

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MINUTES

May 7, 2009

### **SUMMARY OF THE MEETING**

This regular meeting concluded the Spring Semester. It was called to order at 5:42 p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

##### Teaching Evaluations

CourseRank, developed by students at Stanford, is a student-driven tool for students to rank classes, provide written comments, search for and compare classes, and plan schedules.

Evaluations include the number of hours of work required by the class and the overall grade distribution. The Registrar would provide data and Student Systems would do the hosting. There would be no cost to students for this system. Berkeley would use it as part of a beta test. There would be a student governance board to deal with, e.g., inflammatory comments.

Course evaluation results were under the control of individual departments. But evaluations were by the students and should be for the students. They've found that students at Stanford want to use CourseRank when they register and read evaluations. In order to do that, students had to evaluate at least three courses. So the program was self-promoting. While there's a judicial review board at Stanford, they haven't actually found a need for judicial review. And a student submitting a terrible review that other students didn't agree with would cause the review and the reviewer's ranking to go down.

Eventually there will be a cost associated with this, but campus IT will pay for it. The departments were the ones that had to be brokered.

##### Report from the ASUC

The ASUC Senate ratified the revenue-sharing agreement with the GA.

An MOU for CourseRank will be drafted on Tuesday.

Will Smelko, the incoming ASUC President, and Tu Tran, the incoming Executive Vice President, introduced themselves.

##### Christie Byon, UCSA

Christine Byon, UC Student Association Field Organizer, introduced herself and distributed an information sheet, "Graduate Student Health Insurance," a campaign the UCSA was working on. The goal was to make grad health care more affordable and provide more benefits. GSHIPs vary from campus to campus,

and the UCSA was working with UCOP to price out a universal health care plan for all UC grads. It would allow for reciprocity, getting health care at another UC school.

From the testimonials the UCSA collected, the most frequently documented problem was dependent care. There was no dependent care coverage for Berkeley grads. They have to use plans that weren't really sufficient for their needs, such as helping with their families. So these are the demands that the UCSA and the Graduate and Professional Committee on the UCSA Board were also seeking for graduate and professional students. They've been working with the University Office of the President and the Systemwide GSHIP Committee, with student representatives, faculty representatives, and administrators, to price out plans and work out a Systemwide plan that really benefits all graduate students.

Mr. Rabkin said it was preposterous to say that they could get more by paying less. He asked why it was in their interest to have the same package as Santa Barbara students if maybe Berkeley could get a better deal. Ms. Byon said that when they worked out all the data with UCOP, they actually priced things out. They had a comparison of what a universal health care system would look like, as opposed to each campus having its own, separate health care plan. When UCOP priced it out, it actually would benefit all campuses, and students would actually receive more benefits. The reason why they're asking for these demands and concerns to be met was because these were the concerns that popped up the most in testimonials. She'd pass around more of these testimonials that Delegates could hopefully read about and they could see what other students thought about the GSHIP on their campus. Delegates could also fill out a testimonial on their Web site. If this was something they didn't want to work on or didn't believe was something they should demand, they could totally voice that. But there were many graduate students who have families they wish to have protected.

Ms. Rivas asked if that would be an option when filing, because when one files, they lose their SHIP insurance. Ms. Byon said the UCSA wanted the plan outright. Students now have to pay for it. So the UCSA wanted to have it at a more affordable cost. They're still working that out with UCOP in terms of the numbers, data, and statistics. Actually, a universal plan will be priced out at the at the July Regents meeting. The Systemwide Committee forwarded a universal plan, and after that, they'll price out the benefits, with dependent care, like COBRA, added to that. That couldn't have been done without the collection of all the testimonials. Seriously, when UCOP was pricing plans with the UCSA, they definitely wanted those testimonials. They are what really made UCOP administrators knowledgeable about what students were going through on some campus that didn't even cover prescription coverage plans, such as EHD and things like that. So it was really important to consider these concerns.

A concern was raised that having the same coverage on all campuses might not help Berkeley. But universal coverage would benefit Berkeley greatly. No campus, by equalizing coverage, would lose benefits.

### Food Co-op Update

A steering committee has formed to create the Berkeley Student Food Cooperative. They've raised \$106,000 in the last three months. They'd have a grocery store and also sell cold deli, soups, salads, sandwiches, pastries, and coffee, with vegetarian and vegan options. They're looking at locations on Lower Sproul and upper Telegraph Ave. They were looking for student volunteers.

### UC Police Review Board

The UC Police Review Board had its annual open house / town hall meeting. The current Police Chief is retiring and the campus was currently recruiting for the position. Another issue was the timing and publicizing of these meetings. There seemed to be a trend that students were strongly discouraged from making a complaint, and to keep complaints at the lowest level, a "work file memo." There's no third-party to speak to.

### BUDGET OFFICER'S REPORT / GA OBJECTIVES FOR THE COMING YEARS

There was a \$40,000 increase in the student fees the GA gets because there were 1,000 new grads that year. Of that, \$20,000 went towards a Contingency Fund.

Also, the Women of Color Conference Initiative will be able to invest its trustee account into an endowment and get a better return. Money would also be returned to the Funding line item.

The GA budget was 14% less than last year. That was softened to 7%, which was divvied up between the various units.

With no objection, the 2009-10 GA budget was approved.

Things the GA did were divided into three categories: student advocacy, student support, and internal GA stuff. Delegates were asked to indicate on the feedback form what areas they'd like to see the GA expend more of an effort towards. If they wanted more funding for an area, Delegates were asked to indicate which budget areas should be cut.

It was noted that one way to lessen the load of the GA President was having a "President's Committee." Another suggestion was to encourage departments to have full representation on the GA.

Questions on the feedback form were for Delegates to tell the GA what they from the GA.

### Resolution 0903e

By a hand-vote of 19-6-0, the GA amended and passed the Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the 6th Public Hearing on Campus Climate: "Make a New Vision of Hope Real At UC Berkeley: Make UCB a Diverse, Integrated, and Affordable Sanctuary Campus." The Resolution calls on Pres. Obama and Congress to pass the Federal DREAM Act and for the GA to send a letter and the bill to the Obama Administration and send to BAMN.

### Resolution 0903a

By a hand-vote of 23-0, the GA approved the Resolution In Support of Shared Commercial Activities Revenue Between the ASUC and the GA and Directed Action and Standing Policy Regarding Commercial Activity Revenue Sharing Between the ASUC and the GA. The bill would amend the Commercial

Activities Agreement the GA and ASUC had, with the GA to share commercial revenue earned by the Auxiliary and to create a Revenue Sharing Committee analyze relevant circumstances since the last report and make recommendations.

Resolution 0903b

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution to Share Expenses Between the ASUC and the GA. The bill establishes the terms and conditions for the GA and the ASUC to share various expenses.

REPORTS (cont'd)

With no objection, the GA approved the budget memo prepared by GA. It prioritizes what the campus Administration should cut more or less.

The Regents voted to raise grad student fees from 5-10%, depending on the program.

The GA allocated funding for a group of students to go to Washington, D.C. to lobby on expanding the loan forgiveness program and to get grad student scholarships and fellowships to be non-taxable income. Legislators were supportive of loan forgiveness, but it was just introduced and expanded. But there was a lot of support for the tax item.

From the Environmental Sustainability Committee report, a \$55,000 grant was awarded for recycling on campus.

Resolution 0905b

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA approved the Resolution to Amend the GA Budget to Allow *The Berkeley Graduate* to Transfer Funds from Its Copying/Printing Line Item to the Miscellaneous Line Item.

Resolution 0905a

By unanimous voice-vote, the GA passed with 0905a, Resolution on Directed Action In Support of Open Access Publications. The Resolution supports open access to research journals and supports the "Student Statement on the Right to Research."

This meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

**End Summary of the Meeting**

-----

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, concluding the Spring Semester, was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:42 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank people for attending the last GA Delegates meeting of the year.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Teaching Evaluations

Mr. Daal said the first announcement was from Paul Albertus, about teaching evaluations. Mr. Albertus said that he was a former GA Delegate, and while in the GA, he was appointed to the Teaching Committee on campus. One thing the Committee looked at was student access to course evaluations, and one thing he learned while on the Committee was that Berkeley was very decentralized, and student evaluations were actually owned by departments and not by the central Administration. So course evaluations were very hard to get access to. While on the Teaching Committee he also learned about a tool, CourseRank, that was developed by some students at Stanford. It's a tool that would allow evaluations to happen. Mr. Albertus said he would like to briefly describe the CourseRank tool, introduce some people, and maybe take questions.

CourseRank is a student-driven tool in that students fill out a lot of information on it. They can rank classes with this tool with both a number and with written comments, a rich way to evaluate classes. It was also a tool to search for and compare classes. So instead of going through a huge course schedule, students could type in something like "graphics" or "art," and find all the classes at a school related to those two topics. It's also a tool that could be used to plan schedules. That's particularly important for undergrads when they block in different times. That feature probably wasn't as important to grads. Also, the Web site was [www.courserank.com](http://www.courserank.com). It contains a demonstration and a few slides.

Mr. Albertus said he wanted to show the main interface. The screen showed what a sample page of CourseRank looked like. He'd run through a few of the main features. It lists courses and the course descriptions itself, with data that can be imported from the Registrar. And then there were a couple of ratings. There's an overall rating, which was essentially a number, and was an overall rating for the class. As they could see on the screen, there's a place for people to include written comments, allowing detailed comments to be given on what students thought about the class.

The evaluation includes the number of hours of work required by the class, which would be helpful in planning schedules. An overall grade distribution was also shown, which undergrads and potentially grads could be interested in.

Mr. Albertus said CourseRank has been under development for a while, and at the campus level and at the ASUC level, people were pretty much interested in it. The Registrar would provide data, such as the course guide, the classes that were being offered, and things like that. Also, Student Systems would do all of the hosting and leg work on this.

Mr. Albertus said there would be no cost to students for this system. It was developed by Stanford, and the school was trying to develop it and eventually spread it out to other universities, and wants to have Berkeley use it in order to do beta testing. So Stanford was giving the program to Berkeley for free. Berkeley students will do a lot of the programming itself. The program was presented to the ASUC Senate last night, and the ASUC also wanted to have CourseRank on the campus.

As for a couple of things for the GA, Mr. Albertus said there were a variety of issues with the system. One was that it should really be a student-driven system, even on the Berkeley campus. That would mean there would be a governance board. That board would decide what sorts of features CourseRank would have in terms of being specialized for the Berkeley campus. This board would also be in charge of looking at people, e.g., writing inflammatory comments about some faculty member. There would be a board of students to determine whether, e.g., such comments should be removed. It would just sort of provide advice about student development for the Berkeley campus.

Mr. Albertus said he would like to introduce Tony Christopher, from Student Systems, with Johanna Metzgar, from the Registrar's Office. He said John Rheame had some comments.

Mr. Rheame said TEACH-Us has been working for two years to try and get the Registrar's Office to be more forthcoming with course evaluation results. But as Mr. Albertus said, the Registrar's Office wasn't really in charge of those, but rather, it was each individual department. They're working on more access to them, and to that effect, he wrote an opinion piece that he submitted to the Daily Cal that people might have in their packets. If they didn't have one, he had copies. Essentially, his argument was that students create these course evaluations, so they should have access to them. The University uses them for various things, such as tenure cases. These evaluations were by the students and should be for the students. He thought that CourseRank was an excellent first step, and an excellent first step to take. But these evaluations weren't the ones that students fill out in class, but the ones they click online afterwards. He would like to see a greater connection with the students and would like to see these evaluations coming from the Administration itself. That was the ultimate goal. As to whether that will happen anytime soon, it probably won't. With the opinion piece he wrote, it urges a change, so that as a student filled out their course evaluation, they could write in a comment box, "Please share evaluations with other students." It sounded simple and was a good first step, and hopefully, if enough students do it, then the Administration will become more open to having the central campus do that.

Mr. Albertus said that if that ever did happen, it might take some time for that to occur. But CourseRank would allow students to get access to evaluations sooner. In fact, CourseRank will be rolled out that fall. He called for any questions.

A Delegate asked about classes taught by two different faculty, with just a number rating. Mr. Albertus said different things were linked. So they could have classes associated with faculty and separately as a class.

In order to be able to on CourseRank and read evaluations, a student had to evaluate at least three of their courses. So the program was kind of self-promoting. The more people who put information in, the better the information was, and the more people would use it. And to use it, they had to put in more

information. At Stanford they've had many, many thousands of simple numerical ratings, but they've had 3,000 written evaluations, as opposed to numerical ratings. And while they have a judicial review board, they haven't actually found any of the written evaluations to be in need of judicial review. Further, the way the tool worked was that if a student submitted a terrible review, and other students in the class didn't agree with it, they could rate that review. So the "terrible" review, or the review that was at odds with the majority of opinion, would go down in ranking; and the reviewer's ranking would also go down. So the system tries to make little corrections to keep things as fair and accurate as possible.

Mr. St. Clair said he felt that was fairly idealistic. Secondly, he didn't feel course evaluations should be opened up to the public. It was a matter between student and the teaching supervisor. If they open it up to the public, that would destroy that relationship. It becomes a matter of the department saying the student did poorly in the class. It was open to the public, and departments would fear losing money or hurting its image.

Mr. Daal said they were running short on time, so he'd like to take two more questions.

Mr. Rabkin said he was amazed that the University was going along with this. He asked if the necessary amount of official involvement would be there and also, if they were confident that the terms of the contract would stay the same for the long term. It could be that after they buy it, the price will go up.

Mr. Konwinski said that that to say this would be at no cost to students was very pie-in-the-ski. Any Web service costs money, even to just host stuff. He asked about the actual cost involved, especially if it was in beta testing at that time, and what would be involved in future contracts be. Mr. Christopher said that what they've been told by their Director was that eventually there will be a cost associated with this. When the students who developed this program graduate from Stanford and go forth, funding that was currently allocated for IT infrastructure would actually pay for this. It's not the intent to charge students for the use of this service. And to answer the question as to what support the Administration will give to this, that was also in place, including data that would populate CourseRank from the Schedule of Classes and the General Catalog, as well as grad distributions. Those agreements were already in place. The departments were the ones that had to be brokered, with agreements between individual departments and the campus to make this information available. And to answer the question about not every student going online, Mr. Christopher said he was the manager of the MyBerkeley application, which all the undergraduates use. The only students not using that application were visiting scholars. So essentially, 99% of all the students use it. He didn't know how it was with graduate students, but in the undergrad population, 99% go online to use an application, and he didn't think they could get better numbers than that.

Mr. Albertus said the GA Delegate feedback form had a couple of questions about CourseRank, and it would be great if Delegates could fill those out. The campus wants to make a decision about CourseRank by early next week. He thought this was a near-term way to actually have students get access to course evaluations. People should feel free to check out the Web site or e-mail Mr. Christopher.

Mr. Christopher said he'd be happy to speak with them. They'll meet with the ASUC to write the MOU on Tuesday. They would love to the GA to sponsor this as well. They're looking at a fall implementation of CourseRank.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank them attending.

### Report from the ASUC

Mr. Tran said there were two things that happened at the Senate meeting last night that might be pertinent to the GA. The ASUC Senate ratified the revenue-sharing agreement with the GA. He'd presume the details of that will be given by Pres. Daal. So that was good news. Mr. Tran said that he and President-elect Smelko really hope this agreement will allow the GA and the ASUC to continue to work with each other, and that this will help both of them out in the long run.

Regarding CourseRank, they're looking to draft an MOU on Tuesday and come to an agreement about how they can manage it as a student-directed system, so it's students who manage it, without much administrative oversight or interference. That was the ASUC's hope and goal, and it's something they'd like to share with the GA and work on together, so that the system was managed by graduates and undergraduates.

Mr. Smelko said the back-end stuff will be done by the Stanford people who developed the program, but Berkeley was asking the developers to turn over the operation of all the front-end stuff, and to give Berkeley an outline of everything that went on for the entire process, so UC Berkeley students can get involved in managing it, and can change it and adapt it to what UC Berkeley students want and need with regard to the front-end access to this program.

Mr. Daal asked if they wanted to introduce themselves and the positions they held. Will Smelko introduced himself and said he was current ASUC Senator and will work with Mr. Daal and the GA next year as ASUC President. Tu Tran introduced himself and said he was currently an ASUC Senator and was Executive Vice President-elect.

### Christie Byon, UCSA

Ms. Chavez said that just to give a quick introduction, Christine Byon was a UC Student Association staff, a Field Organizer, a former Santa Barbara student who was involved in student government there as well. She's a great resource and will hopefully be with the organization next year.

Ms. Byon said she would like to thank Ms. Chavez for a great introduction. She would distribute and would ask them to take an information sheet, "Graduate Student Health Insurance," a fact sheet about one of the campaigns the UCSA has been working on for that year.

Ms. Byon said that as Ms. Chavez mentioned, she's one of the Field Organizers for the UCSA. Just to remind them, the UCSA works with all of the External Affairs Vice Presidents for all Associations, such



as Mr. Ortega's position. The UCSA is the official voice to the Regents and to the State Legislature concerning higher education advocacy within the UC System. They usually deal with fee freezes and lowering or freezing student fees for undergraduate, professional, and graduate students.

Ms. Byon said that year they've been working on an additional campaign for graduate student health insurance, which consists of making graduate health care more affordable and providing more benefits. As all of them probably know, GSHIPs vary from campus to campus, and they don't provide as many benefits as graduate students need in terms of caring for their families and how long they had to live there to do in order to do research. Therefore, the Graduate and Professional Committee within the UCSA, of which Mr. Ortega was a member and helped to lead, has been working with UCOP to price out a universal health care plan that would affect all graduate students across the UC System. For the campaign, they've actually collected over 120 graduate student testimonials from students from every UC campus. It's basically just stating really honest and heart-felt testimonials about the struggles that graduate students were going through from their personal experiences, and the lack of support the GSHIP on their campus provides.

Problems that students have expressed include high COBRA fees, the lack of prescription coverage support, and reciprocity. As many of them already know, graduate students sometimes have to do research on another UC campus, or they commute from the Bay Area to Davis, situations like that. But unfortunately, students only get to use that health care plan on their direct campus. A lot of times that was inconvenient for students, and it constricted students from receiving benefits that they really need, or from actually making a visit.

Ms. Byon said the most frequently documented problem that they databased from the testimonials was actually dependent care. She knew that Berkeley grads don't get any dependent care coverage whatsoever. They have to use plans that weren't really sufficient for their needs, such as helping with their families. So these are the demands that the UCSA and the Graduate and Professional Committee on the UCSA Board were also seeking for graduate and professional students. They've been working with the University Office of the President and the Systemwide GSHIP Committee, with student representatives, faculty representatives, and administrators, to price out plans and work out a Systemwide plan that really benefits all graduate students.

Mr. Rabkin said it was preposterous to say that they could get more by paying less. He asked why it was in their interest to have the same package as Santa Barbara students if maybe Berkeley could get a better deal. Ms. Byon said that when they worked out all the data with UCOP, they actually priced things out. They had a comparison of what a universal health care system would look like, as opposed to each campus having its own, separate health care plan. When UCOP priced it out, it actually would benefit all campuses, and students would actually receive more benefits. The reason why they're asking for these demands and concerns to be met was because these were the concerns that popped up the most in testimonials. She'd pass around more of these testimonials that Delegates could hopefully read about and they could see what other students thought about the GSHIP on their campus. Delegates could also fill out a testimonial on their Web site. If this was something they didn't want to work on or didn't believe was something they should demand, they could totally voice that. But there were many graduate students who have families they wish to have protected.

Ms. Rivas asked if that would be an option when filing, because when one files, they lose their SHIP insurance. Ms. Byon said the UCSA wanted the plan outright. Students now have to pay for it. So the UCSA wanted to have it at a more affordable cost. They're still working that out with UCOP in terms of the numbers, data, and statistics. Actually, a universal plan will be priced out at the at the July Regents meeting. The Systemwide Committee forwarded a universal plan, and after that, they'll price out the benefits, with dependent care, like COBRA, added to that. That couldn't have been done without the collection of all the testimonials. Seriously, when UCOP was pricing plans with the UCSA, they definitely wanted those testimonials. They are what really made UCOP administrators knowledgeable about what students were going through on some campus that didn't even cover prescription coverage plans, such as EHD and things like that. So it was really important to consider these concerns.

Mr. Konwinski said he would find it very helpful if the coverage was not the same and asked if there was a table comparing campuses, so Delegates could know if this would help Berkeley. He would imagine Berkeley might be one of the best coverages among the UC campuses. Ms. Byon that when they priced things out, they measured plans on a scale of 0 to 1, with 0 being that the plan that would benefit students the most, very much so, and 1 being something that wouldn't benefit them. She was pretty sure that Berkeley was at the 0 end of that when they charted all of those benefits in a comprehensive way.

Ms. Byon asked who wouldn't benefit from this. Ms. Chavez said that everyone benefits. It was just the amount of benefit. For example, UCLA at that time doesn't have dental coverage, and they would get that. Mr. Konwinski said that everybody benefits. But what Ms. Byon meant was that graduate students pay the greatest common denominator. No University, by equalizing coverage, will lose benefits. Everybody will go up. So if some school had dental, every university would have dental.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank them for the presentation. Ms. Byon said she wanted to thank them. And if Delegates could write testimonials and pass them over, that would be appreciated. She wanted to thank them.

### Food Co-op Update

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was from David Corso-Knowles from the Food Co-operative. Mr. Corso-Knowles said he wanted to thank the GA for inviting him and for having him. He's been working in an advisory capacity with a group of about 50 students, with six to eight of them full-time, on a steering committee to found the Berkeley Student Food Cooperative. Over the last three months they've raised \$106,000 and have done a lot of research. They have a lot more research to do. They did a focus group on what kinds of food service people want and found that there was an emphasis sort of on quick food. So the Co-op has a concept for a healthy grocery store with lots of fresh produce based on the model of The Local.

Mr. Corso-Knowles said many of them might be aware of The Local, a student-run farmers market on Upper Sproul Plaza that happens on Wednesdays from 11:00 to 3:00. It's an all-volunteer effort. They go

through about \$700-800 in of produce every week during the lunch hour rush. They really hope to build on that model with volunteer labor and to produce cheap, healthy food for students and turn it into a full-time, around-the-clock food co-op. So they want to turn the model of The Local into a food cooperative. Their tentative hours would be from 11 a.m. to 11 p.m., and possibly even later for special events. They also want to have the space available for student activities, concerts, readings, meetings, and so on.

They're looking at locations on Lower Sproul and have also gone out to the upper Telegraph Ave. Area. That last week they've met with real estate agents and with architects to talk about the empty, vacant spaces along Bancroft and along Telegraph that they might turn into a really welcoming student-run space. And they're thinking of ways to invite the community in to really build momentum behind this idea of having sustainable, healthy, locally sourced food service for Berkeley students.

A Delegate asked where the funding for this was coming from. Mr. Corso-Knowles said they have three major donors, one of which has tentatively approved the funding. One funding source was Bears Breaking Boundaries, a student competition that gets money from the Chancellor, as he understood it. That was their first donor, for \$5,000. And then they got a major grant from The Green Initiative Fund. They also have tentative approval for a development grant from the Berkeley Student Cooperative, the housing association. And they have three other grants currently under consideration, from two external agencies. If anybody was interested in fundraising, they could definitely jump on board at that time.

Mr. Wolgin said there are a number of different models for co-ops, and asked how this one would work. One model was that people had to volunteer to work if they wanted to purchase things from the co-op. He asked how this co-op would work. Mr. Corso-Knowles said they have a draft membership structure. It hasn't been approved yet and will be approved at a general membership meeting. Their membership structure will be based on giving four hours a month as a volunteer. That was their main focus. Those members who then go to weekly meetings on a regular basis will become voting members and part of the governing board of the organization. They would also be entitled to a 5% discount. That was the main focus of the cooperative. Also, any employees would be members of the cooperative. It's a hybrid model like the Park Slope Cooperative food model in New York, one of the most gigantic and successful cooperatives in the nation. Both members and workers would be members of the co-op.

Mr. Smelko said that specifically, with regard to the revenue aspect of the plan, since he was in this space, he asked what the GA would get out of this, in light of the revenue sharing bill the Senate passed last night. As a result of that bill after the ASUC got a certain amount of revenue, only then would the GA actually see any returns on that revenue from. The ASUC would get money after up to \$600,000 or so, and after that, the GA would see commercial revenue after that higher level was met. He asked about the financial projections of the co-op in terms of revenue and asked how he would expect the Graduate Assembly to be able to realize any of that commercial revenue, and asked if there was a model yet. Mr. Corso-Knowles said they have tentative revenue projections for the first three years. When their business plan is completed, which is currently under development, they'll have ten-year projections. But the revenue was in the range of \$300-500,000 of total sales over three years.

Ms. Rivas asked how this will affect the GA. Mr. Corso-Knowles said it wouldn't necessarily affect the GA. It depended whether they go into a Lower Sproul space and on the contract they draw up with the

Auxiliary. That was all very tentative. He could talk about the available locations. They include the former Postal Annex space, which has been offered to the food co-op, although it was only 800 square feet. The kind of deli they could run and the number of groceries and produce they could sell in that space would be pretty small, because the space was quite constraining. The revenue generated would also be small. The other space they're considering, the STA Travel space, would require extensive renovations. The Naia lounge was also a potential, and the co-op could possibly buy out that lease or negotiate a partnership with Naia that would allow Naia to re-open. Naia will probably never meet its revenue projections, but the co-op potentially could, and could potentially be a revenue generator.

Ms. Anderson said it was mentioned that the co-op's survey suggested that people want quick food. She asked if the co-op had any idea of the kind of food it would serve, or if that would depend on the space they get. Mr. Corso-Knowles said they definitely want cold deli service, including soups, salads, sandwiches, pastries, and coffee. They want to be able to prepare food to order as well as provide ready-made food and vegetables. It will have vegetarian and vegan options, but it wouldn't be restricted in that way. It will also be mostly or entirely organic. They're going to try and meet the requirements of the Real Food Challenge, which is a nationwide effort to get more real food into schools, from grade level up to university level. It's basically a detailed ranking system to determine how healthy a particular kind of food was, based on sourcing and production. People might have heard of Michael Pollan's book. The short version was to eat mostly plants, and not too much. The Real Food Challenge kind of puts that down into a table and makes it really easy to verify sources of the food. That was the kind of food the co-op planned to serve. They'll get a lot of food from the farmers they see at the Berkeley Farmers' Market.

Mr. Marchand asked if there was any way to reach the co-op if someone was interested in giving input. Mr. Corso-Knowles said it would be great if he could send out an announcement e-mail to the GA and asked if that was possible. There were lots of ways to get involved. The easiest way was for anyone who wanted to just jump on board with this project. Their first general membership will be held on Monday at Castro House, 2310 Prospect St., at 7 p.m. Another great way to get involved was to continue to raise publicity and word of mouth about this project. There's been a lot of excitement. The co-op has talked to local architects, realtors, and "celebrities," and everyone wanted to get on board for this project and to have a culture and a community around food in this part of Berkeley. That would be great to resurrect that. So they really were looking for student volunteers from various departments, as well as graphic designers, architects, and computer people. They have a Web site development committee of about five people at that time. If anybody was interested in business or in non-profit management, they had to marry both sides of that picture to be really successful. If anybody was interested in fundraising that would be great. The cost to renovate and put in a kitchen somewhere was on the order of \$3-400,000. So they're a third of the way there.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank Mr. Corso-Knowles for the announcement. Mr. Corso-Knowles said he would like to thank them.

UC Police Review Board

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was about the Police Review Board. A Delegate said she was the GA representative on the Police Review Board. They had their annual open house / town hall meeting last night and she basically wanted to give the GA a quick update on what was covered and where they need to look in the future. Miranda Ritterman attended and took notes. One concern she brought forward was the GA's position on the new police chief. She didn't know how many of them knew, but the current Police Chief is retiring at the end of June, and the campus was currently recruiting for the position, along with everybody else in the Bay Area for. One thing that Ms. Ritterman brought up was the fact that the ASUC and a number of other organizations on campus want to make sure the search committee keeps in mind the difference between being a police chief at a university environment versus an urban environment, and to basically keep an eye on the social communities there as opposed to elsewhere. The Chair of the Police Review Board said he was sitting in on the hiring process, something that was paramount to the search committee. So that did seem to be something that they had the intention of doing.

The Delegate said the second issue for next year was the timing and publicizing of these meetings. They had two people at the meeting last night. That meant there were eight people from the Police Department and two students. Part of the problem was the timing of the meeting, nearly finals week. Miranda was there with three people, with one graduate student and two undergrads in the audience. The ASUC rep on the Board was, unfortunately, not present. But again, there was a meeting last night.

Mr. Konwinski asked what meeting she was referring to. The Delegate said people on the PRB didn't know what they were doing either. They're supposed to have a closed Board meeting to talk about what the Board does and to make sure everybody on the Board knew that, due to all the changes from year to year. So members of the PRB had to understand what objectives they had from year to year, and what issues needed to be dealt with. In the spring the PRB was supposed to conduct town hall meetings for the public to come and talk about their concerns, hear more about what the PRB does, etc. That was the meeting that occurred last night. They had a little publicity, including one ad in the Daily Cal last week and something in "*The Berkeleyan*." But of the two students who attended, one was the current President of the ASUC. She and the other undergrad rep voiced concern about the timing of the meeting. It was a major problem. They want to make sure this meeting next year is held early in the spring. That would help it get better attendance.

Notwithstanding the small number of attendees, there seemed to be a theme on what the PRB heard, which was based on her own experience as well. The Delegate said the reason she wanted to have this position was because of a really horrible experience she had with the police her second year there, with one officer. A lot of these concerns dealt with complaints to the police. What seemed to be was a trend was that when students went in and wanted to sit down and talk with a sergeant or somebody responsible for officers for whom there was a complaint, they're strongly discouraged from making a complaint. There's a lot of pressure to keep a complaint at the lowest level, called a "work file memo," which consists of a little slip that goes into the officer's file. Nothing happens at all. That was in comparison to a formal complaint procedure, which was a bit more arduous. But again, students have been strongly encouraged from doing that.

The police say they're doing great, and that there have only been two complaints in the past however many years. But ex-students who have heard about that say that wasn't reflective of the process. Students

felt intimidated about going in there. There was no third-party, and the student had to speak to the police, who advocate for their officers, discouraging the student from making a complaint, and then the police doing the investigation themselves.

So in terms of moving forward, the Delegate said that what she walked away with was thinking that if she was there next year and had this position again, she'd really like to look into changing some of these things. She thought the police there needed to be more pressured by student groups to make sure students were encouraged to make complaints when it was appropriate. She was also interested in knowing whether or not they could change the system in terms of having an independent third-party involved a little bit earlier in the process. That might entail having an independent third-party presence for the actual discussion about the complaint, in addition to the sergeant, or at the very least, an independent third-party involved in the investigation, which was the way a lot of PRBs do it elsewhere, such as at Berkeley and Richmond, where a third-party was involved in that way.

Mr. Rabkin asked to what extent it was the goal of the PRB to prevent bad policing and to what extent the goal was to encourage more policing. People were worried about the crime rate on campus. The Delegate said that wasn't really the PRB's job. In fact, the PRB, as she learned last night, was an appeals board. People only go to the PRB with their complaints after they've first gone through the arduous first step of filing a formal complaint, which students were discouraged from doing. And if a student wasn't happy with the outcome, then they could go to the PRB. The other thing the PRB does was to supposedly have some oversight function in reviewing police policies and the need to change those policies. That was where some of the other things came in that she mentioned.

The Delegate said the Chair of the PRB is Chris Kutz, from the Law School. He definitely seemed to be on board to push some of these changes, although Mr. Kutz was distracted, like many of them were. So there was some oversight on his part, which was why they haven't had a meeting lately. The PRB hadn't met for over a year.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank her for the report.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Mr. Rajan moved, in the interests of time, and the fact that the meeting was running behind a little, to amend the agenda such things he give his report on the budget and conflate it with the discussion about GA objectives in the coming year. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rabkin. Mr. Daal said he was going to entertain a motion to hear discussion of GA objectives to next to last, and asked if that was sufficiently close to his motion. Mr. Rajan said it wasn't, but would work. He asked to rescind his motion and moved to move item 2 on the agenda to the end. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wolgin. Mr. Rabkin said it was important to discuss GA objectives and he would rather do that than do Resolutions 0903e and f, which weren't particularly urgent.

Mr. Daal said that an additional amendment to the agenda was the withdrawal of the Resolution about Oscar Grant, at the request of the author.

Mr. Rajan moved to conflate his report with a discussion of the GA's objectives in the coming year, and to devote 15 minutes to both. Mr. Daal said he would entertain another motion to amend the agenda to insert Mr. Rajan's Resolution.

Mr. Rajan said he would rescind his motion and moved to amend the agenda to limit to 15 minutes the discussion of GA objectives in the coming years, and to also include the Budget Officer's report, and to talk about 0905b sooner, perhaps as soon as item 2. Mr. Daal said that bill wasn't on the agenda. Mr. Rajan said he would rescind that motion. Mr. Rajan moved to amend the agenda to give the Budget Officer's report, together with item 2), discussion of GA objectives in coming years, limited to 15 minutes, in the interests of time. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Marchand moved to amend the agenda to put 0903e at the beginning, to deal with the agenda item they tabled at the previous meeting, before they continue. The bill was in the Campus Affairs Committee two months ago. Mr. Daal said the motion was to move 0903e to after item 2), discussion of GA objectives/Budget Officer's Report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rajan. The motion to amend the agenda passed by hand-vote 20-5-0.

A motion to approve the agenda as amended was made Mr. Froehle and was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daal said he would entertain a motion to approve the minutes from the April meeting. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 2, 2009 GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

#### BUDGET OFFICER'S REPORT / GA OBJECTIVES FOR THE COMING YEARS

Mr. Rajan said he put his report on the Web site a month ago, but there have been some major changes. One major change was on page 4. Given what happened last year, they projected student fees to stay the same. But that was no longer true. His job was being made easier by the fact that there were 1,000 new grad students this year. So the GA got \$40,000 more. Of that \$40,000, he put \$20,000 in this budget and he didn't budget the other \$20,000, and stuck it in the budget in sort of an odd way, and put it all in the Contingency Fund. He did that because the GA never really got a chance to look at the way the money would be expended. So he decided to give either the Executive Board, or any Delegate who was interested, some oversight over how the money was spent.

Mr. Rajan said there are three contingencies that now exist, as found on page 3, in Contingencies, Reserve, and Surplus. There are three contingencies. The first, General Contingency, would stay the

same as before. This was all the stuff the GA did that year that it hadn't planned for. There's also a Trustee Account buffer to allow the Women of Color Conference Initiative (WoCCI) to invest its trustee account into the endowment and get a better return. Next year will be the Conference's 25th anniversary. They expect a big turnout, and hopefully there will be a lot of fundraising opportunities. The buffer will give them enough flexibility to do whatever was needed. He thought they could spot them this. There are also storage costs in there, which was a last-minute thing.

Mr. Rajan said he also took some money out of Funding and fully intended to return it. He put it in with the title that this will be returned to funding. The funding line item, which he was sure Delegates cared a lot about, was on page 3. They'll notice it was a pretty sizeable decrease from last year, but he was hoping that won't last, especially because there's \$12,000 in contingency as well. And he expected Dean Szeri to pony up \$10,000. So hopefully, they'll bring Funding back up to \$150,000 and they'll maintain it at the level it has been before.

Mr. Rajan said that Delegates knew this from before, but the budget was now 14% less than it was last year. That's how much it would have been if they just had the numbers that they knew. They softened that to 7%. That was a 7% cut, and they could see how the 7% was divvied up between the various units. At the end of page 3, percent cuts at the very bottom for Executive Offices, the Projects, the committees, student funding, for IT/Web, and so on.

Mr. Rabkin said there was a line item under Dues, giving \$5,000 to UC Berkeley. He asked why they were doing that. Mr. Rajan said the GA gave the campus \$25,000 last year to jointly administer with the Grad Division to do fun stuff like give fellowships or conference travel. The GA, in next year's budget, will add to that endowment by giving the campus \$5,000. For that, the GA could do what it probably would have wanted to do anyway, and get the Chancellor to be happy about it.

Mr. Rabkin asked if the Chancellor cared. Mr. Rajan said he cared a lot. Because even if the amount wasn't a lot, he could say the GA was invested in Berkeley and that the campus had the full support of graduate students. The Chancellor was also matching that funding. Mr. Rabkin asked if the University was giving the GA \$25,000 and the GA was giving the campus \$5,000. Mr. Rajan said that wasn't the case. The GA budget was entirely independent from the University. Grads pay student fees regardless, and student fees go to the GA. But the GA would be giving its own money. Mr. Rabkin asked about the \$10,000 from the Grad Division. Mr. Rajan said there are always these kinds of transfers back and forth. The \$5,000 had ancillary benefits.

Ms. Abel said that regarding the \$10,000 from the Graduate Division, the Grad Division used to provide student funding for a lot of the same kinds of things the GA funded. The Grad Division liked how the GA did it and decided to give \$10,000 for the GA to use for student group funding. That money was very tightly controlled and was for specific purposes. And that was the same situation with the money that the GA gave to the Graduate Division. That money only goes to support student funding. It's just that now the GA was doing different types of student funding, like travel or conferences. That way the GA could provide graduate students with that money without having to actually create infrastructure.

Ms. Rivas said that as for the money the GA gives back, the GA cannot donate student fees back to the University. So the GA uses commercial revenue to donate that money, because student fee money



couldn't be used. Mr. Rabkin said he thought they didn't have commercial revenue. Ms. Rivas said they did have some. It was only \$5,000 as opposed to \$25,000 they gave last year.

Mr. Konwinski asked if it was possible to get acronyms spelled out. Mr. Rajan said it absolutely was and said that would be more transparent.

Mr. Konwinski asked why only four Committees were funded. Ms. Anderson said the other ones were under Executive Offices. Mr. Rajan said that the Rules and Budget Committee, for instance, were under the Rule and Budget Officers.

A Delegate asked if there was money for SAGE. Mr. Rajan said there was \$1,000. SAGE is the fun thing in Washington, D.C. that Mr. Ortega did that was very successful and useful. A few people went. It was definitely worth doing again next year. It wasn't done in enough time for him to plan to put it in the budget, but there was plenty of contingency for that express purpose.

Mr. Kline asked if any stipends were reduced. Mr. Rajan said there weren't. Ms. Anderson said one stipend was reduced. Mr. Rajan said that was donated back to the GA, Ms. Anderson's. (Applause)

A Delegate said that on page 13, where it says funding Grad Events \$130,000, that was the total for all funding. Mr. Rajan said it didn't have to go to Grad Events.

Mr. Rajan said he would entertain a motion to pass the budget. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Wolgin and Mr. Kramer. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE 2009-10 GA BUDGET PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.** (Applause)

Ms. Abel said they were going to have a half hour discussion on GA objectives, including not only what the GA currently does, but also what Delegates would like to see the GA do more of in the future. Unfortunately, they really didn't have time that evening, so she would just give the shortened version. On the back of the feedback form was a list of not all, but some of the things that GA has worked on in the past year. Some of those things were continual, things the GA does every year. Others were just short-term, where something came up and the GA just worked on it this year and was done, or was continuing to work on it.

She divided things the GA does into three categories. One was student advocacy, both reactive or preventative, because sometimes something will happen and then individual graduate students or the Administration but the GA to respond. And then sometimes, because of all the committees, campus meetings, and other meetings that GA representatives sit in on, they hear about something happening and try to get grad student input into that process before it was too late and it already happened. So both individual grad students come and ask for student advocacy as well as sometimes that happening at the campus-wide level. And then there are the Systemwide and national levels.

The second category of things the GA did involved student support. The GA provides student services through workshops, conferences, funding to student groups, and provides resources and provides individual funding for resources and travel. And in addition, they hold social functions.

The last objective the GA had was not listed on the feedback form and was internal GA stuff, which included GA efficiency. The budget they passed was the biggest part of that. The GA would like to sustain its budget. The GA was also working on fundraising to get more money. Every year they have more student groups apply for funding to the GA, and the GA had the same amount to give every year. So student groups get a lower percentage than they ask. And every year that percentage goes down, and the GA didn't want to see that happen. So the GA has been doing a lot of outside fundraising efforts to keep their level of funding to grad students high. Additionally, there's super internal stuff that Delegates never see, just to make the GA more efficient and more effective on campus committees, By-laws, with Resolutions, like referring Resolutions to committees, so there's feedback. That was an effort to make the Resolution process more helpful and get more support on it, and to have less discussion on the floor.

Ms. Abel said these were just categories that she saw that stood out. There could be other categories and stuff that didn't fit into these categories. At the very bottom there was a question on what Delegates would like to see the GA focus on in coming years. The GA was looking more not for very specific things listed, but more on bigger picture things. If Delegates felt that any of these categories, student advocacy, support, or GA efficiency, was more important, or they something the GA has been neglecting and would like to see more of their efforts expended towards, they should indicate that. Those would be things they want the GA to spend more time, money, and people time towards. It would be impossible that evening to have an actual conversation with so many people, and they definitely wouldn't debate the merits of different ideas, but if there were any big-picture things that Delegates didn't see on the feedback form that they thought the GA should work on, and it's been in their heads and was something they've been waiting to mention, now was the time to do so and tell her what they wanted. So she would ask them to do that at that time. If there was other stuff they just wanted to write on the feedback form, the GA will read that and will tabulate the results.

Mr. Rajan said he wanted to add to that. People could use the same metric at least in their heads that they used when they talked about the budget memo, when they thought about making something "above average," or thought something was underserved, etc. He could assure them that the budget they had wasn't because there was plenty of slack somewhere that they could simply draw from. People might think having social functions was the most important thing and was underserved. If that was the case, it would be useful for the GA to know which of the budget areas they thought the GA should cut. That would allow the GA to come back and explain what they did in that realm. This would allow people to make more informed judgments and would validate their reasoning and help the organization be as transparent as possible.

Ms. Abel said that over the summer the GA will do a lot of internal development to try and find some mission statement to help guide the GA's actions, as they had so many things they were working on. It was very disparate, and they would like to have a clear path to take.

Ms. Abel asked if there was anything people would like to say. She wasn't asking for super specific, tiny things. For tiny issues, i.e., really specific issues, they could write that on the feedback form. But at that time, she was asking for any bigger things they thought the GA should be working on, things it wasn't working on at that time.

Mr. Kramer asked about structural staff. He was thinking that a lot of the stuff the GA dealt with ended up not falling under the purview of a committee and got bumped up to the top, to Mr. Daal, in particular, with Mr. Daal ending up dealing with too much.

Ms. Abel asked for an example. Mr. Kramer said that Mr. Daal could answer that better than he could. Mr. Daal said an example would be the budget memo.

Mr. Kramer asked if there was a way to have a structure that would take some of the load off the GA President.

Mr. Wolgin suggested having a "President's Committee," and said they had a committee for everything else.

Ms. Abel said that by "structural," he meant the structure of the GA, like reworking the structure of the GA so that things were more fairly distributed. Mr. Kramer said he wasn't thinking of restructuring, but maybe extending the size of the GA, to make room for one or two more committees that people would be forced to work on, as with other committees. That would take some of the workload off. Mr. Wolgin said he thought that was a great idea. That was the kind of thing that was internal, reworking how committees were done. There was no reason they couldn't add this as well.

Mr. Marchand said there are departments without full representation on the GA, and maybe they could go to departments more.

Ms. Abel called for any other ideas. Mr. Kline suggested a census of the graduate student population. Ms. Anderson said that was already part of their rules and had to happen. Mr. Kline said he would like to see that on the GA Web site.

Mr. Rajan said he would like to ask a quick question. If he were to say as Budget Officer that each category they've been talking about was worth one-third of the budget, he asked if people would agree with that.

A Delegate said she honestly felt that student advocacy was more important than student support. Workshops and things like that were for very specific groups, and from a budget perspective, she saw ways to add in a lot more fundraising, and not necessarily such as with membership fees, because she'd hate attendance for events to go down. But as far as student advocacy, in looking at the impact of the work that was done on the advocacy level, that kind of work had a much broader impact on the campus, and on the remainder of the student body and on other graduate students the GA was supposed to represent. Therefore she thought more work and more resources should be put towards that. It was very difficult to do additional fundraising and put resources for that given the sort of current structure of the GA budget.

Mr. Rabkin said he had the opposite set of preferences. He thought GA advocacy would be a benefit center rather than a cost center. Fundraising should be for profit. If they raise money, they should get more than what they started with. What he hears from his constituents is that they don't actually notice GA funded services. They don't notice the advocacy. And they're perplexed as to why their student

activity fees, which are coerced from them, were being used to support lobbying over which they had very little control, whereas they like the other stuff.

Ms. Abel said that was a fantastic point, because a lot of that occurs at meetings people in the GA have, such as meetings with the Chancellor. A lot of that stuff students never see. And there wasn't really a way to put that out there. A lot of that dealt with relationship building with the Graduate Division and with the Chancellor, to get other end goals, like having them give the GA money for funding. It was a totally valid point, and was a perception that every grad student had with the GA, ultimately, if they were unhappy with where they thought their money was going.

Mr. Rajan said that Mr. Rabkin's point was valid. The answer was too subtle to give in the next two minutes. If the question was why they were doing it, they have a very good answer, but would need time to prep it, and could give him the answer next year.

Ms. Anderson said she wanted to speak to that. She knew that in his department the students weren't paying their student activity fees, and the Department was paying. The other thing was that as an advocate for mental health, she thought a lot of the things students support help with that. Maybe the tax workshops weren't the biggest thing for mental health, but she thought the Grad Social Club was one of the best things they have. She thought maybe people in the room didn't see that because they're at the GA, and they meet people from other departments. But it was very easy to come to Berkeley and never talk to anyone outside their own department, and miss out on this really amazing community. Silly things like the Spring Siesta, which they were all missing at that time, and other such events, were really wonderful ways to meet other people, and were really wonderful for people's mental health.

Ms. Abel said they didn't have the time to build a safe space in there for everybody to be able to state their ideas. So instead, she wanted Delegates to put their thoughts on the feedback form. What she would ask for verbally were any new ideas, anything they felt the GA was neglecting.

Mr. Rajan said he thought they just wanted to know what it was that Delegates wanted from them. They don't want people to be quiet about that. It was quite hard for people in the GA to know exactly what this huge body was thinking, since they see Delegates only once a month, and Delegates don't seem to ever speak up. So if Delegates could tell them what should be prioritized, that would be great.

Ms. Anderson said people could also mention things about how Delegate meetings were run. If they really wanted to be more active in the GA but found out these meetings really frustrated them, they could write structural things to improve meetings.

Ms. Abel said that Question 6 on the feedback form actually asks about meetings. So if people had specific thoughts, they should include them there. She would ask them to please put their opinions in the feedback form, and she'd read them all.

Resolution 0903e

The following Resolution, 0903e, was authored by Mr. Cruz:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE 6th PUBLIC HEARING ON CAMPUS CLIMATE: "MAKE A NEW VISION OF HOPE REAL AT UC BERKELEY: MAKE UCB A DIVERSE, INTEGRATED, AND AFFORDABLE SANCTUARY CAMPUS."

Whereas, to maintain its long tradition of being California's flagship public university, a world-class research institution, and a diverse campus, UC Berkeley must respond to the changing racial and ethnic demographics of California; and

Whereas, the numbers of underrepresented minority students (black, Latina/o, and Native American students) enrolled at UC Berkeley have been abysmally low. In 2008, underrepresented minority students comprised about 16.1% of UC Berkeley's 2008 freshman class, while making up 42% of California's high school graduates. (UC Office of the President, California Department of Education); and

Whereas, these underrepresented minority students experience everyday acts of isolation, discrimination, and prejudice on and off campus; and

Whereas, undocumented immigrant students face a situation analogous to that of black students during the old Jim Crow era: Due to circumstances that were and are out of their control, they are stigmatized and denied financial aid and an opportunity to pursue their dream of a higher education; and

Whereas, the election of Barack Obama as this nation's first black president opens a new period of hope, and the possibility of removing the barriers to higher education for black, Latina/o, Native American, other underrepresented minority, and undocumented immigrant students, as well as the possibility of expanding educational opportunities for all; and

Whereas, the Federal DREAM Act would allow undocumented immigrant students to be eligible for federal financial aid and open a pathway to citizenship; and

Whereas, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reported in its November 24, 2008 issue ("Immigration in the First 100 Days?") that Senate majority leader Harry Reid (D-NV) said, "On [the Federal DREAM Act], there's been an agreement between [President-elect] Obama and [Senator] McCain to move forward on that." President-elect Obama and a large bipartisan majority of Congress have repeatedly declared their support for the passage of the Federal DREAM Act. Among previous co-sponsors of the DREAM Act have been Sen. Richard Durbin (D-IL) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT). On November 5, 2008, Chancellor Robert Birgeneau called on Obama to enact the Federal DREAM Act as soon as he assumes office; and

Whereas, on March 17, 2009, the Coalition to Definite Affirmative Action, Integration, and Immigrant Rights and Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary (BAMN) will host a public hearing

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE 6th PUBLIC HEARING ON CAMPUS CLIMATE: "MAKE A NEW VISION OF HOPE REAL AT UC BERKELEY: MAKE UCB A DIVERSE, INTEGRATED, AND AFFORDABLE SANCTUARY CAMPUS" (cont'd)

titled, "Make the New Vision of Hope Real at UC Berkeley: Make UCB a Diverse, Integrated, and Affordable Sanctuary Campus"; and

Whereas, the event allows underrepresented minority and immigrant students to recollect and speak openly about instances during which they faced isolation, discrimination, and prejudice on and off campus; and

Whereas, the transcript and video of the hearing will be made available to the Obama Administration, Congress, the campus community, and the public at large, to highlight the urgency and justice of passing the DREAM Act and opening up UC Berkeley and other universities to Latina/o, black, Native American, and other underrepresented minority students; and

STANDING POLICY

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly will endorse the Public Hearing on Campus Climate: "Make the New Vision of Hope Real at UC Berkeley: Make UCB a Diverse, Integrated, and Affordable Sanctuary Campus."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly calls on President Barack Obama and the Democrat-controlled Congress to pass the Federal DREAM Act.

DIRECTED ACTION

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the President or the External Affairs Vice President of the Graduate Assembly shall send a letter appended with a copy of grants bill to the Obama Administration, and send a copy of this letter to BAMN, so that they may help publicize the Graduate Assembly's position.

Mr. Cruz said the action on this was for the GA to endorse the public hearing on campus climate and to also call on Pres. Obama and the Democrat-controlled Congress to pass the federal DREAM Act. The Campus Affairs Committee thought it was a good idea, but that they didn't really feel that Pres. Obama will read their letter. So they didn't feel that was a very efficient way of supporting the DREAM Act. But as for the idea in general, the Committee liked it.

Mr. St. Claire said he was very concerned about the DREAM Act, and said it seemed to basically reward people who violated the law. He was all for legal immigration, and his wife is a legal immigrant. But he thought good citizenship was a very valid criterion, and the proposed legislation would violate that and would reward people and use tax money for people who violated the law. He opposed the Resolution on that basis.

Mr. Rabkin said the last Whereas Clause states that a video will be available. He checked and it's not available. It was nowhere online. So he moved to strike that Whereas Clause. Also, he was reluctant to endorse a hearing none of whose transcripts or proceedings are public. Therefore he would also move to strike the first Resolved Clause. He didn't want to endorse something he didn't have access to.

Mr. Rajan said that the author of the Resolution wrote him and requested that the last three Whereas Clauses be struck, and the first Resolved Clause be struck. He asked if Mr. Rabkin would like to add that to his motion.

Mr. Rabkin said he would like to make that motion, and strike the fourth Whereas Clause, which all his friends have told him was over the top, flamboyant, and provocative. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wolgin.

Mr. Kramer moved to amend the amendment, to leave lines the fourth Whereas Clause in. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Wolgin suggested splitting the amendments into two motions, to remove the fourth Whereas Clause and to then vote on the other amendment.

The motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Rabkin moved to strike lines the fourth Whereas Clause, which mentions Jim Crow. The motion was seconded by Mr. St. Claire.

Mr. Konwinski said it wasn't discriminating between faculty members and students. Some suffer from this, but he didn't think all undocumented students suffer from this.

Ms. Anderson said she thought they all had strong opinions on this and they're not going to convince each other, so someone should move to vote on this.

On a point of information, Mr. Ortega said that the way the DREAM Act was worded, it didn't apply to just any undocumented students. The Act looks at undocumented students who have been part of the California system and who meet all the requirements to attend a school in the UC System. That meant they have at least gone through a high school education in California and have met all the requirements and taken all the exams to get into UC. These are students who have been in California since they were very young and did not have an option whether or not to be here, and were suffering the consequences of not being supported financially in any way because they are not.

Ms. Anderson said Mr. Ortega's comment was debate on the Resolution. As Rules Chair, it was her job to note that the statement was not a point of information.

Mr. Wolgin said he didn't have a problem with the fourth Whereas Clause, but he had an issue with the comparison to the old Jim Crow era, which seemed to him both odd and vague. He didn't think the situation was analogous. He thought the situation was discriminatory in a lot of senses, and he supported the

DREAM Act. But without going into the history, it was a different situation, and that Whereas Clause tried to use something that was very inflammatory just to prove a point. He strongly didn't like that language.

Mr. Rabkin said the DREAM Act had nothing to do with tuition in California, and it grants American citizenship to illegal aliens who came here when they were minors. Maybe that was worthwhile, but this happens not to be Jim Crow-like. This was not about their stigmatized, but we're they're treating them but we would treat them as if they were legal immigrants from Mexico. One doesn't get American tuition breaks if one isn't an American citizen. The fact that they have been living her a long time didn't mean they were being deeply stigmatized. The Act treats unlawful immigrants the same as lawful immigrants are treated.

A Delegate called the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT, TO STRIKE THE FOURTH WHEREAS CLAUSE PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 13-11.

Mr. Daal said they were back to the Resolution as amended.

Mr. Rabkin moved to strike the last three Whereas Clauses ("on March 17...."; "the event allows...."; "the transcript...."), and to strike the first Resolved Clause ("that the GA will endorse"). The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Rabkin moved to amend the bill by striking the last Resolved Clause ("the President or the EAVP...."). He said BAMN was a controversial organization and if people wanted to send a letter, the GA could do that itself and didn't need to send it through BAMN. But it did appear that the External Affairs Committee thought sending such a letter was not the right way to do this.

The motion to amend was seconded by Mr. St. Claire.

Mr. Wolgin asked if the amendment would mean the GA was getting rid of the Directed Action. Ms. Anderson said it did.

Mr. Kramer said that if they didn't like BAMN, he would ask why they wouldn't just move to strike the wording about BAMN. Mr. Rabkin said that it sounded like they didn't want to send a letter in the first place. That's what he heard from the External Affairs Committee, that sending a letter was pointless. Mr. Kramer said it was symbolic.

Mr. Marchand said he supported leaving that wording in. The question was not that the President of the US read every letter, but if 50 student associations sent a letter supporting the Act, that would have an impact just by the number. Mr. Rabkin said he would like to withdraw and modify his proposal.

Mr. Rabkin said he would make a new motion, to amend the last Resolved Clause strike from the comma after "Administration" to the end of the sentence. The GA could send the letter itself. As amended, the third Resolved Clause would read as follows:



"Resolved, that the President or the External Affairs Vice President of the Graduate Assembly shall send a letter appended with a copy of this bill to the Obama Administration."

Mr. Daal said there was now a new motion on the floor, to strike from line 79, after the comma, to line 80, to the end. The motion to amend was seconded. Mr. Daal said the letter would just go to the Obama Administration, not to BAMN.

Mr. Konwinski asked what BAMN was. Ms. Rivas said it's an organization and was nationwide. It's "By Any Means Necessary."

Mr. Rajan moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed with no objection.

The motion amend the last Resolved Clause failed by hand-vote 11-12-0.

Mr. Daal said they were back to discussion of the Resolution.

Ms. Ritterman moved to amend to return the fourth Whereas Clause in the bill, but to delete the Jim Crow statement. The amendment would delete "analogous" through "old Jim Crow era," and replace that wording to read as follows:

"Whereas, undocumented immigrant students face a situation where, due to circumstances that were and are out of their control, are stigmatized...."

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Rabkin said he didn't think it was true, and didn't think the students were stigmatized. Mr. Daal said there was an objection to the motion. He called for any debate.

A motion to end debate on the motion was made by Ms. Ritterman and was seconded.

Mr. Rabkin asked if they had a quorum at that time. Mr. Rajan said that if they have half of the people who started the meeting, plus one present, they have a quorum. But if quorum was all Delegates, half plus one, then everything the GA did was invalid.

Ms. Anderson said she's looked up the answer to this question and never recalled how it went exactly. Mr. Daal said he would entertain a motion to recess for three minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Daal said they had a quorum.

Mr. Daal said the vote was on Ms. Ritterman's amendment. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 20-4.

Mr. Daal called for further discussion on the Resolution. Mr. Froehle moved to call the question. The motion to end debate on 0903e, as amended, passed by hand-vote 15-6.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0903e, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 19-6-0, RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF THE 6th PUBLIC HEARING ON CAMPUS CLIMATE: "MAKE A NEW VISION OF HOPE REAL AT UC BERKELEY: MAKE UCB A DIVERSE, INTEGRATED, AND AFFORDABLE SANCTUARY CAMPUS."

Mr. Rabkin moved to reconsider the Resolution and said it was shocking to say, "Here's the position of the GA." If they were to say that this represented the GA, it should be at least discussed. Mr. Froehle said that Mr. Rabkin did not vote on the prevailing side and therefore could not move to reconsider the motion. Mr. Rabkin said he would withdraw his motion.

Ms. Able said they wouldn't say that all graduate students support this.

Mr. Rajan moved to extend meeting time by ten minutes and to go to the Resolution on Revenue Sharing, 0903a, as the next item on the agenda. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

#### Resolution 0903a

Mr. Daal said they were now talking about the motion to revisit 0903a and 0903b. Last night, the ASUC Senate finally voted on the revenue sharing Resolution that the GA reviewed last time, as well as the expense sharing Resolution. Since Delegates last saw it, amendments have been made, and the changes were substantive. Those changes have been marked clearly on the version of the bill Delegates had. It's the version that the Senate passed on Wednesday. He thought that what was passed was acceptable to the GA. One thing that made him think it was acceptable was that the Resolution calls for the creation of a committee that will constantly review how the revenue sharing was going. He believed that if the GA were to have grievances, they would be able to get them positively addressed through this committee, because it had favorable membership.

Mr. Daal said they would first start by discussing 0903a.

#### DIRECTED ACTION AND STANDING POLICY REGARDING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY REVENUE SHARING BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GA

WHEREAS, the ASUC Senate has voted to pass an amended version of the appended GA/ASUC revenue sharing bill; and

DIRECTED ACTION AND STANDING POLICY REGARDING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY  
REVENUE SHARING BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GA (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the GA and the ASUC must approve identical versions of the bill in order to confirm bilateral support of the terms of revenue sharing; therefore it is moved to reconsider the previously approved Resolution, 0903a, amended to reflect the terms approved by the ASUC Senate.

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly (GA) President has written the appended bill in support of the fair and equitable sharing of commercial activities revenue between the GA and the ASUC;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA makes it a standing policy to support the bill.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the GA President is directed to continue pursuit of passage of the bill and, with the approval of the Executive Board, to make any necessary changes in order to secure approval by the ASUC Senate, the Chancellor, and the Store Operations Board.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SHARED COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES REVENUE BETWEEN  
THE ASUC AND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY (GA) [Authored by Miguel Daal GA President,  
2008-9]

WHEREAS, when graduate and undergraduate students work collaboratively on a project in the pursuit of a mutual goal, the success of that project is all the more likely; and

WHEREAS, graduate students comprise approximately one-third of the student population on the Berkeley campus; and

WHEREAS, ASUC commercial activities revenue has been relatively flat for the past ten years, which is inconsistent with inflation, since if the revenue had kept up with inflation, the total revenue would have been \$1,000,000 more than it is today; and

WHEREAS, the residual commercial activities revenue returned to the ASUC student government was \$0 for fiscal year 2007-2008 and is projected to be \$0 for fiscal year 2008-2009; and

WHEREAS, it is fiscally beneficial to develop ASUC businesses that are attractive to graduate students; and

WHEREAS, it is fiscally sensible to encourage greater patronage of existing and future ASUC commercial business in general; and

WHEREAS, it is important and necessary to create incentives for graduate students to invest time and money in order to ensure the present and future profitability of student government commercial activities; and

DIRECTED ACTION AND STANDING POLICY REGARDING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY  
REVENUE SHARING BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GA (cont'd)

WHEREAS, an agreement to share commercial activities revenue would make it worthwhile for the GA to proceed with its plans to make available the Anthony Hall patio as rental space and to pursue the idea of situating a coffee vendor cart in front of Anthony Hall; and

WHEREAS, an agreement to share commercial activities revenue would make it worthwhile for the GA to promote graduate student patronage of the Lower Sproul businesses; and

WHEREAS, graduate students are at Berkeley for longer periods of time, and consequently have a more expansive institutional memory, which is crucial for successfully managed business; and

WHEREAS, it would bring about fiscal equity and financial responsibility for commercial activities revenue to be shared as equally and as fairly as student fees currently are; and

WHEREAS, in their document titled "Graduate Provisions Regarding Lower Sproul Redevelopment," graduate students indicated that GA investment in a Lower Sproul campaign should be consistent with returns graduate students could see on that investment; and

WHEREAS, a plan to share only those revenues generated by graduate student patronage would be inconsistent with the goal of maximally increasing revenue because it would only yield revenue generated by a subset of students; and

WHEREAS, a plan to share only those revenues generated by graduate student patronage would be intractable to implement; and

WHEREAS, a revenue sharing agreement aimed at increasing overall ASUC commercial activities revenue would be an appropriate action to attempt to jumpstart revenue growth after ten years of essentially constant revenue; and

WHEREAS, revenue received by the GA from student government commercial activities would enable it to better serve its constituency by increasing its capacity to fund student groups and advocacy, and to adequately support a wide range of programming aimed at improving student life and services; and

WHEREAS, the proposed sharing agreement seeks to enlarge revenue rather than divide up an already small residual, given the \$274,000 minimum sharing threshold; and

WHEREAS, the \$274,000 minimum sharing threshold corresponds to slightly more than the maximum residual revenue ever returned to student government (in Fiscal Year 1999 - 2000); and

WHEREAS, a residual revenue return in excess of the \$274,000 minimum sharing threshold would benchmark the accomplishment of the GA and the ASUC collaboratively working toward a more successful commercial activities enterprise; and

DIRECTED ACTION AND STANDING POLICY REGARDING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY REVENUE SHARING BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GA (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Commercial Activities Agreement are consistent with the intent to share revenue and to encourage greater graduate student involvement in commercial activities for the purpose of establishing financial equity and optimizing fiscal returns; and

WHEREAS, the proposed sharing agreement is responsible since it is accompanied by a proposal to share expenses;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly agree to recommend amendments to the Commercial Activities Agreement as follows (altered/added text appears in all caps):

-----

Begin proposed amendment to the Commercial Activities Agreement

L. The ASUC Senate and the Graduate Assembly approved a resolution recommending amendments to the Commercial Activities Agreement which create a greater stake for the Graduate Assembly in the success of ASUC commercial activities. Both parties agree that increasing the Graduate Assembly’s stake is fair and creates incentive for the Graduate Assembly to work with the ASUC toward successful commercial activities. This resolution is attached hereto as Exhibit H and made a part hereof.

1.2.3 The PRESIDENT OF THE ASUC, THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY, OR THEIR DESIGNATES shall be ex officio voting members of the Board.

4.1 ASUC and GA Accounts.

- A. STUDENT GOVERNMENT FEES AND REVENUE. TWO SEPARATE BANK ACCOUNTS SHALL BE ESTABLISHED, ONE DESIGNATED AS THE ASUC STUDENT FEE ACCOUNT AND ONE DESIGNATED AS THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLE STUDENT FEE ACCOUNT. STUDENT REGISTRATION FEES AND OTHER NON-COMMERCIAL FUNDS GENERATED BY THE RESPECTIVE BRANCHES OF STUDENT GOVERNMENT SHALL BE DEPOSITED AS APPROPRIATE INTO EACH OF THE AFORESAID ACCOUNTS. STUDENT FEES SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO EACH ACCOUNT IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 4.1.1, BELOW.
- B. COMMERCIAL REVENUE. TWO SEPARATE BANK ACCOUNTS SHALL BE ESTABLISHED, ONE DESIGNATED AS THE ASUC COMMERCIAL REVENUES ACCOUNT AND ONE DESIGNATED AS THE GRADUATE

DIRECTED ACTION AND STANDING POLICY REGARDING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY REVENUE SHARING BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GA (cont'd)

C. ASSEMBLY COMMERCIAL REVENUES ACCOUNT. REVENUE FROM STUDENT GOVERNMENT COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO EACH ACCOUNT IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 5.3, 5.3.1 AND 5.3.2.

4.1.1. FAIR SHARE PERCENTAGE. THE ASUC FAIR SHARE PERCENTAGE IS THE NUMBER OF ENROLLED UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL ENROLLED STUDENTS FOR THE PREVIOUS ACADEMIC YEAR (SEPTEMBER THROUGH MAY). THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY FAIR SHARE PERCENTAGE IS ONE HUNDRED PERCENT (100%) LESS THE ASUC FAIR SHARE PERCENTAGE.

4.2 Accounting. The Auxiliary shall provide accounting services for the ASUC and ASUC Commercial Activities. Both the Student Fee Account(s) and the Commercial Revenue Account(s) shall be established and maintained with two groups of signatories. The signatories of Group "A" shall be the President and Executive Vice President of the ASUC. The signatories of Group "B" shall be the Director of the Auxiliary and his/her designee(s). Checks drawn in the amount of \$1,000 or more shall require two signatures, at least one of which shall be from Group "A". A stop payment order with respect to checks of \$1,000 or more shall require two signatures, at least one of which shall be from Group "A". The bank(s) at which these accounts are maintained shall issue duplicate monthly statements to both the ASUC and the Auxiliary. FOR PURPOSES OF THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY STUDENT FEE ACCOUNT AND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY COMMERCIAL REVENUES ACCOUNT, THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY PRESIDENT SHALL BE A SIGNATORY OF GROUP "A".

4.3.1 Any official of the ASUC, ANY DELEGATE, CHAIR, OR OFFICER OF GA and any member of the Board may at all reasonable times during regular business hours inspect the books and records of the Auxiliary and make copies and extracts therefrom and may discuss the affairs, accounts and finances of the Auxiliary with its managers and employees, and the University will furnish to the ASUC, GRADUATE ASSEMBLY, and the Board statements which are accurate in all material respects regarding the operations of the Auxiliary, its rental income, its Operating Expenses, and, to the extent known to the University, the operations of third party providers of ASUC Campus Commercial Activities, all at such times and as often as shall be reasonably requested.

5.1 ..... In order to control Operating Expenses, the Auxiliary's budget for any fiscal year shall not, without the express, prior written consent of the Chancellor, THE ASUC SENATE AND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY, exceed the budget for the preceding fiscal year plus an amount equal to the product of the budget for the preceding fiscal year multiplied by the sum of five percent plus the percentage increase in the Consumer Price

DIRECTED ACTION AND STANDING POLICY REGARDING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY REVENUE SHARING BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GA (cont'd)

Index for All Urban Consumers (I 982-84=1 00) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (or any comparable successor thereto) for such fiscal year.

5.3 ASUC Commercial Activities Income After Repayment of ASUC Debt. After the ASUC Debt is fully repaid, all income received by the University or the ASUC from third parties conducting ASUC Commercial Activities shall be paid as follows:

5.3.1 such third parties shall make periodic payments to the University sufficient in the aggregate to cover the estimated Operating Expenses for the then current fiscal year of the Auxiliary; and

5.3.2 SUCH THIRD PARTIES SHALL PAY THE BALANCE OF THEIR CONTRACTUAL PAYMENT OBLIGATIONS ("STUDENT GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS") DIRECTLY TO THE STUDENT GOVERNMENTS AS FOLLOWS:

A. IF THE TOTAL ANNUAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS ARE \$274,000 OR LESS, THEN THEY SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO THE ASUC COMMERCIAL REVENUES ACCOUNT.

IF THE TOTAL ANNUAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS ARE GREATER THAN \$274,000, AND LESS THAN \$690,000, THEN THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY FAIR SHARE PERCENTAGE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TOTAL ANNUAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND \$274,000 SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY COMMERCIAL REVENUES ACCOUNT, WITH THE REMAINDER BEING DEPOSITED INTO THE ASUC COMMERCIAL REVENUES ACCOUNT.

B. IF THE TOTAL ANNUAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS ARE GREATER THAN \$690,000, THEN THE ASUC FAIR SHARE PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL ANNUAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO THE ASUC COMMERCIAL REVENUES ACCOUNT, WITH THE REMAINDER BEING DEPOSITED INTO THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY COMMERCIAL REVENUES ACCOUNT.

The Director of the Auxiliary may propose for the Board's approval that one or more of the third party providers of ASUC Commercial Activities divide payments between the ASUC and the University so as to affect the intent of this Section 5.3, based on the Auxiliary's budget.

11.2 Appeal to the Chancellor. If resolution of a dispute cannot be achieved through the measures described in Section 11.1, above, the President of the ASUC AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY may appeal directly to the Chancellor whose decision shall be final. Any such appeal shall be in writing, setting forth the basis for the

DIRECTED ACTION AND STANDING POLICY REGARDING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY  
REVENUE SHARING BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GA (cont'd)

appeal. The Chancellor may, but shall not be obligated to, meet and confer with the President of the ASUC regarding such appeal. Any decision of the Chancellor hereunder shall be in writing, shall be delivered to the President of the ASUC and to the Board, and shall be accompanied by a written statement of the basis for such decision.

15 All notices, requests, demands and other communications given or required to be given under this Agreement shall be in writing, delivered personally, by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, or via overnight commercial courier services as follows:

University:  
Office of the Vice Chancellor Business and Administrative Services California Hall  
University of California Berkeley, CA 94720

ASUC:  
Office of the President Associated Students of the University of California 200  
Eshleman Hall  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

ASUC Senate:  
200 Eshleman Hall  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
Attention: Executive Vice President

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY:  
ANTHONY HALL MC 4500  
UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY  
BERKELEY, CA 94720  
ATTENTION: GRADUATE ASSEMBLY PRESIDENT

Any such notice sent by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, shall be deemed to have been duly given and received two (2) business days after it is mailed with postage prepaid. Notice sent in any other manner shall be effective upon actual receipt thereof.

End proposed amendment to the Commercial Activities Agreement  
-----

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that approval of this bill shall neither imply nor engender changes to current revenue or expense allocation agreements or practices except where specifically defined in this or future agreements.



BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if approved, this bill will be forwarded to the Stores Operation Board for approval and, with the approval of the Board, shall be forwarded to the UC Berkeley Chancellor for final approval and contract amendment execution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a committee whose name shall be called the Revenue Sharing Committee be created under Title III of the ASUC Financial By-laws consisting of the ASUC President, the GA President, one Senator, and one graduate student member of the Stores Operation Board.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Revenue Sharing Committee shall be charged with producing a Report on Commercial Activity Revenue Sharing due on February 29th (every four years) to both the ASUC Senate and the GA Delegate Assembly, which analyzes relevant changes in circumstances since the last report and which makes recommendations regarding how to continue progress toward the goals of this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in years when the Report on Commercial Activity Revenue Sharing is not due, the Committee is charged with monitoring progress toward the goals of this Resolution and, if the Committee decides it is necessary, may issue an interim Report on Commercial Activity Revenue Sharing due on or before February 28th of the current academic year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the purview of the Revenue Sharing Committee and subject of the Report on Commercial Activity Revenue Sharing may encompass consideration of any sharing of ASUC and GA expenses insofar as such sharing is related to the goals of this Resolution and the financial circumstances of the time.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate delegates all necessary authority to the ASUC President to make any necessary change to agreement in order to secure approval by the Chancellor and the Stores Operation Board.

Mr. Froehle asked if he could refer 5.3.2.B, and said the figure there, \$600,000, should be amended to \$690,000. Mr. Daal said that should be changed to \$690,000. As printed, it was an error, so they should consider it amended.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0903a, AS CORRECTED, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 23-0, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SHARED COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES REVENUE BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY (GA)

Resolution 0903b

Mr. Daal said the next Resolution was 0903b.

May 7, 2009: Motion to reconsider bill 0903b:

WHEREAS, the ASUC Senate has voted to pass an amended version of the appended GA/ASUC expense sharing bill; and

WHEREAS, the GA and the ASUC must approve identical versions of the bill in order to confirm bilateral support of the terms of revenue sharing;

THEREFORE it is moved to reconsider the previously approved Resolution, 0903b, amended to reflect the terms approved by the ASUC Senate.

#### RESOLUTION TO SHARE EXPENSES BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY

[authored by Miguel Daal, 2008-9, and was co-sponsored by Ms. Winston, Executive Vice President Pasco, Sen. Hussain, Sen. Mairena, Sen. Zuo, and Sen. Tran]

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly (GA) and the ASUC recognize that a fair and equitable commercial activities revenue sharing agreement implies a responsibility to the fair and equal sharing of the fiscal burden from goods and services that mutually benefit the GA and the ASUC; and

WHEREAS, a fair and equitable commercial activities revenue sharing agreement is, in itself, an agreement to share the expense of funding the ASUC Auxiliary; and

WHEREAS, there are goods and services of obvious mutual benefit to the GA and the ASUC, which are not provided by the ASUC Auxiliary; and

WHEREAS, the sharing of expenses implies an equal distribution of authority and ownership over those expenses; and

WHEREAS, the ASUC fiscal year 08-09 budget allocates \$48,000 for elections costs, \$48,000 in attorney's fees, \$15,572.14 for the Legal Defense Fund, and the GA fiscal year 08-09 budget allocates approximately \$50,000 for its Business Office and stenographer; and

WHEREAS, the "expense sharing percentage" shall be defined as the percentage of all commercial activities residual revenue which is directed to the GA from the previous fiscal year;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA and the ASUC agree to share fairly and equitably the expenses of ASUC elections, the GA Business Office and stenographer, the ASUC attorney, and contributions to the ASUC Legal Defense Fund, subject to the following terms:

1. For the ASUC elections, the GA shall pay the greater of the expense share percentage of the election cost and the amount specified in Section V of the "Memorandum of

RESOLUTION TO SHARE EXPENSES BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY (cont'd)

Understanding between the Associated Students of the University of California and the Graduate Assembly";

2. The ASUC and the GA formally request that the ASUC Auxiliary pay the full expense of the GA Business Office and stenographer;
3. The GA shall pay the expense share percentage of ASUC attorney's fees;
4. The GA shall pay the portion equal to the expense share percentage of the total amount to be deposited into the Legal Defense Fund that year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this expense sharing agreement shall be in effect in years when the following three conditions are fulfilled:

1. The GA Delegates and the ASUC Senate ratify identical expense sharing Resolutions;
2. The Chancellor executes proposed amendments to the Commercial Activities Agreement which bring about fair commercial activities revenue sharing between the GA and the ASUC;
3. The total residual commercial activities revenue returned to student government is at least \$274,000.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the GA adopts this expense sharing Resolution as a standing policy.

Mr. Daal called for any discussion. A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RES 0903b PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO SHARE EXPENSES BETWEEN THE ASUC AND THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY.

REPORTS (cont'd)

Mr. Daal said it was 7:23 and the meeting was extended by ten minutes. Reports were posted online and in the packet.

Mr. Daal said he would begin with his President's report, and would like to tell them about the budget memo. Several people who were present have been working on it, and it was just about ready to be released to the Administration. It would make it a more powerful statement if they could say that it was

approved by the Delegate Assembly. The memo, which was provided to Delegates, describes graduate student budget priorities, which was timely to talk about in these times of deep cuts. He believed perhaps the most interesting part was the actual prioritization of what things to cut more or less.

Mr. Daal said he would entertain a motion to approve the budget memo. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Wolgin and Mr. St. Claire. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BUDGET MEMO PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. [See Appendix.]

For the report from the External Affairs Vice President, Mr. Ortega said that very briefly, the Regents voted that day to raise grad student fees anywhere from 5-10%, depending on which program they're in. He wasn't at the meeting and he didn't have all the details, but he Lucero Chavez was pretty informed about what was happening and people could contact her at [president@ucsa.org](mailto:president@ucsa.org).

For an update on their national lobby, Mr. Ortega said that as they knew, the GA approved to allocate funding to take a group of students to Washington, D.C. and lobby on two student issues, which were to expand the loan forgiveness program and to get graduate student scholarships and fellowships to be non-taxable income. Regarding the expansion of loan forgiveness, people were supportive of it, but didn't think it was a good time for that since it was just introduced and expanded in the last couple of years. But they did receive a lot of support for the tax item, and hopefully that's something they'll be able to achieve in the next couple of years.

Reporting for the Environmental Sustainability Committee, Mr. Kramer said they got a \$55,000 grant for recycling on campus, due to the excellent work of Mikel Schulman and Philippe Marchand, and somebody else.

In the report from the Business Manager, Ms. Hsueh said that from the Business Office, they'll continue to be open Monday through Thursday. Until May 22 their hours are from 10:00 to 5:00, and on Fridays, from 10:00 to 4:00. After the Memorial Day holiday, they'll have summer hours, from 10:00 to 3:00, Monday through Friday.

Ms. Hsueh said that May 11 is the last day for people in student groups to submit their receipt in order to get reimbursed. Beyond May 11, if they submit a receipt, they wouldn't get their money.

Mr. Daal said he would like to call their attention to the Delegate feedback form and would ask them to please remember to fill it out. It was very important. In addition, he would like to bring up the fact that next Thursday, from 5:30 to 8:30, the GA will have a barbecue at Anthony Hall, with ASUC Senators. Delegates were invited. The Senators would like to meet them, and maybe Delegates would like to meet Senators.

#### RESOLUTION REFERAL

Mr. Daal said that that bills that are referred will be considered under Old Business.

Mr. Rajan moved to fast track 0905b. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Resolution 0905b

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO ALLOW *THE BERKELEY GRADUATE* TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM ITS COPYING/PRINTING LINE ITEM TO THE MISCELLANEOUS LINE ITEM

WHEREAS, *The Berkeley Graduate* needs to update its hardware to allow it to switch from print to digital editions; and

WHEREAS, there is a surplus in the Copying/Printing line item; and

WHEREAS, the proposed solution will not require any additional funds but simply reallocates existing funds; and

WHEREAS, the Budget Committee fully supports a change to the budget to resolve this situation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA authorizes the transfer of the remaining funds from the Copying/Printing line item to the Miscellaneous line item of the 2008-2009 *The Berkeley Graduate* budget.

Mr. Daal said that to give some background on this, the GA voted to fast track this Resolution last time, but apparently they never actually voted to approve the Resolution.

Mr. Rajan said the Resolution was exactly the same as it was last time when the GA voted to fast track it. He had assumed that was a vote to approve it, although that was not the case. The only thing that's changed is that there was no longer \$37,500, but it was whatever was left in the account. This was purely procedural, and they just needed to get this done, so Ms. ElNaggar could get reimbursed. If the GA didn't pass this, Ms. ElNaggar would get reimbursed anyway, and Mr. Rajan said that people could yell at him next year.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0905b PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GA BUDGET TO ALLOW *THE BERKELEY GRADUATE* TO TRANSFER FUNDS FROM ITS COPYING/PRINTING LINE ITEM TO THE MISCELLANEOUS LINE ITEM.

Resolution 0905a

Ms. Anderson moved to fast track Resolution 0905a. The motion was seconded by Mr. St. Claire and passed with no objection.

The following Resolution, 0905a, was authored by Ms. Anderson and Mr. Daal:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATIONS

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly (GA) believes that advances in scholarly research should be available free of cost to a wider public; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GA fully supports the attached "Student Statement on the Right to Research," or a more final draft of it, which is substantively the same.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Assembly calls upon the President or his staff to draft a letter on behalf of the Assembly expressing support of the attached statement.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that copies of this letter, signed by the President, be sent to Thomas Leonard, the University Librarian for UC Berkeley, by August 1, 2009.

-----

Begin Student Statement on the Right to Research

STUDENT STATEMENT ON THE RIGHT TO RESEARCH

Scholarly knowledge is part of the common wealth of humanity

Unfortunately, not everyone has access to the scholarly literature, despite advances in communications technology. The high cost of academic journals restricts access to knowledge -- in some fields, prices can reach \$20,000 for a single journal subscription, or \$30 for an individual article.<sup>1</sup> Research is funded overwhelmingly from public sources, and scholarly authors are not paid for their articles. Yet taxpayers are locked out. Learning and inquiry are impeded when scholars lack access to fellow researchers' work, and when students lack access to the work of scholars before them.

At the same time, digital technologies open new opportunities for research. New tools can facilitate faster discoveries, speed the development of new technologies, and accelerate the progress of science. Patients could have access to the latest medical research, citizens could evaluate scientific information on environmental impacts, and developing countries could apply the most recent scholarship to public health and development efforts. But access barriers leave these opportunities under-explored.

Open access

Open access is an alternative to the traditional close system of scholarly communication. Open access makes the result of scholarly research available online for free, removes permission barriers for scholarly and educational uses<sup>2</sup>. Entire journals can be open access, or an author can provide open access to an individual article by posting a copy on an open access Web site. In either case, open access is compatible with rigorous methods of quality control, including peer review.

## RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATIONS (cont'd)

-----  
Student Statement on the Right to Research (cont'd)

Open access has achieved remarkable success to date -- including nearly 4,000 open access journals<sup>3</sup>, millions of articles available via open access repositories<sup>4</sup>, and dozens of policies at universities and research funders supporting open access<sup>5</sup> -- but more still needs to be done.

We, the undersigned student organizations, hereby endorse open access as the preferred model for scholarly communication, because:

- a) *Open access improves the educational experience.* All students, regardless of their institution's ability to afford subscriptions, should have access to the full scholarly record, whether for assigned reading, research for a term paper, or literature review for a dissertation.
- b) *Open access democratizes research information.* Students from around the world should have full access to the scholarly literature, along with patients looking for medical information, and citizens seeking to learn about the environment.
- c) *Open access advances research.* Open access helps researchers be more productive by reducing the cost and burden of gaining access to the latest studies. Open access also enables new techniques for computer-assisted research, paving the way for scientific advancements.
- d) *Open access improves the visibility of scholarship.* Today's student is tomorrow's scholar. Recent studies suggest that open access articles are downloaded and cited more frequently than articles that are accessible only through subscription.<sup>6</sup> Open access fulfills researchers' professional responsibility to maximize the impact of their research.

Therefore, we hereby:

Call upon universities to support open access

Universities should adopt policies that ensure open access to their faculty's research, such as the policies recently adopted at Harvard University<sup>7</sup> and Stanford University.<sup>8</sup>

Call upon governments and research funders to support open access

Research agencies should adopt policies that ensure open access to publicly funded research, such as those of the National Institutes of Health<sup>9</sup> and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.<sup>10</sup>

Charitable funders likewise should adopt policies that ensure open access to their funded research, such as those of the Canadian Cancer Society<sup>11</sup> and Autism Speaks.<sup>12</sup>

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATIONS (cont'd)

-----  
Student Statement on the Right to Research (cont'd)

Call upon researchers to support open access

Researchers should publish in open access journals, and/or deposit it peer-reviewed manuscripts in open access repositories.<sup>13</sup>

Commit to support open access in our activities

We will undertake activities, in our membership and on our campuses, to educate students about open access and to engage them in efforts supporting open access.

<sup>1</sup> (cite)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www222.soros.org/openaccess/read.shtml>; <http://shewww.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/Bethesda.htm>; <http://oa.pg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html>

<sup>3</sup> DOAJ

<sup>4</sup> [http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA\\_by\\_the\\_numbers](http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/OA_by_the_numbers)

<sup>5</sup> ROARMAP

<sup>6</sup> (cite)

<sup>7</sup> <http://osc.hul.harvard.edu/Openaccess/overview.php>

<sup>8</sup> <http://ed.stanford.edu/suse/faculty/openaccess.html>

<sup>9</sup> <http://publicaccess.nih.gov/policy.htm>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/34846.html>

<sup>11</sup> [http://cancer.ca/research/policies and administration/policy/open access.aspx](http://cancer.ca/research/policies_and_administration/policy/open_access.aspx)

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.autismspeaks.org/science/overview/policies/policy\\_on\\_public\\_access\\_to\\_research.php](http://www.autismspeaks.org/science/overview/policies/policy_on_public_access_to_research.php)

<sup>13</sup> (cite)

End Student Statement on the Right to Research  
-----

Mr. Daal said the Resolution deals with open access publications. It would save the University a lot of money.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE 0905a PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION IN SUPPORT OF OPEN ACCESS PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. Daal said that completed their agenda items. A motion to adjourn was made and seconded passed with no objection. (Applause)

This meeting, concluding the Spring Semester, adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

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



The following Resolution, 0903e, as amended on the floor, was authored by Mr. Cruz:

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action In Support of the 6th Public Hearing on Campus Climate: "Make a New Vision of Hope Real at UC Berkeley: Make UCB a Diverse, Integrated, and Affordable Sanctuary Campus." [Amended version, as amended on the floor.]

Whereas, to maintain its long tradition of being California's flagship public university, a world-class research institution, and a diverse campus, UC Berkeley must respond to the changing racial and ethnic demographics of California; and

Whereas, the numbers of underrepresented minority students (black, Latina/o, and Native American students) enrolled at UC Berkeley have been abysmally low. In 2008, underrepresented minority students comprised about 16.1% of UC Berkeley's 2008 freshman class, while making up 42% of California's high school graduates. (UC Office of the President, California Department of Education); and

Whereas, these underrepresented minority students experience everyday acts of isolation, discrimination, and prejudice on and off campus; and

Whereas, undocumented immigrant students face a situation where, due to circumstances that were and are out of their control, are stigmatized and denied financial aid and an opportunity to pursue their dream of a higher education; and

Whereas, the election of Barack Obama as this nation's first black president opens a new period of hope, and the possibility of removing the barriers to higher education for black, Latina/o, Native American, other underrepresented minority, and undocumented immigrant students, as well as the possibility of expanding educational opportunities for all; and

Whereas, the Federal DREAM Act would allow undocumented immigrant students to be eligible for federal financial aid and open a pathway to citizenship; and

Whereas, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reported in its November 24, 2008 issue ("Immigration in the First 100 Days?") that Senate majority leader Harry Reid (D-NV) said, "On [the Federal DREAM Act], there's been an agreement between [President-elect] Obama and [Senator] McCain to move forward on that." President-elect Obama and a large bipartisan majority of Congress have repeatedly declared their support for the passage of the Federal DREAM Act. Among previous co-sponsors of the DREAM Act have been Sen. Richard Durbin (D-IL) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT). On November 5, 2008, Chancellor Robert Birgeneau called on Obama to enact the Federal DREAM Act as soon as he assumes office;

#### Standing Policy

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly calls on President Barack Obama and the Democrat-controlled Congress to pass the Federal DREAM Act.

Directed Action

Be It Further Resolved, that the President or the External Affairs Vice President of the Graduate Assembly shall send a letter appended with a copy of this bill to the Obama Administration, and send a copy of this letter to BAMN, so that they may help publicize the Graduate Assembly's position.

-----  
Begin Budget Memo

June 4, 2009

Chancellor Robert J. Birgeneau  
200 California Hall  
UC Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dear Chancellor Birgeneau,

As representatives of UC Berkeley's 10,000+ graduate student population, the Graduate Assembly (GA) would like to present the graduate student perspective on the UC Berkeley budget. This AY 2009-10 budget memo expresses the GA's convictions on how the administration should treat student and student-approved funds, as well as the GA's recommendations for each third-tier activity based budget approach (ABBA) category. This document is also meant to articulate the interests of the graduate student population to help ensure that they are represented while budget decisions are being made.

As citizens of the campus community, we are committed to maintaining the preeminence of the University and assuming our fair share of the burden. We understand that the fiscal situation of the University and the UC system as a whole has deteriorated since last year. This memo assumes a shortfall of \$147M<sup>1</sup> in UC Berkeley's AY 2009-10 budget, due to reduced state funding and expanded unfunded mandates. We acknowledge that such a shortfall, in comparison to the \$633.7M of State General Funds Berkeley received for AY 2008-09, will require that exceptionally difficult decisions be made. We are confident that such decisions will be fair, ethical, and efficacious at balancing the budget.

We believe that the campus should be committed to sustained competitive funding for graduate student support. We also believe that it should honor its existing agreements, which are based on a relationship of trust, with the student body. However, we are concerned that the administration does not always take into account the importance of trust in its budgetary decisions. This issue is discussed further in two appendices of this letter. We urge you to read them, as the points reflected therein are crucial to maintaining the preeminence of UC Berkeley's graduate program, and its ability to recruit and retain the best graduate students.

We have derived these recommendations from a combination of input from the Delegates of the Graduate Assembly, a budget advisory subcommittee of the GA, and from technical information provided by acting Associate Vice Chancellor Teresa Constantinidis and Senior Budget Coordinator Jill Moak. The GA Delegates unanimously approved the following recommendations at their May 7, 2009 meeting.

Budget Recommendations

Our recommendations assign average, above average, and below average cuts to each third-level ABBA category. In the interest of producing a fiscally responsible balance, our cuts are designed so that the total amount receiving a below average cut recommendation is approximately equal to that receiving an above average cut recommendation. The amounts shown are the funds subject to cut for AY 2009-10, less any applicable program exclusions. They do include Central Campus provision, such as employee benefits.

We based our recommendations on the ABBA categories because our priorities are more aligned with functional groupings of units and we organized our priorities according to the following three criteria:

1. Maintaining Graduate Student Financial Support and Competitiveness: While the community as a whole faces fiscal uncertainty, graduate students in particular are already on average among the lowest paid campus members. Many have trouble keeping up with living expenses. At the same time, graduate students with offers of admission to Berkeley decide whether or not to accept while giving consideration to competing schools' financial support packages. In the interest of Berkeley's competitiveness at attracting the best graduate students, and its support for our constituents, Berkeley's current graduate students, this criterion is paramount.

2. Maintaining Graduate Student Well-Being: It is critical that programs and services which support the essential needs of graduate students, such as food, lodging, health and safety, be maintained. Such programs and services may be easy to cut because they appear, at cursory glance, as ancillary to the research and teaching missions of the University. However, we believe that the destabilizing effects they would have on graduate students would in fact negatively impact research, teaching and learning.

3. Sustaining Comprehensive Academic Excellence: We believe that, even in times of crisis, the University must work to preserve its comprehensive excellence. We hope that the campus will see the road ahead not as not as a challenge to be weathered, but an opportunity to streamline the every-day functioning of the University.

BELOW AVERAGE CUT RECOMMENDATIONS

ABBA Category	Funds Subject to Cut	Rationale
Instruction (Graduate Student Portion s Only)	\$52M	Many graduate student stipends are supported by GSI and Readership positions. If funding for instruction is reduced, and the number of GSI positions available is curtailed, the financial stability of graduate students will be negatively affected. Especially with the Bay Area cost of living, graduate students cannot afford to lose possible sources of funding. Many campus departments, already strapped for cash, rely on GSI positions to fund their graduate students, and would otherwise be unable to continue supporting their obligations. Additionally, raising the number of students in GSI sections would make it harder for graduate students to complete their own work and make progress to the degree they seek. The GA fears that significant cuts to instruction will affect the University at all levels, and will greatly hinder education across the campus.
Research	\$31.6M	Just as many graduate students rely on instructional funding for their financial support, many others depend on UC Berkeley’s research programs. These programs contribute greatly to the competitiveness and comprehensive excellence of UC Berkeley. We believe that significant cuts to research funding will directly affect graduate student education, funding, and quality of life.
Research Museums	\$14.7M	The Berkeley National History Museum, the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, the Botanical Gardens, and other research museums are important places that sustain our comprehensive excellence, contribute to the curriculum and make our campus unique. And, while they take up only a small portion of the campus budget as a whole, they disproportionately help to support graduate students.
Student Life and Services	\$14.7M	Programs such as the University Health Services, Student Health Insurance Program (SHIP), and Recreational Sports provide services that ensure that graduate students stay healthy (mentally and physically) and maximize their academic performance. With the current financial situation, graduate students cannot afford to have these services take up a larger percentage of their already meager wages. Since SHIP receives no campus funds, we emphasize our recommendation that it retain its Short Term Investment Pool (STIP) interest. The decision to sweep its STIP will result in a 2.9% increase to the SHIP premiums paid by graduate students. Cuts to the Student Life and Services category negatively affect graduate student well-being, while increasing their cost of living.

Equity and Inclusion	\$1.3M	UC Berkeley’s focus on equity and inclusion (E&I) works to increase campus diversity, to ensure that everyone at our University feels a part of the community. We do not want tough budget times to impede the work of E&I. We suggest that any cut made to E&I take into consideration the unit’s recent establishment, as well as whatever state targeted cuts materialize on the Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) funding, which currently constitutes half of E&I’s funding.
Library	\$23.1M	The tremendous access to knowledge afforded by the University’s library system is crucial to maintaining Berkeley’s competitiveness and comprehensive excellence. We need a strong and well-funded library to keep up with cutting edge materials from around the globe, and provide a critical foundation for students, faculty, and staff. Additionally, many students at all levels rely on the ability to borrow course texts from the library system to stem rising book costs. We believe then that cutting the library’s budget will directly affect the student population. We also commend the library system on sound economic and financial management, and believe that they should be rewarded for their fiscal prudence. As a final note, we would like to encourage the library system to embrace open access publications whenever appropriate, as a means of decreasing subscription costs.
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$126.2M</b>	

AVERAGE CUT RECOMMENDATIONS

ABBA Category	Funds Subject to Cut	Rationale
Instruction (General Expenses)	\$109.2M	While the Graduate Assembly believes that all instruction related to GSI, Readership, and stipend related positions cannot afford to have even an average cut, we believe that the remainder of the instruction budget, \$109.2 Million approximately, can sustain cuts in line with the campus average.
Research Administration	\$6M	After much debate, we have decided to recommend that all sectors of the administration take at least an average cut. We believe that an underfunded administrative apparatus decreases the effectiveness of the University as a whole. Still, we are unable to justify giving this item higher priority, compared to the more pressing needs for graduate students, such as stipends, teaching positions, and health services. Of all the administrative categories, we believe that research administration is the most critical to the graduate student experience, and that the category that cannot sustain more than average cuts.
Capital Planning and Management	\$1.6M	The University’s infrastructure is a valuable component of the campus’s health. Simply put, infrastructure is research and instruction enabling. Students and the administration have committed to new facilities for student life (i.e., Lower Sproul) and an average cut would be in line with such agreements.

Divisional Libraries	\$6.2M	While all libraries are important to the University, having already requested that the library system as a whole receive a below average budget cut, we believe that the divisional libraries can maintain themselves with an average cut. Additionally, we suggest that in the future, the library system explore ways to centralize and consolidate services, in an effort to streamline operations and save money.
Development	\$14.3M	Building a strong endowment is certainly a goal that UC Berkeley should work toward, and we applaud the efforts of the Development Office to this point. Still, we feel that a focus on the present is more important than the future, in light of the current situation.
Academic Achievement Programs	\$1.4M	Improving academic preparation, expanding opportunities, and ensuring access are important to the University's mission as a public institution. Nevertheless, graduate students do not benefit as directly from this funding category, and we believe that the campus can maintain its public commitments even with an average cut to this program area.
Safety and Security	\$12.5M	Campus security is vital to the functioning of the University as a whole. In making the recommendation for an average budget cut we understand the trade-off that has to be made, but believe that non-essential programs and administrative budgets can be trimmed, without sacrificing the safety of the community.
OMP & Building Services	\$27.7M	The Graduate Assembly recognizes the need for building and maintenance services, and recognizes that at least some of the ABBA budget will be required to cover basic utilities cost, over and above those funds already budgeted. Thus we believe that an average budget cut, in line with the general cuts to the campus as a whole, will be sufficient for this category.

SUBTOTAL \$151.2M

ABOVE AVERAGE CUT RECOMMENDATIONS

ABBA Category	Funds Subject to Cut	Rationale
Student Services Admin, Academic Admin, General Admin	\$11.1M \$32.8M \$9.3M respectively	As stated above, after much discussion, we have decided that providing for the security of academic and student-life related funding categories must come before that of the administration. While we believe that everything that can be done to help the administration should be done, we also believe that other sectors are of a higher priority. We do applaud the administration's restructuring attempts to date, and hope that they can continue to find ways to streamline the operations of the University, without sacrificing quality of service.

Student Academic Support, Accounting & Financial Services, Budget & Resource Planning, Business Services, Human Resources, Academic Planning, Cultural & Public Education Services, Public Affairs	\$6.8M \$8.1M \$2.8M \$3M \$4.9M \$2.9M \$4M \$2.9M respectively	Similar to our recommendation for administrative categories, we believe that these services, while crucial to the University, should absorb a higher than average cut.
Campus IT Leadership, Central IT Services	\$2.9M \$25.7M respectively	A basic computing and technology infrastructure is vital for maintaining the day-to-day operations of the University. However, in light of the more pressing categories of funding, which directly impact graduate student life, we believe that many of the IT services provided in excess of the baseline operations are not a high priority for the present time. We also suggest the reallocation of existing registration fee funding to support IT services.
Academic Support	\$2.7M	We believe that ancillary support for teaching and research, while important to Berkeley's success as an R1 institution, is of secondary value to the direct support of teaching and research, which the above categories provide. We do not believe that an above average cut to Academic Support will negatively affect the quality of graduate student life.
Athletics	\$2M	We commend Intercollegiate Athletics (IA) for making significant progress in reducing its deficit, which was once as high as \$13M2, to \$2M. However, we believe that especially in these trying budget times the Central Campus allocation to extramural sports and their administrative support ought to be \$0. To arrive at \$0 in campus support, IA might consider curtailing its program or increasing revenue.
SUBTOTAL	\$122.0M	

The GA acknowledges that as good campus citizens we ought to shoulder our fair share of Berkeley's financial burdens. We wish to point out several ways in which the GA and graduate students have done so.

- We donated \$25k of our funds to create an endowment for graduate student support in December 2008.
- We do not contest the 2% increase in AFC on ASUC Auxiliary Commercial Revenue income, but see it as a cost of doing business on the Berkeley Campus.
- We are absorbing a 4.2% increase in the Registration Fee, a 10% increase in the Education Fee, a 13.7% increase in SHIP premiums, a 3% increase in the Campus Health Care Fee, a 19.2% increase in the Class Pass Fee, and a 12.5% increase in the Recreational Sports Fee for AY 2009-103.
- We are reducing FTE and thus services in the ASUC Auxiliary.
- We are coping with reductions in support and services in our respective home departments.
- We continue to lobby at the state and federal levels for increased education funding and student aid provisions .

On behalf of the more than 10,000 graduate students on campus, we thank you in advance for considering our budget commentary. If we can provide any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Miguel Daal  
President, 2008-10

Cc: George Breslauer, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost  
Nathan Brostrom, Vice Chancellor of Administration and Chief Financial Officer  
Harry Le Grande, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs  
Ed Denton, Vice Chancellor of Facilities Services  
Scott Bidy, Vice Chancellor of University Relations  
Graham Fleming, Vice Chancellor of Research  
Gibor Basri, Vice Chancellor of Equity and Inclusion  
Frank Yeary, Vice Chancellor  
Teresa Constantinidis, Acting Associate Vice Chancellor  
Shelton Waggener, Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer  
Andrew Szeri, Graduate Division Dean  
Mary Firestone, Academic Senate Chair  
Will Smelko, 2009-10 ASUC President  
All Academic Deans and Department Chairs

---

<sup>1</sup> This figure includes the AY 2008-09 midyear cuts, and the AY 2009-10 permanent budget cuts plus unfunded mandate liabilities.

<sup>2</sup> The total of campus recourses and student fees committed to IA in AY 2004-05. One could subtract such things as AFC and the return to aid collected from athletic scholarships as money IA has return to campus offsetting the \$13M.

<sup>3</sup> This totals to a \$1001.50 increase over AY 2008-09 for an academic graduate student who has California residency.



## Appendix 1: Sustenance of Graduate Student Support Funding

Fellowships, GSIs, and GSRs are the primary modes of graduate student financial support, and alleviate financial need over a broad spectrum of graduate students, with little overlap among them. We are pleased that graduate student stipend, registration fee and nonresident tuition funding coming in the form of departmental block grants from Graduate Division will not be reduced from their AY 2008-09 levels. However, this stasis would afford no cost of living adjustment for current graduate students and no competitive increase in admissions packages for admitted graduate students who are supported by the block grants, if no corresponding adjustments are made to other departmental funding priorities. We encourage departments to do whatever it takes to adequately support their current graduate students, and to competitively recruit new ones. We encourage Central Campus to fund Graduate Division at a level sufficient for achievement of these two interests.

Approximately 20% of graduate students are supported by the University's temporary academic salary (TAS) curriculum support budget, which includes funding for lecturers, tutors, readers, etc. TAS funding for AY 2009-10 is of particular concern, because departments, whose budgets are already strapped, may find it difficult to make their contributions to TAS. The projected TAS funding need for AY 2009-10, excluding Business and Law, is approximately \$55M. We applaud Provost Breslauer's \$2.1M increase to TAS from last year bringing his total contribution to approximately \$13M for AY 2009-10. His expectation that the deans offer an AY 2009-2010 curriculum that would meet the aggregate level of undergraduate student demand that existed in AY 2007-2008<sup>4</sup> makes sense.

We join him in encouraging the Deans and Chairs to be creative, to dig deep, and to produce such a curriculum. Additionally, we encourage the Deans and Chairs to make maximal use of GSIs in offering this curriculum. GSI appointments fund graduate students, provide curriculum support, enrich the educations of graduate students, represent an integral component of graduate student admissions packages, and contribute to the professional development of graduate students. GSI appointments support the University's graduate program, undergraduate curriculum, and, insofar as these appointments help attract and retain graduate students, they support Berkeley's research enterprise and competitiveness. We believe a decrease in the number of GSI's would be detrimental to the educational mission of the University.

<sup>4</sup> The choice of AY 2007-08 avoids the impact of the budget cuts which occurred in AY 2008-09.

## Appendix 2: Honoring Agreements with Students

We expect that the administration will honor both the letter and the spirit of its standing agreements with students. Student-approved campus-based fees fund graduate student health and well-being resources such as the University Health Services, SHIP, and Recreational Sports Facility. Students chose to contribute funds to these programs because they wanted expanded services. If the ability of the responsible unit to provide expanded services is diminished due to: taxes on carry forwards, redirection of STIP earnings to Central Campus, imposition of 'cost sharing' programs with Central Campus, or excessive increases in administrative full costing burdens, it would violate the trust upon which students predicated the contribution of their funds. In addition, if staff furloughs become an approved cost savings measure, the savings should stay with the student-supported auxiliary unit. We also note that continued and substantial student trust will be needed for a successful Lower Sproul Student Center referendum.

The decision to redirect ASUC Auxiliary STIP to Central Campus dissolves trust between students and campus administration and is inconsistent with the Commercial Activities Agreement (CAA). Moreover, because money generated from ASUC commercial activities first funds the ASUC Auxiliary, and then the ASUC, which distributes it to students and student groups, redirecting income from the ASUC Auxiliary may be interpreted as taking funds directly from the pockets of students. The redirection of ASUC Auxiliary and student health insurance STIP earnings are both of dubious ethical footing. We will present these arguments in more detail in a forthcoming letter.

As a final note, we would like to highlight the special relationship between the University's auxiliary enterprises and the services they provide all students, not just graduate students. Auxiliaries such as Residential and Student Services Program, University Health Service, the Student Health Insurance Program, Parking and Transportation, Recreational Sports, and the ASUC Auxiliary provide food, shelter, and transportation as well as sustain the homeostasis and support the co-curricular development of students. Such auxiliaries serve the basic needs of students, allowing them to achieve academic excellence. They also have limited eligibility for state funding, and so must balance their budgets with the revenues generated from the services they provide. Financial models which siphon revenue from these auxiliaries may result in increased prices borne upon the students. (For example, the redirection of SHIP STIP has resulted in a 2.9% increase in the premiums paid by students.) Financial aid is intended to offset the total cost of attendance. Since a return to aid is not assessed on auxiliary service fees, we fear that if the University is not careful, its revenue generation measures may simultaneously deplete other funds as they are directed to financial aid while decreasing the affordability of a Berkeley education.