

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

April 1, 2010

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

Announcements

Viola Tang, ASUC Senator, reported for the ASUC. The Senate passed a bill, In Support of ASUC Divestment from War Crimes, to divest from two companies that provide military equipment to Israel. There was five hours of public comment. But that past week the ASUC President vetoed the bill, which will be considered again at the April 14 Senate meeting. Also, the Senate will approve the final language of the BEARS Initiative that will appear on the ballot. In addition, the Berkeley Census Coordinator wanted to remind people to fill out the census, since students filling it out would mean more State funding.

Vinit Sukhija, ASUC Elections Council Chair, said ASUC elections will begin on Tuesday, with the BEARS Initiative on the ballot. In the past, grads have played spoiler in critical fee referendums, so it was important for them to vote.

Speakers from the Coalition for a Strong UC said there will be a ballot initiative in November that would replace the two-thirds vote that was needed to pass the California budget with a simple majority. The Coalition hoped the GA was open to working with them.

The Grad Social Club was putting on the Boat Cruise on April 24, for \$10, leaving from Oakland, from 8:00 to 11 p.m. Six hundred and fifty people could attend.

An announcement was made of almost 10% of EECS grads suffering from credit card fraud over Spring Break. They're trying to convince people on the Committee on Campus Security to send out a University-wide e-mail.

Resolution

By unanimous voice-vote, 1003e was approved, Resolution on a By-law Amendment to Rename the Technology Committee to the Communications Committee.

GA Elections

The procedure for elections was to have nominations, hear statements, ask questions, and then to ask the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. Officers and members of the Grad Council were also responsible for attending meetings of the Exec Board. Terms start July 1.

Mary Hamblin was elected as Budget Officer.

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts

In deciding what should be supported in this budget crisis, grads were at the top of everybody's list.

Graduate fees have gone up and up, and undergraduate fees even more so. But the reality was that the quality of the education and the opportunities that were available were superb.

Government was unbelievably dysfunctional in terms of the two-thirds vote said to pass the budget and taxes.

It was felt that student fees, for undergrads specifically, could go up substantially more before getting to the tipping point. There was intense interest in preserving access, and they were doing reasonably well. But it was a worry.

For federal support, California got far fewer tax dollars than it paid in, maybe 55-70-75%. Population statistics were quite good, with relatively fat growth in high school graduates, which was one place UC hung its hat. But even if that was flat, if a rising part of that high school population got increasingly educationally gifted, then even without a rising number of high school graduates there would be an increasing population that could benefit from higher education. UC keeps its eye on that kind of thing all the time.

Two-thirds of the population believed that higher education was really the way forward for the country. But people don't want taxes or fees. As for taking a stand on ballot initiatives or legislative proposals, e.g., UC was very strategic as far as what it supported.

For professional degree fees, he looks at fees and would probably send some requests back if they weren't justified. OP kind of vets plans, but deans were responsible.

GA Elections (cont'd)

An election was held for Campus Affairs VP. It was about 20 hours a week.

Report from the Lower Sproul Student Council

ASUC elections will be held next week, and people will vote on the BEARS Initiative. If passed, a Fee Committee, with a majority of students, would be established. There would be a legally binding MOU with the campus. Three programs were guaranteed: a graduate student center, a multicultural community center, and a 24-hour study area. In a year or two the Career Center would move right across the street from Eshleman. Anthony Hall would be renovated and an endowment for the building would be established, to fund ongoing building operations. Both Mr. Guzmán and Mr. Daal have put in a tremendous amount of work on this.

GA Elections (cont'd)

Connie Wun was elected the next Campus Affairs Vice President.

Michael Nicholas was elected Budget Officer.

For Project Coordinator Liaison, a question was raised regarding Projects not necessarily following the same accountability structure as other GA initiatives, with guaranteed funding for a certain number of events. It was suggested that Projects be more visible to the GA and the larger campus community.

Tacuma Peters was elected Project Coordinator Liaison.

Report from the Funding Committee

The Ad Hoc Funding Committee will meet next month, to consider funding policy for the GA.

GA Elections (cont'd)

Committee chairs had a small budget and they were expected to go to Executive Board meetings, to two GA retreats, and to give Officer reports.

Jordan Zachritz was elected Chair of the Environmental Sustainability Committee.

Brad Froehle was elected Chair of the Communications Committee.

Dhawal Mujumdar was elected International Student Affairs Chair.

The GA had three representatives to the Graduate Council, an Academic Senate Committee of faculty in charge of setting policy for grad students, including curriculum, degree requirements, maternity leave, and health benefits. It has 14 faculty members and three graduate students.

The GA elected Graduate Council representatives: Samveg Saxena, Aleks Polosikhina, and Kfir Cohen, with Nick Kohut as the Alternate.

REPORTS

Yomaira Figueroa, Project Coordinator for the Empowering Women of Color Conference, said the event was held March 13-14. About 500 women attended the two-day event.

Resolution

By voice-vote, the GA approved Resolution 1002e, On Directed Action In Support of Securing a Space on Campus for the Berkeley Student Food Collective. It would have GA reps on the Store Operations Board vote to prioritize space being provided to the Berkeley Student Food Collective, bypassing the RFP process, recognizing the student Food Collective as an exceptional circumstance.

Report from the Budget Officer

Mr. Rajan reported as Budget Chair. The GA has certain sources of revenue, the main one being student fees. Grads pay \$27.50 per semester to the GA, totaling \$420,000. The GA has also received \$50,000

from a beverage contract with Coca-Cola, commercial money that could be spent for things student fees couldn't be spent on, such as alcohol.

Their savings account was \$104,000. Reserves were \$476,000, about the size of their operating budget.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 4 -

This year everybody was taking a cut of about 13%. The amounts were: \$68,000 for Executive Officers; \$115,000 going to Projects; \$4,000 to committees; \$113,000 to funding, which was a big problem; \$29,000 to IT infrastructure; \$68,000 to Business Office or overhead; \$31,000 for dues and the agreements, including ASUC election costs and UCSA fees; and \$30,000 in contingencies.

The operating budget was \$435,000: reserves, \$100,000; commercial reserves, \$372,000; savings, \$104,000. From the savings account that year they'd borrow around \$54,000 to balance the budget. The budget has very deep cuts. Executive Offices took a 16% cut. Committees took the biggest cut, 30%. Funding was cut 13%.

The projected budget for next year was 25% for student group funding; 25% for projects; 15% on the Business Office; 6% on IT; 15% for Executive Offices; 1%, committees; 7%, dues and agreements; and 6%, contingencies and reserves.

An Action Agenda Item, headed by Ms. Zohar, will consider changes in future budgets.

The GA was negotiating with the ASUC to have the manager's payroll completely supported, \$20,000. There was also work to grow an endowment.

There were 120 student groups that registered last year, and 149 this year.

Report from the Campus Affairs Vice President

Mr. Marchand reported. For the graduate survey, there were over 2,000 responses. The Selection Committee for the Faculty Mentorship Award made its selections, and the ceremony will be April 28.

Resolution Referral

The following Resolutions were referred to committee:

1004a, To Create an Action Agenda Item Focused on Restructuring the Graduate Assembly Budget.

1004b, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement.

1004c, In Support of the Coalition for a Strong UC at UC Berkeley.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:35 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

Announcements

- 5 -

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daal said the first announcement was from Viola Tang, reporting for the ASUC. Ms. Tang said the Senate considered a bill, In Support of ASUC Divestment from War Crimes. The bill was to divest from, but wasn't against, Israel. The Senate heard five hours of public comment at the Senate meeting and eventually passed the bill 16-4. However, that past week ASUC President Will Smelko decided to veto the bill. So it will be considered again at the next Senate meeting, April 14. She would recommend that people come out, find out what the bill was about, and talk about this issue. If the GA wanted to take a different stance than the ASUC, they'd need to inform the Senate of that.

Ms. Tang said the MOU for the Lower Sproul redevelopment project was being considered at that time. The Senate will have a meeting on Sunday evening, at 6 p.m. to approve the final language to appear on the ballot. This issue will also impact graduate students in coming years. She also wanted to make an announcement for Joe Lee, the Census Coordinator for the Berkeley City Council, who wanted to ask people to help outreach graduate students and remind everyone to fill out the census. For every student who fills it out, it meant \$10,000 from the State in funding to UC over the next 10 years.

Ms. Tang said she would like to yield time to Vinit Sukhija, the ASUC Elections Council Chair. Mr. Sukhija introduced himself and said it was his job to run the elections, which the ASUC holds every spring. If they've been on Sproul over the past few days, they've seen people campaigning really hard. The election will take place next Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Voting begins at 9 a.m. on April 6. The election Web site is election@asuc.org. Voting will go until 11:59 p.m. on April 8.

Mr. Sukhija said there was a really important Initiative on the ballot, the BEARS Initiative, which he's sure they all heard about. He wanted to thank Mr. Daal for doing a lot of hard work on it. In the past, graduate students have played spoiler, in either the passage or failure of critical fee referendums, so it was critically important that graduate students come out to vote that year. There are five polling stations on campus, and one off-campus. The five on campus were at Sproul, Dwight, Kroeber, Evans, and GPB. The one off-campus site will be at Crossroads. He called for any questions.

Mr. Froehle asked if people could vote over AirBears. Mr. Sukhija said that voting wasn't allowed via AirBears. But this year, because they have fewer polling locations from last year, voting will be allowed via AirBears from Moffitt, Doe, and the main stacks.

Ms. Tang said she would encourage all of them to vote in the upcoming elections that year. There were a lot of things the ASUC and the GA could do together. It was important to tell their friends and people in their departments about what was going on, and to encourage them to vote.

Mr. Rajan asked if there was any idea of how much the elections will cost that year. Mr. Sukhija said that because they reduced a lot of polling stations that year, he thought the estimate now was about \$20,000; and their budget is \$40,000. So they hope to save to save around \$20,000 on the budget.

Mr. Klein asked if he knew the historic ratio between electronic and in-person voting. Mr. Sukhija said they did. It's something they've talked a lot about in the ASUC Senate. Last year, 90% voted online, and 10% voted at polling stations. That's why they felt the need to reduce polling stations, since they were a bit too costly and no one was voting at them. Traditionally, it usually rains during elections, so people don't come out to polling stations as much.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was from Jonathan Stein and Seth Garz. Mr. Stein introduced himself and said he's a graduate student in the School of Public Policy there and is the head of a new student group, the Coalition for a Strong UC. It's leading the campaign across the campus and hopefully across all UC campuses. The campaign is Restore the Majority, Restore the UC. It's focused on educating students about ballot initiatives on the November, 2010 ballot that would eliminate the two-thirds super majority requirement for passing the budget in California. It would replace that with a simple majority required to pass the budget. The effect of that would be for spending decisions in California to finally be made by the Democratic majority, which supports higher education instead of the conservative minority, which refuses to support higher education. The message to students was that the most important vote people could cast for the future of the UC System was for a ballot initiative that people knew nothing about. He had some information sheets to explain what they're doing and how people could contact the group. He'd also pass around a sign-up sheet in case people wanted to know more information or wanted to get involved. Mr. Stein said it was said that there was a lot of talk around campus about how the Regents were to blame for UC's problems, or how Mark Yudoff was to blame. It was the group's position that these were exercises in scapegoating. In reality, the problem was California's highly dysfunctional system of government. They have all these incredibly screwy provisions in the California Constitution that sets them up to fail. They have Prop. 13, which limits property tax revenues; they have gerrymandered districts that elect politicians from the extremes; they have some of the longest term limits in the country, which doesn't allow politicians an opportunity to get to know each other and build coalitions; and then they have the initiative system that often creates unfunded mandates and other crazy laws approved by voters that then had to be budgeted and paid for by politicians. All of those things, although problematic, were hugely popular with voters, and there was very little chance they'd ever be changed. But there's one additional provision that was particularly lacking and wasn't so popular, the fact that they had to pass a budget with two-thirds support in both the Assembly and in the Senate. That meant the majority vote during budget season falls just short of 66%. And then there had to be horse trading, and people to bend, corrupt, or compromise their vision to get a couple of votes from the minority.

Mr. Stein said that this has two impacts. First, it was simply anti-democratic, where 14 of 40 Senators in the California State Senate could block anything from happening. But most importantly, it hurts higher education every year. In last year's budget, the Democratic majority wanted to cut \$1.2 billion from the prison budget and put it towards higher education and social services. But since they fell short of the 66% majority requirement, they went to the Republicans to do horse trading to get two more votes in the Senate and four more votes in the Assembly. To do that, they had to scrap the plan and put the money back towards prisons.

There are three initiatives currently trying to get on the November ballot that would reduce the majority requirement to pass a budget from two-thirds to 50%. The Coalition for a Strong UC supports all three initiatives. It was waiting to see which of the three will eventually make the ballot. If people sign up with the Coalition, they could keep people updated, and hopefully Delegates will let people know about this across campus why this was important and why students should vote for these initiatives. He hoped the GA was open to working with them.

Mr. Marchand asked if international and out-of-State students could also sign the petition. Mr. Stein said they had to be a registered voter in California. The campaign run by his group, the Coalition for a Strong UC, wasn't in the process of gathering signatures. They don't want students to be free labor for these campaigns, but they want to have a share in guiding the campaigns and want to be the student outreach arm so they have a voice and so people know that students will have made this a reality. He wanted to thank them very much for their time.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 7 -

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was about the Boat Cruise, from the Grad Social Club. Alex Baer said he and Ashley Russell were the two new GSC Coordinators. They were hoping to get Delegates to help publicize the boat cruise on April 24. Last year many of them were probably on the cruise. They're increasing the cost by \$10 that year, but they're also adding another hour, and will leave from Oakland, making it more convenient. They could have up to 650 people on the boat, which was a lot. It's a pretty substantial cost they've already had to pay, so they hope to sell out the cruise. So hopefully Delegates could talk to their friends about this and tell them to go to the GA Web page for a link to directly buy tickets, from the Grad Social Club page.

A Delegate asked if one had to be a grad student to go on the cruise. Mr. Baer said they didn't, and just had to be at least 21, as there will be an open bar for three hours. The cruise will be from 8:00 to 11 p.m., on April 24.

Mr. Daal asked when tickets will go on sale. Mr. Baer said it will be Monday or Tuesday. Mr. Daal asked how long it took last year for tickets to sell out. Mr. Baer said they sold out in three hours. Ms. Russell said they had an event that week and huge numbers of people signed up to get on the list. So she thought it will be fine in terms of selling out, but they just wanted to make sure everybody knew about this.

Mr. Baer said they'll send something to Mr. Daal with a timeframe on when tickets will go on sale. It will be a lot of fun.

Mr. Daal called for any other announcements. A Delegate said she was on the Committee on Campus Security and Privacy and was in the EECS Department. Almost 10% of EECS graduate students have suffered from credit card fraud over Spring Break. They're trying to convince people on the Committee on Campus Security that a University-wide e-mail should be sent out, and she was told that there were "coincidences." But 10% simultaneously suffering from credit card fraud in her Department was a big "coincidence." She would ask people in other departments to talk to people and for people to check their credit card and debit card statements over the last two weeks, and to call the Berkeley PD and tell them about any suspicious behavior. There is an officer and a detective on this case. A Delegate said he heard about this happening at in the Law School as well.

Mr. Daal said the GA could include information on this in their University-wide e-mail, a sentence or something. Dean Szeri said he was going to suggest including this information in the April e-Grad message.

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was from Joe Lee, the Census Coordinator for the City of Berkeley. Mr. Lee introduced himself and said he brought material for people to look at, "How People are Counted" brochures for the 2010 census. He brought some gifts for people for participating, including some bags with a message about the 2010 census in multiple languages. He would like to thank the GA for its

efforts in educating the entire community about the census. They expect people to fill out the form and mail it back. He would ask people to please visit his Web site, census2010.berkeley.edu.

Mr. Daal called for any final announcements, and seeing none, said they would move on.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Approval of the Agenda and the Minutes

- 8 -

Resolution 1003e, On a By-law Amendment to Rename the Technology Committee to the Communications Committee

Mr. Daal said there was a request to amend the agenda. Ms. Chavez moved to add the EWOC report. Mr. Froehle moved to re-arrange the agenda to have item 6b, a By-law amend, to be considered immediately after item 1. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Ortega said he would like to add a Resolution to Resolution Referral, for the Restore the Majority Campaign. Mr. Daal said that would be 1004c, if people allow it, In Support of the Coalition for a Strength UC, at UC Berkeley.

Mr. Daal said he would like to add to the agenda a report from the CAVP.

Mr. Daal said he would like to roll all those proposed amendments into one vote. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Daal called for a motion to approve the minutes from the March meeting. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 4, 2010 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Resolution 1003e

The following Resolution, 1003e, was authored by Mr. Froehle:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO RENAME THE TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE TO THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has had a Technology Committee for many years; and

WHEREAS, technology within the Graduate Assembly is primarily used to communicate internally and with the campus at large; and

WHEREAS, the Technology Committee, having recently focused on improving the Graduate Assembly's ability to communicate effectively, would be more accurately described as the Communications Committee; and

WHEREAS, recruiting for a Communications Committee would likely be easier;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly By-laws be modified so that section 4.15.5, currently "Committees & Workgroups: Jurisdiction: Technology," reads:

4.15.5 Communications. The Communications Committee shall advise the Graduate Assembly on effective ways to communicate both internally and with the larger campus community. It shall identify appropriate ways to inform, solicit feedback, and foster dialog on significant institutional issues. It shall make recommendations on new opportunities and technologies to enhance internal and external communications. It shall establish policies that govern the use of and placement of content on the

Resolution 1003e, On a By-law Amendment to Rename the Technology Committee to the
Communications Committee (cont'd)

- 9 -

GA Elections

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO RENAME THE TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
TO THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE (cont'd)

Graduate Assembly's Web site and other electronic presences. It shall also establish policies that govern the use of other Graduate Assembly technology. It shall work, on behalf of the Graduate Assembly, with any entity or individual that provides support for the Graduate Assembly's communications or technology.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly By-laws be modified so that the mention of "Technology Committee" in section 4.1 is replaced with "Communications Committee."

Mr. Froehle said that as Delegates knew, the GA has had a Technology Committee for several years. He thought it was now kind of a dated committee, and its functions didn't really match up with its name that year. They're trying to focus more on communications, so he authored a bill to actually rename the committee to the "Communications Committee," to sort of accomplish the role they've taken on that year, and the role he hoped the Committee will take on in future years. They're working to do things like help publicize the GA, so maybe they'll have a Facebook page and help write content for the GA Web site. He thought this would fit naturally into technology because communications these days really was technologically focused.

Mr. Marchand said he handed out part of the results of the survey of graduate students, and they'd see that there were a lot of suggestions about doing better outreach to graduates. That's what Mr. Froehle was trying to do. Mr. Marchand said he was trying to find someone to chair the Communications Committee.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no further discussion, they'd come to a vote. As this was a By-law amendment, approval would require a two-thirds majority.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1003e PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE,
RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO RENAME THE TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
TO THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE.

GA ELECTIONS

Mr. Daal said he would go over elections procedure. They'll first have a nomination period, with the nominees to have a chance to make a case for their candidacy and speak for a couple of minutes on how they'd handle the office. Delegates will then have an opportunity to question candidates. After that, candidates will then be asked to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. The candidates will then be invited back in the room and the winner will be announced. They'll proceed until the scheduled speaker arrives, when they'd interrupt the elections.

Mr. Daal the first election to take place was for the Funding Committee Chair.

A Delegate nominated Mary Hamblin. Mr. Daal called for any other nominations, and hearing none, said nominations were closed. He asked Ms. Hamblin to say a few words about herself and what she planned

Resolution 1003e, On a By-law Amendment to Rename the Technology Committee to the Communications Committee (cont'd) - 9 -

GA Elections

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts

on doing. Ms. Whelan said she was a representative from Geography, having just joined the GA that semester. She thought that chairing the Funding Committee would be an easy and important way to get involved in the GA. Funding was important in promoting community on and around campus and she was interested in distributing funds in an equitable way.

Mr. Daal called for any questions.

Mr. Kramer asked what she meant by distributing funds in an "equitable" way. There have been fights about that in the past, and he asked what her thoughts were on that. Ms. Hamblin said she knew there were a few different arrangements on how to deal with the problem of equity, so she wanted to talk to people who actually served on the Funding Committee and have gone through the process of submitting funding proposals, and see what they thought from their experiences was the best way to move forward. The Delegate asked if she didn't have thoughts on this already. Ms. Whelan said she's only talked to Mr. Tahir, so she would be interested in talking to others to get a clearer idea of what was going on.

Mr. Ellsworth asked where she was in her program. Ms. Whelan said she'll graduate in 2012.

Seeing no further questions, Mr. Daal asked the candidate to step out of the room for a discussion and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Daal asked to have the candidate returned to the room and said he would like to congratulate Ms. Hamblin for being elected Funding Committee Chair. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said he would like to remind everybody that the positions for next year start on July 1.

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts

Mr. Daal said he would like to introduce Systemwide Provost Lawrence Pitts. Mr. Pitts said he would like to thank the GA for allowing him to visit them. He didn't have any specific prepared remarks and was free to get chewed on, talked to, or asked questions. The Graduate Dean, Prof. Szeri, sent him some information about the program at Berkeley and was clearly incredibly impressive. It had to be if not the best, then one of the best general graduate programs in the entire world. It was kind of the heart of the University.

Mr. Pitts said that about five years or so ago, when he sat on the Board of Regents as Chair of the State-wide Academic Senate, there was sort of a little minor budget dip, compared the chasm they were facing currently. In deciding what things ought to be supported, graduate students were at the top of everybody's list. It was accepted by the Regents and everybody else that graduate education was really the heart and soul of the education and the research engine of the University. So there's a ton of people in grads' corner. There wasn't enough money, but clearly it was understood that graduate education was central.

Mr. Pitts said UC, over its life, has been in a constant growth mode. Education has grown with the State. With some ups and downs, the State has largely been very generous to the University of California, to the

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts (cont'd)

- 11 -

point where every campus can't think in other than a growth mode. A growth mode allowed things to be shaped in very useful ways. If some arena or niche was becoming less important somehow in the eyes of the public or the world, the discipline could still be held sort of steady while other things grew that needed to grow. And UC campuses have shaped themselves and evolved over time. It's so much easier to hold something steady while in a growth mode. In a no-growth mode, things can't grow in one area without shrinking other areas, and was a lot harder. So even when there have been slow downs in the growth of various campuses, every single campus has stressed the need for growth in graduate education.

Mr. Pitts said it's easy for grads to imagine people not fully appreciating what they do, and from day-to-day, they're probably confident nobody appreciated what they do. But that really wasn't true. Among other things, their bosses, by and large, couldn't live without them. So the importance and the desire to continue to support graduate students was really one of the very high imperatives within UC.

With that said, Mr. Pitts said there are budget problems. Some graduate programs, because of the cost for students, have had to limit, slow, or reduce the number of students, and the System was tremendously sad about that. But given the amount of money that flows to any given program, some adjustments clearly had to be made. It's not because UC wanted to do that, but it was to kind of balance the books and pay the paychecks of everybody who stays. It was just kind of budget reality.

Mr. Pitts said graduate fees have gone up and up, and undergraduate fees even more so. They've hit a point where next fall, the Education Fee will be the same for undergraduates and graduate students. He could promise them that every campus he's visited and talked to administrators and students, and they were all very upset with the amount that graduate student fees cost, as departments had to pay that in addition to other support for graduate students. That was very appropriate, but it was a substantial amount. These fees are high, and departments weren't sure how they could pay them.

When Gov. Schwarzenegger first became Governor, he hired a Director of Finance who had just sliced the heart out of education in Florida. She seemed like a good person to come and sort of control California's education, a slash-and-burn lady. At that time, she concluded that since graduate students had a chance to make more money when they got out of their studies, she would go after graduate education. She restricted the amount of money UC could steer to graduate fees. So grads were really a targeted group in terms of State support to the University, as reflected in support of graduate students.

Mr. Pitts said he was hoping that she was very uncomfortable right now with the fact that they have high graduate student fees. Undergraduate fees have come up to match them, and it wasn't as if graduate fees

were lowered to get them to match to undergrads. This lady would be astonished that people would ever consider charging the same for undergrads as they did for grads. She was sure that grads ought to pay more. So to get graduate fees below undergraduate student fees would be politically very tricky. So departments had to pay the bills for graduate student fees, plus other appropriate support, and had that financial burden.

Mr. Pitts said that students and supporting departments in this circumstance were paying more. At the moment, UC didn't have any other way to balance their books, and they were headed in that direction. With the number of costs coming before the University in the next 5, 7, to 10 years, they had to find a way to balance their books somehow. As a result, students all up and down the line were paying more, and graduate and professional schools were having very substantial fee increases in many instances. Graduate student fees are high, and undergraduate student fees have gone up 30% in the last year and a half.

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts (cont'd)

- 12 -

It wasn't easy telling this to somebody who had to pay the bill, but as expensive as a UC education was, it was still a bargain. He wouldn't try to do that because if it was a bargain, it was a very expensive one. But the reality was that the quality of the education and the opportunities that were available were superb. He thought people in the room would attest to that. So UC really hated this solution a lot, but that was sort of what they were faced with.

Mr. Pitts said the student demonstrations on campus were directed in a whole bunch of ways. But as time has gone on, they were being increasingly directed at State government. Government which was unbelievably dysfunctional in terms of the two-thirds law for revenue enhancement, or in other English, "taxes." More than half the public would support higher taxes for many things, including for education. But the way the State tax system worked, it took a two-thirds vote, which was almost impossible. A 60% vote was doable in many instances, but two-thirds was really hard. So the State process would be a problem for anybody trying to be Governor, just because of the minority-rule circumstances. So student fees were too high. UC really didn't like to do that.

Mr. Pitts said that Mr. Daal was sitting as a member of the UC Commission on the Future, particularly the Size and Shape Work Group, dealing with how big the University should be and what it should look like. These were serious, fundamental questions that they'll have to think about as they look at the University and how to preserve its quality at that time of reduced public support. This wasn't just the case in California, but across the country, and was also true of the national universities of Japan and Europe, which were also receiving less and less public support.

So the question was what UC should do over the next X period of years to keep the quality that was unquestionably at the moment very near the top. Mr. Pitts said these are issues they had to deal with while current grads finish their degrees and hone their research projects and the teaching they do. UC was lucky to have them there. And they're sorry they had to charge students so much, but UC, at the moment, didn't have any easy solution to this very unfortunate circumstance. With that cheery note, Mr. Pitts said he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Kohut asked how much he thought the increased fees would increase the quality of graduate education. Mr. Pitts said he had no idea of how to answer that question. One question that has come up in terms of how to pay for things was whether they should take some schools that had a very high demand and allow those campuses to charge more, with Berkeley charging more than Merced or Riverside. The judgment from several different groups has been that right now, student fees were weighted lower in the

aggregate across the campus, so right now there was no interest. There's discussion about, but no composite interest, in charging different fee. It's felt that student fees, for undergrads specifically, could go up substantially more before getting to the tipping point where students say they couldn't afford it and decided to take a different educational path. Fees went up 30% that year. Undergraduate applications went up about 15%; and transfer applications went up 25%. So they have not, with this terrible fee increase, priced themselves out of the market. He wasn't bragging about that and it wasn't a reason to rejoice. But it was kind of a practical fact. If they go up too much, at some point they alter educational plans. If the fees got so high that the only students who could attend had a large amount of money, and the quality started to go down, because superior students wouldn't have the resources, when quality goes down for that reason, then they have very much reached the tipping point and have gone too far. He didn't believe they were there, and hasn't seen any evidence to suggest they were at that point.

Mr. Pitts said he thought they're reacting to the circumstances in a slightly different way. Instead of altering who they take, they're sort of taking fewer. So the reaction was a smaller number of salaries and

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts (cont'd)

- 13 -

support packages in exchange for preserving to a substantial degree the access students have, and trying to take the very best students and make sure the bills were paid. At the moment there was intense interest in preserving access, and so far he thought they were doing reasonably well. But if fees kept going up, that would be a worry, and may get to what the question asked. He didn't think they were there, but it was a worry.

Mr. Ellsworth said they were all worried about short-term stuff, which made sense, but for him, it was also very important to wonder what will happen in a few years. As a student, he would find it much easier to accept fee increases if he knew that the Administration would reduce fees again if the State increased funding increased to make up for the shortfall that UC has been experiencing. He asked if there was any way that could become part of UC's plan to sell fee increases to the students. He thought that would make a big difference, hearing that increases wouldn't be permanent.

Mr. Pitts said he thought it would be a reach to say that they could do that in the abstract. They'd start to hang out expectations. So it wasn't likely they would say that. It was certainly true that historically when the State has been flush, such as at the height of the dot-com bubble, when State income was very high, the State bought out student fees, so fees dropped like a rock in those periods of time. The cost of education was a different, complicated topic. That cost probably won't go down substantially. So the costs had to be met. To the degree that a government, federal or State, puts more money into education, UC would be delighted to pay its bills and not charge so much to the students. To the degree that they could garner resources to help them do that, they would absolutely drop fees. The privates, for instance, with their big endowments, buy out student fees. There's an effort to get more money into endowment funds to cover that same purpose. He thought there were parallels with undergraduate education.

There's a study that shows that in actual dollars spent in providing education for undergraduates at public research universities, the cost per student did not go up between 2002 and 2006. What the students had to write a check for went up tremendously because public funding went down. So they feel like they're being charged more and more and that things weren't being run efficiently. But in point of fact, it was flat for that four-year period. With the budget crises happening throughout public higher education, he thought the cost per student, with efficiencies and getting rid of administrative bloat, trying to get at some of the things they can and should control, he wouldn't be shocked if the cost were a little bit less at this minute. But student fees certainly wouldn't reflect that. It's a trade out of funding rather than an inexorable double-the-inflation rise in the cost of education. It's a rise in the cost of the student or family paying

the bills, but there was a serious intent to do things as efficiently as they could, and to offer a quality product to their students, for them to do well and benefit the State and the country, as UC graduates have done for 100 years.

A Delegate asked if UC has done any economic analysis to determine how much of the fee increases might be obviated by reforming the federal student loan program so changes in interest rate and overall unsubsidized loan availability to students would have fee increases reduced in real dollars by the student rather than in gross dollars in terms of fees paid.

Mr. Pitts said that this change would have all funding come from the feds instead of through middlemen, who take a piece of the action. Ten or so years ago, UC would get about \$300 million out of the loan wallets of students by being the middleman for a big chunk of change. That's been done away with by legislation. So UC could conceivably lose a source of income by this change of the middle man. If students take out loans, the net effect was that the student cost to borrow would go down, at least for those

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts (cont'd)

- 14 -

who use this particular plan. He didn't think that any of the financial aid or the way they calculate need, however need-based aid was awarded, would reflect what the loan cost was. In other words, they would figure a certain portion as work loan, meeting the overall balance of student aid. If anything, the amount of money a student would have to borrow would be the same. It would be cheaper for students to borrow now than before, but it wouldn't be any different in the exchange of money within the University. He wasn't sure he understood the question.

The Delegate said his question was more towards the Obama Administration's plans to reform the federal loan program. He was aware that reforms in past decades for federal loan programs reduced the middleman, and he definitely appreciated that as a student. But he was talking more about perspective changes in policy and how the current proposed cuts might be obviated by potential future changes in federal policy, understanding that in the State of California, they face significant fiscal resource shortages. He asked how their partners at the federal level, through proposed changes to the federal student loan programs might help to solve some of UC's fee angst.

Mr. Pitts said he wasn't sure he knew the answer to the question. He wasn't aware that there were substantive future changes planned in the loan structure program. The newest thing that was passed the other day with the health plan reform bill will have all loans come through the federal government, with overall lower interest rates to the students, which he thought was a fine idea. He wasn't sure if another piece was being talked about.

The Delegate said the change in interest rates to students was a real dollar benefit. Mr. Pitts said it was. What was happening to those savings was that it was staying in the loan realm. He thought part of it came out towards fixing the budget. He thought there was about \$65 billion or \$100 billion in planned reduction of income because the loan fee was about \$90-100 billion, of which he thought about two-thirds will stay in the student aid world. He thought it meant more Pell Grants and other types of things. It was already a done deal. And then those monies will fall in the next decade. He wasn't aware of additional changes.

The Delegate said he thought it would behoove the UC System look at student fees as an entire package rather than placing blame on the State of California or the UC System, and look at how the real cost of education has increased for the students relative to federal and State fiscal issues. That may obviate some

of the blame that was coming to UC and the State Legislature. They could say to people in the State that they have problems, but there have been changes at the federal level that will reduce some of the pain people were feeling as a result of increases to fees, taking credit for something else that Congress has done. It was really making the case for UC.

Mr. Pitts said that just to pursue another piece of this sort of role of the federal government, and what UC would like to see its role be, the federal government puts a ton of money into Pell Grants, which was incredibly important for access to students who need those funds to go to college. Those dollars really just cover the student fee, and there was a cost involved in taking the student, such as teaching them, giving them service, and all the other things. So schools spend the money students bring in as fees, and it really doesn't benefit the growth of infrastructure, new building, and so forth for the University when the government picks up those Pell Grants. Mark Yudoff put forward a proposal. Washington has been tied up with health care and other things, and so they haven't gotten on this yet. But Congressman Miller, from Southern California, has a proposal that would have government consider adding 7%, or 10% payment on top of Pell Grants, so that when a Pell Grant went to a student to pay their fees, 10% would

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts (cont'd)

- 15 -

follow that student to the campus and would go beyond covering the student's cost for the education, but would start to support the infrastructure with the universities that had the most Pell Grant students. It would give something beyond just the fee. That would be a case where the federal government would be doing what the State was doing poorly, supporting infrastructure and maintaining and improving campuses. The states weren't doing that, so that would be a terrific place for the federal government to take a new step in improving physical plant and other parts of education. UC thought that was a fine idea and they were trying to get some traction on it. But this was a different idea that was currently not being pursued. UC would love to see that because they're not sure the State will be able to do that.

Mr. Ortega said that to follow-up on that, Chancellor Birgeneau had a proposal for a combined public/federal/State university system and he asked if Mr. Pitts had any thoughts on the piece the Chancellor wrote on that topic. Mr. Pitts said he remembered the piece that the Chancellor and Frank Yeary put together. He didn't remember all the details and he'd be happy to have somebody comment on it. As he recalled, it was thinking of ideas to put before the federal government to support public higher education. Mr. Pitts said he didn't remember enough of the details to respond.

Mr. Ortega said the Chancellor and Mr. Yeary suggested that top public universities should receive a certain amount of federal dollars, and in return, a higher number of out-of-State students who would go to those schools. That would kind of change the system they currently have. Mr. Pitts said he couldn't respond and didn't remember that feature being a part of the proposal.

A Delegate said that last year California made national news by being one of the few states where more people moved out, resulting in a net loss of population. Given the State's dysfunction, it wasn't unreasonable to assume that might continue for some years to come. He asked how that would affect incoming students to UC, with fewer students coming into UC. He asked if that was an argument used when talking to State and federal government as a reason to increase funds, or if he thought it would be another obstacle because Congress and State government would have less students, and less money.

Mr. Pitts said he just arrived there from the Office of the President, which was doing a California story on NPR, and hitting up Republican candidates on fiscal responsibility on government and spending their socks off. It was followed by a piece by a professor in Southern California talking about the point made

about the population shift. The professor made a couple of interesting points he hadn't thought about. A large part of the rise in California's population was in migration, not birth rate. He talked about immigrants to California being from Idaho, Montana, and Iowa, as well as from Taiwan, South America, and so forth. And he said that as the cost of living in California has gotten so high, the number of these individuals, both Americans and the foreign born, found they could get cheaper housing and reasonable wages in other parts of the country, and that California was no longer the draw that it once was. That was just a natural understanding of the economics, where people go to where their cost of living was as low as it could be for whatever they could earn. The professor made a point that the age of the population in California was younger than in most other states, which was a resource. So assuming the population could be educated, or trained, not just necessarily all with college degrees, but technical education or whatever else was needed to get that younger population into the work force profitably, that would benefit California. So they weren't in a terrible situation from that standpoint.

As for federal support, California already got far fewer tax dollars than it paid in. In terms of dollars paid in taxes versus dollars that come back, he thought it was maybe 55-70-75%. Hopefully, in the future, they could shrink that delta down. The population statistics were quite good, and demographics show a

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts (cont'd)

- 16 -

relatively fast growth in high school graduates; and expected growth of high school graduates was one place UC hung its hat. But even if that was flat, if a rising part of that high school population got increasingly educationally gifted, then even without a rising number of high school graduates there would be an increasing population that could benefit from higher education. UC keeps its eye on that kind of thing all the time.

Mr. Pitts said he just had a conversation with the Provosts of three independents and the two public higher education segments, and there will be a meeting next week of the leaders of each segment, including Pres. Yudoff, the Chancellors of community colleges, and CSUs. The message that will come out of that was that the schools were doing what they could, maybe not everything they could, but were trying to improve education. That included things like making transfers easier, and working with online education, thinking how they could improve education. They're doing what they can. But the schools were having a capacity problem, and when they run out of room, students who were prepared for higher education wouldn't have a place to be. That was the message that they had to take back to government. That involved more State government, but they'll make the same points to the federal government as well. So UC was aware of these issues and was trying to craft messages around them to make sure this stayed in the public eye.

One of the more interesting polls to him was that two-thirds of the population believed that higher education was really the way forward for the country. They could probably get a two-thirds vote from that population for the benefit of higher education. But voters didn't want to pay for that with higher fees. And they don't want taxes raised either. So the concept of how to pay for it was less firmly implanted in people's minds. When he moved to California 40 years ago, no education bond ever failed. The population supported education ballot initiatives constantly. There's a different mood now. People without kids in schools feel it's not their problem. That was crazy because people benefit from the economy even if they don't have kids in high school, college, or grammar school. But there's a different kind of "what's in it for me" among people who vote. So they have to find the best way to educate the public as to how much benefit they actually get from the educational system, even if they don't have a child or grandchild in school. But it's a constant attempt at education.

A Delegate said ballot initiatives were mentioned. Before he arrived, somebody was there from a group, Restore the Majority, pitching the three initiatives to reduce the super majority to pass a budget. He asked if there was official UC support for any of these initiatives and asked what prospects there were for UC-wide support for the initiative that made it to the ballot. Mr. Pitts said that was such a complex political arena that he had no idea where it will go. There were people all over the political spectrum, and the University would like all of them to love UC. It was hard to get that while taking political stances. So UC was really strategic when it came to what it supported. They have no opinion on a ton of legislative proposals, some of which they should be opposed to. But they say “no opinion.” He didn't know the details of the particular initiative that was mentioned, but in his own personal opinion, there was no official University opinion or position about that. But his personal opinion was that unless they get back to a smaller super majority, or to majority rule for the finances of the State, it will remain ungovernable. He thought the only answer was that services would be cut right out of the heart of the State. Until the public became sufficiently unhappy about the loss of services, and then decided to change things and voted for one of these initiatives, or there's a constitutional convention, or something, it would remain a very, very difficult circumstance. For getting something done, a 67% majority vote was an absolute nightmare.

Mr. Ortega asked if he could speak a little about the status of the professional degree policy. Mr. Pitts said the Regents put in place professional degree fees, which have been around for quite some time.

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts (cont'd)

- 17 -

These fees have had a weird political life, which he wouldn't bore the GA with. Six or seven years ago in a budget crisis, around 1993 or '94, the professional schools had levied in the aggregate a 25% reduction in State support. The State came to the University and said it was taking 25% out of this amount of money, which represented State support of the professional schools. Except for medicine and nursing. The others took a 25% cut, which turned out to be a 37% cut in State support. The Regents recrafted its policy in 2007, the policy they have now. The policy is that on an annual basis, a professional school will put forward a request from the OP that got wrapped up in all the Professional Degree Fee packages, and was sent to the Regents for their approval. On an annual basis, they approve the fee for the next year. They want to tell students what to expect in the next two years. Fees are high.

There was a minor controversy about whether to compare the professional fee to other public, professional schools, such as UC medical schools only to the University of Michigan, the University of Virginia, the University of Illinois, e.g., or to compare UC's professional schools to the universe of appropriate comparisons. In many instances, that would be the Stanford or the Harvard Medical Schools, because that's where UC gets its faculty, where they recruit students from, and where they send students and faculty to. Taking the public and private comparators, which they do for undergraduates, and for all kinds of stuff, like the size of libraries, faculty salaries, etc., UC's professional schools were not high compared to public and private comparators. Some of them were above the public-only comparators. When a professional school raises its fees, one job he and his staff have was to ask what the student would get. The student didn't have any additional professors, just higher paid professors. It's not clear that what they see in the classroom was better. So part of what he was expected to do was to go to those schools and say, “Okay, you've asked for a 5-10% increase in your fee, what educational programs have they run, and ask if they've talked to students and faculty about to. Deans have different ideas, sometimes, than their faculties.

Mr. Pitts said the expected ability was of a student to pay what was the effective non-access, what was in place for loan forgiveness or other things to help with access. That was supposed to be part of the package of submission for requests for the PDFs. And that was not reviewed as aggressively as a handful of

years ago. So they're looking at those fees, and he'll probably send some fees back because he just wasn't convinced the proposed fee was justified, based on what he was told were factors for the increase.

Mr. Ortega said that in those proposals, he asked if there were any accountability measures. For example, he's heard from colleagues that the School of Environmental Design was proposing a certain fee structure, and it seemed that now they're going to distribute that differently than the plan outlined. He asked if there was any way to redress that.

Mr. Pitts said that at OP they can kind of vet plans. They do not intend to get down to individual campus accountability and rely on the Chancellor and the Chancellor's staff to do that. They have deans who are responsible, such as the Dean of Optometry. If there is a concern in a given school by the faculty or the student body that something was not right, there was a method to raise questions and to try to get information. Virtually every dollar spent was in the public domain, so budget information was public. That would be a place for the Graduate Council to be influential, and if they were worried about a given school, they could ask for some accountability. Everything they're talking about was public. So people should be able to get some sort of response. OP would screw that up if they tried to do that centrally. There are so many different, individual circumstances in terms of cost of real estate, numbers of faculty, and all kinds of things that would cause the OP to not get things right if it tried to intrude at that level. But they will, at the level of approval, try to review proposed fee increases for what appears to be questionable, or appeared to be a good plan for the proposed fee increase.

Presentation by UC System Provost Lawrence Pitts (cont'd)
GA Elections (cont'd)

- 18 -

Mr. Ortega said he works with the UCSA, and asked if there were any thoughts on some of the recommended language that the UCSA put forward to his office, such as specific provisions on how some of the money could be allocated, and provisions on how to restrict the increase, such as new fees that are implemented where previously there wasn't a fee.

Mr. Pitts asked if he was asking about the initiation of a new professional degree fee. Mr. Ortega said he was. Mr. Pitts said that would kind of get some particular scrutiny by his office. Of the various things he's received from the UCSA, he didn't remember anything specifically along those lines. He would ask people's opinions there. With this current round of professional degree fee requests, there are some schools of Engineering that have suggested a professional degree fee for Ph.Ds. in Engineering. That's the first time that would happen. He has referred that to the Academic Senate to get some feeling. If people talk about professional masters and engineering, or a business degree, that was something else. But as he sat there, he personally was worried about the idea of starting to put professional fees on Ph.Ds. He had no idea where the end of that would be. He had to wait for other reviews and didn't know where he would come down on this. But his feeling was that this was out of the ordinary and required a special level of review and justification before he'd be willing to recommend that the Regents go down that path.

Mr. Daal said that speaking time had expired. He wanted to thank Mr. Pitts for coming to talk to them. Mr. Pitts said he would like to thank them. (Applause)

GA Elections (cont'd)

Mr. Daal said they would continue with GA elections, and said the next position was for the Campus Affairs VP. He called for nominations.

A Delegate nominated Connie Wun. A Delegate nominated Jeff Lidicker. Mr. Daal called for any other nominations, and seeing none, said nominations were closed.

Mr. Daal asked the candidates to talk about their aspirations for the position. Ms. Wun introduced herself and said she was in the School of Education. She went to San Francisco State University and did her Bachelors and Masters there. She was also in student government and was a VP and a representative. She has sat on various campus committees and represented the campus on State, national, and local levels. She was a representative to the United States Student Association and to the California State Student Association and chaired the Diversity Committee. In her professional environment, she also worked for the UCSA as a Coordinator, so she was on staff and attended tons of meetings and helped to organize different campaigns for the organization on behalf of students.

Ms. Wun said that she's also done many other different things. She was a public school teacher. After a few years of that, she realized it was very difficult to teach in the educational system considering the budget cuts. She was a high school teacher and was forced to leave so she could figure out what was going on. She works with the Graduate Minority Students Project and worked on a couple of committees and worked on a speaker series and dinners. She's worked with different organizations on campus on budget cuts and was on a panel in the Education Department. She wanted to share some of that experience and find out what Delegates were thinking about regarding budget cuts. She could offer her

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 19 -

enthusiasm for student advocacy, and she was pretty adamant on student activism and advocacy. She thought they could work better with the GA's different projects, get the word out about the GA and do outreach, as with the Mentor Awards, and get more information and get the word out on the Normative Time Fellowship. She wanted to coordinate with Projects to get the word out. Not enough people were involved with the GA. She would also like to foster relationships with people outside the room. And she thought she was creative enough to do that.

Mr. Lidicker introduced himself and said he was a Transportation engineer working for a Ph.D. He was finishing his course work hopefully that semester, which was why he was entering this arena, as he had flexible time. He has been President of different Department graduate student groups for four years, two at SF State. He also worked in the public schools a little bit and got out and came here to further his education. He's on the Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee to the Chancellor. He was currently working with the Cal student chapter of a national professional engineering organization. He provides himself as a resource to undergrads running group. He understood the position was be e-mail intensive, and he was pretty good with that. He'd make himself available. He understood recruiting was a big part of the position. He had a lot of experience with sales, which was similar to recruiting, following up on calls, meeting with people, answering questions, and getting people enthusiastic.

Mr. Daal called for any questions for the candidates.

A Delegate asked how much time on average he'd spend on his transportation course. Mr. Lidicker said it wasn't as intensive as student government and was just a student organization. He'll meet with undergraduates for their officer meetings and make sure to run any drafts and documents by his desk first, so he could comment on them and send them on. It hasn't been that intensive. He's finishing his coursework at that time and had been waiting to get involved in student government. He'll be around that summer, so starting in July was perfect.

Mr. Daal asked if both candidates will be around in the summer. Ms. Connie said she would be.

Mr. Daal said the job was 20 hours a week, and asked if both candidates were available to do the job at that level. The candidates both said they were.

A Delegate asked if they could talk about their relationship with the student community and how they'd cultivate that relationship, since that was a big part of the job. Ms. Wun said that as she mentioned, she wanted to gauge what students understood and what they needed in terms of budget cuts. She works with people organizing at different levels in education. She was there for a number of walkouts and has been involved. She was cordial, effervescent, and personable, and tended to quite often meet people in different departments. She was taking courses in tons of departments, which made her quite accessible.

Mr. Lidicker said he didn't have as much personal involvement in student organizations. He was trying to get that going at that time. But he's always been involved, and was the President of a student group for four years and VP for a year. He thought he also transcended department lines. He sits in on other courses and meets students from other departments. He just liked to know people. One aspect of the position was to sit on several committees around campus, six meetings a month or so. That was one of the things that attracted him to the position. People on committees he'd join were comprised of important people around campus who were doing different things, people he'd like to work with.

GA Elections (cont'd)
Report from the Lower Sproul Student Council

- 20 -

Mr. Haddad asked how familiar the candidates were about the amazing outreach efforts already being done by the CAVP and the communications set up to get Delegates on committees. Along with that, he asked what their 2.0 mentality was, like building the Web and doing outreach. Ms. Wun said that when she decided she wanted to run and felt she could do this, she e-mailed Mr. Marchand and asked what he's been doing and what she could do to continue the efforts he already established. She wanted to carry through with what's already been successful. Mr. Marchand said he mentioned he did a survey as a project. She talked with him and heard what was expected and how to continue his ideas. She actually received the survey and knew people who were distributing the surveys. Mr. Lidicker said he read e-mails he got and felt Mr. Marchand was doing a great job. He felt there were some key words that could inject into the e-mails to generate more enthusiasm and excitement in terms of response, and he had a lot of marketing and sales experience. Hopefully more people could get hooked, with a higher percentages of people reading them and responding. He also met with Mr. Marchand, who mentioned he had plans to raise the visibility GA activities among grad students, and Mr. Lidicker said he would like to work along those lines and raise awareness in general across the University about the work the GA has done.

Mr. Saxena said that it seemed that a lot of CAVPs end up as the next GA President in subsequent years. He asked if either of them had aspirations for that at the moment. The CAVP works closely with the President and was an ideal candidate. Ms. Wun said she thought it would depend. She hadn't thought about it, and it would depend on how she and the Board related to one another. She'd have to see if she was qualified. Mr. Lidicker said he had a similar response. He's been President for years in other organizations, so he was okay with that. This position seemed like a good way to get his feet wet. As Ms. Wun said, it was both ways, and whether he liked it and whether people liked him. He just finished his coursework and he'd be around for at least two years.

Mr. Daal said one of them wouldn't win the position, and asked if they'd be in another position if they weren't elected CAVP. Ms. Berkeley said she found that extremely manipulative, and if one of them said they'd do something else, they wouldn't get elected. She asked if they could turn that around and encourage them, if they wanted to, to run for something else. But if it was okay, she thought they didn't have to answer that.

A motion was made and seconded to go to the report from the Lower Sproul Student Council.

Report from the Lower Sproul Student Council

Joey Guzmán said he would like to thank them for giving them five minutes to report on this. They came to the GA last month to discuss this project. They have some information cards to distribute. Next week, during the ASUC elections, people will vote on the BEARS Initiative. People should have received a campus-wide e-mail from him and Joycerine Lee about this.

Ms. Lee said there was a question as to what would happen with fees if the budget was under budget. A Fee Committee, with a majority of students, would be established. They would have jurisdiction over the decision about what to do with the excess fee money, and whether to lower fees or expand the scope of the project, or decrease its scope.

Report from the Lower Sproul Student Council (cont'd) GA Elections (cont'd)

- 21 -

Mr. Guzmán said this definitely wasn't a perfect project and there were some issues they were unable to resolve. With that said, he thought this project was one step towards a Student Union and a campus where all students felt welcome and were celebrated. There were issues they thought about specifically, such as with AB540 students, and there were some things where their hands were tied. AB540 students wouldn't have financial aid for this fee. That's a State and federal law they couldn't figure out. A lot of undergrads were concerned about that. So the project wasn't perfect, but it was pretty good. And it's taken them a long time to get to this point. He thought that Mr. Daal could confirm that students got a pretty good amount of concessions from the Administration and would put them in a very strong place going forward. It would also put students in a very strong place regarding control over their space, and new space, and enhancing student life on campus, for grads and undergrads.

Mr. Saxena said he heard there were promises of 24-hour services and all sorts of other services for students. He asked if those have all been agreed to in the MOU between students and the University. Mr. Daal said that's what he did during Spring Break. Mr. Guzmán said there would be a legally binding MOU between the ASUC, which the GA is a part of, and the campus. There are three guaranteed programs, including a graduate student center, a multicultural community center, with some connections with certain support services that those folks use, and a 24-hour study area. Besides that, there's a list of best-effort programs, such as prayer/meditation space, and a bunch of other programs that the University and the Program Committee, which oversees the project, will make the best efforts to accommodate. Those are things that largely will be accommodated, considering that they're going to have a lot more space and only three programs have been guaranteed. There's been a lot of push back from the campus on guaranteed programs and the Student Committee was able to get three programs guaranteed, which was an uphill battle.

Mr. Haddad asked if grads will be around when this goes live. Mr. Guzmán said that some of them will be. There are some immediate benefits within the next year. They'll likely see in a year or two the Career Center moving to 2440 Bancroft, right across the street from Eshleman. There will also be dance and performance space established in Hearst Gymnasium and storage space in Lower Sproul.

Mr. Guzmán said he had blue and gold construction bears to distribute if people would like one, as well as pens and shirts.

Mr. Daal said that if the BEARS Initiative passes, Anthony Hall will also be renovated, and an endowment for the building would be established, to fund ongoing operations of the building.

Mr. Rajan said that both Mr. Guzmán and Mr. Daal have put in a tremendous amount of work and deserve a lot of props in bringing this forward, no matter what happened with the vote. (Applause) Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Mr. Guzmán.

GA ELECTIONS (cont'd)

Mr. Daal said they would return to elections. They finished asking questions of candidates for Campus Affairs VP, and he would ask Mr. Lidicker and Ms. Wun to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 22 -

After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Daal asked the candidates to return to the room and said he would like to congratulate Ms. Wun for being the next Campus Affairs Vice President. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said he would like to entertain a motion to extend the time of the meeting by 20 minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daal said the next position up for election was Budget Officer. He called for any nominations. Mr. Rajan nominated Michael Nicholas. Mr. Daal said that seeing no other nominations, nominations were closed.

He called for a statement. Mr. Nicholas said he was a first-year student in the Music Department. This was his third meeting as an Alternate Delegate for Tiffany, who was currently doing her orals. He got the idea for the position when Mr. Rajan said he wanted to step down next year, but would be around. Mr. Nicholas said he thought it would be a good way to dive into this and also get some help. He didn't have any experience with budgeting other than his own. But after graduation, he planned on starting a business, a production company, so he thought it was important to have some practice with budgets. It also seemed to be a very interesting time to take on this job. He was at the Budget Committee meeting on Monday, and it seemed that they had a lot of work to do.

Mr. Helu said that Mr. Ortega and Mr. Rajan had ways to do fundraising, and asked if he would be committed to working with them on that. Mr. Nicholas said he'll look at ways to make money and to steer

money from things they have at that time. It seems that about 50% of the GA's budget goes towards funding, and the rest was overhead. He would like to increase funding.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no further questions, he would ask the candidate to step out of the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

After a discussion and an election, Mr. Daal asked to have the candidate returned to the room and said he would like to congratulate Mr. Nicholas for being elected next year's Budget Officer. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said the next position up for election was the Project Coordinator Liaison. He called for any nominations.

Ms. Chavez nominated Tacuma Peters. Ms. Chavez nominated Elizabeth De La Torre. Mr. Daal called for any other nominations and hearing none, said he would call on the candidates to make statements.

Mr. Peters said he's a fourth-year in Political Science and was dedicated to the Projects. He'd relay information among Projects and facilitate Project leaders in talking to each other about doing publicity, and to bring more people in, and running things more effectively. As to why he was dedicated to the Projects, he thought they were important for sustaining the graduate community in a much more meaningful way, providing safe spaces for dialogue, and they were resources. His main thing would be to make the Projects run more effectively and to do publicity, especially given the survey that they need to get the word out much more about what the GA does and what specific Projects do, and encourage people to come out and be in a much larger graduate community than their own programs.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 23 -

Ms. De La Torre said she's never been to a Delegates' meeting. She was in her first-year at Boalt. She was a student in a community college and attended the Women of Color Conference and was amazed at it. Since starting Law School, she felt she needed a connection with the GA, but didn't know how to find it until she went to women's and minority study halls and started to connect with people. She didn't think Law School students showed up to many events, so she started inviting her peers and found out about the position. She wanted to help different projects get together. She could connect to different people and help as a liaison, rather than a facilitator. If she wasn't elected, she hoped she'd still be able to run one of the Projects.

Mr. Saxena said that one criticism he and some others had was that Projects didn't necessarily follow the same accountability structure that other GA initiatives had to follow. In budgets from previous years there was almost guaranteed funding for the projects to run certain numbers of events, and the Delegate body didn't know how that money was used. He thought they do a pretty good job of sending out e-mails and raising awareness, but ultimately, they had to report back to the GA have more accountability. He asked if they had any ideas on how that could be done.

Ms. Chavez said that as current Project Liaison, she requires a lot of tracking for events, with goals and objectives at the beginning of each semester. So she thought Projects were held to a higher bar than other committees. For next year, that could be improved. Part of it was what was reported at Delegate meetings.

Mr. Peters asked what kind of accountability needed to happen. Mr. Saxena said the question was how to improve information so people knew about the Projects. Ms. De La Torre said that maybe they could have actual pictures of events along with publicity, to make people want to come.

Ms. Figueroa said that in going through the archives, there was a lack of e-mails from her Project to the GA. So this year she made it a point to do that. There's a lot of criticism of how much money they get and what Projects do, but people making those comments don't show up to the events. So she would ask how they'd know. There could be a five-page report, but if someone wasn't there, they might not believe it. Whoever became PC Liaison, maybe they could alleviate that situation.

Mr. Peters said he understood transparency had a lot to do with being visible, and thought Projects should be more visible to the GA and the larger campus community. She'd make it a point to document what happened so people know what happened at events.

Mr. Ellsworth asked how long they'd be around. Mr. Peters said that unless he wrote his dissertation in one year, he should be around for at least two years. Ms. De La Torre said she expected to graduate in 2012 and will be involved in the GA.

Seeing no other questions, Mr. Daal asked the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote. After a discussion and a vote, Mr. Daal said he would like to invite the candidates back into room and would like to congratulate Mr. Peters on being elected the next Project Coordinator.
(Applause)

Mr. Daal said they were behind schedule and could continue with elections if people wished. Mr. Klein suggested accelerating the process if there's one candidate.

Report from the Funding Committee
GA Elections (cont'd)

- 24 -

Mr. Froehle moved to go to the report from the Funding Committee Chair. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Report from the Funding Committee

Mr. Tahir said the Funding Committee has done a funding round for student applications. It didn't meet last month and won't meet until the next academic year. Most members of the Committee are on the Ad Hoc Funding Committee. It was supposed to meet last month, but there was only one response. They'll meet next month.

A couple of issues came up, including one about equity and the way that student funding was allocated to student groups. If people wanted to have anything to say about that, he would ask them to please sign up on the Google link and indicate their availability. They'll hopefully meet in the next couple of weeks. The new Funding Chair was part of the Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Tahir said he wanted to thank them.

Mr. Daal said the changes being considered by the Ad Hoc Funding Committee were important and would design funding policy. He would ask people to please get involved in it.

GA Elections (cont'd)

Mr. Daal said the next position was Environmental Sustainability Committee Chair. A Delegate asked if they were doing descriptions. Mr. Kramer said the Chair got to do whatever he wanted to do that would improve environmental sustainability on campus in conjunction with a committee the chair forms with good organizing.

Mr. Daal said the chair would have a small budget from the GA. They were also expected to go to Executive Board meetings, go to two GA retreats, and give Officer reports.

Mr. Daal called for nominations. Mr. Kramer nominated Jordan Zachritz Mr. Froehle moved to go to a vote. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

By unanimous voice-vote, Jordan Zachritz was elected Chair of the Environmental Sustainability Committee. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said the next position was Communications Committee Chair, which was just created that evening. Mr. Froehle said people hopefully read the Resolution that describes the position. Mr. Daal said the Technology Committee also had a small budget. Typically, the Chair gets a stipend, goes to retreats and to meetings of the Executive Board, and gives reports at GA meetings. This was a new position, so people could be creative in defining it. He said nominations were open.

GA Elections (cont'd) Resolution 1002e

- 25 -

Mr. Froehle nominated himself, and said he would withdraw his nomination if anybody else was nominated. Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Daal said nominations were closed. A motion to go to an immediate vote was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

By unanimous voice-vote, Brad Froehle was elected Chair of the Communications Committee. Mr. Daal said he would like to congratulate Mr. Froehle for being the first Communications Committee Chair. (Applause)

Mr. Daal said next position was the International Student Affairs Chair. Mr. Daal said the position has a small budget, goes to retreats, meetings, and gives reports. The position was responsible for fostering international student community and feelings of inclusiveness, and to work on international student issues and make the lives of international graduate students better at Berkeley.

A Delegate nominated Dhawal Mujumdar. Seeing no other nominations, Mr. Daal said nominations were closed. A motion to immediately go to a vote was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA elected Dhawal Mujumdar as International Student Affairs Chair.

Mr. Daal said the next positions were three representatives and an alternate to the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council is an Academic Senate Committee of faculty and was in charge of setting policy for graduate students, such as curriculum, degree requirements, maternity leave, and health benefits, and other things like that. There are 14 faculty members and three graduate students. The Alternate goes to meetings when a principle can't. Principles and the Alternate are expected to go to Exec Board meetings and retreats. Grad Council representatives have a certain level of confidentiality and must be somewhat secretive to items discussed by the Grad Council. This was a great jumping off point for those who might be interested in becoming more involved in the GA. Mr. Daal said he was on the Grad Council and it was great.

Mr. Marchand said the By-laws state that Grad Council reps had to represent the diversity of the GA.

Resolutions

Mr. Rajan moved to go Resolution 1002e at that time, Resolution on Directed Action In Support of Securing a Space on Campus for the Berkeley Student Food Collective. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Christina Oatfield introduced herself and said she was an ASUC Senator, but was present that evening as co-founder of the Berkeley Student Food Collective. They expect to enter negotiations with the Administration about a space for the collective, for a produce stand and café. It would be wonderful to have GA support. The ASUC Senate passed an almost parallel Resolution. Ms. Adem was also present, from the ASUC Finance Committee, and would give a little update.

Resolution 1002e (cont'd)
GA Elections (cont'd)

- 26 -

Ms. Adem said the Senate passed a motion to pursue a mobile kitchen, so they'll probably operate out of a cart or trailer for a while. They'd buy it from a co-op elsewhere. They're looking for space for storage and other uses.

Ms. Oatfield asked for a straw poll on approval of the bill, and said she would like to thank them.

GA Elections (cont'd)

Mr. Froehle nominated Samveg Saxena to the Graduate Council. A Delegate nominated Nick Kohut. A Delegate nominated Karin Shankar, who respectfully declined. A Delegate nominated Aleks Polosikhina. A Delegate nominated Elizabeth De La Torre, who respectfully declined. A Delegate nominated Jeff Lidicker, who respectfully declined. A Delegate nominated Kfir Cohen. Mr. Daal said that seeing no other nominations, nominations were closed.

Mr. Daal said he would ask candidates to state why they were interested in being a Grad Council representative.

Mr. Saxena said considering the campus as a whole was important for this job because people make decisions that affect the academic lives of many people on campus. There's a non-disclosure type of agreement representatives make. He was aware of a wide range of issues affecting grad students on campus, having been involved in various committees in the GA, including Budget, External Affairs, the Projects, the Grad Social Club, to a limited degree, International, the Exec Board, as well as having been Grad Council Alternate that year. He was far into his program and was a GSR/GSI, and did his qualifying and preliminary exams. So he's seen how a lot of things work, and still had plenty of time to be active. There was one specific thing he would like to improve. Having served as Alternate, he thought there was very poor communication of information between the Grad Council and the position of Alternate. He would like to see that changed.

Ms. Cohen said she was a sixth-year grad in Comparative Literature. She's been involved with DNTF, so academic issues were close to her heart. She'll be there for the next two years. She's been very involved in her department and one issue that was important to her and many other people was having more time to negotiate and more structure of studies before exams, as well as questions between studies and the job market.

Mr. Kohut said this was his second year in the GA. He's been involved in his Department's Graduate Student Council, setting up social events and liaisons between grad students and faculty through town halls and other events. He serves on the Rec Sports Governors where he had Rec Sports rearrange the weight room for safety reasons, and was pushing them to change IM sign ups. Last year he tried to reach out to constituents to try and get as much information as possible. He had a passion for trying to improve grad education. His Department is Mechanical Engineering.

Ms. Polosikhina said she's a third-year in the Vision Science Program, a tiny program. She would like to advocate for more communication among departments to have greater involvement with the GA, the Exec Board, and the faculty. She's also been involved with Campus Affairs and could bring more awareness. She works with the MCB Department and would be happy to bring more people in.

GA Elections (cont'd)

- 27 -

Report from the Empowering Women of Color Conference Coordinator

Mr. Daal said Delegates could vote each time, and the three candidates with the highest number of votes would be the three principles, and the other would be the Alternate, unless a candidate resigned. But everybody would have a seat.

Mr. Haddad asked Mr. Saxena about his department. Mr. Saxena said his Department was Mechanical Engineering, but he was aware of several programs.

Ms. Chavez asked about graduation dates. Mr. Saxena said it was at the end of 2012. Mr. Kohut said he would probably be there two or three more years. Ms. Cohen said that applied to her as well.

A Delegate asked if anybody would like to be an alternate. Mr. Daal said nobody would.

Mr. Klein said that it was mentioned that as an Alternate, not much information was given. Mr. Saxena because of non-disclosure agreements, and the way the Grad Council was administered, meeting notes were only sent to the Alternate once one of the three other elected people said they couldn't make it.

Often times, if another meeting came up for a principle two hours before the Grad Council met, that would give no time for the Alternate to review the meeting notes, which were very extensive. He would like to see this policy changed.

Mr. Klein asked why the Alternate didn't attend all meetings. Mr. Saxena said that wasn't allowed. He tried and they gave him very angry looks. It was very procedurally-based.

Mr. Marchand said he talked to the Chair and said that overarching confidentiality was involved. An e-mail that was sent to the entire campus was sent to Grad Council members marked "confidential." He thought that policy could be changed. Some things needed to be confidential, but not everything.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no other questions, he would ask the candidates to leave the room for a discussion off the record and a vote.

After a discussion and an election, Mr. Daal said Graduate Council representatives were elected, Samveg Saxena, Aleks Polosikhina, and Kfir Cohen, with Nick Kohut as the Alternate. (Applause)

Mr. Klein moved to extend the meeting until 9 p.m. The motion died for lack of a second.

Report from the Empowering Women of Color Conference Coordinator

Yomaira Figueroa introduced herself and said she was the Project Coordinator for the Empowering Women of Color Conference was March 13-14. They had about 500 women attend the two-day event. They expected about 800. Each year they have between 3-450 attendees, so she thought their attendance was really good, especially since Sunday was the start of Daylight Savings. They had two keynote speakers. The entire event was filmed and will go online. It was the first time the Conference was documented. They have a huge stack of evaluations that will be synthesized and sent out to everybody

Report from the Empowering Women of Color Conference Coordinator (cont'd)
Resolution 1002e, On Directed Action In Support of Securing a Space on Campus for the
Berkeley Student Food Collective (cont'd)

- 28 -

through the listserv. It was really exciting. Next year the Conference will be in February, and they're in talks with Angela Davis to speak. She was going to come this year, but had a family emergency. The Conference was amazing. Photos will be on Facebook.

Mr. Marchand said that since there didn't seem to be much debate, he asked if they could move to a vote on 1002e, since it's been postponed twice. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Resolution

The following Resolution, 1002e, was submitted:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF SECURING A SPACE ON CAMPUS FOR THE BERKELEY STUDENT FOOD COLLECTIVE

WHEREAS, the mission of the Berkeley Student Food Collective is as follows: The mission of the Berkeley Student Food Collective is to provide fresh, local, healthy, environmentally sustainable, and ethically produced food at affordable prices to the Berkeley campus and greater community. The Collective seeks to educate students about nutrition and food systems, empower new leaders, and train youth to work in and manage a sustainable business. Through inclusive, democratic decision-making, we will operate a cooperative cafe and market that promotes community-building and environmental stewardship; and

WHEREAS, the Berkeley Student Food Collective was born out of a grassroots student movement at UC Berkeley in the spring of 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Berkeley Student Food Collective, a recently incorporated organization under the California nonprofit code, is pursuing nonprofit tax exempt status, in hopes of being fully recognized as a public benefit corporation by the end of the calendar year; and

WHEREAS, the Food Collective has been searching for a location since May, and has faced unique challenges in its location search as a start-up, student-run business; and

WHEREAS, student-run cooperative/collective groceries, delis and cafes have operated successfully on college campuses for decades, and many of them have been on the cutting edge of providing their members and customers with sustainable and healthy foods. The University of Maryland at College Park, the University of British Columbia, Evergreen State College, Lewis and Clark College, UC Santa Cruz, UC San Diego, Binghamton State University of New York, and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, all have student run food co-ops; and

WHEREAS, a student-run food co-op on or near a university campus can be an educational tool. Student members learn business management, cooking, decision-making, and leadership skills. Since most student run food co-ops currently in existence have a sustainability, health and/or

Resolution 1002e, On Directed Action In Support of Securing a Space on Campus for the Berkeley Student Food Collective (cont'd)

- 29 -

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF SECURING A SPACE ON CAMPUS FOR THE BERKELEY STUDENT FOOD COLLECTIVE (cont'd)

social justice focus, the food co-op also provides exposure to and discussion of the many social and global issues tied to food systems. Additionally food co-ops provide a model for responsible purchasing practices that are often much further ahead of the campus' other eateries;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly directs its representatives on the Store Operations Board to inform the Board that the GA supports the prioritization of the Berkeley Student Food Collective in allocating space for food service operations, and that the GA urges the Board to work to find an adequate space for the Food Collective and acknowledges that the best way to go about this may be to bypass the Request for Proposal (RFP) process which is called for in the Commercial Activities Agreement.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that these Graduate Assembly representatives inform the Store Operations Board that should the Board bypass an RFP process in order to set aside a space for the Food Collective. The GA requests that the following three conditions also be met:

- 1) That the Store Operations Board explicitly acknowledge that the ASUC is making an exception to policy for an exceptional organization;
- 2) That the ASUC make a public statement about why it recognizes the creation of the Food Collective as an exceptional circumstance; and
- 3) That the process be very transparent and allow for student input on the decision.

Mr. Saxena asked if this would displace another rent paying entity. Mr. Rajan said the Auxiliary didn't have any rent-paying entities in the space the Collective was considering. He didn't know how much of this was public information, and thought the Collective had alternate means of preparing foods that didn't require it to be in a restaurant space. There are empty spaces in the ASUC Mall to use as storage. The SOB would thank the GA and do what the Board thought was best.

Mr. Ortega asked what he felt about bypassing an RFP. Mr. Rajan said this was far more complicated. The RFP process was the most transparent way to get businesses into Lower Sproul. The Food Collective would like to bypass that process. Like most small businesses, it finds the RFP process to be expensive. He was in favor of an RFP process, but this was not a done deal at the SOB. The Food Collective was in favor of the RFP process, and he believed it was warranted an exception.

Mr. Marchand said the Daily Cal operates space in Eshleman, and it too is an independent, non-profit corporation. The Food Collective would be similar to the Daily Cal.

Seeing no further discussion, Mr. Daal said they would come to a vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 1002e passed by voice-vote, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF SECURING A SPACE ON CAMPUS FOR THE BERKELEY STUDENT FOOD COLLECTIVE.

Report from the Budget Officer

- 30 -

Report from the Budget Officer

Mr. Rajan said that last year he chided Delegates for not being more involved. This year he was coming to them hat in hand because the budget was a little too daunting. When he came to this meeting, he hoped to have a set of alternatives and have Delegates choose from them. But the permutations of the budget were so large, he didn't want to pick any particular one and have inertia take over. So he'll present the same thing he presented last year. It will give Delegates an idea of the challenges the GA faced this past year. This year they were in a position to finally understand those challenges and find a way to move forward, and what to do next year to make that happen.

Mr. Rajan said the GA has certain sources of revenue, the main one being student fees. Grads pay \$27.50 per semester to the GA, and that was \$420,000. That number stays pretty constant. This year they think it will go up to \$435,000. In the past the GA has also received \$50,000 from a beverage contract with

Coca-Cola. That money is put into the GA's commercial reserve because it's money that could be spent for things like alcohol or in the case of a lawsuit, e.g. So that money was kept aside. The GA also tended to borrow quite a bit from its "savings account" to balance the budget. But generally, fees and the beverage contract were the GA's only two sources of income, totaling about \$470,000.

The GA tended to borrow quite sizeable amounts. They've been doing that because they thought their savings account was quite big. But it turned out that they didn't know what their savings account was. This year, they do know, and it's \$104,000. If they put \$50,000 into commercial reserves, it will be hard to borrow another \$50,000 from savings, because then they'd have to borrow another \$50K to balance their budget, and they've wiped out their savings for a year. That will facilitate a rather deep cut that year of around \$50,000. The reason they're saving commercial reserves is because they want to build their reserves, which have now grown to about \$476,000, to be about the same size as their operating budget. That way the amount they make from investments will hopefully cancel out any sort of inflationary pressure on the reserves. It's good to have a reserve as big as their operating budget, and they were finally there. So what they have accomplished that year, thanks to a lot of sacrifice from past GAs, was to get to the point where reserves are healthy enough to be a sustainable investment strategy.

This year Mr. Rajan said he was presenting a budget that will look like what he described, as the screen showed. In the past they haven't necessarily cut stipends and always kept what they paid to the President, to VPs, and to Project Coordinators. They've kept that constant. But this year everybody was taking a cut of about 13% that will be spread out differentially over the six or seven main aspects of the GA. Executive Officers will get 84% of what they received, and Projects 86%. The totals were shown. The amounts were: \$68,000 for Executive Officers; \$115,000 going to Projects; \$4,000 to committees; \$113,000 to funding, which was a big problem; \$29,000 to IT infrastructure; \$68,000 to Business Office or overhead; \$31,000 for dues and the agreements, including ASUC election costs and UCSA fees; and \$30,000 in contingencies, which hopefully they won't spend.

Mr. Klein asked if the GA paid for ASUC elections. Mr. Rajan said they do. The GA pays a floor of 12.5% of the total election costs. If the proportion of grads voting in the election was larger than 12.5%, they pay that proportion. So if 33% of voters are grads, the GA will pay 33%. If grads are 8%, the GA would pay 12.5%. The GA also owed the ASUC \$75,000 from past elections, and this year they have \$17,000 budgeted for that.

Report from the Budget Officer (cont'd)

- 31 -

The operating budget is \$435,000: reserves, \$100,000; commercial reserve, \$372,000; savings, \$104,000. From the savings account that year he was going to borrow around \$54,000 to balance the budget. The budget has very deep cuts. The screen showed not the percentage of cuts, but the percentage of budgets as they were last year. So 84% for Executive Offices meant that was 84% as that budget was last year, about a 16% cut. Committees were taking the biggest hit, at 30%. Funding was taking a 13% cut.

Mr. Rajan said the screen showed the projected budget for next year. They spend about 25% of GA money on student group funding; about 25% on projects; 15% on the Business Office; about 6% on IT; 15% for Executive Offices; 1% on committees; 7% on dues and agreements; and 6% for contingencies and reserves.

Mr. Rajan said the next screen showed their assets. Carryforward is their savings account. That will probably go away the way they borrow \$50,000 every year to balance their budget. Ideally, this wouldn't

be a problem because in two years, when it goes away, and the GA will be in a steady state. That was the plan. Mr. Rajan said he didn't know if he'd be around to make it happen, but Mr. Nicholas will, and next year he'll have help to get it closer. They now have about 47% of their revenue invested.

Finally, as to how each office breaks down, Executive Offices break down with the President getting 23%; CAVP 26%; EAVP 32%; PC Liaison, 15%; and Budget and Rules Officers both at 2%. But all of them share a lot of infrastructure. The Projects were all pretty even, within reason, 11-12%.

The Business Office spends a significant portion of its budget supporting the GA's funding enterprise. The ASUC pays most of the Funding Advisor's salary, with the GA paying a little. The GA also pays for the recorder and for the front desk, which actually processes reimbursements, so overhead was a sizeable amount of the Business Office budget. They have about \$4,000 budgeted for alcohol that year, which comes from commercial reserve.

Mr. Marchand said they never spend student fees on beer, but spend commercial revenue for that, and ticket sales of the Graduate Social Club.

Mr. Rajan said that even though the savings of \$104,000 was a little bit of weight, when all was said and done, they have about \$49,000 to work with next year for the year after. That number might be larger. He hoped there will be unspent money this year. The \$419K was from student fees. The \$104K was tenuous. If the GA loses the \$50,000 from the Coke contract, which would happen if it isn't renegotiated, they'll be \$50,000 poorer next year and will have exactly \$50,000 to wipe it out, and would then be stuck; so they better be in steady state. That means that next year, for the year after next, for the 2011-2012 budget, they'd probably have to take another sizeable cut. The good news was that once that was done, the GA will be poised to grow. They'll have long-term revenue coming in for investment and hopefully by then, be streamlined; and the projection could only go up because they'd go from spending more than they had to spending what they had, and would also have cash flow coming in. If managed right, this will be sort of self-sustaining, and the GA will be a lot stronger in two or three years than this year or next year. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked how much the GA spends each year to have dinner. Mr. Rajan said he couldn't give an actual amount. They've allocated about \$3,795 to do that. Next year they'll allocate \$3,300. It's a comparatively very small percentage.

Report from the Budget Officer (cont'd)

- 32 -

Mr. Klein asked how cuts were decided. Mr. Rajan said that because he couldn't come up with a method to decide these cuts fairly, they were evenly spread across for everybody. Certain things they were contractually obligated to pay. Mr. Klein said his question was about the way the GA allocates. Mr. Rajan said that was a very sticky process. It depends on what happened the previous year. It's not like they start with a blank budget, and every Budget Chair uses the budget from the previous year, and stays reasonably close to the previous year's budget. It would be ideal to do blank budgeting, but that required a lot of coordination and motivation to really focus on the GA's goal. They're trying to change it slowly.

Mr. Klein asked who had the authority to slash funding by 15%. Mr. Rajan said the Delegates do, and they'll vote on that next month. They could vote to change it, but the vote was basically an up-or-down vote. The budget will be online.

Mr. Kramer said they could see how it was a problem, approving the same budget as years prior, even though it's smaller and people didn't know to build an alternative budget. So that's what they end up voting on. Mr. Rajan said that has been his platform for the last three years, and he'd admit that he's failed. That's why there's an Action Agenda Item on this agenda about creating a special commission to do that, and have more authority. The challenge was that it was very hard to have a focal point to collect all the information all across the GA and then disseminate it into a budget. That would require a lot of coordination and making sure everybody's voice was heard. It requires a lot of power and dedication, and almost a single-minded effort through the year. They could ask a President, perhaps, to do it, but it was hard to ask the Budget Committee to do that. It would make that Committee very powerful, and he's always tried to limit the scope of the Budget Committee and not give it such a big job, filtering everything about the GA and defining the GA's vision. But that's what they'd need to do to make a good budget.

Mr. Kramer asked if he wanted to give that authority to the Action Agenda Item. Mr. Rajan said he did. It would need a lot of credibility. The person heading the Action Agenda Item might as well be somebody who was technically an outsider. Hagar Zohar has not been on the Exec Board even though she was very well versed in almost everything the GA does. She has a sort of outsider status and hopefully she wasn't biased. Mr. Rajan said he was very biased towards the Executive Board, for instance. Ms. Zohar was independently minded and would do this right. Mr. Rajan said he'd help her, and he had Mr. Froehle's support as well. So hopefully this commission will have enough authority to get something done.

Mr. Ortega said there was a lot of interest from the Exec Board in being involved in this process and considering the purpose of the GA and what needed to happen.

Mr. Rajan said funding will be hardest to filter because the GA spends that money into space and hopes it's spent well. But they don't get student groups to come together to coordinate and present a unified voice. He would like to keep Projects at \$113,000. This year they spent \$142,000 on funding. Last year it was \$110,000. The global cut that year was as high as 60%. Next year funding will be a disaster, and the GA would have to take the pain that year, or do something drastic this year. He couldn't imagine what they'd do this year that wouldn't be as damaging as cutting funding this much. He was trying to make peace for this being a necessary sacrifice this year and building that cost up.

Mr. Klein asked how they'd build it back up. Mr. Rajan said that long term they'll have revenue coming in, and there were certain savings long term that they could achieve. They're negotiating with the ASUC, and if they have the manager's payroll completely supported, that would be \$20,000. This year the

Report from the Budget Officer (cont'd)
Report from the Campus Affairs Vice President
Resolution Referral

- 33 -

Auxiliary was broke, and he was hoping the Auxiliary moving forward won't be broke, although he couldn't guarantee that. In addition, if there are fundraising initiatives and investment payouts, that would help the rest of the budget. Ideally, there's still more streamlining to be done, and hopefully costs savings.

Mr. Ortega said there was also work on the endowment that will hopefully get a lot of donors and grow significantly. And if renovation of Lower Sproul is approved, they'll get more sources of revenue from commercial revenues.

Mr. Rajan said that if the Coca-Cola contract is renegotiated, they'd get funds from that.

Ms. Hsueh said that Mr. Daal also negotiated with Dean Szeri, who will put \$10,000 into funding for next year. He did \$10,000 for this year as well.

Mr. Rajan said the final budget will look similar to the budget that will be presented in May.

Mr. Kohut asked if they could get a succinct summary. Mr. Rajan said that Ms. Zohar made a Power-Point presentation. He'd see what he could do.

A Delegate asked what fraction of requested money he thought student groups will actually get next year. Mr. Rajan said he thought next year they'd get 50%. Mr. Klein said groups also request twice as much knowing they'll get cut. Mr. Rajan said next year it could be a 30% cut. The demand outstrips the supply. It will get worse for hopefully only one or two years.

Ms. Hsueh said they had 120 student groups register last year and have 149 this year. So student groups were growing. The people could be the same, but they create a second student group. If the GA could do fundamental change, they may eliminate some problems. But some student groups will have funding for three groups with different names, and all apply.

Mr. Daal said the other phenomenon is that departments used to give students money, and now departments had to cut. So groups ask for money from the GA.

A motion to extend the meeting until 9 o'clock was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Report from the Campus Affairs Vice President

Mr. Marchand said they have survey results from the graduate survey. They got over 2,000 responses. The prizes have been awarded for taking the survey, and were drawn at random. The Selection Committee for the Faculty Mentorship Award had to choose from 53 faculty nominations, and three Faculty Mentor Awards were awarded. The ceremony will be April 28.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

The following Resolutions were referred to committee:

Resolution Referral (cont'd)

- 34 -

1004a, To Create an Action Agenda Item Focused on Restructuring the Graduate Assembly Budget, to the Budget, Rules, and Campus Affairs Committees

1004b, To Approve an Amended Graduate Assembly Mission Statement, to all committees

1004c, In Support of the Coalition for a Strong UC at UC Berkeley, to the External Affairs Committee and the Rules Committee.

Mr. Daal said the third Resolution, 1004c, was added that evening.

Mr. Daal called for any objection to referrals.

Mr. Daal said that concluded the agenda.

This meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary