

## ASUC SENATE MEETING

September 24, 2008

Fifth Week

This regular meeting of the ASUC Senate was called to order by Krystle Pasco at 7:10 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Pasco called for any changes to the minutes from the September 17 meeting.

Ms. Hussain said that on page 9, the minutes should read that a prowler was found in Ehrman Hall, not Harmon hall.

Mr. Moghtader said that on page 19, the minutes should read that the Holocaust killed a majority of European Jews, not a majority of Jews in the world.

A motion to approve the minutes, as amended, was made and seconded by Mr. Mairena and Ms. Yang. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2008 MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

### NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Pasco referred the following bills to committee:

SB 38, In Support of Measure FF: The Berkeley Public Library Bond, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee and to the University and External Affairs Committee

SB 39, In Support of Black Women's Appreciation, to the Finance Committee

SB 40, In Support of the AFSCME Workers Strike, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee, and to the University and External Affairs Committee

SB 41, In Support of the Berkeley Stop the War Coalition, to the Finance Committee

SB 42, In Support of Social for Social Change, not referred

SB 43, In Support of a Community Land Use and Capital Projects Committee, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee and to the University and External Affairs Committee

SB 44, In Support of Compliance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act and Financial Responsibility with Regards to the Proposed California Memorial Stadium Renovation, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee, and to the University and External Affairs Committee

- SB 45, In Support of the Disabled Students Accommodation Fund (DSAF), to the Finance Committee and to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee
- SB 46, In Support of Global Medical Brigades @ Berkeley's Social Responsibility Forum, to the Finance Committee
- SB 47, In Support of Asian Americans Reaching Out in the Community, to the Finance Committee
- SB 48, In Support of FACE AIDS at Berkeley, to the Finance Committee
- SB 49, In Support of the 2008 Nikkei Student Union Culture Show: (r)evolutions, to the Finance Committee
- SB 50, In Support of the Queer Straight Alliance, to the Finance Committee
- SB 51, In Support of the Undergraduate Philosophy Forum, to the Finance Committee
- SB 52, Suggesting the Academic Senate's Involvement in Urging Faculty Compliance with Early Text-book Adoption, to the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee and to the University and External Affairs Committee
- SB 53, In Support of the Hindu Students Council (HSC), to the Finance Committee

Ms. Pasco called for any changes to New Business, and seeing none, said New Business was approved.

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (October 1)

Ms. Pasco called for any changes to the agenda for next week. Ms. Rodriguez moved to add the selection of the ASUC representative to the Multi-Cultural Greek Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nahabet and passed with no objection.

Ms. Tran moved to include a Special Order next week for a 30-minute presentation from 8:30 to 9:00 for a presentation by the Cal Student Store Director, Jeff Deutsch, to talk about book adoption.

Ms. Pasco said she would like to include two Special Orders for next week, from 7:30 to 8:00, for Senate intern introductions, by Ms. Vir-Banks, Jeremy De Nivea and David Velasquez.

Ms. Pasco said she would also like to schedule another Special Order from 8:00 to 8:30 by the Dean of Students, Jonathan Poullard, to talk about the social change model of leadership. It was so moved and seconded by Ms. Ude and Mr. Mairena and passed with no objection.

A motion to approve the agenda for the October 1 meeting was made and seconded by Ms. Ude and Ms. Tran. **THE AGENDA FOR THE OCTOBER 1 MEETING, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

#### GUEST ANNOUNCEMENTS

Igor Tregub introduced himself said he wanted to commend the Senate. Senate alums and others were still getting minutes from Mr. Litwak and Mr. Tregub said he's been following the Senate. So he could say that this Senate has been the best Senate yet that he knew of. They were certainly doing a much better job than his Senate was doing four weeks into the semester.

Mr. Tregub said he's been involved in the ASUC for four years, and in the last two years he became a Berkeley City official on the Labor Commission. In that capacity, he and others have done everything in their power to try and lower the barrier of access between the student population and the City of Berkeley. He was running for the Berkeley Rent Board as part of a pro-tenant slate and would pass around some literature.

Students make up 20-25% of the Berkeley population and the Rent Board was there to keep housing affordable and to mitigate the housing crisis in Berkeley and Bay Area wide. The Rent Board was there to fight for people's rights as tenants and to make sure that they're aware of those rights. If people had any questions about any rent situation facing them or someone they knew, he would ask them to please not hesitate to send him an e-mail.

Mr. Tregub said he also wanted to talk about getting new blood into the City of Berkeley and before the City Council. The median age in the City of Berkeley was 28. But if they walk into a City Council meeting, the median age of Councilmembers was closer to 50 or 55. So there was a definite disparity. He would ask them to encourage everyone they know who lived in Berkeley to register to vote there. Young people should be represented in the City. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by five minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Ude and Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

Mr. Tregub several young people were running for the City Council and in the next couple of weeks he'll try his best to introduce the Senate to one of them, Jesse Arreguin, who's running for District 4, downtown Berkeley. Mr. Tregub said that Mr. Arreguin actually inspired him to deal with and educate himself about City issues. This wasn't a partisan statement, but a call for Senators to educate themselves on all the candidates and propositions on the ballot.

Many, many battles have been won with 20 people showing up to a City Council meeting. If every Senator went to a Tuesday City Council meeting, they would have a very good chance of winning a battle that students really cared about. And if they brought a friend, with 40 people there, they'd scare the living daylight out of a lot of current Councilmembers. If there was anything he could do to answer questions about the City of Berkeley or how the ASUC and the City could work together more actively, he would ask them to send him an e-mail, at [itregub@gmail.com](mailto:itregub@gmail.com) He called for any questions.

Ms. Ude asked what "rent control" was. Mr. Tregub said it's essentially a rent ceiling that stabilizes the rent for long-time residents. The City of Berkeley was one of the few remaining cities in the State of California that has a rent control ordinance. There are about 4,600 units in Berkeley, essentially apartment units, that tenants live in. Out of those, 2,200 to 2,400 units were under rent control. Rent for those units would not be substantively increased in coming years. It would increase a little based on inflation by an annual general adjustment between 1-6% every year. It was a way to make sure that the people who make just barely enough to make ends meet or making less than the median income. In Berkeley, the median income for a family of three was about \$50,000. If people make less than that, rent was really expensive there. Rent control was a way to keep the talents of the people who were there and prevent them from being priced out of the City.

Ms. Pasco said she would like to thank Mr. Tregub for his announcement. Mr. Tregub said he would like to thank them for their time.

Roll call was taken for attendance.

MEMBERS LEGALLY PRESENT:

Sheila Chen	Eddie Nahabet	Will Smelko
Sarah Cho	Christina Oatfield	Lisa Tran
Meghana Dhar	Tommy Owens	Tu Tran
Mary June Flores	Tara Raffi	Obiamaka Ude
Saira Hussain	Claudia Rodriguez	Stephanie Yang
Oscar Mairena	Lyell Sakaue	Yishi Zuo
John Moghtader	Kifah Shah	

REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ASUC

Report from the UCPD Liaison

Sgt. Tucker said he would hand out two of the UCPD's most recent Crime Alerts. A third Crime Alert was available that he didn't print out. All three were available on the UCPD Web site. The third one had to do with an arson on Sproul Plaza on the 23rd, at about 11:45 p.m. Someone lit one of the round kiosks for posting. They had a couple of leads on that and it was under investigation.

What was on many people's minds, and on the Chancellor's mind, was the incident at Dwinelle Hall and the bus stop by Eshleman. The Chancellor issued a statement on the 22nd that was reported in the Daily Cal and other newspapers. In the statement, the Chancellor states:

“Deplorable acts of hate are the antithesis of the University community. As a center of higher learning, we must stand in opposition to such acts and strive to promote a climate of understanding and acceptance of all groups on campus.

Our discourse must be both open and civil. I call on all of us to join together against cowardly acts of hatred and to reflect the ideal of that global community here on our campus.”

Sgt. Tucker said that in no way was this type of crime was in any way productive towards resolving these problems and issues. This was an issue the campus and the Police Department took very seriously.

Sgt. Tucker said that there were only seven bicycle thefts in the past week as opposed to 13 last week. He thought part of that was due to the fact that they made two arrests of bicycle theft suspects. On the 18th, at about 5 p.m., a UCPD officer was on patrol at Shattuck and Allston and saw someone pushing two bicycles and decided to talk to that person. At about the same time, someone on campus called and

said they just saw somebody cutting a cable on a bicycle. They talked to the person, who said he forgot his key. The person who called the police didn't believe the story and described the person and the bicycle, and was able to come out and verify the person who was stopped was the same person they saw cutting the cable. That individual was arrested for possession of stolen property and theft. That person was also on probation, and the DA is charging several felonies. So that was a big success from the police standpoint. The other incident was on the 21st. An officer, at about 4:30 p.m., at the Unit 2 courtyard, saw someone trying to steal a bicycle, which also had a cable lock. An arrest was made, and that person was found to be in possession of controlled substance and burglary tools. But there were still seven bicycle thefts that past week, so the police will keep looking.

Sgt. Tucker said that on the 19th, at about 2 a.m., the UCPD and COB police both responded to 2710 Durant for a report with a man with shotgun inside the house. The house was evacuated and the officers made contact and discovered that the person was probably a danger to themselves more than anything else. The person's associates had already separated him from the firearm. That person was retained for mental health evaluation. There were no injuries.

Also on Thursday, the 19th, at about 8 a.m., there was burglary and Mulford Hall, on the northwest corner of the campus. A campus employee coming in for work in the morning discovered someone walking out with her laptop and called the police. The police responded quickly but unfortunately, the person had already left the area. But on 5 o'clock on Friday an officer at People's Park recalled the description of that morning's burglary, saw someone matching the description, made contact, and was able to arrest that person because they had warrants for other crimes. After investigation they were able to determine that this was the same person who stole the laptop in the morning.

Sgt. Tucker said that last week he got several questions about bicycles and he had some data on bike citations and collisions. He'll e-mail that to the Senate. Finally, the UCPD was looking forward to the home football game against Colorado State. Hopefully they'll have a victory and everyone will be safe and have a good time at the game. He would ask Senators to not drink if they're under 21 and show up at the football. If they're over 21, he would remind them to drink responsibility. He called for any questions.

Ms. Cho asked how the UCPD decided which crimes would be made into a crime alert. Sgt. Tucker said they look at things geographically, that are in a crime detail area. That includes campus property and campus housing. It also included areas immediately adjacent to University property. So geography was involved. But it was also the type of crime. He believed the line was drawn based on FBI standards for reportable incidents. He wasn't sure, but it was based on FBI standards.

Ms. Pasco said that seeing no further questions, she would like to thank Sgt. Tucker. (Applause)

#### Report From The Chancellor's Designee

Mr. Poullard said he would like to suspend the rules so he could engage Senators. A motion to enter into a committee of the whole was made and was seconded by Ms. Tran and passed with no objection.

This meeting entered into a committee of the whole. Mr. Poullard asked to go around the room and ask for a one-word statement about the hate crime events.

Back in regular session, Mr. Poullard said his two words would be “weary,” and yet “hopeful.”

Mr. Poullard said that since last week, he has been engaged with many people in the room and he would like to thank all the Senators and Executive Officers who have met with him to express their feelings. He’s had more meetings with more community members than he would want to over these issues: issues of graffiti, hate speech, intimidation, and harassment. Just that day, when he left to come to the Senate meeting, he got a call from the Executive Director of Hillel to let him know that yet more graffiti has appeared on the campus and was now at the other side of the campus, at the Valley Life Sciences Building, with a huge anti-Israel statement. Clearly, something was amiss in their own community.

Mr. Poullard said at the core of this, even in this room, something he felt when he was in this room, was that this body of people has not learned how to talk to each other.

Mr. Poullard said he wanted to talk about the “snaps” that people give. They disturbed him to his core; not when something positive happened, but how they snapped to disagree with each other. It was basically passive-aggressive behavior and told the person being snapped on, “f-you.” He’s been there for two years and five months, and that’s bugged him since the day he got there. It felt very alienating when people were on the receiving end of that when it's done in the negative.

Mr. Poullard said his concern for this community is that they had to figure out the “how” of their behavior. They can take issue with each other and disagree, but how they do that, what that would look like, had to be decided as a Senate. If the Senate didn't get it, their peers wouldn't get it done. Their peers were looking to the Senate for leadership and watching what Senators do with each other as the example of what was supposed to happen in the broader community. If the Senate couldn't do it, he'd ask how they rest of the community to do it.

Mr. Poullard said he was committed to a dialogue. Not a discussion, debate, or tit-for-tat, but a dialogue. And that meant understanding. People didn't have to like what others said, or agree, but he needed to hear them. If they couldn't, then they couldn't have community. And that’s what they now had. They're only in week 5, and he would ask what happens in December, February, and April, if they haven't figured this out as a community.

Mr. Poullard said that he’s met with Senators, with Executive Officers, and with four different student organizations. Luckily, all of them were willing to come to the table of dialogue. That’s why he was hopeful, because at least they can begin to figure out what the common ground was. If they could figure that out, then they could figure out rules of engagement. And if they have rules of engagement, then they could hold each other accountable to those rules, in the Senate and on the campus. What he saw happening was a few folks doing dangerous stuff and no one was speaking out in students’ name that that not happen. For him, that’s what needed to happen. And he wasn't talking about one conversation, but several, over time, for people to think critically about how they move as a community. They had work to do.

Mr. Poullard said he would give them good news. They should be very proud of Mr. Tran, who pulled together a meeting that day in his office to talk about book adoptions with five other Senators and AAVP folks. They have a strategy. Every two weeks before the book adoption deadline, which was October 15

and April 15, there will be a student-run campaign to increase the level of adoptions by faculty, thus saving students money, allowing them to buy used books as opposed to new books.

Mr. Poullard said this was huge. There was now a 21% adoption rate. Even if it got to 35%, that would be huge and would save students tons of money. He asked the AAVP to make sure there was continuity with this from year-to-year, so there's a process for the ASUC to work with the Bookstore to make sure that they all have a way of working with the broader community and their faculty peers to get this done. Mr. Poullard said he thought one of the most effective things to be done was if students spent their time and energy talking to faculty directly. Think of what the response would be if 2,000 students gave their faculty a flier and asking them to please adopt their books by October 15, a personal plea. When faculty do that, the cost of books goes down. So that was huge good news.

Mr. Poullard said they'll also be happy to know that the Vice Chancellors Advisory Committee approved the \$10,000 for insurance for student group liability. They'll also be happy to know that the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs approved \$15,000 for dances on campus for the year. That will be a part of the dance policy process. When groups go to try and have events on campus, the security will be paid for. So that won't be a barrier any more for why people couldn't have events on campus as opposed to off-campus.

Finally, Mr. Poullard said they got a space for prayer for Muslim students on the campus. That took him almost two years to do and to figure out both for Friday prayer and for daily prayers, from 11:00 to 5:00, when people sort of stop in for a brief time to reflect and then move on. As they knew, the Tilden Room was what that space was supposed to, for all faith positions on the campus. But as the campus grew, that space could no longer be used for that purpose. UCSD had a phenomenal space on its campus, almost 2,000 square feet for any student to go to, reflect, or mediate, or do whatever they do. There was no such space on this campus, and that was something that was sorely missing. They'll monitor this new space over the course of the semester and see how that goes. But he was very happy that it's finally gotten some traction. He called for any questions.

Ms. Oatfield asked where the prayer space was located. Mr. Poullard said the space for Friday prayer, which was usually 300 people, will be in the Hearst Gymnasium. These students had been paying about \$400 a month to hold that prayer service at the YWCA. The daily ones will take place in Dwinelle. They identified a space they feel will work. It's kind of out of the way, is semi-private, respectful, and wasn't being used. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by five minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Shah and Ms. Oatfield and passed with no objection.

Mr. Moghtader said he appreciated the powerful and meaningful things the Dean said. When the Dean talked about dialogue with the Senate, he asked if Mr. Poullard was talking about one issue in particular or about a slew of issues. Mr. Poullard said this was his third Senate and he's never seen them all be so disrespectful to one another, ever, and has never seen them use Robert's Rules to be nasty to each other as much as has happened that year, or to use their speaking time, even in Announcements, to basically have a dialogue without a dialogue. It suggests that they don't have ways to engage each other they can agree to that was respectful. Events over the course of the last week have just heightened this situation, and how they hold themselves accountable when those kinds of things happen, especially when they have people watching them do that. That's what he was referring to.

Ms. Pasco said she would like to thank Mr. Poullard for his report. (Applause)

Report from the ASUC Store Operations Board

Mr. Permaul said he wanted to echo much of what the Dean of Students said, and to thank him for his efforts. They worked together to try and find space for prayers on campus, for both a daily basis and for Friday prayers, and were delighted to have that accomplished.

Mr. Permaul said that when he teaches his American Cultures class in Rhetoric, when they talk about the Native American people, they talk about the concept of reciprocity. The Dean was talking about how they engage each other in a mature and substantive fashion, where they respect each other even if they disagree. He was all about reaching across different aisles, and he would encourage people to listen to the Dean.

On Saturday there's an opportunity, "Fill the Bus," to help the food banks in the City of Berkeley and the East Bay to provide food as the winter season approaches. The Daily Cal, the ASUC, and AC Transit were working on a joint Harvest Festival. There will be an AC Transit bus on Sproul Plaza, and the goal was to fill it with canned food for people in the East Bay who will need it this winter. He would urge people to contact their student groups about this and make sure the bus was filled.

Mr. Permaul said Sen. Tran was at the meeting last week of the Academic Senate Committee on Student Affairs, along with the ASUC President, the Dean of Students, the Associate Director of the Auxiliary, who represented the Auxiliary when Mr. Permaul said he was in Pullman, and other students. He thought what came out of that was that there will be a bill in the Senate on adoptions. The critical issue was mobilization. If last year's ASUC Pres. Nguyen was there, he would say it was about community organizing. Students need to get themselves together to encourage the campus, the Administration and particularly the faculty, to get on this bandwagon. There was less than 20% adoptions a year ago that fall, and just over 20% for the spring. That meant that 80% of textbook adoptions that would make it possible for the ASUC Bookstore to go out into the national market and buy used books were not available to Berkeley students. That was not acceptable. So they need to galvanize students to make sure that the campus did the right thing. Mr. Permaul said AVC Coley, his immediate boss, was also convening a group that met with the State auditors that past year, and they're going to review all procedures of the Bookstore and the rest of campus to ensure that they're all doing what they could to make sure adoptions take place.

Mr. Permaul said this was not exclusive to the Student Store, and they also share their adoptions with Ned's and any other bookstore willing to provide books to all students. Ned's is the Nebraska Book Corporation, a major company like Follett. It's okay to compete for book sales, which hopefully keeps prices down. But it's not good when faculty members decide they're not going to share their adoptions with one or another bookstore for ideological or personal reasons. They sometimes send students hither and yon to buy books because faculty weren't willing to provide them to the ASUC Bookstore, Ned's, or somebody else. The campus needs to make sure all book adoptions come to, at minimum, the ASUC Bookstore, but also to the other major bookstores in the area.

Regarding building hours, Mr. Permaul said October 1 was coming and they'll have a new security system. People should be sure that they and their student groups are signed up. He was also looking to spend out of Auxiliary reserves. As he's mentioned, a substantial amount of money will be spent to put in security on the floors themselves. He just couldn't tackle this problem any other way. They had to ensure the safety of students in Eshleman, especially since people were there around the clock.

The Store Operations Board met on Tuesday and he wanted to thank Senators for attending. They had a three and-a-half hour meeting. It was a great meeting and they got a lot of work done.

The Daily Cal General Manager, Editor-in-Chief, and two members of the paper's Board of Directors spoke to the SOB about the pending fiscal crisis facing the paper. There was a long discussion and questions, and then later, in closed session, discussion of terms the ASUC would make to the Daily Cal about ways to help protect and save the paper as a major entity on the campus and an independent student activity. When they came out of closed session, the Board made a proposal. Mr. Permaul said he's been working on it that day and it was sent out to ASUC Officers for their review. He'll send it to the Daily Cal on Thursday. It will help the paper get through this crisis by May of 2009.

The Board listened in closed session to terms and conditions from Tully's Coffee. Tully's is proposing to build a lovely kiosk by the base of the stairs on the 2nd floor of the Student Union, with tables, chairs, and umbrellas, and serve quality coffee and some food. It will be called "Student Central at the ASUC," right out in front of the Plaza. People will be able to hang out on the deck. The Board voted to give him authority to work on a letter of intent, and later, on a contract. The vote was unanimous and Mr. Permaul said he was truly grateful for that support.

Regarding Kaplan testing service, Mr. Permaul said the Board listened in closed session to terms from Kaplan. Board members were extremely pleased, particularly about offering Pell Grants students a substantial discount in order to take entire courses. They're still negotiating. Kaplan would come into the space that was going to be occupied by STA Travel, which has departed from the campus. That will increase the amount of rent for that space, and Kaplan will also rent rooms in the Student Union during the day, when students don't use them, bringing in additional revenue to students.

Regarding Campus Link, people might have read the article in *The Daily Planet* or heard some rumors about Campus Link leaving. The article was as erroneous and fictitious as could possibly be imagined. None of the reasons cited in the article as to why the Auxiliary asked the Campus Link to leave were accurate. Campus Link has been in violation for over a year of the campus Fire Marshall's edict to put in proper fire protection measures at that site, because of the electronics and the computers there. Campus Link promised last October to spend \$15,000 to do so and a year later, none of it was done. Campus Link was also in arrears in its rent. The Auxiliary has told them to please remove their equipment and restore the location to the condition it was before. The Auxiliary will work with the Daily Cal to put in an information kiosk and plasma screens.

Regarding technology sales in the Student Union, the Auxiliary was working on that as well with IS&T, The Scholar's Workstation, and Follett. They're still negotiating how it would take place. It would bring millions of dollars in business to the Cal Student Store, which would mean more revenue for the students.

Regarding the Brazil Café, the original location that was being proposed was no longer viable because the campus wouldn't allow water to be brought there. So the Auxiliary was looking at another location, still on the western deck of the Student Union. He fully intended to get the Brazil Café there.

They're also still working with the Bear's Lair Pub to expand and do a variety of other things. Finally, Mr. Permaul said he wanted to say Go Bears, beat Colorado State! He called for any questions.

Ms. Ude said that in reference to book adoptions, some departments send students to smaller bookstores, for ideological reasons that were very closely related to the department. She asked if the committee

working on this would be willing to work with these bookstores. Some professors work closely with those bookstores, some of which have historical significance to communities. She asked if that could be conveyed. Mr. Permaul said he absolutely would convey it. The goal was to be inclusive, not exclusive, and make sure that adoptions get to everybody. They want to have the widest set of adoptions, and they strongly support small businesses in the community and want to make sure adoptions get to them.

Ms. Pasco said she would like to thank Mr. Permaul for his report. (Applause)

-----  
Begin written report from Auxiliary Director Permaul

September 24, 2008

ASUC Senate: Auxiliary Director  
Store Operations Board Report

The next meeting of the Store Operations Board is on September 23, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. in either the Senate Chambers or another location to be determined. Please consider attending.

I have updates for you on issues relating to the business enterprises and services of the ASUC and the Auxiliary:

Tonight's Special Order: Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom of Administration. Here is the Vice Chancellor's bio:

<http://administration.berkeley.edu/about/vcbio.htm>

1. Building Hours and Security for Eshleman Hall and MLK, Jr. Union:

The clock is ticking and October 1 will be here sooner than later. Please be sure that you have your application completed for access to the building, if you have not already done it, and be sure your students groups have also signed up.

2. Store Operations Board Meeting:

First I want to thank all of the members of the ASUC Senate who made an appearance at, or stayed for the whole meeting, of the Store Operations Board. This was the largest showing by members of the Senate in my tenure here, I was truly grateful for the level of the engagement. The meeting last night was also the longest of my tenure here at the ASUC, almost 3.5 hours. Here are the issues that were discussed and acted upon:

The Daily Californian: The Daily Cal's General Manager, Editor-in-Chief, and two members of their Board of Directors, spoke to the Store Operations Board about the current fiscal crisis facing the newspaper and made a proposal for the ASUC to assist them through the crisis. The Board took their presentation very seriously, asked thoughtful questions about their current financial status and the prospects for the future. Then the Board went into closed session to discuss what if any terms they would want in an amendment with the Daily Cal. I was directed to take those terms, once agreed upon in open session, and to put them into a proposal. The bottom line is that

-----  
 Written report from Auxiliary Director Permaul

the ASUC feels it has a vested interest in protecting one of the symbols of student independence on the campus, and had made an offer to the DC that would assist them through the term of their current contract, May of 2009.

Tully's Coffee: The Board reviewed a rendering submitted by Tully's Coffee for location of a coffee booth/kiosk at the base of the staircase in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Student Union, 2nd floor. For those who need some directions, this is the staircase located off the entrance to the Union at Sproul Plaza, and before you get to the Heller Lounge and Multicultural Center. The Board also reviewed the terms of a proposed Letter of Intent with Tully's in closed session. In open session, they voted to accept the terms, and direct the Auxiliary to move forward with contract negotiations and physical assessment of the plan with the campus.

Kaplan's Testing Service: The Board discussed a proposal submitted by Kaplan's Testing Service to move into space that had originally been allocated to STA Travel when they moved to make way for Panda Express's proposed restaurant. The Board discussed the terms proposed by Kaplan's in closed session, and then voted in open session to have the ASUC Auxiliary move forward with Kaplan letting them know that we are prepared to offer them the site if we can negotiate acceptable terms. The Daily Cal wrote a story about this matter today and it was published at this link:

[http://www.dailycal.org/article/102758/kaplan\\_seeks\\_to\\_occupy\\_vacant\\_business\\_space\\_in\\_lo](http://www.dailycal.org/article/102758/kaplan_seeks_to_occupy_vacant_business_space_in_lo)

Campus Link: The ASUC Auxiliary has put Campus Link on notice that they are in violation of the campus fire marshal assessment given to them over one year ago. They had agreed to spend \$15,000 in October of 2007 to correct the deficiency, but have never done so. They are also in arrears in their rent to the ASUC. We have advised them that they are in violation, and are asking them to restore the space they occupy to the condition it was in prior to their installation.

Technology Sales at the Student Union: The ASUC Auxiliary, Information Systems & Technology, and Follett are working together to transition the sale of individual computers, software, peripherals, and other technology to the Cal Student Store. The details are still in the planning stage, and when they are more clear, I will share them with you. Right now, The Scholar's Work Station is the technology provider on the campus and we are working them on all the issues on how the business will transition to the Union.

Brazil Café: The proposed location for the Brazil Café will have to change. We will be working with the owners on assessing a new site, proximate to the other one on the deck of the student union, facing Lower Sproul.

3. Special Orders: Tonight, Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom at 8:00 p.m.

Intercollegiate Athletic Director Sandy Barbour is scheduled on Wednesday October 15, from 7:30 to 8:00 p.m. on the goals of that large student program, and how the ASUC could work more closely with Athletics. Recall that student government once managed athletics, so it would be natural for there to be a strong connection between the two programs.

-----  
Written report from Auxiliary Director Permaul and

4. ASUC and CLL Student Advising Collaboration:

Beginning with a pilot presentation on September 18, student groups will be able to get an in-depth seminar on scheduling special events, named "Events 101." Already over 20 student groups have signed up for this class that will be presented by the Office of Campus Life and Leadership in conjunction with the ASUC Office of Student Affairs and Student Union Director Peter Quintin, who is responsible for reservations. Students who go through the training will receive a certificate of completion and will be entitled to special privileges associated with setting up events, including priority access. Student groups interested in signing up for this new and innovative training should contact Amanda Carleton at CLL. The goal of this training is to help student groups prepare for project management through learning how to run successful campus events. Marketing and promotion will also be presented, budgeting, learning how to choose the right venue, and other useful information. I urge you to promote this program to your student groups. The first class was a success with over 30 students attending. The next training will be planned for November.

5. The Campaign for Berkeley:

I understand the ASUC participation in the kick-off dinner was very successful. I was told that the alumni were truly delighted to be able to socialize and meet members of student government. I hope you will share the pictures with me.

Please feel free to send me an e-mail to ask follow up questions. Of course, you are always welcome to write me, or visit during my office hours (Thursdays from 2:30 to 3:30 p.m.), or to schedule a time that would be convenient to you.

Submitted by: Nadesan Permaul  
Director of the ASUC Auxiliary

End written report from Auxiliary Director Permaul  
-----

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY -- Presentation on the Campus Budget by Vice Chancellor  
Nathan Brostrom

Mr. Permaul said the Berkeley campus was incredibly fortunate to have Vice Chancellor Brostrom as the person in charge of their finances and of overseeing administration. Before coming to the campus he served for ten years as the Managing Director of the Western Region Public Finance Group of J.P. Morgan, where he worked on financing totaling \$100 billion for municipal finances throughout the western states. Vice Chancellor Brostrom served as lead banker for an \$11.3 billion bond program for California water resources and has worked for higher education and cultural institutions including Stanford, the Cal

State System, and the California community college system. Vice Chancellor Brostrom graduated Phi Beta Kappa at Stanford, holds a Master's degree in Public and International Affairs from the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton. He and his wife, who teaches on campus, live in this community and have six children. He would like to introduce Vice Chancellor Nathan Brostrom. (Applause)

Mr. Brostrom said it was good to see them. He knew many familiar faces and he looked forward to meeting the rest of them that school year. He's the Vice Chancellor of Administration and he has been on campus two and a half years. It's been a wonderful, challenging, and very fulfilling experience. He comes from a background in budget and finance. He was in banking and worked in California State government, the State Treasurer's Office for four years.

A lot of his portfolio covered administrative services, everything from University Health Services, human services, the Police Department, Athletics, the ASUC Auxiliary, and Rec Sports. It was a very rewarding and interesting job. He'd be happy after his talk to take questions on any number of issues. He wanted to focus on a long-range view of the State budget.

Mr. Brostrom said that when the Chancellor brought him on to campus, the Chancellor asked him to take a look at the finances of UC Berkeley and give his assessment. After about a year, the phrase that he came up with was that their finances are solid, but not sustainable. He'll talk a lot about the competitive environment they find themselves in and how their financial model will have to transform over the coming years in order to stay competitive and offer the comprehensive excellence people were currently enjoying.

Mr. Brostrom said that UC Berkeley really was in a very unique position in higher education. One reason he was drawn to the campus was that they combine excellence at the highest level and compete with the top five universities for academic excellence, no matter how they do the ranking. And yet they combine that with a strong commitment to access for all Californians. One way they measure access is by the number of Pell Grants recipients on campus. To get a Pell Grant in California one's family must have income roughly between \$40-45,000 or less, depending on the size of the family and how many students they had in college. At UC Berkeley, about 33% of its student body are Pell Grant eligible and get Pell Grants. The only school of their size that had more was UCLA, at about 37%. Comparing that with peers UC Berkeley competes with for top faculty and graduate students, places like Stanford, Princeton, or Harvard, their numbers of Pell Grant students was much, much lower. Princeton was about 8%, Harvard about 10%, and Stanford about 12%. They actually have more Pell Grant recipients on the Berkeley campus than the entire Ivy League combined. That's a commitment to the combination of excellence and access. But it's a very different financial model from the places they compete with for this comprehensive excellence.

Mr. Brostrom said he really wanted to talk about how their financial model was changing over time, and some of the measures they're going to have to take in order to preserve both that excellence and that commitment to access. The slides he had would demonstrate that.

A couple of their public peers, also strong universities, have made a different choice. He didn't fault them, but at the University of Michigan about 12% of their undergrads are Pell Grant recipients. Virginia was less than 10%. What happened to them is that they hit a fiscal crisis much earlier than UC did. As they know, Michigan is basically a one-industry state. When the auto industry started to decline in the early '90s, their funding for higher education really dipped. Michigan gets less than 10% of its funds

now from the State of Michigan. What they chose to do was basically give up a lot of their commitment to access and opened up their environment to out-of-State students, all of whom pay Ivy League-type tuitions. About 40% of undergrads at the University of Michigan come from out-of-state. At UC, they have a strong commitment that no more than 10% come from out-of-State. What UM basically did was sacrifice low-income kids from Michigan for richer, out-of-State students. That was a path Berkeley chose not to go down.

Mr. Brostrom said the next slide demonstrates all of the challenges they face. About 30 years ago more than half of their funds came from the State of California, 53%. Two years ago it was 30%. And after the stagnation in the State budget this last year, the number this year will be more like 27%.

What has made that up is tuition. During that time, tuition, as a percent, has doubled during that time. Private gifts, grants, and contracts have more than quadrupled over that same period. And yet, their funding mix still was about the same. They still spend about 60% on core teaching and research.

One myth that was out there was that the State was actually defunding UC Berkeley. If they look at it on an absolute basis, in terms of absolute dollars, State funding has largely kept pace with inflation over the past 30 years. They got about \$500 million from the State. In absolute terms, that was about the same as it was about 30 years. So the State has largely kept up with the Consumer Price Index.

The problem was that the cost of education has risen at a much more dramatic rate than the CPI. They have something in higher education called "HEPI," the Higher Education Price Index. It averages about 2% higher than the CPI. So if they look at it compared to their costs, it is grossly inflated.

On a per-student basis, State funding has declined. So on an absolute level, even though they're still getting about the same, they have many, many more students and costs have gone up much more dramatically.

One reason higher education was much more expensive than the CPI was that a lot of their basic research and teaching costs have gone up. The main component of their cost is payroll, and all the things that go into payroll, such as higher health insurance.

Berkeley is compared to its main peers, and the ones they compete with most, "SHYMP," are Stanford, Harvard, Yale, MIT, and Princeton. People always point and say, "Well, UC fees have gone up dramatically." And they have, on a percentage basis, and have doubled in the last 20 years. But if they look at it in terms of absolute dollars, Berkeley's main peers have gone up from roughly \$20,000 to close to \$35,000, in absolute dollars. So while Berkeley's went up in absolute dollars by \$3,000, their peers went up by almost \$15,000 during that time. If anybody in the room was pre-law and wanted to take on an anti-trust case, they could see from the slide how their peers' tuitions have tracked together. It's a perfect example of collusion.

Probably the biggest growth of their peers was of endowments. Mr. Brostrom said they might have read about this in the paper because it's been getting a lot of inquiry and a lot of skepticism in Congress. One way he liked to look at the growth of endowment and think about Berkeley's competitive disadvantage was to take their State appropriation, about \$500 million last year, and roll that up into an endowment. An "endowment" is funds they've set aside and have a payout from every year, that they use to fund their operations.

A normal payout for an endowment is about 4.5%. They get \$500 million from the State, and if they had a \$500 million payout from an endowment, they'd need an endowment of about \$11 billion to fund that annually. As they could see from the slide, up until the early '90s, their State appropriation was a huge competitive advantage to Berkeley. No one had an endowment that was anywhere close to \$10 billion. But starting in the early '90s, Harvard, based on prodigious capital campaigns and also on incredible returns on their endowment, shot past Berkeley. Harvard was now at \$36 billion.

In the early part of this decade, Yale, Stanford, and Princeton all passed them. Yale's endowment is about \$24 billion, Stanford and Princeton in the high teens, and MIT is close to passing Berkeley. So just as a measure of comparison, the payout of the Stanford endowment alone was about \$300 million higher than Berkeley's State appropriation at this time, even though Stanford has a fraction of the number of students that Berkeley has.

Berkeley's endowment was about \$3 billion, and adding that to the \$11 billion "endowment," Berkeley was close to \$15 billion. So they're still able to be competitive. But they're competing for faculty, top grads, and researchers. The problem was extrapolating that out for ten years. The reason he told the Chancellor it wasn't sustainable is because their peers' endowments are growing at rates of growth that were close to 10% every year. They use as a proxy for the growth of endowment of 8.5, 9, 10%. Their State funding, in the best of times, keeps up with inflation. So it might be 3%, or 4%. This year it was 0%. And next year wasn't looking good.

If they extrapolate this out for ten years, and their peers are having double-digit growth rates and Berkeley's was basically flat, that wedge will become unsustainable and they wouldn't be able to maintain the level of excellence that they now enjoy.

Mr. Brostrom said that on a per-student basis, it's even more dramatic. In the last decade Berkeley's per-student revenues have barely grown, when adjusted for inflation, and was about \$20,000. A couple of years ago Princeton had more than \$100,000 per student, between tuition, fees, and endowment. Stanford, Harvard, and Yale are at many multiples than Berkeley has on a per-student basis.

Mr. Brostrom said he has been developing this model and has made several presentations. His counterpart at Stanford, Randy Livingston, a good friend, had been making a similar analysis. Mr. Livingston made a presentation at a national forum that basically showed the same thing. Mr. Livingston was making it from another perspective, in that a lot of these privates were really worried that Congress may take a look at their tax-exempt status or at their endowment payout rates and take some action.

The slide showed a bar chart with the bars on the far left being the SHYMP schools; the six public schools were the middle bars and included UC Berkeley and UCLA. The bars on the far right were ten of the privates, including most of the Ivy League, Chicago, Washington U. What Mr. Livingston did was to look at all these resources, endowment, research, and State appropriation, and he asked what the share was of financial resources.

If they look at Stanford, the five schools on the far left of the chart, they were at about 28% in the early '80s. That has grown to about 42% of all those resources by 2007. That has come primarily at the expense of the publics. The publics went down from 35% to now, 23%. And there are publics like Virginia, Michigan, and even U of Washington that have taken far bigger hits in terms of their State support ASUC Berkeley has. But it's also that the other privates haven't done that well. They've kept largely the

same, but have actually lost a couple of percentage points. So it really was becoming, as a lot of sectors were, a winner-take-all kind of industry, where the five SHYMP schools are outpacing not only publics, but many other privates in their financial resources. That also translates into their academic prowess.

This is even more dramatic when Mr. Livingston compared Stanford to Cal. They could see these were the same resources. In the early '90s, they had relatively the same financial resources as Stanford. Berkeley had more students, but on a resource basis, they were about the same. Now, Stanford has more than doubled, and has almost tripled, the amount of resources in these areas. Mr. Brostrom said he had to give Mr. Livingston credit as he really played this out at the national conference, and what was amazing was that the correlation between financial resources and academic ratings was pretty strong. In the 1980s Berkeley was the number 1 rated school in terms of its faculty academic reputation. They could see the correlation on the slide, on the Y-axis. The X-axis was financial resources. In 1984 they could see that Berkeley was number 1, Stanford was number 2, and they still were doing pretty well in terms of financial resources. But the next slide showed the same chart in 2007, and the line has gotten tighter. The one outlier in this case, Berkeley, dropped to number 2 in the rankings. They've fallen to number 16 in its financial resources ranking. But they're still number 2 in terms of academic reputation. So their academic excellence has remained even though they're slipping in terms of their financial resources.

There's a lot of hypothesis as to why academic reputation remains high while financial resources decreases. A lot of that had to do with faculty loyalty, real commitment to public education, public service, and Berkeley's ability to attract top grad students, who might get a better package at other places.

Mr. Brostrom said that his concern was that if they do this again in 20 years, and if Berkeley continued to lose in financial resources, they may not be able to maintain this kind of outlier status. So his goal was that they still stay in the top 1, 2, or 3 in terms of academic rankings, but they're able to increase their financial resources.

Mr. Brostrom said he'll talk about four things they're doing to address these challenges, and touch on several others. The four include new approaches to budgeting. The second is more aggressive use of the school's debt. Third is better asset liability management. And finally, which was apropos that evening because they just launched a campaign, was to increase private philanthropy to maintain Berkeley's academic excellence.

The next slide showed something that startled him when he came to Berkeley. He had come from private universities and colleges and other not-for-profits around the country, and Berkeley's budgeting process really surprised him. They are a \$1.7 billion enterprise and yet all spring they focus on a budget process that really only looked at the incremental budget, the additional amount of money that they had from the State every year. Once they had all the things they had to pay, like faculty, merit, utilities, they were talking about talked about maybe many \$40-50 million on a budget of \$1.7 billion. No one ever looked back at what they were doing in their core. All they looked at was the incremental budget in terms of parsing up to what they were doing going forward.

One thing they're in the third year of doing, and actually Jonathan Poullard and his group were the pilot and did a terrific job, was that they are looking at activity-based budgeting. When they make new budget requests, they should look at all the things they do and prioritize those as compared with the new requests. That is a much healthier and a much more prudent way of doing budgets. This is being rolled out to the entire campus. When they think about it, there are a lot of sectors where it's an absolute necessity. In information technology, e.g., several million dollars can be spent on a new IT system, and at the

same time they should be able to achieve savings by phasing out old systems and possibly even achieving some personal savings.

The other thing that was part of this budget process was to look at all funds. It used to be that people only looked at the State funds. They didn't look at philanthropy, or look at research or grants. Those were kept sort of sacrosanct, and apart. And now they're saying no, that in order to do this holistically and in order to provide a good comprehensive picture of the campus' financial state, they had to include all these funds in budgeting.

He wasn't casting aspersions, but there was also an undue level of what he would call "hoarding," in that because the State budget was so volatile, what happened was that when people had discrepancy money, they would put it aside and save it for a rainy day or a downturn in their funds. On a budget of \$1.7 billion, Berkeley actually had reserve funds that were invested in short-term instruments of about \$600 million. And there was no need. And these sort of grew inexorably, in good times and bad. In the early part of this decade the money that was being pull aside was still going up, even though people were taking operational cuts. So they weren't even being used for a rainy day.

So the campus started to work at adopting a more prudent reserve policy and using those funds for a better purpose. One thing that made this possible is that they really needed to open up and make the budget transparent. That's because the only way to get people to follow incentives and follow better budgeting practices was if they were open, clean, and trustworthy on what the overall state is. So Mr. Brostrom said they've been going to any group that would have them and talking about the budget and about the challenges.

Mr. Brostrom said the other area came from his past life as a banker. The University was not really following best practices in terms of its balance management. This was largely because for most of its history, it was a State institution. So they viewed themselves as sort of an income driven institution and had debt practices that really looked solely to their net income in terms of bonding. But if they look at it, they're more of a hybrid. They're not a private, like Harvard, but they're not solely relying on year-by-year income, like a community college. Berkeley has a fairly sizable endowment and other assets that they could leverage.

The University can issue tax-exempt debt that an investor buys and doesn't have to pay taxes on, either federal or State. It's one of the few, but most powerful tools that Congress has given to colleges and universities. Berkeley's private peers use that to the max. Harvard has about \$3 billion of outstanding debt and Stanford has close to \$2 billion. The whole UC System, which was probably has 15-times the number of students of Harvard, had only \$5 million of debt when he first joined. That was a real wasted opportunity, because if they look at the opportunity costs of money, they could borrow at 4.5% and have other uses of that money that could earn them a lot more. So it made sense to borrow as much as they could and put that into endowment or current uses that have a higher return. So they've started to look at that.

The Student Athlete High Performance Center will be the first project that's done where they actually leverage their funding through debt issuance. All the money for the facility was being raised from private donors. They're taking that money and putting it into an endowment. And at the same time, they'll issue tax-exempt debt, which will be roughly 4.5%. The endowment will grow, they think, at 9-10%. So the differential of what they need to use to pay off the debt service and what's left could be used to support Athletics and address its operating budget.

It has even more of a powerful effect when they look at it for research buildings, because you can count the interest as indirect cost rate, the amount of overhead they could get at contracts and grants was 10-15 points lower than their private peers. When these advantages are built in, the cost of building for Berkeley was probably around 2%. That was something they could really use to build their long-term sustainability.

At the same time, Mr. Brostrom said they also need to manage their assets better. Fortunately, they're making a lot of great strides there. He's mentioned how they had \$600 million in these reserves. They were all invested in short-term instruments. They were primarily investing for liquidity, meaning that if they needed it, they could get all \$600 million not overnight, but probably within a week. And there was no need for that. The campus' need for liquidity was probably, on an intraday basis, maybe \$20-30 million. But they had all that invested in ways that gave them excess liquidity. So they created something this year, the Total Return Investment Pool. It's the same safety as a short-term investment pool but it doesn't have the same liquidity. In fact, the campus was investing for returns more than liquidity. But it's the same types of instruments. They believe this could yield anywhere between 1.5-2.5% in additional

Mr. Brostrom said that with the UC Berkeley Foundation, they're also looking at setting up a management company. In fact, about \$3 million of the grant from the Hewlett Foundation was for better management. That was one of the real drivers. They saw in the slide that yield jumped up in their endowment, and that was because it was driven by their management company, which has typically been 2-4% higher than their peers in terms of their return. When they talk about a \$20 billion base, that's a lot of addition money every year.

Mr. Brostrom said they not only need to increase private philanthropy, but one thing he'd point out is that they have to change the way that they do it. Fortunately, the Hewlett Foundation grant was a huge lift in this area. What used to happen on this campus was that they had \$3 billion and they had very generous donors supporting their programs. But it largely led to what he called "private wealth and public poverty."

A good example was to take an endowed chair. Previously, to endow a chair it took \$500,000. So a donor would give \$500,000 to an endowed chair for Nad Permaul in Rhetoric. But all that did was to give \$25,000 a year for the professor's own research. So she or he would have this \$25,000 every year to use for research or whatever they wanted to use it for, and that was great. It was one of the measures of their faculty excellence that they had this research money. But that did nothing to add to the common good of the campus.

So with the Hewlett Foundation grant, and the Chancellor has made it this goal of his, they raised the amount to endow a chair, which now took \$2 million. In this case, \$1 million would come from the Hewlett grant and \$1 million would be a match. At 4.5-5% a year, \$2 million, pays about \$100,000 a year. The professor will still get \$25,000 so they're not hurt by this. But for the other \$75,000, \$25,000 would go to graduate student support in their department and \$50,000 goes to their faculty salary. That, in turn, would relieve some of the central fund that the campus had to pay to support them. So this way, they're not only funding what they want to fund, but it also relieves some of the campus good. The way he liked to think about it was that they have so many needs on the campus, whether it's burst steam pipes or the rise in their utility costs because of natural gas and oil that no donor would ever get to. No donor will say they want a steam plant named after them. But those demands were just as urgent as their faculty excellence. So this way, the campus was able to use private philanthropy for the things that donors

want to give to. Donors want to support faculty. But at the same time, it will also leave money that could then be used to spend on common infrastructure and deferred maintenance, and the types of things they need to do to maintain the overall excellence of the campus. Ms. Pasco said the time for the Special Order had expired. A motion to extend by ten minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Hussain and Mr. Zuo and passed with no objection.

Mr. Brostrom said that was all he had for the slides, so he'd open it up to questions, comments, or ideas.

Ms. Hussain said that with the new guidelines he talked about, and the different ways they compare to other educational, she asked if this will keep them sustainable. Mr. Brostrom said that on that alone it will help them maintain, but they're going to have to use a variety of measures in order to be competitive. He anticipated that they're going to look at everything. Not just asset management, but they'll also have to look at the expenditure side and really look at all the things they're doing and see if this was the best use of their resources. The campaign will help a great deal, particularly in things like student financial aid, faculty salaries, and graduate student support, where they have the biggest shortfalls. But they also have shortfalls in staff salaries relative to the market, as well as deferred maintenance, purchase of utilities, IT, etc. There was a whole list of things they'll have to look at in order to be sustainable long term. One problem was that it was simply mathematical. Harvard, with \$36 billion, could do away with tuition and not raise another dime in the capital campaign, and would still, after the payout, at 10%, add \$2 billion a year. And Berkeley was struggling to raise \$3 billion over five years.

Ms. Ude asked how investment worked in a total return investment portfolio. Mr. Brostrom said the short-term investment pool was not invested in equities, i.e. stocks. They're only invested in debt instruments such as Treasury bonds or commercial paper, or certificates of deposit. There are three paramount principles of investing: safety, return, and liquidity. Basically, the short-term investment pool was invested for safety and liquidity. They put a dollar in, they know they're going to get a dollar out whenever they want. What they sacrifice was return. This pool in the last couple of years has raised about 4% in return. So they add \$100 and get \$4 every year in terms of their short-term pool. The campus did not want to sacrifice safety and wanted to be in the same instruments, and not in equities or other derivative types of products. But they realized that simply by moving up the yield curve, and instead of investing in 30-day paper, invest in two-year paper, they'd pick up that much yield. So it's the same as a Treasury bond, but picking up the investment yield. They didn't want to start investing in exotic instruments. They have just started to move out the yield curve and to be a little more aggressive in managing the portfolio. They haven't seen the overall yearly result that they anticipate. Instead of earning 4% they might earn 6-6.5% with a strategy like that. They don't need overnight liquidity.

Mr. Zuo asked what students and student representatives could do to help the University manage its budget situation. Mr. Brostrom said he thought the students were doing a great part already. The one thing he would say is that one of the cultural changes that had to happen didn't have so much to do with students, but as they move into being an alumni is that they have to inculcate more of a cultural philanthropy for their graduates. He went to Stanford, his dirty little secret, or at Princeton, e.g., the minute students get on campus, they're told that private support was what made the university work and to provide financial support. He was there on a full scholarship and that made it possible for him to go there, and for future students to go there. Princeton's giving rate was 60%, and at Stanford it was 40%. The giving rate from alumni at Berkeley was about 14%; and that was actually pretty high for a public university. A lot of people think that public universities are supported by the state, and since they pay their taxes, they were supporting the school. What Berkeley had to do was to get a message like this out, and

make the case that to support a great public university that could compete with Harvard and Stanford, it would take private giving. He thought that was going back to Ms. Hussain's question. He thought this was one of the school's greatest opportunities because they have 450,000 living alumni. He would argue that the school has a greater net worth in its alumni base than any university in the world, because it's so large, because of its access. If they could get the story out to them and show how they will support future generations of students, that would be extremely important long term. So he thought starting as a student, if students could start to get this message out to their fellow classmates, that would be great.

Ms. Chen said she was at the Chancellor's Gala and was talking to Mr. Coleman Fung, the Chair, and he said alumni donors were very beneficial and were on a separate network, and the school didn't have that much access to them. She asked if Mr. Brostrom knew what that referred to. Mr. Brostrom said he thought what was being referred to was that the Alumni Association at Cal was independent, which differed from a lot of universities, where it's part of the university. So at Berkeley they don't have the same interaction in terms of shared databases. He thought a lot of measures were being adopted to improve that and try to mesh them more. But it was a structural issue.

Mr. Smelko said it was noted that priority was given towards activity-based finances. He asked what priority was given to maybe a process of working with the ASUC, such as bringing in a coffee shop or a new company in a way that students and UC would benefit, and using that process for the school. In the whole process of Lower Sproul redevelopment, the ASUC could work with the school to bring companies and groups in to benefit students, groups, and the school. Mr. Brostrom said that was a good question and could be an entire Special Order itself. He thought under Mr. Permaul's leadership that things were really starting to move that way. Mr. Brostrom said he thought there was a lot of untapped potential on the campus for outside revenues. One thing he didn't mention was that they're taking a look at all of their "auxiliary" or external enterprises. Many of them have business-like natures but have never been run like a business. They don't want to sacrifice the mission and what they're doing, but want to run them in ways that were more reflective of a business and actually returned something to the campus.

Intercollegiate Athletics was a good example. When he first got to Berkeley, Athletics had a huge operating deficit that was coming straight out of campus discretionary funds and could have gone to teaching and research. But under the Athletic Director's leadership, she's cut that in half; and it will be even greater when they get some of these financial-type things set. The Athletics enterprise was now in the black and actually supporting all of the athletic scholarships. Their goal was to actually try and wipe out all of that deficit. But whether it's the ASUC Auxiliary, Cal Performances, University Extension, the campus had the potential of unleashing a lot of revenue from those, while at the same time preserving their nature. He thought the ASUC had a golden opportunity to look at overall commercial activities, look at what the students' needs were, and use this not only to generate more revenues for their activities, but also as a big financial possibility for the redevelopment of Lower Sproul. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by ten minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Flores and Ms. Ude and passed with no objection.

Ms. Flores said it seemed that so much endowment was created to benefit Athletics, or academic programs, or professors, but not for temporary academic status positions or actual departmental funding. She asked how they compare which sectors have endowments created for them. Mr. Brostrom said endowments were largely driven by donors and what areas they wanted to give to. In the past it's tended to be for financial aid, faculty excellence, graduate student support, and some to buildings. It's a different type of donor who wants to give to capital programs. Creating endowment was healthy for the long-term

stability of any institution. It would be good to raise endowment for any operation on campus. It cushions the volatility of year in, year out revenues. The school doesn't direct endowments, but it's driven by where donors want to give. The capital campaign has identified a number of key areas, including faculty chairs, graduate student support, undergraduate student financial aid, and then a lot for buildings and facilities. Mr. Brostrom said that what he was trying to do was to make sure that in creating endowment, they create it in a way that could also free up funds for things they don't get endowments for, or donor support for. These would be things like leaky roofs, burst pipes, or temporary academic status. Not many endowments are created for lecturers, but that was a huge need on the campus. So they had to create a financial structure where donors give what they want, but with the concept of fungibility, that "all money is green," and start to look at ways to take a donor's preference and still be able to funnel monies back to the school's top priorities.

Ms. Flores asked how donors could be encouraged to create an endowment for a particular department that lacked funding, and would benefit the academic excellence of Berkeley, even with a lack of resources. Mr. Brostrom said that one problem was that they have very few people giving to the campus. Alumni and donors haven't wanted to give to endowment, but to give to annual programs. So they might give to the Band every year, e.g. About 40% of their giving comes to endowment, 60% in annual giving. That was a flip-flop of what they want. As for having a lack of resources and showing a dire situation with State funding, Mr. Brostrom said they don't ever really want to say that what they're doing is to supplement State funds, because the point he wanted to make is that the State has been generous, and has been a fairly consistent partner. Comparing it to all the other needs of the State, the State has largely kept up with inflation. California was in a much better situation than a lot of other states. People don't want to give if they think they're replacing State funding. In fact, the campus was a little worried about launching the campaign during such a bad budget crisis, because then it looks like they're doing it out of desperation. And for whatever reason, people like to give to winners. He didn't know why anyone gave a dollar to Harvard any more, but the school raises \$3-400 million every year. David Rockefeller just gave \$100 million. They could walk around here and show him what that would be used for. Scott Biddy, the Vice Chancellor for University Relations, could talk about how to raise money. But the real way to do it was to find what a donor's interest was and target that. For a campus like Berkeley that was great, because they have such breadth. A donor might have an interest in Bach fugues, and the school could find a well-renowned professor and target that. In fact, for a school without a medical school, Berkeley was probably one of the top fundraisers in the country.

Ms. Oatfield said she heard the UC endowment will at some point be managed by a private company. Mr. Brostrom said there are two endowments. One is managed by the Regents, about \$2 billion, and the second is managed by Berkeley's Foundation, about \$1 billion. The school received part of this grant, the \$3 million, to set up its own management company. Right now they outsource everything and they have an investment advisor and a volunteer board that helps them do their investments. They've actually done surprisingly well and have exceeded all their benchmarks. But they'd actually have their own investment manager. However, because of the size, they'd still manage it through outside groups in large measure, but they'd have their own person on the campus who would manage those monies. They're looking at trying to get the Regents to invest Berkeley's portion of the endowment here as well, and give \$3 million. They've outperformed in the last five years. And they have not only a better strategy, but it made more sense in terms of donor relations to be as close to the investment as possible, so it's not invested in a private company. A whole series of managers work on their different asset classes. They hope to launch the management company early next year, and start a search for a chief investment officer.

Ms. Oatfield said the school currently divests from tobacco and divested from apartheid in South Africa. A year or so before she got to the campus a working group was thinking to include environmental and social justice issues. Mr. Brostrom said he wasn't on the investment side, so he didn't know. He was on one group that had very strong filters. They could find managers who meet benchmarks and still work through filters. It's hard work, but it can be done. The school doesn't do anything in guns or ammunition, e.g. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by three minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Chen and Ms. Flores and passed with no objection.

Ms. Cho asked how they could preserve lecturers and staffmembers who are essential for their education. Mr. Brostrom said the question was about hiring temporary academics. He didn't know much about the hiring process. The Provost has made a very strong pitch to carve out more of the budget for that purpose. Most of those decisions actually happen with individual deans and chairs.

Ms. Dhar asked if the presentation could be made available through e-mail. Mr. Brostrom said he could send it. He had a presentation with a lot more slides and detail that he'd be happy to send out. If people had questions, he would ask them to please feel free to e-mail him.

Ms. Yang said she would like to thank him for taking the time to talk to them. There was one graph showing why Berkeley's financial resources decreased so dramatically compared to other schools and asked why that was the case. Mr. Brostrom said that was sort of the nub. If they look at Berkeley's growth, their main source of revenue, State appropriations, has declined. Over the last 15 years it's probably grown at an average rate of maybe 3%. Some years it was 4-5%, some years it was flat. At the same time, the average growth of endowments over that period probably increased 12-13%. There were some downturns in the early part of decade, with the dot.com bust. But even in 2007-8, when markets were actually way down, Harvard had a 9% return on its endowment. There really was a differential in the rate of growth of Harvard's primary source of revenue, endowment, and actually a very strong growth in tuition fees, which was going up 6-7% at the same time. In comparison, there's been a relative stagnation in Berkeley's main source of revenue, the State. The school kept up pace in terms of federal research grants and probably the growth in tuition increase. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by five minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Shah and Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

Ms. Shah asked if increasing endowments would affect affordability on campus. Mr. Brostrom said there was now a correlation. What they're seeing now was that other schools with these large endowments were quite panicked because they're getting unwelcome scrutiny from state and federal officials. So they're pouring a lot of their resources into financial aid. At Harvard, he believed students were eligible for financial aid up to \$200,000 in family income. Tuition is free up to \$80,000 in family income. At those kinds of levels, there's a reverse correlation. One slide showed that Princeton could get rid of tuition and fees and still have a very strong campus. Berkeley will not be in that situation for many, many decades. As they get those endowments and as they're sufficiently unrestricted, they can pour a lot into making the place more affordable.

Mr. Zuo asked about the chance of Congress revoking the tax-exempt status of privates. Mr. Brostrom said he hoped that didn't happen because they wouldn't just do it for the Ivy Leagues, but probably for all universities. It would hurt the Ivy League schools, but it would hurt Berkeley as well. He thought the direction they're more likely to take was to legislate a payout. Private foundations, 501(c)3s are required to pay out a certain amount of their earnings every year in terms of operations. Some of these schools have been growing so rapidly that they pay a fairly small percentage, and it just goes into their

endowment growth. More likely, legislation would require them to pay 4.5-5% of the endowment out every year, and find ways to use it. Mr. Brostrom said it was his hope that one of the outcomes of these kinds of huge private endowments was that in some sense, maybe Harvard, Stanford, and Yale will become more public and will start to take on more public enterprises. There was talk about Harvard establishing connections with African universities that were woefully underfunded. With a small percentage of its endowment, it could really help something like that. So he hoped more of their endowment payout goes into areas of public service rather than into more research or faculty salaries.

Ms. Cho asked about the financial situation with Lower Sproul development. Mr. Brostrom said he actually didn't know the specifics on Lower Sproul, but he could tell them some of the principles it should have. These were just his own views. Dr. Permaul was much better informed about it. He thought Lower Sproul was a very viable option, but it will have to come in several phases with a myriad of financing resources needed that they'd have to look at. First, he thought what was untapped was looking at commercial enterprises. In some ways, he thought they could use commercial enterprises to subsidize space in Lower Sproul that can't pay. He met with the President of Follett, and it could probably take a bookstore that was twice the size that Follett has. If one looked at comparable campuses like Notre Dame or Stanford, and looked at revenue and floor space, Follett could probably double the size at Berkeley and still have a viable enterprise. One thing the students could do was to actually take a survey and see what was needed on campus, see what students wanted. He thought a fee referendum would be a viable part of this. Also, there could be other opportunities for fundraising, especially from creative types of design. A lot of foundations would give to certain elements of green design and build buildings that were as emission neutral as possible, and get foundation support for things like that. Finally, there might be a portion of campus debt. He thought the best way to do it was rather than wait until they have a comprehensive financing package, maybe the first thing they'd do was to take down Eshleman, build a storefront along Bancroft that would have an expanded student store as well as all the ASUC offices. And then they'd keep moving the development, and doing it in phase like that. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired.

Mr. Brostrom said he would like to thank them very much and said he enjoyed the opportunity.  
(Applause)

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would entertain a motion to move back into Reports from ASUC Representatives. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Mairena and Mr. Tran and passed by hand-vote 10-0-6.

Mr. Smelko moved to recess for two minutes. The motion was seconded and passed by voice-vote. This meeting was recessed.

#### Report from the Graduate Assembly Representative

Back in session, with Ms. Vir-Banks chairing the meeting, Mr. Daal said he sent out an e-mail regarding what they're calling the "Lower Sproul Student Council." He would encourage those who received it to respond with their availability. It was sent to people who raised their hands the last time he was there

about being interested in such a committee. Also, he wanted to talk about Welcome Week. The GA Vice President for Campus Affairs and the ASUC VP for Academic Affairs spoke to the Provost about Welcome Week being shortened to two days rather than a week. Students were working on trying to extend Welcome Week and reinstate it as a week, five days, in the interest of promoting awareness of student services. Welcome Week was when students learn about what services were available to them, such as the Tang Center, the Campus Life and Leadership, and other things. And it was also a time when networking occurred among students. It's a time when graduates and undergraduates alike have an opportunity to establish social networks that help them academically throughout the school year. If people have any thoughts on how shortening of Welcome Week has negatively impacted their lives and the lives of undergrads, it would be helpful to know about those issues.

Mr. Daal said he has not yet convened the group of people to work on the shared governance idea. He's been trying to figure out how to go about that. The last time he reported he said it was very important that they somehow work with the Administration to make it clear when students ought to be consulted about governance matters such as decisions about budgets and what to do with student fees, those kinds of decisions. The campus has pushed back over the words "shared" and "governance." Those words have a coded meaning for administrators and faculty and they get really defensive when students use those words. So he was looking for other words to use.

Lastly, Mr. Daal said that he wanted to state that in general, he really would like to get to know Senators. There are 20 Senators and only one of him, so it was hard for him to learn everybody's names. So what he'd try to do, and he'd see if this worked, was to have coffees with people. He wrote down five times to have coffee with people and he'd pass around a sheet. He'd buy. He'd come back in a week and put out some more dates. He called for any questions.

Ms. Rodriguez asked if there was something the GA would like to hear about from the ASUC at the meeting. Mr. Daal said it would be helpful if the GA got a fervent plug for the Judicial Council and for people to apply for the graduate positions.

Mr. Tran asked when directed actions were due for the meeting. Mr. Daal said the text was due before the meeting and the intent to submit a resolution was due on Thursday. All he'd need was a title, and he'd be happy to include it on their agenda. (Applause)

Mr. Mairena moved to go to Guest Announcements. The motion was seconded by Ms. Yang and passed with no objection.

#### Guest Announcements (cont'd)

Ms. Pasco said the next Guest Announcement was from Kao Thao, on voter registration. Ms. Thao introduced herself and said this was the first time she's been there. She's the Vote Coalition Coordinator for UC Berkeley. They reached 2,500 cards of student voters, which was great given the limited

resources they have with funding and volunteers. The goal of the Vote Coalition was 10,000, so she would ask Senators to help. That meant representing their communities or as a student leader. Having their input made it more visible to the student body.

Ricardo Gomez said that day they registered over 100 people just from tabling, which they're trying to do every day. They've modeled this after UCSB, which had the strongest voter reg machine out there of all the other UCs. UCSB's By-laws require all their Senators to either table two hours, turn in 20 reg cards, or do vote work. So the Vote Coalition will ask Senators to do two hours of tabling or bring in 20 voter reg cards. Ms. Thao said every person out there volunteering made a difference. They had 120 cards done, the greatest advancement that semester. They'll have an event on Thursday and that's when they need Senators to help out. If they can't table, she would recommend that everyone register at least 20 people. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by five minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Ude and Mr. Smelko and passed with no objection.

Mr. Gomez said people could get voter reg cards on the 2nd floor, the EAVP office. Ms. Thao said all volunteers get the beautiful blue T-shirt they were wearing. Mr. Gomez said there's an e-mail sign up. They would also ask Senators to change their Facebook profile picture that week to the Vote Coalition flier. People need to re-register if they've moved, and to register in Berkeley, not San Diego or LA, or get an absentee ballot. Changing their Facebook is important in order to increase visibility. The Vote Coalition meeting will be on Thursday in the Senate lounge from 5:00 to 6:00, and they try to end on time. If people had questions they could send her an e-mail. Ms. Pasco said she would like to thank them for the announcement. (Applause)

Ms. Pasco said the next Guest Announcement was by Kevin Huynh, from SUPERB. Mr. Huynh said SUPERB had a down week that week and were handling most of their hiring. Last week on Wednesday they had the San Francisco Stand-Up Comedy Competition in the Bear's Lair, and on Thursday they had Trivia Night, after doing an emergency relocation from Naia to the Bear's Lair. It turned out well. On Friday they had their second noon concert with "The Frail" and they topped off the week with two comedy shows in Zellerbach, Henry Rollins and Lewis Black. They had a great turnout for hires for most of their departments, except for Art and Web Design. If Senators knew names of people who would be interested in SUPERB, he would ask them to please refer them to him.

Ms. Huynh said their next film will be "Wall-E," the week after next. They'll have a sneak preview of a new Russell Crowe, Leonardo DiCaprio movie, "Body of Lies" on October 9 in Wheeler Hall. For concerts, "The Crew" was coming up, as well as "The Summer Set."

The first SUPERB Oversight Board meeting will be next Thursday, and is usually the first Thursday of every month. If the Senate SUPERB rep could reach out to him, that would be great. He called for any questions. Ms. Pasco said she would like to thank him for his report. (Applause)

Mr. Zuo moved to recess for ten minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Raffi and passed by hand-vote 20-0-0. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by three minutes was made and seconded by Mr. Nahabet and was seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Elected Official Announcements

Back in session, Mr. Nahabet said he wanted to talk about Elected Official Announcements and Representative Announcements. He would like to have an unofficial rule of giving speakers an extension of three minutes, then two minutes, and then one minute. Speakers would see that they needed to start wrapping up. When they give people five minutes and then extensions, it makes them talk more. That would take the Senate three or four hours before they got to bills. He thought a 3-2-1-minute pattern wouldn't disrespect the speakers would make things faster and would speed things up. The speakers were officials people could always talk to off the floor.

Ms. Tran said Senators' keys were available at the Management Service office, 23 MLK. Richard Watson asks that people call him to verify that their keys were there, since some Senators turned in their applications late. Their card keys should be activated the first week of October that will allow access to the 2nd, 3rd, and 5th floors.

Ms. Flores said she would ask for their undivided attention. She read the following:

-----  
Begin announcement by Ms. Flores

I am here to remind our senate of a few things. First, we need to recall the community working agreements we had made at the Senate Leadership Institute, and remember to show respect to each other not only in this room, but also outside these Chamber doors. These agreements were made for a reason, and they serve as our promises to one another when all of us agreed to them. We agreed to respect each other, to assume positive intent from one another, to be open-minded and to be understanding of our differences.

In the past couple of weeks we have experienced many difficult situations on our campus. As a Senate, we must condemn the hate crime that have occurred last week and this week, as well as condemn the threatening words painted on the walls of 145 Dwinelle a few days ago.

End Announcement by Ms. Flores  
-----

She was there to remind Senators of a few things they needed to recall, the community organization agreement they made at the Senate Leadership Institute. She would ask them to remember to show respect to each other. The agreement serves as a promise to one another to respect each other and be open-minded and to understand their difference.

Ms. Flores said nobody on the campus deserved to feel threatened. As student leaders they must show respect to their peers and support their peers on campus regardless of their beliefs, values, ethics, religion, ethnicity, or background. This space was supposed to be welcoming, inclusive, and respectful to all students. She hoped they can foster honest and genuine relationship with one another that will be model for their constituents and community. She would not yield to questions.

Ms. Hussain said she would like to thank Ms. Flores for her words. And she wanted to thank Dean Poullard and Mr. Permaul for the prayer space that was given to Muslim students on campus. It's a huge step forward. This has been a problem since long before she was a student there. It was great to see things come to fruition.

Ms. Raffi said she wanted to thank Ms. Hussain and Ms. Flores for their comments. Ms. Raffi said that to refer back to what Mr. Nahabet said about giving extensions of three, two, and then one minute, she said it was to impress upon people that Senators' time was limited. It wasn't to cut people off, and they should be given all the time to say what they wanted to. But the Senate needed to convey a sense of urgency.

Ms. Yang said she wanted to give a shout out to previous comments and wanted to wish people good luck in the first round of midterms. Saturday was a home football game and she didn't have anyone to go with.

Mr. Tran asked Senators to let people know they could join the campaign for textbook adoptions. It transcended political lines in the sense that all communities could benefit, and it dealt with student interests. On another note, he would like to recommend a little procedural implementation, that any time the Senate talked about a specific event and they had logistics, they could send it to Ms. Pasco to e-mail out.

#### Standing Committee Reports

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Mr. Moghtader said that Fi-Comm would try and stick to a five-minute speaker's time and pace the meeting to have no dull moments. Ms. Pasco asked Mr. Moghtader to please just report on the activities, bills, and attendance, for the sake of time.

Mr. Moghtader said all members were present except Pres. Winston and Finance Officer Cheney. All the rule waivers passed: Latino Pre Law Society, \$60; HMAP, \$500; BAMN, amended to \$1,600; BAMN - \$2,400 requested, and that was amended to \$1,600.

SB 26 was tabled; SB 29 was approved; SBs 33, 37, 23, and 25 passed as amended; SBs 27 and 29 were approved; SBs 34, 28, 24, 32, 20, 22, 35 were passed as amended; SB 31 was tabled; SB 30 was passed as amended; SBs 19 and 21 were tabled. At final roll call, all were present except for Ms. Winston and Mr. Chaney. The meeting adjourned at 1:32 a.m.

Ms. Hussain asked about SB 18. Mr. Moghtader said he wasn't sure why it wasn't in the minutes, but it was approved. Ms. Flores said it was amended to \$150.

Ms. Hussain said the minutes showed two amounts for SB 25. Ms. Dhar said it was amended to \$350.

Mr. Sakaue said that SB 18 was amended, changing its status from a SAG to a SISG. Ms. Hussain said it was a SISG in the original bill. Mr. Moghtader said it was passed with no amendments.

-----  
Begin written report from the Finance Committee

Fall 2008 Session – Week 4  
Monday, September 22nd, 2008  
9:00 pm, Senate Chambers, Eshleman Hall

Minutes from 9/8 are approved

Agenda is approved

Committee Business

5-minute speaker time

Hasten meetings - no lull moments

Soft cap of \$150 for 1st year

Roll call: all present excepting President Winston and Finance Officer Chaney

Rule Waivers (all passed):

Latino Pre Law Society - \$60

HMAP - \$500

BAMN - \$2,400 for funding statewide mobilization to Sac for right of financial aid to undocumented students

Amended: \$1600 for buses carrying Cal students only

SB 26 - A bill in support of funding for the Public Service Fund

AAVP De La Cruz:

Application was made without funds in the account

Bill is time sensitive: students are waiting on their money

TABLED for one week

SB 29 - \$200

Amendment: Student initiated student group to student initiative service group

PASSED with amendments

SB 33 - A Bill in Support of Wrestling Club at Berkeley - \$170

Senator Mairena adds himself as a co-sponsor

PASSED with amendment

SB 37 - A Bill in Support of Sigma Pi Alpha Sorority, Inc. - \$250

Amendment: amount to \$250

PASSED with amendment

SB 23 - A Bill in Support of Remedy Music Productions - \$234

-----  
Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

Amendment: SAG to SISG (Student Initiated Service Group)

PASSED with amendment

SB 25 - A Bill in Support of LiNK Outreach: Bay Area (LOBA) - \$350

Amendment: \$800 to \$250

PASSED with amendment

SB 27 - A Bill in Support of Engineering Student Groups: American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) and CalSOL

PASSED

SB 29 - A Bill in Support of Engineers Without Borders at Berkeley

PASSED

SB 34 - A Bill in Support of Cal Libertarians

Amendment: \$200 allocated to \$150

PASSED with amendment

SB 28 - A Bill in Support of Chemists for Peace's Green Chemistry Seminar - \$200

Amendment: \$200 allocated instead of \$500

PASSED with amendment

SB 24 - A Bill in Support of Eggster Hunt and Learning Festival - \$325

Amendment: \$325

PASSED with amendment

SB 32 - A Bill in Support of jericho! - \$350

Amendment: \$350

PASSED with amendment

SB 20 - A Bill in Support of the European Students Union - \$400

Amendment: Strike out "thousand"

PASSED with amendment

SB 22- A Bill in Support of the Russian Club - \$529

Amendment: call the group a first-year SAG

Because it did not receive ASUC funding for the past 2 years

Amendment: \$150 allocated

PASSED with amendment

SB 35 - A Bill in Support of Education Undergraduates

Amendment: should be recognized as a second-year student activity group

Amendment: \$200

-----  
Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

PASSED with amendment

SB 31 - A Bill in Support of the Rotaract Club

Amendment: \$350

Tabled till next week

SB 30a - DREAM

Not applicable to Ficomm

SB 19, 21 tabled by Senator Nahabet because student group representatives could not come so late at night

Roll Call: all present except President Winston, Finance Officer Chaney

Meeting adjourned at 1:32am

End written report from the Finance Committee  
-----

Reporting for the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee, Mr. Nahabet said they began at 9:13. All Senators were present. SB 30 was passed as amended and SB 36 was approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:24.

-----  
Begin written report from the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee

Con Review Meeting Notes

September 22, 2008

Members present: Senators Shah, Mairena, Smelko, Owens, Oatfield, Nahabet

Meeting began at 9:13pm

\* Minutes from 9/15/08 as amended on 9/17/08 approved

\*Guest Announcement from EVP Pasco: Space allocations final recommendations come to con review next week, and appeals will go through con review →only 2 appeals to draft decision

\*Meeting 4 Agenda approved

New Business:

\*Motion to amend SB 30 to reflect changes sent out by Senator Flores, motion passes and SB30 as amended passes

\*SB36 passes with no amendments

Meeting adjourned at 9:24pm

End written report from the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee  
-----

Reporting for the University and External Affairs Committee, Ms. Hussain said the meeting was called to order at 9:07. SB 30 was passed as amended, as Ms. Flores sent out. They adjourned at 9:42. All Senators were present.

-----  
Begin written report from the University and External Affairs Committee

External Committee Minutes  
Monday, September 22, 2008  
9 pm, June Jordan Room

- I. Approval of minutes from last meeting
- II. Approval of agenda
- III. Old Business
  - a. Meeting with Vice Chancellor Brostrom (Sen. Zuo)
    - i. Land Use Commission suggested by Sen. Oatfield and VC Brostrom was in favor of it
    - ii. Under Alquist-Priolo, there is no existing case law and the University would be arguing that they are trying to preserve a historic building and are acting in the interest of public safety
    - iii. Stadium would be built by 2012
- IV. New Business
  - a. SB 30—currently in consideration of the amended version
    - i. DREAM Act: for all undocumented students or just for those that are attempting to gain citizenship?
    - ii. Asking for just campus-based funding this year compared to last year where it was asking for state-based funding
    - iii. Last year Gov. Schwarzanegger waited until the last day to veto it; this year has until Sept. 30
    - iv. Students under AB 540 had to have gone to CA high school for at least 3 years, whereas out-of-state students would only have to be enrolled in a CA school for 3 years
    - v. Amended to add Sen. Ude as a co-sponsor
    - vi. Passed 5-0-1
  - b. Student Safety at the Stadium
    - i. Sen. Shah would like University to promise return of Grand Mother Oak to the tribe
      1. Oldest, biggest tree that was cut down and the indigenous tribe (Ohlone) and the police agreed to return it to them
  - c. In Support of Berkeley Public Libraries
    - i. Will be introduced into committee next week
  - d. Possible op-ed for Daily Cal for hate crime incident
- V. Adjournment at 9:42 pm
  - a. Roll Call
    - i. Sen. Hussain
    - ii. Sen. Raffi
    - iii. Sen. Lisa Tran
    - iv. Sen. Ude

Reporting for the University and External Affairs Committee, Ms. Hussain said the meeting was called to order at 9:07. SB 30 was passed as amended, as Ms. Flores sent out. They adjourned at 9:42. All Senators were present.

-----  
Written report from the University and External Affairs Committee (cont'd)

- v. Sen. Yang
- vi. Sen. Zuo

End written report from the University and External Affairs Committee  
-----

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would entertain a motion for a two-minute recess. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Owens and Mr. Mairena and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Ms. Ude moved to go to Elected Official Announcements. The motion was seconded and passed by hand-vote 14-1-1.

Elected Official Announcements (cont'd)

Ms. Oatfield said Ms. Brittain was there for an appointment and she hoped people would respect a motion to move to Appointments.

Mr. Tran moved to go to Executive Officer reports. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Report from the President

Ms. Winston said people have been distressed about what's been taking place the last few weeks on the campus. She'll produce a statement to respond, saying that students on campus don't stand for hate speech or hate acts of any type. She would ask them to forward it to their friends.

Preliminary meetings for Activism Right There will start on Friday. She's meeting with the previous Coordinator. Discussion will take place on Friday with the current Coordinator, Ms. O, and community members interested in getting involved with high school students.

Ms. Winston said Senators and Officers just got interns, and she would ask people to treat them nicely, and to give them something to do. In the past, interns have not known what to do, and they like to do things. That's why they were interns. The office will have a mixer for them.

Ms. Winston said she was doing Finance Officer interviews, starting on Friday. They have quite a few very talented applicants. When it comes up for approval, they should know she spent a lot of time finding the best person for the position. One thing will be different that year for the Finance Officer. She'll make the appointment in the fall, but for this semester, the person will shadow the previous Finance Officer, Mr. Chaney, so there's continuity and to have a more seamless transition.

Ms. Winston said she'll have a meeting with the Chancellor on Friday at 8:30 a.m. If people have issues they want to see on the agenda, they should send her an e-mail. She'll send out the agenda so people can see what the conversation will look like.

A discussion will take place between the GA and the ASUC about potentially sharing commercial revenue. This might become adversarial. This has been an issue people have been fond of in the past. It's important to realize the importance of the two student governments on the campus, and understand that different students have different needs that can be represented by others better than the Senate. If people have any hesitations or frustrations about sharing revenue with the GA, she would ask them to please let her know so they can discuss it.

The SOB meeting was held yesterday. A lot of Senators were there, which was encouraging. It's important they know what's going on with finances on the campus. She wanted to thank Sens. Raffi and Oatfield for sending her notes on portions of the meeting she missed. The Board decided to send letters of intent to Tully's and Kaplan. One negotiating point was to have Kaplan offer 30-40 free SAT classes to low-income high school students the ASUC would reach out to through different student organizations.

Ms. Winston said she got some e-mails requesting Daily Cal ad space the ASUC had. The ASUC has one page per week. If people have ads they want to include, they should send that to her and she'll forward it to the Daily Cal Ad Page Manager. There's only so much space, but Senators should contact student groups about this possibility.

Regarding Lower Sproul redevelopment focus groups, Ms. Winston said they decided on sustainability, academic resources, student parents, transfer students, student resources (safety, health, academics), sustainability and inclusion.

Ms. Winston said she was taking Female Sexuality that semester and it was amazing. That day they had a menarche party, for getting one's period for the first time. They all wore red. They discussed different alternatives for menstruation. She was bringing this upon because they're often not told about the different resources they have available. Some things they use are toxic and they shouldn't put things in their body that have cancer-causing chemicals.

Mr. Moghtader asked what department and course number the class was. Ms. Winston said the class was in Integrative Biology. Men can take the class, and she would encourage that.

Mr. Nahabet asked if Ms. Winston's statement will go to the entire student body. Ms. Winston said it wouldn't, but would go to networks people send things out to. They only get one message per month to

the entire student body. It will be posted on the Web site, if they get a Web master, and posted by the ground-floor door of Eshleman. Mr. Nahabet asked if the Senate could take a look at it before it's sent out. Ms. Winston said she'd let them see it ahead of time. People could send feedback, but the statement would be her impression of things.

Mr. Zuo asked when she planned to appoint a Finance Officer. Ms. Winston said she's doing six interviews and the goal was to have an appointment by next Wednesday. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by three minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Chen and Ms. Yang and passed with no objection.

Ms. Chen asked who would make the calls as Finance Officer if the new person was shadowing the previous FO. Ms. Winston said the goal was for them to work collaboratively. She didn't know how many calls had to be made in the fall and could look into that. When they look at how funds are allocated from the Contingency Fund, they could do that together. Ms. Chen asked if the new person would be the Finance Officer and the old one would have a chance to collaborate with them. Ms. Winston said that was correct.

Ms. Chen said that it mentioned that the focus groups were things they wanted to focus on, she asked who Ms. Winston meant by "they." Ms. Winston said that was the President's office. She felt these topics were overarching after spending some time brainstorming. If there are topics they think were missed, they should send them to her. She asked for feedback previously. (Applause)

Ms. Oatfield moved to go to Appointments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Zuo and passed with no objection.

## APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Pasco said the first appointment was Amin Ebrahimi, for Cal Lobby Corps Student-at-large member. Mr. Ebrahimi said he joined UC Berkeley that semester and had some experience from his years at community college student government. His school had about 23,000 students and student government had a Senate and a House. He sat as Speaker of the House for one year. He was also involved in California Students for Community College, an organization that lobbied and testified for certain bills that affected them. He worked with the ASUC and the USSA. He thought he was qualified. He's met with different people. He called for any questions.

Ms. Yang asked what some of his activities were outside classes and how they could help with this position. Mr. Ebrahimi said he was involved in parliamentary debates, an intercollegiate activity he did at community college. He's a member of UCB Model UN. He was also taking courses at the Berkeley City College and would like to help that student government as well.

Seeing no further questions Ms. Pasco said they would vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE AMIN EBRAHIMI AS CAL LOBBY CORPS STUDENT-AT-LARGE MEMBER PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 19-0-0. (Applause)

Ms. Pasco said the next appointment was of Katherine Brittain, for Director of Environmental Sustainability. Ms. Brittain introduced herself and said she was a member of the Sustainability Team. She's majoring in Ethnic Studies and Conservation of Resource Studies, with a specialization of energy and environmental policy. Through STEAM, she got involved in The Green Initiative Fund and Earth Week that happens every April. They're working on a new project, the one side, clean paper project. She also had an internship with Cal in the Capitol and worked on energy issues in the House and did research through the Energy and Resources Group.

Ms. Brittain said that STEAM was a microcosm of Cal and was totally student-driven. Because of student innovation, they have The Local outside MLK. Three years ago it didn't exist, and now it was a thriving community happening every Wednesday from 11:00 to 4:00, provide local, organic produce which would otherwise be inaccessible to students who don't have time to go to the farmer's market. Because they're student driven they're constantly evolving and looking to the students and the campus to see what they feel is a need. STEAM sells clean canteens at a great price, \$13-18, to use instead of water bottles. They're basically sold with on profit, and the bottles are \$25 online. They're also part of the TGIF campaign and others. They care about sustainability on campus and representing students.

As for this year, STEAM has traditional projects, such as The Local and Earth Week. STEAM's new project, the one-side clean paper project, deals with paper that had printing on one side and was perfectly useable on the other. And such paper was everywhere. They want to collect it and make it into notebooks. It shouldn't be such a radical idea to re-use paper. They'll launch the project that semester and will keep the Senate updated. STEAM wants good communication with the ASUC. If Senators feel there's an issue on campus nobody was addressing and needed manpower, they could provide that. They meet on Thursdays at 7 p.m. in MLK.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE KATHERINE BRITTAI AS DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 20-0-0.

Ms. Pasco said the next appointment was a Senator to serve on the Multicultural Center Advisory Board. Ms. Rodriguez nominated Mr. Mairena. Seeing no other nominations, Ms. Pasco said they'd vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE MR. MAIRENA AS THE ASUC SENATOR ON THE MULTICULTURAL CENTER ADVISORY BOARD PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 19-0-1.

#### Report from the Executive Vice President

With Ms. Vir-Banks chairing the meeting, Ms. Pasco said that hopefully the Senate will end before they ended last week, at 12:30 a.m.

Ms. Pasco said they received 29 interns, and each Senator will have one or two interns by next week. Her staff will facilitate a 30-minute Special Order so Senators and interns can introduce themselves to each other. She'll send out some recommendations on interns. Space allocation preliminary decisions came out that week and appeal applications were due to the Chair of Con-Review, Mr. Nahabet, on Friday by 5:00. All questions should be directed to her or Mr. Nahabet.

Regarding the Web master vacancy, Ms. Pasco said she sent out applications. They're due on Friday. According to the Constitution and By-laws, this position was part of the EVP's staff. Hopefully they could fill this quickly as there were already a lot of updates that needed to happen. People should send her requests for any changes to the Web site that need to be made and she'll try and address those as soon as she could.

Ms. Pasco said her office had a staff meeting on Monday that was really good. All her staff was there. They heard an update on the Multicultural Center. The MCC was actually looking for interns. Applications were released yesterday. If people were interested in working on the MCC, for staffing or programming, they should fill out an application and send it to Andrew Chang, the MCC manager.

Regarding check-ins, Ms. Pasco said she sent out e-mails last week. On Friday, from 12:00 to 12:30 she'll meet with Mr. Nahabet; with Ms. Chen from 12:30 to 1:00; with Mr. Zuo from 2:00 to 2:30, and with Mr. Owens from 2:30 to 3:00. She'll send them questions she wanted them to answer in terms of feedback. It was the fifth week and she wanted constructive feedback on her role as the Chair. She was really open to feedback so she could improve as a Chair and have a more efficient Senate. She'd send some questions just to frame the feedback she was looking for.

Ms. Pasco said she would like to nominate Salma Vir-Banks as the Vice Chair of the Senate, with a stipend of \$1,000.

Mr. DeMartini, the Student Advocate, asked her to make nominations for his staff: Hassan Kahn, Chief-of-Staff, stipend of \$1,000; Neil Gehlawat, Conduct Director, stipend of \$550; Nikhil Matani, Academic Director, stipend of \$350; Leah Rabkin, Grievance Director, stipend of \$250; and Karen Baker, for Financial Aid and Residency Director, stipend of \$250. She called for any questions.

Mr. Tran asked if anybody applied for Web master. Ms. Pasco said there was one application and résumé.

#### Report from the External Affairs Vice President

Ms. Jirachaikitti said she would apologize for not being there last week. The food allergy she thought she had was something else, because it came back without her eating apples. They have 19 interns in the office. They'll have an orientation on Monday, 7:00 to 9:00 and see what departments they want to intern for. The Senate heard earlier about the amazing work staff was doing on vote work. Some EAVP members were present for vote stuff. They've been tabling every day. They have a new spot on College and Bancroft and they extended hours, from 10:00 to 4:00. People could get buttons and, if they volunteer, a T-shirt. They had 150 cards from tabling that day. They're also doing class and org raps. The current vote count was about 2,500. It was good, but a long way from their goal of 10,000. The County Registrar's Office will bring the Vote Bus to campus the last week to register. The delineate was October 20.

Ms. Jirachaikitti asked how many people have heard of the Ultimate College Bowl. They're working with Head Count, which will do a free concert for the campus that registers the most voters. She would ask people to help with voter registration and make sure their constituents and communities were

registered. This was a non-partisan campaign, and the office will give out non-partisan voting guides prior to the election.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said she's going to Washington, D.C. on Thursday for the USSA Board meeting and will be back on Sunday night. They'll talk about the federal DREAM Act and other things. She'll go with Courtney McBride, in the National Department in the office, who was also a USSA Board member.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said the Senate that evening will discuss the California DREAM Act bill. She would encourage people to make sure they dialogue and to not be afraid to ask questions. If anything, they want to educate each other on the issue. Conversations can be difficult, especially in this space and especially with issues not everyone knew about. She wanted to thank Senators on the External Affairs Committee for having a conversation and being honest. She hoped the Senate can continue that when they debate.

#### Report from the Academic Affairs Vice President

Mr. De la Cruz said Friday was the last day to add or drop a class. After that, they need a letter from a dean or an administrator. Yesterday was his 21st birthday, and he wanted to thank Senators who wished him a happy birthday. The Grants Department has already started interviews. Money can't be allocated until the grants committees meet. The Grants Department will meet that week to prepare for an upcoming grants workshop on October 8, from 7:00 to 8:00 in the Senate Chamber. Student groups and individual applicants will learn how to apply for these grants. The Internal Department recently hired a new staffperson for communications to ensure that the office was communicating with Execs and the student body as a whole through various means like Cal TV and the Daily Cal, tabling, and flyering. They're also preparing socials and study nights.

Mr. De la Cruz said his office had quite a large staff of 30 individuals. They'll discuss with the Office of the President about having from 25 to 30 interns, so around 60 people will come out of 203 and 205 Eshleman. He would ask Senators to please say "hi" to them. They want to make an office that has more cohesion and a more comfortable workspace and to see each other as professional and academic resources. Along with study nights, they'll have a common course list with other Executive office with large staffs. There are up to 150 people, including interns, and if people know what courses they share, that could be a resource.

Mr. De la Cruz said University committee representatives have attended their first meetings. Many reps are enthusiastic and reporting, and getting a lot out of those meetings, and were excited to file reports. Mr. De la Cruz they're a little stalled on the online system for reports from committee reps because there's no Web master.

One goal that year for student reps was to ensure they're knowledgeable about academic policy and issues on the campus. They had one Advocacy Agenda Issue Brief during Academic Senate rep training on East Asian languages and security of employment. In addition, they'll educate reps on the new textbook adoption campaign, headed by several Senators, with the assistance of the ASUC Bookstore and Dean Poullard. Reps will sit with faculty members at monthly evenings and were an avenue to push for early adoption.

Mr. de la Cruz said he had a meeting with Dean Poullard, Jeff Deutsch, Store Director, Mr. Tran, Ms. Tran, and Ms. Flores. They were all excited about saving students over \$1.2 million by turning in the list of required textbooks on time, by the October 15 deadline. The office will be deeply involved in this.

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would entertain a motion to move back to the Consent Calendar. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Mairena and Ms. Yang and passed with no objection.

### CONSENT CALENDAR

The following bills and waivers were up for consideration that evening under the Consent Calendar: SBs 18; 20, as amended; 22, as amended; 23, as amended; 24, as amended; 25, as amended; 27; 28, as amended; 29; 30, as amended; 32, as amended; 33, as amended; 34, as amended; 35, as amended; 36; and 37, as amended.

The following bills were removed from the Consent Calendar: SBs 22, as amended; 30, as amended; 32, as amended; and 37, as amended.

The following bills remained under the Consent Calendar: SBs 18; 20, as amended; 23, as amended; 24, as amended; 25, as amended; 27; 28, as amended; 29; 33, as amended; 34, as amended; 35, as amended; and 36.

Ms. Pasco called for any other changes to the Consent Calendar. A motion to approve was made and seconded by Ms. Yang and Mr. Mairena and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION:

THE FOLLOWING RULE WAIVERS WERE APPROVED UNDER THE CONSENT CALENDAR:  
LATINO PRE LAW SOCIETY, \$60; HMAP, \$500; BAMN, AMENDED TO \$1,600.

THE FOLLOWING BILLS WERE APPROVED UNDER THE CONSENT CALENDAR: SB 18; SB 20, AS AMENDED; SB 23, AS AMENDED; SB 24, AS AMENDED; SB 25, AS AMENDED; SB 27; SB 28, AS AMENDED; SB 29; SB 33, AS AMENDED; SB 34, AS AMENDED; SB 35, AS AMENDED; AND SB 36.

The following Resolution, SB 18, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Chanchi Chau and Ms. Yang and was co-sponsored by Ms. Flores and Ms. Shah:

### RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF NOURISH INTERNATIONAL CHAPTER AT UC BERKELEY

WHEREAS, Nourish International (NI) is a student-run organization that originated at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and has grown to have chapters located in many more

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF NOURISH INTERNATIONAL CHAPTER AT UC BERKELEY (cont'd)

universities, such as Duke, Yale, UT Austin, UGA, University of Michigan, Stanford, UC Davis, and UCLA; and

WHEREAS, Nourish International believes that many communities constrained by the cycles of poverty lack the resources and opportunity to substantially improve their conditions; and

WHEREAS, because of this, Nourish International at Berkeley is an organization whose mission is to help eradicate poverty by engaging students and empowering communities through long-term, sustainable projects for impoverished communities; and

WHEREAS, Nourish International serves to help students make a stand against the poverty crisis in a tangible way, such as innovative social entrepreneurships, implementing various fundraising activities, and working alongside developing communities to implement sustainable development projects; and

WHEREAS, Nourish will implement fundraising activities, called Ventures, to cater to the student market, meaning it will provide a good or service that other students are willing to purchase for the inherent value of the good or service; and

WHEREAS, the organization will partner up with organizations that are carrying out grassroots development work around the world, including nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), non-profits, and international relief organizations; and

WHEREAS, it hopes to engage and serve as a medium to help students figure their roles in the ever-evolving world economy as they enter the workforce as global leaders in their respective professions; and

WHEREAS, the budget for Nourish International is as follows: Total, \$250.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognizes Nourish International as a first-year, ASUC-sponsored Student-Initiated Service Group (SISG).

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocates \$200 (two hundred dollars) from the Senate Contingency Fund to Nourish International.

The following Resolution, SB 20, as amended in committee, was authored by Tatyana Bren, Yuriy Tsurkan, and Mr. Nahabet:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE EUROPEAN STUDENT UNION (ESU)

WHEREAS, the European Student Union (ESU) is an organization dedicated to revealing and fostering the incredible diversity of European cultures and all that they have to offer here at Berkeley; and

Consent Calendar -- SB 20, In Support of the European Student Union (ESU) (cont'd)  
-- SB 23, In Support of Remedy Music Productions  
-- SB 24, In Support of Eggster Hunt and Learning Festival

- 40 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE EUROPEAN STUDENT UNION (ESU) (cont'd)

WHEREAS, ESU's vision is "to promote and share European culture through a variety of social and academic events such as cultural festivals, exchanges with other student groups, movie nights, dinners, debates, speaker panels, and parties"; and

WHEREAS, the budget from spring 2008 documents the European Student Union as a first-year Student Activity Group and only allocated \$200 to them; and

WHEREAS, this is incorrect and the European Student Union is a fourth-year ASUC sponsored group; and

WHEREAS, the budget for the European Student Union is as follows: Total, \$1,543.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognizes the European Student Union as a fourth-year ASUC sponsored Student Activity Group (SAG).

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocate \$400 from the Senate Contingency Fund to the European Student Union.

The following Resolution, SB 23, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Cynthia Tan, Josephine Yu, Curtis Lee, and Mr. Nahabet:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF REMEDY MUSIC PRODUCTIONS

WHEREAS, the ASUC exists to serve the needs of student groups, and one way in which this duty is fulfilled is by providing sponsorship for student groups; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of Remedy Music Productions is to provide a community for Cal students dedicated to using music to spread awareness of global issues such as AIDS and poverty and to help students express themselves through music; and

WHEREAS, the budget for Remedy Music Productions for the following year is as follows: Total, \$304.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognizes Remedy Music Productions as a second-year ASUC sponsored Student-Initiated Service Group (SISG).

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$234 from the Senate Contingency Fund to Remedy Music Productions.

The following Resolution, SB 24, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Rena Lee and Mr. Zuo:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE EGGSTER HUNT AND LEARNING FESTIVAL

- WHEREAS, Eggster is an 8<sup>th</sup> year ASUC sponsored SAG which organizes the Bay Area's largest free egg hunt and learning festival on the UC Berkeley campus that consists of egg hunts, interactive learning booths, and cultural performances accessible to all children and their families; and
- WHEREAS, Eggster serves approximately 3,000 children and families every year through this event, but specifically gears towards disabled and economically disadvantaged youth of the Bay Area; and
- WHEREAS, Eggster aims to inspire children, older siblings and their parents by exposing them to the University campus and higher-level education; and
- WHEREAS, Eggster unites UC Berkeley student clubs, fraternities, sororities, living communities (residence halls), UCB departments, and individual students in serving the local community as a campus; and
- WHEREAS, Eggster raises funds for non-profit agencies dedicated to supporting needs of children; and
- WHEREAS, Eggster brings together local businesses, corporations, alumni, and other members of the Bay Area community towards supporting three to four youth oriented non-profit agencies; and
- WHEREAS, the projected budget for Eggster Hunt and Learning Festival is as follows: Total \$7,245; and
- WHEREAS, Eggster this year hopes to expand as a student organization, by providing more publicity events, more organization retreats and activities, and by upgrading old resources (such as storage supplies) and providing more event supplies to expand Eggster's reach towards the outer Bay Area; and
- WHEREAS, Eggster's funding of \$1,390.46 does not meet its anticipated expenditures this year, and the organization risks falling into debt without additional ASUC financial support;
- THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$325.00 from the Senate contingency fund to Eggster.

The following Resolution, SB 25, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Jennie Chang, Paul Kim, and Ms. Cho, and was co-sponsored by Mr. Owens:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF LiNK Outreach: Bay Area (LOBA)

- WHEREAS, LiNK Outreach: Bay Area (LOBA), is a non-profit, non-partisan, non-ethnic and non-religious group formed in pursuit of educating the world about North Korean human rights,

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF LiNK Outreach: Bay Area (LOBA) (cont'd)

decreasing apathy, and protecting the North Korean people where they can be reached by means of education, outreach, political advocacy and fundraising efforts; and

WHEREAS, LiNK's headquarters in Washington D.C. is organizing a nationwide tour of concerts by the name of Liberty Live Tour that promotes North Korean human rights and spreads awareness of the crisis; and

WHEREAS, LOBA will be hosting for UC Berkeley at the Julia Morgan Center for the Arts on October 6; and

WHEREAS, LOBA serves to spread awareness about human rights violations in North Korea for both the on- and off-campus community and empower citizens of the world to take effective action and make a difference; and

WHEREAS, the concert will be open to anyone in the Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, LOBA will use its marketing resources particularly to publicize the concert to the students of UC Berkeley with the goal of 300 student attendees; and

WHEREAS, the total amount of concert proceeds from will be donated to directly support the cause of continual education and activism projects to aid global humanitarianism; and

WHEREAS, LOBA's expenses for the event are as follows: Total. \$1,350.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$350 (three hundred and fifty USD) from the Senate Contingency Fund to LOBA.

The following Resolution, SB 27, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Mr. Tran:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ENGINEERING STUDENT GROUPS: AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERS (ASME) AND CALSOL

WHEREAS, ASME, CalSOL, and IIE have been ASUC sponsored Student Activity Groups (SAG) for the past three, nine, and seven years, respectively; and

WHEREAS, all three groups are proud members of the Engineers' Joint Council (EJC) and its budgeting process, receiving direct funding from EJC; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ENGINEERING STUDENT GROUPS: AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERS (ASME) AND CALSOL (cont'd)

WHEREAS, ASME is a student chapter of a national organization that serves students of the Mechanical Engineering Department in the College of Engineering by encouraging advancement and quality of Mechanical Engineering education, serving as a representative on behalf of members in presenting their needs and objects to the faculty, department, professional, and Cal community; they set up meetings and socials to provide networking, enhancement, and retention opportunities among students, faculty, staff, and industry; and

WHEREAS, ASME is currently facilitating the efforts to organize a large-scale, joint Mechanical Engineering Career Fair, in conjunction with other Mechanical Engineering-based student groups, involving a great deal of financial management; and

WHEREAS, ASME received sponsorship during the 2006-2007 year but was not granted sponsorship due to an oversight in the 2008-2009 spring budgeting process; and

WHEREAS, CalSOL is a proven, high-performing, award-winning multidisciplinary team dedicated to the engineering, construction, and racing of solar vehicles in the annual North American Solar Challenge; and

WHEREAS, the ASUC's 501(c) non-profit status conferred upon ASME and CalSOL will benefit the student organization immensely in their expansive programming;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognize ASME and CalSOL as 10<sup>th</sup> year and 11<sup>th</sup> year Student Activity Groups (SAGs), respectively.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that these groups shall receive funding from the ASUC through the Engineers' Joint Council umbrella as member organizations; no funding is requested.

The following Resolution, SB 28, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Julian Bigi, Martin Mulvihill, and Mr. Tran, and was co-sponsored by Ms. Oatfield:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CHEMISTS FOR PEACE'S GREEN CHEMISTRY SEMINAR

WHEREAS, sustainability has become a major global focus in the physical sciences, policy making, various institutional credos, day-to-day living practices; and

WHEREAS, the ASUC and University of California, Berkeley have taken proactive stances to advance the practice and ideals of sustainability through, to name a few, TGIF, Berkeley research scientist Dr. Michael Wilson's 2006 Report entitled "Green Chemistry: A Framework..." and follow up report in 2008, "Green Chemistry: Cornerstone to a Sustainable California"; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CHEMISTS FOR PEACE'S GREEN CHEMISTRY SEMINAR (cont'd)

WHEREAS, Chemists for Peace, a graduate student group, strives to connect the areas of science research, education and training, and public policy together in order to produce ethical, sustainable chemistry, and

WHEREAS, many agencies such as the EPA, ACS, SPH continually insist on the need of green chemistry in order to reduce waste, pollution, and harmful byproducts in research practices and the engineering of products; and

WHEREAS, Chemists for Peace approaches green chemistry with a bottom-up approach: introducing toxicological and sustainable principles during the education and training of chemists; and

WHEREAS, Chemists for Peace have designed and are currently implementing a multidisciplinary seminar course in green chemistry (CHEM298-section 10); the group is receiving faculty commitment from the College of Chemistry and the School of Public Health, albeit no monetary support; and

WHEREAS, the seminar course is a well directed and structured seminar covering units such as: fundamentals of green chemistry, quantitative structure-activity relationships, biodegradable vs. bioaccumulative materials design, bioactivity in chemical design, and industrial applications of sustainable design, and

WHEREAS, Chemists for Peace hope to transform the seminar into an eventual required course both for undergraduates and graduates in the College of Chemistry, not only for a sustainable world, but to also equip graduates with the mindset and knowledge they need to be competitive in a forever increasingly sustainable market, and

WHEREAS, the University of California Berkeley's College of Chemistry is the nation's top chemistry program; adoption of said seminar and curricular innovation will pave the way for many other chemistry programs in the nation to follow suit, and

WHEREAS, Chemists for Peace have already began instruction and have secured multiple prominent speakers for their seminar series (three out-of-state speakers); however, their budget constraints prevent the group from flying in Professor Vicki Colvin, a current leader in Green Chemistry; and

WHEREAS, Chemists for Peace's seminar budget, as of September 11, 2008, is as follows: Total Expenses, \$4,750 - \$6,850, Total Revenue, \$4,750.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that \$200 (two hundred USD) shall be allocated from the Senate Contingency Fund to Chemists for Peace.

The following Resolution, SB 29, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Robert Brodsky, Dominic Molinari, Robert Zeller, and Mr. Tran:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ENGINEERS WITHOUT BORDERS AT BERKELEY

WHEREAS, the ASUC supports a diversity of student groups that enrich the academic, intellectual, and philanthropic atmosphere at the University of California; and

WHEREAS, Engineers Without Borders at Berkeley (EWB) is a humanitarian organization revived to partner with developing communities worldwide in order to improve their quality of life; this partnership focuses on implementing sustainable, equitable, and economic engineering projects, while involving and training internationally, socially responsible engineers and engineering students; and

WHEREAS, EWB offers the opportunity to enhance many attributes critical to successful engineering practice including team work, problem solving, creativity whilst pursuing meaningful, moral purposes; and

WHEREAS, EWB at Berkeley specifically plans to [insert specific activities and projects];

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognize Engineers Without Borders at Berkeley as an ASUC-sponsored first-year student-initiative service group (SISG).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Engineers Without Borders at Berkeley shall receive funding from the ASUC through the Engineers' Joint Council umbrella as a proud member organization.

The following Resolution, SB 33, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Ali Rawaf Mr. Zuo and was co-sponsored by Ms. Shah and Mr. Mairena:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE WRESTLING CLUB AT BERKELEY

WHEREAS, the ASUC supports a diverse array of student groups to enrich the lives and serve the interests of students on the UC Berkeley campus; and

WHEREAS, the mission of the Wrestling Club at Berkeley is to provide an environment in which members may practice and develop their skills in a non-competitive atmosphere; and

WHEREAS, it seeks to provide resources needed for students to learn and practice the sport of wrestling; and

WHEREAS, the founders of Wrestling Club at Berkeley have researched and prepared for safety and insurance measures through USA Wrestling National Governing Body insurance for their members and a Waiver of Liability signed by all members; and

WHEREAS, there is currently no other organization at UC Berkeley sponsored by the ASUC or any other department dedicated to the interest of recreational wrestling; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE WRESTLING CLUB AT BERKELEY (cont'd)

WHEREAS, officers of the Wrestling Club at Berkeley have already secured many donations of services and new and used equipment in order to lower the amount of money needed to operate; and

WHEREAS, the is Club attempting to expand its presence through more events and increased recruitment; and

WHEREAS, it cannot host events and programs without ASUC financial scholarship; and

WHEREAS, the \$230 allocated to Wrestling Club at Berkeley last spring does not meet the Club's anticipated operating expenses; and

WHEREAS, the budget for the 2008-2009 school year for the Wrestling Club at Berkeley is as follows:  
Total, \$580;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Wrestling Club at Berkeley be recognized as a second-year ASUC sponsored Student Activity Group (SAG).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$170 from the Senate contingency fund to the Wrestling Club at Berkeley.

The following Resolution, SB 34, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Jim Allen and Ms. Shah:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CAL LIBERTARIANS

WHEREAS, there is currently no active third-party political representative organization on campus; and

WHEREAS, this is a crucial year in regards to our representative government in that an election is afoot; and

WHEREAS, Cal Libertarians would serve to foster debate and discussion concerning the libertarian political philosophy; and

WHEREAS, Cal Libertarians would not be exclusive to students who affiliate as a part of the Libertarian Party; and

WHEREAS, the Cal Libertarians will table on Sproul Plaza, invite speakers such as Anthony Gregory, encourage monthly partisan debates lead by students (from Cal Democrats, Berkeley College Republicans, etc.); and

WHEREAS, the line item budget of anticipated expenses as of September 12, 2008 is: Total, \$550.00 USD;

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CAL LIBERTARIANS (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC shall recognize Cal Libertarians as a first-year ASUC Student Activity Group (SAG).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC shall allocate \$150 (one hundred and fifty dollars) from the Senate Contingency fund to sponsor the Cal Libertarians.

The following Resolution, SB 35, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Brian Ikkanda and Ms. Shah and was co-sponsored by Mr. Tran:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF EDUCATION UNDERGRADUATES (EDU)

WHEREAS, Education Undergraduates (EdU) (previously recognized as Educators United) was founded by Cal students during the Spring 2007 Semester, with the goal of professional development for students who wish to pursue a career in education; and

WHEREAS, EdU will host seminars featuring professionals and teachers ranging from grades K-12 from around the Bay Area, providing a wide range of educational knowledge; and

WHEREAS, EdU will feature teacher panels allowing students to hold Q&A session with professionals; and

WHEREAS, EdU will allow members to shadow teachers at their respective schools to gain real world experience; and

WHEREAS, EdU will host workshops featuring professionals from the Lawrence Hall of Science aimed at developing leadership skills and educational tools for future educators; and

WHEREAS, EdU is an expansion of the Cal Teach program, which only promotes math and science teachers from K-12, to a club that serves all students pursuing any field of education through the aforementioned: seminars, teacher panels, shadowing events, and workshops; and

WHEREAS, EdU aims to funnel graduates into the professionals career of education possibly through other programs such as Teach for America; and

WHEREAS, the line item budget of anticipated expenses as of September 12, 2008 is: Total, \$430.00 USD;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Education Undergraduates be recognized by its new name and no longer as Educators United, and as a second-year student activity group.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$200 (two hundred dollars) for the items listed above from the Senate Contingency Fund to Education Undergraduates.

The following Resolution, SB 36, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Ms. Oatfield:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE ASUC BY-LAWS' ARTICLE ABOUT THE DIRECTOR OF SUSTAINABILITY

WHEREAS, Section 1.3 of the By-Laws of The Green Initiative Fund Grant Making Committee states that the Committee shall include "One undergraduate student appointed by the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) Environmental Sustainability Director"; and

WHEREAS, during the past two year the ASUC Director of Sustainability has carried out her duties by leading the ASUC Sustainability Team, which is a special program in the ASUC dedicated to these three goals:

- Create and implement projects that address campus environmental problems, establish sustainable practices on campus, and raise sustainability awareness to students, faculty, and staff
- Provide students with the training and tools necessary to accomplish effective sustainability advocacy and project implementation, navigation of the campus bureaucracy, and experience required to succeed in future leadership roles
- Serve as a liaison between students and the ASUC, GA, administration, faculty, staff, and Berkeley community; facilitate effective networking between all environmental entities on campus; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Sustainability, created in January 2008, has taken on the role of organizing a semesterly meeting (by employing student interns) with environmental student groups to facilitate better communication among various environmentalist organizing bodies on the campus. This role is more appropriate for a permanent staff-led entity than a student-run entity because the Office of Sustainability has a greater capacity to ensure institutional memory; and

WHEREAS, Title I, Article 9.26 of the ASUC By-Laws currently reads:

9.26 Director of Environmental Sustainability

1. The Executive Vice President shall appoint a temporary committee consisting of five (5) ASUC Senators, voted on by the Senate. The committee shall select and forward one (1) Director of Environmental Sustainability nomination to the fall Senate for confirmation by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Senate. Nominees for consideration by this committee shall be limited to those nominated by an elected officer. Following the formation of the Director of Environmental Sustainability Selection Committee, all elected officials shall have at least one (1) week to submit nominations. The committee shall be formed at the first Senate meeting, and make a nomination to the Senate by the fourth regular Senate meeting.

## RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE ASUC BY-LAWS' ARTICLE ABOUT THE DIRECTOR OF SUSTAINABILITY (cont'd)

2. Director of Environmental Sustainability shall be responsible for the following:
  - a. Encouraging positive environmental practices within the ASUC and the campus community.
  - b. Fulfilling the responsibilities of the voting position awarded yearly to the ASUC on the Chancellors Advisory Committee on Sustainability.
  - c. Monitoring and enforcing environmental rules designated by the Constitution, By-laws, or Standing Rules.
  - d. Submitting and implementing environmental legislation that promotes positive environmental practices within the ASUC and the campus community.
  - e. Documenting and archiving all the environmental work done by the ASUC for benefit of future Directors of Environmental Sustainability and the campus community.
  - f. Organizing a semesterly meeting with environmental student groups to share knowledge on how to write legislation for the ASUC, help groups with applying for funding and support, and to increase collaboration amongst groups.
  - g. All other related duties as assigned by the Senate.
3. The Director of Environmental Sustainability may be removed from office for failing to do his or her duties by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Senate.

THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED THAT Title I, Article 9.26 of the ASUC By-Laws be amended to reflect the following changes:

## 9.26 Director of Environmental Sustainability

1. The Executive Vice President shall appoint a temporary committee consisting of five (5) ASUC Senators, voted on by the Senate. This committee shall consult with leaders of the ASUC Sustainability Team program and then the committee shall select and forward one (1) Director of Environmental Sustainability nomination to the fall Senate for confirmation by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Senate. Nominees for consideration by this committee shall be limited to those nominated by an elected officer. Following the formation of the Director of Environmental Sustainability Selection Committee, all elected officials shall have at least one (1) week to submit nominations. The committee shall be formed at the first Senate meeting, and make a nomination to the Senate by the fourth regular Senate meeting.
2. Director of Environmental Sustainability shall be responsible for the following:
  - a. Encouraging positive environmental practices within the ASUC and the campus community.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE ASUC BY-LAWS' ARTICLE ABOUT THE DIRECTOR OF SUSTAINABILITY (cont'd)

- b. Serving as a leader of the ASUC Sustainability team and acting as a liaison between the Senate and the Sustainability Team.
  - c. Fulfilling the responsibilities of the voting position awarded yearly to the ASUC on the Chancellors Advisory Committee on Sustainability.
  - d. Fulfilling the responsibilities of the voting position awarded yearly to the ASUC on The Green Initiative Fund Grant Making Committee or appointing someone to do so.
  - e. Monitoring and enforcing environmental rules designated by the Constitution, By-laws, or Standing Rules.
  - f. Submitting and implementing environmental legislation that promotes positive environmental practices within the ASUC and the campus community.
  - g. Documenting and archiving all the environmental work done by the ASUC for benefit of future Directors of Environmental Sustainability and the campus community.
  - h. Maintaining regular contact with the UC Berkeley Office of Sustainability.
  - i. All other related duties as assigned by the Senate.
3. The Director of Environmental Sustainability may be removed from office for failing to do his or her duties by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Senate.

ITEMS FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION

Ms. Dhar moved to go to SB 32. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moghtader and passed with no objection.

The following Resolution, SB 32, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Ellen Young, Ryan Field and Ms. Dhar:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF JERICHO! IMPROV AND SKETCH COMEDY TROUPE

WHEREAS, Jericho! is a fourth-year Student Activity Group (SAG) that received a final budget of \$300;  
and

WHEREAS, Jericho! branched away from Theater Rice in 2005 and has since then grown into a well-known and popular comedy group on campus that performs several times during the year;  
and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF JERICHO! IMPROV AND SKETCH COMEDY TROUPE (cont'd)

WHEREAS, Jericho! has since then broadened its areas of performance to sketch comedy, guerilla improv, and comedic videos; and

WHEREAS, the group has never asked for an increase in funding, aware of the financial difficulties that the ASUC encountered in the past; and

WHEREAS, Jericho! donates all its proceeds from shows and events to charity, which to date, have totaled over \$2,000; and

WHEREAS, this year, Jericho! will be, contingent on Senate funding, hosting workshops with a professional improv coach from the Upright Citizens Brigade, one of the best-known improv comedy groups from Los Angeles; and

WHEREAS, Jericho! has always sought to teach improv, but it has lacked resources in the past, and has witnessed an overwhelmingly positive response to the idea of the workshop this year; and

WHEREAS, the budget for planned workshop is as follows: Total Revenue (Projected), \$1,500; Total Expenditure, \$2,450;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocate \$350 from the Senate Contingency Fund to the Jericho! Improv and Sketch comedy troupe for the improv comedy workshop.

Ms. Dhar moved to amend the bill to allocate \$500 from the Senate Contingency Fund to Jericho! The motion was seconded by Mr. Smelko. Mr. Mairena said that to amend a bill by a financial allocation, the Senate had to fill in a blank.

Ms. Rodriguez moved to create in the blank. Ms. Pasco called for suggested amendments. Ms. Dhar suggested \$500; Mr. Mairena suggested \$200; Ms. Flores suggested \$250; Mr. Moghtader suggested \$600; Ms. Hussain suggested \$350; Mr. Owens suggested \$450. Ms. Ude suggested \$300. Ms. Hussain suggested \$400. Seeing no further suggestions, Ms. Pasco said they would vote.

Ms. Pasco said the first amount was \$600. The motion to amend SB 32 to \$600 failed by hand-vote 3-8-6.

Ms. Pasco said the next amount was \$500.

Ms. Hussain moved to meet in a committee of the whole. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rodriguez and passed by hand-vote 9-8-1. This meeting entered into a committee of the whole.

Back in regular session, Mr. Nahabet moved to recess for three minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dhar and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, Mr. Nahabet moved to recess for three minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Yang and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Ms. Pasco said the next amount under consideration was \$500.

Mr. Mairena moved to go to SB 37. Hearing no objection, Ms. Pasco said they would consider SB 37.

The following Resolution, SB 37, as amended in committee, was authored by Eva Cisneros and was co-sponsored by Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Mairena:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SIGMA PI ALPHA SORORITY, INC.

WHEREAS, Sigma Pi Alpha was founded in 1996 at the University of California, Berkeley by nine women who saw the need to create a close network of Latinas wishing to make a difference in their communities, starting with themselves, by addressing academic, cultural, communal, and social needs; and

WHEREAS, Sigma Pi Alpha follows and performs under the following goals: To enhance Chicana/Latina heritage within the sorority, to be involved within campus and our communities, and to promote higher education in future generations, amongst others; and

WHEREAS, Sigma Pi Alpha is a member of the Multicultural Greek Council and dedicates time to community outreach and promoted higher education among high school students in underprivileged communities; and

WHEREAS, Sigma Pi Alpha works annually with high school students in impoverished communities in the Oakland and Richmond school districts, guiding students and parents in selecting colleges/universities to further their goals; and

WHEREAS, Sigma Pi Alpha is a non-profit sorority that annually fundraises money to sponsor annual scholarships to Chicana/Latina high school seniors attending an accredited college or university; and

WHEREAS, operational expenses for Sigma Pi Alpha in fall 2008 are as follows: Total, \$1170.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognizes Sigma Pi Alpha Sorority, Inc. as a first-year Student-Initiated Service Group.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocate \$250 (two hundred and fifty dollars) to Sigma Pi Alpha, Inc. from the ASUC Senate Contingency Fund.

Ms. Rodriguez said representatives were present, who were also at Fi-Comm. They're requesting \$300 as a first-year SISG. The reps in this: Eva Cisneros, President of Sigma Pi Alpha; Diana Rangel, Vice President; and Maggie Mireles, a member.

Ms. Oatfield said she was under the impression that the Senate had the Greek Opportunity Fund for Greek organizations. She asked why money for this bill, and group, should come from the Contingency Fund. Mr. Mairena said the Greek Op Fund was used to fund events put on by Greek orgs. The sorority was asking for sponsorship as a first-year SISG, and the money was for the overall operation of the

group. Ms. Oatfield said the sorority, then, could get money from the Greek Opportunity Fund. Mr. Mairena said they could.

Ms. Cisneros said they tried to get sponsors from big corporations and mailed out 500 pieces. But sororities have stereotypes for partying and having fun. What the sorority did was to help out impoverished communities in Oakland and Richmond, where children don't have access to programs. They'll have a Halloween carnival for Oakland and Richmond kids so they could trick or treat in a safe environment. They'll co-sponsor an event to bring a speaker to talk about activism and how to work with the community.

Ms. Chen asked what percentage of events were service oriented. Ms. Cisneros said they do two to three community events per month, which were 75-80% of the events they hold. They also have an event to raise money for the scholarship they've given out for ten years to minority students. Ms. Cisneros said their "socials" are community events, such as going to the Marina to clean up. They have three socials a month, two or three community events, and they tutor. They try and hold a party once a semester to fund the scholarship. Ms. Cisneros said a lot of their girls are first-year college students and work 40-hours or more; so they limit themselves to ten events. Ms. Mireles said that was the maximum number every month. That gave out two \$250 scholarships last year. That was all they could afford. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by three minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Cho and Ms. Flores and passed with no objection.

Mr. Smelko asked how much went towards service events out of the \$250 requested. Ms. Mireles they're asking for money for the group's operations. Ms. Cisneros said their request includes transportation, since their members don't have cars. A lot of expenses were out of pocket. They need insurance because they have events off-campus, and had to pay \$142 every month for that, out of pocket. Ms. Rangel said that other chapters don't require liability insurance, so the national doesn't pay for that, and members had to pay for that out of pocket. And their members are on financial assistance. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by three minutes was made and was seconded by Ms. Tran and passed with no objection.

Mr. Moghtader asked if their community service events reach out more to Berkeley students or to high school students. Ms. Cisneros they participated in the Health Fair. Their events were open to the Berkeley campus. Ms. Rangel said the majority of their outreach was directly to the community, including high school and middle schools.

Ms. Ude asked what events they've had on campus. Ms. Cisneros last year they brought elementary school students to campus. That was their biggest event last year, bringing over 100 students, and most were minorities and first generation in the US. Parents hadn't known that college was accessible to their children. On Sunday they'll give tours to high school students from underrepresented communities. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by three minutes was made and seconded by Mr. Sakaue and Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

Ms. Mireles said that some students they outreached to are now at Berkeley. Ms. Cisneros said sisters also work with Upward Bound, a group on campus in the dorms and tutors them and shows them how it felt to be on campus.

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would entertain a motion for a ten-minute recess. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Zuo and Mr. Tran and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in

session, a motion to extend speaking time by three minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Ude and Mr. Smelko and passed with no objection.

Back in session, Ms. Chen said that when she asked on Monday how many service events they did every month, they said it was two to three. Ms. Cisneros said those were three big events. They do smaller events as well. Big events took a whole day to participate. They're events the sorority hosts. The other events are those they participate in. To be an active sister requires participation for in ten hours a month.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and was seconded by Mr. Owens and failed by hand-vote 9-6-2.

Mr. Tran moved to create a blank. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moghtader. Ms. Pasco called for suggested amounts. Mr. Sakaue suggested \$300. Ms. Dhar suggested \$150. Mr. Sakaue suggested \$250. Ms. Rodriguez suggested \$200. Ms. Ude suggested \$275. Mr. Owens suggested \$400.

Ms. Pasco said the first amount under consideration was \$400.

Ms. Oatfield said she totally supported this group and its activities, but felt that money for the group should come from the Greek Opportunity Fund, not the Contingency Fund.

Mr. Mairena said that Greek groups can apply for SISG status. The sorority was established in Berkeley and this was the first chapter. The same questions people were asking were asked in Fi-Comm. The Fi-Comm Chair realized that this group was service-based sorority and why it was recognized as a SISG.

Mr. Owens said he had to give the speakers props and thank them for talking to the Senate. He liked giving back to the community and would give them the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Moghtader said that he thought the group would qualify for SISG funding. Greek Opportunity funding was generally reserved for events. The group should apply for that funding. This was an exclusive body since it's a sorority. Ms. Cisneros said men can join, although there were no men.

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would entertain a motion for a ten-minute recess. She felt the conversation was going in circles and she would ask Senators to speak to each other off the floor.

Mr. Moghtader moved to call the question on \$400. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO AMEND SB 37 BY FUNDING THE GROUP \$400 PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 9-4-6.

Mr. Mairena said he was in favor of funding the group \$300, which the bill originally asked for. CLL recognizes the MCGC as a student-initiated service Council.

Mr. Zuo moved to call the question. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. A roll call vote was requested by Mr. Sakaue and Ms. Shah.

Roll call was taken on SB 37, as amended to \$400:

YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Mary June Flores	Oscar Mairena	Sheila Chen
Tommy Owens	John Moghtader	Sarah Cho
Claudia Rodriguez	Christina Oatfield	Meghana Dhar
Lyell Sakaue	Tu Tran	Saira Hussain
Kifah Shah		Eddie Nahabet
Lisa Tran		Tara Raffi
Obiamaka Ude		Will Smelko
Stephanie Yang		Yishi Zuo

A motion to close the rolls was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to approve SB 37, as amended to \$400, failed 8-4-8. Voting comments were heard.

Mr. Mairena moved to reconsider SB 37. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

A motion to create a blank was made and seconded by Mr. Mairena and Ms. Tran and passed with no objection. Mr. Mairena suggested \$300. Ms. Flores suggested \$250. Ms. Dhar suggested \$150. Mr. Owens suggested \$400. Ms. Ude suggested \$275. Ms. Rodriguez suggested \$350.

Mr. Tran said the group had good planning and benefited the community, but he didn't agree with double dipping and applying for the Greek Opportunity Fund.

Mr. Mairena said the group was requesting money for operational expenses. The GOF doesn't fund operations, only events. SB 37 was a request to fund operating costs. The bill wasn't funding an event.

Mr. Owens asked people to stop using the same arguments over and over. It was 12:30 a.m.

Mr. Nahabet moved to call the question. The motion was seconded by Ms. Chen and passed with no objection. The motion to amend SB 37 to \$400 failed by hand-vote 4-9-7.

Ms. Pasco said the next amendment for consideration was \$350. Seeing no discussion, the question was automatically called. The motion to amend SB 37 to \$350 failed by hand-vote 9-10-1.

The motion to amend SB 37 to \$300 failed by hand-vote 9-9-2.

Ms. Flores and Ms. Yang requested a roll call vote on \$275. Roll call was taken to amend SB 37 to \$275:

YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Mary June Flores	Sheila Chen	Saira Hussain
Oscar Mairena	Sarah Cho	
Tommy Owens	Meghana Dhar	
Claudia Rodriguez	John Moghtader	
Lyell Sakaue	Eddie Nahabet	
Kifah Shah	Christina Oatfield	
Lisa Tran	Tara Raffi	
Obiamaka Ude	Will Smelko	
Stephanie Yang	Tu Tran	
	Yishi Zuo	

A motion to close the rolls was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to amend SB 37 to \$275 failed 9-10-1. Voting comments were heard.

With no objection, the question was called and debate closed on amending SB 37 to \$250. A roll call vote was requested.

Roll call was taken on the motion to amend SB 37 at \$250:

YES	NO
Mary June Flores	Sheila Chen
Saira Hussain	Sarah Cho
Oscar Mairena	Meghana Dhar
Tommy Owens	John Moghtader
Claudia Rodriguez	Eddie Nahabet
Lyell Sakaue	Christina Oatfield
Kifah Shah	Tara Raffi
Lisa Tran	Will Smelko
Obiamaka Ude	Tu Tran
Stephanie Yang	Yishi Zuo

A motion to close the rolls was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to amend SB 37 to \$250 failed 10-10-0. Voting comments were heard.

Mr. Mairena asked to add \$200 as an amendment. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Mairena said \$200 would cut the group from what Fi-Comm allocated. According to the Constitution, as a SISG and as an MCGC Greek, the group was entitled to get money from both sources, as a SISG and from the GOF. Their rules state that the Greek Opportunity Funding shall be the sole source of funding for fraternity and sorority. They can't receive money from the Contingency Fund unless they're recognized as a SISG. There's a cap of \$1,500 in the amount a group received from the GOF and the Senate Contingency Fund. The bill was asking for operational costs.

Ms. Chen said there's a cap in funding from the Greek Opportunity Fund and the Contingency Fund, but that was for a single event. The By-laws don't say groups can get money from the Contingency Fund for operations and then get funding from the GOF. That's in Title III, Article 3.7. She would ask people to not misinterpret the By-laws.

Mr. Moghtader said the group was not yet recognized as a SISG. It's recognized as a Greek. If the group applied from the GOF, this process would go much differently.

A motion to call the question and end debate was made and seconded and passed by hand-vote 12-7-1.

Ms. Hussain and Ms. Ude requested a roll call vote. Roll call was taken on the motion to approve SB 37 at \$200:

YES	NO
Mary June Flores	Sheila Chen
Saira Hussain	Sarah Cho
Oscar Mairena	Meghana Dhar
Tommy Owens	John Moghtader
Claudia Rodriguez	Eddie Nahabet
Lyell Sakaue	Christina Oatfield
Kifah Shah	Tara Raffi
Lisa Tran	Will Smelko
Obiamaka Ude	Tu Tran
Stephanie Yang	Yishi Zuo

A motion to close the rolls was made and seconded and passed with no objection. With the rolls closed, the motion to amend SB 37 to \$200 failed 10-10-0. Voting comments were heard.

Ms. Hussain moved to recess for five minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by one minute was made and seconded by Ms. Ude and Mr. Owens and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Zuo moved to reconsider amending SB 37 to \$300. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection. With no objection, the question was called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE AMENDING SB 37 AT \$300 PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 14-3-3.

Ms. Dhar moved to recess for two minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tran and passed by hand-vote 10-9-1. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by two minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Tran and Mr. Zuo and failed by hand-vote 8-10-2.

Ms. Dhar moved to go to back SB 32. The motion was seconded by Ms. Raffi and failed by hand-vote 9-9-1. Ms. Pasco said they were still under consideration of SB 37, as amended at \$300.

Mr. Mairena said SB 37 was being compared to another bill, and they were completely different. The Senate should move on with this bill. The ladies of Sigma Pi Alpha have been there a long time.

Mr. Moghtader said the reason another bill was brought up was because the Senate was talking about where funds would come from. Any money not taken from the Contingency Fund could go to any other student group, not just Jericho! Sigma Pi Alpha was in the unique opportunity to go to the Greek Opportunity Fund. It wasn't tit for tat.

Mr. Smelko said they were considering the ramifications of SB 37 on all other bills that were funded from the Contingency Fund.

Mr. Mairena moved to call the question. The motion was seconded by Ms. Flores and passed with no objection. A request for a roll call vote was made by Mr. Mairena and was seconded.

Roll call was taken on the motion to approve SB 37 at \$300:

YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Mary June Flores	Sheila Chen	Sarah Cho
Oscar Mairena	Meghana Dhar	Saira Hussain
Tommy Owens	John Moghtader	Eddie Nahabet
Claudia Rodriguez	Christina Oatfield	
Kifah Shah	Tara Raffi	
Lisa Tran	Lyell Sakaue	
Obiamaka Ude	Will Smelko	
Stephanie Yang	Tu Tran	
	Yishi Zuo	

A motion to close the rolls was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to approve SB 37, as amended to \$300, failed 8-9-3.

Mr. Sakaue moved to reconsider. The motion was seconded by Ms. Flores and passed with no objection.

Mr. Mairena asked to add an amendment to the blank, at \$150.

Ms. Oatfield moved to amend the Final Resolved Clause of SB 37 to read as follows:

“Finally Resolved, that the ASUC Senate allocate \$400 to Sigma Pi Alpha, Inc. from the ASUC Greek Opportunity Fund.”

Mr. Mairena said the amendment wasn't constitutional. The GOF was strictly for events. Ms. Oatfield said she considered all of the expenses to be for events.

Mr. Nahabet moved to recess for two minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dhar and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by two minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Dhar and Mr. Owens. Ms. Dhar rescinded her motion.

Ms. Pasco said Ms. Oatfield’s motion to amend died for lack of a second. The Senate was in consideration of Mr. Mairena’s amendment, to \$150. Mr. Nahabet moved to call the question. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection. A roll call vote was requested and was seconded.

Roll call was taken on the motion to amend SB 37 to \$150:

YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Mary June Flores	Sheila Chen	Tu Tran
Saira Hussain	Sarah Cho	
Tommy Owens	Meghana Dhar	
Claudia Rodriguez	Oscar Mairena	
Lyell Sakaue	John Moghtader	
Kifah Shah	Eddie Nahabet	
Lisa Tran	Christina Oatfield	
Obiamaka Ude	Tara Raffi	
Stephanie Yang	Will Smelko	
	Yishi Zuo	

A motion to close the rolls was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to approve the amendment to SB 37 at \$150 failed 9-10-1. Voting comments were heard.

Mr. Zuo asked if the bill was at \$250. Ms. Pasco said it was. Mr. Zuo moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE SB 37, AS AMENDED AT \$250, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 16-2-1, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SIGMA PI ALPHA SORORITY, INC.

Ms. Pasco said they were in consideration of SB 32, In Support of Jericho! Improv and Sketch Comedy Troupe. The Senate previously suggested amendments to fill in the blank.

Ms. Dhar moved to recess for two minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by five minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Shah and Ms. Tran and passed by hand-vote 8-1-1. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Ms. Pasco said they were in consideration of filling in the blank at \$500 for SB 32. Seeing no discussion the question was automatically called. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO SB 32 AT \$500 PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 10-8-2.

Mr. Sakaue said he was uncomfortable with the number. He thought they should respect the decision of Fi-Comm, considering that they meet until the wee hours of the morning.

Ms. Dhar said that as Vice Chair of Fi-Comm, she agreed with Mr. Sakaue. But given recent information from Jericho, they realized the group's event couldn't happen with \$350. The group did great things for the community and the performing arts. She believed amending the bill to \$500 was the only way to make the event happen.

Ms. Rodriguez said she was also uncomfortable with \$500. The bill was passed at \$350, and the sponsor herself lowered the amount to that figure. The amount of the proposed increase, \$150, would be the amount a first-year SAG would get. She didn't think they were inhibiting Jericho, but would inhibit a group coming to the Senate in the future.

Mr. Mairena moved to amend the amount of SB 32 to \$350. Ms. Pasco said that amount was already on the board.

The motion to amend SB 32 by filling in the blank with \$350 failed by hand-vote 8-10-1.

Ms. Hussain moved to amend to \$400. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran. The motion to amend failed by hand-vote 4-15-1.

Ms. Pasco said they were back to consideration of the bill at \$500.

Mr. Nahabet moved to amend to \$425. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran and failed by hand-vote 2-15-2.

Mr. Tran moved to amend SB 32 to \$450. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moghtader. THE MOTION TO AMEND SB 32 TO \$450 PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 11-9-0.

Seeing no discussion the question was automatically called. The motion to approve SB 32, as amended to \$450, failed by hand-vote 11-9-0.

Mr. Mairena moved to reconsider SB 32. The motion was seconded by Ms. Flores and passed with no objection.

Ms. Hussain moved to create a blank for SB 32. The motion was seconded. Ms. Pasco called for amount s. Mr. Tran suggested \$500; Ms. Hussain suggested \$400. Ms. Cho suggested \$425. Ms. Rodriguez suggested \$350. Ms. Flores suggested \$300. Mr. Mairena suggested \$200. Ms. Shah suggested \$150. Ms. Pasco said seeing no further amendment s, they would vote.

The motion to amend SB 32 at \$500 passed by hand-vote 10-9-1.

Mr. Mairena moved to meet in a committee of the whole. The motion was seconded and failed by hand-vote 8-11-1.

Mr. Mairena moved to call the question on \$500. The motion was seconded and failed by hand-vote 10-8-0.

Mr. Mairena moved to amend the bill to \$350. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rodriguez and failed by hand-vote 9-9-2. Ms. Pasco said the bill was still amended to \$500.

Mr. Nahabet moved to recess for three minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mairena and passed by hand-vote 17-1-1. This meeting was recessed. Back in session a motion to recess for two minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Hussain and Ms. Ude and failed by hand-vote 7-13-0.

Seeing no discussion, Ms. Pasco said the question was automatically called. The motion to approve SB 32 at \$500 failed by hand-vote 8-12-2.

Mr. Nahabet moved to reconsider SB 32. The motion was seconded by Ms. Flores and passed with no objection.

A motion to call the question on SB 32, as amended out of committee, at \$350, was made and seconded passed with no objection.

The motion to approve SB 32, as amended out of committee at \$350, failed by hand-vote 11-7-2.

Mr. Nahabet moved to recess for three minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dhar and passed by hand-vote 10-9-1. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by three minutes was made and was seconded by Ms. Tran and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by two minutes was made and seconded by Mr. Zuo and Ms. Yang and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Nahabet moved to reconsider SB 32. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

Ms. Pasco called for any motions or points of discussion.

Mr. Tran said it was difficult that the group wasn't there, but the Senate had to consider Ms. Dhar's statement that if the Senate didn't give this money, the event wouldn't happen. He felt the Senate could fund the group at \$450, which was close to what the group needed, \$500.

Ms. Hussain said it was respectful to not drag groups into a three-hour procedure when all they'd do is answer questions for two minutes, and then watch the Senate try to vote.

Ms. Dhar said she would ask the Senate to consider what they were fighting about, to have the group's event happen. It wouldn't happen with \$350.

Ms. Rodriguez said it wasn't fair to blame the Senate for the event not happening. They weren't cutting the group more than what was allocated in Fi-Comm. People were making an effort to work with Jericho to make sure the event happened.

Ms. Raffi said despite what allocation they thought was feasible on Monday, that didn't necessarily indicate reality if more facts have come to life since then. The Senate needed to consider what was needed to make this event happen. Jericho was one of the most active groups on campus. Arguing over \$50 wasn't worth the Senate's time.

Mr. Mairena said he wasn't questioning the worth of Jericho. But it's hard for him to think the event wouldn't happen without \$50 when he hasn't heard that from the group itself. He knew what it was like for a group to sit through many hours of nothing at a Senate meeting.

Mr. Nahabet said that as soon as the amount was decided in Fi-Comm, there was a sentiment against the number. He talked to members of Fi-Comm and they were saying they shouldn't have approved the bill at that amount. So this was brought up on Monday right after the meeting. He would ask people to please be open to compromise.

Ms. Tran said she thought \$400 was a very good compromise.

Mr. Smelko said their object was to have communication, so they shouldn't stifle things that happen after Fi-Comm met. If a group decided it needed more to put on than event, that was the type of fluid communication the Senate needed.

Ms. Shah said that next time in the event something changes, hopefully they can send that out to the Senate and ask people what they think rather than bringing it up at 2:37 a.m.

Mr. Nahabet moved to amend the bill to \$400. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tran. On a point of order, Mr. Mairena said they had to fill in a blank. Mr. Nahabet rescinded his motion and move to create a blank. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens.

Ms. Pasco called for amounts. Mr. Nahabet suggested \$400. Ms. Rodriguez suggested \$350.

Ms. Pasco said that seeing no further amendments they were in consideration of \$400. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO SB 32, AT \$400, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 12-8-0.

Seeing no further speakers the question was automatically called. The motion to approve SB 32 as amended to \$400 failed by hand-vote 11-9-0.

Mr. Mairena moved to reconsider SB 32. The motion was seconded by Ms. Raffi and passed with no objection.

Mr. Mairena moved to create a blank. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens.

Mr. Mairena suggested \$350. Ms. Raffi suggested \$400.

Mr. Tran said there were thresholds to this event. Fifty dollars could be the tipping point. He bankrolled Cal Hep B free by bankrolling his car, so he knew what thresholds were like.

Mr. Smelko said he would like to hear arguments why \$400 was inappropriate.

THE MOTION TO AMEND SB 32 TO \$400 PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 11-9-0.

Ms. Hussain moved to recess for five minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Raffi and passed by hand-vote 15-1-2. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Mairena moved to go to approval of Advocacy Agenda committees. If that wasn't done that evening, the fifth week, the Senate couldn't function. Ms. Pasco said that was a motion to go to Old Business. The motion was seconded by Ms. Flores and failed by hand-vote 9-10-1.

Ms. Pasco said they were under consideration of SB 32, as amended to \$400.

Ms. Dhar said the event wouldn't happen with \$350. The \$50 would go towards the fee for the workshop itself. The Senate would be accountable for this, and not allowing this campus-wide event was an insult. She believed there was something bigger happening there if they weren't willing to fund \$50 to a group when the event couldn't happen without it.

Ms. Hussain said Senators needed to maintain professionalism and dialogue. They weren't currently moving the process along. She was on the other side for the previous bill, and the amount in question was just \$50. She would ask them to move on with the agenda.

Ms. Pasco said she would ask members to not use divisive language.

Mr. Smelko said people could always come up with an excuse to not fund a group. He asked why they should make the group raise \$50 when the Senate could fund that easily.

Ms. Chen said the Senate shouldn't hinder a student group from putting on an event.

Ms. Shah said the Vice Chair of Fi-Comm and others in the room agreed to \$350. The number was agreed to, and now people had problems with the amount.

Mr. Nahabet said he was sending out a link for one of Jericho's skits.

Ms. Cho said she thought \$400 was the only amount that had a possibility of passing. Nothing above or below would get passed.

Mr. Mairena moved to recess for two minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by two minutes was made by Ms. Hussain and was seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, a motion to extend the recess by five minutes was made and seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, Mr. Tran moved to extend the recess by five minutes. The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Pasco said they were under consideration of SB 32 as amended to \$400. Ms. Hussain moved to call the question. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection. The motion to approve failed by hand-vote 11-9-0. Ms. Pasco said that was the fifth time it's failed.

Mr. Nahabet moved to reconsider. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mairena and passed with no objection. He sent a clip out of Jericho's "crosswalk marathon." It lightened his mood and maybe would sway others' opinions.

Ms. Shah said the Senate hasn't been critical of Jericho's programming. They're talking about compromise, but this was the first time some Senators have ever talked to her, which was problematic. It was audacious to start bringing up compromise now. She was willing to do that, but to throw that word round now was uncalled for. This was the first time certain Senators have ever approached her.

Ms. Raffi said the fact that programming hasn't come up before was an indication as to where the Senate's problem came from. They should look at concrete examples of what Jericho was doing.

Ms. Chen said instead of talking about compromise they should do it. There are Senators in the room who have never approached her, and she didn't think it was a big deal, and wasn't offended. It's just how the Senate did things. If people want to compromise, they should just do it.

Mr. Moghtader said he thought Jericho would use the extra \$50 productively.

Ms. Raffi said that people all like Jericho, and she asked what people were fighting for.

Ms. Oatfield said she thought it was ludicrous the Senate was spending so much time discussing a matter of \$50. She would like people to keep things in context for this bill and for all financial bills for the rest of the year.

Ms. Shah moved to call the question. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Shah rescinded her motion.

Mr. Nahabet moved to amend SB 32 to \$400. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mairena. Ms. Shah asked to create a blank and suggested \$400. Seeing no other amendments, Ms. Pasco said they were in consideration of that amount. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 20-0-0.**

A roll call vote was requested by Ms. Rodriguez. Roll call was taken on the motion to approve SB 32, as amended to \$400:

YES

Sheila Chen	Eddie Nahabet	Will Smelko
Sarah Cho	Christina Oatfield	Lisa Tran
Meghana Dhar	Tommy Owens	Tu Tran
Mary June Flores	Tara Raffi	Obiamaka Ude
Saira Hussain	Claudia Rodriguez	Stephanie Yang
Oscar Mairena	Lyell Sakaue	Yishi Zuo
John Moghtader	Kifah Shah	

A motion to close the rolls was made and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE SB 32, AS AMENDED TO \$400, PASSED 20-0-0, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF JERICO! IMPROV AND SKETCH COMEDY TROUPE. Voting comments were heard.

The following Resolution, SB 22, as amended in committee, was authored by Yuriy Tsurkan and Mr. Nahabet:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE RUSSIAN CLUB

WHEREAS, the mission of the Russian Club is to unite the Russian-speaking community at UC Berkeley by promoting social activities, networking, leadership opportunities, and cultural support; and

WHEREAS, members of the Russian Club come from various countries of the former USSR and of the world; and

WHEREAS, the Russian language is one of the strongest cultural and social characteristics of their identity; and

WHEREAS, the Russian Club has been establishing a warm and welcoming environment for its members so that they can enjoy communicating and interacting with people, whom they share their historical and social heritage with; and

WHEREAS, the following is the budget for the Russian Club: Total, \$529; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognizes the Russian Club as a first-year ASUC sponsored Student Activities Group (SAG).

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocates \$150 from the Senate Contingency Fund to the Russian Club of Berkeley.

Mr. Nahabet said the group has been a little unorganized in terms of some technical stuff. The group that refers to itself now as "The Russian Club" was actually "The Russian-Speaking Business and Law Association," (RSBLA). There have been issues with its funding because everybody starting to call it "The Russian Club." In the past, the group hasn't really held any events that specifically cater to Business or Law students. This was the group's eighth year of standing, having started in 2001. According to the information he had from the 4th floor, The group didn't receive funding in 06-07 and 07-08. In the ASUC Constitution it states that if a group isn't funded for two years, from any source, -- when they came to the ASUC in 2006-7, there's a bill and the status is "not available." Mr. Nahabet said he talked to the Senator who wrote that bill and he said that when the group came to the ASUC, it was the end of the year, the Senate was tight on money with its Contingency Fund, and for some reason, the Senate told the group to seek alternate forms of funding and told them to go to the Jewish Student Union. Apparently there were a lot of Jewish people in the group, and the Senate felt it could get funding there. The group did get funding from JSU. So for the two years the 4th floor, Millicent Morris-Chaney, said the group didn't receive funding, in one of those years, the group received funding from the JSU. Considering that the ASUC funds the JSU, which uses all of that money to give to its groups, the Senate indirectly funded the Russian Club. So the constitutional provision was up for interpretation. The group has been around for eight years and caters to 201 undergrads, 33 grads, five non-registered students, and 8 non-students. It has a lot of great programs. To give them first-year standing would be inappropriate. The word "funding" could be interpreted at the Senate's discretion.

Mr. Sakaue said he interpreted "funding" as ASUC recognition and sponsorship. Sponsorship doesn't just involve funding, but a review of the group's constitution, how it publicizes events, etc. The Senate couldn't ignore the By-laws that state that a group not receiving funding for two years would be considered a first-year group.

Ms. Rodriguez said the last time the group appears in the ASUC budget was 05-06. That was the last time the group received funding. The EJC also funds student groups with ASUC funds.

Ms. Raffi said the JSU is an ASUC group, an umbrella group, and had the infrastructure in place to distribute funds to other groups. To become a JSU group, certain rules must be followed that have been approved by the ASUC. The groups have to put "sponsored by the ASUC" on their fliers. There are records and minutes from every meeting and meticulous records for every budget the JSU has gotten. The Russian Club went to the Finance Committee in 06-07, and Fi-Comm recommended that the group go to the JSU, even though the group wanted to be part of the ASUC.

Mr. Mairena said the group was applying to be recognized by the ASUC, so they weren't recognized at this point. He was concerned with an extremely loose interpretation by the Chair of Con-Review. The organization wasn't recognized as a SAG for two years in a row.

Ms. Raffi said that when a group comes before the Senate for spring budgeting, they're already a recognized student group. Funding was separate from being recognized. Groups submit their Constitution and By-laws to be recognized. Mr. Mairena said that for two years the group wasn't recognized, and therefore it had to start over. It was unfair, but that was how the ASUC operated.

Mr. Tran said there was an example of one group that went into the EJC, felt they were getting screwed, became independent, left the EJC, and were recognized as a sixth-year group. So that has been done in the past.

Mr. Nahabet said that in the best interests of their health, and in the interests of compromising for the sake of time, he would move to table the bill.

Ms. Shah asked if Mr. Nahabet could e-mail out the documentation.

The motion to table was seconded by Mr. Moghtader.

Mr. Nahabet said he would rescind his motion to table.

Mr. Mairena said that for two years, there was no record of the group in the ASUC. So it should be recognized as a first-year group, and act according to the Constitution.

Ms. Rodriguez moved to table SB 22. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nahabet. THE MOTION TO TABLE SB 22, AS AMENDED IN COMMITTEE, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE RUSSIAN CLUB.

The following Resolution, SB 30, as amended in committee, was authored by Ms. Flores, Ms. Rodriguez, and EAVP Jirachaikitti, and was co-sponsored by Mr. Mairena, Ms. Shah, Mr. Sakaue, Ms. Yang, AAVP De La Cruz, EVP Pasco, and Pres. Winston:

RESOLUTION TO MAKE THE AMERICAN DREAM A REALITY FOR ALL CALIFORNIA STUDENTS: SUPPORT THE SEPTEMBER 26, 2008 MARCH TO GET GOV. SCHWARZENEGGER TO SIGN THE CALIFORNIA DREAM ACT

WHEREAS, the University of California System was founded, as stated in the California Master Plan of Higher Education, to serve the public of the State; and

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 540 (AB 540), authored by Assemblyman Marco Firebaugh, and passed in 2001, increases access to higher education for undocumented students who meet all the outlined requirements and thus qualify to pay in-State tuition; and

WHEREAS, AB 540, supported by numerous organizations, ratified by the State Legislature, and upheld by the State's courts, presents an opportunity for California's high school graduates to continue their education in the State's accredited public community colleges and universities; and

WHEREAS, AB 540 places California at the forefront of a nationwide movement to recognize the merit of undocumented students; and

WHEREAS, these students are indistinguishable from their UC Berkeley peers and contribute to the vibrant campus community through unique perspectives and diverse backgrounds; and

RESOLUTION TO MAKE THE AMERICAN DREAM A REALITY FOR ALL CALIFORNIA STUDENTS: SUPPORT THE SEPTEMBER 26, 2008 MARCH TO GET GOV. SCHWARZENEGGER TO SIGN THE CALIFORNIA DREAM ACT (cont'd)

WHEREAS, undocumented students, despite the relief from high out-of-State student fees granted through AB 540, still face enormous financial burdens when attending the University of California due to the lack of access to institutional federal and State financial aid; and

WHEREAS, the California DREAM Act, otherwise known as Senate Bill 1 (formally Senate Bill 160 and Senate Bill 65) as introduced by Senator Gil Cedillo (D-22nd), was passed in the State Legislature on September 11th, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) Senate passed a bill in support of the California DREAM Act (SB 1) last year; and

WHEREAS, the California DREAM Act SB 1 was vetoed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger last year; and

WHEREAS, the California DREAM Act was reintroduced this year as Senate Bill 1301 by Senator Gil Cedillo (D-22nd); and

WHEREAS, this year's version of the California DREAM Act (SB 1301) is by and large the same as the version supported by the ASUC one year ago. Last year's bill would have allowed undocumented students to receive State-based financial aid. This year's bill would allow undocumented students to receive campus-based financial aid; and

WHEREAS, on August 31, 2008, the legislature passed SB 1301, the California DREAM Act, which would make campus-based financial aid programs available to undocumented California students;

WHEREAS, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger has until September 30, 2008 to sign the California DREAM Act (SB 1301) into law; and

WHEREAS, a significant number of our peers at UC-Berkeley are undocumented and must cope with rising tuition and housing costs without any access to financial aid, loans, or grants. These students are our peers and equals, and they deserve to be treated with respect and dignity;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Associated Students of the University of California strongly support the California DREAM Act (SB 1301), which would further increase accessibility to the University System for undocumented students.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC supports the September 26, 2008 march to get Gov. Schwarzenegger to sign the California DREAM Act (SB1301).

RESOLUTION TO MAKE THE AMERICAN DREAM A REALITY FOR ALL CALIFORNIA STUDENTS: SUPPORT THE SEPTEMBER 26, 2008 MARCH TO GET GOV. SCHWARZENEGGER TO SIGN THE CALIFORNIA DREAM ACT (cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that ASUC President Winston and External Affairs Vice President Jirachaikitti will send a letter expressing the ASUC's support urging Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger to sign the California DREAM Act (SB 1301).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President and External Affairs Vice President draft and sign a letter in support of California DREAM Act (SB 1301) to other UC campuses.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC is committed to making the UC Berkeley campus an inclusive and safe environment for everyone and ensuring the accessibility of higher education for all California students who hope to complete their educational goals, maintain their good moral standing, and contribute to this society.

Mr. Sakaue moved to call the question. The motion was seconded by Ms. Oatfield and failed by hand-vote 7-8-1.

Ms. Rodriguez said she would like Sen. Owens for giving feedback. They talk about speaking to each other and she really appreciated what he spoke about the bill. The legislation, SB 1301, was on the Governor's desk, who had until the 30th to sign it into law. The Legislature already passed it, and passed a similar bill last year.

Mr. Mairena said the California DREAM Act was initially proposed to allow AB 540 students to be eligible for State financial aid. The new DREAM Act allows AB 540 students to be eligible for campus-provided financial aid, which was a little different. Assembly Bill 540 was passed in 2001 and allowed out-of-State students who graduated from a California high school they attended for three years to be eligible to pay in-State tuition rather than out-of-State tuition, if they applied for AB 540 status. A number of AB 540 students, but not all, are undocumented. Some were out-of-State students. Out-of-State tuition was ridiculously high, as Senators knew. The California DREAM Act allows AB 540 students, who can't currently receive financial aid to receive campus-based financial aid. Undocumented students cannot go to the Financial Aid Office and ask for resources or advice. Financial aid advising is not available to them.

Ms. Chen asked if AB 540 students pay income tax in high school. Mr. Mairena said it depended on whether or not they worked and had a federal tax ID. With a tax ID they'd pay income tax but wouldn't get a refund. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by five minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Ude and Ms. Tran and passed with no objection.

Ms. Rodriguez said this was about access to higher education. These students have to pay out-of-State tuition but weren't eligible to work.

Mr. Mairena said not all undocumented students were AB 540 eligible, and had to meet the requirements, or wouldn't qualify for financial aid provided by the California DREAM Act. Ms. Pasco said speaking

time had expired. A motion to extend by two minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Chen Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

Mr. Owens asked if it was true that the sons and daughters of undocumented immigrants were automatically given United States citizenship, and asked what prevented those sons and daughters, if they didn't want to be here, from going home. Mr. Mairena said if they were born here, then there citizens. As to what prevented them from going back, it was the same dream that brought their parents here, and for the gratitude to their parents. He was born in the US. His mother and father were immigrants and are citizens now, and there's a process to do that. AB 540 students were on that track. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by one minute was made and seconded by Ms. Chen and Mr. Nahabet and passed with no objection.

Ms. Chen asked why the Governor wasn't signing the bill. Mr. Mairena said one argument was that people didn't think these people contribute to the economy. But they contribute in many ways. It would only benefit the economy to have more educated individuals with citizenship, being quote "whole" members of society. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by three minutes was made by Ms. Shah and seconded and passed with no objection.

Mr. Moghtader asked if passage of the DREAM Act would encourage illegal immigration and if he thought illegal immigration was a problem. Mr. Mairena yielded time to Vanessa Coe. Ms. Coe said it didn't matter what US policy was on immigration. Economies were devastated in Latin American, whether or not that was due to US foreign policy. Reforms that are passed didn't matter, and people will come, no matter what.

Mr. Moghtader asked if illegal immigration was a problem. Mr. Mairena said he didn't feel that was germane. Ms. Coe said she didn't wish to answer that question.

Ms. Rodriguez said this was not about illegal immigration, but about education and talent that will contribute to overall American society and the American Dream. Everybody in the room was really privileged, but there are students there who weren't as privileged. Education wasn't a privilege, but a right. Ms. Pasco said speaking time had expired. A motion to extend by two minutes was made and seconded by Ms. Hussain and Ms. Yang and passed with no objection.

Mr. Mairena said AB 540 students on campus have it really hard, and he would like to have the ASUC be an ally to these communities, who are part of the ASUC.

Mr. Moghtader said he thought his question was germane. A main argument against the DREAM Act was that it encouraged illegal immigration. He asked if Mr. Mairena thought it was a problem. Mr. Mairena said that since he was being asked his beliefs, they could speak about it off the floor. His beliefs might not correlate with others' in the room. Mr. Moghtader said he would like to know Mr. Mairena's position since he was an author of the bill.

Mr. Owens moved to table SB 30A indefinitely, as it violated federal law. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moghtader. A roll call vote was requested and seconded.

Roll call was taken on the motion to table SB 30A indefinitely:

YES	NO	ABSTAIN
John Moghtader	Sarah Cho	Sheila Chen
Tommy Owens	Mary June Flores	Meghana Dhar
Tara Raffi	Saira Hussain	Will Smelko
	Oscar Mairena	
	Eddie Nahabet	
	Christina Oatfield	
	Claudia Rodriguez	
	Lyell Sakaue	
	Kifah Shah	
	Lisa Tran	
	Tu Tran	
	Obiamaka Ude	
	Stephanie Yang	
	Yishi Zuo	

A motion to close the rolls was made and seconded and passed with no objection. The motion to table indefinitely SB 30A failed 3-14-3. Voting comments were heard.

Mr. Mairena moved to call the question on the bill. The motion was seconded by Mr. Zuo and passed by hand-vote 14-0-6.

A roll call vote was requested and seconded.

Roll call was taken on the motion to approve SB 30, as amended in committee:

YES	NO
Sarah Cho	Lyell Sakaue
Mary June Flores	Kifah Shah
Saira Hussain	Will Smelko
Oscar Mairena	Lisa Tran
Eddie Nahabet	Tu Tran
Christina Oatfield	Obiamaka Ude
Claudia Rodriguez	Stephanie Yang
	Yishi Zuo
	John Moghtader
	Tommy Owens
	ABSTAIN
	Sheila Chen
	Meghana Dhar
	Tara Raffi

A MOTION TO CLOSE THE ROLLS WAS MADE AND SECONDED AND PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION. THE MOTION TO APPROVE SB 30, AS AMENDED IN COMMITTEE, PASSED 15-2-3, RESOLUTION TO MAKE THE AMERICAN DREAM A REALITY FOR ALL CALIFORNIA STUDENTS: SUPPORT THE SEPTEMBER 26, 2008 MARCH TO GET GOV. SCHWARZENEGGER TO SIGN THE CALIFORNIA DREAM ACT. Voting comments were heard.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would like to refer SB 1A out of the Standing Committee on the Advocacy Agenda. She would like to vote on SB 1A, with the new issues.

The following Resolution SB 1, as amended, was authored by Ms. Pasco:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ASUC ADVOCACY AGENDA

WHEREAS, the ASUC Advocacy Agenda is the collective vision of the ASUC Senate; and

WHEREAS, the ASUC Constitution defines the Advocacy Agenda as "a series of student concerns to be advocated for by the ASUC Senate for the remainder of its term"; and

WHEREAS, elected officials and students-at-large have submitted Issue Briefs to the Executive Vice President; and

WHEREAS, Issues Committees will refine and consolidate these Briefs into Advocacy Agenda items, ranked in order of preference, by the third Senate meeting on September 10th; and

WHEREAS, attached to this bill are each of the twenty-two issue briefs and a flowchart of the Advocacy Agenda process; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Vice President refers the following Issue Briefs to Issues Committee #1:

- "Campus Prayer Space "
- "Equity & Inclusion: Prayer/Meditation Space on Campus"
- "Equity & Inclusion: Student Health "
- "Democratize the Regents "
- "Campus Prayer Room"
- "Campus Prayer Room (2)"
- "Campus Prayer Room (3)"
- "Textbook Costs"
- " Uniting the Arts Community"; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Vice President refers the following Issue Briefs to Issues Committee #2:

- "Cal Performances Affordability "
- "Activism Grant"
- "Equity & Inclusion: Campus Safety"
- "Safety at the Stadium"
- "Short and Long Range Academic Resources Improvement"
- "Security of Employment"
- "Housing"; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ASUC ADVOCACY AGENDA (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Executive Vice President refers the following Issue Briefs to Issues Committee #3:

"Equity & Inclusion: Halal Food on Campus "

"Responsible Investments "

"Confronting Israeli Apartheid "

"Environmental Sustainability and UC Berkeley's "Ecological Footprint"

"Big Ideas Networking"

"Commercial Revenue and Establishment of a Once "Envisioned Student Union";

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate adopt the ASUC Advocacy Agenda to be developed in accordance with the procedures outlined in the ASUC Constitution and By-laws.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that this bill will be automatically amended to include the first choice Advocacy Agenda items submitted by the Issues Committees.

Issue Committee #1: Equity and Inclusion; Student Health and Mental/Spiritual Well-Being

Ms. Shah, Ms. Hussain, Ms. Tran, Ms. Ude, Mr. Sakaue, Ms. Yang.

Issue Committee #2: Short- and Long-Range Academic Resources; Improvement and Security of Employment

Mr. Owens, Mr. Zuo, Ms. Cho, Ms. Flores, Mr. Smelko, Mr. Tran, and Ms. Chen.

Issue Committee #3: Bringing Business that Demonstrates Strong Values of Fiscal, Environmental, and Social Responsibility to Lower Sproul

Mr. Mairena, Mr. Nahabet, Ms. Oatfield, Ms. Rodriguez, Ms. Dhar, Ms. Raffi, and Mr. Moghtader.

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would entertain a motion to call the question on SB 1A. It was so moved and seconded and passed with no objection. THE MOTION TO APPROVE SB 1, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ASUC ADVOCACY AGENDA.

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would like to reappoint the Advocacy Agenda Committees. She called for any changes. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE ADVOCACY AGENDA COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS IN SB 1A PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Pasco said that in the interests of time, she would ask these Committees to do a little homework, and she'd ask the Advocacy Agenda Committees to figure out a standard meeting time and to elect chairs and vice chairs.

Mr. Mairena moved to go to Special Committee Reports. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moghtader and passed with no objection.

Special Committee Reports

Reporting for the Attorney General/Solicitor General Selection Committee, Mr. Smelko said they had two really great people. Even though they only had three people apply, two were fantastic. It was a tough choice, but the Committee decided its nominee for Attorney General was Michael Sinanian, and for Solicitor General they were nominating Andrew Hollihan. Mr. Smelko said the Senate needed to make the appointments by next week, so if people had serious questions, they should look into them. The Senate had to get this done next week or else it would be really bad for the Senate. He'll send out the nominees' information and arrange for meetings, if people were interested.

Mr. Mairena asked if the positions receive stipends. Ms. Pasco said they did. Mr. Mairena said the nominees, then, had to go to the Fi-Comm meeting on Monday. Ms. Pasco asked Mr. Smelko to please invite them to the Fi-Comm meeting.

Reports from ASUC Representatives

Reporting as the ASUC representative to the Residence Hall Assembly, Ms. Tran said the first meeting of the RHA was held on Monday at 7:00, in Unit 1. She was present with Sens. Yang and Zuo. The RHA President, Catherine Cho, said that if any Senator wanted to publicize in the RHA or a residential hall, she'll create a document to inform them how to access the RHA without violating University policy. If people have questions about publicizing the RHA, they should send Ms. C. Cho an e-mail. Mr. Lam was also at the meeting to advertise the Hep B Awareness Campaign. They selected an RHA rep to sit on the Class Pass Advisory Committee. This was the first meeting so there were no sponsorships.

Mr. Nahabet moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens and passed with no objection.

Roll call was taken for attendance. Members present were:

Sheila Chen	Eddie Nahabet	Will Smelko
Sarah Cho	Christina Oatfield	Lisa Tran
Meghana Dhar	Tommy Owens	Tu Tran
Mary June Flores	Tara Raffi	Obiamaka Ude
Saira Hussain	Claudia Rodriguez	Stephanie Yang
Oscar Mairena	Lyell Sakaue	Yishi Zuo
John Moghtader	Kifah Shah	

This meeting adjourned at 4:45 a.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak  
Recording Secretary