officers' reports.](#)
- [Heard a presentation by Charles Shank, Director, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.](#)

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Jessica Quindel at 5:45 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Quindel said she would like to add a report from the Executive Board under New Business. The report was included in the packet. A motion to add the item was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Sharma moved to consider the Finance Committee report before the new budget. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

A motion to approve the agenda, as amended, was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Quindel called for any objection to approval of the minutes from the March meeting. Mr. Garcia said that at the bottom of page 29, the marriage date he and his partner set was February 15.

A motion to approve the minutes, as amended, was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 4, 2004 MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

GA Announcements

Mr. Frazier introduced himself and said he was the Media Relations Coordinator. He wanted to make Delegates aware of the student government page in the Daily Cal. On it, the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly are allocated a certain amount of space, for GA-sponsored events or policy issues. The government page is a method for the GA to foster dialogue and make people aware of things outside of e-mails. The government page comes out on Tuesdays, and he would send Delegates an e-mail about the process by which to submit information for the page. Delegates can let Officers and staff know what they're doing and include items, or if they have any ideas for each week's page, they should let people know. They're all part of this. Ms. Quindel said that if Delegates have a student government event that they'd like to announce in the Daily Cal, the GA can do that with this page. Mr. Frazier said the page is printed weekly, and people should submit items the Wednesday before the page is printed.

Ms. Davis introduced herself and said she was the Graduate Support Services Project Coordinator. The Graduate Minority Students Project is putting on a fantastic Distinguished Lecturer of Color series and posters were available. They're putting them up in the community and are asking for Delegates' help in getting them posted in departments and grad student lounges. If people could grab one or more, that would be a great help. Ms. Davis said they have two workshops that month. The first will be next Thursday, on financial management for grads. This is a new workshop put together recently, and hopefully people got the e-mail about it. Issues to be

covered include debt management, budgeting, and living within their means. The second workshop will address communications and relationships with faculty advisors, how to get good advice from them, and how to manage problems that might come up. It's outlined in her staff report. It's in two parts, a lecture-style workshop and a trouble-shooting session. It will be at the end of the month, and she'd send out information as the date gets closer.

Ms. Williams said she had announcements for dates from April 15 to the 19th. On the 15th they'll have a budget forum and talk about "where their money goes." Grads pay fees and have had fee increases, and the forum will discuss where the money goes. It will be from 7:00 to 9 p.m., at a place to be determined. On the 17th and 18th there will be a lobbying conference, an opportunity for people interested in learning how to talk to their legislators and in having a good relationship with Sacramento. They have a lot of issues coming up the rest of that year and next year. If people are interested in going to the conference, she would ask them to please let her know that evening. Also, the 19th is the UC Student Association Lobbying Day. They're trying to mobilize as many grads as they can, since they're the ones being severely affected by fee hikes. So they need to get grads out on Monday, April 19. If they don't have anything to do he would ask them to please talk to her.

Mr. Kashmiri asked if anybody was interested in going on Monday, April 19. He said they'll go to Sacramento to lobby against grad student fee hikes. They'll leave in the morning and come back in the afternoon. Ms. Williams said this is an opportunity to talk to their legislators. Mr. Kashmiri asked if people could commit to getting someone else to go as well.

Mr. Kashmiri said they're having a town hall meeting on student rights on the issue of the Code of Conduct and the taking away of legal representation. He would ask if people could post fliers in their departments, and would ask them to take as many as they need. He, Dave Madan, the ASUC Student Advocate, and others, will talk about students' rights to legal representation. This protects people such as, e.g., when they do civil disobedience on campus. Grads have often won Code of Conduct hearings, such as during the Third World Strike, because they had legal representation. People are needed to come out and talk about what should be done and talk about a plan of action. He would ask people to please let people know in their departments and to spread the word.

Ms. Quindel said the Publications Coordinator for the ASUC is doing a publications award for the best publications on campus, and they're wondering if any grad would be interested in sitting on the award selection committee. If

anyone was interested, she would ask them to please let her know before they leave. All different kinds of publications on campus will be involved, from science, to poetry, to ethnic-specific. This would be a great activity if they're interested in publications. If grads would like to look publications over, she'd send out an e-mail.

Ms. Moore said her report as Funding Advisor was at the back of the agenda packet. She left out the very last funding deadline, which is April 16. They're extending the date for one week for the end of the semester, such as for parties, e.g. The dates are from Friday May 7 to Friday May 14. There was a typo on the Web site as being May 7 to May 12. The coming deadline is April 16. Ms. Moore said she was also a member of the Empowering Women of Color Conference Committee, and they're having the 19th Annual EWOC Conference. There are fliers in the back. They'll have Sonia Sanchez attend, a very powerful poet and author. She would ask Delegates to please come and hear this women speak. The Conference will be on April 24, and she would ask people to please grab some fliers, which were in the back.

Ms. Quindel said GA elections will be held next month, and she'd send out announcements about what the positions entail. If people were interested, they should feel free to e-mail her or other Officers. People on the Executive Board have a good understanding of the positions, and people should get it touch with them if they were interested.

AGSE/UAW Announcement

Sue Wilson introduced herself and said she was the Unit Chair of the Union. She asked how many people there were already members of the Union for GSIs, readers, and tutors. If they're not a member and are a grad, they're welcome to join, and they could talk to her about how to do that. Even if they haven't been teaching yet, they were welcome to join. The Union is having its Annual Statewide Membership Meeting on Saturday, April 17, from 3:00 to 6:00. This is a meeting where UAW 2865 members from the different UC campuses come together, at Berkeley this year, two discuss things. The two major things they'll do is to look back at the past year, including a presentation on the contract they won in December. They'll also do agenda setting for the following year, and set priorities. She wanted to encourage people to take the time out of their weekends and make a commitment to show up for this, so they can voice their input, hear opinions, and advice as they set this agenda together

for the coming year. She would pass around some sign-in sheets, and if they could come she would ask them to please write their name, department, and phone number. She called for any questions.

Report from the Business GA Manager/Advisor

Ms. Dugas said she didn't have anything to report because everything would be dealt with by the Finance Committee.

NEW BUSINESS

-

-

Report from the Executive Board

Ms. Quindel said there was a lengthy report from the Executive Board at the end of the packet, pages 10 and 11. The Board made a lot of recommendations. She'd go through each proposal so they're clear, the first thing they talked about was the need to be clear about how Delegates and committee chairs can access funds. The Organization and Rules will look into developing a By-law on this. Also, there was a funding appeal that was considered and the Board made a recommendation on Grad Council representation. They also made recommendations on the Faculty Mentoring Award, and how to advertise it and future administration, and how to deal with it after seeing how this award goes.

The Executive Board addressed communication issues and also talked about creating a food policy for meetings, retreats, etc. They also changed the structure of the Media Relations Coordinator. They talked about committee reports, to make meetings more efficient, and gave recommendations about the budget that went to the Finance Committee. The Executive Board also recommended additional staff positions to help Ms. Dugas, since she has to do quite a bit. The Board also talked about where funding should come from. For committee budgets next year, since they're in flux, they wouldn't be required to submit yearly budgets. For the Grad Social Club, it will change from a separate entity to a project, and will work with the Events Coordinator.

One thing that's really important is the use of Pauley Ballroom. The Board feels that the purpose of the ASUC Auxiliary is to support student government s, not balance the budget on their backs. The GA was requesting that the ASUC Store Operations Board factor into the ASUC budget ten free events per year for the GA and a comparable amount for the ASUC. The Executive Board recommendation s that refuse to pay for GA sponsored event s to be held in Pauley Ballroom and will use other venues if they're charged. This is important because of annual things they do in Pauley for free that they'd have to pay for, including the New Grad Student Orientation, Grad Social Club events, and the Empowering Women of Color Conference. The GA's budget was already tight. The Executive Board also recommends American Cultures course development or teaching grants. They also made a recommendation on the timeline for the Graduate Support Services Project. The Board also recommended that the issue of international students paying in-State tuition be referred to the Student Affairs Committee. She called for any questions about the report.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the Executive Board's report. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD Passed with no objection.

Begin written report from the Executive Board

- a. Role of the Finance Committee/Delegates in allocating funds: The Board directs the Organization and Rules Committee to develop a By-law mandating distribution of orientation materials for both GA delegates and committee chairs explaining how to access and/or request GA funds, by the May GA meeting.
- b. Grad Council Representation: The Board recommends that Jevan attend the subcommittee meetings until his work is complete, and that Susan (unofficially), Marc, and Katie attend Grad Council meetings.
- c. Boalt LGBT Caucus funding appeal: The Board recommends giving the group the amount it would have gotten had it gone through the Grad Events funding process.
- d. Faculty Mentoring Award: The Board recommends continuing with the Faculty Mentoring Award (separate from cash prize). A cash prize will be included pending approval by the date of the Mentorship Reception (previously approved by the Delegates). If there is no approval, there should be no mention of a cash award upon the announcement of the winners. If the cash prize is not approved, we'll come up with an alternate non-cash award within ASUC and University guidelines.

The following language (proposed by Kate) shall be sent out as a reminder to the Delegates and Grad Assistants immediately: "Four awards will be presented to the selected research mentors. Pending approval, each award will be accompanied by a \$1,000 prize."

Additionally, the final deadline will be Monday March 22nd at 5 p.m. All of this updated information should be posted on the Web site as soon as possible.

- e. Future Faculty Mentoring Award Program: The Board requests a proposal from the Academic Affairs Committee, including a plan for the administration of the program. If approved by the Board, the Finance Committee will look for funding in the GA budget, and the Board will ask the Organization and Rules Committee if there need to be any changes in the By-laws.

- f. Communication Problems:

Approved Communication Guidelines

Whenever communicating with Business Office or project coordinator staff, all communication should go through the Business Director/Manager or be routed through the Board if for some reason it is uncomfortable.

Any other uncomfortable communication of a personal nature should be brought to the Board.

All GA issues that cause disputes should be routed through the Board.

The Board will inform the Business Office of how to inform passers-by regarding events pertaining only to Temina (in particular, Faculty Mentoring Award questions should be e-mailed to the Academic Affairs VP).

Emails should be short and action-oriented or ask for clarification. Emails between Jessica and Temina should be cc-ed to an outside email address.

Written report from the Executive Board

Temina must recuse herself from the official evaluation of the Business Director/Manager, but forward any general concerns about the role to the Board for future discussion.

The current Academic Affairs Vice President (Temina) should stick solely to the following roles: Faculty Mentoring Award administration, Mental Health Task Force, Academic Affairs Committee, Committee Appointment Process, and should drop all other roles. The current President (Jessica) should stay out of these roles as much as possible.

- g. Food policy: The Board recommends continuing to provide food for graduate/professional students at meetings of the GA. The Board requests that the Organization and Rules Committee develop expenditure guidelines for the various food-consuming possibilities (meetings, retreats, travel, etc.).

- h. Media: The Board directs that the Media Relations Coordinator be managed by the President instead of the Academic Affairs VP, effective immediately.
- i. Committee Reports: The Board directs the President to clarify bundling in an email to the delegates. Budget, By-law and Charter amendments, Creation of Committee or Task force, Changes to Structure of the GA, Staff Directives are all EXCLUDED from bundling.

As per the By-law cited below, this meeting focused on making budget recommendations to the Finance Committee, including whether to continue the various projects and which line items to prioritize.

"15.1.2 By March 1st of each year the Executive Board shall submit to the Finance Committee a statement of Graduate Assembly policies and plans with financial implications. In addition, the Executive Board should forward to the Finance Committee any staff and/or committee budget requests, together with Executive Board comments. Budget issues having implications for the Graduate Assembly structure shall also be accompanied by recommendations from the Organization and Rules Committee.

- j. Solar Panels: \$50,000 for Solar Panels. APPROVED. Jessica will request an itemized budget from ASUC Auxiliary Director Tom Cordi to see exactly where the money is going. This was done and the information was forwarded to the Board.
- k. GMSP Project: APPROVED
- l. GSSP Project: APPROVED
- m. Web Project: APPROVED
- n. The Berkeley Graduate Magazine: APPROVED
- o. GWP/EWOC: APPROVED
- p. GSC as a project (though they can choose to be a student group if they so choose): APPROVED. However, GSC should increase communication with Events Coordinator.

 Written report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

- q. Grad Mentoring Project (new project): We recommend that GSSP incorporate new aspects (i.e., international student mentoring) into the program, and ensure that each component is incorporated into existing projects if it doesn't currently do so (i.e., Events, GMSP, etc.). An example of this incorporation is that GSSP's Web site would

have a link to mentoring, after which students can choose what kind of mentoring they need. PROJECT NOT APPROVED

- r. Other recommended Priorities:
 - i. Funding/Grant programs: APPROVED. Prioritize student group funding, particularly student activism grants and campus diversity grants. Additionally, the Board recommends ensuring adequate staff support in the Business Office to process reimbursements, payments, etc.
 - ii. Business Office: APPROVED
 - iii. Executive Office: APPROVED. The Board recommends that the Electric Grad responsibilities be transferred to the Berkeley Graduate editor. The Board recommends that the GA Media Relations Coordinator role include Media Spokesperson, website communication, and media strategy/coordination regarding GA advocacy.
 - iv. Departmental Liaison: APPROVED. Delegate committee Web function should be included in duties of the DL.
- s. Assistant Manager: The Board directs Nzingha to research how much it would cost, how the position would get funded, and what the particular duties of the Assistant Manager would be (what's currently needed). Jessica, Vivian, Temina, Rishi, and Katie will offer input regarding the role of the Assistant Manager.
- T GWP/GMSP funding & Graduate Division funding: The Board decided to request funding from Graduate Division and if the conditions are amenable we accept, and if not or if we don't get the funding, the GA will internalize the cost.
- u. Committee budgets: The Board decided that since the committee needs are too in flux, committees should not be required to submit yearly budgets. However, a document needs to be created regarding avenues that people can travel to get funding. An amendment was proposed for a separate fund for all committees rather than using funds from the Exec Office budget. The amendment FAILED.
- v. Budget organization (categories of the budget): The Board recommends retaining the status quo regarding travel funding, and defer the remaining concerns regarding budget organization to the Finance Committee.
- w. GSC: The Board recommends declaring that the GSC is a project, discussing the suggestion with them, and letting them know that they could opt to be a student group if they felt it were a better option.
- x. Email policy: The Board recommends that the officers first ask herself if all students need to hear the information in the email. If this test is passed, the officer should send the email, keeping in mind the need to prioritize.

Written report from the Executive Board (cont'd)

- y. Pauley Ballroom charges: The Board feels that the purpose of the ASUC Auxiliary is to support student governments, not balance the budget on their backs. The GA requests that the ASUC Store Operations Board factor into the ASUC Auxiliary budget at least 10 free events per year for the GA and a comparable amount for the ASUC. The Executive Board recommends that the GA refuse to pay for GA sponsored events to be held Pauley Ballroom and will use other venues if we are charged.

- z. American Cultures Course Development or Teaching Grants for GSIs: The Board recommends granting no more than \$3400 to "American Cultures" to be used as grant money for American Cultures course development (supplies, materials, films, etc.). The Board further recommends research passing of the cost to the University by recommending that the American Cultures Center Director contact the Academic Senate, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Paul Grey, and the Chair of the Campus on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) committee.

- aa. Recommendations for the Graduate Support Services Project (GSSP): The Board regrets that the relevant deadline was missed and recommends that changes to this project be proposed for next year by the March 19, 2005 deadline. We request that the Business Manager put the proposal on file. We recommend that the Academic Affairs & Health and Welfare committee could take up related research including consulting the manager and GSSP coordinator. They should then draft a proposal for the Board that would ultimately go to the GA delegates next year.

- bb. International student fees: The Board recommends that the issue of international students paying in-state tuition after their first year be referred to the Foreign Student Affairs Committee.

End written report from the Executive Board

NEW BUSINESS

-

-

FY 2004-2005 Budget

Mr. Sharma said budget documents were floating around, including a spreadsheet shows the allocation of funds of the GA budget, line item by line item and a quick explanation of projected revenue, amounts, and how the money falls into larger categories and classifications. The second document is

much longer, a narrative of how the money is spent, and includes evaluation measures for each project, detailed requests for money, and where money will be going. The third document to be noted was the Finance Committee report, which was in the agenda packet.

Mr. Sharma said the Finance Committee has been meeting since January. It's been very active and has worked wonderfully well. The budget was done by consensus, so it manifests agreement by a lot of groups from all over the campus.

Before going into more detail, he asked if there were any questions about the budget or any document, and asked what things people wanted to know about the budget. If they go to the spreadsheet section in the packet, he'd go over the general picture of the GA budget and people could look at specific items later. The second block, labeled "All programs," is a breakdown of revenues. They could see the projected revenue from student fees, \$399,000; \$50,000 from the beverage contract; and matching grants, \$12,500, that the Graduate Assembly administers. Grad funding from other programs will dry up next year, so they budgeted as if there was no money there. They project a carryforward of \$86,000. The budget is in balance. They're projecting two years ahead to have a small surplus of \$5,000. In the Finance Committee report, that's allocated back to the Executive Office to help restore salary cuts they had to make while in the process of doing budget cuts.

Above the revenue figures was a breakdown of major spending categories, such as the Business Office, the Executive Office, and GA projects, which includes things like the Grad Student Support Project, the GMSP, and grants funding.

With Mr. Cantor chairing the meeting, Ms. Dugas said she wanted to point out special features built into the budget number. Grants funding that year, counting the original and supplemental allocations, was \$159,000 that year. They cut back the original allocation of \$159K to \$125K in order to balance the budget. But if they look at the comment, there's a built-in residual at the end of this year, and all unspent student group funding automatically rolls over into next year's student group funding. It's difficult to estimate how much will be unspent, but it's safe to say it's a lot. All of them on the Committee are committed to funding, and this action was a compromise to ensure that next year they have as much, if not more, student group funding.

Secondly, Ms. Dugas said that both in the report and in the budget there was an administrative shift in the Grad Social Club. The content and administration

are retained, but it's been brought in officially as a program in the GA, and moved in the budget. The Events Project Coordinator will work closer in the hope of collaborating programming. Finally, they cut GA reserves by \$20,000, which is something they did to balance the budget. But there's a residual clause whereby for any surplus numbers that arise over the summer, the first \$20,000 would go back to reserves, so they don't risk their funding picture.

Mr. Sharma said he wouldn't go into individual line items unless people have questions. Ms. Quindel called for any questions, or any information that could be provided so people feel comfortable making amendments.

A Delegate asked if there were any significant changes since last year that haven't been mentioned. Mr. Sharma said the GA budgeted solar panels that year at \$50,000. For various reasons the original budget did not include that. Among the reasons were autonomy issues and the feeling that the GA wasn't getting its fair share. So they were reluctant to give that \$50,000. It's a lot of money, and there was a question as to where they'd cut. He wouldn't feel comfortable giving \$50,000 to solar panels at the expense of the GMSP. They have a tighter budget that year. If they look at older budget documents, they have a budget with a much smaller number that year. So there were cuts all around. The Events project took close to a 20% cut and the Grad Social Club took a pretty big cut. The GMSP and Grad Women Project took cuts. The Executive Office took a huge cut, from \$118K to \$95,000 next year.

Ms. Madon asked if he could go over the pilot projects they've had that wouldn't continue. Mr. Sharma said they expire at the end of every year and must be renewed. He wasn't around last year, and unless a pilot project was renewed at the beginning of this year, it wasn't in the budget this year. The two he could mention that will not continue are the Grad Disability Project and the Grad Mentoring, which are set to expire that year as they received no request to continue them. Ms. Madon asked what the values were for them. Mr. Sharma said he didn't know. The residual was several thousand that wasn't spent. If they didn't receive a request there was no money budgeted. An example would be ASUC elections dues. No organ of the GA requested that in the budget, so it's not included. But it's in the Finance Committee report as an item they have to get to next year, and that's looked into things like automatically. Ms. Quindel said people could see the programs they did last year on page 8, including solar panels, CRENO, the GRE, et.al.

Ms. Quindel asked if Mr. Sharma could provide any other information so people feel comfortable amending it or adopting it.

Mr. Sharma said page 3 of the Fi-Comm report outlines some of the major things they did. Number 2) is structural modifications and 3) is future budget issues.

Ms. Quindel called for a motion to adopt the Finance Committee report and the budget for 2004-2005.

Ms. Madan said the proposal calls for two sources of funding for retreats, for the Business Office and the Executive Office. She asked if that was a mistake or if there was a duplication. Ms. Dugas said there are several retreats that occur, the Executive Office retreat and a separate staff retreat. The Executive Office has its own retreat where she does training with incoming people. They're adding people to that retreat. Money for staff retreats doesn't come out of her budget and the Executive Office retreat comes out of its budget.

A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT AND THE GA FISCAL YEAR 2004-2005 BUDGET PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Begin written report from the Finance Committee Chair

Finance Committee Report
24 March 2004

The Finance Committee met several times during the month of March to develop the Graduate Assembly budget for the 2004-2005 Fiscal Year. At current, we have active participation from all committee members: Rishi Sharma (Law), Laura Altieri (Law), Marlon Bailey (African American Studies), Duane De Witt (City & Regional Planning), David Garcia (Chemistry), Vivian Hwa (Economics), Erick Muñoz (Law), Funmi Olorunnipa (Law), Robert Ricketts (Business), and S. Nzingha Dugas (GA Business Manager & Finance Officer).

The FY 2004-2005 Budget is considered as a separate agenda item for the Delegate meeting on 1 April 2004. The following recommendations were approved by consensus and are now forwarded for Delegate consideration as part of the overall budget process:

1. Surplus and Carry-forward Allocations

GA Reserve Refill

Written report from the Finance Committee Chair (cont'd)

Historically the GA reserves have been \$50,000. In light of the financial constraints now facing the GA, the Committee lowered the GA reserves to \$30,000 for FY 2004-2005. In doing so, however, the Committee recommends that the first \$20,000 of the surplus or carry-forward balance that becomes available automatically refill the reserve amount until it reaches \$50,000.

Student Group Funding Rollover

The Committee originally allocated \$150,000 to student group funding and grants, but to balance the overall budget, the Committee lowered the budgeted amount. Recognizing the importance of student group funding, however, the Committee recommends that any and all unused money from student group funding this year automatically roll over into student group funding for the next fiscal year.

Surplus Spending Priority List

The Committee recommends that any further carry-forward or surplus money be allocated in the next fiscal year in the following priority: (1) Graduate Minority Students Project (GMSP) and Graduate Women's Project (GWP); (2) the University of California Student Association; (3) the Business Office; (4) Mentoring; and (5) Solar Panels.

2. Structural Modifications

New Staff Position

Following discussion with the Executive Board, the Committee budgeted fifty percent of a new full-time salary for program advising. The Committee recommends that the GA seek the remaining funds from the ASUC Auxiliary in light of both our current programming needs and fiscal constraints.

Executive Office Funding

To balance the budget, the Committee made hefty cuts to the Executive Office budget, including reducing the Campus Organizing Director (COD) and Legislative Liaison (LL) salaries to \$5,500 each. In light of the change this affects on Executive Office structure, the Committee recommends that the Executive Office be given the flexibility to use existing funds in the Executive Office budget and the remaining unallocated amount (\$5,230) to restore COD and LL stipends to their current levels.

Graduate Social Club

The Committee budgeted for the Graduate Social Club (GSC) based on the recommendations of the Executive Board to make GSC a GA project. The Committee further recommends that GSC be moved into the Events Project to further collaboration and content sharing with an eye towards further diversity while maintaining the content and administrative autonomy GSC currently enjoys.

3.Future Budget Issues

ASUC Elections

The Committee did not allocate the anticipated amount due to the ASUC for elections in the next academic year because (1) the request was received too late and (2) the issue is directly tied to ongoing negotiations relating to GA autonomy from the ASUC and Store-side profits.

Written report from the Finance Committee Chair (cont'd)

UCSA Dues

In light of budget constraints, the Committee did not allocate the full amount required for complete membership in UCSA but has recommended this item as priority number two on the surplus spending list. The Committee and Delegates next year will have to approve any further allocation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Rishi Sharma, Chair, GA Finance Committee
24 March 2004

End written report from the Finance Committee Chair

Funding Committee Report

Ms. Levitan said they have one more funding round that Ms. Moore announced, and they were asked to have their groups informed that the correct deadline was May 7 - 14. They had \$19,000 in requests and the Funding Committee awarded \$4,500, a discrepancy that always happens. She called for any questions. A motion to adopt the recommendations of the Funding Committee was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FUNDING COMMITTEE FOR GRAD EVENTS ALLOCATIONS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the Academic Affairs Committee

Ms. Madan said they'd like to note some things in their report. First, they seek approval of a Faculty Mentoring Award Selection Committee. Five grads from the Academic Affairs Committee would like to nominate themselves for the Selection Committee, and

were listed on page 2 of the agenda packet. Mr. Stagi, who wasn't present that evening, is in City and Regional Planning and is a Delegate; Ms. Gulate, Bioengineering, sits on SWEM and just applied to be a Delegate; Mr. Zimmerman, Education, was not a Delegate and sits on the Teaching Committee. In addition, they have two faculty members from the Academic Senate. They were asking for the GA's approval. The Academic Senate already approved the two faculty members, Nicholas Sitar, from Civil Engineering, and Claire Kramsch, on the Committee on Teaching of the Academic Senate, a professor in German. Ms. Madan said they'd like to augment the Committee by two women, preferably, but anybody could nominate themselves for the Teaching Task Force. People have to be available next Tuesday between 1:00 and 3 p.m. if they're interested, when the Selection Committee will meet. Ms. Odusanya volunteered.

Ms. Madan said the second part of the Committee report is a Resolution from the UC-DOE Subcommittee. The forum on the Labs is scheduled for April 21 in the I-House auditorium. This arose from the December Resolution the GA passed. Michael Krasny, KQED radio moderator, will host. They'll have a great bunch of panelists, including people from the National Labs, from the Western States Legal Foundation, policy wonks, and interesting people. They asked for \$2,500 from the speakers fund in the Resolution.

Mr. Garcia said the Charter, Section 5.5, states that the Finance Committee has to bring monetary re-allocations to the floor, and sections 12.3.2 and 15.3 of the By-laws states that only the Executive Board can do line item transfers, which have to be less than \$500. So the Resolution was out of order because the Academic Affairs Committee does not have the authority to recommend monetary re-allocations or line item transfers on the floor. He would ask to have the Resolution struck from the report, or to find the entire report out of order.

Ms. Quindel said that part of the report was out of order. She asked to continue with the report.

Mr. Sharma said that if this is a direct allocation, he thought Mr. Garcia was right, and it had to be channeled through the Finance Committee. And there wasn't \$2,500 in the Speakers Fund.

Ms. Quindel said she would rule that part out of order.

Ms. Madon said an addendum dealt with a proposal from the Faculty Mentoring Award Subcommittee. It outlines the process. This is what they're soliciting the GA's approval for.

Ms. Quindel said they'd nominate individuals and the policies by which the individuals will select the Faculty Mentor Award winner.

A Delegate Mr. Daal asked what was involved in suspending the rules so the Resolution that Ms. Madan brought to the table could be considered. Ms. Quindel said they'd have to overrule the Chair, since she agreed that it was out of order. If the GA agrees that she

made the wrong decision, they could proceed with suspending the rules. Mr. Dual asked if there was any debate on that. Ms. Ahn said there was no debate on overruling the Chair. A motion to suspend the rules was debatable.

Ms. Hwa asked if this was something Delegates had to decide or if it was a question of finding money, and something the Academic Affairs Committee could talk about with the Finance Committee. She asked if the GA would decide. Ms. Quindel said the Finance Committee makes recommendation to the Assembly, and since this event was scheduled for April 21, there wouldn't be a GA meeting before then. So Fi-Comm would have to meet and then make a recommendation to the GA as a whole. Ms. Ahn said the Executive Committee can allocate \$500. Ms. Madan asked if they could amend the Resolution to have the GA, in addition to the \$1,000, recommend that the Finance Committee consider an allocation. Ms. Quindel said they couldn't. They need to vote on overruling her decision.

A Delegate Mr. Daal asked about the timeline and why the money was so necessary before they decide if the Chair was out of order. Mr. Garcia said the Resolution was out of order and violated the GA's Charter and By-laws. Mr. Daal said the goal was to suspend the rules. He moved to overrule the Chair so the event could occur. The motion was seconded. The motion to overrule the Chair failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Quindel said they were still in consideration of adopting the entire report. She called for any other questions on the Faculty Mentoring Award.

Mr. Sharma said that 2.5 says the Task Force will select up to four nominees to forward to the GA for final approval, but 6 says it doesn't require approval of the Delegate body.

Ms. Madon moved to amend, to strike the clause, "forward to the GA Delegate body." Mr. Sharma moved to strike everything in 5) after the word "applications," striking "to forward to the GA Delegate body for final approval." The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO 2.5 TO THE ADDENDUM TO THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PROPOSAL FOR THE GA DISTINGUISHED FACULTY MENTORS AWARD PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Quindel called for any other questions or motions.

A motion to adopt was made by Ms. Levitan and was seconded. THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT, AND THE PROPOSAL FOR THE GA DISTINGUISHED FACULTY MENTORS AWARD, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the Organization and Rules Committee

Ms. Quindel said that Mr. Sharma was the acting Chair of the Committee since Mr. Akiba resigned his position for personal issues. The GA would have an election for the position that evening.

Mr. Sharma said the Committee just met a few times, and talked about three things. The first is an agenda item that would come up later on, and at that point the GA was discussing the other two, and getting staff ready for the May meeting.

A motion to approve was made by Ms. Ahn and was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE ORGANIZATION AND RULES COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Report from the Mental Health Task Force

Ms. Madon asked how many people received the survey on mental health, which went to every grad on campus. The Mental Health Task Force worked on developing the survey over the Fall Semester and the beginning of the Spring. This is the first such study of grad student welfare on the Berkeley campus, and they think it will yield interesting and helpful results. They have planned educational material, including posters, hand-outs, and other material, that tell people how to get help if they need it, whether it's with academic, financial, or career or counseling concerns. The budget was included in the agenda packet, \$2,200 and \$4,300 for educational material.

Ms. Madon said the second part of the report was a Resolution to create a GA Health and Welfare Committee to take over the work of the Mental Health Task Force. This went through the Organization and Rules Committee. It points out the fact that grads, in spite of their youth and vigor, are just as susceptible to some mental health disorders as others with an onset between 18 and 30. They have minimum access to health coverage because not many grads can afford outside health insurance, which is expensive, especially if one has a pre-existing condition, and costs about as much as people pay in rent. So the campus needs to be aware of grad student welfare and health. Faculty have a Faculty Welfare Committee and one might think that's because they're old. But she thought grads have as many needs and concerns relating to health and welfare. The Resolution is a recommendation and doesn't establish a committee, which would have to go through the Organization and Rules Committee.

Ms. Quindel said she would have to rule this out of order. As noted by item I) in the Executive Board report, budget changes are excluded from bundling. Secondly, this should come from the Organization and Rules Committee to the GA, not from the Task Force. She didn't think this followed proper procedures.

A Delegate asked if the GA could defer this to Organization and Rules. Ms. Madon said she would do that. She would exclude that from the recommendation because it was out of order. The entire Resolution to create a committee should go straight to O&RC to

bring to the Assembly. Otherwise they might make a decision about structure without looking at the entire picture, which that Committee does. Ms. Madon asked if they could strike the first Resolved Clause and keep the rest of it. Ms. Quindel said they couldn't, and said it should go to committee. Ms. Madan said it would be, then, a recommendation to the Committee.

A Delegate asked how long it would take for the Committee to review this. Mr. Sharma said the Committee discussed it, but they didn't have a quorum. Also, in May, he anticipated that there will be an entire By-law revision. So it was the consensus of those there that the Committee would be part of that.

A motion to adopt the report, as ruled appropriate, was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE REPORT OF THE ORGANIZATION AND RULES COMMITTEE, AS RULED UPON, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. Ms. Quindel said the first part of the report was adopted.

Statute for Creation of Judicial Review

Mr. Sharma said that just before Mr. Akiba had to step down, they were working on several ways to improve accountability, and the consensus was that one way to do that was to have a judicial committee or system of judicial review, an impartial body of people to resolve disputes in the GA over interpretation of provisions, sort of like a court. There was some disagreement, so they met in a working group to come to a consensus on policy. He worked on the language and that is what was before the body. He had two slight grammatical changes: 20.2.2.1 should read, "Under no circumstances shall Judicial Council members serve on the Executive Board...." And in 20.2.9, "Replacement" should be capitalized.

Ms. Quindel called for any other information to adopt a new dispute Resolution and judicial review process.

Mr. Garcia asked if he could give an example of a dispute this board might settle. Mr. Sharma said the Executive Board can refer questions of procedure to this body for a definitive answer on whether something is appropriate. Or, the president of propaganda might be about to issue a mass mailing, with a committee questioning whether that's in the person's job description. Things that can't go to this board for resolution are policy, so the judicial board couldn't tell the Finance Committee what to do, and would only deal with disputes.

Ms. Dugas asked about the question of Prop. 54, and how it would be handled if the judicial body said that expenditures were fine and the University said they weren't allowed. Mr. Garcia moved to extend speaking time for three

minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Sharma said the judicial committee only has jurisdiction to resolve disputes under the Charter or By-laws, not University policy.

Ms. Dugas said her concern was that they have already dealt with this particular issue on the Board and things could go around and around, because people can reinterpret policy and procedure based on their reading. She asked how this proposal dealt with that.

Ms. Quindel asked about the judicial committee saying one thing and the Business Manager saying something else. Mr. Sharma said the jurisdictional section the judicial committee only gives it authority over the Charter and By-laws. It should never decide anything within the supervising authority of the Business Manager.

A Delegate said that in the situation that was described, if the expenditure wasn't okay with the University, it wouldn't be okay, and that's where the problem lies. Mr. Sharma said this just helps with GA governing documents, not anything else. It's restricted to the Charter and the By-laws. The By-laws should reflect the most accurate policies the University has imposed on them. So there was some resonance.

A Delegate said it seemed the Resolution was to create a committee, and the GA just had another committee is to be created by the Organization and Rules Committee and this is being proposed by the O&RC.

Ms. Ahn moved to call the question and adopt the Statute. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE STATUTE FOR CREATION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Organization and Rules Committee Chair Election

Ms. Quindel said the position was for one month, so she hoped there was a brave soul to fill it. Kristen Gray introduced herself and said she was a first-year in Sociology, and was an Alternate Delegate. She's been working all year on the Autonomy Committee, so she was really interested in getting the GA a constitution so autonomy can happen, because it wouldn't happen without a Constitution. So she would like to hold this position and thought it would be great to have better communications between the O&RC and Autonomy.

Ms. Quindel asked if anybody else would like to run for the position, and called for any questions for the candidate.

Mr. Garcia asked if Alternates can Chair GA Committees. Ms. Quindel said they could.

A Delegate Ms. Levitan asked if she was prepared to join the Executive Board. Ms. Gray said she understood that would be one of her duties.

Ms. Quindel called for any other questions and asked Ms. Gray to step outside for a discussion and a vote. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE KRISTEN GRAY AS CHAIR OF THE ORGANIZATION AND RULES COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. (Applause)

REPORTS

Officers' Reports

Ms. Quindel said the President's report was on page 8 of the agenda packet. She had a few announcements. She wanted to say "thank you" to the staff. They've left the meeting at that point but they've done a really great job. The GA would not operate without them. A lot of time people think things just happen, but a lot happens because of staff, and she wanted to honor them and to thank them.

Following up on Resolutions, Ms. Quindel said she's still working on the Committee to advise the UC President on the new Chancellor. It's a long process and hopefully there will be a new Chancellor selected soon. If people have feedback on what kind of Chancellor they want, the Committee was still in the selection process, and they could give her feedback that she'd relay to the Committee. Regarding the mentoring student fee policy, they have met with UC Berkeley Administration to get feedback on mandatory student fee policy. She asked how many have read the free speech updates, and said she'd keep sending them out, if people were interested, because she was trying to make sure people are aware that this policy will change their governing documents, the Charter, because policy was unclear. That's what caused the debacle with Prop. 54. Regarding faculty and grad student diversity, she and Marlon Bailey, from African American Studies, talked to Chancellor Berdahl about faculty diversity and apologized and admitted he had not done enough on this issue, and said that he'd really push the new Chancellor to do more, especially given some of the outrageous things that happened in particular searches, not even the numbers in general, but in particular, particular searches and how

people were excluded from the process. Regarding the Code of Student Conduct, Delegates got notice of the Student Rights Town Hall. Lastly, that fall will be the 40th anniversary of the Free Speech Movement. There will be a huge series of events, and if anybody was interested in the FSM, or they know of someone who is interested, such as connecting the Free Speech Movement to what was happening today, she would ask them to please get in touch.

Ms. Williams said the External Affairs Vice President's report was in the packet. They have postcards going around that will be sent in bulk, and she would ask Delegates to please get them to her by the end of the meeting, if possible. If people could send the letters to the editors of their hometown newspapers, that could be effective. They had one published in the Los Angeles Times. It's really difficult to get students fired up. They're angry about the fee hikes and need to do something about that. That's why it's important to encourage students to participate. There will be a rally and Lobby Day on the 19th, and they'll do lobby visits. She would ask them to get involved and make an impact on legislators, and show them that grads care about this 40% increase. That's 85% in two years. So they need to make that happen. They're organizing a bus to go to Sacramento.

Ms. Madon said her Academic Affairs Vice President's report was on page 9. They've talked about the Faculty Mentors Award, and the meeting to decide the winners will be on Tuesday. They have 39 nominations representing probably 200 letters of recommendation from grads and professors, both at Cal and at universities nationwide. So it's been really successful in that sense. They'll plan the reception that month. Hopefully, the Chancellor will attend. Regarding the Department of Energy National Labs, there will be a forum on Wednesday, April 21, from 7:00 to 9:00 at the I-House. It will be a really well-attended event. This is a chance to learn about the charge of the National Labs, and hopefully the GA will find funding sources. It looks like it will be a wonderful event, with a lot of very interesting people will speak.

Ms. Madon said that last month she went to a conference through the GA about depression on college campuses, at the University of Michigan. It was really compelling the fact that this is a public health problem. There are people with depression on college campuses, along with suicide and anxiety disorder, a major problem for grads. This is something the World Health Organization realized in recent years, and depression and depressive illnesses are the leading causes of disability in the world. There are a number of studies worldwide that look at this and how people's productivity can be improved by making sure they're supported emotionally and psychologically. There are a lot of statistics. Depression can be a lethal disease and it's treatable. Eighty percent of the people who get adequate care get better. Ms. Williams said it was a very interesting conference and if people would like material, she had PowerPoint presentations and statistics to share. Ms. Ahn asked if she could put them on the GA Web site. Ms. Madon said she would

Ms. Madon said that they have at UC Berkeley medical care for all students, and they don't have to be on SHIP insurance to have access to that care. The Mental Health Task Force will work on materials to send out to grads. So Delegates have a lab mate or classmate who seems depressed, they should recognize the signs and encourage them to get help. That also applies to GSIs' students, such as if they have a student who cries during office hours. Ms. Madon asked if they'd just throw up their hands or if they'd help. There are a lot of resources on campus. A lot of her report had to do with health because that's what she focused on last month. If people were interested in other things, they should send her an e-mail.

Ms. Quindel said she wanted to remind people on the role of Delegates, to take information back to their departments, such as via e-mail, to let people know from their perspective the most important information. Delegates' other role is to bring their department' concerns to the GA or to a committee. If they're not sure which committee was appropriate, Ms. Quindel said they could talk to her or to another Officer. It's really a matter of give and take. The role of Delegates was to listen to concerns in departments and to make sure departments know what's going on. The point of the GA is not just for individuals to come together, but for departments to know what the issues are. Mental health is an issue that affects people in all departments and was something they could work on together.

SPECIAL GUEST: Charles Shank, Director, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

-

-

Ms. Quindel said that based on a lot of heated discussion by the GA earlier in the year, they have the National Lab Director, Charles Shank. Vice President Madon asked if Ms. Quindel could bring him to the GA, and he was at the meeting to talk about what the Lab does. She would ask people to please prepare questions.

Mr. Shank said she wanted to thank the Graduate Assembly for inviting him. The Lab is up on the Hill, above the Berkeley campus, and he's always amazed at the number of people who graduate from Berkeley and don't realize there's a terrific Lab there. He has not done enough to communicate what the Lab does.

The Laboratory was founded in 1931 on the campus. Earnest Lawrence invented an accelerator of a very unique design and opened up a whole branch of physics, understanding atoms, nuclear particles, and fundamental interactions. He wanted to build ever bigger machines and ran out of space on campus, and The Laboratory was built, the first big facility up on the hill. Work was done at this Laboratory, with Livermore, until the early 1970s, at which point all nuclear weapons work was transferred to Livermore. What they have in Berkeley is a basic science laboratory. Over its existence, the Laboratory has had nine Nobel Prizes.

Today, the Laboratory has a budget of a half a billion dollars. They have nearly 1,000 Berkeley students up there, doing research of one kind or another. They're very closely integrated with the campus. Their work is no longer high energy and nuclear physics, which makes up only 10% of what the Lab does. Their work is in computing, high energy physics, and a good 25-30% of the Lab is doing biology. They made a major contribution to the human genome project, sequencing the genome. They have a major facility, the Advanced Light Source, which is a very complicated facility that serves the needs of structural biology and materials engineering. There is a cyclotron that operates on the hill. They're building a new, \$85 million facility called "the molecular foundry," which will be devoted to nanoscience. Every one of these efforts is led by faculty and is something that students can take advantage of. The Laboratory is an open space, and he fought very hard to make sure there weren't restrictions on the kind of work they do that would make it not friendly to students. He thought the reason he's at the Lab, and the reason it's very exciting, is that dynamic of having students and post-docs come and remake the Laboratory on a very regular basis. That makes it a very exciting place to be. It's a Laboratory that is engaged in many important problems that the country is facing, particularly energy efficiency and the environment. The Lab does everything from having autonomous drones go out into the ocean to look at carbon concentration to a major discovery, which he was optimistic will be the next Nobel Prize, by Saul Perlmutter, who looked out into the universe and was able to determine that the universe is expanding. While that was understood by Hubble, they didn't know the universe was accelerating its expansion. That means there's an energy they don't know about. The estimate of that energy before this observation and after observation was off by a factor of 10^{128} , one of the worst mistakes physics has ever made. And that's generating new and exciting work. It's a very lively and interesting place, and welcoming to people, and very important, he thought, to the campus.

Mr. Shank said he's a professor on campus as well as the leader of the Lab, and he has, after nine years, just resigned as Director because he wanted to get back to doing science and being part of the campus life. But he's greatly enjoyed his 15 years there, and he thought it was really unique, and really an advantage for them at Berkeley, and he was delighted the GA had an interest in it. His only trepidation is coming to talk to them about it on April 1st. Ms. Quindel called for any questions.

Ms. Ahn asked how the USA Patriot Act affected the composition of researchers and national origin restrictions. Mr. Shank said there are no national origin restrictions, and they have people at the Lab from all over the world; and one-third of the people who work in the Lab are from different parts of the world. That's one of the most exciting things about it. When people visit the Lab, he explains that this is a place where they can have world science, which is open, and everything is published, and it's work that is very much synergistic with what goes on at the campus, and they welcome people from all over the world. It's a very important, real value that the Lab brings. There was a time, after World War II where they thought they knew all the science there was in the world. They only understand a few percent of all scientific research taking place in the world, so it's important to take advantage places like this Laboratory that are welcome to the whole world.

Ms. Ahn said she wondered if the Lab was out of compliance in terms of policies the campus set out that would not necessarily work with the Laboratory, and asked about concern over research done at the Lab. Mr. Shank said he wanted to make very, very clear that the Lawrence Berkeley Lab is not Lawrence Livermore and was not Los Alamos, which are two separate laboratories, which have a weapons mission. Lawrence Berkeley does not, and has open, academic science. In fact, all of the conflict of interest and ethics requirements are same as on campus. He worked very hard to do that. He looks to the campus if there are problems with conflict of interest, human use, or animal studies, they work with the campus. So there is no distinguishing as a result the kind of work they do. He wanted to make clear that this was a very different kind of organization, and Livermore and Los Alamos have different responsibilities. One of his frustrations as a laboratory is seen in story he often tells of a tourist coming up to the Laboratory, getting out of the bus, looking out of the beautiful hills, and saying how he didn't how you could see the Golden Gate Bridge from Livermore. It's confusing because there are many things with Lawrence's name on it, and to try to distinguish themselves, they call it the "Berkeley Lab." But it really doesn't work, and he has even been introduced by the President of the University as the Director of Lawrence Livermore. It was a slip of the tongue, and it's something the Berkeley Lab deals with all the time. But he wanted the GA to know that this Lab does scientific work of real value to the academic environment. There's no distinction made, and work students do is publishable, and there are no restrictions other than they want to have this at the very highest quality, with the highest level of ethics. They work with eight or ten different departments, or more, on campus. They try to be open and welcoming to all.

Ms. Madon said that one goal of the GA is diversity, and the LBNL has fewer restrictions in that it doesn't have Prop. 209 to regulate who comes in. She asked what initiatives and efforts they've had to increase diversity. Mr. Shank said his first 20 years of experience was at Bell Laboratories, where he had a very successful diversity program, and they had people from all parts of the community. He came there with the idea that this Laboratory should be open. Taxpayers pay for what goes on, and everybody should feel represented and be part of the Lab. He found an institution that loves to intellectualize about diversity, but to actually take real steps, they're doing wonderful things and have partnerships with Jackson State, and historically black universities. They run a summer job program and bring 50 to 100 students from all parts of the community. But they haven't done a very good job of actually hiring. So three years ago he said that he didn't want to leave as his legacy the fact that they've made such little progress. They're in legal compliance, but that wasn't good enough. So he created the Best Practices Council, which actively looks at other places in the country to see how they do affirmative action and create a diverse workforce.

Mr. Shank said there are a couple of things they're doing. They work with local community colleges. There aren't enough African American high energy physicists, but there are many other jobs. The Lab works with local colleges to have a school-to-work program, where if students attend a local school, work with the Lab, and complete their degree, they'd have a guaranteed job. This has worked out to be fantastic, and these are

some of their most highly motivated people. They've been through the school of hard knocks, are a little older, and are extremely grateful to have a job. He's received more positive feedback from that program than any other. At the same time, he's created fellowship programs and other programs that would bring more black scientists to the Laboratory. He invited the Society of Black Physicists to the Laboratory, and that was a wonderful opportunity. He brought the local group to the Lab and it was a terrific interaction. So they have visibility and should be doing much better in the future. But at this point, it's not easy. Prop. 209 does not apply to the Lab, and they don't behave as if it does. They do what they want in this area, and an important principle of his was to make this Laboratory available to all.

A Delegate asked if he could talk about the pros and cons of Berkeley running the Labs versus not running them in the future. Mr. Shank said that at the Laboratory they have up on the hill, there's \$500 million worth of research that comes to Berkeley, and over 1,000 Berkeley students take advantage of the Laboratory. And another 3-400 students from all around the country come to the Laboratory. This Laboratory is the envy of every university in the country, and they'd love to have it. So on the positive side, they get an enormous benefit. He's taken the view over the time he's been Laboratory Director that the Laboratory is not there in isolation and didn't really need to be there unless it's an absolute benefit to the Berkeley campus. He's worked very hard to help recruit some of the best scientists in the world to come to Berkeley to be a part of their science faculty, in Math, Physics, and Engineering, and they've been very successful in doing that. So that's the very strong, positive side. It takes energy, effort, and dedication to run one of these labs, so there's an opportunity cost that the University has in running the Laboratory. But he looks at running this Laboratory as having many upsides and very few downsides that he could see.

Mr. Vaughan said he was big on grassroots operations and getting people there. He asked how open Mr. Shank and the facility were to accommodating middle school kids to come up there for a day and checking out the nano world. He asked if that was available, and if the Lab caters to young minds like that. Mr. Shank said they absolutely do. He'd tell them about "nano high." They have an emerging science where ethical, health, and other issues will be raised, and he believed the most important thing they could do is inform the public of what the Lab is doing. After such books as "Prey," and others, people were frightened, and the reality is more interesting than a book or movie. To make this something that people in the region know about, they've invited people from all over the region. It amazes him that kids from Berkeley and all around the area come up on a Saturday, and 300 kids listen to a lecture on nanoscience. Their parents can't fit in the room because it's filled with kids, and have to go to another room to watch the event on video. The Lab works with school systems all over the region. Berkeley was one of the more difficult to get started with was Berkeley, and they've now done that. Oakland has welcomed them with open arms, and at one point the Lab wrote the scientific academic plan for Oakland. The Lab has a very strong presence working with people in Oakland. He's been to several Oakland schools, trying to provide resources. The funding and capability of these schools was pathetic. The State was not living up to what the needs are. The Lab works closely with Vallejo schools. So it serves as a resource for the

entire region. Staff give lectures at local schools and show demonstrations. But they welcome kids from El Cerrito, Richmond, and Oakland, and a number of students from those different schools get jobs in the summer. The Lab has other open programs and has an open house every two years, filled with kids from all over the country. The Laboratory thinks this is a very important part of what they do, to let people know what it is. It's not a place that's sealed off and it's open to everybody. If grads have kids who want to see some of the stuff going on, they should let him know, and he'd help them set that up.

Ms. Williams asked where funding comes from for the Lab. Mr. Shank said the Laboratory was originally created as part of the Atomic Energy Commission, now the Department of Energy. Roughly 80% of the Lab's money, a little less, comes from the Department of Energy; 12-13% comes from the National Institute of Health; and a small percentage comes from industry and from a little work they do with NSF. But primarily, it's the DOE, which owns the facilities there.

A Delegate asked how much research is determined by their funders. When Lab staff make research decisions, the question was how much was in response to the DOE and other funders and how much was decided by the Lab's staff. Mr. Shank said it's often thought that he receives a big pot of money and doles it out, and he would love to have that job. However, the fact is that they have to compete for everything. There isn't one dime that's given to the Lab. However, because UC sees a real value in this Lab, they don't take a fee for running it. They return it to him, a small amount, less than 1% of what they do at the Lab. He uses that money to build new partnerships start new things. He tries to start new research efforts, ideas they couldn't expect to come from people in Washington, who are basically bureaucrats, and who aren't expected to come up with new ideas for research. So even though they respond competitively to opportunities, they also go out and create those opportunities and new ways of getting people involved in science. They help people develop new initiatives that ultimately benefit the Lab. So even though he says it's all competitive, they also play a large role in stirring things up and making sure new scientific advances are possible.

Ms. Williams asked if there was any connection to pharmaceutical companies. Mr. Shank said a few of them have supported cooperative research agreements and the Lab has done work with some of those companies. Some pharmaceutical companies use the Lab's structural biology tools at the Advanced Light Source. It's a relatively tiny part of what they do. Some have good science going on in a number of those companies, and the Lab tries to work where real science was happening. He had a philosophy that the goal of The Laboratory is not to get money into the Lab, but to do the best possible science and support the best scientists, and create value for the University. So they pick and choose what they do. They don't do things that would necessarily just bring money into the Lab, and they want a requirement they be involved with the best science.

Ms. Quindel said she would like to thank Mr. Shank for attending the meeting. (Applause) Mr. Shank said he wanted to thank the GA for the opportunity to speak with them.

Ms. Quindel asked people to please clean up their area and take fliers back to their departments, and keep people informed on what the GA is doing. She would also ask people to make sure they vote in ASUC's elections, April 13-15, and to vote for people who support Delegates and whatever Delegates think their interests are. The most important thing was to get people in their departments to vote, hopefully in one of the last years that grads will be able to vote in ASUC elections. She asked them to please take the time to vote, and asked who could not get 10 people to vote, which would mean they'd get 200 people to vote. GA elections will occur next month, at the May 6 GA meeting. If people were interested in running for any position, she would ask them to please contact the GA. They want to get candidates informed. They have exciting leadership positions available. She's graduating, as are many others there. At the May meeting they'll also have another special guest speaker, Prof. Chapela, who will talk about his tenure battle and about some of the free speech issues and corporate control of research that are going on. She wanted to thank Delegates for coming to the meeting.

This meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

Present at the GA Meeting of April 1, 2004

African Diaspora Studies, Zoe Franklin	Architecture, Romi
Sanyal	
Bioengineering, Carmel Levitan	Economics, Paul Chen
Economics, Vivian Hwa	History, Matthew
Sargent	
Sociology, Kristen Gray	Anthropology, David
Cohen	
Bioengineering, Matt Eckerle	Chemical
Engineering, Lola Odusanya	
Chemistry, David Garcia	Education, Charles
Hammond	
Energy & Resources, Fanta Kamakate	ESPM, Josh Fisher
ESPM, Peter Oboyski	Geography,
Jason Strange	
History, Candace Chen	History of Art, Jessen Kelly
Law, Funmi Olorunnipa	Law, Rishi Sharma
Logic & the Methodology of Science, Johanna Franklin	Mathematics,
Peter Gerdes	
MCB, Kathryn McElroy	Physics, Matthijs
Randsdorp	
Physics, Miguel Daal	Physics, Trevor
Lanting	
Political Science, Darius Ornston	Public Policy,
Allison Cole	
Public Policy, Anat Shenker	Sociology, Maria
Hollowell-Fuentes	
Officer, COD, Mo Kashmiri	Officer, President,
Jessica Quindel	
Officer, VPAA, Temina Madon	ASUC Representative,
Bahar Khanjari	
Officer, VPEA, Dawn Williams	Staff, Bus. Director,
Nzingha Dugas	
Staff, Dept. Liaison, Chris Cantor	Staff, Events Coord.,
Tiffany Crawford	
Staff, Funding, Shayla Moore	Staff, GSSP, Wendy
Davis	
Staff, Legislative Liaison, Claudia Medina	