

## GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 3, 2005

**SUMMARY OF THE MEETING**

- The meeting was called to order at 5:32 p.m.

**Announcements**

One of the GA's reps on the Grad Council, Ms. Perring, was leaving the position next semester, and an election will be held in December to elect a new rep.

With no objection, a motion was approved to have a short presentation prior to the start of the December GA meeting on the GA itself, and possibly discuss its authority, mechanics, regulations, etc.

A public inquiry and hearing was announced on the hostile climate for underrepresented minority students.

**Reports**

The GA Manager reported on an open house the GA held on October 26, attended by 180-200 people. Workshops will be held on "Surviving Oral Examinations," and on "Do Babies Matter."

The Funding Advisor reported that for Grad Events Round 3 and for Round 2 of Grants, nearly every request was funded. The next funding round is November 18, covering Round 4, for December 2 - 9, and Round 4-A, for January 2 - February 3.

The Coordinator of the Women of Color Initiative reported on an event, "Do You Have My Back?", aiming at building working coalitions between white women and women of color on campus. Also, the 21st Annual Women of Color Conference will be held Saturday, March 4.

The ASUC rep to the GA reported on the Judicial Council lawsuit, which has frozen a transfer of \$30,000 between the GA and the ASUC. The case will be heard within the next month.

**Presentation by Ms. Gillis, of the Chancellor's Senior Advisory Group on Diversity and Inclusion (SAGDI).**

SAGDI will recommend the creation of a new position and office to direct students, faculty, and staff on diversity and inclusion, to be established in the fall. Its goal would be to increase numbers of students and faculty of color and improve the emotional environment on campus. It would give the diversity issue a stronger voice to the Chancellor. There currently was no central structure dealing with this, but programs under different offices. Positions would be cost-neutral as they'd come from existing positions. It was felt that having people working together as a team, rather than being isolated, would be an improvement. With no objection, the GA approved a motion to forward to SAGDI its preference for the strong, centralized structure for the new position.

-

- Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 2 -

**GA Autonomy Update**

Progress on this issue has been going well. Meetings have been held with the GA and ASUC Presidents and their assistants. The only of some contention was the question of GA contribution to the cost of ASUC elections. The only way autonomy would occur was with such a buy-in. It would allow the GA to put referenda on the ballot and allow grad students to sit in the ASUC Senate. There was currently one grad student Senator. The other option was absolute autonomy, with no connection with the ASUC whatsoever. But that would completely set the process back to square one.

Problems have regularly occurred with ASUC elections. The GA agreed, in principle, to pay \$36,000 in elections costs that were in arrears, which seemed reasonable. The sticking point was determining the appropriate level of GA support in the future. The GA has offered a 12% floor for costs, given that historically, 12% of grads vote. Another element of the agreement would be to allow the GA to speak before the Academic Senate, since the ASUC was now the only student government recognized by the Academic Senate. With the arrival of the Chancellor, discussion was tabled.

Presentation by Chancellor Birgeneau

A deep concern at Berkeley was the incredible underrepresentation of a number of groups, including Native Americans, African Americans, and Chicano/Latinos. The campus was successful in having economic diversity, and they have the largest percentage of financially disadvantaged students of any major university system in the country, with more undergrads on campus from financially disadvantaged backgrounds than the entire Ivy League. And the graduation rate over six years of students from the lowest financial quartile was the same as those from the highest quartile.

But there were 16 Native American students in this year's freshman class, astoundingly low. The Chancellor has tried to convince people that Native American students were members of sovereign nations and should not have to pay out-of-State tuition, which would have a dramatic effect. The campus has a new Director of Undergraduate Admissions, trying to do a better job with outreach programs. The campus was also creating the Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative, to investigate multicultural societies, which was a relatively new phenomenon, and which raises a range of research issues.

The currently level of self-help for undergrads was \$8,600, provided by combination loans and work. This can present a problem for students from poor backgrounds. Fees were increasing, but the problem was the cost-of-living in the Bay Area. The campus was seeking to significantly improve financial aid, in terms of fundraising, public-private partnerships, and dealing with State and federal government.

From talking to legislators, it was the Chancellor's opinion that as long as Prop. 209 was law, they wouldn't make profound changes. Prop. 209 passed by 400,000 votes out of a population of 35 million. There were 4 million unregistered, mostly young Chicano/Latino and Asian people in the State. With a new generation of student activists doing voter registration, they could, in two years, reverse Prop. 209, making the situation a totally different ballgame.

Questions to the Chancellor included allowing student government to advocate for ballot propositions; the subsidy to Intercollegiate Athletics; increasing students' representation on the campus according to zip code; the high cost of University housing; renewable energy; the question of the affect of high fees and high debt on recruitment; on military recruitment on campus; militarizing the Student Union at a career fair attended by military recruiters; the hostile climate on campus for underrepresented minority students;

-

-  
Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 3 -

and the problems with overturning Prop. 209 on the ballot; encouraging campus participation in industrial liaisons and enterprise; and having a two-tiered UC System, with blacks and Latinos getting into UC Riverside, but not into Berkeley.

Reports

The Graduate Minority Student Project Coordinator reported on activities undertaken. The position will be vacated in a few months.

The Coordinator of the Minority Outreach, Recruitment and Retention Project reported on recent activities. A Unity Weekend will be held for grads and undergrads, to establish community.

Resolutions

By voice-vote, the GA passed the Resolution Calling for a Campus Climate Protection Plan. It would urge the Chancellor to endorse the principle of climate neutrality (net zero emissions of greenhouse gases); commit to greenhouse gas emission reduction targets; and to charter a Climate Protection Task Force to establish a Climate Protection Plan for Berkeley.

GA Autonomy Update (cont'd)

After ratification of the autonomy proposal, the GA would not be subject to any rulings by the ASUC Senate or the Judicial Council, and the GA and the ASUC would be parallel bodies. Maintaining some connection with the ASUC would also allow the GA the ability to influence the undergraduate body.

The ASUC's previous opposition to GA autonomy has involved politics. The GA has negotiated with the Registrar the option of having a grad student referendum, if needed.

A straw poll was held. There were 15 votes for GA parallel autonomy with the ASUC, with the GA paying 12% of the cost of ASUC elections; there were 6 votes for total autonomy.

Resolutions (cont'd)

With no objection, the GA approved the Resolution to Endorse the Public Inquiry and Hearing to Investigate Hostile Climate on Campus Facing Underrepresented Minority Students. It called on the GA to endorse the November 10 public hearing to investigate hostile climate on campus for underrepresented minority students; to encourage participation in the hearing by students and student groups; and to send a rep to the Public Hearing as a member of the panel.

With no objection, the GA approved, as amended, the Resolution In Support of Protecting the Political Free Speech Rights Of Students. It calls on the GA to ASUC Santa Barbara's lawsuit against the UC Regents in order to preserve the free speech rights of students.

## Reports

With no objection, the GA approved the report from the Funding Committee, approving Round 3 of Graduate Events allocations and Round 2 of Grants allocations.

—

## Summary of the Meeting (cont'd)

- 4 -

With no objection, the GA approved moving, from the Executive Office budget, \$10,000 to the Empowering Women of Color Conference, to rectify a budgeting oversight from last year, and \$10,000 to the GA's Web Team, to develop the GA's online funding system.

## Officers' Reports

The Academic Affairs office has been working on student fees and student services, looking at how much in student fees was allocated to various student services, and how many people were served. A survey was distributed to gauge the importance of these services to Delegates as individuals and to the campus. There were some major disparities in the way funding was allocated.

The GA wanted a system allocating money based on the academic mission of the campus, first, and then services used by the majority of students, and then everyone else.

The Career Services Center, in a fee referendum, will ask students to pay \$13 to \$16 a semester, starting next year, to fund a commercial lease for a facility across the street from Eshleman, closer than it's current location. The GA was pressing the University to pay half, and suggesting \$1.50 to \$3.00 more, to add staff who would serve grads. A straw poll was held. There were 7 votes to pay nothing; 2 votes to pay \$13-16 for a lease to move Career Services; and 4 votes to add an additional \$1.50 or \$3.00 for more resources for grads.

The Recreational Sports Facility used to be free, and students now pay \$59 a semester. The RSF was asked to close its operating deficit and pay back its debt, and could face up to \$1.2 million in budget cuts next semester, 15% of its budget. If students pay the same amount, the RSF would cut almost 50% of its budget. At \$75 the same level of services now available would be retained. The RSF is totally paid for by students. Straw polls were held on amounts of extra fees. For \$50 there were 3 votes; for \$60, 3 votes; for \$75, 3 votes. Six Delegates didn't have RSF membership. Three people had an RSF membership in the past but cancelled.

The GA's Academic Affairs Committee meets to discuss policy issues such were considered under this report.

### Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

The Grad Council was trying to develop a faculty- student message to State leaders, the Regents, and legislators about the amount of money that grad students bring vis-à-vis out-of-State fees grads pay. The Grad Council also discussed a big done on mental health among grad students. General enjoyment of grad school had a lot to do with grads' level of mentoring. They talked about encouraging departments and colleges to have a greater emphasis on mentoring training for professors.

The meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

[End Summary of the Meeting]

.....

—

- Announcements

- 5 -

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Lola Odusanya at 5:32 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Ms. Odusanya said she would like to welcome them to the third meeting of the GA.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Ms. Odusanya called for any corrections to the agenda. Mr. Inkabi said that under the Graduate Minority Project report, Kofi Turner should be "Mr." Kofi Turner. Mr. Cantor moved to strike section 1, Approval of the Agenda. The motion died for lack of a second. A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

#### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes from the October GA meeting. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 6, 2005 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Odusanya said Ann Perring was currently a GA representative on the Grad Council, but could no longer fulfill her responsibilities next semester. The GA would will therefore need to hold an election in December to elect a new Grad Council member. She would ask Delegates to please keep that in mind. Ms. Odusanya asked if Ms. Perring could give a brief overview of the position. Ms. Perring said she's only been to one meeting. The Grad Council was a panel of faculty members, administrators, and grad students, who make recommendations to the Chancellor and deal with pretty much anything having to deal with graduate student life. It was interesting and there was an opportunity to have input on grad student life. They've been talking a lot about mental health, affordable housing and, as always, the increase in grad student fees. Ms. Odusanya said that if anybody had questions, she would ask them to please feel free to ask her, Ms. Perring, or any of the GA's Grad Council members, Ben Allen, Jeff Wolf, Miriam Elnaggar, or Jay Stagi, a previous Grad Council rep.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (cont'd)

Mr. Stagi some additional agenda items needed to be added, and moved to include under New Business a report on the standing of autonomy negotiations with the ASUC. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Stagi said a report from the Grad Council should be added under Reports. Ms. Odusanya called for any objection to the change to the agenda, and seeing none, said it was approved.

-

-  
Announcements (cont'd)

- 6 -

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS (cont'd)

Ms. Brakora said she would like to get together a group of people to research the rights of GA committees, where committees come from, what their definitions were, and what their domain of power and influence were. This was her second meeting and she didn't have an intimate working knowledge of how the GA worked. She would like to have that explicit and available for everyone. If more people would like to join her in this effort, she would ask them to please see her afterwards.

Ms. Odusanya said she thought it was very important to get more information and background on how to write a resolution properly, the rules and regulations of the Assembly, what they could do there, things of that nature.

Mr. Stagi said that in years past, they've had a session where people new to the GA came to a meeting a little early, and the Departmental Liaison would give a quick primer. He asked if people thought that would be of help, and if so, if the following meeting would be a good

time to do that. Mr. Valleé asked what the primer would cover and said that in the past they've focused on roles governing discussion. He asked if that's what was being suggested. Mr. Stagi said it could be more expansive, and it sounded like Ms. Brakora had a few other issues. This could be fleshed out with Mr. Fisher, and a small program given. Ms. Brakora said her idea was to create a hand-out or outline of what the GA was and where their rights and responsibilities come from, and have that online. Mr. Stagi said he thought it would be good to do that in tandem with the actual mechanics of how the GA operated. Such a presentation may have been missing in the past. Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to include a short course before the meeting next month to teach new and old Delegates about GA regulations and any other subjects decided upon. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO HAVE A SHORT PRESENTATION ON THE GA BEFORE THE NEXT GA MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. Ms. Odusanya said they would include that next month.

Mr. Daal asked about the content of the meeting and asked if Mr. Fisher would give a report or update on grad student participation in grad committees, since he hasn't heard anything about that. Ms. Odusanya said she was pleased to announce that for the first time in a very long while, the GA has been able to successfully fill all campus committee positions for grad students. Mr. Daal said he hadn't received any information about actually attending a committee meeting. Ms. Odusanya said Mr. Schechtman would be there shortly, and she was sure he could answer that.

Mr. Besbris said he would like to ask for a motion to change the agenda to move his report to before New Business. Ms. Odusanya said it would be at the end of Staff Reports. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Cruz said there would be a public inquiry on Thursday, and a Resolution will be considered that evening on whether the GA would endorse it. The inquiry would be to investigate hostile climate for underrepresented minority students, convened by a task force of at least 12 ASUC Senators. They'll hear testimony from students about their real experiences daily with isolation and hostility, including subtle and not so subtle comments that they were unwelcome on campus. Such things have increased as a result of the plummeting numbers of black, Latino, and other underrepresented minority students. Chancellor

-

-  
Announcements (cont'd)

- 7 -

Birgeneau agreed to attend, which was wonderful, since this would really be an important way to buttress any and all efforts to increase underrepresented minority enrollment, and to make the case that the end of affirmative action has increased discrimination and preferential treatment against minority students on the UC campuses. Mr. Cruz said he passed around information about the event and would encourage Delegates to spread the word about it in their departments. He'd try to find e-mail addresses and send them an e-mail. Mr. Cruz said they were also looking for more people to step forward and tell their stories as well, and people should contact Ms. Felarca about that. The public inquiry would be at the Multicultural Center in the MLK Student Union next Thursday at 6 o'clock. He would encourage everyone to attend.

Ms. Odusanya said that since the Chancellor wasn't present yet, she called for a motion to move into reports. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

## REPORTS

-

### Report from the GA Manager

Ms. Hsueh said it was nice to see the Delegates again. She didn't know how many of them have learned about the open house the GA held on October 26, and they may have gotten an e-mail about it. If they didn't, she would ask them to please sign up so they could be notified in the future. It was held from 4:00 to 7:00 and was a success, with 180-200 people. They tried to have everybody sign up, but forgot to put a table in the back, and since people came in from the front as well as from the patio, they didn't catch everybody. She wanted to thank everybody who attended and said they'd do it again. She heard so many good things about it and everybody had a wonderful time.

Ms. Hsueh said she brought fliers about two workshops, and would appreciate it if Delegates could post them in their department. One will be "Surviving Oral Examinations," on Monday, so it was important that an e-mail be sent out to student groups, as well as posting it. The second was "Do Babies Matter." These were part of a series of workshops offered through the GA. The Project Coordinator was the Graduate Women's Project Coordinator, and this was the second part. A third part will be held on November 14. Ms. Hsueh said she would ask Delegates to please post these notices on bulletin boards. It was very important that female graduate students attend, and Dean Mason will be present as well. They'll talk about how to become tenured and the difficulties female professors experience.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve the report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE GA OFFICE MANAGER PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Giving her report as Funding Advisor, Ms. Moore said people should have received the funding report for November. The funding allocations for Grad Events Round 3 and for Round 2 of Grants were included. She was very happy to announce that they had a great funding round. They were not overwhelmed with requests and they were able to nearly fund almost everyone. With the exception of policy and procedural stuff occurring on applications, they went through and applied policy for the amounts that were granted.

Reports (cont'd)

- 8 -

Other than that, they were able to fund everyone in this round. The next funding round would be November 18 for two particular rounds, and the November 18 deadline would cover Round 4, one week, December 2 - 9, and Round 4-A, January 2 - February 3, only. She would ask them to please keep that in mind if they apply for the November 18 round, and would ask them to please grab one of the sheets.

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING ADVISOR PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Giving her report as Coordinator of the Women of Color Initiative at the GA, Gabriela Rico introduced herself and said this was her second year in the position of Project Coordinator. Her position has historically worked under the Graduate Women's Project, specifically to target retention, recruitment, and outreach to graduate women of color. The programs she held annually were set to meet that goal. One of them was "Do You Have My Back?", which aims at building working coalitions between white women and women of color on the campus. They hold discussions on racial identity and multicultural building and try to build sisterhood across their community. Ms. Rico said a second program would be the 21st Annual Women of Color Conference. This was a very important Conference held every year by the GA's Women of Color Initiative. It was actually the longest-running women of color conference in the country, so it had national fame, and they get mostly women from outside Berkeley who come to the Conference every year. Last year was the 20th anniversary of the Conference, so it was a particularly big year. This year the Conference will be smaller in scale. It will be held Saturday, March 4, 2006, and the theme that year was "Environmental Awakening: Restoring Traditions and Heritage." Basically, it will surround the women of color legacy in the environmental justice movement and will focus on justice and rights around the current Hurricane Katrina issues that have been raised. Ms. Rico said she hoped Delegates would attend. They'd hear more about it through e-mails, fliers, and posters.

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE COORDINATOR OF THE WOMEN OF COLOR INITIATIVE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

#### Report from the ASUC Representative

Max Besbris introduced himself and said he was the ASUC's representative to the GA. The last time he was there he talked about a current lawsuit going on before the ASUC Judicial Council in which a transfer of funds was frozen between the GA and the ASUC. He didn't have the figure last time, and looked it up, and the amount that was currently frozen was \$30,000. The J-Council has not yet met to hear the case. The plaintiff was the current Executive Vice President of the ASUC. Mr. Besbris said he believed the case will be heard within the next month, and he would definitely keep the GA posted on any decisions made by the Judicial Council or actions taken by the ASUC.

As for what the ASUC was doing at that time, he didn't think there was anything important to report to the GA. He called for any questions.

Mr. Besbris said it was mentioned earlier that the GA would talk about GA autonomy, and asked if that would occur at every meeting, an update on how that was going. Ms. Odusanya said it would definitely be the case at the meeting that evening, and probably the next meeting as well.

Reports (cont'd)

- 9 -

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE ASUC REPRESENTATIVE TO THE GA PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

NEW BUSINESSPresentation by Ms. Gillis, of the Chancellor's Senior Advisory Group on Diversity and Inclusion (SAGDI).

Ms. Odusanya said she would like to introduce Elizabeth Gillis, who has been working very hard with this Committee to come up with a structure to address diversity issues on campus. The draft structure they have so far was written on the board. She would ask Delegates to please take some time to review that structure, and ask questions, which she or Ms. Gillis could answer.

Ms. Gillis said that to clarify the proposed structure, the Chancellor's Senior Advisory Group on Diversity and Inclusion (SAGDI) was heading towards recommending a new position that would include an office. There were actually two structures being debated, and both will be forwarded to the Chancellor. The structure on the board was what was called "the strong, centralized structure." The other structure was to have a central office, but not have programs coming from there, with programs having a dotted-line relationship to the central office. That was just a consideration to think about. The purpose in creating the office was if it would make a difference if programs and services were be dealt with in a working relationship rather than a reporting relationship.

Ms. Odusanya said it was critical for Delegates to take time to review this and think about it, because this will be established on campus next fall.

A Delegate asked if they could clarify what was written on the Board. Ms. Odusanya said the campus was thinking about creating a new position, a "director of inclusion," which would report to the Chancellor. Reporting report to the Director would be the Council on Diversity, which would be composed of students, faculty, and staff. The purpose of the new office would be to direct students, faculty, and staff with regard to diversity and inclusion. The executive position was the strong, centralized model, which meant that current programs would be moved under the auspices of this office. The second option would be to have a dotted-line relationship to the new position, and have grad diversity programs report to that. So a question was whether this office should have programs or to keep that function in the Grad Division.

Ms. Odusanya asked about the Faculty Equity Office. Ms. Gillis said it reports to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. Ms. Odusanya said that was Paul Gray. She asked who Staff Equity Diversity reports to at that time. Ms. Gillis said it reports to the Vice Chancellor and Provost. The executive in charge of the Division on Inclusion would have staff, including management, community development, public relations, liaison to campus committees, an analyst, and a legal advocate. The Delegate asked if this would mean the diversity issue would have a stronger voice to the Chancellor. Ms. Odusanya said it would create a new position that doesn't currently exist.

Ms. Gillis said they've held a series of focus groups, including grad student focus groups; and a bunch of people from the GA participated. The question they were focusing on was what would make a credible

-

- Presentation by the Chancellor's Senior Advisory Group on Diversity and Inclusion (cont'd)

- 10 -

office, and what kinds of actions would be the most important. And then back-stepping from that, the Advisory Group was trying to determine what would be necessary to have their internal functions, where these activities currently exist, whether that was something they could move, and what kind of authorities to give this position. The Committee would be really interested in hearing what things would be necessary for this office to be credible in students' eyes, so they could look at what they have and prepare something to take to the Chancellor.

Mr. Daal asked what was wrong with the current structure. Ms. Odusanya said there really was no current structure, and instead, there were different programs. Mr. Daal said there's a Grad Division program. Ms. Odusanya said there are programs under different offices, but no centralized unit that would bring all the programs together. These activities were very decentralized. The idea was to bring them together in some way, with a focus point both for undergrads, grads, faculty, and staff.

Mr. Purdy asked if there were any models of how this was done at other universities. Ms. Odusanya said there were. Ms. Gillis said she could give a report on at least 12 other schools, and the Committee has studied about 12 other universities, including UCs. There were very few. The University of Washington had the most robust program. Very few programs combine faculty, students, and staff. Many campuses have structures that address just students, or just faculty, but there were very few that have a combination.

Mr. Schechtman said that in terms of effectiveness, he thought it made a lot of sense to have someone at a high level, reporting directly to the Chancellor, focusing on this. When this issue got spread among many different offices, it might get diluted. And when they look at some other offices, like Athletics, which have direct access to the Chancellor, one would argue that diversity is probably more important on this campus. So in that sense, this was a good idea. In order for this to be critical and effective, he thought this office would need to probably have direct control over these programs, perhaps with dotted reporting lines. An advisory role would be unlikely to change much. And on

the student side, this person would need to have a lot of authority, such as when suggesting alterations to the admissions policy, because the campus' current policies were obviously broken. On the faculty side, that would probably be even more difficult, especially with the hiring and tenure process, which needed to be altered. So this person would need to be given a lot of authority and backing by the Chancellor. And unless they have a direct line, he didn't see much change. So he would suggest the strong, centralized model.

Mr. Schechtman said he had a question about cost. The GA did an analysis about a year and a half ago that said the Vice Chancellors and various associates and assistants of that set cost the campus \$12 million a year. Plus, there's another \$15 million in office and staff costs. The position being discussed was probably a \$200,000 position with another \$250,000 in staff costs. That was a half million dollars that could be spent on financial aid to better compete with other institutions for faculty salaries. While he thought creating a position was fine, but they'd be creating an entire office, with all the associated costs. It would seem there were already enough people in California Hall such that some of the support structure could be shared, and they wouldn't end up spending a half million dollars a year just to have an office.

Ms. Gillis said most of the positions written on the board would be cost-neutral since they'd come from existing positions. They would be offered from various control units already on campus. Programs would be a simple lateral transfer. What has not yet been decided is the level the position would be, and the Committee will actually talk about that at its next meeting on Monday. Mr. Schechtman was free to ask the Chancellor about this, when he arrived at the meeting, but people could also feel pretty confident that the Chancellor would be able to raise some resources for this.

-

Presentation by the Chancellor's Senior Advisory Group on Diversity and Inclusion (cont'd)

- 11 -

Mr. Cantor asked about the impact the proposed office would have on existing programs and recruitment. He asked if there would be lateral shifts and if this position would cannibalize from other programs, and if this proposal would come with a commitment to fund those other programs on this campus. Ms. Gillis said she would also ask a question, and ask what he wanted out of this. As it's proposed now, the Committee was still considering what programs to include. That included asking the Vice Chancellor and directors in charge of those programs what they wanted. There's a feeling right now that a change in those programs, with people working together as a team, would be an improvement, as most of the programs right now were isolated from each other. But as yet, that has not been decided.

A Delegate asked if there was any possibility the position would challenge Prop. 209. Ms. Gillis said there was.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions, and called for a motion to approve the strong, centralized structure, as what the GA, as a whole, preferred, agreeing to recommend that structure to this Committee.

Ms. Levitan asked if this agreement came with anything, such as promises they must give them something. Ms. Odusanya said it didn't. The GA was just being asked for its approval.

A motion to approve the structure was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO FORWARD TO THE SENIOR ADVISORY GROUP ON DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION THE GA'S PREFERENCE FOR THE STRONG, CENTRALIZED STRUCTURE FOR THE NEW POSITION, DIRECTOR OF INCLUSION, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. Ms. Odusanya said the GA, then, had approved the strong, centralized structure.

Mr. Purdy asked if Ms. Gillis could talk about the new, proposed position, Director of Diversity and Inclusion. Ms. Odusanya said the first task would be to increase numbers and to get more minority students on campus, and to hire more faculty and staff of color. The other mission was more emotional, for students to be happier and to have staff more satisfied.

A Delegate asked if the job search for this position would also take diversity into consideration. Ms. Odusanya said it would.

#### GA AUTONOMY UPDATE

Ms. Odusanya said she's been working very closely on this with Mr. Stagi and with ASUC President Buenrostro. Mr. Stagi said progress on this issue has actually been going fairly well. As they know, autonomy from the ASUC has been on the GA's agenda for several years. They've had several rather disheartening last-minute things that have fallen through, such as a ballot initiative that was removed from the ballot at the last minute, and with Attorney Generals who have ruled language vague, etc. So for several years this issue has not moved forward. This year the GA decided to include this issue in its Advocacy Agenda. Or, at least it's on their agenda, although he didn't know if "advocacy" was the right word. Meetings have been held with the Presidents of the GA and the ASUC and their assistants. Mr. Stagi said he was Ms. Odusanya's assistant, and as the nominal Chair of the Organization and Rules Committee, it was also appropriate that he was there. They're also negotiating on behalf of the Chancellor, who has indicated his support of the GA's plight, recognizing that they really ought to be autonomous. The Chancellor has suggested that the GA negotiate with the ASUC.



-

GA Autonomy Update (cont'd)

- 12 -

Mr. Stagi said the GA has gotten along with the ASUC really well in most areas. The only area in which there has been some contention has been the funding element for future payments for the elections process, which he would get into. But that begged the initial question, which, in retrospect, was something he and Ms. Odusanya realized they needed to put before the GA. Any proposal would have to be ratified by the ASUC Senate and the GA. And in order for any change to be ratified by the ASUC Senate, it would have to be politically palatable to them.

Mr. Stagi said the GA was convinced by the ASUC, and he believed it was the case, that the only way a change of this manner would occur was if there were still some GA buy-in, literally and figuratively, into the electoral process. That worked for the GA, to a degree, because the GA could run contemporaneous referenda, since both levels of students, grads and undergrads, would need to ratify any referenda, such as the Class Pass Referendum coming up in the spring. So there was a need for the GA to be involved in elections. Plus, the GA did have a graduate student who sat in the ASUC Senate, and there was some value to that. So consequently, rather than having an absolute break, some of what they've been negotiating was for the GA to have complete purview over grad student affairs and to speak for graduate students.

Mr. Stagi said they realized they need to speak to the GA about this because it's not something they should be bargaining about lightly. He wanted to get a sense of the Delegate Assembly about how they feel about this. Obviously there were pros and cons on both sides. If the GA was to insist on absolute autonomy without any connection with the ASUC whatsoever, it would torpedo this process completely and they'd be back to square one. In the final analysis, the GA would probably win, but it would be a lengthy, protracted process. So this seemed to probably be the best route to go. Mr. Stagi said that was some of where they were at.

Mr. Stagi said that one thing they looked at was what the GA would be required to pay for the elections. As Delegates could see, the total cost of the elections has gone up markedly, and even more markedly as a result of computerizing the electoral process and of having a complete debacle with the elections. Problems have occurred in 2000-1, 2001-2, and 2002-3. Apparently, from that point back, the records were rather sketchy. Mr. Stagi said the GA reached a point where they have negotiated an agreement, in principle, to pay \$36,000 in elections costs that were in arrears, that the GA apparently owed. That seemed to be a relatively reasonable figure. The sticking point now was to determine the appropriate level of support the GA should provide for future elections. At this point, Mr. Stagi said the offer that he and Ms. Odusanya were tendering consisted of a 12% floor as the level of grad student participation in the election, given that 12% was the percentage of all grad students who vote in ASUC elections. For grad students, that figure has historically been around 11%; so 12% was a reasonable ballpark figure. The ASUC initially started with a request to have the GA pay 20% of elections costs, and the GA started with 10%. The ASUC then went to 16%. So that is where they stand at this point, with the GA to pay 12% of total elections costs.

Mr. Stagi said he would like some sense of how Delegates felt about the more modified form of autonomy they're speaking about, and also the level of the cost which the GA would be willing to assume in future elections.

Ms. Brakora asked if the 12% would be the percentage of ASUC elections costs. Mr. Stagi said that was correct. Ms. Brakora asked if that would be on top of what the GA's election costs were. Mr. Stagi said the GA had a more informal level of elections. The GA was more of a republican form of government,

-

GA Autonomy Update (cont'd)

- 13 -

where the ASUC was more of a democracy. From the GA's Delegate body, people were nominated and elected as officers, whereas the ASUC had its candidates come from the student body at-large.

Mr. Cantor was he was confused as to where the Internet productivity miracle was in all this. Mr. Stagi said that was the hardest to understand. Mr. Cantor said they would expect the cost to go down, but that hadn't occurred. He asked if there was a way to push the ASUC on that, and if having a bunch of laptops on campus was worth \$20,000, or if they could go back to the old system. Mr. Stagi said one component he forgot to mention was that the GA felt that given the ASUC's clearly astronomical rise in the rate of its election costs, and the fact that there didn't seem to be a lot of good management control, that it was imperative for the GA, if it was going to be involved in the elections, to have some say in the elections. So one structure they have agreed to, in principle, was to have a joint committee oversee the elections. This committee would be comprised of three grads appointed by the Delegate Assembly, and three undergrads appointed by the ASUC. They would nominate a chair and a vice chair of the Elections Council such that one or the other, the chair or vice chair, would be a grad student and an undergrad student, to directly oversee the elections. In addition, there would be a grad student outreach worker directly responsible for making sure that grads were more informed of the possibilities involved in the elections.

A Delegate asked if there were really two concerns with autonomy: monetary, and having the GA able to pass its own initiatives without

having them agreed upon by the ASUC. Mr. Stagi said that was correct. The Delegate asked if that was a realistic concern, and asked how often aspects of autonomy actually came into play. Mr. Stagi said historically, autonomy issues haven't come into play that often. But one issue they did have was that the GA was not currently at liberty to speak before the Academic Senate because the GA was not recognized as a student government, as such. The ASUC was the student government that was recognized by the Academic Senate. One element of any agreement would be for the GA to be able to speak before the Academic Senate, which was an important issue for the GA.

A Delegate said the other issue he wasn't certain about dealt with the fees grad students pay every year, and whether there was an issue as to how much of those fees the GA received. Mr. Stagi said the GA received its share. The Delegate asked if the only money they were talking about was contributing 12% of elections costs, or if there was other monetary questions involved. Mr. Stagi said the 12% of costs was the only monetary issue they were referring to. They've run the numbers as far as ascertaining the allocation of grad student fees to the GA. Grads were 29% of the absolute student population. Generally, it's around that figure, and that was the basis of the allocation the GA has received in the past. The ASUC made an offer and the GA tried to make another, but since the ASUC was close enough, the GA agreed to that figure. So things worked out. The GA reps felt this was a relatively good offer, but nevertheless, in terms of the question about other monies being involved, contributing to the cost of the elections was the only money they were talking about at that point.

Ms. Odusanya said the Chancellor was present and she would call for a motion to table further discussion on autonomy until after the Chancellor finished his presentation, after which the GA could revisit this question. The motion to table was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

#### PRESENTATION BY CHANCELLOR BIRGENEAU

Chancellor Birgeneau said he didn't prepare anything and said it was nice to be there with them. He would guess they wanted to talk about what the campus was doing with diversity, broadly speaking; and

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 14 -

he would ask the GA what it was doing, and would give them a specific suggestion. He personally focused more on the undergraduate body than the graduate body, because the admissions process for undergrads was very directly affected by politics more than graduate student admissions. As many of them knew, one of their deep concerns at Berkeley was that although Asian American student involvement was successful, which he thought was incredibly admirable across the economic spectrum, the current system has led to incredible underrepresentation of a number of groups, including Native Americans, African Americans, and Chicano/Latinos. They live in a State where, in 2025, what is called the "minority" will actually be the majority in State. And that will be the situation for the nation as well. He felt strongly, as he felt many of them did, that they need to be educating people now who will be the leaders of society 20 or 25 years from now, and those people should be at places like Berkeley, or its equivalents. Chancellor Birgeneau said it wasn't just him, but others who have also been quite outspoken about this. This has turned out to be remarkably frustrating, which he's learned in his first year there.

On the one hand, Chancellor Birgeneau said they were doing some things successfully. The first thing they've done successfully, with Berkeley and UCLA playing a leadership role, was in terms of economic diversity. Some grads present may know that Berkeley and UCLA, both of them together, have the largest percentage of financially disadvantaged students of any major university system in the country. Just on the Berkeley campus alone they have more undergrad students from financially disadvantaged backgrounds than the entire Ivy League put together. All of the Ivy League schools have fewer students from poor backgrounds than Berkeley does, just on this campus. There were some challenges as they go forward on this, and he would be happy to talk about those. But the California System, and Berkeley, have been phenomenally successful in that regard.

In addition, Chancellor Birgeneau said that a statistic that made Berkeley unique, although he didn't know the data for UCLA, was that it turned out that Berkeley's graduation rate over a six-year time period from people from the lowest quartile financially was the same as with the highest quartile financially. That was a remarkable success, and it meant Berkeley was providing to its poor students a level of support, financial and otherwise, that enabled them, once they get to Berkeley, to function as well as people from rich backgrounds. The data were similar for underrepresented minorities. So once students get to campus, it worked out quite well.

Regarding specific issues, especially in talking about certain groups on campus, on average, statistically, Berkeley was doing reasonably well. Chancellor Birgeneau said he spent a lot of time talking to students, especially undergraduate students, in order to get a good personal feel for what students feel. For limited numbers, it's a very bad experience, and those students were very angry; and justifiably. But on average, once they get students there, the students were able to function pretty well. However, statistically, there were so few that it was very deleterious, particularly for African Americans, and most notably for Native American students. In this year's freshman class they have 16 Native American students, an astoundingly low number. So the campus has been doing a whole range of things. Chancellor Birgeneau said he's been doing a lot of work with legislators in Sacramento, trying to convince people that because Native American students were members of sovereign nations, no matter where they lived in the country, should not, in his opinion, have to pay out-of-State tuition. That

would have a dramatic effect on the size of the Native American population on campus and would totally change the community of Native American students there, even if those students lived on reservations in North Dakota, e.g., or spent the last four years in Canada. And it turns out, he spent the last four years there, and in Canada, they're called "First Nations People," which he liked better, since they were here first. The First Nations People in southern Ontario, it turns out, were citizens of both Canada and the US. He wanted to have them declared citizens

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 15 -

of California in order for them to qualify for in-State tuition. So the campus was making efforts on that front.

Chancellor Birgeneau said they have a new Director of Undergraduate Admissions, who was very sophisticated about improving outreach, Walter Robertson. They're trying to do a much better job on outreach programs, trying to identify which outreach programs work well and which don't, and narrowing those down. The campus was prepared to invest in those activities that work and probably abandon the ones that don't work. Their undergrad students, especially Bridges, were really important in this, and were really helpful. Some student groups work very well and some don't work so well, and the campus wanted to make sure they invest money in those that work well.

On the research front, Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought that some of them may know that the campus was in the process of creating the Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative, which would be of interest to a lot of grads. Again, while this was not unique to him, he was a strong supporter for this. California was almost a living laboratory. Multicultural societies were actually relatively new, and this raised a whole range of serious, interesting research issues. These issues include access to health care, legal access, treatment by the legal system, and a whole variety of legal issues. Chancellor Birgeneau said they haven't decided on the exact forum, but they'll start to hire additional faculty in, e.g., Economics or Law, and hire people who have a particular interest in multiculturalism in their respective fields, whether it's Economics, Public Health, or Social Welfare. These positions wouldn't displace Ethnic Studies or African American Studies, but would make them part of a larger whole. Their ambition was for Berkeley to become a leader in terms of research, graduate education, and issues of multiculturalism in a diverse society. They hope that would have trickle-down effects, although that was associated with politics.

Chancellor Birgeneau said the things he's mentioned were a set of things the campus was doing. One of his principle concerns was undergrad related, but he understood there were parallel issues for grad students. The UC System, generally, and Berkeley in particular, have been phenomenally successful in terms of every other institution in the country, including other public institutions. They have three times as many poor students as the University of Virginia, e.g. So Berkeley has maintained its public commitment. But currently the level of self-help was \$8,600, which had to be provided through a combination of loans and work. Empirically, \$8,600 does present a problem for the number of students they have from poor backgrounds. And while, first of all, fees were increasing, that was not actually the problem. The basic problem was the cost-of-living in the Bay Area, and food, books, transportation, etc. If they extrapolate \$2,011 remaining from their currently available resources for needs-based financial aid, that \$8,600 projects to around \$13,000. Chancellor Birgeneau said his fear was that there was a tipping point, and that someone admitted to Berkeley, even if given a great financial aid package, would "only" have to pay \$2,000; and other than that, it was terrific. So the campus has spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to improve significantly as they go forward with financial aid. They have various ideas in terms of fundraising, public-private partnerships, and dealing with Sacramento and the federal government. They've gotten a very good response from various people, including important people in the State Assembly and the State Senate. They're currently trying to figure out how to get to the Governor, because the Governor doesn't endorse ideas the campus has in terms of using public-private partnerships to raise financial aid. That would also have a significant impact.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that regarding diversity of the undergraduate body, if the campus wasn't successful, it would have a negative impact. For example, two-thirds of campus' undergrad African American students were in this lower financial quartile, compared to 20% of their Caucasian students. So

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 16 -

there's a big discrepancy among their undergrad student body in terms of strong correlation of ethnicity and likely financial income.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that was a number of things the campus was doing. He would give them his blunt opinion and tell them what he thought students should be doing. He's spent a lot of time talking to legislators, African American and Chicano legislators, trying to figure out ways to move forward. The opinion he's gotten back from those groups is that if they were to have a vote right now, Prop. 209 would pass, which was a pretty depressing conclusion. That opinion didn't come from people in the majority, but from the Latino/Chicano caucus and from African American Assembly people as well. Delegates probably know that for the Law School, and other entities, one thing he's looked at was the flexibility they have within the current law, as long as Prop. 209 was law. The conclusion was that they can make some changes in the margins, but they're not going to make profound changes. And in his opinion, they need to make profound changes to have a

just situation at Berkeley. He didn't know if any Delegates have looked at voting patterns that took place in 1996, but they're quite interesting. First of all, Prop. 209 actually failed in the Bay Area, and also failed in metropolitan Los Angeles. So neither of the populations in San Francisco, where they live, or in greater Los Angeles, ordered it, and those populations saw through this. Unfortunately, it passed by such a large margin in other parts of the State that it overwhelmed the SF and LA areas. Nevertheless, they might have heard, as he has, since he's been outspoken about these issues and gets unpleasant letters quite often from people who have differing viewpoints, that it is the law, as they put it, and that it's mandated and that the campus was required to follow it. It's true that they're required to follow it, but the mandate turns out to be greatly exaggerated. It turns out Prop. 209 actually passed by 400,000 votes out of a population of 35 million. In conversations with Cruz Bustamante about how to move forward, it was pointed out that there were currently 4 million unregistered, mostly young Chicano/Latino and Asian people in the State. So in theory, a simple voter registration drive to register the 4 million unregistered Chicano/Latinos, along with a voter education drive, to make sure people being registered actually understand the implications of what they might be voting for, could, within the next two years, simply reverse Prop. 209. If it was reversed it would be a totally different ballgame, and the University could start assessing people more fairly.

Chancellor Birgeneau said that from his political approach, Prop. 209 was internally contradictory. First of all, it stated that it banned discrimination and said they couldn't take into account race in any judgments. But denying the reality of race in contemporary America was discriminatory, in his opinion. Prop. 209 said they're not allowed to discriminate, but by not taking race into account, they are discriminating. So it's an internal contradiction. Not many people understand that. And to his total amazement, after Hurricane Katrina, even the President of the United States realized that poverty and race were connected, and he actually said that in a public statement. So they now have the authority of the President of the United States in correlating race and poverty, and that race was a reality in America. So if they can simply succeed in registering enough people who might support Prop. 209, and also educating people appropriately, so they don't get confused and so they understand the consequences, he thought they might be able to make some very significant progress.

Ms. Odusanya called for any questions for the Chancellor.

Mr. Stagi said the Chancellor discussed the GA climbing on board the effort to deal with Prop. 209, and Mr. Stagi said he had no doubt they would be willing, as he didn't think there was anybody in the room who would not want to be of assistance in the process of education and support for an electoral solution to the Prop. 209 problem. Unfortunately, the GA has been led to believe that UC policy has supposedly tied

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 17 -

their hands in terms of advocating for propositions and what not, and they have actually had difficulty with that. There have been historical issues occur with that policy. Chancellor Birgeneau said they could certainly participate in voter registration drives. Mr. Stagi said they felt they could probably be most effective as graduate government. Chancellor Birgeneau said he didn't agree with that. His opinion was that it was time for another generation of student activists to go out and participate in major voter registration drives.

Mr. Eckerle asked if that would be in a non-partisan manner. Chancellor Birgeneau said that was the case, absolutely. If they actually got everybody registered and, in the end, the total population ended up supporting Prop. 209, they'd have to say that was it.

Mr. Valleé asked why they couldn't they have individuals working on this as well as student government, and asked why it couldn't be both. Chancellor Birgeneau said he was not opposed to that, but he was saying there were constraints as to what student government could do. Certainly there were constraints on what he could do as an employee of the State. But there certainly could be both.

Mr. Stagi said his other question was that they're very grateful that the Chancellor was really concerned about the level of the burden placed upon students in terms of being able to meet their financial need, particularly as it applied to those who have less. It was clear that the University was adopting that policy as well, and had a no-deficit policy, which was good. But there were concerns. For instance, facilities that were utilized by the vast majority of students, such as the Recreational Sports Facility, were really being strictly enjoined to follow that policy, whereas others, such as Intercollegiate Athletics, was being subsidized to the tune of \$5 million, as well as running a deficit of \$6.5 million. Given the approximately 900 athletes, that worked out to be \$1,200 per athlete. He asked if there was some way to resolve that kind of conflict. Chancellor Birgeneau said Intercollegiate Athletics was not the only unit that was running a deficit. They're working hard to bridge that gap. Mr. Stagi asked if, then, they will be held to the same standards. Chancellor Birgeneau said they would, absolutely. He would qualify that he had to admit he's biased, having a daughter who played intercollegiate athletics and profited from Title IX, and didn't have to ride around in some crummy van and instead, rode in the same quality buses and stayed in the same hotels as did football players. And that was because of Title IX. Title IX came in during the '70s, but was enforced during the Clinton Administration. It's what is called an unfunded mandate, because unfortunately, people attend male football and basketball games in large numbers, and those sports generate revenue, while it turned out that every single women's sport loses money. So his own view was that at the time Title IX was introduced on the Berkeley campus, and was implemented, many more opportunities were made available for women athletes, and they were also then given comparable facilities and treated properly. But at that time there was nothing done in the budget to fund that kind of mandate. So that meant that as long as they tried to maintain some gender balance in athletics, they would have a shortfall, given the reality of sports their students and the community choose to attend. He was willing to cover that shortfall as a contribution to equity.

Mr. Schechtman said the Chancellor mentioned that ethnic background and economic background and status correlate very highly in this country, at least in their student body. He thought the reality of their country also was that they still were physically segregated, to a high degree. That was certainly the case economically, and then by corollary, racially and ethnically. He asked if it was within the bounds of Prop. 209 to start looking at policies that would have a more representative student body by zip code. Chancellor Birgeneau said they do things like that. But that turns out to be less successful than he would hope. There are areas where they've tried to make improvements, and he would give an example.

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 18 -

They've taken a lot of students from community colleges, like 1,700 a year, and the racial distribution was quite different in community colleges. He would have assumed that transfer students from community colleges would be more racially balanced and would look more like the State. But it turns out they look less like the State, and there was an imbalance in the wrong direction. He was astonished by that. The question was, then, how to understand that. He wanted that broken down, and it turned out to be poor advising. It turned out that underrepresented minority students were preferentially going into places like Berkeley with the least number of spots to transfer in. Before he got people to do the data analysis, no one knew this, so this was relatively new information. As a result, he's been in discussions with the head of Peralta Colleges, and others, and now the campus' admissions people understand, which they hadn't understood before. So they're beginning to try to see if they can make some progress in this. But this was an example where he had a naïve view, and it turned out the data were quite different, and it turned out there's an underlying reason for the data. Meetings have been held with community college people who hadn't understood the situation. That's an example of where they might make some progress. But still, it's limited.

Mr. Schechtman said his perennial issue with the Chancellor, which the Chancellor has heard about, was that while Cal students pay the lowest fees in the UC System, they have the highest cost of education; and as the Chancellor pointed out, the high cost of living in the Bay Area was a factor. One component of that was housing, and the University continues to build and operate housing that was nearly at the cost of market, and in some cases, above market. He would suggest that if they looking at keeping down the family contribution over the coming years, that a high-level task force could focus on what could be done to reduce the cost of housing, particularly when compared to the Co-op system. Co-ops operate housing at 40% of the cost of the University, so maybe the campus should be radical and privatize its housing, and turn it all over to the Co-op system, and do something very different. He thought there was a lot more room to control housing costs than what they're doing. Chancellor Birgeneau said that was a good point.

A Delegate said she had a strong interest in renewable energy and didn't see the campus as being a huge pioneer in using renewable energy in as many places as they could. She knew it wasn't the most affordable thing, but she would like to see lights that gain their power from the sun during the day and then light paths at night. That kind of technology was very much available, and she thought Cal would be very interested in being a leading campus in the country for promoting renewable energy. She asked if this was on the Chancellor's radar, and if so, if he was interested in hiring faculty who were specifically interested in renewable energy research. Chancellor Birgeneau said he personally doesn't determine which faculty got hired. Such people would be in the College of Natural Resources, and there were a number of faculty very interested in renewable energy. The Delegate said a number of departments were involved. Chancellor Birgeneau said he had sustainability assessments for the campus, with a number of recommendations. So they were making some investment in this area. He did have to say, however, that in the end, one problem when they build was that the money that was raised was usually by some department, mostly from philanthropy, because the State won't provide the funds needed to construct buildings. There's never enough money, and people were always trimming. So then the kinds of things one would like to see were compromised because they're more expensive. That was true at MIT, Toronto, and at Cal as well. So it wasn't a simple solution. The solution would be for the State to invest more money in infrastructure. But that's one of the extreme problems they have at older campuses such as Berkeley, where they have an extreme problem with infrastructure. The State has provided some resources for seismic upgrades, but has otherwise provided no money for building things. So it meant that senior administrators, like himself, end up becoming not beggars, but people who spend a lot of time trying to raise resources for their facilities. They have almost no money for maintenance, which was probably

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 19 -

their single biggest problem. They get \$1 million from the State, while their deferred maintenance bill was going up at the rate of \$30 million a year. So at some point things will collapse.

Mr. McCombs said the Chancellor mentioned recruitment at the undergraduate level, which was really great. He asked if the Chancellor could talk about how affordability, specifically high fees and high debt burden, translated to their ability to recruit a diverse student body at the grad level. And as a follow-up question, he asked whether the proposed restoration and return-to-aid program would help at all with financial aid packages at the undergraduate level, which would, in turn, help the graduate level. Chancellor Birgeneau said return to aid

obviously helped a lot because it's money that's set aside. And just a semantic point, their in-State fees were actually quite low. So it's out-of-State students at both the undergrad and grad levels that have a huge problem. Those fees were relatively high at the graduate level. But after one year, a grad student can become a State resident, after which they pay in-State fees, which were low by any reasonable measure. However, it's a huge problem for out-of-State undergrads because they cannot attain State residency, and therefore had to pay out-of-State fees for their full four years. He knew some students disagree with this, but especially having spent 25 years at MIT, compared to private university fees, in terms of in-State fees and looking at the cost of education at Cal, fees were actually very low relative to the cost of education. The problem was the cost-of-living in this area. Again, the only way to address that was for the campus to have increased resources for financial aid. Tuition set-aside was one part of that. The Office of the President has been pushing to increase the percentage for grads at the 50% level. So for grads, the situation was more favorable than for undergrads. But there was no question that administrators understand well that they have to find ways to increase stipends for grad students. They're too low. The campus at that time was in a "silent" phase of a fundraising campaign, and grad student support was an important part of that. But they need better ways to package support. He's done some things himself, although to be honest, they haven't been that successful so far. But they have to figure out how to sell grad student financial aid as something people want to invest in.

Ms. Odusanya said they were out of time and called for a motion to extend speaking time. A motion to extend speaking time by ten minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Cantor said he wanted to thank the Chancellor for his time and said he appreciated the Chancellor's comments on diversity and discrimination. He had several questions regarding the Chancellor's stance on military recruitment on campus. The GA passed a Resolution unanimously opposing military recruitment on campus and opposing official assistance to military recruitment on campus, based on the University's non-discrimination policy, and other reasons mentioned in a number of whereas clauses. The ASUC passed a similar Resolution as well. Those bills were then basically used to ask the Office of Career Services not to invite or allow military recruiters to recruit at its career fair in MLK, which was the students' Student Union. The Career Center, however, decided to go ahead and do that. At the career fair on Wednesday, Mr. Cantor said he talked to Tom Devlin, the head of Career Services, and Mr. Devlin told him that the Chancellor's office explicitly instructed him to ignore those Resolutions, and that it was the Chancellor's opinion that the students didn't have jurisdiction over MLK, the students' Student Union, and that the students were not allowed to take that action. Chancellor Birgeneau said he certainly didn't say the latter. Mr. Cantor said Mr. Devlin said that statement came from the Chancellor's office. Chancellor Birgeneau said that in terms of the specific location, they should go back one step. He was sure it was understood that this was a more complicated and sophisticated issue than the way it was presented. Just to give people some background, the campus does not, and correctly so, allow on campus any organization to recruit that violates campus rules and discriminates based on sexual orientation. That's something they don't permit. So no other employer doing that, other than the military, was allowed on

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 20 -

campus. He thought most of them, himself included, in an ideal world, would like that extended to the military, in order to force the military to change its policies, on the basis of sexual discrimination. Unfortunately, the campus had to deal with the Solomon Amendment, sponsored by Mr. Solomon, which says that if a university chose to do that, it would lose all federal funding. To bar military recruiting would mean the campus would lose all federal funding support of grad students. And that would mean that one-third of grads would disappear, at least people who were in supported research assistantships. Research on campus was supported by the federal government at a tune of \$4-500 million a year, and would disappear as well. So they had to make a balance. If he were to put it out that one-third of them would have to give up their graduate careers, he might get a different response. This was one of those things where the federal government, like some others, forces them to do things that they may oppose based on their own personal political stances. The Solomon Amendment, as many of them know, was currently being challenged on the basis of being unconstitutional. Because he only educated himself recently on this, the campus missed, by a couple of weeks, being able to submit an amicus brief opposing the Solomon Amendment. However, in any case, that would have been a symbolic act, and the campus couldn't have done it without getting Regental approval, which they didn't receive. So that was the current situation they were in. If they're fortunate, the Solomon Amendment will be overturned and then they could force the military, like any other recruiter, to respect the campus' principles.

Mr. Cantor said he had three questions and the Chancellor answered two. The Chancellor explained why he overruled the students, which was his second question. The Chancellor expressed now that he had the authority to overrule the students, which was a matter that was not so important. The third question was more of a question of how far the Chancellor was willing to go to overrule the students. As he's said, what limits he puts on the military was one question, and he may choose not to limit them on the basis of the Solomon Amendment. But there was a parallel question: the limits he was willing to put on students to prevent them from actually going into their own Student Union and protesting the presence of military recruiters in a building that was, again, students' property, and a new generation of activists, who have made this a big issue, having the right to a voice. In May there was a protest of these recruiters and the Student Union was militarized to a level where it was ridiculous for a university. This was the only building on campus where that happened, their own Student Union, with students forced to have their bags searched, their IDs scanned through an ID machine, and where they had to go through a line of police armed with various riot gear, videotaping students as they entered. And students were subjected to this at a career fair at students' own Student Union. Mr. Cantor said he thought that was above and beyond what the University was required to do to make the stay of two

military recruiters in Pauley Ballroom a comfortable experience for them.

Chancellor Birgeneau said he was actually unaware of that, so he wanted to thank Mr. Cantor for informing him of that. He would presume things were done for safety reasons, to protect students. Secondly, he did want to say that it was consistent in terms of being balance, and of course, lots of students end up with careers in the military. And as long as the military recruit on campus, when one asks to protest, those students have a right to talk to those recruiters. On the one hand, he had no difficulty with student protests. But on the other hand, he thought that if protests interfere with the rights of those other students, that would be inappropriate and hypocritical. One protest by students occurred last summer that he quite admired. There was a long line of students lined up in front of military recruiters to discuss how people could work with an organization that was so homophobic. Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought that was pretty clever. But at the same time, it allowed students who were actually interested in the military the option of talking to the recruiters.

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 21 -

Ms. Zahrt said she thought that what Mr. Cantor was saying was that students were saying they didn't want that presence on campus. It's not saying that students wouldn't be allowed to talk to recruiters on campus per se, but that this was an event where student government didn't want those recruiters there, and they forced their way in anyway. Chancellor Birgeneau said that as long as there was a career fair, those recruiters were there for that. The Delegate said they could be on campus, but they didn't necessarily have to be at the particular facility. Chancellor Birgeneau said he understood.

Ronald Cruz introduced himself and said he was a BAMN organizer, By Any Means Necessary. Along with the ASUC, they're putting on a public inquiry next week on hostile climate. He would first like to applaud the Chancellor for his decision to attend that hearing as well and listen to the testimony. The hostile climate on campus was a real concern. Just that day he made an announcement about the hearing at a classroom, 155 Dwinelle, a very large room. There wasn't a single black student in there, and a white student interrupted his speech by applauding right in the middle of it, trying to make him stop talking about this issue. There were people who were gathering the courage to make statements next week and working diligently to prepare what they were going to say, in a particularly open discussion, and talk about the academic as well as the social environment, and how they have been truly affected by this. In the debate on affirmative action that happened a couple of weeks ago, there were explicit racist statements made by the anti-affirmative action speaker, who said that students who came there under affirmative action had only been sold into bondage. A group of white students stood up and applauded this racist speaker and made other disparaging, individual comments. So racism was alive and well at Berkeley. He, a Filipino person, and others, including those who will testify, feel that this has to change. They applaud the Chancellor's decision to attend, and would applaud any demonstration that he's prepared to move to action beyond the positive words he stated last spring; and any such action would be very important right now. Chancellor Birgeneau said he would repeat his former call to action of all students to work on voter registration, which he thought was the most political action they need to carry forward. He personally believed that was the only way. He has spent a lot of time talking to a lot of people, and in thinking about this, personally believed that reversing Prop. 209 was the only way would satisfactorily deal with this issue. He thought they need a new voter registration movement.

Ms. Odusanya said she would open the list again to more questions, after which the list would be closed. She asked if there was a motion to extend speaking time. Mr. Daal asked how much more time the Chancellor had. Chancellor Birgeneau said he had five minutes. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate said his question referred to Prop. 209. If they get 4 million more minority voters registered, he kind of believed that one couldn't just tell people to go out and vote in their best interests, and that part of the issue was propaganda and the propaganda machine, such that even if they got Prop. 209 on the ballot, and had more minority voters, he feared that people wouldn't know how to vote. Chancellor Birgeneau said that's why he mentioned not only voter registration, but voter education. He agreed with the Delegate completely. The Delegate said he didn't think "education" was the right word, because he didn't believe one could just teach people what the right thing was. He believed it involved tricking people into doing the right thing; and he was absolutely serious about that. One couldn't simply tell someone that something was good for them, or good for the country, or good for everyone. That didn't matter. One kind of had to convince people that the repeal of Prop. 209 fit into what they already believe. So it was a big issue, and kind of went back to the question of whether they could make a movement with individual action. He didn't think it was something any number of individuals could do. Chancellor Birgeneau said he had a more optimistic outlook, but he understood the point being made, and thought

-

Presentation by the Chancellor (cont'd)

- 22 -

what was being said was that to be successful, one would have to work hard at it. At least according to Mr. Bustamante. And the Chicano/Latino community was actually quite split on Prop. 209 the first time around, although the language was very confusing. A

Delegate said it was intentionally confusing. Chancellor Birgeneau said there's a version of Prop. 209 that will officially be on the Michigan ballot in November of 2006, so this was now happening in the State of Michigan. And again, it's called "the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative." The Delegate said that if something was called "civil rights," people would vote for it.

Mr. Purdy said that prior to coming to grad school he was in research and development in federal government in Silicon Valley, and from his experience, both in industry and in grad school, he could see there were a lot of talented grad students who will work in industry, in internships. The problem he's seen was that on the East Coast and on the West Coast, schools like MIT and Stanford have vastly greater representation in science and technology than students at Berkeley, which was not only bigger, but was a better university than either of them. He asked how the Chancellor was working with departments to encourage industrial liaisons, and asked how the Chancellor looked at students being engaged in industrial enterprise. Chancellor Birgeneau said he thought it was a good thing. He was at MIT for so long, and industry funding that Berkeley, e.g., was a factor of five less than that at MIT. It hasn't been part of the culture and tradition at Cal. The Vice President of Research, Beth Burnside, has been trying to promote this. So there's been some progression in that area, but he agreed with a Delegate that the campus could work harder to provide more opportunity to students. A Delegate said they could change the situation within departments as well. At Stanford there were a large number of faculty who were on advisory boards. Chancellor Birgeneau said that would end up creating complications with the two, and with academic freedom issues. So it was a mixed bag.

Ms. Odusanya called for one last, quick question. Ms. Felarca said she wanted to thank the Chancellor. In terms of Prop. 209 and what the University could do, and in terms of voter registration and another ballot initiative, she was dubious. However, regardless of that, other UCs, like UC Riverside, for instance, have been able to increase black and Latino enrollment even under Prop. 209. In fact, it's as a result of Prop. 209 that they now have a two-tiered UC System, where if one was black or Latino they could get into UC Riverside, but not into UC Berkeley. That had to change, and any actions the Chancellor's office could take for next year to increase underrepresented minority students' enrollment that was in his power should be taken. Students were organizing, mobilizing, marching, and demonstrating, and there were voter registration drives. But students want to know that the Chancellor would take that seriously and translate that into increases for admissions or next year. Chancellor Birgeneau said she just mentioned a list of things the campus was trying to do to accomplish exactly that.

Ms. Odusanya said she would like to thank Chancellor Birgeneau for coming. (Applause)

Ms. Odusanya asked to finish staff reports.

## REPORTS

Giving his report as Graduate Minority Student Project Coordinator, Mr. Turner said he wanted to introduce himself, and said he came out that evening just to tell them who he was. He's Kofi Nat Turner, the

-

- Reports (cont'd)

- 23 -

Graduate Minority Student Project Coordinator. He was busy working on all of the issues the GA has talked about that evening, diversity and Prop. 209. He helped to sponsor the BAMN forum that was held the other night on campus climate and he was currently helping to draft a letter to the Chancellor demanding to increase black students on this campus. So he had a lot of things he was working on. He submits a report each month, so he would ask Delegates to please read that and to keep an eye out for all the events the Graduate Minority Student Project was having. Also, Mr. Turner said he'd be moving on in a few months. He's held this position for about two and-a-half years, and the will therefore need a new Graduate Minority Student Project Coordinator to step up and do the job better than he's done it. Applications will be available soon. Just to let them know, if Delegates see any activists of color who want to represent the GA and the Grad Minority Student Project, they should let them know about position.

Hodari Toure introduced herself and said she's the Director of Minority Outreach, Recruitment and Retention Project Coordinator. They've been doing a lot of things lately. They helped establish the Latino Grad Student Association and put on events with that group. The Project has also put on events with the Black Graduate Student Association, in conjunction with undergrads. The Project will have another event coming up, probably in a couple of weeks, a Unity Weekend, where they'll get grads and undergrads together. They'll have a dinner, and then the next day will have a meeting and a basketball tournament, just to foster unity and establish a community, so that when they do outreach to grad students, there would be a place to come, so that when people come there, they would not end up seeing no black community or Latino community. That was the mission of her department. She's been in this department for about a year and previously was a Delegate. Before that she was on the Executive Board. So she's been in grad school for about four years now. She looked forward to Delegates participating in the Project's activities. If people have anything they want to add, or had any questions, she would ask them to



please see her at the Graduate Assembly. She wanted to thank them.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve both reports. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORTS FROM THE GRADUATE MINORITY STUDENT PROJECT COORDINATOR AND THE MINORITY OUTREACH, RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION PROJECT COORDINATOR PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Odusanya said that before the Chancellor gave his presentation, the Assembly was discussing the autonomy issue. There was also a motion to move to Mr. Zimmerman's Resolution. The person who was present to discuss the proposal had to leave. The motion was to move Mr. Zimmerman's Resolution ahead. The motion was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to move all Resolutions ahead of the autonomy discussion. An objection was raised. Ms. Odusanya said they would take a vote on continuing the autonomy discussion after Mr. Zimmerman's Resolution. The vote was to move autonomy discussion after Mr. Zimmerman's Resolution. The motion passed by voice-vote.

## RESOLUTION

The following Resolution was authored by Scott A. Zimmermann & Brooke Owyang and was sponsored by Hollie Sawyers:

-

- Resolution Calling for a Campus Climate Protection Plan (cont'd)

- 24 -

## RESOLUTION CALLING FOR A CAMPUS CLIMATE PROTECTION PLAN

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley is a leading public educational institution for research and development in the State and nation, with a tremendous influence over environmental, economic, and social policies; and

WHEREAS, the California Legislature has found and declared that climate change is a matter of increasing concern for public health and the environment and that the control and reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases are critical to slow the effects of global warming as stated in AB 1493; and

WHEREAS, Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order S-3-05 established the following greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for California: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels; and

WHEREAS, UC San Diego and UC Santa Barbara have become members of the California Climate Action Registry, in a sincere effort to account for their campus' contribution to global climate change and demonstrate environmental leadership; and

WHEREAS, one hundred seventy-nine mayors representing nearly 40 million Americans, including the City of Berkeley, have signed the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement, agreeing to meet or beat Kyoto Protocol targets for their own communities, and to urge State and federal governments to enact policies and programs that reduce greenhouse gas emission reductions; and

WHEREAS, on July 17, 2003, the Board of Regents of the University of California expressed their support for a Presidential Policy to promote "...the principles of energy efficiency and sustainability in the planning, financing, design, construction, renewal, maintenance, operation, space management, facilities utilization, and decommissioning of facilities and infrastructure to the fullest extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements."; and

WHEREAS, it is the duty of Regents to work with students, staff, faculty and administration within the UC System to address the pressing issues facing our State by shaping our environmental, economic, and social policies into a responsible strategy that ensures the well being of current and future generations;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly urges Chancellor Birgeneau to:

1. Endorse the principle of climate neutrality (net zero emissions of greenhouse gases), and to commit to greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that meet or exceed the State of California's established targets; and to
2. Charter a Climate Protection Task Force to establish a Climate Protection Plan for the Berkeley campus, leveraging the results of the 2005 Campus Sustainability Assessment and the expertise and commitment of faculty, staff, and students.

-

## Resolution Calling for a Campus Climate Protection Plan (cont'd)

- 25 -

Mr. Zimmerman said there a group of students, faculty, and staff have been organizing since the spring on trying to think about the impact that the campus had on climate change and its contribution to global warming. They organized a group of some key faculty members and graduate students who were involved in climate change research. Berkeley was actually one of the leading institutions in terms of helping the world understand what was going on with this issue. The group put together a letter to the Chancellor last April asking him to make a statement about climate change and the importance climate neutrality. As Ms. Rico mentioned earlier, this affected communities she's been working with, and environmental justice was a key issue, and was obviously a very important issue. There were over 180-190 cities committed to addressing the impacts they have on climate change. Many universities have made a commitment to reduce their emissions, such as Yale, which made such a commitment two weeks ago. There was an incredible movement going on around the country, and, of course, around the world as well, on this issue. Last year the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability put together an assessment that was very important. The Chancellor mentioned that briefly in response to a question. It was really incredible, and was a very comprehensive assessment of what the campus could do to become more sustainable. They really need to take the next step in figuring out which of those recommendations were the most important. Actually, Joel was the GA's representative to the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Sustainability, and creating that assessment was one of his major activities. In a lot of cases, there was a lot of overlap involved between sustainability and climate change, but climate change was one issue that actually evoked a lot more emotion, especially now with people recognizing how many hurricanes there have been. There was not yet proof of anything, but it was time to do something. They actually have a meeting with the Chancellor on November 15. They have support of the ASUC for this, and have the support of CACS as well, asking the Chancellor to make a commitment to work on climate change and to put together a team that would create a climate protection plan for the campus. They're not asking for any real specific commitments at this point, although the Governor has actually made a commitment to the State of California. Mr. Zimmerman said they're asking the University to at least beat those targets, or more. The idea really was to have a cooperative effort to find out what they could do. There were a lot of things that they could do that would actually not cost a lot of money. They really think that with the leadership of the Chancellor, going out to tell the community that this was important, and making staff, faculty, and students aware of what could be done, really could make a huge difference in this area, without a huge financial commitment. The Resolution basically was what they were asking for. He called for any questions.

Ms. Brakora said she had some questions about some points in the Resolution, especially clauses 1, 4, and 5. Just because other entities have passed some resolutions didn't mean the GA should pass them. However, she did think the GA should consider whether other entities have passed something, and consider the stances others have taken, because there was an interesting controversy over the role of humans in climate change. That controversy needed to be addressed before action could be taken on climate change. She found those types of precedents and arguments to be lacking. So as it stood, she wouldn't be able to support the Resolution, basically because of the controversy involved and the background documentation to show the roles of humans and the climate change that has been observed. So she would like to see some sort of presentation of the scientific evidence for and against this question so she could make a decision accordingly. Such a presentation could just be a one-page sheet showing the pros and cons. Mr. Zimmerman said the issue was complicated, which is why they're asking the Chancellor to put together a task force, to address some of these issues and to talk about their mission, what impact the campus creates, what the financial implications would be to meet certain targets. That's why he didn't think they were asking for anything specific from the GA, and they don't have anything specific to put together at that time to ask for. Ms. Brakora asked why, then, the GA should take a position.

-

## Resolution Calling for a Campus Climate Protection Plan (cont'd)

- 26 -

Ms. Odusanya said that before they go on, she would explain the process. If people have questions about the wording of the Resolution they could ask them at that time. After that there would be a motion to approve the Resolution, followed by debate. She called for any questions.

A Delegate said that although he wasn't a climate scientist, he didn't think the jury was still out, and thought a verdict was in, and that people need to change things. But with respect to the specific Resolution, the only part that stuck out for him was the part after the Resolved Clause dealing with net zero emissions of greenhouse gases. He asked if that wording has been included in similar sorts of Resolutions and measures adopted by cities and other universities. He was all for reduction of emissions, but asked if seeking net zero emissions was realistic. Mr. Zimmerman said he thought the idea behind that was to support the principle of net zero emissions. That's actually what the Resolution went on to say, that they would like to meet or exceed the State of California's requirements. Those requirements didn't call for net zero emissions, but rather, to have 1990 levels by 2020, he believed, something like that. But the idea behind climate neutrality was to acknowledge the need to stop continuing to increase the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and that the way to do that was to put into effect Kyoto principles. The idea was to state that this is what they believe in, and what they would be doing was to make a statement that they do find that there is human-induced increases of carbon dioxide and that there was a high risk, a probable risk, such increases would have a really negative impact on human societies. The Delegate said he agreed, and said he wondered why, if that was the case, why the author of the Resolution inserted specific knowledge about zero emission of greenhouse gases since they were talking about decades in the

future. Mr. Zimmerman said the principle was that eventually a balance would have to be found so societies don't continue to increase the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. That's what climate neutrality referred to.

Mr. Purdy said he thought the word "net" zero emissions was the key.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve the Resolution, after which they'd move into debate. A motion to approve was made and seconded.

A motion to call the question and to come to an immediate vote was made and seconded. A division was requested. The motion to call the question passed by hand-vote 17-11-4. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION CALLING FOR A CAMPUS CLIMATE PROTECTION PLAN PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE.

Mr. Zimmerman said he wanted to thank them.

#### GA AUTONOMY UPDATE (cont'd)

Mr. Stagi said that when they last left off on this discussion, there were basically two options. He thought more or less they would probably have to pay something back to the ASUC, which the GA might get into a discussion about. But actually, the real question a choice between two options. The first question was whether the GA wanted to have a negotiated settlement, where the outcome was a clear way to ratification of autonomy, which would be politically palatable and would be able to be completed that year, and something the GA would be able to hang their hat on. The second option was whether the GA wanted to stand completely on principle. He understood both sides and wasn't advocating one side or the other.

-

GA Autonomy Update (cont'd)

- 27 -

With the second option, the GA eventually would win, but the reality was, he couldn't honestly tell them when that would be. That's kind of where things stood.

Mr. Eckerle asked if either of the solutions would allow the GA to spend money on political campaigns. Mr. Stagi said he didn't think so. He wasn't really sure, when he posed that question to the Chancellor, that he got a clear answer. That wasn't really clear. But they're working on that front as well, and the ability of the GA to participate in political campaigns was a whole other kettle of fish.

Mr. Garcia asked what would happen with the Memorandum of Understanding they had with the ASUC, which called for the GA to give the ASUC something like \$30,000, after which all past debt would be forgiven. Mr. Stagi said that was rolled into the current proposal, and that idea was more or less an expression of the current proposal. Mr. Garcia asked if that was not accepted by the Senate. Mr. Stagi that was never finished, but that was actually the template they've been working from. He said Mr. Garcia was referring to an MOU the GA had which had been negotiated between the Presidents of the GA and ASUC last year. However, it kind of fell off the map, which was an indication of the need to get what they could at a certain point as opposed to standing on principle, because sometimes things fall off the map and nothing goes forward, and they'd be in the same situation next year.

Mr. Garcia said he wasn't really sure he understood the difference between what they have now and what was being proposed, because right now, as long as the GA passed Resolutions that didn't pretend to speak for the entire student body, and instead, only claimed to speak to the grad student voice, the Senate had no authority to overturn those resolutions. So it sounded to him that the situation was that the GA was being asked to basically pay a tax every year so the GA could be represented on the floor of the Academic Senate. He asked if that was a fair characterization. Ms. Odusanya said it was also a tax so the GA could have grads run in ASUC elections. Mr. Stagi noted that they currently do have one representative in the Senate. Also, ostensibly the President of the ASUC has noted that he would make every effort to institutionalize areas where grad students vote, such as with the Elections Council, in order to give grads greater leverage within these areas, if the GA paid this. And of course, that recognizes the fact that this was politics, and the fact that the ASUC President this year was one particular person, and that the GA didn't know what the future would hold. But the President this year would make an effort to better institutionalize grad student participation. But part of what the GA was negotiating was a lower payment package, less than the 29% for costs that was previously allocated.

Mr. Schechtman said he was very concerned about the proposal that the GA would pay anything. The GA has been working for at least three years on autonomy, and "autonomy," as they've been working on it, was complete separation from the ASUC. Under that form of autonomy, the GA would continue to be under the Auxiliary, the business arm of the University, but the GA would not participate in ASUC elections and would not be subject to rulings of the ASUC Judicial Council. Basically, the ASUC would become an undergraduate body and the GA would become a graduate body. The analogy he has used was that when West Virginia split off from Virginia, West Virginia did not report to

the Supreme Court of Virginia anymore, did not run candidates in Virginia's elections, and did not pay taxes to Virginia. That's what they were talking about with autonomy. The problem was, and has been, that the ASUC Senate would not approve that type of proposal. But that was exactly the problem that the GA took to the Chancellor; and the Chancellor asked the GA, based on what he perceived to be Mr. Buenrostro's political skills, to give it one more try. If this failed, they could still go back to the Chancellor, since the Chancellor was the one person on campus who had the authority to recognize student governments, he could, by fiat, separate the GA. The Chancellor would prefer not to do that, but the GA doesn't have to make

-

GA Autonomy Update (cont'd)

- 28 -

decisions based on whether or not they think the undergrads would approve those decisions. The GA should make decisions based on what they thought was best for the graduate body.

Mr. Stagi said he would like to basically respond to something along that line. He didn't disagree with what Mr. Schechtman said, but part of what their negotiations would achieve would be that after ratification, the GA would not, in any way, be subject to any rulings by the ASUC Senate. In addition, the GA would not be subject to any rulings by the Judicial Council, by the Senate, or by anything ASUC related. Honestly, the GA and the ASUC would be parallel bodies. Another thing the GA would accomplish would be to retain the ability to influence the undergraduate body by having representation on that body. The GA wouldn't have to do the corollary, unfortunately. If they win, the GA would pay an amount of money, but he honestly thought that would give the GA some leverage with the ASUC, and that might not be a bad thing to do. He asked if Ms. Felarca had something to say about this.

Ms. Felarca said she was the graduate student on the ASUC Senate, and she has been for the past two years. It has been a battle, particularly with the Judicial Council. She thought the Graduate Assembly's moves towards autonomy, and its threats of autonomy, have been effective in getting more movement on the part of the ASUC as a whole to recognize that the bull had to stop, and that they had to get out of the sandbox. She thought that the second option, which would pretty much give the GA autonomy around everything, except around the elections, was worth maintaining. Not having complete autonomy from ASUC elections would allow for a graduate representative in the ASUC, or many graduate representatives. And she meant that, and not just because she's done it for three years, since she was not going to do it next year. So she would encourage anyone there to be a part of the ASUC. But she definitely felt that it was important that there could be unity between the graduate students and undergraduate students, and important for grads to have the ability to impact decisions of undergraduates, and impact understandings, and the political process of the undergraduate students, who still make up the majority of students on this campus. It was important to be able to prevent undergrads from supporting precedents that could very well be detrimental to students' rights in general, and which could then be used by future Administrations to play students against each other and pit undergrad students against grad students, especially around questions of the Student Code of Conduct, civil liberties, those kinds of issues. For the GA to have that kind of influence was important. So Ms. Felarca said she thought it was completely well worth it to maintain some level of relationship with the ASUC in which there was still a possibility of a graduate student voice, or many graduate student voices among the undergrads, and maintain that kind of unity, while still maintaining more autonomy when it came to the decision-making of the GA as a whole.

A Delegate said he thought total autonomy made a lot of sense. If the GA was going to pay 12% for elections, his first question was how many people were actually in the ASUC. Mr. Stagi said there were 20 people in the ASUC Senate, and grads have had one or two members in the Senate. The Delegate said grads, then, have 5% representation there, and 7% of grads vote. Mr. Stagi said the 7% vote was probably a little bit of an anomaly since the turnout was low because grads were very upset that the referendum was removed. There were a lot of grad students, and if the GA actually pushed and got people organized, they could have an actual voice in the ASUC. They now only have a symbolic voice, with one person in the Senate. But if they could have a 12% vote, and actually have three or four people in the Senate, if they got lots of grads to vote, and actually organize grads to vote, and to actually care and vote for grad students, they'd have more than just the voice they're looking for by being autonomous, and they'd have a real voice with the entire student body. It seemed like that should be the way to go. Also, the 12% was of total costs, and he thought the GA should push for that at the same time.

-

GA Autonomy Update (cont'd)

- 29 -

A Delegate asked if there was any sense of why the ASUC did not want the GA to be autonomous. Mr. Stagi said that some of the reasons clearly involved politics. There were a number of political parties. There has been a long-term relationship between a large constituency of graduate students and the Cal-SERVE Party. There are Senators in the ASUC Senate who are of that Party and count on the grad student vote in order to be able to continue to return to office. So it's their political agenda that requires to have that stance, or puts them in that stance. That was his understanding. He could be wrong, but he believed that was the case. The Delegate asked if money, then, was not an issue. Mr. Stagi said partially, the amount in arrears was one issue. There were two money issues, the money in arrears, and then, part and

parcel to this, was continuing to vote in the elections. The GA would have to continue to pay for part of the elections; and the ASUC wanted the GA to continue to vote in the elections. So this came as a package deal, as far as that went.

Mr. Purdy said it seemed this was boiling down to one issue: money for elections. If that was the case, and the issue actually was money for elections, it sounded like there have been some issues with the elections where the undergrads have kind of screwed around and have run up costs, or screwed up beforehand, and increased costs. He thought the notion of the relationship between Virginia and West Virginia, as mentioned earlier, missed the point, in that both do pay taxes to the federal government, which then got engaged in elections. One question he had was how much of these costs represented budget overruns from what had been planned for the elections. And the other question was whether an agreement could be made to have a joint fund from both the ASUC and the GA, so that both would participate, whereby the fund would cause both the ASUC and the GA to be held accountable, so that if one side or the other had cost overruns, then they would pay for that part of the cost overruns out of this fund. Mr. Stagi said it was hard to imagine that because the elections cost what they cost. The GA actually did have a big concern about these costs, and that was part of the reason why the GA tried to institute a graduate student presence on the Elections Council, in order to make certain that there was proper oversight. That's what GA concerns revolved around. Mr. Purdy asked if there was a budget for these things, and if there's been mismanagement. Mr. Stagi said he believed there was a budget, but he was not intricately involved in or aware of the entire elections process. The GA only had a broad understanding of it. He got a sense of where Mr. Purdy going, and to some degree, they're still kind of in negotiations. Mr. Stagi said he was happy to take into the points Mr. Purdy raised into account, and take them under advisement. Speaking for Ms. Odusanya as well, he said they could run with any sense of what the GA wanted to do with that; but basically, the details around this probably involved issues per se with the elections. The GA response would probably be whether the GA would have some participation in the elections, or whether the GA would prefer absolute autonomy. Mr. Stagi said that was really where they wanted to get a sense of from the GA, and where the GA stood, GA reps wouldn't be negotiating in bad faith with the ASUC and against the wishes of the Delegates. They've only been engaged in this process for about a month, and things were moving along.

Mr. Stagi said the discussion the GA was having at that point was kind of wandering off the path the reps intended on taking that evening. The reason they were there was to make certain that what they were proposing was advisable, or if they should really stick to absolute autonomy. That's what they wanted to do that evening, to get a sense of where the GA stood. They didn't want to get too much into micromanagement there, or get into the specific details. Mr. Purdy asked if they'd still be required to have campus-wide elections. Mr. Stagi said they would. They have already negotiated with the Registrar the option of having a referendum, so that if, for instance, an autonomy vote was held, or something else that needed to come up for ratification by the graduate student body, they could have that vote. As long as it wasn't too complicated a measure and there was enough notification, the registrar could probably institute it on Tele-

-

GA Autonomy Update (cont'd)

- 30 -

Bears. So a vote could probably could happen on that basis and it could run contemporaneously with the ASUC's elections which generally happen in April. So that question was not a primary concern. This was something the GA actually held over the ASUC's head in terms of negotiations. They don't have an agenda with this, and he was just trying to put things out there and make things clear, and get a sense of what the Delegate Assembly wished. He didn't want to debate this too long and noted that they were probably over time at that point.

Mr. Garcia his first comment was that he thought the air needed to be cleared, because some Cal-SERVE people were pissed at Mr. Stagi's last comment because this was the Party that has wholeheartedly supported GA autonomy since day one, and that Party has never once said they didn't want the GA to be completely autonomous. Mr. Stagi said he would apologize. Mr. Garcia said he just didn't want to alienate their friends. The parties who have stood against the GA have been Student Action and the Berkeley College Republicans. Mr. Stagi said he would apologize.

Mr. Garcia said that in terms of this report, he asked if the idea was to get the GA to vote on which option they would like best, or if they were just presenting this for Delegates' information. Ms. Odusanya said they're just presenting what they've done, and wanted to get feedback on how to proceed. Mr. Garcia asked how they wanted that feedback, and if they wanted it in terms of a vote on which options the Delegate body would like. Ms. Odusanya asked if they had a quorum, and said that if they didn't have a quorum, they couldn't take any official action. Mr. Schechtman said that in such a case, they could simply do a straw poll. Mr. Garcia said this was just a report, so a straw poll was fine, and if that was the case, he would move to call this to question. The motion to call the question and end debate was seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Odusanya said they would take a straw poll as to how people feel about either option one or option two. With number one, the ASUC wanted 15% of election costs paid and the GA wants 12% for the elections, while option number two was total autonomy. So that was the range for which votes would be taken. After a straw poll was taken, Ms. Odusanya said that there were 15 votes for option one, and 6 votes for option two.

Mr. Stagi said he wanted to thank them, and would apologize to Cal-SERVE folks for mischaracterizing things, and said he would recognize that they were the GA's allies.

RESOLUTION

The following Resolution was authored by Ms. Felarca and was sponsored by Mr. Cantor:

**RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE PUBLIC INQUIRY AND HEARING TO INVESTIGATE HOSTILE CLIMATE ON CAMPUS  
FACING UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY STUDENTS**

WHEREAS, the crisis of underrepresented minority enrollment since Proposition 209 banned affirmative action has been the subject of grave concern for students and the general campus community; and

WHEREAS, over the past several years, thousands of students have protested, marched, circulated and signed petitions, and spoken out on the urgent need for the University to take concrete steps to reverse the continuing drop in underrepresented minority enrollment; and

-

- Resolution to Endorse the Public Inquiry and Hearing to Investigate Hostile Climate on Campus - 31 -  
Facing Underrepresented Minority Students (cont'd)

**RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE PUBLIC INQUIRY AND HEARING TO INVESTIGATE HOSTILE CLIMATE ON CAMPUS  
FACING UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY STUDENTS (cont'd)**

WHEREAS, in response to overwhelming campus-wide demand, Chancellor Birgeneau addressed this crisis and the hardship that it has created for underrepresented minority students at Cal. He cites how the drop of black students from 260 in 1997 to just 108 students in last year's freshman class, "has meant the loss of an essential, supportive community for Black students and the resultant creation of an environment which many view as actively hostile" ("The Meaning of Inclusion" March 4, 2005). This crisis of hostile environment also negatively shapes the campus experiences of Latino, Native American, and other underrepresented minority students, as well as the student body as a whole; and

WHEREAS, the hostile climate denies underrepresented minority students the right to have full and equal access to full educational opportunity at Cal; and

WHEREAS, on November 10, at 6 pm in Eshleman Library, an ASUC Task Force, in conjunction with BAMN and other student organizations, will conduct an investigation and public hearing on the hostile climate facing underrepresented minority students at UC Berkeley. Results from the public hearing will be compiled in a written report and submitted to the Chancellor and to the UC Regents at the November 2005 Regents meeting at UC Berkeley.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that:

The Graduate Assembly will endorse the November 10 public hearing to investigate hostile climate on campus for underrepresented minority students.

The Graduate Assembly and its delegates will encourage broad and full participation in the hearing by students and student groups throughout the campus.

The Graduate Assembly will send a representative to the Public Hearing to sit as a member of the panel that will receive testimony from students.

Ms. Odusanya said the second Resolution was a request to endorse the public inquiry on hostile climate, to be presented by Ms. Felarca.

Ms. Felarca said she wanted to thank them very much and said she would make the presentation brief since the GA discussed this when the Chancellor was there. A task force of the ASUC, made up of all the parties in the ASUC, was convening a task force. A public inquiry and hearing was going to be held on the hostile campus climate. She's the Chair of BAMN, which, with other organizations as well, and hopefully with the GA too, was going to hold this hearing to make sure that they really get a record and evidence of the real ways in which the climate of this campus has shifted since the ban of affirmative action. In the interests of equality and democracy and really for a full and real educational experience at Berkeley that was geared towards an intellectual and progressive endeavor, she thought it was important for them to really make clear that as the GA and as students of the campus, that they stand united against any kind of hostility or racism that was expressed on this campus, or ways in which isolation

-

Resolution to Endorse the Public Inquiry and Hearing to Investigate Hostile Climate on Campus - 32 -  
Facing Underrepresented Minority Students (cont'd)

And overt hostility had to be combated. The hope of this public hearing was to create a record about this and make a case, and to also see some real results in increasing underrepresented minority student enrolment. So it would be great for the GA to endorse this. In addition, Ms. Felarca said she would like to thank Ms. Odusanya for agreeing to testify at this hearing. They would also like to invite anybody present at the GA to testify as well.

Mr. Garcia asked if Ms. Odusanya was counted as the GA representative who would sit on the panel. Ms. Odusanya she wasn't, and the GA would have to get someone.

A Delegate asked if she could explain, when talking about hostile climate, what that meant. He always thought about that in terms of sexual harassment claims or something illegal. Ms. Odusanya said she believed that what the authors of the Resolution meant was that the Berkeley campus was not welcoming to students of color. Mr. Stagi said he thought that when Mr. Cruz made a statement to the Chancellor, he cited several examples where he thought there was a hostile climate, a statement which Mr. Stagi said sounded rather hostile to him. He thought that was the testimony. The Delegate asked if this, then, specifically dealt with racism on campus. Ms. Odusanya said that was the case, specific racism. Ms. Felarca said that other students could also speak on how that was related to increases of sexism and other forces of discrimination. Students who would like to testify on how this has impacted the overall climate on the campus as a whole, of their unity as a student body, and in terms of intellectual endeavor on this campus, could also be included. But certainly, first and foremost, it would deal with racial hostility on this campus, and the sense of being unwelcome, to straight out attacks, and would deal with the whole range of covert to overt expressions of hostility. The Delegate asked if there would be any documentation of testimony and if information would be carried beyond the hearing. Ms. Felarca said Mr. Litwak will transcribe the testimony, and she would like to thank him very much for that. So they'd have a written record and were also going to videotape it. They'll submit the testimony to the Chancellor in December, and submit it to the UC Regents as well.

Ms. Brakora asked how this would be disseminated. Ms. Felarca said that hopefully they'll get a grant from the GA to make lots of copies of the testimony, and hopefully will have it on line as well.

A Delegate asked if videos will be made of people who speak openly about racism on campus, as well as making a document. Ms. Felarca said she didn't say that the videotape would be public, but the transcript would be available to people, and they'd make sure the Chancellor got a copy of it. The Chancellor will also be present at the public hearing for the first part of the testimony.

Ms. Brakora asked if the testimony will be available. Ms. Felarca said it would be. They'll also have questionnaires available that people could fill out while they were at the public hearing. People would be able to choose whether or not they want to sign it, and whether or not they would also want to publicly speak on it.

Ms. Odusanya called for any other questions or comments, and called for a motion to approve the Resolution. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE PUBLIC INQUIRY AND HEARING TO INVESTIGATE HOSTILE CLIMATE ON CAMPUS FACING UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY STUDENTS PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. Ms. Odusanya said she would like to thank Ms. Felarca. Ms. Felarca said she wanted to thank them.

-

Resolution In Support of Protecting the Political Free Speech Rights of Students - 33 -

## RESOLUTION

-

The following Resolution was authored by Ms. Medina and was sponsored by the Executive Board:

### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROTECTING THE POLITICAL FREE SPEECH RIGHTS OF STUDENTS

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly advocates for the rights of students, including their constitutional First Amendment right to express their political views and opinions; and

WHEREAS, the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) established guidelines prohibiting student governments from using self-imposed student fees to oppose or support an initiative campaign that would have an impact on the interests of students

even though a refund system exists; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly already has a prorata refund mechanism for students that do not want their student fee to be used to oppose or support a political campaign for which the Graduate Assembly delegates have taken a position on; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly is not a unit of the University nor are State or University funds used to fund the political or lobbying activities of the GA; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Assembly's advocacy involves financial issues concerning the quality and affordability of UC schools, including lobbying for increased appropriations to the UC System, increases in financial aid, and limits on tuition fee increases; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 76, the "Live Within our Means Act," would give the Governor power to unilaterally cut funding for line items in the State budget, including items that fund UC; and

WHEREAS, the Governor has cut millions of dollars from the UC budget, causing graduate fees to increase by 70% and professional fees to increase by 132% in the last three years;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly allocates \$100 dollars to print flyers and oppose Proposition 76, the "Live Within Our Means Act."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in the event that the University opposes our attempts to spend the allocated funds to oppose Proposition 76, the Graduate Assembly will join ASUC Santa Barbara's lawsuit against the UC Regents in order to preserve the free speech rights of students.

Ms. Medina said the GA heard the Chancellor talk about how important voter education was and about all the great research that was being conducted on campus around diversity, because California really was a living laboratory. She would like to give the GA a little background on this. Last month she talked about Proposition 54 and how, if it would have passed, how it would have had a drastic impact on student research, since students would have been prohibited from collecting racial data. In response to that, the

-

-  
Resolution In Support of Protecting the Political Free Speech Rights of Students (cont'd)

- 34 -

GA unanimously voted to allocate student fee money to oppose passage of Prop. 54 because the GA felt it was important for them to go out and educate the community, including the undergrads, because as everyone knew, undergrads, and the 18 to 25-year-old age group, had the least voter turnout. So the Delegates voted to oppose that Proposition. And in response, the UC Office of the President developed a policy that said that student governments could not use their student fees to oppose or support a campaign, even if it affected the interests of students. And these were student fees that students voted to impose upon themselves to give their student governments. And just as the GA heard from the about how far UC was willing to go to restrict student control over students' own property, which their fees bought, this policy was another example of how UC sought to control what students could do with their own money. So for the past three years, since that policy was developed, student governments have been had a lot of talk about this. Students have actually been doing this, dealing with campaign issues, every time they developed voter guides and material. But they are told to do that in a content-neutral way. So student governments have been doing that, and in material from the GA, have also added to that material the positions that the GA as a whole has taken. And they've been able to do that for the past two years. But this year the situation was different. The GA was ready to publicize the positions it took last month on two propositions, but was told by UC Office of the President that they couldn't even do that anymore. As a result, the GA was really concerned about what would happen in the next election, and if they'd be prohibited from even taking a stance, period. So that's where they stood as far as this Resolution went.

Ms. Odusanya called for any questions.

Mr. Garcia said the GA believed there was legal merit for the GA actually being able to spend money in this regard. He asked if it was correct that there have been lawsuits settled in favor of students being able to spend money on ballot initiatives. Ms. Medina said that was correct, and said the last suit was filed by ASUC Riverside. The holding of that lawsuit was that student governments could use student fee money to support or oppose a political campaign as long as they had a refund mechanism, which did exist on this campus. So if a student wanted a refund and didn't want their fees to be used for a particular campaign that the Delegates took a position on, they could ask for a refund. So that refund mechanism was available. But even though a refund was available, the University still said that student governments could not use student fee money to support or oppose a campaign.

Ms. Odusanya said the GA at that time didn't have quorum. They could continue to debate the Resolution, but they could not take any official action on it. Mr. Daal asked by how many Delegates they were under quorum. Mr. Fisher said that if nobody called for a quorum, he didn't have to say anything. For instance, the funding report has not yet been presented, and if that didn't pass that evening, it would be



bad. Ms. Odusanya asked people to please not call for a quorum. Mr. Fisher noted, however, that people were within their rights to call for a quorum. Ms. Odusanya asked if anybody wished to call for a quorum, or if they should go ahead.

Ms. Levitan asked if they could move to the Funding Committee report. A Delegate said they don't have to ask people not to call for a quorum, and they could just keep on going until somebody asked for a quorum call. Ms. Zahrt said, however, that if somebody called for a quorum and the Funding Committee report hasn't been considered, that would make the Committee's report ineligible to be approved that evening, and that would mean that no groups would get money for that month.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to consider the Funding Committee report ahead of the Resolution, and to then come back to the Resolution. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

#### Committee Reports

- 35 -

-

Reporting for the Funding Committee, Ms. Zahrt said there was no report to give other than the requests that were distributed as part of the agenda packet. A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING COMMITTEE, APPROVING ROUND 3 OF GRADUATE EVENTS FUNDING ALLOCATIONS AND ROUND 2 OF GRANTS FUNDING ALLOCATIONS, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Ms. Odusanya said that Ms. Tom, Finance Committee Chair, couldn't make it to the meeting that evening to give the Finance Committee report, so in her stead, she would give the report. The GA was moving some money to the Empowering Women of Color Conference. Ms. Rico made a presentation to the GA earlier that evening. Last year the GA made an error and sent no money to her office. The Fi-Comm report also proposed to move some money to develop the GA's online funding system. Ms. Odusanya called for any questions that she could answer for Ms. Tom.

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

-----  
Begin report from the Finance Committee

The Finance Committee is seeking approval to move \$10,000 to the Empowering Women of Color Conference (EWOCC) and \$10,000 to the Web Team, from the Executive Office budget. There was an oversight in the budgeting process last year, and EWOCC did not receive a budget for any operating costs. The funds for the Web Team still go towards a new computer server for the GA, as part of the effort to update the campus-wide systems.

End report from the Finance Committee  
-----

#### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROTECTING THE POLITICAL FREE SPEECH RIGHTS OF STUDENTS (cont'd)

Ms. Odusanya said the GA would return to a discussion on the Resolution In Support of Protecting the Political Free Speech Rights of Students.

Ms. Felarca said she was completely in support of this Resolution and thought there really was a time for students on this campus to assert their rights. There was a precedent called "past practice," and the GA has engaged in these kinds of activities in the past. The GA has to stand up to arbitrary decisions on the part of the Administration when campuses start to restrict and control free speech. So she thought this was a reasonable Resolution and was completely defensible. Prop. 76 would devastate funding for public education, and it was obviously in students' interests to stand up against that.

Ms. Medina said she would like to amend the bill. When she drafted the Resolution she thought the GA needed to allocate the money in order to have standing in the suit. However, they don't need to do that

-

- Resolution In Support of Protecting the Political Free Speech Rights of Students (cont'd)

- 36 -

anymore because the policy was there, and the GA already had standing to just go ahead and join the lawsuit. So they can strike from "Whereas Prop. 76... would... cut... items that fund UC." Ms. Odusanya said the amendment would strike the sixth Whereas Clause.

Mr. Garcia asked if they would have standing in court if the GA hadn't contributed to opposition to the Proposition. Ms. Medina said they would, because before this new, arbitrary policy, they needed to have been told they couldn't spend the money, but now, with this policy, they're just saying no, they could not even publicize their position. So the GA already had standing. She talked to the attorney, and could therefore make that statement.

Ms. Odusanya asked if there was support to strike Whereas Clause six through the first comma in the second Resolved Clause, to have the remaining Resolved Clause read as follows: "Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly still join ASUC Santa Barbara's lawsuit... to preserve the free speech rights of students." She called for any objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

A motion to approve the Resolution, as amended, was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROTECTING THE POLITICAL FREE SPEECH RIGHTS OF STUDENTS.

Ms. Odusanya said the next item was a report from Mr. Fisher, and asked if he wanted to report on members of committees. Mr. Fisher said he would give his report by e-mail.

#### OFFICERS' REPORTS

Ms. Odusanya said her President's report was in the packet and she would ask people to read through it. If people had any questions they should let her know.

For the report from the Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said he was looking for feedback from Delegates who were present, and he would send around a form. The office has been working on a number of issues on student fees and student services. The form he sent around was an analysis that was part way finished, looking at how much money was allocated from their student fees to various student services, and how many people were served. He would ask Delegates to just indicate whether they've used any of the services listed. The most important services were the top ones, labeled "core," the academic services. They're not so much looking for feedback on those, but rather, the services labeled "non-core." If Delegates have used those services, he would ask them to indicate that. And then from 1 to 5, he would ask them to indicate how important those services were to grads and to the campus. The first question was "How important do you think the service is to the campus?", such as for the Recreational Sports Facility. It might be very important to them individually, but they might not think it was very important to the campus. Or, the Art Museum might not be very important to them, but they see it as important to the campus. So the first column was for Berkeley and the second column was for Delegates' opinions.

-

-

Officers' Reports -- Academic Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

- 37 -

Mr. Schechtman said he would like to draw Delegates' attention to some of the figures the GA considered to be some major disparities in the way funding was allocated at that time. If they take a look at the list, childcare services cost around \$7,000 per child served. That was a lot of money, was actually not surprising given how much childcare costs. Number two, the Disabled Students Program cost about \$700 per student. Number three was Health Services, with about \$170 spent per student. None of these figures were actually surprising. However, he would like to point out three other numbers. Intercollegiate Athletics currently receives over \$1,700 of students' fees per student athlete. That was more than twice as much money as was being spent per disabled student on this campus. Additionally, he asked if anyone present had been to the Lawrence Hall of Science as a graduate student, and noted that three people said they had. This unit received 890 visits from students last year and received around \$1,500,000 from the campus. And for student musical activities, the Cal Band and the Jazz Band, and choruses, received \$700 per student. That's about five times as much as the Health Center.

Mr. Schechtman said that what the GA was trying to do was to argue for a more rational system that allocated money based on, number one, a direct service relating to the academic mission of this University; and that was core. Secondly, they want to have money allocated to services that were used by the majority of students. Thirdly, they want money allocated to everyone else. So that's basically what the Academic Affairs office has been working on.

Mr. Schechtman said he wanted to ask for a little straw poll feedback on the RSF and Career Services. These were two issues in particular that he and Ms. Odusanya have been working on with the Administration. First of all, Career Services was asking for students pay \$13 to \$16 a semester, starting next year, in order to fund a commercial lease for a facility across the street from Eshleman. The Career Services Center was currently down at Oxford and Bancroft, and it would like to move to a new location closer to campus. There's very strong student support for moving this closer, and all student governments believe this would improve access for students. The question was, however, how much graduate students use Career Services and whether it was worth moving the office for grads, unless they increase service, that is, headcount, devoted to graduate students. Right now, Career Services has 1.5 people dedicated to 9,000 graduate students. The proposed fee of \$13-16 would pay for a lease, and that itself was unprecedented, for student fees to go towards paying a commercial lease. Mr. Schechtman said the GA was trying to press the University to pay half of that, and was also suggesting that \$1.50 to \$3.00 more would get grads one to two more people to serve graduate students. The GA was saying that if grads were going to pay for a service that was predominantly undergraduate at that time, grads would like to increase the resources available for graduate students. A lot of this would be for graduate students who might not want to go into academia but would like to do commercial work or government or non-profit work. This was currently really underserved by academic departments.

Mr. Schechtman said he would like to get a straw poll of the people present. Option A would be to just pay the lease, and option B would be a willingness to pay the lease and some more money, for increased services.

Mr. Stagi asked if they could have a third option, of paying nothing, and said he would vote for not paying Career Services more.

Mr. Schechtman said that after the straw poll he would tell the Delegates what the Executive Board thought. He said the straw poll was not a binding resolution, but just to gather their sense. A straw poll was held. For not paying anything more there were 7 votes. The second option would be to pay \$13-16

-

Officers' Reports -- Academic Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

- 38 -

in fees for a lease to move Career Services across the street. For those who were on fee waivers, such as for GSIships and fellowships, this would be paid for by the fee waiver. For this option there were 2 votes. Mr. Schechtman said the last option was to pay for a move if they added on an additional \$1.50 or \$3.00 for more resources for graduate students. He said there were 4 votes for that option.

Mr. Schechtman said he would like to thank them. The second thing he wanted to talk about was the Recreational Sports Facility. From 1985 to 2000, the RSF was free. Now, each student currently paid \$59 a semester for the building. Because of budget cuts, the RSF instituted its first membership fee in 2001, when it was originally \$25. Two years ago that went up to \$35, and the next year, to \$45. As people may have read in the Daily Cal, the RSF was one of the units that was being asked to close its operating deficit and to pay back its debt immediately. Athletics was not being asked to do that on the same timeframe. So the RSF was facing up to \$1.2 million in budget cuts in the next semester. That was almost 15% of the RSF's budget. If grads saw a survey about this, he would ask them to please take that survey, as feedback was needed. One thing the GA was trying to gauge was how much graduate students would be willing or able to pay per semester, above and beyond \$45. Several options were being discussed. If students paid the same amount, the RSF would have to basically cut almost 50% of the budget. Just based on Delegates' personal budgets, he asked what the maximum would be that they would reasonably be willing to pay. And he noted that when this fee got up to about \$75, that would keep the same level of services that were now available. Everything else would entail some service cuts. The RSF was trying to figure out what those cuts would be.

Ms. Odusanya said she would entertain a motion to extend speaking time for Mr. Schechtman by five minutes. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Daal said he didn't think that was the right question to be asking, because graduate students who go to the RSF would probably spend a whole lot of money, and pay pretty much whatever they're asked to pay in order to keep on going. Mr. Schechtman said that's the argument the Administration was making, that if students had to go to the YMCA they'd pay \$40-50 a month, and therefore the RSF could afford to charge students \$40-50 a month. Mr. Schechtman said his argument was that grad students don't have that kind of income. Grads were trying to live in the Bay Area on anywhere from \$1,400 to \$1,800 a month, if they're on a fellowship or GSIship. Or, if they're a professional student, they borrow every penny they have. So there will probably be an upper limit to the dollar amount that grad students, with their limited budgets, would be willing to pay.

Ms. Odusanya noted that other UC campuses don't pay for this. Mr. Schechtman said that Cal students were the only ones who pay anything. They will probably go back to a referendum next year to make the fee mandatory, which would then be covered by fee waivers and financial aid. But in the meantime, they must continue to have a membership fee. The Administration was arguing for the higher range.

Ms. Levitan asked if, once the fee went up, if it would ever go down again, and if this was set in stone or if it was a one-time, \$1.2 million gap. Mr. Schechtman said it was for once the gap was closed. Ms. Levitan asked if the gap was of building costs or of ongoing expenses. Mr. Schechtman said it was both. The fee wouldn't go up to \$60 and then back to \$45.

A Delegate asked if the YMCA had a sliding scale, such as giving consideration to grads being destitute. Mr. Schechtman that was an interesting point, and he didn't know the answer.

-

Officers' Reports -- Academic Affairs Vice President (cont'd)

- 39 -

A Delegate said she went to the RSF, but if the fee increase was so great, she'd just go to the YWCA instead. Mr. Schechtman said he would follow up on that and said he wanted to thank her very much.

Ms. Levitan asked if this also involved fitness classes. Mr. Schechtman said it did, and said the RSF might start to charge fees.

A Delegate said they pay \$59, and asked if they would pay \$45 if they were to use it. Mr. Schechtman said that was correct. The Delegate asked what the dollar amount would to keep services at the same level if students paid a flat fee. Mr. Schechtman said it would be lower than \$59 plus \$75, because right now two-thirds of the student body were members and a flat fee would spread the costs out over the entire student body. So the entire student body was paying for the building, and two-thirds of the student body were actually members. Mr. Daal said that all students, though, were paying for the building for historical reasons. Mr. Schechtman said it's a student-funded building. Mr. Daal said that perhaps Mr. Schechtman should review how that came about and how students decided to borrow to create this facility. Mr. Schechtman said it's a classic student-services model. They previously didn't have a fitness center on campus and students wanted one, and in a referendum, voted for a fee, and basically borrowed against a bond in order to have the RSF built. That was the same thing students did with MLK, and that involved the issue of whether the Chancellor had the right to put police in MLK and turn students away, since funded that building, as they also provided funding for Eshleman Hall. The RSF was paid for by students 100%.

Mr. Schechtman said people could vote for the maximum.

Mr. Stagi asked when the fee increase would be implemented. Mr. Schechtman said it would start next semester. That's what the online survey was about. The campus was trying to find out what the most important services were to students, in order to protect those services. He was trying to argue for a top level, a cap on what students would be willing to pay. The fee was currently at \$45.

Straw polls were held on amounts of extra fees. For \$50 there were three votes; for \$60 there were three votes; for \$75 there were three votes. Mr. Schechtman said he wanted to thank them very much.

Mr. Daal asked if they could take a poll of how many people didn't have an RSF membership. Mr. Schechtman asked for a show of hands of Delegates who didn't have a current RSF membership, and said there were six Delegates who didn't. He asked how many had an RSF membership in the past but cancelled their membership, and noted that there were three people in that category.

Mr. Schechtman said the last thing he would report on was the GA's Academic Affairs Committee. This was a Committee of Delegates that meets with him to discuss policy issues such as this, and what stances to take with the Administration. They could go into a lot more detail at Committee meetings. Right now the Committee was about two members short of a quorum. It's a forum where grads could consider any point of policy with the Senate and the Administration. He would very much welcome any Delegates who would like to serve on it. Mr. Schechtman asked people to please see him or Mr. Fisher if they were interested.

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve Mr. Schechtman's report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

-

Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

- 40 -

Ms. Odusanya said she would like to acknowledge that Ms. Zahrt wrote her Master's exam, and it was over. (Applause)

#### Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

Mr. Allen said he would be very brief. There were a couple of matters that were discussed by the Graduate Council at its last meeting. One item dealt with trying to have a faculty and student message to State leaders, the Regents, and legislators about the money differential involving grads, whereby grad students, e.g., bring in so many funds through investment. That's something they want the State to look at that when they take into account out-of-State fees for graduate students. One idea was that it might be more appropriate at the undergraduate

level to have a tremendous disparity between out-of-State and in-State fees, but that when they look at the amount of money that grad students bring in, particularly for those in the sciences, and look at the larger level, it was very significant. So the idea was to take that into account in offsetting some of the tremendous out-of-State fees that grad students are charged, which affect the school's ability to recruit. That issue was being explored, and he would come back next month and talk more about any progress that was made.

Mr. Allen said the other thing that came before the Grad Council was a discussion on a big study done on mental health among grad students. Some very interesting findings came out of that some of which were obvious. Students' mental health and their general enjoyment of grad school, and what they get out of the grad student experience, had a lot to do with the level of mentoring they had, and grads' sense of a greater connection with their mentor and with professors. There were some interesting disparities between men and women in terms of connection. One thing they've talked about was trying to re-ignite an effort to really push the faculty a little further on mentoring issues. This was already an issue the Graduate Assembly has prioritized in the mentoring awards the GA gives out. There was talk about trying to encourage departments and different colleges to put in place a stronger emphasis for graduate professors on mentoring training. One complaint a lot of professors had was that grads didn't show up for this. So this was an ongoing issue, one that he and Mr. Schechtman have worked on a lot in the past, and it was something they need to talk about a lot. It's an issue of great importance to many graduate students, and was possibly something the GA might want to look at, perhaps with an ad hoc committee, to get some feedback. Mr. Allen said he would want any suggestions Delegates might have, or whether they share this concern on mentoring and thought it was an important element in the quality of their education, or if it was a quality-of-life issue for grads. That was certainly something that seemed to come across in the mental health study.

Mr. Stagi said this was a very important issue and something he's also been working on. And he would note that the GA needed to constitute a committee to administer the upcoming Faculty Mentoring Awards. Mr. Allen said he knew it was a big task, but if he could, he would recommend that the Academic Affairs Committee look at that as well.

Lastly, Mr. Allen said that the School of Information Management & Systems has decided to change its name to the "School of Information." As that presupposes that it wasn't doing information itself, the Graduate Council voted "no comment" on the proposal. Mr. Allen said he just thought Delegates might be interested in that. The School was formerly "Library Sciences," so it's had an interesting evolution.

-

-  
Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

- 41 -

Ms. Odusanya called for a motion to approve the Graduate Council report. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE GA'S GRADUATE COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Odusanya said she would like to thank Delegates for staying so late.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak, Recording Secretary

Present at the November 3, 2005 GA Meeting

Agarwal, Harish	Physics	Huezo, Hector	Law
Anderson, Meghan	Math	Huff, Eric	Astronomy
Arons, Sam	Energy & Resources Group	Inkabi, Kofi	Civil & Env Engineering
Babel, Molly	Linguistics	Jimenez, Javier	Comp Lit
Begtrup, Gavi	Physics	Jones, Alexander	Plant & Microbial Biology
Bertucci, Sonja	French	Kasad, Roshni	MCB
Besbris, Max	ASUC Rep	Levitan, Carmel	Bio E
Botello, Elizabeth	Journalism	Martire, Anthony	Italian Studies
Brakora, Katie	IB	Medina, Claudia	GA External Aff VP
Buccitelli, Anthony	Folklore	Miyazaki, Karin	Optometry
Cantor, Chris	Vision Science	Moore, Shayla	Funding Advisor
Chakrabarti, Monami	Law	Odusanya, Lola	GA President

Chanzit, Adam	East Asian Languages	Ofi, Kwame	History
Cobb, Corie	Mech Eng	Penn, Charli	Journalism
Cohon, Adam	Political Science	Perring, Anne	Chemistry
Crosby, Joy	Performance Studies	Purdy, David	Stats
Daal, Miguel	Physics	Rajan, Nishanth	Haas Ph.D.
Eswaran, Krishnan	EECS	Salas, Luis	Art Hist
Fairbrother, Malcolm	Sociology	Sawyers, Hollie	Law
Franklin, Johanna	Logic	Scales, Joyce	Public Policy
Ganesan, Prema	Vision Science	Schechtman, Rob	GA Acad Aff VP
Garcia, David	Chemistry	Stagi, Jay	DCRP
González, Mónica	Spanish & Portuguese	Stalcup, Meg	Anthro
Gross, Stephen	History	Trahey, Lynn	Chemistry
Guenther, Joel	Chemistry	Troyani, Sara	Italian Studies
Hao, Andy	Anthro	Virgili, Justin	Chem Eng
Holland, Cameron	Law	Way, Cecily	Transportation Engineering
Hsueh, Susan	GA Manager	Yu, Way	Optometry

Amended Resolution

- 42 -

Amended Resolution

Resolution In Support of Protecting the Political Free Speech Rights of Students [Amended version]

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly advocates for the rights of students, including their constitutional First Amendment right to express their political views and opinions; and

Whereas, the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) established guidelines prohibiting student governments from using self-imposed student fees to oppose or support an initiative campaign that would have an impact on the interests of students even though a refund system exists; and

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly already has a prorata refund mechanism for students that do not want their student fee to be used to oppose or support a political campaign for which the Graduate Assembly delegates have taken a position on; and

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly is not a unit of the University nor are State or University funds used to fund the political or lobbying activities of the GA; and

Whereas, the Graduate Assembly's advocacy involves financial issues concerning the quality and affordability of UC schools, including lobbying for increased appropriations to the UC System, increases in financial aid, and limits on tuition fee increases; and

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly will join ASUC Santa Barbara's lawsuit against the UC Regents in order to preserve the free speech rights of students.