

Order of The Golden Bear

διδάκωσ

ESTABLISHED 1900

Temporary Meeting Location October 1, 2019

The meeting was convened at 6:00pm.

Items for the Good of the Order:

The Warden encourages the Fellowship to come forward with nominations for the Arleigh Williams forum, which will be about expanding what the term “access” means in its relationship to campus.

The Warden encourages fellows to consider bringing their own cutlery to dinner, as to make our meetings more environmentally friendly.

The Warden reminds the Fellowship about the continuing Warden’s Challenge. Anyone who feels led to contribute to the cause can donate to the Order of the Golden Bear or the Senior Hall Restoration Program, by going to give.berkeley.edu.

A fellow asks the Fellowship to consider volunteering to fill to vacant positions on the Order Council. These currently include the roles of Steward and Scribe.

Items for the Good of the University: Labor and the UC

The Warden introduces the Fellowship to the topic of labor and how it relates to the greater University (and the Berkeley campus specifically). Labor touches so many spheres of our campus. Some topics into which the conversation can evolve include: fair labor practices, with specific emphasis on recent labor strikes, potential or actual invisibility of various campus non-faculty or student worker staff members, work study, compensating student athletes and the recent California legislation regarding this point, the status and treatment of non-professor lecturers, salaries of lecturers versus athletic coaches and any disparities which may exist, and volunteering and free labor (clubs, labs, and other organizations included). Throughout our conversation, the Warden encourages the Fellowship to keep in mind that the UC system is 3rd largest employer in the state of California.

A fellow provides information on a campus event relevant to our conversation, held Friday October 18th. A seminar titled “Food Slaves: Labor Trafficking in American Agriculture,” presented by the class of 1967.

A fellow asks for clarification about compensation for athletes.

In response to a previous fellow, a different fellow elaborates on the new conundrum facing the state and the University's athletic department. New legislation passed by the California Governor allows student athletes to profit from their name, image, and likeness. The Governor justifies this by noting that other talented students can make money off of their likenesses, so why should athletes be barred? A current tenant of the NCAA is amateurism: name, likeness, and image are all interesting concepts; here at Berkeley, there is a minute percentage of student athletes who will actually be able to profit from their images. There may be secondary effects, such as diminished funding from Under Armour, our athletic sponsors. Then, our budget will only allow for us to have a few men's sports for revenue, and only the minimum number of women's sports to compensate for Title IX. This possibility is frightening, because only a few athletes will actually benefit from the new California legislation and the other ~800 athletes are getting the short end of the new stick. This particular fellow believes that there will be negative consequences because of this legislation.

A fellow thanks a previous speaker for the comments they made regarding compensation for student athletes. This fellow also wonders what the other side of the argument is: why is this new legislation so important for our student athletes, to use their own likeness to profit?

A fellow guesses that our student athletes do not place much importance on profiting from their own likeness, and posits that many do not think that it makes much sense for them. Most student athletes know that the University and the Department of Athletics take good care of them, in terms of their health, nutrition, and academic support. If we surveyed all 850 of our student athletes, this fellow would be surprised if more than 10 were following this report of being able to profit from their likenesses. The Governor's reasoning does not take into account all the other benefits student athletes get from the University. This process has already started hurting our recruiting, because student athletes cannot (as of three years from now) compete in national championships under NCAA guidelines.

A fellow offers a perspective from someone familiar with the athletic study center. This fellow knows that some student athletes have struggled immensely with finances, and taking advantages of resources that the rest of the student body is able to do, but are not able to because of their restrictions by the NCAA. It is difficult for student athletes when they are restricted, and though there is nuance in this issue, it is difficult to paint all 850 student athletes with the same light.

A fellow speaks to a previous speaker's worries, and adds that ~99% of appeals for support reconsideration do get approved by the NCAA.

Notwithstanding other fellow's opinions, another fellow thinks that there is an issue with intercollegiate athletics across the board. It is currently an arms race for money. For

example, coaches in the SEC conference can make up to three times more than top-rated coaches from the Berkeley campus, even though our top 5 earners on the faculty roster here at Berkeley are in the athletics. Because of the way the market works, athletes can make an enormous amount of money, thanks to donations coming to this campus and their ties to our athletics department. Is our practice of improving our athletic programs and facilities with our limited budget sustainable? Ultimately, the answer is no, according to this fellow. Navigating the NCAA is very cumbersome, not only for athletes but also for conferences. They have complete control over many of our operations. The athletics program used to be managed by the ASUC. At the first Big Game between Cal and Stanford, our student athletic manager Herbert Lang helped collect and count fees by hand. The money generated by athletics used to go toward the entire Associated Students, but this is no longer the case. Schools are becoming factories for athletics, and the money from these programs is restricted to athletics.

Another fellow familiar with property issues in law comments on how images of athletes are monetized. Some programs or companies do not want to give money to the University, but they instead want to feature single athletes. All of our facilities, jerseys, and marketing symbols still belong to the University. The entire package really should be taken into account when considering compensation for athletes. If companies and organizations want to feature only specific athletes, they should not be able to use any of our settings or facilities. There are ways to negotiate with industries that don't want to pay the University for our athletic branding. Athletes should not be connected to Cal if they want to profit off their own image. Other people involved in the whole package should be compensated as well.

A fellow branches off from the topic of athletics, and mentions that there is a lot of physical and emotional investment put into service to the University. A lot of student workers do not have authority over their workplace. They are often labeled as "casually restricted," so that departments can let student employees go without any reasonable or advanced justification. The University places a lot of stress and anxiety on their student employees because of this constant threat and wayward nature of student employment.

A fellow offers a different perspective on both of the previously mentioned topics. Our current culture undermines workers, to get the most out of the fruits of their labor. UC Berkeley is contributing to this in a privatized way, and undermines the solidarity of groups in favor of privileging a few who can make exorbitant gains. This extends to Hall Staff, other student workers, and lecturers. What is our economic system doing to our ability to support our students and staff?

A fellow changes the current topic to focus on lecturers on the Berkeley campus. Some lecturers have to teach three different classes, lack long-term benefits, and have to accommodate this job as well as others of other campuses. Lecturers make up ~40% of the teaching force on this campus. In this fellow's opinion, without state support the University is unable to hire full-time faculty for teaching positions. Lecturers are grateful to have these jobs, but they have no sustainability. Any lecturer can be suddenly

released, and these jobs often do not have employment security. Many departments cut workers to save money. We paint ourselves as an institution committed to undergraduate education, but the people who do the bulk of the work to support them get little compensation for the work that they do, and this is an ongoing issue.

A fellow adds to a previous speaker by mentioning associate professors- they are under a lot of stress as well. From GSIs to associate professors to lecturers, students can tell when these teaching aids are under stress. Putting strain on these employees and not giving them what they deserve financially limits how students can learn on this campus. Some specializations are favored, while others are marginalized.

A fellow sheds some light on the lecturer situation. This fellow, a lecturer themselves, would beg for classes to teach; during the first six years, a lecturer can be fired at any time. Now, the University has limited the number the classes a lecturer can teach a year, and it is really difficult for these people because they have to spread their labor thin to other universities.

A fellow thinks about custodial staff, and other staff members that help maintain the University. How much of our work that we do to sustain ourselves can be also attributed to these types of staff members? They are surely the unsung heroes of this campus. They maintain this University in its day-to-day life.

A fellow is also concerned about custodial workers. They are still bargaining for a fair contract, and this is a very precarious situation. There have even been numerous occasions on the Berkeley campus when members of the custodial staff have been deported for reporting to work. Several weeks ago at Berkeley Law, a custodial worker was assaulted by somebody who was homeless. After calling UCPD, this worker was actually arrested themselves, incurring bail and towing fees. We should recognize that many of the workers on this campus are vulnerable, some more so than others.

This fellow was a teaching assistant a number of decades ago, and there were resources that were provided for graduate students. It seems like this is no longer held up. Being a teaching assistant was not a financial strain back then, but this fellow is skeptical that this is still true today.

In some schools (such as the Haas School of Business), GSIs are paid really well. But this varies, of course, and this fellow is wary of how other departments treat grad students.

This fellow is a reader for the Gender and Women's Studies department, but resides in the school of Education. Because there is only an undergraduate minor, there are not enough courses for GSIs to teach, and the pay is not as nice for other departments where they are forced to look. There are semesters where this fellow has had to work

multiple jobs at a time to make it as a graduate student. Some GSI salaries are not even enough to pay rent. GSI stipends have not changed enough to match the times.

A fellow comments that the University has not provided workers with as much as it should. But in fact, there is a reason that very few lecturers have secure employment. In a broad sense (although this fellow believes this is unfair, especially when trying to make a living), the alternative is that the University will eventually reach a threshold where everybody gets a lot of benefits, and the University is trying to put a lid on costs to save money. Some think that the University is just on the “dark side,” but there are practical reasons for the various ways that previous fellows are experiencing hurts by the system. Oftentimes, a way to make a difference in the ways people do their jobs is how we treat them. Here, we have discussed the big gaps that have existed between departments on how lecturers are treated. Though it would not change their financial experience, the way that we treat people might take the edge off so that there is a reason for these lecturers to keep giving to the University. This fellow brings volunteers into the mix, commenting that they are absolutely unrecognized, and receive no awards. They often do their work even though they do not have the time. They are committed to making our community better, perhaps they are interested in giving their time and talents to their alma mater. They are committed to the mission of keeping us alive while the greater mechanism tries to sort through complicated issues. Everybody associated with the Order are volunteers. The people who keep this organization running are not paid, these volunteers do it because they have heart and they want to make a difference. This fellow is fortunate that they have the time to give to the University, but they want to stress that people should be very conscientious when we interact with people on this campus. Volunteers are the face of this University. Remember that they exist, and do not undervalue their contribution even though they are not paid.

A fellow poses a question to the Fellowship. Does anyone have information on how much of the University’s funding comes from donations, rather than disbursements from the state? Big Give is big on campus now, but how many people donate?

A fellow comments that this institution used to be funded publicly by the state, with upward of 60% of our total budget state-provided. Now, the state provides us ~12.5% of the support we need for the whole UC system, strictly for academic purposes. The largest contribution today is student tuition, followed by donors or federal research grants. We have very generous donors, but by contrast, our friends at UCLA have a medical school, and much bigger donors. We collect somewhere around 600 million dollars last year which is tremendous for the University. But this is a 2.1-billion-dollar plant that has evolving needs. This is not enough to support the complexity of which a previous speaker spoke, to support our lecturers, et cetera. This fellow is worried about the University sustaining itself long term, competing with other organizations for resources. Everybody is after the same private dollars. We are not Harvard, Yale, Princeton, or Stanford, and we do not have any other substantial sources of income. We have big issues coming for sustaining our University.

A fellow who has worked with the University budget closely mentions that we have finally balanced our budget. But everything this fellow has heard draws back to the fact that the University has not received substantial funding from the state. A school like Stanford is a machine for fundraising and revenue-generation. Our fundraising operations are a very tiny portion of that. This money is nowhere near enough to give our workers what they deserve. Resources are not available, our model is in tough shape, and we really need to fight for more resources in Sacramento, but we might have to solve it here on our own campus.

A fellow comments on this particular topic: finances. In Santa Barbara, there were recently built condos for faculty and staff. The funding was through a relationship with a construction contractor, but the basic end is that there very low-cost building (without lowering quality) because of guaranteed revenue. University is paying the salary of the people living there, so it is a risk-free investment. This idea struck this fellow as a potential source for solutions, because since we cannot provide faculty with enough money, we might be able to provide starter faculty and staff with basic needs. This reduces the need for major donations, from a very simple structure. To what extent can Berkeley get into these type of projects? There is an initiative similar to this at UC Irvine. UC Berkeley has a similar problem- how do we pay faculty enough to be able to live in the area? This mechanism may be a way to fix this. In the same way that we have technological developments, there are also financial developments in the ways we can support our faculty and staff.

People oftentimes think that their tax dollars already pay for the University, and do not want to give more. We used to be state funded, then we went to state-supported, now we are (at best) state-endorsed. Yet, the state holds our money until we agree to take on more students, which puts more stress on us. One way to take action is to vote. Send letters to councilmen and representatives that we need to fund this University through state dollars.

A fellow notices that a lot of previous fellows' problems can be fixed with a lot of money. This fellow pictures the University rich with money, GSIs get respected, lectures get paid, everybody gets what they need to thrive. However, there are still going to be people who are struggling to get by. How much do we look at problems on a case-by-case basis, so that GSIs do not have to work three jobs? This fellow is out of state, but luckily gets a scholarship because of ROTC. Do people come into school knowing that ROTC is an opportunity to get stipends? Also, the Co-ops are a good way to save money. Essentially, they subsidize rent for work. If student population is increasing, people who live in Co-ops have a financial system solved. Money solves everything, but we cannot simply sit around and wait for the money, there has to be solutions to resource distribution.

A previous speaker has raised an important point: the power of the ballot. A number of candidates for president run on the basis of small donations, from people who appreciate values. The UC does not get enough finances; we worry about other people

giving us finances. We have the internet and well-established donation reception processes. Why do not we have certain students at different UC campuses (alumni and current) who vote for people who are going to fund us? We can take control this way. Small-dollar donations go to causes which appeal to certain voters. We need to have a commitment to a certain hardcore group of people who are going to take this on. But ten years from now, we are going to control the state legislature and give money to Cal and other UCs.

A fellow notes that we did elect Rigel Robinson to City Council, thereby electing one of our own to a place of power. Granted, city council does not control budgeting to the UC. This fellow thinks that it is important if students were more aware of our need for donations. A lot of students do not want to ever donate back to the UC. This fellow thinks it is important to spread the word on why we should give. This fellow also comments on student resources like the student food pantry, for students who are struggling.

A fellow notices that state senators actually do respond to letter-writing. The way we contact our representatives is huge in making differences.

The Warden notices a lot of times labor and money are intertwined. The Warden wants to focus on solutions on how to redistribute money, and use it differently to solve the labor challenges already discussed.

A fellow clarifies a comment they made, about how we treat others. This fellow is sorry to hear that we have many students who leave our University who would never consider donating. That is more than sad, and is not sustainable. This fellow wonders how we might prevent this, thinking about our interactions with each other. A previous speaker mentioned the Chancellor has solved the structural problems in our budget. That has happened a number of times in recent memory, oftentimes with some damage to the University. \$150 million were cut- there are programs that no longer exist because of this money. We have cut so many times and have not replaced staff or faculty. The programs continued, the same numbers of students are on the campus. The people who are left are left with more work, get overworked, and work quality goes down. Student advisors are a good example. Their workload has gone up because we have removed advisors and increased population. This effects student experience, which affects giving. Keep the people behind the counter, sweeping the floors, in mind. With regards to the Warden's comment, it is a zero-sum gain. Name the place on campus with too much money. If we give more money to A, we take money from B. Where does our money come from? Student fees is a big part of this. All of the sudden, student fees might get funneled from one program to another that does not benefit particular students at all. Unless we get more money in the door, redistributing it means that somebody bears more of a burden.

A fellow appreciates comments of a previous speaker. This fellow is an economist, and studied scarcity and its effects. This tends to be synonymous with trade-offs. Two points:

1. Can the University take money from x to increase wages? Wages for most of the University employees does not support cost of living. But 2/3 of the University budget already goes toward compensation. It is very difficult to take more money from our existing budget.
2. Currently, this fellow manages several hundred employees. Most employees under their purview do not get good compensation, and cannot even afford to live in the Bay Area. This fellow has a hard time attracting high-quality employees because of limited salaries. Employment in libraries for example has gone down by 25% (since 2000). That is a terrible circumstance. We have to reduce the number of jobs, and/or reduce wages. There are no easy solutions. We are desperate to attract good employees.

A fellow understands that redistributing money is really hard. If we hypothetically get more money (donors, federal, state, research), where does it go? It is a waste to throw it at an academic department, academics, maintenance for buildings, et cetera. This fellow thinks it is important to put a lot of new sources into investments, so that we can ensure that we are improving and growing. We have to stop thinking short term, instead, where do we want that money 50 years down the road?

To comment toward a previous speaker, the University does have an endowment and tries to build it. The money we raise only sustains the University from year to year, it is hard to increase our endowment. We would be in much better shape if we had many more millions to build our endowment. This fellow is perplexed as to why we do such a poor job at advertising the UC to the state of California and its constituents. We really stink at educating the public at the benefits we give to the state. We need to go out and show the people of California how their investment to higher education has been paid back many times over to improve the economy of the state. Why don't we have advertisements on how the UC system is benefitting the state (beyond faculty and student-athlete contributions)? We make a significant impact in the life of this state.

The Warden reiterates: the UC should work for the students who attend, and also for the state of California. Do other fellows have an opinion on this? How does the UC system use labor to benefit the state of California?

A fellow acknowledges that citizens of California do not understand how important the University is to the state. Somebody may think that they do not go (or their children do not) go here, why bother supporting? This fellow comments on how UC Davis has created crops that are grown all over the central valley, and how the UC Berkeley campus has revolutionized computing and material science.

Lastly, a fellow encourages all of us to give back to the University.

The meeting closed with song, and was adjourned promptly at 7:27pm.

Meeting minutes taken and compiled by the Chronicler for the Order.

