

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

February 4, 2010

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

The meeting commenced Spring Semester. It was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:30 p.m.

Announcements

Viola Tang, ASUC representative to the GA, reported on some bills the ASUC Senate passed supporting a Chinese Tang Center worker who was laid off and the 2010 Student Lobby Conference

Vinit Sukhija, ASUC Elections Council Chair, said the MOU between the GA and the ASUC calls for the Council to have a Graduate Student Outreach Coordinator, and asked if anybody was interested.

Lucy Diekmann, Project Coordinator for *The Berkeley Graduate*, announced a new aspect of the project, a blog, written by and for grads and professional students.

Iris, Co-Chair of the Student Technology Council, is starting a proposal process to fund student-initiated projects to improve technology on campus.

Mr. Daal said the GA will hold an open house on February 25 for people interested in running for office. At its next meeting, the GA will hold elections for '10-11.

Jennifer Lewis, from the Police Review Board, said they're beginning a review of the Wheeler Hall protests. There's a request forward any videos, photos, audio, or written accounts that anybody had. A report was due at the end of May.

Mr. Daal said the GA's Business Office was doing a survey that Delegates were encouraged to take.

Officers Reports

Mr. Asad, Chair, said the Funding Committee makes sure applications conform to GA standards for groups to get funding. An Ad Hoc Funding Committee was looking at policies for next year. With no objection, the GA approved the Funding Committee report: Group Resources, Round 2, \$4,912.37 awarded; Grants, Round 3, \$10,754.60 awarded.

Mr. Marchand, Campus Affairs VP, said the position was the voice of grads on campus. It also nominates students to 50 campus committees that need grad student input. He was also working on the Faculty Mentor Awards and a survey of grads. Grads were needed on the Dean of Students Advisory Committee and the Selection Committee for the Faculty Mentor Awards. There was also a request for feedback on changes to the Dean's Normative Time Fellowship.

Mr. Ortega, External Affairs VP, said the position covered everything beyond the campus that affected grads. They're part of the UCSA and the position does quite a bit of lobbying and also works on things in

response to current issues. The person in the position traveled a lot within the State and to DC. They're trying to improve the GSHIP and there will be a town hall February 26.

Ms. Anderson, Chair, Rules Committee, helps the President at GA meetings and works on the By-laws. Mr. Rajan, Chair, Budget Committee, said the position creates the following year's budget, and the rest of the position was whatever they made of it. The Assembly last year voted to invest reserves with the Berkeley Foundation, and they're finally ready to act on that, putting \$100,000 in two types of endowments. And for commercial revenue, they're looking at an investment vehicle outside student fee restrictions to maximize return.

Ms. Chavez, Project Coordinator Liaison, said the position is stipended and the person is a GA Officer. The position oversees the Coordinators of the GA's seven projects.

Mr. Froehle, Chair, Technology Committee, said he'll try to remove the position for next year.

Mr. Kramer, Chair, Environmental Sustainability Committee, said the Committee has 17 members and will try to determine a new Chair for next year.

Mr. Briggs, Chair, Student Advisory Council, said the role advocates for grads and works as a liaison with the campus financial office and the Graduate Division.

Ms. Harrison-Shermoen, Grad Council representative, said the position attends monthly meetings with faculty and talk about grad issues. It runs departmental reviews and considers proposed changes to departmental requirements.

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies at UCOP

Also present was Pamela Jennings, UCOP Director of Graduate Student Studies.

Mr. Beckwith said the position was created in January of 2008 in order to have an explicit reporting line to the President for research and graduate studies.

Their research enterprise was about \$5 billion a year, about 25% of the UC budget. His office distributes about \$100 million a year in support for research, about \$60 million in UC money alone. They put the money up for competition. Most of the 120 staff in the office was devoted to research. He and Ms. Jennings were devoted to graduate studies. They also work with graduate deans on the ten campuses.

One issue facing UC graduate programs was the overall ratio between grads and undergrads. At Berkeley it was about 28%, pretty high. Some peer institutions have even higher ratios. So one goal was to fund more students and increase that ratio. Another challenge was to maintain an adequate balance across different disciplines of scholarship. Decades ago, the number of students in the humanities compared to engineering and science, was higher.

He'd explain "indirect costing," or overhead, which was taken from grants. It pays for things the University provides, for things from the library to heating buildings. Those costs are spread across the enterprise. The problem was that they under-recover costs by 15-20%.

A final problem was having a range of programs of varying quality, and the challenge of maintaining the very best programs and still being even-handed.

Resolution Referral

The following Resolutions were referred to committee:

1002a, To Amend the GA Budget to Increase External Affairs Funding for SAGE 2010 Day on the Hill and UCSA Membership Dues

1002b, Budget Amendment to Fund Incentives for the 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey

1002c, A By-law to Facilitate Procedural Resolutions

1002d, To Create a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target Action Agenda Item

1002e, Directed Action In Support of Securing a Space on Campus for the Berkeley Student Food Collective, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, Rules, and Environmental Sustainability Committees.

Resolution Discussion and Vote

Resolution 0912b

Resolution on a By-law to Change Committee Quorum Requirements was amended to require GA committees to have at least three members. A quorum is 50% of voting members plus one member. As amended, 0912b was approved unanimously by voice-vote.

Resolution 0911b

Resolution on By-law Amendment to Expedite Funding Appeals established the Funding Appeal Committee, to appeal decisions of the Funding Committee. The Appeals Committee was amended to be comprised of the Rules Chair, the President (or a member of the Exec Board, chosen by the President), and the Funding Chair (or a member of the Funding Committee). 0911b, as amended, passed unanimously by voice-vote.

Resolution 0912c

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action for United Lobbying for Public Funding was amended and passed by voice-vote. The Resolution supports an increase and restored State funding for public education and the UC System; with these funds prioritized to reverse fee increases, enrollment cuts, and layoffs that occurred since 2007; encourages participation in demonstrations on March 1 and 4; and has the Exec Board send letters to the Chancellor and others to indicating the above priorities.

Resolution was 0912d

Resolution on Directed Action on the RFP for the Taqueria Tacotento was amended and passed unanimously by voice-vote. It calls on the SOB to prioritize local, independent businesses when considering bids to replace the Taqueria and Healthy Heavenly Foods.

Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)
Announcements

- 4 -

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daal said he would like to welcome them to the 1st first Graduate Assembly Delegates meeting of 2010.

End Summary of the Meeting

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly, commencing the Spring Semester, was called to order by Miguel Daal at 5:30 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Daal said he would like to welcome them to the 1st first Graduate Assembly Delegates meeting of 2010.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Daal said he would ask Delegates to please not forget to fill out their Delegate feedback forms. It was very important information they were collecting. He would ask them to please fill it out, and to fill it out entirely. They really need the information.

Viola Tang introduced herself and said she was the ASUC representative to the Graduate Assembly. She had a few announcements. The ASUC Senate passed some bills she'd mention. The first was to support a Chinese University Health Services worker who got laid off at the Tang Center. The bill was to support her cause and to arrange a meeting with the UHS Director to talk about her layoff, because her service was really important to the Chinese community. Another bill they passed was in support of the 2010 Student Lobby Conference. The UC Student Association will host a Student Lobby Conference at the end of February, and the bill supports the effort to promote higher education to the State Legislature. Also, that evening the Haiti benefit concert will take place in 155 Dwinelle, to raise funds for victims of the earthquake. If people could come out, that would be great. People were also donating jeans for the cause. There will also be Cal Slam event at the Multicultural Center, which should be really interesting. Ms. Tang said the next announcement would be from the Elections Council Chair.

Vinit Sukhija introduced himself and said he was the ASUC Elections Council Chair, in charge of running the election that spring. From the '08 election season to the '09 election season, graduate student turnout actually went down, even though overall turnout went up. That was pretty concerning to him as Elections Council Chair. According to the ASUC-GA Memorandum of Understanding, they need a Graduate Student Outreach Coordinator on the Elections Council. If any grads were interested in the position, he would love to have them on the Council. They could collaborate ideas on how to get more graduate students come out to vote. His e-mail address was electionscouncil2010@gmail.com. If people

were interested in the position, or had questions, comments, or suggestions, he would ask them to please feel free to e-mail him at any time.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 5 -

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was from Lucy Diekmann. Ms. Diekmann said she's the Project Coordinator for *The Berkeley Graduate* and she wanted to introduce them to a new aspect of her project, a blog. It's relatively new and has only been active since the Fall Semester. It's written by and for graduate and professional students. In the first semester, it covered things like research, professional development, and fun things like do-it-yourself projects, and fun, cheap things to do, places to eat, etc. She saw the blog as a space for grad students to share their collective wisdom and share their experiences to others on campus. The blog address is www.theberkeleygraduate.com. Her contact information was also on the GA Web site. She wanted to introduce the blog that evening to get people to take a look at it, and also to spread the word among their friends and department that it exists. She thought it was a really neat resource for graduate students, and she would like to see more people involved.

Ms. Diekmann said she would also be really interested in getting people's feedback on topics they think would be interesting. She was also curious about other blogs on campus that people knew about, or read. She'd like to mention them on the blog. Finally, Ms. Diekmann said she's been trying to encourage people to write for the blog. She had some great writers already and would like some more. Anybody was welcome to write. A small part of her budget was set aside for modest compensation. If Delegates were interested, or knew people interested in writing, she would ask them to please spread the word.

Mr. Daal said the next speaker was Iris from the Student Technology Council. Iris said she's one of the Co-Chairs of the Student Technology Council, which was a relatively new group. They're out of Office of the Chief Information Officer for the campus. They're starting a proposal process to fund student-initiated projects to improve technology on campus. It's a two-step process, with a letter of intent and then an application. They're going to roll out the letter of intent process starting next week. All the information will be on the Web site, stc.berkeley.edu.

Mr. Briggs asked where their funding was coming from. Iris said it was from Shel Waggener.

Mr. Daal said that for the next announcement, he wanted to point out that the GA will hold an open house on February 25 at 5 p.m. It was meant to be a mixer among elected people at the GA and people who were interested in running for office. They're having the mixer/open house because at the GA's next meeting they'll hold elections for '10-11. They ideally would like to elect everybody at the March meeting and have them take office on July 1. If people were interested in running for an office, they might have fun at this open house. There will be refreshments. It will be at Anthony Hall.

A Delegate asked people to please scrape the plates off and stack them neatly back on the cart when they were done eating. He wanted to thank them.

Mr. Daal said the next announcement was from Jennifer Lewis, from the Police Review Board. Ms. Lewis said the Police Review Board had its first meeting of the semester. They're beginning a review of the Wheeler Hall protests. There's a request for the students to forward information from any video, photos, audio, or written accounts that anybody had. They could send that to the Police Review Board, at prbchair@berkeley.edu. The Board wanted to make sure it had as much information as possible, and to

not just rely on information that the UCPD had, so that there was a full review. A report was due at the end of May.

Mr. Daal said he would like to point out that a survey was being conducted by the GA's Business Office. If they've ever been to Anthony Hall, there's a front desk, with people helping with applications for

Announcements (cont'd)
Officers' Reports

- 6 -

funding, answering questions, etc. They're doing a survey. Details about it were on a sheet that was part of the agenda packet. Delegates were encouraged to take the survey.

A Delegate said that Robert's Rules of Order sheets were being passed around.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Froehle said he would like to add to Resolution Referral a Resolution on the Student Food Co-operative, which was submitted that day. Mr. Daal said the Resolution would be numbered 1002e. Mr. Daal said that with no objection, they would approve the agenda, with that one small modification. WITH NO OBJECTION, THE AGENDA WAS APPROVED, AS AMENDED.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Daal called for a motion to approve the minutes from the last GA meeting. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE DECEMBER 3, 2009 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

REPORTS

Officers' Reports

Mr. Daal said he would ask Officers giving reports to give a brief description of their jobs, as an elected officer, in view of the fact that the GA will hold elections at its next meeting.

Mr. Asad, Funding Committee Chair, reported that the Funding Committee met on Monday. They went over applications for Group Resources and Graduate Students Grants. Grants didn't have any budget cuts. Group Resources did have budget cuts.

Mr. Asad said the Funding Committee was in charge of making sure that applications conform to the standards that the Graduate Assembly has set for groups to get funding. They also set up a new committee, the Ad Hoc Funding Committee, to determine the best policies for the next academic year. The next meeting will be sometime next week. If anybody would like to be a part of this, they could send

him an e-mail at funding@ga.berkeley.edu. They're also going to invite a representative from student groups so the Committee could have a better idea of what problems groups were facing, and the best ways to solve them next year.

Mr. Daal said they had to approve the Funding Committee's report. A motion to approve the Funding Committee report was made and seconded. Mr. Daal said the Funding Committee report was part of the

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 7 -

agenda packet, and it's where they list all of the allocations given to student group, which the Delegate body had to approve. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FUNDING COMMITTEE REPORT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION: WITH GROUP RESOURCES, ROUND 2, \$4,912.37 AWARDED; GRANTS, ROUND 3, WITH \$10,754.60 AWARDED.**

Mr. Daal asked if he had a report on the Ad Hoc Committee on Funding Practices. Mr. Asad they'll meet next week. If anybody would like to attend he would ask them to please send him an e-mail and he'd send them a date and time.

Mr. Froehle asked what that meeting will discuss. Mr. Asad said they have some proposal about changes to the funding structure. For example, for Grad Events, currently, students can get a maximum of \$1,000 a semester. The Ad Hoc Committee wanted to cut that down by half so they don't have as many budget cuts and so student groups could have a better idea of what they'd get. That was one of many proposals. They were also thinking about that instead of having appeals voted. If people had any suggestions or strong opinions on how they thought student groups should get funding according to their size or to some other criteria they want considered, he would ask them to please attend at the meeting.

Mr. Daal said the next report was from the Campus Affairs Vice President. He would ask Mr. Marchand to begin with a description of his job. Philippe Marchand introduced himself. First of all, the Campus Affairs Vice President responds to and maybe researches any issues that need the voice of graduate students on the campus, whether for external affairs or government. Besides that, there are specific projects and tasks the position does, such as nominating graduate students to all campus committees. There are about 50 of them. They need to have graduate student input, and to keep in touch with constituents and make sure communication happens.

Mr. Marchand added he was also working on two important programs. One was the Faculty Mentor Awards. The deadline for applications was February 19, after which a Selection Committee will award three faculty mentor awards. Another program he was also working on was a survey to evaluate graduate student satisfaction in a number of respects. He mentioned in his report that he would have a draft, but he could give them an overview of the survey. There will be questions about their academic experience at Berkeley, about their funding and finances, and on student services outside academics, such as public transit, and questions about working at the GA. The survey will go out to all students. It's something Campus Affairs will do every year.

Mr. Marchand said there are a number of things they need volunteers for that Delegates might be interested in. They need graduate representatives on the Dean of Students Advisory Committee. He had a sign-up sheet with a small description of what it does and when it meets. If people were interested, they should put their name down.

As he said, they have to form the Selection Committee for the faculty Mentor Award. They'll read applications in February and March, and people could also sign up for that. Also, if they were interested in working with faculty, they could respond to proposed changes to the Dean's Normative Time Fellowship. Hopefully they read about it, since he sent it out to all departments.

As he also mentioned in his report, there were a number of questions he raised about the Code of Student Conduct, and whether there was some way to allow sanctions that were beyond what was held by the law.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 8 -

The Graduate Assembly will try to get student opinion in response to that question. He couldn't discuss this at length before the Assembly, but if people wanted more details, they could sign up. Or if they have any other questions or were interested in various things happening on campus, they could get in contact with him.

Mr. Marchand said that regarding the Dean's Normative Time Fellowship, students in the social sciences and who advance to candidacy in normative time can get a one-year fellowship that pays stipends and fees. The Graduate Division has made changes such that any student who accepts this award would have to finish their program within normative time. If they didn't, after seven years, they couldn't get any type of support from the campus. That's a restriction to get people to finish on time. But some people were worried about the side effects of that change. So he would like to get Delegates' feedback if they were in one of the department affected by this. He'd be happy to answer questions in more details at the meeting.

Mr. Daal asked people to please answer that question, as funding was at stake.

Mr. Ortega introduced himself and said he was External Affairs Vice President. Personally, he thought it was the coolest position in the Graduate Assembly. It's an incredibly broad realm within the GA in that it covers pretty much everything that extended beyond the confines of the campus that affects graduate students. If it's beyond the walls and it affects a student, it could be something the position works on. Within that there were a couple of things that they typically work on. One of them was being part of the UCSA, the Systemwide student organization that works on UC-wide issues and also does a lot of work with State lobbying. They also work with student advocates for graduate education on the federal level, where they also do quite a bit of work in terms of lobbying. Everything else they work on was, to a large extent, in response to issues that were present that now affect graduate students and the different interests of the committee members, given that there was a limited amount of time to work on things.

Mr. Ortega said he wouldn't go too much into his report, but there were a couple of things he wanted to point out. One of them was that for the past year and a half, they've been trying to improve the Systemwide graduate student health insurance plan. They'll have a town hall on February 26, from 12:00 to 1:30 p.m. in the Senate Chamber. There will be some minor refreshments. It was to inform grad students about what's been going on, where they were headed, how it would affect students, and to get some feedback from grads. The other thing he wanted to focus on was one of their goals that semester, increasing advocacy for graduate students. If they look at the back of the first page, where the External Affairs report started, and looked at the part in bold, they were urged to contact at least one of their State representatives. The link at the bottom had contact information. And if they have any family members in the State, they should also be encouraged to send an e-mail, or to pick up the phone and call. The main message they're trying to send out was that higher education has been cut too much already and that it was imperative that the current funding they have is maintained throughout the budget process and that they

don't have any more cuts. If they had any personal stories or anything else they wanted to add, that would be great.

Mr. Ortega said that if anybody wanted to be part of External Affairs, his contact information was in the report. If they had any questions, he was also available after the meeting.

Meghan Anderson introduced herself and said she was the Rules Committee Chair. The Rules Committee hasn't met in a couple of months because they haven't made quorum. There's a Resolution in

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 9 -

the agenda packet that would fix that. They have three members and they need five, and the Resolution would make it okay for them to just have three. She was okay with that, but if Delegates thought that more than three people should be talking about rules, they could attend the meetings and make that happen.

Ms. Anderson said the other important note was that she was leaving, and needed to find a replacement. There were only three of them on the Rules Committee, and both Committee members have indicated that they weren't interested in being Chair. If people had any interest in GA rules, she would ask them to please attend the after-meeting beer or come talk to the office or e-mail her and she could tell them all about her job and why they actually want it. The GA Rules Officer sits next to the President at GA meetings, and made sure everybody stuck to the schedule. They also have a lot of control over how the meetings are run, which she hasn't been exercising, although that was something they could do if they get this job. They get to work on how the By-laws look. If they had a little bit of spare time, they could completely re-write the By-laws. She had some ideas about that and will be around that spring. So if they were interested, it would be a good idea to get involved now so that she could help bring them up to speed. If they had any interest in being Rules Chair, she would ask them to please talk to her, even if they only had a little bit of interest. She'd promise she wouldn't follow-up and bully them into it. If they decide it wasn't for them, that would be fine.

Nish Rajan introduced himself and said he was the Budget Committee Chair. The minimum duty of the Budget Chair was to create the budget for next year. It was a reasonable easy job, and when he left office in the spring, he hoped to make it easier for the next person. They just put together some numbers they projected. It was pretty straightforward and anybody with high school math and any interest in helping out the GA could be a phenomenal Budget Chair. The rest of the position was whatever they made of it. If they only stick to the minimum duties, it was back loaded, and most of their work was done in the spring. The budget is due in March, so a lot of work was done in January and February, and then they'd be done. A lot of this work was maybe 20 hours or so, and then there were also Resolutions and things to keep on top of.

It was a pretty straightforward and easy job and was a great way to learn about the Graduate Assembly, if they were interested in getting more involved down the line. He'd be around for any questions. He would like to leave at the end of that year. One thing that really benefitted him was having the previous Budget Chair, more than three years ago, stay an extra year and show him the ropes for the first year, and Mr. Rajan said he would like to do the same thing so the Budget Chair next year had no trouble. So he'll be around and would be on the Budget Committee. He would like to step out of this role, and he would ask people to please consider this position. It was a great job.

Ms. Anderson said she had two things to add to that. She was Budget Committee Chair for one year, taking it over from Mr. Rajan for a year. So she could attest that Mr. Rajan was very helpful in taking Budget Chair over from him. Also, the Budget Chair got to decide a lot of things, including Officers' stipends.

Ms. Anderson said that one thing that hasn't been mentioned was that their jobs come with \$1,100 stipend. Mr. Rajan said it was \$1,190. If they do it for one year, they just get under the tax reporting cutoff. Ms. Anderson said they didn't have to take the stipend, and she turned hers down because she was happy to do this as a volunteer job. But if that was motivation, there was a stipend. Mr. Rajan said that

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 10 -

both the Budget and Rules Officers tend to have a lot of power to do what they want, although they try to downplay that. The positions were hard but very rewarding. So he would ask them to please consider it.

Mr. Rajan said there were two things he wanted to bring to their attention. Last year the Delegate Assembly voted to invest their reserves with the Berkeley Foundation. They're finally, about a year later, getting ready to act upon that. They're thinking of putting \$100,000 from the Berkeley Foundation in two types of endowments. They will be highly restricted against the GA taking out the principle. One will not allow the GA to engage the principle at all unless there was a need to match funds for fundraising purposes, and the other one would allow the GA to liquidate up to half the fund every four years.

The purpose of these funds was for long-term investment. It's money to sock away for a long, long time. The two funds accomplish that, while giving the GA some liquidity. The GA has lots of other reserves it can count on as well. But these endowments will hopefully bring them some interest income way down the line.

Mr. Rajan said the GA also has commercial revenue they get from a contract from Coca-Cola. That was different from student fee revenue. They're now looking at an investment vehicle outside student fee restrictions to see how they could maximize return on that. Greg Holland, in the Law School and the Business School, wasn't present that evening, and has been working a lot with Mr. Daal to put By-laws for that. Mr. Rajan said any Delegate interested in seeing those By-laws at that time could send him an e-mail.

Mr. Rajan said the Budget Committee will meet soon and he would encourage Delegates to attend. They'll do some wonderful budget magic. People could e-mail him with any questions.

A Delegate asked where they could find out more about the investment vehicles used by the Berkeley Foundation. Mr. Rajan said all that information was online, he believed, and they could Google "UC Berkeley Foundation" and get a prospectus. The Berkeley Foundation wasn't so much to maximize the return, but to cover people in case something went horribly wrong, and to make a safe investment.

Mr. Daal asked if there were any questions people had about any report.

Lucero Chavez introduced herself and said she was the Project Coordinator Liaison. She was another Officer, but wasn't very well known in the Delegate Assembly space. The Project Coordinator Liaison is an Officer and a stipended position on the GA Board. She works with the seven Projects the GA has. So it they go to the study hall put on by the Graduate Women's Project, or beer night by the Grad Social Club, she oversees the Coordinators who put on those events. She also works with the Executive Board

to find funding for those events and does advocacy work with the Vice Chancellor of Equity and the Graduate Dean. If people were interested in having the position, and working on more of the fun stuff they do as a GA, her contact information was in the agenda packet and she'd be happy to talk to them.

Brad Froehle introduced himself and said he was the Technology Chair. He'll try and get rid of his position next year.

Danny Kramer introduced himself and said he was the Environmental Sustainability Chair. As they'll see in the reports, the Committee had a lot of balls in the air. He'll be leaving at the end of the year. They have 17 members on the Committee and hopefully one of them will step up and do his job. They'll figure that out at the next Committee meeting, and see if they could put forward a unified voice.

Officers' Reports (cont'd)

- 11 -

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies

Farren Briggs introduced himself and said he was the Student Advisory Council Chair. He has been plagued by a lack of participation or difficulty arranging the proper scheduling for everyone. Basically, his role was to advocate for graduate students and identify issues they're interested in targeting. He works as a liaison with the Berkeley financial office as well as with the Graduate Division.

Gwyneth Harrison-Shermoen introduced herself and said she was one of the Graduate Council members. She attends monthly meetings with a bunch of faculty who weren't too scary. They talk about graduate student issues. The Graduate Council does things like run graduate department program reviews. Departments that want to change requirements also have to submit the proposed changes to the Graduate Council.

Mr. Ortega said that one thing he forgot to mention about External Affairs was that the person got to do a lot of travel within the State and to DC. Secondly, the position was also a liaison with government and community affairs, at Berkeley, UCOP, and UC DC. The person in the position gets to meet a lot of people and it's a lot of fun.

Ms. Anderson said that regarding committees not having enough members to meet, there was some discussion at the Executive Board retreat of completely restructuring the GA's committees. The Rules Chair who comes after her will basically get to make that decision and define how that will look. If people had a better idea of how to run everything, now was the time to step up.

PRESENTATION BY STEVE BECKWITH, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES AT UCOP

Mr. Daal said he would like to introduce Steve Beckwith, the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies at UCOP, dealing with all of the campuses. Also present was Pamela Jennings, the UCOP Director of Graduate Student Studies.

Mr. Beckwith said he would like to thank them very much for inviting him. His title was Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. It's a new position, created in January of 2008, and it was created in response to the sense that the Office of the President's structure didn't recognize either research or graduate studies explicitly, as a reporting line up to the President. So it's the first senior position with graduate studies in its title.

Mr. Beckwith said that when he came, there was no definition of the role whatsoever. So he was even now inventing it. They've been expanding. He'd talk a little about the research side and the graduate studies side. Pamela Jennings is the Director of Graduate Studies. She's been on board just a couple of months. Ms. Jennings said she came on board last summer. Mr. Beckwith said they're looking to expand her area as well.

Mr. Beckwith said he thought the importance of graduate study, coupled with research, was critical. Research and graduate studies go together and were intimately connected. At least at universities like this, they're just not done separately.

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 12 -

Mr. Beckwith said he would talk a little about the role he had in research and then he'd talk about some of the issues.

Right now their research enterprise is about \$5 billion a year, in round numbers. That's about 25% of the UC budget. And as they knew, it's the reason that UC actually existed. Almost all of that was from federal money. Some was from non-profits, and a little bit from industry.

Mr. Beckwith said that from his office, they distribute about \$100 million a year in support for various research activities, of which about \$60 million was UC money alone. He was sure some of them there were working on projects that were supported by this office.

Mr. Beckwith said before he came, it wasn't entirely clear how a lot of this money was distributed. One big change they made when he got there was to try to re-balance all of the different fields and to put the money up for competition. As a result, they've turned over quite a bit of support that they've had in the last year.

One interesting thing he'd talk about was to see how they balance the different subfields of scholarship between the humanities and the arts and the sciences. He thought this was a continuing problem they might want to address and talk about. The office oversees research policy. That sounds boring, but it affects the lives of all of them there. One thing they didn't see much as graduate students, but will certainly see it very quickly, was an increasing tendency in the country to be risk averse. As a result, on top of other requirements, they have compliance requirements. Just to give an example, all of them at UCOP have to take different kinds of training. They take sexual harassment training, training on conflicts of interest, they have to worry about reporting their time, etc. Increasingly with federally supported research, on top of other issues they have to deal with they're now larding on compliance issues. And that's part of what his office oversees. Mr. Beckwith said that one thing he was trying to do was play a role like in this and thought that, frankly the pendulum has swung too far. The policy is a problem.

Mr. Beckwith said he'd talk a little about support. They give out quite a bit of support each year. One initiative he brought in was to judge that support based on how much it supported graduate studies, and they've actually made a tilt in that direction, towards more graduate study support.

They also oversee technology transfer, which he wouldn't talk about that evening.

Mr. Beckwith said that most of the staff was devoted specifically to problems of research. In his office they have about 120 staffmembers. Of those, there are two devoted to graduate studies, including Ms. Jennings and part of himself. So maybe he should say there are 1.2 people devoted to graduate studies in his office. That gives a flavor for how the demands on their time go. But the graduate problems were really quite important to them.

Mr. Beckwith said that one big challenge was to make sure that they can continue to support graduate studies at a time when there's a lot of decline in their budget and with their ability to support other things. The good news was that UC was the top ranked, largest university system in the world. It's the most prestigious and got the most money. He was sure that they'll be pleased to hear that Berkeley is the crown jewel in that. It's not only the top-ranked campus in the System, by the measures he reports to the Regents, it's #3 in the world behind Harvard and Stanford. For those of them who have colleagues and rivals at those schools, they might want to play that up a little bit, and he hoped people work on that.

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 13 -

Berkeley produces more Ph.D. students than any other comparable university campus in the world. The GA was part of 2% of all Ph.Ds. in the country, on this campus. And it's not the biggest campus. So it shows the importance of graduate studies to Berkeley.

He thought that one of their big issues was maintaining that excellence. There will be a lot of pressure to cut across the board, and he believed that they cannot let the top place they have go downhill; and this was the top.

The University was pretty complex, so there were lots of things that they deal with; and he'd give them a flavor for a few. Then, he'd move on to the major issues, how he felt about them, and give Delegates a chance to have a dialogue.

Mr. Beckwith said the first thing to keep in mind was that in a large organization, the way that things really got done was the way that the budget was allocated. And it's often the case that the budget function didn't even report to the President, or someone through the President. The budget in the capital resources function didn't report to him. So while he controlled a certain fraction of the resources that go through his office, the bulk of the activity went through a separate office.

Mr. Beckwith said he was mentioning this because he hoped that most of them will eventually get out into the world where they will discover that the difference between the apparent locus of power and the actual locus of power was actually quite distinct. The way to understand how decisions were made was to see what happens with the budget function. Fortunately, he and Ms. Jennings understand that. So one thing they do was work to make friends in the budget office. While they don't report to his office, if they like them, his office can exert some influence that way. And they've had some success with that.

Mr. Beckwith said they also work with the graduate deans on the ten campuses. They meet with them several times a year and have teleconferences with them regularly. They're going to meet with them at Irvine next week. They have a number of co-operative grants programs at the Systemwide level. One was the Association for Graduate Education and the Professoriate, AGEP. It's a program designed to help increase the numbers of currently underrepresented minorities and graduate faculty ranks. The PI Grant doesn't require as much work as the office would otherwise like. One problem at the OP, and one reason he thought meeting with the GA was useful, was that they don't have a lot of interaction with students. He sees very few students at his office in Oakland. He sees very few students who actually want to come

to Oakland. Part of what he's done to remedy that was to teach a course at Berkeley. He actually just came from it, at Campbell Hall. He's a physicist by training and an astronomer by trade. So he's teaching a seminar in cosmology. It gets him back on campus. It's not a graduate level course, so it might not be representative. But he thought it was something students would see a little bit more of. Those in the OP who are also professors and have teaching credentials try to keep their ties to the campus so that they understand a little more about the affects of their decisions. Mr. Beckwith said one problem with this was that since he teaches at Berkeley, all the other campus worry a little bit about that. But Berkeley didn't have to worry about that.

Mr. Beckwith said they also work to support and highlight graduate education and support campuses with outreach and recruitment for graduate students. Part of that was giving speeches and part of that was leading efforts, like the UC LEEDS program, and some of the other STEM programs. They work with the California State University Chancellor's office to coordinate Statewide forums and try to stimulate transfer students to come into UC. They also recognize, especially for certain kinds of students, that the

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 14 -

California State University System provides a tremendous reservoir from which they can draw. And as they knew, the UC President believed this was an important thing to do at that time.

Mr. Beckwith said he would talk about what he thought the major issues were facing UC's graduate programs. He's mentioned one, but he'd mention it again. One problem was the overall ratio between graduate students and undergraduates. He thought the people in the room were fortunate to be at a campus where the ratio was relatively high. As he recalled, Berkeley was about 28%, with close to 30% of the population being graduate students. People might not be aware of it, but that gives a very distinct feel to a campus and to the importance of the research enterprise. That was compared to a campus where it was, less than 10%, such as at Santa Cruz. They want to increase the number of graduate students at all of the campuses. It wasn't clear that they needed to increase the number at Berkeley as it was already pretty high. But some of their peer institutions have even higher ratios. When he was a graduate student, he thought there were more graduate students than undergraduate students in a lot of the major research universities, especially on the East Coast, where the proportion was a little higher. So if they could, they would increase the ratio there a little bit. He thought that was important because it really did give a distinctive feel to the way the campus was.

Mr. Beckwith said that one of their high goals was to fund more students so that they can increase this ratio. They knew it was extremely challenging in the current budget climate, and it remains a high priority. And if he could do anything about it, he'll try and make sure they don't retrench from what they have at that time. One way they did that over the last couple of years was to take some of the money from UC that flowed through his office to support research. And they competed it for new opportunities, and they specifically made support of graduate students one of the high selecting criteria. So the way these things go, he'd give them the two big examples. He thought many of them, those in the STEM fields know that the University of California manages the two national weapons labs, the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos Labs. There's a third weapons lab, Sandia, that they don't manage. Those are the principle weapons labs. They get from that a management fee. One of the first things he did when he came was to work with the Senate, which wanted this very much. Out of the entire net management fee they get, after paying certain things they had to pay, they took the entire net and they put it back into the programs for research opportunities, about \$2 million a year. They put out a Request for Proposals for all fields. There weren't a whole lot of humanities, but there were some, and some social scientists especially having to do with the impact of weapons on the world. They had two high selecting criteria. One was to

support research that was collaborative between Lab scientists and UC scientists, and secondly, they wanted it to support graduate students. They wanted graduate student opportunities to see what the Labs could do, as well as the other campuses. So they made that a high selecting criteria, which helps tilt the ratio a little bit.

Mr. Beckwith said the second thing they did was when they turned over their Multicampus Research Units, to recompute the MRUs in a slightly broader program, that's about \$13 million a year, and could be growing. They also made the involvement and support of graduate students a very high goal.

One other thing, which he didn't advertise very often, because it went a little outside of what he had wanted to be able to do, was that they have several institutes that work at the Labs that support graduate students solely, and they simply removed them from the competition and funded them for the last few years. They'll probably recompute that. It had been all for Los Alamos and Livermore, hopefully they'll open up more opportunities to fund graduate students through that. This will be a challenge in the current budget climate.

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 15 -

Mr. Beckwith said he thought a second challenge was to maintain an adequate balance across different disciplines of scholarship. When he was an undergraduate, a few decades ago, the number of students who went into the humanities compared to engineering and science, which he was in, was higher than it is today. It was a time before there was an incredible injection of money to support the STEM fields, which they know see today. So now, for engineering, physics, chemistry, or any of a number of the other fields like that, biosciences, there's a tremendous amount of federal money and non-profit money available, and proportionately less for scholarship in the humanities and the arts. And they can't maintain a great university if they get way out of balance. They are not MIT, they are Berkeley. There's a lot of pressure to change that balance, and they have to fight for that balance. And he thought they have, and thought they were doing okay. But some of the challenges involved with this were a little arcane.

He'd explain one field, because those of them going into the professoriate and getting grants will see this. Most of them who were on grants or who work with grants recognize that when they get grant funding, they also pay a certain fraction of that to what was called "indirect costing," or overhead. It's always very contentious, because when people pay that for the grant, they have no idea of what really happens to it. So most faculty he talks to see it as a tax. But the way they actually do things was there were many costs of doing research. These are inconvenient to account for, one-on-one. For example, they have a great library, to do great research. In any field library resources were needed. But the campus doesn't charge every time someone goes to the library. If they hire a graduate student they expect to be able to give graduate students offices. For some of them, maybe they're sharing offices; but at least they're not sitting out in the rain. Offices cost money. Somebody had to pay for heating, all that stuff. So there's actually quite a bit of stuff from the University that's provided for. Somebody had to pay for that. So they spread that cost across the enterprise and they cover that through this indirect cost recovery. The problem was that they're under-recovering their costs by a tremendous amount. Their indirect rates were lower than those of some of their top peer institutions by 15-20 percentage points. And they waive indirect and other things. He calculated that the amount of money they waive at that time, Systemwide, was about \$700 million a year. If they've been paying attention, they know all of the hubbub about furloughs and downsizing and all of that stuff was because they have a \$900 million a year drop. So they are under-recovering money. What that means is that everybody suffers. It was easy to say that some fields were subsidizing other fields. But that wasn't true. What was happening is they're using State money to subsidize everybody more than they need to, more than they should. This was fine when they had a lot of

State money and the State was supplying more money for students. But now it wasn't, and now UC simply do that. He didn't know if he'll be able to get the situation fixed, but they could just listen to the numbers he was talking about, the magnitude of the problem was very similar to the problem they have from the State. So that's an area while a little bit arcane, and frankly, pretty boring for most people, is the lifeblood of how they're going to finance the University research.

Mr. Rabkin said that maybe he didn't understand how overhead works, but once a grant is awarded, the University takes slice to fund these things. It seems like increasingly, the overhead fraction was taking money away from faculty that would have funded graduate students and hands that money up to the University to pay for the library and heating bill. He asked if it was true that it doesn't increase the amount of money available.

Mr. Beckwith said that if they want, they could get rid of the library and not heat the buildings, and give that money back. It costs a certain amount of money to fund the library. And they bring in people who keep using the library, and expand it. As they bring in people, they don't bring in enough money to account for the extra load on the building. And they have to take money from somewhere else in the

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 16 -

System to fund that problem. So the point of the indirect system was to put money back so they don't have to take State money for that problem.

He'd give another example, on graduate fellowships, near and dear to their hearts. If they want more money for graduate fellowships, they could take that out of their State funding. But they can't take it out of the State funding easily if it competes with heating a library. They can't generate fellowships out of indirect costs, but can generate fellowships out of State funding. So if they could make the budget whole, he could get money to pay for the library and the way the System could work was that in principle, they could put more money into graduate fellowships, or they could build another library. These were choices. But the problem now was that they were running at a deficit and had to address that.

Ms. Shankar asked about student protests. She's in the Department of Theatre and that day they received an e-mail saying that none of their faculty members except the Department head would have a phone any longer in their office. That's the reality for her Department. It's a small Department and they're all on fellowship. The student protesters say that the UCOP was sort of using the budget crisis as an excuse to streamline operations, whereas UCOP was saying protesters should direct their efforts and not focus internally. She asked if he thought the student protests should direct all organizational efforts towards Sacramento. She asked what he would advise the student protesters and people in Departments like hers that were facing cuts in a very real way.

Mr. Beckwith said the first issue was getting enough money per student based on the Master Plan where they could actually fund students' education. That was a global problem. The answer was no, they weren't. And that's a Sacramento problem. The President can't print money. There really isn't much they could do. If the University got less money in, they just had to make choices. He wouldn't defend whether taking out telephones was a better choice than another, but that was the kind of choice they were facing. That was one problem, they really should direct themselves to Sacramento.

On the specific choices the University makes internally on budget priorities, it can be taking phones out, getting rid of buildings, not heating buildings, or letting people go, whether staff or faculty, although they haven't let any faculty go, even though they have stopped hiring. Those were internal discussions, and

choices they make internally. He was an officer of the University and he didn't really want people protesting directly. But he did think that it was a legitimate conversation people and the campus had to have about choices. And he thought people had every right to expect people like him to be transparent about what they're doing. And if there's a protest to be had, or at least a conversation, yes, it was internal, to the Administration at Berkeley, to UCOP, to the extent they affect it.

The phone situation was a good overhead example. That was really internal to the campus. UCOP staff carry cell phones, and they all pay for them as well. The things UCOP gets involved with was how much money might go to Berkeley versus UCLA versus Merced, and so forth. So far they haven't made hard choices because there are historical formulas set up, and they haven't played with the formulas. But this was one of the big issues, a UCOP issue. It had to do with choices. He was really glad that students were grappling with these issues, but he would ask them to please understand that some issues they can deal with and some issues they can't. They can't get more money out of Sacramento without the students' help.

Ms. Shankar asked what avenues he was suggesting for students to engage in this conversation on a regular basis, and with departments that face the impacts of cuts. Mr. Beckwith said they should get the

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 17 -

Administration to explain the choices they've made. And students might find those choices were reasonable. They're all pretty Draconian. He thought that when UCOP makes decisions, at least in any of his programs, they should ask him and he'd be happy to talk with them. He's done controversial things. He thought recomputing the MRUs was controversial. And he was happy to talk about that. He thought they need to have transparency. They are a community of scholars and they should be able to debate these things and explain what they do. Working with the Senate, and with shared governance, was a good way to go. He would hope they could keep the conversation on a high level, but he knew these were pretty tough times.

Mr. Marchand said he would like to thank him for answering questions. It was mentioned that all parts of the UC were in deficit, but he believed UC medical centers were profit-making, to some extent. He asked if there was a possibility or talk about the option, in bad budget years, of taking profit from the medical centers to absorb some of the losses in the rest of the UC System.

Mr. Beckwith said he didn't think so. With all the various enterprises they run, it wouldn't be legal to take from Peter to pay Paul. The President was bound in many ways. As an example, people have advertised the idea that UC has a huge amount of unrestricted reserves. It isn't reserve. In budgeting, that's money that was already promised to people and just hasn't been paid out. If they don't keep it in the bank, they can't pay their bills. It's like owing \$3,000 on a credit card and having \$1,000 in the bank, and someone saying, "Gee, you have \$1K, take me out to dinner." On the medical centers, they can't do that. It's nice to think that would be good, but that's an area they're just not going to touch. If they follow it, they'd realize that. There's quite a bit of attention to the cost of health care. If they raise health care to support graduate research, patients would not be happy. So they had to be very careful about what they do, and they have some constraints.

Mr. Helu asked what percentage of grant money went to support overhead and how that compared with other comparable universities. Also, it was mentioned that Berkeley, relative to comparable institutions, has a 50-20% shortfall in covering a lot of these costs. He asked if that was due to the ratio of the

students who depend on these funds relative to the amount of money being brought in, or if there were other reasons.

Mr. Beckwith said the reason was different. Overall, they get \$3.9 billion of direct research support. On top of that, he believed they get another \$800 million of indirect support. So the ratio of \$800 million to \$3.9 billion was about 20-25%. Typically, about 25% of grants goes towards indirect costs. That was the first question. He didn't know what it was for the others, but he could tell them what the rate difference was. The rates there on indirect were about 52%. The rate at Harvard was 68%; and at MIT, 68%. Typically, some of their peers have rates that are much higher. Berkeley estimates that its costs, when it goes into this negotiation, are about 71%. And they walk away with 52%. So that's almost a 20% gap. That was a big part of the problem. And the reason for that was because in the past, the State supplied enough money to take care of the library, the heating, the telephones, all of that. When State funding goes down, they're left without those funds. Many other universities are private and have another funding model, and don't depend on state support. They depend on payout from their endowments, which was calculated very carefully.

Mr. Kohut said it was mentioned that the indirect recovery fees from the grants was \$700 million a year, and was waived. He asked who got a waiver. Mr. Beckwith said that actually about \$350M was is waived, and they lose another \$350M just because of the rate differential. The Delegate asked how they

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 18 -

decide. Mr. Beckwith said they've been pretty lackadaisical about that in the past. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is happy to support research, but refuses to pay indirect rates, or refuses to pay more than a few percent on top. So UC could either take the money and have someone else pick up the rest of that, or else they could not take the money. At UC, they never turn anybody away. They go with the flow. At MIT there's a hard policy that they don't accept any money that doesn't pay indirects. And if a department wanted to accept a grant where there's not indirect, such as from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, then the Department had to make up the difference from its own funds. As

As to how many indirect waivers were granted, it was zero. Nobody does that. In some fields, maybe dance and humanities, the indirects were not a well understood concept, whereas in industry and big federal agencies, like NSF, they're well understood. Right now, UC just weights it, and he thought they had to be a little more judicious about that.

Mr. Kohut asked what was to stop any company or funding source from saying they didn't want to pay the indirects. Mr. Beckwith said there was nothing. That was a problem they have, which they have confronted. Mr. Kohut asked if there was a movement to fix that or change that. Mr. Beckwith said they're talking about that. In the past they've just always done it. But people had to get used to it. It may mean that they turn people away. On the money side, that actually affects graduate education in a big way, in the amount of money they have to support things.

Mr. Beckwith said there were two other problems he'd bring up that he thought the University was facing. One problem was to make it possible to bring in international students while still recovering the costs of education. At every forum he goes to, the issue of non-resident tuition comes up; and it's always seen as a tax. But people had to keep in mind that UC got money from the State to support students who were residents, and they don't get money from the State to support non-residents. So they had to find a way to get that. And furthermore, the money they get from the State for graduate students was too low. A decision made about 15 years ago was to recover exactly the same costs for graduate students and

undergraduates, even though it costs more to educate graduate students and less to educate undergraduates. By the way, that policy change has clearly had a downward pressure on the number of graduate students because chancellors and deans recognize that just to balance the books, they're better off having more undergraduates than graduates. It costs less and they get the same tuition. Mr. Beckwith said he thought they were going to have to talk about that, because all these fields, especially in graduate school, profit enormously from the high influx of international students. As a personal experience, he lived abroad for several years and actually cut all ties to this country just because of the job. So he had a very keen sense of what it was like. If they're going to remain intellectually vibrant, they had to deal with the world, and bring in the best talent from the world that they could. But it was going to be tough because of the budgets he's mentioned and which he thought was a problem going forward.

Mr. Beckwith said he thought the final problem, which will speak to grads' hearts, is that they have a range of programs that were of varying quality. He thought it will be a challenge to maintain the very best programs and still try to be even-handed in the way they budget. These are the Draconian choices. Frankly, the question raised before about telephones didn't bother him so much because whenever he's tried to do research, he was better off if he didn't have a telephone and was better off just left alone. But there were other things people absolutely did need to do research. And those they don't want to cut. Of course, the other choices were whether cuts would be made uniformly or if they were going to try to make choices. He didn't have an answer to that. But he could tell them what the impact was if they cut across the board. They'd end up cutting out things that were, by every measure, excellent. If their excellent

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 19 -

programs starting being notched down, he didn't think anybody would profit. On the other hand, it was very, very painful to actually rank programs and say that they're just not going to fund the lowest in the rank. That was especially painful at a place like Berkeley, where almost every program was ranked in the top 10 nationally, or was the last time they did a survey.

Mr. Beckwith said he thought those were some of the problems they face, and problems that will require a lot of engagement between the students and the faculty, the students and the Administration, and the Administration and the faculty. They were very keenly worried about the whole enterprise and they want to make sure they have the right role in it.

Mr. Beckwith said he would end with a couple of remarks about the role. One thing of most importance for him, for the OP, was frankly just to be a communicator, to carry the word that this was a research university first and foremost. It's distinguished from the California State University system because they have graduate students and they grant Ph.Ds. They're a research university and that's what they do. And training graduate students and researchers was fundamentally different from undergraduates. The way he liked to think of it was that as an undergraduate, one learns a body of knowledge which everybody already knew; and there was a lot to learn. But when one became a graduate student, they learn how to produce knowledge that nobody knew before. And that was a very, very special place in society.

And he thought that this training was pretty general. People on the outside of the University might think that if they get a degree in some very specific subfield, in some arcane study of an author who lived 300 years ago, that the training was like a trade school and that they got training in the wrong thing. But what they're really doing was to learn how to figure out how to create a whole new set of knowledge in the way that nobody has done before. So their responsibility was to recognize their training as a tool that could be redeployed some other place, whether it's in industry, teaching, or some other subfield. That's a great gift, and one that was important to society. The country has moved more and more from an agrarian to a

manufacturing to a knowledge economy. And if they have a knowledge economy, then people who knew how to create knowledge better be the critical players in making sure they stay in the forefront of the world's economy.

Mr. Beckwith said that the job that he and Ms. Jennings had, first and foremost, was to make sure that people on the outside of the institution understood this. There are people in the State Legislature who think that cutting this was a good idea, as was supporting something that was more backwards, such as prisons, the local whipping boy at that time, although there were others. California cannot prosper that way in the long run. The rise of the quality of the University, mirroring the rise of Silicon Valley and Southern California and that whole dynamic economy, go together hand in hand. Their job was to communicate that and do what they could to help students. He thought it would be great if they all went to Sacramento and pounded on their desks. But it needed a parallel effort, which was a little bit more positive. And they're going to try and carry that out.

A Delegate asked if he could say a brief word on the tension between basic research and the athletic programs. He understood athletics for the past several years has been running more than \$10 million losses. Plus they have \$136 million for the student facility and \$321 million to retrofit the Stadium. This was for 450 student athletes. Obviously it was an investment, with expected returns.

Mr. Beckwith said he could make a few comments, but this was a little outside of his area. He didn't understand the cross-linking economics very well. He thought the problem with the statement that was

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)

- 20 -

made was that it mixed up a lot of different issues. For example, if they have a Stadium and it's not compliant seismically and an earthquake came and wiped out a lot of people, the long-term damage to the University would be far, far worse than anything that could be imagined. So the decision to do seismic upgrades was not a trivial decision. And it wasn't a decision that was necessarily based on some trade-off between Athletics and scholarship. He didn't know if the decision was right, and all he was saying was that it was more complicated. As far as the deficit, he just didn't know much about it. It's true that if there's a deficit in one program and it's made up for in another program, they had to worry about it. But there are plenty of programs in graduate studies and at this University that don't even come close to paying for themselves, and are supported by other means. So he thought that was a complex set of decisions. The Chancellor was weighing the need to have an athletic facility to bring in donors and money that supports these programs. Mr. Beckwith said he couldn't say whether it was right or wrong, but he could say that every time he's heard this argument oversimplified, he's asked himself if people have really looked at the complications, because it wasn't that easy. As a graduate student, it would be nice to be able to encapsulate it, to reduce it to a single phrase or sound bite; but it was harder than that.

A Delegate said he didn't mean to sound as if it was a political statement, and what Mr. Beckwith said about retrofitting made perfect sense. A new student athletic center will cost \$136 million. He asked if that could be postponed. Mr. Beckwith said that if they have a donor who really likes athletics and was willing to give \$136M, the University could take it or not. It's not obvious to him that the University should turn that away by saying, "No, what we really need is more linguistics." Chancellors and presidents usually recognize such money wasn't not going to hurt anybody and may improve the image of the school. But Mr. Beckwith said he honestly didn't know and wasn't trying to defend any of these decisions. All he was suggesting was that a lot of times these decisions were a bit more nuanced than they might appear at first. He would encourage them to talk to the Chancellor and find out about the nuances.

Mr. Daal said Chancellor Birgeneau will be their speaker in May.

Ms. Tang asked how the campus justifies bringing in more international students, with their diversity, while decreasing funding to student services for international students by almost half in the past couple of years. Mr. Beckwith said if it was decreased by half in the last couple of years, that paralleled exactly the amount of decrease of support for students that the campus got from the State. So it suggests to him they're treating international student services exactly the same way as everybody else; which wasn't very well. But at least it was even handed. He thought supporting student services was the right way to go, but it's becoming increasingly difficult. He comes back to arcane things like overhead. They don't control the State budget, but they do control other things. Their problem at that time was money. For the size of the staff and the student body that they have, they need more money. They don't really want to take Draconian cuts. He'll repeat what he said. They all believe very strongly that bringing in international students was a high goal for the intellectual health of the University.

Many non-resident students will probably be in professional programs or at the master's level. People in the general sciences are supported by grants or through their departments. Departments will choose to select the student who had to pay \$40,000 versus a student they needed to pay \$20,000 for a year, and then have that student as an expense afterwards. In terms of expanding the intellectual diversity there, he thought it would be at a certain level, not at all levels. Students who would want to come here would get funded at Stanford or Harvard and not come here. Mr. Beckwith said he was a professor of Cornell and Johns Hopkins. When he got a grant at Cornell and wanted to hire a graduate student, he paid the tuition;

Presentation by Steve Beckwith, UCOP VP for Research and Graduate Studies (cont'd)
Resolution Referral

- 21 -

and the tuition was "tuition," not "non-resident tuition"; and it was more than non-resident tuition here. And it was paid for every single graduate student. And that's true at Stanford and Harvard, where everybody is a non-resident unless they were born in Cambridge Yard. He recognizes these are tensions in their public university which was used to having a very small tuition for residents. But their peers at other places have been paying all along. He agreed there's pressure to make differential choices, but he would hope that the top people here would be able to make those choices and not make money the primary factor.

Mr. Beckwith said he would also say that it was actually not true that non-resident tuition was a deficit. In many fields where they have an easy time of getting money, it was a pretty good source of revenue. Engineering, e.g., had no problem with this, and had no problem raising tuition, and just wanted that money to come back to that Department. But people want to spread it around a little bit.

Ms. Tang said that regarding his comment about cuts for all students, for residents there's always money that goes back, such as the \$300 million scholarship initiative by Chancellor Birgeneau. International students weren't part of the package. Mr. Beckwith said he didn't understand that program well enough to speak intelligently about it.

Ms. Anderson said that regarding the statement that non-resident tuition wasn't such a problem in the sciences, Berkeley has very small graduate groups that weren't departments, but weird entities that take on graduate students. Some groups don't even look at non-resident applications. If they only take in three or four students a year, that difference was most of their budget. Mr. Beckwith said he agreed, and that was a problem. He thought one problem was continuing to support international students in the way they have

before. He didn't have a ready solution. These weren't challenges that will be easily solved by administrators sitting alone and thinking, but by having steady engagement. And he'd be happy to come back and talk to the GA at any time, and considered it part of his job. And he thought the GA needed to be connected closely to what goes on in the OP to keep them honest.

A Delegate asked about graduate research positions, and if, given the current funding situation, he foresaw an overall reduction in GSR opportunities for students at Berkeley. Mr. Beckwith said he didn't know the answer. But the way the system works was pretty good and has produced demonstrable excellence. He wouldn't want to diminish the opportunities. They're facing tough times, but he thought things obviously work and Berkeley was at the top of the game. He didn't think they wanted to tinker with that, but tinkering was unavoidable because they don't have enough money.

Mr. Daal said he would like to thank their speaker. (Applause) He said they really appreciate the presentation. Mr. Beckwith said his e-mail address was steven.beckwith@ucop.edu. Also, he didn't want to make this too widely known, but he had an office in Campbell Hall, 641A, and was there every Thursday. He was there primarily there for the students in his class, but if people wanted to stop by, he'd be around. Mr. Daal said he would like to thank him.

RESOLUTION REFERRAL

Mr. Daal said that by popular demand, they'll try to do something differently. He listed all the Resolutions for referral and the committees to which they are to be referred. If people wanted to object to

Resolution Referral (cont'd)

- 22 -

Resolution 0911b, A By-law Amendment to Expedite Funding Appeals

a referral, they should raise that point. Otherwise, they'd vote as a block for the referrals as listed. He noted that resolution 1003e was included.

Mr. Daal asked if anybody wanted to pull a Resolution from being referred. This was also the time to pull a bill to consider it immediately.

Seeing no objection, Mr. Daal said the referrals were made as indicated.

1002a, To Amend the GA Budget to Increase External Affairs Funding for SAGE 2010 Day on the Hill and UCSA Membership Dues, to External Affairs, Budget, and Rules Committees

1002b, Budget Amendment to Fund Incentives for the 2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey, to Campus Affairs, Rules, Budget Committees

1002c, A By-law to Facilitate Procedural Resolutions, to the Rules Committee

1002d, To Create a UC Berkeley Campus Energy Efficiency Target Action Agenda Item, to Campus Affairs, Rules, and the Environmental Sustainability Committees

1002e, Directed Action In Support of Securing a Space on Campus for the Berkeley Student Food Collective, to the Campus Affairs, External Affairs, Rules, and Environmental Sustainability Committees.

RESOLUTION DISCUSSION AND VOTE

Resolution 0911b

The following Resolution, 0911b was authored by Ariel Rabkin:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO EXPEDITE FUNDING APPEALS

WHEREAS the current funding appeals process requires the President, the Rules Officer, and the Funding Chair to meet, which may be difficult to arrange, and this impedes rapid resolution of appeals; and

WHEREAS section 6.7.2 of the By-laws previously began "Decisions of the Funding Committee to deny or limit funding to a particular Graduate Student Group may be appealed to the Funding Appeal Committee, which shall consist of the Funding Chair; the Rules Chair, and the President.",

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the By-laws of the Graduate Assembly be modified to replace the first sentence of section 6.7.2 with the following:

“Decisions of the Funding Committee to deny or limit funding to a particular Graduate Student Group may be appealed to a Funding Appeal Committee. This committee shall be

Resolution 0911b, A By-law Amendment to Expedite Funding Appeals (cont'd)
Resolution 0912b, A By-law Amendment to Change Committee Quorum Requirements

- 23 -

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO EXPEDITE FUNDING APPEALS (cont'd)

convened by the Rules Chair. The membership will consist of the Rules Chair and two additional Executive Board members, to be chosen by the Rules Officer.”

Mr. Rabkin said people want to specify the appeals process. They discussed this Resolution at their last meeting. People were unsure about some details and thought they'd give it another couple of months and see if any further discussion happened. There was no further discussion on this, so he would like to approve the Resolution.

Ms. Anderson said she's the Rules Chair and she spoke about this to the Funding Chair, who had a problem with the Resolution. They would like to suggest an amendment, to change the wording of the last sentence of the proposed amendment to read as follows:

“The membership will consist of the Funding Chair, the Rules Chair, and the President.”

Ms. Anderson said they basically wanted each person to be able to suggest a replacement for themselves. So instead of saying they needed to have these three people, or requiring the Rules Chair to get these people together, they want to change it to say that any member of the Funding Appeals Committee can agree to a replacement.

Mr. Rabkin moved to table the Resolution until they work out the wording.

Mr. Daal suggested waiting on this Resolution until they come up with wording, and in the meantime to move on to Resolution 0912b.

Resolution 0912b

The following Resolution 0912b, was authored by Meghan Anderson:

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW TO CHANGE COMMITTEE QUORUM REQUIREMENTS

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly has many committees serving useful functions, but a limited pool from which to draw committee members; and

WHEREAS, several campus committee spots have been left open, while Delegates serve on GA committees that could function with fewer members;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly By-laws be modified so that section 4.4.5 reads:

4.5. Membership. The Delegate Assembly shall determine the membership of each Committee. Only graduate students may constitute the voting membership of a Committee. A

Resolution 0912b, A By-law Amendment to Change Committee Quorum Requirements (cont'd) - 24 -
Resolution 0911b, A By-law Amendment to Expedite Funding Appeals (cont'd)

RESOLUTION ON A BY-LAW TO CHANGE COMMITTEE QUORUM REQUIREMENTS (cont'd)

majority of these members may vote to invite other individuals to serve as ex officio members. The voting membership of a Committee shall be more than three (3) and less than fifteen (15). All voting members shall have equal privileges.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly By-laws be modified so that section 4.4.11 reads:

4.11. Quorum. Quorum shall be the fraction of existing voting members that is fifty percent (50%) plus one (1) member. The number of members attending each Committee meeting must be included in the Committee's monthly report to the Delegate Assembly.

Ms. Anderson said the Rules Committee only has three members. She was wondering if Delegates even care if there were five people on that Committee. If they did, they should vote the Resolution down and join the Rules Committee. If they think having three people sitting around talking about rules was plenty, then they should pass the bill. It would apply to all committees. Ms. Anderson said the Resolution includes an additional requirement, to include the attendance at committee meetings in the committee report at the Delegates meeting.

Mr. Rabkin said he wanted to ask a question that the EAVP had. He asked if membership should be three or four, since it was now worded as being more than three. Ms. Anderson said that was a typo.

Mr. Rabkin moved to amend the wording in 4.5, to replace “more than three” with “at least three.” The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

A Delegate said she didn't think the Resolution would be disastrous, but thought it was a little off base. Maybe they could change the committee structure and/or increasing the number of Delegates available to sit on these committees in the future.

Ms. Anderson said it wasn't a typo, and they need three people to have quorum. So they were going to require that they have four people on the Rules Committee. But the amended wording was fine.

A motion to call the question was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0912b, AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON A BYLAW TO CHANGE COMMITTEE QUORUM REQUIREMENTS.

Resolution 0911b (cont'd)

Mr. Daal said they would move back to Resolution 0911b, which seems to have been amended. The amendment was to the last sentence of the proposed amendment, to delete “The membership will consist

Resolution 0911b, A By-law Amendment to Expedite Funding Appeals (cont'd) - 25 -
Resolution 0912c, On Standing Policy and Directed Action for United Lobbying for Public Funding

of the Rules Chair and two additional Executive Board members, to be chosen by the Rules Officer,” and replace that to read as follows:

“The membership shall consist of the Rules Chair, the President (or one member of the Executive Board, chosen by the President) and the Funding Chair (or one member of the Funding Committee).”

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0911b, RESOLUTION ON BY-LAW AMENDMENT TO EXPEDITE FUNDING APPEALS AS AMENDED, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Resolution 0912c

Mr. Marchand said that in the interests of time, because two months have passed since it was first proposed, it was changed. He said that Mr. Beckwith earlier said there were two issues: whether they get money from the State and how funding was distributed. The Resolution calls for an increase in State funding and that new funding should be allocated to restore damage done to previous cuts. It included a

directed action, to have a letter sent to the Chancellor and UCOP in support of the March 4 Day of Action Statewide.

Mr. Marchand to adopt the amended wording, to swap Resolved Clauses in the bill with those being recommended by the Campus Affairs Vice President.

The motion to approve the substitute wording passed with no objection.

As amended by substitution, the bill read as follows:

The following Resolution, 0912c, as amended by substitution, was authored by Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION FOR UNITED LOBBYING FOR PUBLIC FUNDING

WHEREAS, University of California (UC) students have been recently hit with fee increases, reduced admission of California residents, and reduced student services due to staff layoffs; and

WHEREAS, UC President Mark Yudof has publicly stated that the cuts in State funding to the UC System is the primary reason for these fee increases, enrollment cuts and layoffs; and

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley and the UC Office of the President (UCOP) administrators have called for united lobbying efforts aimed at re-establishing adequate public funding; and

WHEREAS, California students, their parents, and the general public should be confident that increased funding for the UC will result in improved access and services to students;

Resolution 0912c, On Standing Policy and Directed Action for United Lobbying for (cont'd) - 26 -
Public Funding (cont'd)

RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION FOR UNITED LOBBYING FOR PUBLIC FUNDING (cont'd)

Standing Policy

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly (GA) supports an increase in State funding of California public education in general, and of the UC System in particular.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA is of the opinion that new State funds should be first allocated to reverse the fee increases, enrollment cuts, and layoffs that have been adopted since 2007.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the GA will encourage the participation of its members in demonstrations on March 1 and 4, with the goal to advocate for the funding of California public education in general, and the UC in particular.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the GA Executive Board will send a letter to the UC Berkeley Chancellor and to the UC President and Provost, asking for a pledge to prioritize the reversal of fee increases, enrollment cuts, and layoffs in the eventuality of increased State funding.

Mr. Marchand said they didn't just want this to apply to "new funding," but to restore funding, compared to before the cuts. So he wanted to amend the first Resolved Clause to amend "increase in" with "increase and restore", and in the second Resolved Clause, to replace "new" with "new and restored," to read as follows:

"Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly (GA) supports an increase in and restored State funding of California public education in general, and of the UC System in particular.

"Further Resolved, that the GA is of the opinion that new and restored State funds should be first allocated to reverse the fee increases, enrollment cuts, and layoffs that have been adopted since 2007."

THE MOTION TO AMEND WAS SECONDED AND PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Rabkin said he would like to make another amendment to the second Resolved Clause, regarding the reversal of layoffs. He thought they should make it a priority to reduce faculty furloughs rather than stating that custodians had priority over faculty.

Mr. Daal said the amendment would be to second and last Resolved Clauses. They'd deal with the second amendment to the second Resolved Clause, to read as follows: "Resolved, that the GA is of the opinion that new and restored State funds should be first allocated to reverse faculty furloughs, fee increases, enrollment cuts, and layoffs that have been adopted since 2007."

Mr. Kline asked if there will be faculty furloughs next year. Mr. Daal said that according to Pre. Yudof, there will be none next year.

Mr. Rabkin said they'd still want this to be a priority.

Resolution 0912c, On Standing Policy and Directed Action for United Lobbying for (cont'd)
Public Funding (cont'd)

- 27 -

A Delegate said fee increases should be the GA's top priority, and if faculty furloughs were off the table, they didn't need to include them.

Mr. Rabkin said he would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Rabkin asked about alternative use of the funding that the GA would be saying was of lower priority, and if they're saying they should restore layoffs before they fix campus IT, e.g. He could think of a lot of priorities. It wasn't obvious to him that the GA thought that restoring every last laid off custodial worker should be more important than seismic retrofits.

Mr. Marchand said he wrote the bill not trying to think of everything. Most of the cut services have been from cuts in people. He thought Mr. Rabkin raised valid points.

Mr. Kramer said it made sense to have language like this. Only in a recession would they layoff custodial staff. The Resolution just says the University shouldn't see this as an opportunity to take advantage of this situation and to raise student fees in three years.

Mr. Marchand said layoffs were done in the face of an emergency. Downsizing could be done in more humane ways, like attrition.

Mr. Kohut said that as the GA, they were supposed to look out for graduate interests, and fee increases and enrollment cuts were a big part of that.

Mr. Helu said maybe they could change the wording to do things that could be done if there weren't other pressing things to pay for.

Mr. Daal said the amendment would be in the second Resolved Clause, to delete "first allocated" and to replace that with "prioritized."

The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Kramer said "prioritize" meant to come first.

A Delegate said this was in the context of putting these things higher in the list of priorities, and not so much that they had to give the money to them first, and then move on to other things.

Mr. Ellsworth said he preferred the wording as it stood because none of them were under the illusion that what they say will bind anybody. So it was the GA's job to put forth those things that would be worst represented in administrators' thoughts. He thought administrators will cover libraries and public safety, e.g., as they've done so in the past.

THE MOTION TO AMEND PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 17-16. As amended, the second Resolved Clause read as follows:

"Further Resolved, that the GA is of the opinion that new and restored State funds should be prioritized to reverse the fee increases, enrollment cuts, and layoffs that have been adopted since 2007."

Resolution 0912c, On Standing Policy and Directed Action for United Lobbying for (cont'd) - 28 -
Public Funding (cont'd)
Resolution 0912d, On Directed Action on the RFP for the Taqueria Tacotento

A Delegate said they were mixing a small issue with a giant issue. The small issue was encouraging grads to lobby. The big, complicated issue, was where that money went. She didn't think this was a place to address that in a vague way. The GA has surveys and discussions with the Administration on how to do that, and maybe they didn't want to conflate those issues.

Mr. Rabkin said that really what they were saying was whether they want the campus to be funded centrally out of fees or if they want every college to squeeze as much as it could out of its own funding agencies. It's not obvious that reducing student fees was good for the campus, and doing that would lead to more fragmented funding.

Mr. Daal said that seeing no further discussion they'd vote on the Resolution, as amended.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0912c, AS AMENDED, PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE,
RESOLUTION ON STANDING POLICY AND DIRECTED ACTION FOR UNITED LOBBYING
FOR PUBLIC FUNDING.

Resolution was 0912d

A motion to amend the Resolution to substitute the wording in the CAVP report was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

The following Resolution, 0912d, as amended by substitution, was authored by Matt Marks and was sponsored by Philippe Marchand:

RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION ON THE RFP FOR THE TAQUERIA TACOTENTO

BE IT RESOLVED, that it is the opinion of this Assembly that the Store Operations Board should prioritize the support of locally-owned, independent businesses when considering bids that would potentially replace El Taqueria Tacotento and Healthy Heavenly Foods.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly President communicates this Resolution to the Store Operations Board.

Ms. Shankar said the Resolution came up at the December meeting but they didn't get to it because they didn't have time. They're asking the SOB to prioritize local businesses. The contract for the Taqueria Tacotento's was up for renewal and it couldn't afford it. This was one of the restaurants in the Student Union that people have probably eaten at. The Store Operations Board sent out a Request for Proposal and was currently considering Subway for that spot. The Resolution asks the SOB to support and prioritize small businesses.

Mr. Rajan said he thought the amendment was great. It was certainly the feeling of most members of the SOB that they would like to see something that reflected the Berkeley character, which meant having

Resolution 0912d, On Directed Action on the RFP for the Taqueria Tacotento (cont'd)

- 29 -

locally owned, independent businesses. They would love to have financially viable and locally-owned, independent businesses in this business climate bid on the RFP. The amended Resolution would just direct the SOB to prioritize something it already prioritizes. He would be happy to explain why the Board's final decision did not reflect those priorities.

Seeing no further discussion, Mr. Daal said they would come to a vote.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 0912d, AS AMENDED BY SUBSTITUTION, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE, RESOLUTION ON DIRECTED ACTION ON RFP FOR TAQUERIA TACOTENTO.

This meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

[See text of the minutes for bills amended by substitution.]

The following Resolution, 0911b, was approved by the GA as amended to read as follows:

Resolution on By-Law Amendment to Expedite Funding Appeals

Whereas the current funding appeals process requires the President, the Rules Officer, and the Funding Chair to meet, which may be difficult to arrange, and this impedes rapid resolution of appeals; and

Whereas section 6.7.2 of the By-laws previously began "Decisions of the Funding Committee to deny or limit funding to a particular Graduate Student Group may be appealed to the Funding Appeal Committee, which shall consist of the Funding Chair; the Rules Chair, and the President.",

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the By-laws of the Graduate Assembly be modified to replace the first sentence of section 6.7.2 with the following:

“Decisions of the Funding Committee to deny or limit funding to a particular Graduate Student Group may be appealed to a Funding Appeal Committee. This committee shall be convened by the Rules Chair. The membership shall consist of the Rules Chair, the President (or one member of the Executive Board, chosen by the President) and the Funding Chair (or one member of the Funding Committee).”

The following Resolution, 0911b, was approved by the GA as amended to read as follows:

Resolution on a By-law To Change Committee Quorum Requirements

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly has many committees serving useful functions, but a limited pool from which to draw committee members; and

Whereas, several campus committee spots have been left open, while Delegates serve on GA committees that could function with fewer members;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly By-laws be modified so that section 4.4.5 reads:

4.5. Membership. The Delegate Assembly shall determine the membership of each Committee. Only graduate students may constitute the voting membership of a Committee. A majority of these members may vote to invite other individuals to serve as ex officio members. The voting membership of a Committee shall be at least three (3) and less than fifteen (15). All voting members shall have equal privileges.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly By-laws be modified so that section 4.4.11 reads:

4.11. Quorum. Quorum shall be the fraction of existing voting members that is fifty percent (50%) plus one (1) member. The number of members attending each Committee meeting must be included in the Committee's monthly report to the Delegate Assembly.

The following Resolution, 0911b, was approved by the GA as amended to read as follows:

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action for United Lobbying for Public Funding

Whereas, University of California (UC) students have been recently hit with fee increases, reduced admission of California residents, and reduced student services due to staff layoffs; and

Whereas, UC President Mark Yudof has publicly stated that the cuts in State funding to the UC System is the primary reason for these fee increases, enrollment cuts and layoffs; and

Whereas, UC Berkeley and the UC Office of the President (UCOP) administrators have called for united lobbying efforts aimed at re-establishing adequate public funding; and

Whereas, California students, their parents, and the general public should be confident that increased funding for the UC will result in improved access and services to students;

Standing Policy

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly (GA) supports an increase in and restored State funding of California public education in general, and of the UC System in particular.

Resolution on Standing Policy and Directed Action for United Lobbying for Public Funding (cont'd)

Be It Further Resolved, that the GA is of the opinion that new and restored State funds should be prioritized to reverse the fee increases, enrollment cuts, and layoffs that have been adopted since 2007.

Be It Further Resolved, that the GA will encourage the participation of its members in demonstrations on March 1 and 4, with the goal to advocate for the funding of California public education in general, and the UC in particular.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the GA Executive Board will send a letter to the UC Berkeley Chancellor and to the UC President and Provost, asking for a pledge to prioritize the reversal of fee increases, enrollment cuts, and layoffs in the eventuality of increased State funding.