

ASUC SENATE MEETING

October 15, 2008

Eighth Week

This regular meeting of the ASUC Senate was called to order by Krystle Pasco at 7:14 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Pasco said that unfortunately Mr. Litwak couldn't finish the minutes from last week, so they'd be approved next week.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Pasco referred the following bills to committee:

SB 84, In Support of Pink Ribbon Poetry: A Night of Poetry to Fight Breast Cancer, to the Finance Committee

SB 85, In Support of Funding for the Educational Enhancement Fund, to the Finance Committee

SB 86, In Support of Funding for the Public Service Fund, to the Finance Committee

SB 87, In Support of Funding for the Multicultural Fund, to the Finance Committee

SB 88, In Support of the Berkeley Review of Education (BRE), to the Finance Committee

SB 89, In Support of 2008 Delta Dance-A-Thon: Will You Be the Last One Standing? Dancing for a Cause, to the Finance Committee

SB 90, In Support of the Regents' and Chancellor's Scholars Association (RCSA), to the Finance Committee

SB 91, In Support of UMA's "Cal Got Talent," to the Finance Committee

SB 92, In Support of Sigma Phi Epsilon's 4th Annual Pumpkin Drive Philanthropy Event, to the Finance Committee

SB 93, On Amending the By-laws to Include Umbrella Organizations, to the Finance Committee and to the Constitutional and the Procedural Review Committee University and External Affairs Committee

SB 94, In Support of Theta Delta Chi's House of Horrors, to the Finance Committee

Ms. Hussain said SB 84 was also in last week's agenda packet. Ms. Pasco said that was an error and she would apologize.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (Oct. 22)

Ms. Pasco called for any changes to the agenda for next week. Mr. Mairena moved to add a Special Order from 8:00 to 8:20, to hear a presentation on disability accommodation. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO HEAR A SPECIAL ORDER NEXT WEEK ON DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION, FROM 8:00 TO 8:20, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Ms. Pasco called for any other changes to the agenda. A motion to approve was made and seconded by Ms. Dhar and Ms. Yang. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR NEXT WEEK, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Guest Announcements

Ms. Pasco said the first Guest Announcement was from Gray Brechin, from the Geography Department.

Mr. Brechin read the following:

Begin guest announcement by Mr. Brechin

Senators of the ASUC:

My name is Gray Brechin. I have four degrees from the University of California at Berkeley and am a Visiting Scholar in the Department of Geography, from which I received my Ph.D. for a dissertation which became the best-selling book, Imperial San Francisco: Urban Power, Earthly Ruin, which some of you may have been assigned to read. Its last chapter deals with the hidden history of the University of California that is not altogether positive, especially as regards the University's decades-long development and promotion of nuclear weapons. Although the book was published by the University of California Press in 1999 (and republished in 2007), University graduates did not get a chance to read about it in their alumni magazine since an interview with me by then-editor Russell Schock was spiked at the last moment after an emergency meeting of the Cal Alumni Association Executive Committee. Russell himself was abruptly fired just short of retirement a few years later because he had run other interviews that occasionally contained information unflattering to the University, even though that information was based in fact. The alumni magazine is now all about raising Cal spirit and millions of dollars in donations.

The point here is that the University's motto is "Let There Be Light." But in the real world, money exerts a gravitational field that bends light, and when hundreds of millions of dollars are in play -- as at California Memorial Stadium -- light can be bent so far as to produce darkness. That is what has happened recently -- you, and the public, have been kept in the dark about what you should know before passing

Guest announcement by Mr. Brechin (cont'd)

any resolution supporting the University's current plans to retrofit a very dangerous structure that cannot be made safe in its present location. No amount of Cal spirit will change that basic reality.

I briefly want to make three points.

The first is that if the University was as concerned with public safety as it claims, it would move those who use the structure every day immediately to a surge facility.

The Hayward Fault was known in 1923, yet the University built the stadium on it anyway against the expert advice of its own faculty. It was also a rush job done with poor supervision and on bad foundations: the structure was begun in May and completed in November in time for the 1923 Big Game. That means that it was built in just six months.

In addition to shoddy construction, fault creep has so dramatically distorted it that generations of geology and engineering classes have used it as a convenient local example of where and how not to build.

Yet despite all of this and again, against expert advice, the University built offices and locker rooms in the dangerous west wall of the building over twenty years ago. So it is not just a matter of endangering the lives of as many as 75,000 fans who attend events six times a year there. All who use the building daily -- athletes, secretaries and Coach Tedford himself -- are endangering their lives by doing so.

Secondly, the proposed retrofit solution is designed chiefly to counter the effects of sudden fault shear. But during the violent shaking of a major earthquake, the earth behaves in a number of other unusual ways, including momentary liquefaction on landfill. The stadium is partially built on a podium of a quarter million cubic yards of fill blasted and washed down from Big C Hill. Maps of the USGS show that the flat canyon floor all the way back to Haas Clubhouse is subject to liquefaction when the fault snaps. If that mass mobilizes, I doubt that anything built on or in its path will be able to withstand its force as it suddenly moves downhill toward the lower campus.

Finally, the proposed retrofit does not deal with landslides. Indeed, it cannot. Professor Garniss Curtis has written of what he has learned about the geologic instability of the Berkeley Hills. The hills are prone to enormous quake-induced slides such as that which underlie the Clark Kerr Campus and Mills College. His letter was ignored by the Regents, and, apparently, by the engineers as well. You should read it and make up your own minds.

Finally, in light of what I have just told you, I would like to know who wrote the following clause in the proposed Resolution:

“Whereas, the aforementioned Alquist-Priolo law, legislated 36 years ago, neither takes into consideration modern technological advances nor pressing safety concerns, and nor is it supported by an abundance of specific case law.”

The Alquist-Priolo Act was legislated precisely to protect public safety. Like the Bill of Rights and the Geneva Conventions against torture, it is not quaint and not obsolete. Above all, it is not simply a

Guest announcement by Mr. Brechin (cont'd)

nuisance from which the University should seek a special legislative exemption because hundreds of millions of dollars and Cal spirit are at stake. As a public institution, one of the University's chief concerns should be public safety, not the use of slick public relations to obscure gross public endangerment.

End guest announcement by Mr. Brechin

Mr. Brechin said he would hand out a letter advising against use of the Stadium by a well-known architect, Henrik Bull, who, from 1975 to 1984, was a member of the San Francisco Seismic Investigation and Hazard Survey Committee, and he strongly advises against the use of Memorial Stadium at all.

Mr. Brechin said his reason for the concern was not only as an alumni and somebody who occupies the campus, but he's an historical geographer, studying places in time. He has studied the campus quite a bit.

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 | Claudia Rodriguez | Obiamaka Ude |
| Saira Hussain | Lyell Sakaue | Stephanie Yang |
| Oscar Mairena | Kifah Shah | Yishi Zuo |
| John Moghtader | | |

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Tara Raffi

Begin letter from Henrik Bull

Henrik Bull, architect, FAIA

October 14, 2008

Many years ago when I was studying for the examination to become a licensed architect, I was surprised to learn that the Hayward Fault ran through the Memorial Stadium from end zone to end zone. Licensing of architects is to promote public health and safety. How could an agency of State government maintain a facility that was so obviously dangerous? I also learned that the University Regents had ignored the warnings of many architects and engineers that building on this site was highly dangerous. The fault

Letter from Henrik Bull (cont'd)

location was well known and was obvious because of the offset in Strawberry Creek, which now runs in two culverts along the fault line under the stadium.

The University is now, belatedly, agreeing that seismically retrofitting the Stadium should be done. One provision of the Alquist-Priolo Act of 1972 allows such retrofitting if the cost is not over 50% of the value of the structure. The University has set a value of \$600 million in order to have the numbers come out. Whether or not such retrofitting will make the structure more safe, I would not want to be in the Stadium when the earthquake splits it and moves one half 20 feet. Orderly evacuation of 70,000 people is not likely.

It seem to me that the University Regents are compounding their original mistake.

End letter from Henrik Bull

Ms. Pasco said the next Guest Announcement was from Hank Gehman, from the Panoramic Hill Association. Mr. Gehman introduced himself and said he lived in the Stadium area. He read the Resolution and he was very concerned. It assumes that the new design of the Stadium will ensure spectators' safety, and he would like to tell the Senate that that was an unproven assertion. UC's experts have an overriding commercial interest that controls whatever they say about this project. He believed that the Resolution reflects those distortions. There were, in fact, flat, outright wrong statements about safety at the Stadium. He wasn't an expert but has read a lot about this and he's been involved in it. But if they all just use their common sense and stood back and tried to understand and evaluate the risk, and just take a look at the big picture.

To begin with, UC hid many of the multiple risks present at the Stadium site and overstates how much the Stadium will protect people. It was important to understand that the current design was experimental. It had no independent engineering review and overall safety of the design. The siting of the Stadium in Strawberry Canyon was really based on ignoring various risks. It was important to understand the seismic risks by looking specifically at the site.

To begin with, the design assumed there will be a six-foot lateral displacement shear. In fact, it is now considered to be 12 feet, and as much as 20 feet. The design also relies on a fault break exactly where they hope it will, which was not at all guaranteed. Ms. Raffi asked if he could elaborate on what a "lateral displacement shear" was. Mr. Gehman said the two plates slowly creep, and then suddenly, one side will go to the south and one the north. With no objection, speaking time was extended by three minutes.

Additionally, Mr. Gehman said this is a liquefaction zone. UC, however, has denied that, and therefore wasn't designing for that effect. When an earthquake happened in an area of fill, instead of having a rhythmic, smooth motion, the shaking would be like a bowl of Jell-O, which is what destroys buildings. Also, it's a landslide zone. Tightwad Hill will most likely come down and inundate the Stadium area. UC's own professor, Patrick Williams, studied the adjacent hills and says that the Hayward Fault has

forced those hills up so steeply that they're actually storing seismic energy, like a wound-up spring, and that when the earthquake breaks, it will release that energy and produce as much damage as a larger magnitude earthquake, more than previously estimated. UC denies this and says it has no knowledge of this. Prof. Williams was actually a consultant on this project and withdrew his paper from the studies.

Mr. Gehman said that what really compounds the risk was more than just football games. UC was still considering bringing six or seven concerts and an unlimited number of events of 10,000 or less to the Stadium. That could very likely bring more than 1 million to the site annually and spread out the occupancy over the course of the year. That would vastly increase the risk.

Lastly, all experts agree that one of the greatest risks was panic, and this design did nothing to ensure that there would be no panic. Knowing this risk profile, it was inconceivable that this Stadium-entertainment complex will be allowed. If this was a private commercial project, banks wouldn't lend for it, nobody would insure it, it would never pass Alquist-Priolo, and there would be public outrage.

Mr. Gehman ask why Cal, then should be allowed to subject students, spectators, and also, very importantly, the residents of Berkeley, to these risks when they would never consider letting a business do this. The risks haven't changed. Earthquakes can't be predicted, and there would be no calls for evacuation. So the basic rule of earthquake safety is to keep people away from the most dangerous locations. Less occupancy, not more occupancy, was the way to go.

Ms. Pasco said it was 7:30 and they had a Special Order until 8:00. Ms. Oatfield moved to go back to Guest Announcements for three minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

Ms. Pasco said the next Guest Announcement was from Shirley Dean, from "Save Strawberry Canyon." Ms. Dean said she would like to thank them for this opportunity. She introduced herself and said she was honored to be Mayor of the City of Berkeley from 1994 to 2002. she was running again, on November 4, but she wasn't at the meeting for that. The Senate has gotten a lot of information that evening, and these were new concepts and things to learn. People appreciate that this was going to take a little bit of time on Senators' part. As Senators, they were engaged in a very special position of making a legacy decision. For many of the decisions that they'll talk about, they will not, in the future, remember many of the details. But this decision was one that would be a legacy for this group. And that was because it involved life and life safety.

Ms. Dean said the draft Environmental Impact Report the University has released said that a retrofitted Stadium will minimize the loss of life. But they don't describe or quantify what that meant. There's new technology on the table, but nobody knew if that will change anything. Senators will have the responsibility to think about what happens to people in the future who are in this space. The Senate will share that responsibility.

Ms. Dean said she would suggest that they might want to table this matter and take it up again after they've had time to absorb some of the information, consult with others, hear the pros and cons, and dig out what was really important in terms of safety. She would also suggest that one thing they might want to do immediately was to say to the University, as the community has said, to please move people out of the Stadium now. About 200 people are in the Stadium on a daily basis and they shouldn't be there. The

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Beth Piatnitza, Associate Director, Physical and Environmental Planning, on Lower Sproul Redevelopment

University will have to do that anyway if it starts construction; so they might as well do that now. She would ask the Senate to take the time to make an informed decision. With no objection, speaking time was extended by two minutes.

Ms. Ude asked about some of the organizations or committees that work specifically with reviewing the information and collecting data on Memorial Stadium that would be needed to make an informed decision. Ms. Dean said she would suggest that they start with the letter from Dr. Curtis; that they review material from Dr. Brechin; that they ask the University to talk about the new technology. The engineering firm should be able to expound more on that. They could also talk with the community and the City of Berkeley. The City was the first responder for what would happen in this area. Also, Save Strawberry Canyon would be happy to suggest names, organizations, and contacts.

A motion to move the time of the Special Order from 7:38 to 8:08 passed with no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY -- Presentation by Beth Piatnitza, Associate Director, Physical and Environmental Planning, on Lower Sproul Redevelopment

Ms. Piatnitza introduced herself and said she was the planner on the Lower Sproul Plaza Master Plan and Feasibility Project. She sent around a handout. The front sheet showed an aerial photograph of the Lower Sproul Plaza complex, to give people a clear definition of what they mean. Lower Sproul Plaza wasn't just the Plaza itself, but Eshleman Hall, Martin Luther King, Jr. Union, and the Cesar Chavez building as well. The study they're working on, the Master Plan, will touch lightly on Zellerbach, but they're not planning to have any renovation of Zellerbach funded by a future fee referendum. Rather than, they just want to coordinate with Cal Performances, so the Lower Sproul Master Plan responds.

Ms. Piatnitza said the second sheet included a timeline. A lot of work has been done on Lower Sproul in the past, and over the years, from 1994 to 2007, a lot of studies have occurred. All of these studies play into the Master Plan. The information from those studies will weave into the thinking around the Master Plan, especially the last study, which was an urban design study that included student focus groups, surveys, and interviews. They met with about 160 students over a period of a few weeks, and from that, they gained a lot of insights and common themes about the issues with Lower Sproul and what was and wasn't working, and what things people would like to see or things that were missing.

Ms. Piatnitza said she thought a lot of people could generally agree that Berkeley was a great school academically and for research, but in terms of supporting student life, there was a lot that was missing. The Student Union was built over several years in the 1950's and '60s, in several phases, for 18,000 students. They now have twice that number of students on campus, plus a great deal more faculty and staff. So it was definitely in need of renovation.

Ms. Piatnitza said they're going to spring from those previous studies and weren't going to go back and try and do more visioning or more focus group surveys. They're going to move from those themes, and in that sense, trust Senators' predecessors. If they don't, they couldn't move ahead and keep progressing on

the design and development of Lower Sproul. In the same way, the Senate would pass the baton to those coming after them. This was part of a continuum of student participation in the design process. She thought that's been done so far very well. In the last two or three Administrations she's worked with, they've all passed that baton very well. And Lower Sproul has remained a very top priority. She asked if she was correct that with this group, it was a top priority for student government. She thought that was the case.

Ms. Piatniza said there's a line showing a proposed fee referendum that was planned in the spring of 2010. Backing up from that, in 2008, they're involved in a weaving process and bringing a lot of thinking into the Master Plan. Some of that includes meeting with the Student Advisory Committee, which was established for this. Two more meetings that fall were being planned in order to touch base with this group. Their first meeting was last week. It seemed to be a very good meeting and everybody was very participatory, and a lot of ideas came out of that. They found many of the concerns and ideas that planners found in the 2007 survey. Many of the same themes came up.

Ms. Piatniza said they're also weaving in a retail study. She was at the Store Operations Board meeting on Tuesday to talk about that. The research consultant has done a lot of these, and has also done fee referendums, will take a good, hard look at Lower Sproul, and also look at how it related to Telegraph Ave. They're talking with a lot of stakeholders, including the City of Berkeley and economic development folks. They're just trying to get a broad view of what the potential is for Lower Sproul in terms of retail. She thought there was an incredible amount of time opportunity. They really want to think big things with this.

Ms. Piatniza said they'll also weave in the sustainability design workshop, which will occur on Friday, November 7. It was up to the Senate to help get more students to participate in that. They'll have at least 30 students in that group and she believed only 12 have committed so far. She hoped Senators could attend and get a hold of other people. It will be fun. They'll have good speakers and good food, and it will be very participatory. It will go from 8 a.m. to 2:00. This will be funded by a TGIF grant, so it was funded and supported by the ASUC and the Graduate Assembly.

Ms. Piatniza said they were also weaving in meetings with campus administrators.

Ms. Piatniza said the Master Plan effort goes basically from October to January. After that they'll go to the campus Administration to review what's been done so far so they have a Master Plan concept that moves forward. They'll look at feasibility for the next three months. Feasibility involves technology review where they look at code, life safety issues, cost, and very important, feasibility. The project had to be implementable. It had to be about to be broken into pieces that were affordable. That's why they have a Master Plan, so they know what the overall picture will be.

Ms. Piatniza said that some principles came out of the surveys and out of the meeting last week were that the student center should be student centered. Programs in the space should be geared towards student life. It should have an identity that expresses what was unique about Berkeley, and that it wouldn't necessarily be what San Diego or Wisconsin has done. It had to be sustainable in many aspects in terms of being economically sustainable, ecologically and socially, and with resources and renewable energy. There were many aspects to sustainability.

They want the space to be flexible, so that it could change over time. The spaces they have now were very fixed and static. There also had to be transparency, with the ability to see into Lower Sproul and see what was going on and that there was life there. It also had to be implementable.

As for the schedule, by April or May they'll have a sense of the cost and the feasibility and an idea of a construction schedule. They'll have some sort of presentation, drawings that students could use in a fee referendum. And then, in the summer and fall, students would want what they had to in order to build up the momentum. She would strongly suggest that the students get professional help with the fee referendum. And perhaps the campus could help with that. In the spring of 2010 there would be a vote of the students. Ms. Piatnitza called for any questions.

Ms. Ude asked if there have been any discussions or talks about a permanent space on the campus, within Lower Sproul, for the Multicultural Center. Ms. Piatnitza said she went to the meeting on Tuesday night about the multicultural space. She was the one who brought the architect in to do the temporary work. Planners will incorporate a permanent multicultural center. What she's done was to poll in the guidelines that were developed for the temporary site. She's given that information to the architects. But they need to connect to people in person as well, with representatives from the MCC. At this time they won't actually design a multicultural center, which will happen at a later phase. They'll have to consider ideas about where it should be located and what other types of activities and information should be around it, to feed into it and help support it, because it really couldn't function and be viable by itself. It needed to have things happening right around it.

Ms. Pasco said that to add to that, in terms of the student front of Lower Sproul, they're also planning to institutionalize a Multicultural Center representative to be on the student council, so the issues and concerns for students in terms of the multicultural center will always be present in all of the conversations that happen with regard to Lower Sproul.

Ms. Rodriguez asked when the next Student Advisory Committee will be held. Ms. Piatnitza said they hope to have it November 6. Ms. Rodriguez asked if it would be open to everybody. Ms. Piatnitza said a committee was appointed, with Jonathan Poullard's help. If people wanted to expand that membership, they could propose that to Dean Poullard.

Mr. Smelko asked about the construction process, when it would start, and how long it would take. Ms. Piatnitza said the actual construction on a project this big would probably take at least two years. It wasn't likely that everything would be done at the same time. It would likely be done in pieces. For example, they'd take Eshleman down and replace it with something else. That will probably take 18 months or two years of construction. There were many reasons why they wouldn't do all the construction all at once. They have to figure out where things go, and where they'd temporarily relocate student organizations close to campus.

Ms. Rodriguez asked what some of the locations would be for student groups to be relocated. Ms. Piatnitza said they haven't gotten very far on that, because people currently in those buildings would freak out. They haven't come up with anything yet. It really wasn't quite the time for that yet.

Guest Announcements (cont'd)

Ms. Pasco said the next Guest Announcements was from Janice Thomas, from Save Strawberry Canyon. Ms. Thomas introduced herself and said she passed around some maps. The Senate would be making a life safety decision about this. She wanted to caution them to not buy in to the language of special interests that becomes a false dichotomy between “us” and “them.” That led to ad hominem arguments. What they had to figure out was what was best not just for themselves, including student athletes and friends and people they know, but to figure far out, to the life of the Stadium. When they think about special interests, she would ask them to also think about one-sided information or perspectives they might have gotten instead of in a transparent process. She would ask them to particularly think about people’s careers on the line. Again, the Senate was making a decision that they will remember.

Ms. Thomas said she lives in Strawberry Canyon. She was involved in student government in junior high school, high school, and college. When she became an adult and moved to Berkeley, lived near the University, and now was an activist because of where she lived. So now she was the “enemy.” But she also was a member of the Board of Directors of the Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association and on the Strawberry Canyon Neighborhood Association.

Ms. Thomas said they had to be very careful when making judgments based on the messenger. They had to listen carefully to the content. She passed around handouts from the geotechnical study to remind Senators of what an inaccessible location it was. It was beautiful, but inaccessible, at the base of the Berkeley foothills. The terrain is complex. As they could see from the maps. And the fault ran through Kleeberger Field, Maxwell Family Field it's called now, and the future parking lot, four stories underground. If they add all these things up, what they really had was a question of the financial health of this project. With no objection, speaking time and total time were extended by three minutes.

Ms. Thomas said \$126 million was already going into the Stadium, the Student-Athlete High Performance Center, they don't know what the Stadium retrofit and renovation will cost. She just wanted to remind everybody about what it cost to renovate Stanford’s stadium. The whole thing was done in nine months at a cost of \$90 million. This was going to be an expensive project, and part of that was because of the inaccessible location. It was a question of physical health and public safety, not just for people in the Stadium, but accessible issues for all those in the area. This was an important decision and she would encourage a public process. She hoped they make a good decision. She wanted to thank them.

Ms. Pasco said the next Guest Announcement was by Matthew Taylor, from Peace and Conflict Studies. Mr. Taylor said he wanted to share a few thoughts about the Stadium project. One question before the ASUC Senate was whether the Stadium project make sense from a financial responsibility perspective. He believed the University should use its money wisely, no matter where that money has come from, and whether it was public funding or money that was raised from private donations. And because the money came from a private source, that was not a reason or an excuse to use the money in an unwise way.

To look at what UC has actually said, in its Environmental Impact Report on the Stadium, UC had said that even with the improvements and the rebuilding of the Stadium, that it would suffer structural damage that would require a repair after the earthquake event. Further the proposed increased incapacity of events could increase exposure of people to risk. Therefore, while the mitigation suggested reduced risk, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. In a recent news report, Cal has said that after the Stadium was rebuilt, during an earthquake the Stadium would be torn into three pieces. So Cal wanted to spend \$250 million to rebuild the Stadium knowing that it would be torn into three pieces in the event of

an earthquake. Cal has also said that if the Stadium was rebuilt and then torn into three pieces because of an earthquake, taxpayers may have to pay for the repairs.

On a point of information, Mr. Smelko asked where they could find that information. Mr. Taylor said he believed this was something UC administrators have said at meetings. He didn't have a specific source.

Mr. Taylor says that the money to repair the money for the Stadium after an earthquake could specifically come out of the budget of FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Mr. Taylor said that as they learned in New Orleans from Hurricane Katrina, FEMA has been totally inadequate to deal with a major disaster. In FEMA's internal planning processes, when they were mapping out possible disaster scenarios to prepare for, prior to Hurricane Katrina, a rupture on the Hayward Fault, where the Stadium is, was considered one of the top three disaster scenarios FEMA had to prepare for, along with the breaching of the levees in New Orleans; and they know how that turned out. With no objection, speaking time was extended by three minutes.

Mr. Taylor said he had a news report from the *East Bay Express* from a few years ago. The paper found that a 7.0 quake will very likely happen soon on the Hayward Fault. Between 2 and 4 million people will be in the impact zone. The quake could kill about 4,500 people and cause \$210 billion in economic damage, more than any natural disaster in report memory, including Hurricane Katrina. Only about 7% of the homes damaged will be covered by earthquake insurance.

Mr. Taylor said the question he had for the Senate was whether it was a good idea for UC to spend \$250 million rebuilding the Stadium knowing that when the earthquake comes, the Stadium will be a liability for FEMA and for US taxpayers. FEMA would have to expend its very precious and limited resources on rebuilding the Stadium when that \$250 million could be used in such a manner that there wouldn't be any damage. There could be an alternative that didn't involve the Stadium being torn into three pieces.

REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ASUC

Report from the Faculty Representative

Prof. Lieu said somebody that day slipped a letter under his door that was addressed to the Chair of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. Prof. Lieu said he received a copy, and the letter asked for cooperation of the Academic Senate in trying to get professors on campus to comply with requested adoption dates for getting textbook titles into the Store. Many of them in the Senate actually endorsed that letter. Prof. Lieu said he also fully endorsed the letter. But what he would ask was that whoever wrote the letter, to please send a copy of the letter addressed to him as well. In that way, the letter will be sent from his Committee to the Academic Senate. That would shorten the process a little. If he could get it in electronic form, he could make sure it got on the agenda for the next Student Affairs Committee meeting, in about three weeks. Of course, that wasn't a guarantee that the Academic Senate will look at or act on the letter.

The Academic Senate at that time seemed to be preoccupied with three major issues. One was the over-enrollment of students on campus. As most of them knew, the campus was over-enrolled by 2,000 students. The second was the decreasing number of faculty on campus to handle the extra students. And the last concern was, the impending budget cuts. It was the understanding of faculty that even after this round of 10% across-the-board cuts, across all department, that there will be another cut somewhere in the order of \$15 million on the campus.

Ms. Rodriguez asked how the over-enrollment happened. Prof. Lieu said that was a very interesting question. In the past, the State has always given the University a certain amount of money to handle the enrollment of students. The more students that were enrolled, the more money that was received. Students' tuition doesn't pay for the entire cost of their education. That paid for part, and the remainder was from the State. University policy in the past has been to try to get more students and more resources from the State. With the budget situation in the State, the campus was very successful in getting additional students. But now came the problem of over-enrollment, if the University didn't give the additional funds to educate those students.

Ms. Hussain said the deadline for textbook adoptions was that day, and asked if he knew how that went. Prof. Lieu said he didn't.

Ms. Flores asked how he felt about the letter. Prof. Lieu he actually felt the letter was very well done. He fully endorsed it, and he would expect the Committee will fully endorse it. He didn't see any problem with it getting addressed by the Committee at its next meeting.

Ms. Flores asked if a report will be given about the next adoption deadline. Prof. Lieu said a committee met on that topic, that includes Nad Permaul, Christina Maslach, and Jonathan Poullard. Prof. Lieu said he was involved in that as well. It was his understanding that they'll have a multipronged approach in addition to applying pressure to department chairs, faculty, the Academic Senate, and students going to department meetings, and media campaigns. There were two things they were going to do. The endorsement of the Academic Senate was one portion of it.

Report from the UCPD Liaison

Sgt. Tucker said he had his usual Crime Alerts. One was actually two crimes that occurred at a similar location. About a month ago he told the Senate that most police resources were directed towards the south campus area, because that was where the most problems were, and that they went to the Northside less frequently, unless there was a specific need. They had a need to be on the Northside on Thursday, the 9th, early in the morning, when there were two incidents. He wanted to make sure Senate knew that UC and the City of Berkeley Police Departments were both spending additional time on this because these two events also relate to a few other incidents that have happened on the Northside and beyond. So the UCPD was directing some resources to that.

As for a couple of other interesting cases, on Saturday, the 11th, at about 5 p.m., UCPD officers responded to a report of someone in People's Park who had what turned out to be an imitation AK47, a

very realistic looking Airsoft gun. The two individuals with it were arrested and the weapon was confiscated. Also on the 13th, at about 7 p.m., they got a report of a disoriented man aggressively hugging females at Moffitt Library. They found a person claiming to be Barack Obama who said he needed to go to Dodger Stadium. He was arrested after resisting briefly and was held for intoxication and for the batteries.

Sgt. Tucker said that on Thursday the 9th, some Senators and others were in attendance for the UCPD talk. Lt. Wing was there, and he did a lot of listening. The UCPD thought it was probably a very good first step in dealing with a very important issue: to make sure that the Police Department and its employees were treating everybody fairly on the campus, regardless of every race, culture, etc. A lot of stories and experiences were shared. Sgt. Tucker said he thought that some of it was sort of a surprise to the Lieutenant and to the Department because there were some things they hadn't heard about.

He would first of all he wanted to remind everybody that if anyone had a concern at any time about Police Department or police treatment, they should always come to the Police Department or to Student Life and Leadership, or to 200 California Hall, and they can express that concern. They can file a complaint. But if what was keeping them back was not wanting to go through the complaint process, they could also lodge something less formal. The PD was still interested in that as well, because they want to know how they're doing as a group. The Chief was very clear about that. This meeting they had seemed like a good first step, but the UCPD clearly needed to pay more attention. Hopefully there will be additional meetings. He wasn't sure what Lt. Wing had in mind, but he knew that the Department was done with that.

Sgt. Tucker said he understood that the first UCPD-student forum has been scheduled from 4:00 to 6 p.m. on October 22. It will be an opportunity to talk not just about the issues that were discussed last Thursday, but about other issues as well. They did a few of these last semester and some Senators participated in some of those; and Sgt. Tucker said he went to one of them. He found it to be a really rewarding experience. He thought what happened was exactly what was supposed to. It was a casual exchange between police officers and students, and an opportunity to learn about each other. So he was glad they were going to get that going again. As soon as he learned of the location he'd get that out to them.

Ms. Chen said she was approached by a student who wanted to know if they could potentially bring water guns onto campus. Sgt. Tucker said there was no prohibition on water guns. The concerns the police would have was how realistic they were and if they could be mistaken for a real weapon. They want to make sure no one got hurt, or unintentionally sprayed with water. They also shouldn't hide it or conceal it.

Ms. Cho said there was supposedly a much larger number of crimes that happen at night, and asked if he knew anything about that. Sgt. Tucker said he would have to research that. He would say that crimes occur at any time of day. His own experience was anecdotal, but he thought there was probably more crime in the evening and at night. Perhaps it was the cover of darkness, when it was harder to see people and get descriptions.

Ms. Cho asked if he thought being on a bicycle would decrease the possibility of an assault happening to somebody. Sgt. Tucker said it might make it easier for someone to avoid what they thought might be a difficult situation, if they were paying attention and were capable of whatever physical maneuver was needed. Bicycles have their own risks, for the bike itself, and for traffic. He didn't know if the Police

ever recommended using a bicycle as a way to not get assaulted. From a criminal perspective, someone looking for an opportunity, being on a bike might very well make someone not the easiest target, and therefore make them less vulnerable.

Report from the Graduate Assembly Representative

Mr. Daal said the Lower Sproul Student Council meeting was held on Monday. One result from that is that they need to start to publicize the Lower Sproul project to students. They're looking forward ideas on how to update the general student body as to what was going on with Lower Sproul, so that they could cultivate a general student bias to the Lower Sproul referendum later. The Lower Sproul referendum was slated for next spring. It's potentially a very large referendum. So the sooner they start to cultivate student support, the easier time they'll have in passing the referendum to re-do Lower Sproul.

Mr. Daal said he had an opening to meet with somebody for coffee on Thursday, if anybody was interested, at 5:00. He'd love to meet with anybody, and if not, he'd feel rejected. But he could deal with it.

Ms. Flores asked if anyone has approached him about other referendum ideas with regard to Lower Sproul redevelopment. Mr. Daal said no one has.

Ms. Pasco said Auxiliary Director Permaul wouldn't be there that evening. He just sent out his report that Mr. Permaul sent to her. He apologizes for not being there.

Begin written report from ASUC Auxiliary Director Permaul

October 15, 2008

ASUC Senate: Auxiliary Director
Store Operations Board Report

The next meeting of the Store Operations Board is November. As soon as the Chair establishes a date, I will let you know. I once again want to thank all the ASUC Senators who attended the meeting, keeping themselves apprised of the students' commercial operations.

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

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

We continue to await information from UCPD on the Trilogy locks that utilize electronic readers on each floor of Eshleman and are estimated at approximately \$60,000. We have written to UCPD to see

Written report from ASUC Auxiliary Director Permaul (cont'd)

if there is an alternative approach that will achieve our ends of building security that comes at a lower cost, and/or alternative funding for campus security that we might be eligible to apply for. As I noted last week, the ASUC and the Auxiliary have already spent \$40,000 in improvements related to safety, including lighting in and around the Student Union, new doors on Eshleman, and the elevator card readers for access.

Time Frame for Repairing Cameras:

We have contacted UCPD for a time frame for repair of the cameras in Eshleman, and a cost. In addition, we have obtained an estimate for re-keying the exterior doors of both Eshleman and MLK, Jr. Union to eliminate the many keys that over the years have not been recovered. That cost estimate is \$23,000.

2. ASUC Store Operations Board Meeting:

The Daily Californian:

The SOB discussed a letter to the Daily Californian responding to the terms we offered them regarding their request for relief from rent for the month of October and the remainder of the fiscal year. The Board wants to review the letter which was received last week, and will respond prior to the November SOB meeting.

Kaplan's Testing Service:

The Board reviewed the proposal from Kaplan's to locate their service in a portion of the Bear's Lair Food Court. Student members of the Board were unanimous in feeling that the Bear's Lair location was not optimal, and the Board instructed the Auxiliary to go back to Kaplan's and discuss other options.

Campus Link:

The Board was notified of the difficulties the ASUC has had in working with Campuslink, and their erratic management of the space in their lease. We have a meeting scheduled with Bill Haynor from Campuslink to discuss where to go next.

Panda Express:

The Auxiliary continues to move forward with the Panda Express contract. The SOB was apprised of the meeting held by the co-Chairs for students expressing concern, and Senator Oatfield made a statement to the Board about her position and why she was continuing with her bill in the Senate opposing Panda. The Board expects the Auxiliary to continue its efforts to develop a lease and operating agreement with Panda. Senator Oatfield will be providing the Auxiliary with the names of local California produce growers that would be good options for Panda to use in their purchases for food.

 Written report from ASUC Auxiliary Director Permaul (cont'd)

The Daily Cal's Editor refused to publish the Opinion-Editorial written by the co-Chairs of the SOB to counter their one-sided editorial of last week. They then published another Opinion-Editorial piece written by a student who created the online Web site opposing Panda on Tuesday. I was asked by the graduate student members of the SOB to respond to inaccuracies and misleading statements made in this new piece, but I pointed out that should be the province of students. The editorial implies that the ASUC or students on the Store Operations Board are unaware of the budgeting or operations of the Auxiliary. Neither is true. In fact, the comments suggest that last year's ASUC Executive Officers were either incompetent or asleep at the switch when the budget for the Auxiliary was presented to the SOB, or that the current Executives and the Senate both this year and last year did not take seriously the presentations on the budget made in conjunction with the commercial development plans and in the Executive training.

I reject both of those assumptions because I have more respect for student leaders than that, and the Auxiliary has been completely transparent in its discussions of the budget with the governments of the ASUC. Indeed, it has been the Auxiliary that has made the budget and ASUC funding a central issue for your consideration, and the consideration of the last three ASUC governments.

If the Senate, or the Executives have any questions about the Auxiliary budget, all they need do is ask.

Tully's Coffee:

We have completed the draft of the Tully's LOI and will begin working with them on the Lease and Operating Agreement at the Student Union.

Naia Lounge:

The SOB gave the Auxiliary direction on how to work with the owner's of Naia in hopes of obtaining access to the Lounge, while they remain closed, for student events and programs.

5. Seismic Renovations at the Student Union and Eshleman Hall:

The campus has agreed to hold the start of the Seismic renovations at Martin Luther King, Jr. Union until the end of May 2009. That will allow student groups to use the Union in March, April, and through final exams. The work though, will carry on into the next academic year, and both Pauley and the 4th floor rooms will be out of commission through September 2009, and perhaps beyond.

The campus has not yet released the report that was due in June regarding a seismic solution for Eshleman that would allow the building to remain open until the redevelopment of the entire complex.

6. Meeting Last Thursday with UCPD:

Last Thursday the ASUC student government, lead by President Winston, held a meeting in the Multicultural Center to discuss with campus officials issues surrounding the campus climate toward students of color. UCPD was the special guest and focus of the discussion, but other administrators from the Office of the Dean of Students, the Vice Chancellor of Equity & Inclusion, and the Auxiliary also

Written report from ASUC Auxiliary Director Permaul (cont'd)

attended to listen to concerns of students and to develop a strategy for further engagement on these and other issues. The event, though on short notice, was well attended by students, and President Winston indicated that there will be a follow up meeting in the near future.

7. Cal Lodge:

The SOB received copies of the extension of the management contract for the Cal Lodge. The Lodge cut its losses by 50% this past year, and made significant physical improvements to meet health and safety requirements and code compliance. The new agreement aims at achieving break-even revenue generation during this fiscal year. That will depend a great deal on the weather in the Sierras, and the snowfall. In the agreement, the Auxiliary left a clause to allow the ASUC the option of selling the property if it wishes to do so during the term of the extension.

8. ASUC Art Studio:

I hope you have gone by the ASUC Art Studio to see the entrance and landscaping that has been created there. The Art Studio has been one of the best-kept secrets on the campus, on one of the busiest thoroughfares of the campus. The recent work done there has exposed the Art Studio, cleaned up its entrance, and created a sense of arrival. Since the work was done this past week, students have been stopping and noticing the studio and attracting attention. The new Art Studio Web site also makes it possible for the program to effectively register students and community participants, and ensure that we are capturing all the potential revenue we need to support the business model.

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 ASUC Auxiliary Director Permaul

Begin Written Report from SUPERB

Hey Senators,

I apologize, I had to leave early from the meeting this evening before everyone could return from the recess; however I still wanted to let you know about SUPERB's happenings for the past week! (I might start doing this for each Wednesday, regardless).

Written Report from SUPERB (cont'd)

Recent Events:

Last Friday (10/10): Wall-E (Incredible showing with ~1200 attendees, Voter Reg. tabling throughout the night)

This Monday (10/13): Straylight Run in the Bear's Lair

Tonight, Wednesday (10/15): Sneak Preview of "Engage Her" (Documentary about motivating minority women to lead and vote) followed by live stream of the debates

Upcoming Events:

Thursday (10/16): Guitar Hero Tournament (sponsored by Activision) in Bear's Lair, 7pm

Friday (10/17): Noon Concert with Dave Lowensohn from Speechwriters LLC'

Next Thursday (10/23): The Coup, Lower Sproul 5-7p (Oscar should have made an announcement for me!)

I wish you all a good night, talk to you soon.

Best,

Kevin

End written report from SUPERB

Elected Official Announcements

Ms. Flores said she wanted to invite people to Pilipino Association for Health Careers' second general meeting on Thursday. They'll talk about the medical mission that will take place in January. With what happened last week, she hoped there was some continuity and that people were still aware the group was doing this amazing work throughout the semester. The meeting will be at 7 p.m. at 209 Dwinelle. Afterwards, Cal Slam and bridges will have slam poetry and an open mic in the MCC, also known as Heller Lounge. It will probably go on pretty late, so people could go there after the PAHC meeting.

Ms. Chen said it was Breast Cancer Awareness Month and a lot of things were going on. She was taking \$1 donations for a pin. Donations will go to the Susan G. Coleman Foundation, which funds breast cancer research.

Mr. Tran said she wanted to thank all the Senators who got very involved with the textbook adoption initiative. People took time out of their lives to serve the campus and to really engage people about this. He also wanted to invite people to come back for next semester, as they go back to the drawing board and add to the general textbook affordability initiative. He looked forward to working with people then, and he enjoyed working with people on this. He wanted to thank them very much and send it's been a pleasure.

Ms. Rodriguez said that on Thursday, from 10 p.m. to 2 a.m., Sigma Phi Alpha, Inc. will hold a fundraiser for its scholarship that semester. People were highly encouraged to attend. Tickets were \$4, \$5 at the door. Also, next Tuesday, October 21, the Raza Recruitment and Retention Center will hold a fundraising dinner to raise funds for a spring budget process for AB540 students on campus. She would ask people to please come out. It will be from 6:00 to 8:00 in Pauley Ballroom. Lastly, some Senators participated in a funding workshop for student organizations. She was hoping that was something they could do on a monthly basis. Hopefully, that was something they could put together and give people good information.

Mr. Mairena said he was going to put together a little ad for all the available positions on committees. Unfortunately, he had three midterms on Tuesday, so he's been in study mode. He hoped Senators remember that they were students as well, and that despite 13-hour meetings, he hoped they still do well in their classes. That's been a concern of his, from the peer advisor in him. Mr. Mairena said he needed to know which people to contact about openings. He understood the Selection Committee for the PR Director (Title I) hasn't met yet; Ms. Rodriguez was contact for the Fundraising Director Selection Committee; Ms. Flores, for Commissioner of Diversity Affairs.

Ms. Raffi said that Mr. Permaul couldn't make it that evening, so on his behalf, she would relay some information. Mr. Permaul was now in conversation with Amanda's, which was brought up as an alternative to Panda. The Senate heard from Sen. Oatfield that Amanda's was willing to make a very generous investment to the campus in the event it was brought there. This was something that was happening quickly, and a lot of people had interest in considering all types of possibilities.

Mr. Owens said the Meeting Length Working Group will meet that week, on the heels of last week's 12 and-a-half hour meeting. The Daily Cal had an article that day that made fun of the Senate. Their average meeting length has been 9 hours for that session. Last year it was 6 and a half. So the Senate had a lot of work to do to try and speed things up and to get things to a bi-partisan consensus. Members of the MLWG included himself and Sens. Shah, Cho, Oatfield, Nahabet, Moghtader, and Hussain. They'll decide when to meet off the floor. If other people were interested, they should let him know. He believed they'll meet on Tuesday.

Mr. Mairena said meeting length was a really big concern for him, but the Senate has exceeded the amount of bills they had last year. He thought the word "inefficiency" was the incorrect word for the situation, because he thought the Senate has gotten a lot of work done and has passed a lot of bills. They've allocated funding to a lot of groups and they've done By-law amendments. So they have done a lot. But he wouldn't necessarily say they were being efficient, and their meetings last too long. That was a really big concern. But people should be mindful that they're also getting a lot of work done. He didn't think that's been highlighted as much as the fact that their meetings have been extremely long.

Mr. Owens said that he completely agreed, and the Senate has gotten a lot of bills done. The problem he was seeing was to spend too much time in announcements and Special Orders. Also, when they fill in the

Special Order of the Day -- Presentation by Sandy Barbour, Director, Intercollegiate Athletics, on
Student Athletics

blank, the Senate tended to fall in the middle. They usually spend four or five hours on really controversial bills. He thought they could reach an agreement faster than they have.

Ms. Raffi said Poetry Night for breast cancer awareness will be held on the 7th floor.

Mr. Tran moved to go back to the Special Order for Ms. Barbour, from 8:35 p.m. to 9:05. The motion was seconded by Ms. Rodriguez and passed with no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY -- Presentation by Intercollegiate Athletics Director Sandy Barbour, on
Student Athletics

Ms. Barbour said she would like to thank them for having her there. Given the discussion she just walked in on regarding meeting length, she'd be brief. Mr. Permaul asked her to come and talk to the Senate, which she was very appreciative of, but didn't give her a lot of instruction as to what they wanted to hear about. Given the tenor of the group, she would like to talk briefly about her perspective on athletics at Cal, and from the standpoint of the way she instructed the Athletics Department to do business. What would be most useful for her was to hear what kinds of questions they had, and the kinds of things they were interested in, and what they wanted to ask her about.

Ms. Barbour said she's been at Cal for a little over four years. She came there in September of 2004. A lot has gone on in those four years. She was very fortunate in that she inherited, from a competitive standpoint, a very successful athletic program in terms of wins and losses across the board. She got there in the middle of Jeff Tedford's third season, which ended up being the 10-2 Holiday Bowl season, disappointing in that they didn't go to the Rose Bowl. But she was very fortunate to inherit a program that was on the rise.

Probably the one area that was worrisome to the University when she got there, and still was, and would always be, was a kind of financial balance between the value of Intercollegiate Athletics to the campus and at what cost, questioning what an athletic program should cost a university.

One thing about Berkeley that was a little unique their very large and robust intercollegiate athletic program, with 27 programs. They're not the largest, and Stanford has 31 or 32 programs, and most of the Ivy Leagues were in the mid-30s and had junior varsity programs, and had a much broader program than Cal. But the average in Division 1-A was about 21 programs. And they compete against programs that gave as few as 17. That was a challenge for Athletics. She thought their mission as an intercollegiate athletic program at a place like Cal ought to be to have a large, robust, broad, and diverse sports program. So she was very supportive of the 27 programs they had, even though it took a lot of time, attention, and certainly, resources. But under her leadership, what she has asked the athletic program to do, and what was certainly her philosophy, is that Athletics ought to mirror the mission of the rest of the University.

In her four years there, has been amazed at not only their student athletes, but also their student body. One reason she's been so fortunate and one reason she loved what she did was that she's been fortunate to

be involved with really, really bright and energetic students. She believed it was la crème de la crème in terms of the places she's been. It sounded a little patronizing, but in terms of why she loved what she did, and why she was motivated to do what she did, that was a huge issue.

As she approached her job, what she was asking the Athletic Department to do in every facet, in its culture, with staffmembers, and certainly with student athletes, really came down to four pretty simple pillars. It was a way to frame every-day decision-making and how they act as a Department. These were in no particular order, and every one of them was very important.

The first was athletic excellence. She thought that if they took last year as a snapshot, they had two team national championships; five individual NCAA championships; a couple of Pac-10 championships; 23 of their 27 programs finished in the top 25 of their respective sports. So she thought the athletics excellence piece was certainly in good stead. They could do better, absolutely, and that's what they were striving to do, every day. They won the two national championships in rugby and water polo. Women's tennis was off to UCLA, in the finals. Both of their crew programs could have won the national championships with a little bit of this or that. And their women's basketball program has now put itself on the national front. They've gone out and hired a new men's basketball coach that she thought will do the same there. For their football program, they're going to have a breakout year. After a disappointing loss to Maryland, the team may come back and surprise people, and this may be the year. Arizona was next weekend, and two years ago Arizona beat them there, and she thought this would be a big game for the Bears, to go there and do well. She thought it would breed a lot of confidence in the football team.

The second pillar of the Athletics Department for comprehensive excellence at Cal was academic achievement. Their student athletes must be exactly that: students. They're not all Rhoads Scholars, and students sit in classrooms with them and they know that better than she did. But she thought they were all very diligent students, and some of them were as bright as it got there. But not all of them were, and she wouldn't stand up there and pretend that they were. But the threshold was that they come there understanding the importance of a Cal degree and willing to do the work and put in the effort to pursue it, and pursue successfully. The academic statistics bear that out. Twenty-three of their 27 programs have over 3.0 GPAs. They do a deal with one football game and one basketball game every year where they honor all of their 3.0s from the previous semester. And it's normally over 50% of their student athletes. It's become something that they strive for. That was part of the Department's job, to make sure that student athletes' academics were incentivized in the same way that their athletic achievements were.

Ms. Barbour said the third pillar of the Department was community engagement. That was a very important core piece for her. "Community engagement" meant a lot of things. First and foremost, it meant that their student athletes live up to the expectations of them as role models. Because they're student athletes and because they're on TV playing basketball or football, or because of the different notoriety they get as student athletes, they had an obligation as role models. Not only did they have an obligation from a behavioral standpoint, because people were watching them and looking up to them, but they had an obligation in terms of representation, and to give back to the community. And that community engagement piece was really, really important to her. And that was really stressed to the athletes.

Ms. Barbour said the fourth pillar of the Department was fiscal responsibility. This didn't have so much necessarily to do with their student athletes, but it certainly had to do with the Department as a whole and how they managed their resources. Certainly, they're dependent upon campus support, and dependent in

everything they do. Every source of their revenue came from some other place, from ticket sales, philanthropy, and from campus support. They do not receive any State funding or any money from general revenues from taxpayers. They're heavily dependent upon others to provide resources to them. And therefore they need to engender confidence in what they're doing with those resources. So that fourth piece was for all of them in Cal Athletics to be really fiscally responsible.

Ms. Barbour said all four of those pillars were really, really important, and she hammered home all four of them all the time. At a lot of the places they compete against, only one of those was important. To her, the beauty and challenge of Cal, from the Athletic Department's perspective, was to balance all four of those, because none of them were optional. It was all four, every day, every year.

Ms. Barbour said she would talk quickly about what she saw as the value of Intercollegiate Athletics, which applied to any campus, but particularly this campus. And again, they had a large, robust, and diverse menu of sports. But as a value of campus, athletics were a point of connection to many, many different constituents. Homecoming and the Homecoming Weekend was always built around a football game. It was an opportunity to bring 75,000 back to campus. She thought that certainly had an economic impact not only to the campus, but to the community. And it was probably one of the most visible ways that the campus connected back to its alumni. But she also thought it was a way the campus connected with its student body and with all of its constituents, with its faculty and staff, when done right. And that went back to the four pillars. That's what she called "athletics done right." When done right, it could be great source of pride. When done wrong, it could be a great source of shame. That's why it was important that they do all four of those at a very, very high level.

It was a rallying point for students. Again, when done right, when there's something successful, when there's a thriving entity there for students to support and rally around, it was an opportunity for others to provide related activities around the sporting event, around the sporting pursuit.

Ms. Barbour said that each of these she was about to mention certainly had other aspects to what they do, but athletic events, and performing at athletic events, or around athletic events, was certainly a part of what they do. Whether one talked about Rally Comm., the Marching Band, the Straw Hat Band, spirit squads, "The Bench," or any other student groups that were either formed in part or in whole around athletic events or around athletic entities, it was another indicator of the University's comprehensive excellence.

There's a value to the individual student athletes. They have a population of about 850 student athletes, and certainly there's a value that accrues to them for their participation. These values include all the things they hear about being an athlete, such as teamwork, discipline, persistence, perseverance. There was an opportunity, for a very small number, along with getting an education, to hone their professional skills. But they all included the values of health, welfare, and physical fitness.

Ms. Barbour said that one thing Mr. Permaul asked her specifically to talk about, and it was more a question to the Senate, and part of the discussion, was how can Athletics help students, and how students could help Athletics. She thought that was a question about ways the Athletic Department could play a part in making this a more fulfilling campus, with a more fulfilling experience for all students. It asks what activities they could help the student body with, bring value to as an athletic program, and create things around athletic events, or in what ways the Athletic Department staff, such as administrators, could

help promote and enhance student activities. And then the flip side was how students could help Athletics, ways that they can help create spirit and excitement around athletic events. That not only helps the teams be successful in events, but it helps to create an excitement that then attracts new prospects that help them to either continue to be successful or to get more successful. So she thought there was a lot that they could talk about and get down to specific kinds of things that could really be mutually beneficial. It became a kind of circle. She would like to know how Athletics could help provide a more fulfilling environment and help add value to their experience. And then if happens, and they feel good about connecting with Athletics, increasing the spirit and presence of students, then that helps athletic teams become more and more successful.

Ms. Barbour said that was probably more than the Senate wanted her to talk, but she would like to hear their questions, and would ask how she could help.

Mr. Mairena said he works with the Summer Bridge Program, and he had questions in terms what Intercollegiate sports athletes had to go through that program. Ms. Barbour said that the Admissions Committee provides a rating for all student athletes who are admitted. If a student is below a certain grade, it's mandated that they attend Summer Bridge. In a number of its programs all of the entering athletes go to Summer Bridge because the Department thought it was a very positive introduction to both the academic, the social, and the athletic sides of campus.

Mr. Mairena said that from working in the program, there was an over-representation in certain sports, while other sports were under-represented. Again, it was an extremely enriching program. He himself was a Summer Bridge student, and the Executive Vice President was his counselor during that time. So he just had a question about that.

Mr. Mairena asked if she had an ethnic breakdown of every sport, or if that was not available. Ms. Barbour they certainly did, and could provide that. Mr. Mairena asked if she could e-mail that out to the Senate. Ms. Barbour said she would do that.

Mr. Smelko asked if there were any current or long-term expansion plans that could help out what was going on and boost the Athletics program, anything the Senate should be aware of. Ms. Barbour said that certainly the Student-Athlete High Performance Center and the renovation of the Stadium itself will be transformational for the Department. They are directly going to serve 14 of the Department's programs. They'll have two hubs, at Memorial Stadium and at Haas. The Department, and certainly their student athletes, were very appreciative of the students' support with the High Performance Center.

She thought that as they look at athletic facilities, they certainly have a lot of work to do. The Stadium was probably their most pressing and, because of safety, as well as the place it held as a competitive venue for football, where they try to draw 75,000 people on an every-Saturday basis, to help drive the financial train. There was no secret that they've pursued that one first. They have a number of facilities issues that, over the course of time, need to be addressed in terms of competitive sports, for water polo, basketball and volleyball, practice facilities, so they don't use the Recreational Sports facilities. They have some renovation needs for both soccer and track. They're doing a scoreboard project with tennis. They don't have any huge need for anything fancy. They need to put together a facilities master plan for things they're going to undertake. But most of it was just modernization of spaces and facilities. She thought that was needed for their financial future and their ability to continue to field very, very

competitive and high-quality programs. And it related to their ability to be successful from a philanthropy standpoint. The economy wasn't helping. Their ability to be successful in men's basketball and football was important, to sell tickets. She thought if they look at their women's basketball program and their volleyball program, and where they were from a competitive standpoint, and the ability to have this community embrace those two programs, there were some revenue opportunities for the Department there, beyond just having great programs that they were really proud of being associated with Cal. They have a volleyball program that went to the Final Four last year, and a women's program was about to have a #1 or Top 5 recruiting class in the country, and could potentially be in the top 16.

Ms. Ude asked what some of the ideas that Cal Athletics had in mind to support and help generate more student energy and support for women's athletics, such as the women's basketball and volleyball teams. Ms. Barbour said that was very near and dear to her heart. When she first came to Cal three years ago, they had a volleyball program that was pretty good and on the rise; and they had a struggling women's basketball program. It was very, very important to her that because of their visibility as women's programs, that they both be very successful. She made a coaching change on the women's side in basketball and the Athletics marketing department has done a lot with women's basketball, particularly last year, in terms of promoting to the community, to youth. They had 10,500 attend their basketball game against Stanford. As the team has gotten better, she thought the media has picked up on them a little bit. But the marketing department has done a lot in the community to really try and get out to promote people to come, with different promotional campaigns, such as two-for-ones, "team days," "come to college days," those kinds of things, to get people to women's basketball. They're doing some of those same things with the success last year with volleyball and some of the same things that fall with volleyball.

Ms. Barbour said that to be honest with them, they have not put a lot of resource into marketing on campus, to fellow students. And that may be a place to focus on. And the reason they haven't was because historically, schools have tried to reach out to students without having a really great response. This was across the country, say, in the last 20 years, as women's basketball has kind of taken off with some momentum, such as with Connecticut, Tennessee, and Stanford. None of those has had any great success in attracting students. So if that was something the Senate had some ideas about as to how it could be done successfully, she was all ears. There's nothing better for the young men and women in athletics programs to come out onto the court or the field and have their fellow students really endorsing them and cheering them on. There's was nothing that had a better impact for the students on the floor. So if there were some suggestions about how the Department could be effective with that, she would embrace that with open arms.

Ms. Flores asked about her perspectives on the construction or future construction of the Stadium. Ms. Barbour said that obviously they were embroiled with litigation with three plaintiffs over the course of the last 22 months. The concerns, as she understood them, from the California oaks was about the removal of the trees. She spent a lot of time with the Panoramic Hill Association trying to attend to or answer or respond to some of their suggestions, needs, and concerns. And then the City was the third litigant. The City's concerns had to do with the violations of Alquist-Priolo. She believed very strongly that everything they're doing in both the Student-Athlete High Performance project, and the subsequent renovation of Memorial Stadium, was right on point to their concerns in terms of safety.

In terms of the Stadium renovation, ultimately that will take the Stadium down to about 65,000. So there will actually be 10,000 less people. In terms of the impacts to the neighborhood, she was very sensitive

to the fact that they currently have a 75,000-seat Stadium, and they'll have about 65,000, right smack dab at the base of a neighborhood. Ms. Barbour said she understood that, and the Athletic Department has done a number of things over the course of the last couple of years to respond to some of the concerns and complaints of the neighbors relative to trash pick up, and dealing with noise related to the events. She understood that during actual construction and renovation there will be some inconveniences for those who live and work in that area. Perhaps her perspective was skewed, but one thing she didn't quite understand in terms of neighborhood concerns was that it would actually make things better for the neighbors in terms of cleaning up the Stadium itself. Right now, it was a gaggle of chain-link fences, Porta-potties, and narrow roads. Rimway Road will be widened. It's currently closed during football games, and after the renovation, it will be open. That will help to answer one of the concerns about the neighborhood, emergency access in the case of something happening in the hills. She couldn't help the fact that they play football games there. But she could certainly try to mitigate some of those things for the neighbors. She knew neighbors had concerns about lights and those kinds of things, and those things were being mitigated to the very, very best of the Department's ability. The fact of the matter is that neighbors live in a neighborhood with a football stadium and they have to hold football games. But that didn't mean the campus couldn't do things to try and lessen the impact. She thought the campus has been very responsive in its endeavors.

Ms. Oatfield said she was a Co-oper and she knew some representatives from Athletics talked to a co-op about construction plans for the Student-Athlete High Performance Center, and discussed that with the co-op that's right by the Stadium. Ms. Oatfield said she heard that construction will start at 7-8 a.m. Other students live right there in that neighborhood. She asked if that was something that the Athletic Department was willing to work around. Ms. Barbour said that was the point for the outreach to the co-ops, to present some of the preliminary plans and see the reaction. That was something people in Capital Projects were doing. She certainly thought that was something the Department could take a look at. On the other side, the Haas School of Business doesn't want banging and stuff going on, and has complained about the band practicing in the afternoon at Maxwell Family Field. That was not to say that one was more important than the other, but they have kind of a box the Department was put in. But that was exactly the reason for the outreach, in order to find out what all the issues would be and to see what could be done to mitigate as many of them as possible. With no objection, the Special Order was extended by two minutes.

Ms. Oatfield asked about her thoughts about concerns about financial responsibility to seismically retrofit the Stadium. The plans acknowledge that if a major earthquake happened, there could be a lot of physical damage to the Stadium itself. Some things she heard that evening question how financially responsible that was. Ms. Barbour said she would assume by that question that the concern was whether they were putting money into this, and then there could possibly be huge damage. The whole point of retrofitting the Stadium was that with the advances in seismic engineering, they can now retrofit it so during significant seismic activity, it would basically sort of pre-rupture. So that if there is significant activity, that there will be that major damage. But if that happened right now, they could have that major damage and be in a situation to have to spend significantly. Ms. Oatfield said this might be a better question for an architect or a seismologist. Ms. Barbour said the whole point of a retrofit was to keep exactly what Ms. Oatfield was concerned about from happening.

Ms. Hussain asked who was in charge of Maxwell Field. Ms. Barbour said it was Intercollegiate Athletics. Ms. Hussain asked when the lights are turned off there. Ms. Barbour said it depended on the activity.

Guest Announcements (cont'd)

The activity late at night was usually club sports or intramurals, and the lights have timers on them. She believed the last scheduled activity was at 11:00. She asked if the concern was that the lights were staying on too long. Ms. Hussain said she was wondering if there was any way students who weren't part of club sports could play there. Ms. Barbour said her colleague Mr. Weinberger will discuss that, because it certainly was available.

Mr. Smelko said she didn't have to answer this, but asked about her personal preference, between Nate Longshore or Kevin Riley. Ms. Barbour said the football team was very fortunate to have two very talented quarterbacks.

Ms. Raffi moved to go back to Guest Announcements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection.

Guest Announcements (cont'd)

Ms. Pasco said the next Guest Announcement was from Farrah Moos, for Amnesty International, and "Stand Against Poverty." Ms. Moos said she was there from Amnesty and she was there to tell them about an event. On Friday, from 12:00 to 1:00, in Upper Sproul, they'll have an event, "Stand Against Poverty." They're addressing a global need, and this was part of a global event. Last year, 43.7 million people participated in this between October 17 and October 19. It was in support of the Millennium Development Goals, supported by the United Nations. These goals weren't being implemented very well, or at all. So it was really important that students' voices are heard and that they support these goals to reduce poverty. Everyone will wear white. A lot of different clubs have co-sponsored this and will come out, including a lot of different sororities and fraternities. It should be big. She was there to inform the Senate about this and to invite them to attend.

Ms. Flores asked if this was involved with the poverty studies minor. Ms. Moos said they'll speak at the event about local opportunities for people to get involved in the community. Their theme is "Think Globally, Act Locally." If people have suggestions, they should let her know. With no objection, speaking time was extended by three minutes.

Ms. Cho asked if there was a Web site. Ms. Moos said they could go to standagainstpoverity.org.

Ms. Pasco said the next Guest Announcement was from Itamar Haritan. Mr. Haritan said he was doing the UCPD-Student Forum. There had been a delay for a couple of reasons. The police didn't get back to him for a long time. But they now have a date and time for the forum, but not a place. It will occur October 22 from 4:00 to 6 p.m. He hoped Senators advertise the event to their communities. He was also trying to create an e-mail list of people who were interested, and would request any addresses people could provide.

As for his plans for the Forum, he'd go over the format. Mr. Haritan said it was very important for him to make this something that was built into the system, into the structure of the relationship between students and the UCPD. The process has been going on for a month and a half, and it was important to not have to repeat the process for every forum, or even every semester. So he'll work hard with Kathleen Bedford, of the UCPD, to make sure they have outreach for the entire year, booked month-to-month with forums. He wanted to see if there was someone a bit younger than him to take this over. It should be something that could also be unspoken, with students having opportunities to bring up their concerns to the UCPD. If people wanted to help him, that would be appreciated.

He would pass around a questionnaire for the forum. It was important for the UCPD to take the students seriously. If students didn't show up, they still needed to know that the forum was mandated by the ASUC. With no objection, speaking time was extended by three minutes.

Mr. Haritan said the format was something he developed last semester with Igor Tregub, and Senators should feel free to ask questions or ask for changes. At the beginning of every forum, he'd pass around an optional sign-up sheet. People could be anonymous. He would then read the mission statement, talk about the ground rules, take questions, and then go over how the forum was run. It will be run with a UCPD facilitator, who calls on UCPD officers, and then Mr. Haritan said he would call on the students. The facilitators wouldn't say anything unless there was a point of information. The topics would be generated by the body at the beginning. They try to make it as democratic as possible. After a half hour, they'd generate new topics. They do that for two hours.

Ms. Rodriguez asked if he's looked into having the forum at the Multicultural Center. Mr. Haritan said he hasn't. But they want a place where people don't sit on separate sides. He thought the MCC would be good.

Mr. Zuo moved to go back to Approval of the Agenda for next week. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hussain and passed with no objection.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (Oct. 22) (cont'd)

Mr. Zuo moved to add a Special Order next week, from 8:30 to 9:00, to hear from a representative from the University to talk about the Memorial Stadium issue.

Ms. Oatfield said she would like to amend that motion to include not only reps from the University, but also other students or members of the public. The motion to amend was seconded and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO HEAR A SPECIAL ORDER NEXT WEEK, FROM 8:30 TO 9:00, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, TO HEAR FROM UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER SPEAKERS ON THE MEMORIAL STADIUM ISSUE.

Mr. Mairena asked to add to the agenda a report from the Disability Accommodation Fund Director. The motion to amend was seconded and passed with no objection.

A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR NEXT WEEK, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Mr. Mairena moved to recess for five minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smelko and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, with no objection, the recess was extended by five minutes. Back in session, with no objection, the recess was extended by five minutes. Back in session, a motion to recess until the Chair's discretion passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Ms. Pasco said it was 9:41, and they just had a 40-minute recess.

Standing Committee Reports

Reporting for the Finance Committee, Mr. Moghtader said SB 46 was tabled; SB 55 was passed as amended; SB 59 was passed as amended; SB 62 was passed as amended; SB 61 was tabled. All waivers were approved. SBs 74, 77, 81, 83, and 72 were passed as amended. SB 82 was tabled. SBs 84, 75, 79, 73, and 71 were passed as amended. SB 78 was tabled. SB 80 was passed as amended. For the first and final roll calls, all were present except for Pres. Winston and Finance Officer Chaney.

Begin written report from the Finance Committee

Week 7

Monday, October 13, 2008

9:00 pm, Senate Chambers, Eshleman Hall

Chair: Senator John Moghtader | Vice Chair: Senator Meghana Dhar

Voting Members: Senators Chen, Cho, Dhar, Flores, Moghtader, Rodriguez, and Sakaue

Non-Voting Members: President Winston, EVP Pasco, Finance Officer Chaney

- I. Roll Call
 - a. All present but Winston and Chaney
- II. Approval of the Minutes from October 6, 2008
 - a. Approved
- III. Approval of the Agenda for October 13, 2008
 - a. Approved
- IV. Committee Business

 Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- a. Debate to be limited to Senators or committee members
- b. Yielding time should be minimized

V. Old Business

- a. SB 46
 - i. Tabled - needs to be reintroduced
- b. SB 55
 - i. Amended: Add Senator Nahabet as a co-sponsor
 - ii. Passed
- c. SB 59
 - i. Amended: Add Senator Meghana Dhar as a co-sponsor
 - ii. Amended: \$375
 - iii. Passed
- d. SB 62
 - i. Amended: \$150
 - ii. Passed
- e. SB 61
 - i. Tabled

VI. New Business

- a. Waivers
 - i. Raza Recruitment and Retention Center
 - 1. \$625: Raza Transfer Day
 - 2. Passed
 - ii. Raza Recruitment and Retention Center
 - 1. \$400: Education Inequities Fundraising dinner
 - 2. Passed
 - iii. Best Buddies
 - 1. \$200: Food for events and recruitment meetings for the year
 - 2. Passed
 - iv. Asian American Association
 - 1. \$625: Facility waiver for Pauley
 - 2. Passed
- b. Appointments
 - i. Hassan Khan, Chief of Staff - \$1,000
 - ii. Nikhil Matani - \$350
 - iii. Leah Rabkin - \$250
 - iv. Passed

Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- c. Bills
 - i. SB 74
 - 1. Amendment: Replace everywhere it says “we” with “The Socialist Organizer”
 - 2. Amendment: Add Senator Flores as a co-sponsor
 - 3. Amended: see Senator Shah’s e-mail
 - ii. SB 77
 - 1. Amendment: Add Senators Hussain, Nahabet, Moghtader, Smelko, Cho, shah Flores as co-sponsors
 - 2. Amendment: email (syntactical error)
 - 3. PASSES
 - iii. SB 81
 - 1. Amendment: \$200
 - 2. Passed
 - iv. SB 83
 - 1. Amendment: Add Senators Smelko, Chen and Moghtader as co-sponsors
 - 2. Amendment: \$250
 - 3. Passed
 - v. SB 72
 - 1. Amendment: As e-mailed by Senator Flores
 - 2. Amendment: Add Senators Chen, Cho, Rodriguez as co-sponsors
 - 3. Amendment: \$190
 - 4. Passed
 - vi. SB 82
 - 1. TABLED
 - vii. SB 84
 - 1. Amendment: As e-mailed by Senator Raffi (budget change and adding co-sponsors)
 - 2. Amendment: \$350
 - 3. Passed
 - viii. SB 75
 - 1. Amendment: \$375
 - 2. PASSES
 - ix. SB 79
 - 1. Amendment: \$300
 - 2. PASSES
 - x. SB 73
 - 1. Amended: \$500
 - 2. Amended: Senators Cho and Chen as co-sponsors
 - xi. SB 71

Written report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

1. Amendment: Add Senators: Sakaue, Rodriguez, Shah, Flores, Lisa Tran, Zuo, Cho, Chen as co-sponsors
 2. Amendment: \$567
 3. Passed
- xii. SB 78
1. Tabled
- xiii. SB 80
1. Amendment: \$600
 2. Passed
- VII. Adjournment
- a. Roll Call
 - i. All present but Pasco, Winston, Chaney
 - b. Adjourned at 12:59 AM

End written report from the Finance Committee

Reporting for the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee, Mr. Nahabet said Mr. Tran was absent. They approved SB 70 and SB 76.

Begin written report from the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee

ASUC Standing Committee on Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee
Fall 2008 Session – week 7
Monday, October 13 2008
9:00 pm, Senate Lounge, Eshleman Hall

Chair: Senator Eddie Nahabet; Vice Chair: Senator Christina Oatfield
Voting Members: Senators Mairena, Nahabet, Oatfield, Owens, Shah, Smelko, T. Tran
Member present: -Nahabet, Shah, Mairena, Owens, Smelko,
-Oatfield

- I. Approval of the Minutes from October 6, 2008
- II. Approval of the Agenda for October 13, 2008
- III. Old Business
- IV. New Business
SB 70

Written report from the Constitutional and Procedural Review Committee (cont'd)

bill passes with a 3 to 2

SB 76
passes

V. Adjournment

VI. Roll Call

members present: Nahabet, Shah, Mairena, Owens, Smelko, Oatfield, Sinanian

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 9:04 p.m. That passed SB 70; 76, as amended. The meeting adjourned at 9:09. All Senators were present.

Begin written report from the University and External Affairs Committee

External Committee Meeting Minutes—Monday, October 13, 2008

Meeting called to order at 9:04 pm

I. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting

II. Approval of Agenda for this Meeting

III. Old Business

IV. New Business

a. SB 70

i. Passes—unanimous voice vote

b. SB 76

i. Amended to add EAVP Jirachaikitti as a co-sponsor

ii. Passed by unanimous voice vote

V. Adjournment

a. Meeting adjourned at 9:09 pm

b. Roll Call: Sen. Hussain, Sen. Raffi, Sen. L. Tran, Sen. Ude, Sen. Yang, Sen. Zuo

End written report from the University and External Affairs Committee

Reporting for Advocacy Committee #1, Ms. Tran said the meeting was called to order at 6:18. Sen. Shah was absent. They talked about a tentative schedule for Tang Center Awareness Week they're thinking of

putting on the third week of next semester, February 2. They also included tasks for the next meeting. Ms. Tran said she will e-mail the RHA, health workers, units, health directors, and the OP, to talk about collaborating with this. Sens. Sakaue and Ude will be in charge of booking rooms and locations. Sen. Yang will gather reps from student organizations. There will be a Health Fair on December 7 in Pauley Ballroom.

Begin written report from Advocacy Committee #1

Advocacy Committee #1: Mental & Spiritual Health

Monday October 13, 2008

Meeting Call to Order: 6:18PM

I. Approval of Agenda

A. Agenda Approved

II. New Business: Plans/Suggestion

A. Tang Center Awareness Week

- i. Tentative Schedule: Week of February 2nd; (3rd Week of Spring Semester)
- ii. UHS: Access to UHS with/out SHIP
- iii. Day: Sproul/events; Night: Workshops
- iv. T-shirt ideas: FRONT: SEX-E, HEALTH-E; BACK: Tang Center Awareness Week & Info

B. Collaborations/ Contacts

- i. National Pacific American Women's Forum Berkeley Chapter(NAPAWF)—They will be conducting a survey to see what the barriers are to get contraceptives and sexual health information. Sen. Hussain & Sen. Yang will update the committee next wk
- ii. FEM SEX: Decal (workshop)
- iii. Communities of Color
 - a. BRIDGES, APASD, APAC, MSD
 - b. Queer community
 - c. Student Health Orgs
 - SHEP: Sexual Health Exchange Program
 - SHAC: Student Health Advisory Committee
- iv. DeCals
 - a. Female Sexuality

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

b. Topics in Sexual Health

C. Undergraduate Public Health Coalition : Health Fair, Dec 7th in Pauley Ballroom

III. Tasks Before Next Meeting

A. Find/Email potential collaborators for Tang Center Awareness Week

- i. Senator Lisa Tran: RHA, Health workers in Units, health director of OP

B. Book rooms/location

- i. Senator Sakaue: MCC, Senate Chambers, Unit 1, Unit 3 & etc
ii. Senator Ude: Contact Kim LaPean (communications director of UHS)

C. Student Orgs Collaboration

- i. Senator Yang: Gather reps from Student Orgs
ii. Senator Hussain: Gather info on UPHC & Health Fair

IV. Adjourn

a. Roll Call

- i. Senator Hussain
ii. Senator Sakaue
iii. Senator Shah (absent)
iv. Senator Lisa Tran
v. Senator Ude
vi. Senator Yang

Adjourned Time: 6:46PM

End written report from Advocacy Committee #1

Reporting for Advocacy Committee #2, Ms. Cho said they decided to meet every two weeks. The next meeting will be October 28. They'll have a meeting with a faculty member to talk about secure employment. Sens. Zuo and Nahabet were working on that. For student space, Sen. Chen was researching other campus' 24-hour libraries, with Sen. Raffi. Sen. T. Tran was thinking of allowing people to open up

study space in different rooms on campus. For Lecture Notes, Mr. Owens and Mr. Smelko will meet with Karyn Houston and talk to AAVP De la Cruz about expansion. For secure employment, Ms. Flores and Ms. Cho will do more research. They also discussed possible rental systems in the ASUC, as well as office supply rentals for the ASUC. They'll work on early textbook adoption next semester. Everybody was present for the meeting, which adjourned at 7:44.

Begin written report from Advocacy Committee #2

Advocacy Committee #1: Short- and Long-Range Academic Resources Improvement & Security of Employment – Minutes
Tuesday October 14, 2008
Fall Session 2008 – Week 2
7:00PM June Jordan

Meeting Call to Order: 7:10PM

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Committee Business

- a. Meeting will be every two weeks
- b. Next meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 28

III. New Business

- c. Lecture Notes (Smelko & Owens)
 - i. Gathering ideas to improve program
- d. Security of Employment (Flores)
 - i. Meeting with Professor Khatharya Um, Asian American Studies next week to discuss labor equity issue
 - ii. Also meeting with Nicole U – GSI
- e. Polling System (Zuo)
 - i. Working with Eddie Nahabet to get the polling system set up; working directly with Student Registrar office
- f. Study Space (Chen)
 - i. Researching into other campuses' 24-hour libraries; start-up and operations
 - ii. Tara Raffi met with Head Librarian about Moffitt; currently they are renovating it
- g. Study Space (Tran)
 - i. Idea – allow people to be signatories for random students groups so that they can rent out rooms to lead study groups
- h. Security of Employment (Cho)
 - i. API Education and Languages NOW! now a student group on campus; ASUC-sponsorship bill coming up soon
- i. Early Textbook Adoption Campaign – more organization next semester
- j. Textbook rental system
- k. Office Supply rentals through ASUC

IV. Tasks and deadlines

 Written report from Advocacy Committee #2 (cont'd)

- l. Lecture Notes (Owens & Smelko)
 - i. Awareness and expansion
 1. Meet with Karen Houston
 2. Talk with AAVP Carlo De La Cruz
 - ii. My Scribe – Auxiliary & Follett joint project
- m. Security of Employment (Flores & Cho)
 - i. Get update from Gibor Basri about his meeting with Janet Broughton – issue: equity on faculty level
 - ii. Research on structure, institutions and bureaucracy to establish labor equity
 - iii. Talk to AAVP De La Cruz about contacting and collaborating with relevant committee in Academic Senate
 - iv. Asian Pacific Islander Conference in Spring; Christine possible speaker; brainstorm workshop ideas that we can do (3/14)
- n. Polling System (Zuo)
 - i. Wait for response from Registrar and set up another meeting on the polling system; form a more comprehensive design
 - ii. Meet with administration about working on improving telebears
- o. Study Space (Tu Tran, Chen, Smelko)
 - i. Research on 24-hour library
 1. Generate student interest and form written proposal
 2. Collaborate with AAVP Office; Library committee voting member
 3. Keep in touch with library fundraiser
 4. UQ

V. Adjourn

- b. Roll Call (all present)
 - vii. Senator Cho
 - viii. Senator Chen
 - ix. Senator Flores
 - x. Senator Owens
 - xi. Senator Smelko
 - xii. Senator Tu Tran
 - xiii. Senator Zuo

Adjournment: 7:44PM

End written report from Advocacy Committee #2

Reporting for Advocacy Committee #3, Ms. Raffi they talked about their plan for the semester and goals for the near future. They identified their main goal, which would be to draft a checklist of best practices for the Store Operations Board. That's something they'll draft that semester and then work with the SOB

Consent Calendar -- Fee Waivers

-- SB 55, In Support of UCBD Beginner's Competition

to adopt next semester. The goal was to have this adopted by the end of next semester. The Committee is inviting all members of the Store Operations Board to sit on this Committee. They also want to appoint members that specialize on financial knowledge and knowledge of environmental sustainability. Ms. Raffi said she suggested somebody, and Ms. Oatfield suggested the ASUC Director of Sustainability, the Campus Director of Sustainability, and the OP Director of Sustainability. They plan to keep the SOB in the loop as they draft this document. They also recommend that all Committee members attend SOB meetings. Sen. Moghtader was absent. The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The following Resolution bills and waivers were up for consideration that evening under the Consent Calendar: SBs 55, as amended; 59, as amended; 62, as amended; 74, as amended; 81, as amended; 63, as amended; 72, as amended; 84, as amended; 75, as amended; 79, as amended; 73, as amended; 71, as amended; and 80, as amended. Waivers approved included Raza Recruitment and Retention Center, \$625 for Raza Transfer Day and \$400 for the Education Inequities Fundraising dinner; Best Buddies, \$200 for food for events and recruitment meetings for the year; and the Asian American Association, \$625 for a facility waiver for Pauley.

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

Back in session, a motion to approve the Consent Calendar was made and seconded by Ms. Rodriguez and Ms. Ude. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION: SB 55, AS AMENDED; SB 59, AS AMENDED; SB 62, AS AMENDED; SB 63, AS AMENDED; SB 71, AS AMENDED; SB 72, AS AMENDED; SB 73, AS AMENDED; SB 74, AS AMENDED; SB 75, AS AMENDED; SB 79, AS AMENDED; SB 80, AS AMENDED SB 81, AS AMENDED; AND SB 84, AS AMENDED. WAIVERS WERE APPROVED FOR RAZA RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION CENTER, \$625 AND \$400; BEST BUDDIES, \$200; AND THE ASIAN AMERICAN ASSOCIATION, \$625.

The following waivers were approved under the Consent Calendar:

Raza Recruitment and Retention Center, \$625 for Raza Transfer Day.

Raza Recruitment and Retention Center, \$400 for the Education Inequities Fundraising dinner

Best Buddies, \$200 for food for events and recruitment meetings for the year

Asian American Association, \$625 for a facility waiver for Pauley.

The following Resolution, SB 55, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Ms. Yang Ms. Dhar and was co-sponsored by Mr. Smelko, Mr. Tran, and Mr. Nahabet:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF UCBD BEGINNER'S COMPETITION

WHEREAS, UC Berkeley Ballroom Dancers is a 4th-year Student Activity Group (SAG) with a spring budget allocation of \$400; and

WHEREAS, UCBD's next event is the Berkeley Beginners' Competition, a student-organized event which will be held in Hearst gym on the UC Berkeley campus on October 18th, 2008 and will be open to beginner and intermediate level amateur ballroom dancers from all backgrounds; and

WHEREAS, this competition is geared towards introducing the team's newcomers, and their friends and families, to the world of competitive ballroom dancing in a smaller and more familiar environment; and

WHEREAS, it is also open to outside competitors and spectators and runs in the same format as other larger competitions as it will be adjudicated by professional local judges; and

WHEREAS, UCBD wishes to be as accessible as possible to those students from less privileged backgrounds, and will thus be offering free registration on a need-basis; and

WHEREAS, the event is aimed to stir interest in and share the benefits of ballroom dancing with many others across the campus community; and

WHEREAS, the proposed budget for the event is as follows: Total, \$1,060;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocate \$205 from the Senate Contingency Fund to the UCBD Beginner's competition.

The following Resolution SB 59, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Charles Zhuang and Mr. Zuo and was co-sponsored by Ms. Cho, Ms. Rodriguez, and Ms. Dhar:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE STUDENT HUMAN RESOURCE ASSOCIATION (SHRA)

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, there is currently no other organization at UC Berkeley sponsored by the ASUC or any other department dedicated to educate students about the field of human resources while providing ample networking opportunities with professionals in the field and beyond; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE STUDENT HUMAN RESOURCE ASSOCIATION (SHRA)
(cont'd)

WHEREAS, SHRA provides students with top-notch personal consulting in regards to résumés, interviews, etiquette, and recruiting strategies, through a series of workshops, case competitions, site visits, and a professional networking luncheon; and

WHEREAS, SHRA unites the Berkeley student body by actively collaborating with other business clubs on campus to promote diversity within our organization; and

WHEREAS, SHRA, working with mainly for-profit sectors, attempts to incorporate non-profit organizations to offer students with a panoramic view of the HR function, believing that this addition will allow students with more opportunities to explore and learn more about HR by combining theoretical knowledge with practical experiences; and

WHEREAS, SHRA encourages students to use the knowledge and experience they've gained from mentors/MBAs of the for-profit sectors to assist non-profit organizations in developing better management strategies, especially in the underprivileged communities; and

WHEREAS, SHRA brings together local businesses, corporations, alumni, MBAs and other members of the Bay Area to serve the academic, social, and professional needs of UC Berkeley students as well as the surrounding community; and

WHEREAS, the projected budget for the fall SHRA 2008-2009 school year is as follows: Total (without liability) \$4,180; and

WHEREAS, SHRA currently has an operating debt of \$400 dollars due to delinquencies from several sponsors; and

WHEREAS, SHRA attempts to reinforce the unity of the club by hosting more retreats and social activities and expanding its presence through providing more high quality professional events, and referring more internships/externships opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the \$163.34 allocated to SHRA will not meet the club's anticipated operating expenses; and

WHEREAS, the ASUC has been allocating funds to SHRA, officially founded 20 years ago, based on a three-year club history because there was a discontinuity four years ago;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC Recognize SHRA as a second-year Student Activity Group (SAG).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$375.00 from the Senate contingency fund to SHRA.

The following Resolution, SB 62, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Randall Tom and was co-sponsored by Ms. Rodriguez and Ms. Flores:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ASIA PACIFIC COMMERCE ASSOCIATION

WHEREAS, the Asia Pacific Commerce Association (APCA)'s purpose is to give UCB students an opportunity to explore business opportunities in Asia; to help students understand the fundamental differences between doing business in Asia and America; and

WHEREAS, APCA will mentor students on the skills necessary to attain a career in Asia; to connect with an important aspect of international business as a whole; and

WHEREAS, APCA welcomes members of all backgrounds with a general interest in Asian business; and

WHEREAS, APCA will be actively involved in membership recruitment campaigns; and

WHEREAS, APCA plans to bring in speakers with backgrounds in doing business in both Asia and America to describe their experiences; hold résumé and career building workshops; and

WHEREAS, the startup expenses for fall 2008 are as follows: Total, \$200;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognizes Asia Pacific Commerce Association as a first-year Student Activity Group (SAG).

LET IT BE FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocate \$150 (one hundred and fifty dollars) from the ASUC Senate Contingency Fund.

The following Resolution, SB 63, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Cindy Jaramillo and Irene Padilla and was co-sponsored by Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Mairena:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF HERMANAS UNIDAS, INC. (HaU)

WHEREAS, in the Spring Semester of 1994, five inspiring young women: Zuleyka Heredia, Ricki Robles, Amelia Schustz, Erica Solorzano and Bernadette Vargas came together to establish one of the first Chicana/Latina groups at the University of California, Berkeley; and

WHEREAS, these five women recognized the limited amount of support and resources for Chicana/Latinas on the University campus and they resolved to fill the void. These visionary women established the foundation of what has evolved into a recognized organization; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF HERMANAS UNIDAS, INC. (HaU) (cont'd)

WHEREAS, Hermanas Unidas combines academics, community service and social activities. They unite and support Chicana/Latinas in their quest for higher education, while emphasizing hermanidad; and

WHEREAS, "Poder de la Mujer" is what all hermanas strive to embody, both as individual women and as an organization. The motto also symbolizes the strength and will of each and every hermana in their quest for higher education, the empowerment of their families and communities, as well as equality in education, the workplace and the rest of society; and

WHEREAS, Hermanas Unidas, Incorporated is currently recognized as a 3rd year Student Activity Group on campus; and

WHEREAS, Hermanas Unidas wishes to be recognized as a Student Initiative Service Group (SISG) because of our devoted hands-on commitment to our community and the empowerment of women; and

WHEREAS, in an academic year Hermanas Unidas will mentor and provide school activities for nearby low-funded elementary school, such as LeConte Elementary School, at no cost to the schools; and

WHEREAS, Hermanas Unidas hosts a yearly Christmas Party for foster homes to share with them the joy of the holiday spirit by providing small gifts, a Santa Claus, and many activities; and

WHEREAS, Hermanas Unidas once a semester makes lunches for day laborers, with valuable information regarding workers' rights and compensation; and

WHEREAS, Hermanas Unidas is continually looking for new opportunities to help our community and network with alumni and community organization; and

WHEREAS, according to the Hermanas Unidas motto of "Poder de la Mujer" we also empower our community by hosting various workshops dealing with a range topics from car maintenance to résumés, graduate school applications, and health awareness etc.; and

WHEREAS, Hermanas Unidas not only wishes to improve current issues in our community, but also through education of our members and community, hopes to guarantee a more prosperous future;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Hermanas Unidas, Incorporated be recognized as a third-year Student-Initiative Service Group (SISG) for its great devotion and hands-on commitment to the community.

The following Resolution, SB 71, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Iris Huang, Ms. Hussain, and Ms. Yang and was co-sponsored by Mr. Sakaue, Ms. Rodriguez, Ms. Shah, Ms. Flores, Ms. Tran, Mr. Zuo, Ms. Cho, and Ms. Chen:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF NATIONAL PACIFIC AMERICAN WOMEN'S FORUM
(NAPAWF) BERKELEY CHAPTER

WHEREAS, the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF) Berkeley Chapter's mission statement is to "build an Asian Pacific Islander (API) women's movement among those who believe in advancing social justice, addressing the concerns and increasing the rights of API women and girls"; and

WHEREAS, the California Young Women's Collaborative (CYWC) is an affiliated project that allows API female college students to lead and develop their own community-based research and organizing campaigns that result in groundbreaking data to guide larger campus and community organizing efforts; and

WHEREAS, because there is currently little research on API health issues, NAPAWF members learn about API women's health issues both locally and nationally and have the opportunity to research a women's health topic that most affects their campus community; and

WHEREAS, CYWC is currently working on two studies, the College Women's Sexual Experiences Study and the Tang Center Sexual Health Services Study, in collaboration with Amy Lam, Ph.D., of the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum, and UCB students. Both studies are led by Jere Takahashi, Director of Multicultural Student Development at UCB; and

WHEREAS, research has shown that women in college are at a higher risk of sexual assault/victimization than any other age group of women and 8% to 50% of college women have experienced some sort of unwanted sexual advance while in college; and

WHEREAS, victims of sexual assault are not likely to disclose experience and/or seek help due to the negative stigma and shame of this issue, and disclosure can lead to greater effects such stress, anxiety, and depression; and

WHEREAS, college women have reported concerns about confidentiality as a main barrier to resource utilization on campus and the belief that police would find their disclosure unimportant as another barrier to disclosure; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the College Women's Sexual Experiences Study is to examine women's experiences of unwanted sexual advances in the context of their general sexual experiences. Specifically, the study will investigate women's help-seeking patterns, barriers to help-seeking for unwanted sexual experiences and knowledge and exposure to campus support services and resources for women; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF NATIONAL PACIFIC AMERICAN WOMEN'S FORUM
(NAPAWF) BERKELEY CHAPTER (cont'd)

WHEREAS, through this research, UCB will be able to address sexual assault on campus by understanding the barriers that prevent women from seeking help for unwanted sexual experiences and developing programs that are sensitive these barriers; and

WHEREAS, understanding the utilization patterns of sexual health services among Asian-American women is important because of the prevalence of risky sexual health practices combined with the low utilization of preventative services prior to and after becoming sexually active; and

WHEREAS, low utilization of sexual health services may be related to institutional and psychosocial barriers. Specifically, provider characteristics, cost, and visibility of women's health services have been identified as important factors along with the sexual attitudes of API women and the perceived confidentiality of these services; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Tang Center Sexual Health Services Study is to examine the level of utilization of women's sexual health services and resources offered by the Tang Center among white and Asian American women at UCB. The study will also examine the institutional and psychosocial barriers preventing students from utilizing these services; and

WHEREAS, the results of this study will help inform sexual health programs at the Tang Center and address the institutional and psychosocial barriers faced by women at UCB. They may also help improve the cultural competence of programs for Asian-American women in particular. It is hoped that the study results may also be applied to other university sexual health programs around the nation and used to promote awareness about the cultural and social stigmas that are harmful towards women's health; and

WHEREAS, the estimated budget for the event is as follows: Total, \$772.23;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF) Berkeley Chapter's College Women's Sexual Experiences Study and Tang Center Sexual Health Services Study are ASUC-sponsored events.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$567 (five hundred and sixty-seven dollars) to NAPAWF Berkeley Chapter.

The following Resolution, SB 72, as amended in committee and by the author, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Samantha Sondag and Ms. Flores and was co-sponsored by Ms. Shah, Ms. Ude, Ms. Hussain, Mr. Owens, Ms. Chen, Ms. Cho, and Ms. Rodriguez:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF STOP THE TRAFFICK

WHEREAS, STOP the Traffick is an organization whose purpose is to raise awareness about international and domestic sex trafficking; and

WHEREAS, the organization serves to empower people to take action to stop pimping and modern day slavery; and

WHEREAS, it serves as an avenue to bring together survivors of sex trafficking, Berkeley students, community members, media, policy makers, high-profile individuals, and professionals working in the anti-trafficking field; and

WHEREAS, it works with other non-profit organizations and Berkeley community members in support of the anti-trafficking movement; and

WHEREAS, it does not restrict membership based upon race, color, national origin, religion, sex, physical and mental disability, medical conditions, marital status, age, sexual orientation, or citizenship; and

WHEREAS, the goals of the organization's campaigns are to raise awareness about sex trafficking in the community as well as changing human trafficking legislation in the State of California; and

WHEREAS, the organization will be a momentous step towards ending modern-day slavery caused by sex trafficking; and

WHEREAS, the organization is independent of any government, political ideology or religious creed; and

WHEREAS, it does not support or oppose any government or political system, nor does it support or oppose the views of the victims whose rights it seeks to protect; and

WHEREAS, it is concerned solely with the impartial protection of human rights; and

WHEREAS, the budget for STOP the Traffick is as follows: Total, \$307;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognizes STOP the Traffick as a second-year, ASUC-sponsored Student-Initiated Student Group (SISG).

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocates \$190.00 from the Senate Contingency Fund to STOP the Traffick.

The following Resolution, SB 73, as amended by the author and in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Ms. Flores and Mr. Zuo and was co-sponsored by Mr. Sakaue, Ms. Tran, Ms. Ude, Mr. Owens, Ms. Cho, and Ms. Chen:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ASIAN POLITICAL ASSOCIATION'S *ROCK THE VOTE CONCERT*

- WHEREAS, the Asian Political Association's (APA) mission is to encourage Asian, Pacific Islander, and South Asian Americans to participate through activism and politics in both the domestic and international arenas; and
- WHEREAS, the Asian, Pacific Islander, and South Asian American (APSA) student population at UC Berkeley is at an incredibly high proportion, the involvement of these students in political activities both during their time on campus and post-graduation should be comparable; and
- WHEREAS, the majority of APSA students at UCB remain uninvolved and disinterested in political doings, therefore APA encourages APSA interest and involvement in political activities, during their time as a student and into the rest of their lives; and
- WHEREAS, APA increases awareness of political activities both foreign and domestic of students on campus by assisting and encouraging interest in political issues for APSA students and other interested individuals through various events, speakers, publication, and a Web site; and
- WHEREAS, APA creates and continually updates a network of opportunities for APSAs to become involved in politics; and
- WHEREAS, APA creates an atmosphere in preparation for future professional experience for politically minded APSAs through formal, semi-formal, and social activities; and
- WHEREAS, in 2006, APA introduced *Rock the Vote* as an event bringing together artists from the Bay Area to encourage and mobilize Berkeley students to voice their opinions and take political stances by voting; and
- WHEREAS, APA will host the *Rock the Vote Concert* on November 3, 2008, to motivate political and civic engagement by registering at least 200 students to vote and show up at the polls during Election Day; and
- WHEREAS, the *Rock the Vote Concert* will feature at least five up and coming bands and present various community leaders and politicians to speak about the importance of the elections and the power to vote; and
- WHEREAS, APA is collaborating and coordinating with other on-campus organizations that share the same goal of promoting political participation and student power for the *Rock the Vote Concert*; and
- WHEREAS, the prospective budget for APA's *Rock the Vote Concert* is: Total, \$3,910.00; and
- WHEREAS, the Asian Political Association is a 7th-year ASUC-sponsored Student Activities Group (SAG);

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ASIAN POLITICAL ASSOCIATION'S *ROCK THE VOTE CONCERT* (cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognize the Asian Political Association's *Rock the Vote Concert* as an ASUC-sponsored event.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the ASUC Senate allocate \$500 to the Asian Political Association for the *Rock the Vote Concert* from the ASUC Contingency Fund.

The following Resolution, SB 74, as amended in committee and by the author, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Ms. Shah and Abigail Muñoz and was co-sponsored by Ms. Shah, Ms. Rodriguez, and Ms. Flores:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE SOCIALIST ORGANIZER

WHEREAS, the Socialist Organizer believes firmly, and has history demonstrated, that the emancipation of the working class from the chains of capitalism will come only at the hands of the working class itself; and

WHEREAS, the Socialist Organizer's Constitution states that the history of class struggle has demonstrated this: every gain won has been won through independent organization, through struggle rooted in an understanding of the inexorable antagonism between the rights of working people -- who constitute the world's great majority -- and the relative handful of people who own and control the wealth; and

WHEREAS, the Socialist Organizer believes, as stated in its constitution, that it is only through the abolition of capitalism, a system based on the exploitation of the many by the few, and through the construction of a socialist society that all the rights and gains won through bitter struggle by working people, women, youth and all the oppressed can be assured. We believe only under socialism can we create a world free of racism, sexism, poverty, ignorance and environmental degradation; and

WHEREAS, the Socialist Organizer's perspective is clear and simple: opposition to privatization, deregulation, war, the shifting of production, and an economic system based on profit; support for the right of oppressed peoples to self-determination, the rights of women and youth; and

WHEREAS, the Socialist Organizer looks forward to hosting Monthly Activist Movie Nights, showing films such as: *Sir, No Sir, Sicko, Land and Freedom, Made in L.A., Wetback, Crashing the Party*, and more; and

WHEREAS, the Socialist Organizer will host a speaker series: Rodrigo Ibarra, a Nicaraguan leader during the Sandinista Revolution of 1979; Alan Benjamin, a member of the Executive Board of the San Francisco Labor Council; Millie Phillips, veteran women's rights anti-war leader; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE SOCIALIST ORGANIZER (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the Socialist Organizer will work on a free progressive student informational newsletter, an eight page political newsletter for the campus; and

WHEREAS, the Socialist Organizer hopes to foster debate and discussion about socialism and other political ideologies; and

WHEREAS, the line item budget of anticipated expenses as of September 22, 2008 is: Total, \$1,270.00 USD;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$150 (one hundred fifty dollars) for the items listed above from the Senate Contingency Fund Socialist Organizer, a first-year Student Activity Group (SAG).

The following Resolution, SB 75, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Elena Vilchis and Ms. Shah and was co-sponsored by Ms. Yang and Ms. Rodriguez:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SEMANA DE LA DIGNIDAD REBELDE

WHEREAS, Semana de la Dignidad will be a series of events taking place in the week that Columbus Day is celebrated; and

WHEREAS, in celebrating Columbus Day, people forget the decimation of 96 million indigenous peoples of the Americas; and

WHEREAS, Semana de la Dignidad Rebelde seeks to create an intergenerational movement towards self-determination and liberation of indigenous and colonized peoples within and across these borders; and

WHEREAS, Semana de la Dignidad Rebelde pays respect to our ancestors and elders who have continued the fight against colonization for the past 516 years; and

WHEREAS, Semana de la Dignidad Rebelde will consist of a weeklong of events, five (5) on campus and two (2) off campus (one at the Intertribal Friendship House and the other at Rochdale Co-operative Housing), which will include events such as concerts, workshops, teach-ins, open mic night (flor y canto); and

WHEREAS, at all of the aforementioned events all of the proceeds collected will go to the Peace and Dignity Journey, which is occurring now until November; and

WHEREAS, Xinaxtli has been recognized as an ASUC-sponsored organization for the past thirty-six (36) years and continues to empower indigenous communities on campus, and is the main

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SEMANA DE LA DIGNIDAD REBELDE (cont'd)

organizing body of this week of events (in collaboration with YQUE, MALCS, Huaxtec, Raza Recruitment and Retention Center), and will also reach out, as it always has, to the off-campus community; and

WHEREAS, The line item budget of anticipated expenses as of October 1, 2008 is: Total, \$2,803.85;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$375 (three hundred and seventy-five dollars) for the items listed above from the Senate Contingency Fund to Semana de la Dignidad Rebelde.

The following Resolution, SB 79, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Ximena Egoavil and was co-sponsored by Mr. Mairena and Ms. Rodriguez:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION

WHEREAS, the Latin American Student Association (LASA) has been serving students since 2003; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of LASA is be to have a strong foundation of social support for those interested in the South American, Central American and the Caribbean cultures on the UC Berkeley campus; and

WHEREAS, we believe that as a diverse and rich community, we need to spread awareness of the Latin American identity; and

WHEREAS, our purpose is to raise the consciousness of our fellow campus community members, and to teach others of our own cultures; and

WHEREAS, LASA therefore adheres to its four main objectives:

1. Culture – To promote our culture by organizing, participating, and sponsoring events/activities that celebrate *la cultura Latino-Americana*.
2. Social – To promote a Latin American atmosphere through organizing and/or sponsoring social events in or outside of the campus community.
3. Community – To serve our own communities through social/community service.
4. *Familia* – To create a community of friendship, respect, peer support, trust and understanding between all our members; and

WHEREAS, the group hosts a series of events, including an annual culture show and also co-sponsors several community events; and

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE LATIN AMERICAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION (cont'd)

WHEREAS, LASA currently has about ten to fifteen active members; it is currently re-establishing itself after two years of absence on this campus; and

WHEREAS, the budget for LASA is as follows: Total, \$636.50;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognize the Latin American Student Association as a second-year Student-Initiated Service Group (SISG).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$300.00 (three hundred dollars) from the Senate Contingency Fund to the Latin American Student Association.

The following Resolution, SB 80, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Fabiola Tenorio and Ximena Egoavil and was co-sponsored by Mr. Mairena and Ms. Rodriguez:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE "SABOR Y SASON" CULTURE SHOW

WHEREAS, this year the Latin American Student Association (LASA) will be hosting the 5th Annual "Sabor y Sason" Culture Show; and

WHEREAS, the culture show will be hosted in Heller Lounge on October 23rd from 6-9 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, the culture show will include spoken word, traditional folkdances, music and media -- including short film clips and quick facts from the different Latino cultures; and

WHEREAS, "Sabor y Sason" strives to be inclusive of all Latin American cultures including the Caribbean; and

WHEREAS, performers for the culture show include: Mambo Productions -- Dakin Ferris, Salsa de Cuba, El Tunante Peruvian Dance Company, Marinera Norteña & Tondero (Peru), Kanchis Dance group, Huyanito (Peru), De Rompe y Raja: Afro-Peruvian dance company, Festejo (Peru); and

WHEREAS, in the past years, and more recently last semester, our culture show "De Todo Un Poco" has filled its venue by drawing over 450 people to the event; and

WHEREAS, LASA is working with other Latino organizations and hopes to also incorporate the Latino Greek community; and

WHEREAS, "Sabor y Sason" is the only Latin@ culture show that addresses the issues affecting the Latin@ community as underrepresented marginalized communities; and

Consent Calendar -- SB 80, In Support of the “Sabor y Sason” Culture Show (cont'd) - 50 -
-- SB 81, In Support of Bear Minimum
-- SB 84, In Support of Pink Ribbon Poetry: A Night of Poetry to Fight Breast Cancer

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE “SABOR Y SASON” CULTURE SHOW (cont'd)

WHEREAS, the budget for the culture show is as follows: Total, \$1,399.00;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognize “Sabor y Sason” as an ASUC-sponsored event.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate \$600 (six hundred) from the Senate Contingency Fund to the “Sabor y Sason” Culture Show.

The following Resolution, SB 81, as amended in committee, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Christian Kendell and Mr. Nahabet:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF BEAR MINIMUM

WHEREAS, Bear Minimum is an organization founded by Cal Students with the goal of having UC Berkeley students give back to the community through a volunteer service project; and

WHEREAS, Bear Minimum earns money through fundraising events which will be put towards community projects; and

WHEREAS, project ideas come from attending City Council meetings and ascertaining the needs of the Berkeley community; and

WHEREAS, Bear Minimum is open to any member of the Berkeley community, not just UC students,

WHEREAS, the projected budget for the upcoming semester is: Total, \$285;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ASUC recognizes Bear Minimum as a second-year Student-Initiated Service Group (SISG).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocates a total of \$200 from the Senate Contingency Fund to Bear Minimum.

The following Resolution, SB 84, as amended in committee and by the author, was approved under the Consent Calendar and was authored by Andrew Epstein and Ms. Raffi and was co-sponsored by Ms. Chen, Ms. Cho, Ms. Flores, Ms. Hussain, Mr. Mairena, Mr. Moghtader, Mr. Nahabet, Mr. Owens, Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Sakaue, Ms. Shah, Mr. Smelko, Ms. Tran, Mr. Tran, Ms. Ude, Ms. Yang, and Mr. Zuo:

Report from the President

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PINK RIBBON POETRY: A NIGHT OF POETRY TO FIGHT BREAST CANCER

WHEREAS, spoken word poetry is a long standing tradition on the Berkeley campus; and

WHEREAS, spoken word poetry slams allow for a creative space for self expression; and

WHEREAS, on December 4th, 2008, there will be a collaborative spoken word poetry event titled "Pink Ribbon Poetry: A Night of Poetry to Fight Breast Cancer" co-sponsored by two ASUC sponsored groups, Theater for Charity and Cal Slam; and

WHEREAS, all proceeds of the event will be donated to the Tower Research Cancer Foundation. Located in West Los Angeles, the Foundation conducts leading edge clinical trials offering new treatment options for patients suffering from cancer; and

WHEREAS, the expected turnout of the event will be 350-400 people with spoken word poetry from over 14 artists from both the local and UC Berkeley communities; and

WHEREAS, last year the first ever Pink Ribbon Poetry Night raised over \$2,300 to go to Breast Cancer research; and

WHEREAS, the estimated budget for the event is as follows: Total Budget, \$400;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that "Pink Ribbon Poetry: A Night of Poetry to Fight Breast Cancer" be recognized as an ASUC-sponsored event.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ASUC allocate 350 (three hundred and fifty) dollars to "Pink Ribbon Poetry: A Night of Poetry to Fight Breast Cancer" from the Senate Contingency Fund.

Ms. Flores moved to go to Executive Officer Reports. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Report from the President

Ms. Winston said that last week she spoke of a community forum the OP was having. It was great and was a success. They had people from the UCPD, CLL, and from the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion. About 60 students came out. They had dialogue about numerous issues, but mainly about students feeling comfortable on campus and ways they could make the campus community more welcoming for everyone. They'll have these forums once a month. The UCPD, CLL and the Vice Chancellor's office were committed to being present and making sure students were served. Students

were still following up on some of the ideas that came up. They discussed getting the Police Review Board to convene; making sure students' complaints were being heard; making sure students were more incorporated in the way that campaigns on the campus were run. For instance, in the way the Berkeley Campaign was being run, students felt they were being used as opposed to being incorporated in the process. That was something the Administration should be aware of and should be interested in talking about. They're more than just faces with stories and histories. So it was very productive.

Ms. Winston said they're starting their first Women's Caucus, on October 28. she would encourage people to come out, especially women in the room. The first one will be about the elections and talking about the national, City, and local scenes, and how they affect them as women in the campus community.

Ms. Winston said she did a second follow-up interview for the Finance Officer, with the current Finance Officer present. People should know the decision by next Wednesday. She thought they've found a great person. Mr. Chaney thought the person was a strong candidate as well.

Ms. Winston said she's been receiving applications for the Judicial Council. This was an appointment she was looking forward to making within the next week. If people have friends who were interested, they should send her a résumé.

Ms. Chen asked if she could send out an e-mail regarding the job description of the J-Council. Ms. Winston said the best person to ask for that was someone the J-Council. Ms. Winston said she could send the J-Council Chair an e-mail about that.

Ms. Winston said that evening, Rahul Patel will be up for discussion as the appointment of director of From All Perspectives. She would encourage people to look at his appointment with a critical eye and also to make sure they're appointing new people to come into the ASUC. Also, she will go to Florida from October 31 through November 5, to campaign. She wouldn't say for whom she was campaigning. She was excited. In 40 years, they'll be 61 and will look back on this election, one that will really have an impact on the fabric of US history. And they'll wonder where they were in 2008. so she would encourage them to have no regrets on November 5. Everything they do really did make a difference.

Ms. Chen asked if she could send out the résumé and application for the Director of the From All Perspectives show. Ms. Winston said she would send out his résumé. There was no application process. She looked at different organizing spaces and found a student she thought was qualified for the position.

Ms. Chen asked how many applicants applied. Ms. Winston said there wasn't an application process. She and the EVP looked at different students they felt would be well suited for the position. Ms. Chen said that if a student would have been interested in being director, unless Ms. Winston contacted them, they wouldn't have been able to apply for the position. Ms. Winston said that was one way to look at it. It was in the Constitution and By-laws that this position is appointed by the President. One thing that was surprising was for the Finance Officer position, a lot of people sent her an e-mail before she even sent out a notice about the opening. So she knew people were aware of these different appointments. If people were really interested in doing this position, she felt they would have e-mailed her about that.

Ms. Dhar asked if Ms. Winston got her e-mail about someone who was also interested in directing the From All Perspectives showcase. Ms. Winston asked when she sent the e-mail. Ms. Dhar said it was last night at 12:30 a.m. Ms. Winston said she didn't receive that e-mail. She had two midterms, two

presentations, and a paper due that week. So she hasn't been as diligent in checking. She'll probably respond to the e-mail that evening.

Ms. Dhar asked if she would be open to the idea of it being an open process, where students who were interested in the showcase would be able to participate. Ms. Winston said she would be. She wanted anyone who was interested to participate, and she knew the director would be open to having students give input. When she talked to him about brainstorming and potential visions for the show, in asking if he was qualified, Mr. Patel said he wanted to have a very inclusive process and make sure anyone who was interested in participating had a voice within that space. She could contact that person and they could forward their name to Mr. Patel, who would incorporate them into the process.

Report from the Executive Vice President

With Mr. Gaurano chairing the meeting, Ms. Pasco said that she wanted to remind everyone that there will be a Lower Sproul ecocharrette happening on November 7, from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m., with the location to be announced. If Senators were interested, or knew anyone in a student organization, or students with an interest in environmental sustainability, she would ask them to please talk to her so that she could send the student a nomination to be on this committee. They're looking for 30 students, 20 undergrads and 10 grads. They're still looking for additional students. They currently have 12, so they have a lot more people to involve in this process.

Ms. Pasco said she had a request in with the ASUC Web master and there will be a lot of updates happening in the next few days and weeks. These include bills the Senate has passed, financial allocations, office hours, etc. She would ask people to please be patient in this process. They're not only transitioning the Web master into the ASUC, but they're also catching up on the last five weeks of not having a Web master.

Ms. Pasco said final decisions for space allocations will be released on Thursday. She and Sen. Nahabet had a meeting on Tuesday and went through some offices as well as the cages, to look at the situation they had in terms of space allocation. They'll have clean-up days in the next couple of weekends. The dates were still to be determined. A lot of football games were scheduled and students may not want to come to clean out the cages and offices on those weekends. So they're still looking for a date that worked for as many people as possible. It will happen in phases since there wasn't enough space in the cages to have all groups working to clean out the cages at the same time.

Ms. Pasco said she's talked a lot about how to have more long-term storage spaces for student organizations. A lot of student groups use the cages for permanent storage and don't really go to the cages very frequently, and just use that space for storage. Some offices were also being used for storage. She didn't really feel that maximized the amount of space and resources that students have in the building. So they've looked into ways to have permanent storage so offices in the building could actually be used for offices. Student orgs will continue to apply for office space, and there were no openings to give them.

Ms. Pasco said she hoped people take seriously what Sgt. Tucker says in his reports. She knew that sometimes people didn't always pay attention because they were multi-tasking. She was saying this

because she was actually followed a week and a half ago, and it wasn't a pleasant experience. So she would ask people to please be careful, especially leaving Senate meetings.

Mr. Mairena asked if there were any appeals for space allocations submitted, and if they went to Con-Review. Ms. Pasco said there were appeals that were submitted. She and Mr. Nahabet went through them. If people wanted to wait until they go through Con-Review, that could happen. So they could table that. That would be Mr. Nahabet's decision, as Chair of Con-Review.

Ms. Chen asked about an update on lockers and business cards. Ms. Pasco said business cards were sent to the printer last week. As for lockers, Ms. Pasco said that was not her responsibility, but that of Debbie Lemus, the Secretariat. Ms. Lemus and Ms. Crowder were currently looking for the combinations for the lockers. There was a transition in the Secretariat, and that information has been temporarily misplaced.

Report from the External Affairs Vice President

With Ms. Pasco chairing the meeting, Ms. Jirachaikitti said that people looked a little bit tired. She would yield some time to Melissa, an intern, to give an update on national issues. Melissa said they had a meeting open to interns of all Executive Offices in the ASUC. They're trying to pull in more people for the voter registration campaign. Most people in External Affairs were pretty aware of how to register people to vote, but others didn't necessarily know the best strategy to do that. At the meeting, they went over strategies for voter registration, including how to approach people, be approachable, locations, etc. Hopefully all interns were now on the same page and they can get as many students to register to vote as possible.

Melissa said she just got out of the first meeting of the National Department in the External Affairs Office and they went over six issues/campaigns that they were considering working on throughout the year. The first was the DREAM Act; budget and appropriations to increase funding for Pell Grants recipients, and the economy in terms of the job market and the availability of loans for students; funding for health; and the GI bill to help veterans. Student-veterans get benefits, but they could also be called up for service during their time in school, cutting their academic career short. They discussed equal opportunity in terms of access for students. The office voted on the issues. They're actually going to work on all the issues throughout the year, but they decided to devote most of their energy for the DREAM Act; the economy; the GI bill; and equal opportunity.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said that Melissa was in the vote video, so she might be familiar to people. Ms. Jirachaikitti said that last Friday people from the EAVP and the AAVP offices, and random people on the 2nd floor who were asked to be there made a vote video. She could send out the link. It's called "Voices for the Vote," in collaboration with CalTV, who did a great job by turning it out in one day. It came out on Saturday morning and so far has over 3,300 views. It was also included in a post on the *Washington Post* Web site, in a story on the youth vote. The video was also on the USSA Web site. Ms. Jirachaikitti said that Ms. Crowder sent out e-mails to signatories and to advisors about the video and about voting. Vice Chancellor Harry LeGrande also sent out an e-mail people should have gotten, a Systemwide e-mail about where to vote, how to help people register, and how to see if students were registered or not.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said the record for Berkeley for voter registration was in 2004, with 6,634 registrations. She was happy to announce that they exceed that number that day, and they have 6,659. She wanted to thank everybody for their help. It was only Wednesday, so they had until Sunday. On Saturday they're going to Oakland for a community event and at the Berkeley Thai Temple on Sunday to register people there. They were also going to the Co-op anniversary barbecue party. They've also had a lot of help from CALPIRG, which was having its blitz.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said she had some bad news about the voter registration contest. The contest started September 2, so all of their registration before then, including during Welcome Week, Calapalooza, and Caltopia didn't count. So that brought them down 1,500 for the contest. But Santa Barbara was now only 90 above them, at 6,740. And Santa Barbara's budget was ten times bigger than Cal's and they have unlimited access to dorms. With the resources they had at Cal, they were doing an amazing job.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said Alberto Ortega, the External Affairs Vice President of the Graduate Assembly, came to the meeting on Monday and spoke to staff and interns. The office plans on working with Mr. Ortega.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said they'll be doing voter registration every day at random events. They also did a "Wall-E" with SUPERB, and she wanted to thank SUPERB. All the other UCs were jealous of the vote video and how wonderful Berkeley was doing. Monday will be crazy. They expect more than 1,000 people to register on the last day. Someone from the County Registrar will actually come to the campus and take the cards from them by hand to make sure all of the cards get in on time. In addition, they're going to Theatre Rice that weekend and to the PAHC meeting. They've also been working with Jan Crowder and the Auxiliary to do a viewing party on November 4 in the Bear's Lair. Ms. Crowder has already secured 23 large pizzas and a lot of different drinks, so people should come by. They'll watch the results on a big screen TV.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said they were putting together the Students of Color Conference, which will be the weekend before Thanksgiving, at UCLA. The Coffee Talk for that week has been postponed to next week because everyone in the office was tired. They'll have a staff celebration on Monday night to celebrate all the good vote work. But it doesn't end there, and they're going to do get out the vote and make sure people who registered actually do go out and vote.

Ms. Jirachaikitti said she wanted to thank everybody for their support and their work, and she very much respected the work that all the Senators do, being there late at night and going to dozens of other meetings. She also respected the Executives. She was sure everyone respected everyone's role, and everyone knew their job, and has been elected to do something, and to respect each other's work and choices.

Begin report from Lobby Corps Director Ballard

- 1) State Department of EAVP spoke at last meeting, discussing state ballot initiatives. National Department will speak next week in case any of the Senators are interested in learning about USSA issues.
- 2) We have a second extern, Margaret Hatch, might see her give an update or two later on.
- 3) DeCal still in process of creation, always open to suggestions.

Report from Lobby Corps Director Ballard (cont'd)

- 4) Clais, Legislative Director, from UCSA will be in Berkeley on Friday to discuss Lobby Corps logistics.
- 5) Meetings will continue to happen every Tuesday, 7-8PM, 54 Barrows. However, on the 28th meetings will be changed from 54 Barrows to the Senate Lounge.
- 6) Email with any concerns at calobbycorps@gmail.com.

Thanks.

Megs

End report from Lobby Corps Director Ballard

Report from the Academic Affairs Vice President

Mr. De la Cruz said the office had its first ice cream social on Tuesday in the Senate lounge and had a good turnout. More than two-thirds of the staff showed up. It was one way to really get to know each other as an office. They're having a study night next Tuesday. Senators were more than welcome to join them.

In terms of policy, some new committees have opened up and were requesting student participation. There are 17 spots open for student reps, including student participation on the Student Conduct Committee. They're looking for ten students to participate. If Senators knew of any individuals who wanted to sit on this Committee, he would ask them to please forward those names to him.

Another committee has been created on final exams, to look at not only policy for mandating final exams, but also where finals will take place. There was an issue last year with finals taking up the Blue and Gold Gyms, and when that happens, students can't use that space for recreation, and that really affects the mental health and physical well being during a stressful time like finals. Finals had been held in Haas, and one reason finals were moved to the Blue and Gold Gyms was because the basketball team wanted to use that space to practice. This committee will hopefully discuss on the most beneficial arrangement for all parties, including students, athletes, and students who were just trying to get a workout.

Mr. De la Cruz said that for grants, the Academic Affairs office submitted three bills asking to replenish the funds of the Educational Enhancement Fund, the Public Service Fund, and the Multicultural Fund. He would ask Senators to really consider these amounts critically and to keep in mind that grants were really consolidated, and went from eight grants to five. So there was an even higher demand for grants than what was available, and applications were rolling in.

Mr. De la Cruz said that day was the deadline for the textbook adoption campaign. There was a meeting on Monday morning with Jeff Deutsch, the Director of the ASUC Student Store, Nad Permaul, and staff from Christina Maslach's office. They discussed progress of this campaign. Unfortunately, the numbers did not look encouraging. On Monday the compliance rate was around 8%, whereas last year it was about 20%. There was a lot of discussion about what was at issue and whether it was because faculty were further behind in getting textbooks in or creating syllabi, or whether it was an issue of faculty not really seeing the necessity. Those conversations were ongoing. Mr. De la Cruz said he wanted to urge all Senators who have relations with any academic student group or professors, to please urge them to turn in their textbook requests. Even if they turn it in a couple of days after the deadline, or anytime after the deadline, it would still save students money. He would ask Senators to use the resources of the Senate to reach out to the hundreds of groups associated with the Senate as a collective body.

Mr. De la Cruz said there have been talks that year about the academic calendar. That was especially the case with the new academic calendar starting on a Wednesday instead of Monday, and having Welcome Week go from five days to two days. He's had meetings with staff and administrators to talk about possibly revamping it and moving things back to their original times.

Mr. De la Cruz said that last year, when they first talked about first changing the academic calendar, a task force was created, as was a mini working group of students to provide feedback on changes to the calendar. The task force set forth goals, or requirements for the new academic calendar. One major constraint was a Systemwide policy from UCOP that required all campuses to have a total of 146 days of instruction. One concern was to ensure that each semester had the relatively same number of days of instruction. That was because in previous years, the Fall Semester had 70 days while the Spring Semester had 76 days. So the fall had one less week and one day of instruction than the spring. Faculty were concerned that by the end of the Spring Semester, the end of week 16 and one day, everyone was exhausted. It was way too strenuous on the students and faculty who had to grade papers before Christmas. So equalizing the days of instruction was a big concern in making the new academic calendar.

Another concern that changed the academic calendar was being able to start closer to the public school system. That meant the School District would have to include Berkeley public school, but those in Oakland, Emeryville, Piedmont, Albany, and so on. Many faculty and staff live in the area and have children that go to these public schools. The change ensures that when faculty go back to work, their children aren't left at home, unattended. This was a really big concern for the faculty.

One concern the students had was for finals week to end early enough to ensure they could all get back in time to enjoy the Winter Holidays. They don't want final exams to happen after Christmas. And at the same time, they wanted to ensure that students would have at least two or three dead days. Other UC campuses don't have dead days. Mr. De la Cruz said there's been talk about why Dead Week has been reduced to dead days. But they had to keep in mind that there were a lot of constraints.

The task force, or work group, took all this information into account and worked backwards, starting from when finals had to end. There are seven days of finals; two dead days; and then an equal number of days of instruction. So that was how they came to the new academic calendar, which started on Wednesday. There was a lot of concern that students wouldn't be able to change this because it's already been set going backwards and the calendar met all of the goals that people really sought in the calendar. But he thought they could still try and arrange it to have a longer Welcome Week.

Mr. De la Cruz said the OP just requested their official start and end dates. Students' best option was to talk about extending Welcome Week, including for res halls and student services. Another option was to lobby the OP to reduce the number of mandated days of instruction. If they could reduce that from 146 to 143 or 142, that would give them a lot more flexibility for the academic calendar. It would also give other UC campuses dead days, which they don't have. If any Senators wanted to join him in these conversations, he would appreciate that.

Mr. De la Cruz said he had his second meeting with the Student Advisory Council for Undergraduate Education, with Christina Maslach. They talked about the quality of GSI instruction and discussed concerns with their educational experience. He called for any questions.

Ms. Ude asked if he talked to Mike Weinberger about where actual funding for RSF came from, student funds, for student use of the space. Mr. De la Cruz said he hasn't. The Blue and Gold Gyms were built by student referenda, so students should have priority to use those spaces. With no objection, speaking time was extended by two minutes.

Ms. Dhar asked what his response was when she asked him for password to use ASUC computers on the 2nd floor in order to print her bills for the Senate meeting. Mr. De la Cruz said it was 2 a.m. and he was asleep. He wanted to ensure the printing was equally distributed among offices, so he asked her to use the OP computer. He's been trying to arrange groups of Senators to be assigned to each office to use those printers. With no objection, speaking time was extended by two minutes.

Ms. Dhar asked if any Senators were made aware of that, and what his response was after the printer didn't work. Mr. De la Cruz said he's had conversations with Ms. Pasco that were still in the works. All Senators were able to use the printer in the AAVP's office, but because the toner ran out, he was concerned. He hasn't had a chance to order new toner. He didn't hear that the printer didn't work. His concern for the log-in was with the sensitivity for files. Speaking time was extended for three minutes by a hand-vote of 8-7-0.

Ms. Dhar asked if he could repeat for the record what he told her when the printer didn't work and she asked him for the password again. Mr. De la Cruz said he was waking up, but he thought he asked her if she could print at the OP, because he didn't have a password or wasn't running low on toner. He also asked if there was anyone else around.

Ms. Dhar asked what he told that person when she said somebody else was around. Mr. De la Cruz said he told that person the password, which was entered into the computer. Ms. Dhar asked who that was. Mr. De la Cruz said it was Stephanie Puentes, EAVP Chief-of-Staff.

Mr. Nahabet said the By-laws state that Senators and staff should have access to computers. He asked if Mr. De la Cruz felt he violated the By-laws in refusing to give access to the computer to Ms. Dhar.

On a point of personal privilege, Ms. Shah said she didn't understand why they were trying to put their Executives on trial. People could talk to the J-Council if they wanted. She didn't know how this was helping Senate efficiency.

On a point of personal privilege, Ms. Raffi said she didn't know everything that happened on Monday night and there was a question of transparency and honesty. A question of whether or not there was a

violation of the By-laws was of utmost importance to the ASUC's functioning and deserved to be considered.

Mr. Nahabet said that in refusing to give Ms. Dhar the password, Mr. De la Cruz restricted full access. And this issue was about full access.

Mr. De la Cruz said he didn't believe he was in violation of the By-laws. The By-laws state that access was for "business hours," and he would interpret that to mean when staff was available to open office doors and turn on the printers. He didn't restrict access and he allowed Ms. Dhar to print. He just wanted to ensure that the password wasn't spread around to everyone and that it would remain with staff. Neither he nor his staff has ever denied access to any resources in the Academic Affairs office. He found the tone of this conversation a bit insulting. He was trying to ensure security. The password hadn't been changed in three years, which he found problematic, so he changed it and notified his staff. A motion to extend total time and speaking time by three minutes passed with no objection.

Mr. Mairena asked if Ms. Dhar printed the bills she wanted. Mr. De la Cruz said he wasn't sure because in the morning he found half printed paper on top of the printer, so he would assume Ms. Dhar did print her bill.

Ms. Dhar asked why full access was given to an AAVP staffmember over a Senator. Mr. De la Cruz said that unless every Senator had a key to Executive offices, he wouldn't argue that was "full access."

Mr. Sinanian said he didn't think connecting "building hours" to "business hours" was sufficient to bring a charge of violating the By-laws.

On a point of personal privilege, Ms. Dhar said the point wasn't business hours, but that access was given to someone and not her. With no objection, speaking time was expressed by three minutes.

On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Mairena asked if they could move on. Ms. Dhar was given access and the Senate had other things to consider and people who were waiting.

Ms. Raffi asked if Ms. Dhar was denied primarily because she was asking for this information outside of business hours. Mr. De la Cruz said he couldn't remember the primary reason for not giving a password. It was 2 a.m. and he was still half asleep. He gave Ms. Dhar access by allowing somebody to log onto the computer.

Ms. Dhar asked if giving the password to somebody in another office qualified for the password getting out. Mr. De la Cruz said his office does events collaboration with the EAVP and he didn't consider that a breach for the EAVP COS.

Ms. Ude asked if he would be willing to submit a date when his office would establish a guest or ASUC login. By a vote of 11-7-0, extend speaking was extended by five minutes. Mr. De la Cruz said he would create a password a login for Senators to access the printers. He would also ask the Senate to please respect his decisions to ensure that supplies and resources were available for the office. If the Senate would like to allocate more money to buy paper and toner, he was open to that.

Ms. Shah asked if different people had differing levels of access to computers. Mr. De la Cruz said the ASUC Constitution and By-laws ensures full access, which he's given to every Senator. He only wanted

to ensure that files and important documents were not corrupted by a simple mistake. Non-staff haven't gone through the same training that staff have gone through to make sure files and documents were safe. He would interpret their rules as giving free access, but only AAVP staff had key access to the rooms, and that predicated access to computers.

Ms. Chen asked if any Senators know the password. Mr. De la Cruz said no Senator knew the password. Only AAVP staff knew it, besides the EAVP Chief-of-Staff, as of Tuesday at 2 a.m. Even if all Senators had the password, if the door was locked, they couldn't access the computers. Speaking time was extended for two minutes by a vote of 9-9-0.

Ms. Winston said the OP always has its door open. The password was "progress2" and people were always welcome to use it. She thought this conversation could be taken off the floor, which would be more efficient. Execs weren't trying to restrict access to these resources, and they were available. Speaking time was extended by six minutes by a vote of 9-9-1.

Ms. Dhar asked if Mr. De la Cruz recalled asking her if Stephanie Yang was there, because she knew the password.

Mr. Sinanian said the J-Council could mediate these issues. The Senate couldn't do the job of the J-Council there.

On a point of personal privilege, Ms. Yang said she didn't know why her name was brought into this conversation.

Ms. Dhar said she thought this was directly related to the functioning of the Senate. If Senators were restricted from printing their bills in ASUC space, that was limiting.

Ms. Dhar said she was sorry to bring up names, but some Senators were given the password, and she wasn't. She said her question had not yet been answered.

On a point of personal privilege, Ms. Yang said she didn't know the password to the computer in question and she's never printed from the AAVP's office, and when she asked for it, she was not given the password.

Mr. Mairena said that points of personal privilege were to make a request and not just to speak.

Mr. Smelko said they need to stop the double standards on both sides and stop using points of personal privilege, which should be used for issues involving noise, inadequate ventilation, etc. Ms. Pasco said she would be stricter with people speaking on a point of personal privilege, which has been abused for people to simply say what was on their minds. A motion to extend speaking time by five minutes passed by hand-vote 9-9-0.

Ms. Rodriguez asked if Ms. Dhar talked to Mr. De la Cruz about this before the meeting.

On a point of order, Ms. Chen said that Ms. Dhar's question has still not been answered.

Ms. Pasco asked Ms. Dhar to repeat her question. Ms. Dhar asked Mr. De la Cruz if he denied asking her on the phone that night if Sen. Stephanie Yang was around because she had the password. Mr. De la Cruz

said he didn't recall. He asked her to print out some bills that night, which she was unable to do. He didn't recall whether or not she had the password at that moment.

Mr. De la Cruz said he would no longer yield to questions. Any Senators who wanted to discuss this with him talk to him as an individual or in the office. He would go to his office and create a login for his office to print and would e-mail that.

Ms. Shah said the bills in question were printed out.

Ms. Raffi said she had a follow-up question that was overlooked. If the speaker failed to yield to questions, she asked if her question would go unanswered.

Special Committee Reports

Report from the Selection Committee for the Fundraising Director, Ms. Rodriguez said the Committee met on Monday and all members were present, except for Mr. Tran, who had some health issues. She was elected Chair. They distributed the application on Tuesday. The deadline to submit application was next Thursday, via e-mail, at 8 p.m. They'll hopefully hold interviews on Monday from 1:00 to 3:00 in one of the lounges. They'll e-mail the location out.

Reporting for the Selection Committee for the Services Board Director, Mr. Tran said the only applicant he was aware of was actually very delayed in his application process. The deadline was Monday but the Committee didn't have a candidate at that time. If anybody knew somebody interested in this position, a service-based programs liaison to SIGs, he would ask them to please let him know. It was a very valuable position.

Ms. Raffi moved to go to Elected Official Announcements. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Elected Official Announcements (cont'd)

Ms. Raffi said she respected efforts to keep meetings efficient and relevant to the ASUC's functions, but she didn't believe AAVP De la Cruz's report should have been cut short because it was bringing up very relevant questions of ASUC transparency, accountability, and honesty. Those were things to address on the Senate floor and on the record. Efficiency was a goal, but being a respectable and honest student government was something they needed to hold higher.

Mr. Zuo said he wanted to thank Pres. Winston for offering the use of her computers. He's used them a lot and hasn't had an issue with that. He agreed with Ms. Raffi and thought this entire issue with the

printer was about respect. There existed a lack of respect when AAVP De la Cruz suddenly implemented a new system without letting all Senators know. It was a matter of simple courtesy and trust. With that said, it wasn't that big of a deal. He didn't really care that much. This was the real world, and in the real world, people couldn't always earn everybody's respect. Sometimes they just had to deal with that. The Senate showed disrespect to Mr. De la Cruz by questioning him for 40 minutes and he showed disrespect by leaving in the middle. Mr. Zuo said this was the first time he's ever made an Elected Official Announcement and the first time he's ever talked about respect. He wasn't even complaining at that point, but was putting out the hypocrisy that occurred. He would like officials to stop mentioning respect when there currently existed a total lack of it.

Mr. Nahabet said that when it came to transparency and efficiency, he thought transparency was a priority. The Senate could be as inefficient as they wanted, but as long as they were transparent, that was what was most important.

Ms. Oatfield said she wanted to thank Ms. Dhar and other Senators who raised issues about access. Ms. Oatfield said she agreed it was an important issue. From what she heard, AAVP De la Cruz proposed a great solution, creating a code for Senators. She was confused as to why the Senate was still discussing this. It was immature to spend so much time bickering about this issue. That brought up another issue, that of respect. That was coming up in this debate. As important as all their rules and laws were, respect and civility were just as important. People could stand up for what they believe, but could also be tactful and respectful.

Ms. Hussain asked people to make sure they don't go back and forth, from one party to the other. This was an issue on both sides. She's talked to both sides about this. They're constantly accusing each other. She also wanted to make sure that people don't make assumptions. Respect was an integral part of how the Senate functioned, because otherwise it would be dysfunctional. Everywhere people engage in debate, she would ask them to please remain respectful. They were all human beings above being Senators.

Ms. Dhar said respect was important, as was honesty and transparency; and both those were seriously violated. The By-laws were violated when she wasn't granted full access to ASUC resources, but was granted to someone who wasn't on the AAVP's staff. It confused and worried her about the ASUC when full access was granted to another Senator and not her. AAVP De la Cruz said he couldn't remember if he mentioned another Senator, and that made her confused and worried for the ASUC. She felt really disrespected when By-laws weren't adhered to because of some unspoken reason. Although the AAVP made a new code, she was disappointed that it took this outburst for that to happen. She was happy things were getting done and that people were moving forward.

Mr. Mairena said the conversation was going in circles and Robert's Rules was being abused to keep the conversation going, with invalid points being raised. A problem was brought up with computer usage and a solution was proposed. So he didn't see the point of continuing on this when a solution was brought up. Transparency was important, but people should be congruent with what they say, and not just when it applied to them. A workshop was put on that most people didn't know about, and he would like people to be congruent about there being a denial of rights in that case. This incident with the printer happened at 2 a.m., after operating hours. The Senate shouldn't have continued with the conversation. Rights weren't denied because Ms. Dhar could print what she wanted.

Ms. Yang said she went to the AAVP's office, didn't know the password, e-mailed the bill to get printed out, but the password wasn't known, and got it printed out on the 5th floor. If the Senate talked about transparency and efficiency, there have been many instances where transparency and efficiency have been questionable. She would prefer that things be settled off the floor, and not blown up in the Senate.

Ms. Shah said she didn't have access to 2nd floor computers and went to the 5th floor to print out bills. If the Senate wanted to take up the constitutionality of an action, they should do so with the J-Council and not waste the Senate's time. If something was previously discussed, it didn't have to be brought to the floor. Mr. De la Cruz solved the problem and was in compliance with the Constitution. Senators also had three other offices to go to.

Mr. Nahabet said that if somebody made a mistake and solved it, he asked if that should be overlooked. Ms. Shah said it shouldn't be. But they shouldn't have to go to the podium every time an address has been made. They all make mistakes.

Ms. Flores said there was a difference between questioning transparency and honesty. Mr. De la Cruz didn't refuse to answer questions for the past 40 minutes. Executive offices collaborate, and chiefs-of-staff in different offices collaborate. She didn't believe the Senate had the jurisdiction to judge character or honesty. This could have been addressed off the Senate floor.

Ms. Raffi said this was a question of whether Mr. De la Cruz attempted to deny Ms. Dhar access, unconstitutionally, not whether or not she printed something out. Mr. De la Cruz said he was being careful with giving out the password, and now he's given open access. Ms. Raffi said she didn't think that was the right course of action and thought there should be a password to prevent anybody from printing anything.

Ms. Dhar said this was a system of checks and balances, so it was Senators' right to see that transparency was occurring in the Senate and in Executive offices. If she was being disrespected, or the By-laws were being disrespected, that was legitimate to bring up in Executive Office reports. It was germane to the Senate because it had to do with bills she was printing out for the meeting. When full access was granted on a preferential basis, there were serious questions on the validity of the Constitution. After Fi-Comm, she went upstairs to print her bills. Seeing that the password changed, she called Mr. De la Cruz for the password. He said he didn't feel comfortable giving her the password and asked if anybody else was around. Ms. Dhar said she said that Ms. Chen and Mr. Nahabet were downstairs, and that "Stephanie" was there. When he heard, "Stephanie," he assumed it was Ms. Yang, and said that Sen. Stephanie Yang had the password, and he asked Ms. Dhar to tell Ms. Yang to enter the password. Ms. Dhar said she then told Mr. De la Cruz it was Stephanie Puentes who was there. Mr. De la Cruz said he felt comfortable giving the password to Ms. Puentes and asked Ms. Dhar to give the phone to Ms. Puentes. She gave Ms. Puentes the phone and she was given the password. Also, Ms. Dhar said she tried to use the printer in the President's office, but it wasn't working. So she had to use the one in the AAVP's office.

Ms. Cho said the Senate should move on. This issue wouldn't be solved by talking about it during this meeting. If they thought that transparency and respect were lacking and were so important, she would suggest calling a Special Meeting. She had two midterms on Thursday and she would ask the Senate to move on.

Ms. Hussain moved to go to Appointments. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dhar and passed with no objection.

APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Pasco said the first appointment to consider was appointing the representative from the Senate to the Multi-Cultural Greek Council. She called for nominations.

Ms. Ude nominated Ms. Rodriguez. Mr. Tran nominated Ms. Chen. Ms. Dhar nominated Mr. Smelko. Ms. Shah nominated Mr. Mairena. Ms. Dhar nominated Mr. Owens, who respectfully declined.

Mr. Mairena moved to approve all nominees. The motion was seconded by Ms. Yang. The motion was seconded.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE SENATE REPRESENTATIVES TO THE MULTI-CULTURAL GREEK COUNCIL PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE: MS. RODRIGUEZ, MS. CHEN, MR. SMELKO, AND MR. MAIRENA.

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

Back in session, Ms. Hussain moved to go to Reports from ASUC Representatives. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens and passed with no objection.

Reports from ASUC Representatives

Reporting for the Academic Opportunity Fund, Ms. Flores said they'll meet on Friday.

Ms. Hussain said the Intellectual Community Fund and the Educational Enhancement Fund Committees met last week and this week. The IOF gave money to four different events, a total of about \$900. They included a presidential debate between the Cal Dems and the BCR. EEF met on Monday and they gave money to four DE-Cals. There will be bills coming up to add money to the EEF. It only had \$3,000 and last year the Senate allocated about \$10,000 from that Fund.

Ms. Shah said that she and Ms. Cho went to the Ethnic Studies Fifth Account meeting, where they allocated funds to Alpha Phi Alpha, for Dia de los Muertos, and National Council for Negro Women, Freshwoman, and the Undergraduate Student Collective. They meet every other Wednesday from 9:00 to 10:30 and will meet next Wednesday.

Appointed Official Reports

Report from the Attorney General

Mr. Sinanian read the following:

Begin written report from Attorney General Sinanian

October 15th, 2008

Attorney General's Report to the ASUC Senate Regular Meeting:

On the matters that just broke out earlier...

I don't want anybody to abuse this concept of "transparency". Just because you want to crucify somebody in the minutes doesn't mean you're being "transparent" at least not for the right reasons. By transparency we mean accountability. If you are personally seeking accountability in other members of the ASUC, take it to the J-Council. That's why we have them. Senator Dhar was talking about checks and balances. I want to remind everyone here that our system is based on the United States government, and we follow the same rules of checks and balances. That's why we have the three branches of government. This isn't my personal opinion. This is my informed, legal opinion.

I understand that some of you feel like there's an important issue here, relevant to the Senate, relevant to open access, to constitutional procedure, but to bring transparency into the issue is pure demagoguery. If you feel that AAVP De La Cruz has violated the Constitution, say it once on the Senate floor, say that you'll file suit, and let the J-Council handle it. If you really feel that you have a case, then you'll trust the J-Council to do the job. The ruling of that case will do justice to any party and that's what transparency is all about. The ruling will be public, I assure all of you. So, we must be transparent, but we must be transparent within the framework established by the Constitution and the By-Laws.

Lastly, AAVP De La Cruz mentioned some sort of dilly-dally type access. The Constitution specifies only full access. I don't know about any other half-baked attempts. So he may have to clarify that to fall in line with what procedure states. If he's going to gonna provide access, it's gotta be full-blown (full-blown in the sense that it allows full access to printing and duplication, not to files, etc...)

Going over the Agenda Packet, everything looks O.K. for today's bills. It doesn't seem like any constitutional or procedural issues will arise from what's on the agenda. I'm glad to see my Umbrella bill is going through next week. Thanks to Sen. Tran for the work he did on that.

I am glad we finally have a new Web master now, but it's been over a week and he has not brought the site to at least the minimum level of disclosure we need. I am happy to hear Ms. Pasco's report, particularly where she said the Web master just needed some time to adjust and everything will be up by next week. I hope the Web master will meet that timeframe, or else I'll take action, which I may do pursuant to the section on main motions we have in the By-laws.

I want to address the issues I raised last time about what constitutes majorities, etc...

[From last meeting's report: There is also an ambiguity with what constitutes a majority of the Senate when it comes to constituting a 'quorum.' The Constitution is not clear about this. (Article III, Section 5). I think the language is clear enough here. It means "majority of those present."

Written report from Attorney General Sinanian (cont'd)

[I will also seek to clarify the definition of 'simple majority' in the Constitution and to clarify how this applies to two-thirds rules. Specifically, I am curious as to how the 'simple majority' rule is affected by abstainers?]

On this matter, the Solicitor General and I both believe that the abstain choice of vote is there for a reason. It means that one doesn't feel too compelled by any argument, whether it be pro or con. If many people abstain, let's say the majority, then that just means nobody's made a good enough argument. If this allows a small number of people to get something passed, then so be it. Those abstaining know the repercussions, and we have 'pass' votes as well, so we want to leave this gray area in place. Now, if any of you feel like this still doesn't address the issue properly, please voice your concerns and let's work something out. If a good argument to clarify the language is made, I'll proceed. I want to also caution that I will not take any action that is seemingly politically "one-sided." If I feel that an issue has been raised by a Senator of one party and its repercussions might affect the delicate balance we have in the Senate, then I will ask members of the other party for their input too and work with both. I will not allow my role in this body to be abused. That is a point I am very keen on.

On another point, Senator Zuo forwarded me the application for Attorney General of one Mr. Azadivar, infamously known by his alias "Beetle," who was freelance blogging for his blog titled the "Beetle Beat" about everything that occurred here in these Senate Chambers for several years. (<http://www.beetlebeat.blogspot.com/>) He has apparently ceased doing so just this year and has sent his whole list of "complaints" and "things to fix" (along with some possible solutions) through the Application for the Attorney General. The damn thing was a complete parody, but he had some good points. So now that I have it (thanks Senator Zuo!) I will be examining it to see what's worth taking up as issues and what's not. So I'll keep you all posted of course.

Also, ninth week is approaching and I'll need to go through all the bills that have made amendments to our By-laws and integrate the changes and sign and date the master copies with the head secretariat. I will pursue that duty with due diligence and come the tenth week; you will all be working within the framework of our up-to-date By-laws.

Lastly, I know I mentioned this last time, the issue of being on the mailing list and receiving a healthy flow of information about all ASUC matters. I got on the main mailing list with the Secretariat, but for example, just now, Ms. Pasco e-mailed Dr. Permaul's report to everyone, but I'm not on that list, whatever list that is. I would like to be placed on any of those other lists too. It's just because, I'm really psyched about student government. I love to know what's going on and being involved here, really, it's great. I mean, I don't even have to stay here for the duration of the meetings but I love it and I do my best to drop in on as many meetings as I can. So if I could get more information, that would be great. If Ms. Pasco could put me on that same list she used to send the SOB report just now, that would be great. Thank you all.

End written report from Attorney General Sinanian

Ms. Winston said she was extremely impressed with Mr. Sinanian as AG, and wanted to thank him for working in the ASUC.

Mr. Mairena moved to go back to Appointments. The motion was seconded by Ms. Shah and failed by hand-vote 0-6-5.

Ms. Hussain moved to table SB 70, In Support of Maintaining Student Safety and Student Experience at California Memorial Stadium. The motion was seconded by Ms. Yang. Ms. Hussain rescinded the motion.

Ms. Raffi moved to recess for one minute. The motion was seconded by Mr. Owens and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

BACK IN SESSION, THE MOTION TO TABLE SB 70 PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, IN SUPPORT OF MAINTAINING STUDENT SAFETY AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE AT CALIFORNIA MEMORIAL STADIUM.

Ms. Shah moved to go to Appointments. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

APPOINTMENTS

Ms. Hussain moved to go to the Chief-of-Staff for the Student Advocate Office. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection.

Ms. Pasco said the appointment was of Hassan Khan, Chief-of-Staff in the Student Advocate Office, with a stipend of \$1,000. A motion to call the question was made and seconded by Ms. Hussain and Mr. Mairena and passed with no objection.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE HASSAN KHAN AS CHIEF-OF-STAFF IN THE STUDENT ADVOCATE OFFICE, WITH A STIPEND OF \$1,000, PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 19-0-0.

With no objection, Ms. Pasco said the next appointment to consider was Nikhil Matani, Academic Director, Student Advocate Office, with a stipend of \$350. With no objection the question was called.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE NIKHIL MATANI AS ACADEMIC DIRECTOR, STUDENT ADVOCATE OFFICE, WITH A STIPEND OF \$350, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Pasco said the next appointment was Leah Rabkin, Grievance Director, Student Advocate Office, with a stipend of \$250.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE LEAH RABKIN, GRIEVANCE DIRECTOR, STUDENT ADVOCATE OFFICE, WITH A STIPEND OF \$250, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Ms. Pasco said the next appointment to consider was Rahul Patel, as Director of the From All Perspectives show. Mr. Patel introduced himself and said he was sophomore. He intended to major in Public Health and Ethnic Studies. He was appointed by Ms. Winston to be the director the showcase, From All Perspectives. His vision was to foster and empower a community among Cal students and Cal student groups. He felt process was very important, as important as the event itself. He hoped to contact student groups, form a committee, and create a democratic vision. He wanted to keep the vision malleable, for many groups and voices on campus to partake in the envisioning process and create something they had ownership in; and in that process, to create a community. Mr. Patel said he saw From All Perspectives as a tool for outreach in the surrounding community. He called for any questions.

Ms. Chen asked if he had an application or résumé he could pass around or e-mail. Mr. Patel said Sen. Shah was sending his résumé out.

Ms. Ude asked about his experience in multicomunal spaces on campus. Mr. Patel said he's been active in organizing for Students for Hip-Hop, which puts on free events open to the public and as inclusive of as many voices as possible. These events create spaces for progressive dialogue among attendees and people involved in the planning process. He's also been involved in organizations and attending events to understand perspectives of these different student groups.

Ms. Chen asked if he could pick a complex event he's planned and elaborate on the step-by-step planning from beginning to end, in any previous planning experience. Mr. Patel said Students for Hip-Hop puts on an annual spring showcase in People's Park, Hip-Hop in the Park. With no objection, speaking time was extended by three minutes. The emphasis of the show was to create a family-friendly and communal environment for people and local artists. A lot of planning went into the event, from creating a budget to getting funding from the ASUC, from grants, and from fundraising. They also have to publicize on campus and in the Bay Area. Artists have to be contacted and they have to arrange to schedule People's Park, to keep the event free to the public. They have to reach out to the Cal community and have them table. With no objection, speaking time was extended by five minutes.

Ms. Yang asked about positions he's held. Mr. Patel said that in high school he helped to mentor and staff at a leadership camp held by the American Red Cross. They went through about 130 hours of intense training on communicating personal awareness, facilitating discussion, and helping people communicate. Those experiences carried over to Fresh Education, an after-school mentoring program that focusing on allowing 3rd through 5th graders to find a mode of creative expansion and finding value in critical thinking, using hip-hop as a tool to allow kids to explore facets of education they couldn't access in regular schooling. Mr. Patel said both experiences helped him establish a base for helping people to communicate, which would help with the showcase; and communication was key to building community.

Ms. Shah asked how long Hip-Hop In the Park has happened and how many people attend. Mr. Patel said this was its 15th year. It create a space everyone can joy, and every year, 800 to 1,000 people from the campus and the community come out, from parents to children to college students. They pride themselves on creating a family-friendly environment. With no objection, speaking time was extended by three minutes.

Ms. Rodriguez asked how he would ensure that From All Perspectives didn't exclude certain groups on campus, which happened when other groups that had big programming on campus were excluded. Mr. Patel said it came down to communication with different communities in finding a way to put on the

event that didn't step on anybody's toes. That included date, venue, and costs. With no objection, speaking time was extended by five minutes.

Ms. Dhar asked if he had a timeline and budget for the show. Mr. Patel said that for the sake of efficiency, he would answer this question, but wouldn't yield to other questions, and would answer them off the floor. The logistics and timeframe will be decided by a committee. He would like to be part of that committee rather than "director." They could plan something with as many people's perspectives as possible, and that would make the showcase successful.

Ms. Dhar asked how the committee would be inclusive. Mr. Patel said it would have a variety of voices. He, Ms. Winston, and Ms. Pasco would pick committee members. Members would be open to suggestion from surrounding members of the community and ASUC officials. He would leave the selection process to the community.

Ms. Dhar asked how the committee would pick groups to perform. Mr. Patel said it would be based on a process the committee would think of.

Mr. Sakaue moved to recess for two minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Shah and failed by hand-vote 8-8-4. With no objection speaking time was extended by three minutes.

Ms. Dhar asked how he would find and maintain community for the show. She asked what his definition was of "community" and how they could make a community through a show. Mr. Patel said perspective was powerful, and needed a safe space to express one's experiences, feelings, or opinions. The show had the potential of taking the perspective of many students and groups in the outlying community to express their perspectives. In doing so, they'd have discussion that led to a community. The process of creating an event was just as important as the event itself. Meetings will be enriched, give people food for thought and a space for experiences and perspectives to share with other groups.

Ms. Shah moved to recess for seven minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, Ms. Chen moved to extend the recess by three minutes. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Ms. Pasco said that for a time check, it was 12:42 a.m. Back in session, with no objection, speaking time was extended by three minutes.

Ms. Dhar asked how his vision will be valuable to different perspectives. Mr. Patel said the format for how From All Perspectives would be planned and run would be through a broad coalition of many different voices, including student groups, committee members, a lot of people who will be involved in the visioning process. They'll have a loose outline of what they want for the showcase. Ideally, the vision will be formed during planning meetings, and especially during enriched meetings, that will allow for a lot of different voices. It's like whitewater rafting, and avoiding boulders, and swerving the vision that will bring in different perspectives.

Ms. Dhar asked if he would avoid boulders, and if that meant voices that were "boulders" would be avoided. Mr. Patel said that was just a rough analogy. Voices don't represent boulders, but hindrances to hearing voices. If people were in a raft and see a boulder, they'll all start shouting to each other and throw out ideas to avoid the hindrance, the boulder, and steer to safety. And "safety" would be a showcase that allowed the creation of a vision and avoiding things that would hinder the vision. There's potential for the

showcase to be very different from last year's, and also very similar, based on the things that happened last year. It all depended on the perspective that was present and how people collaborate.

Ms. Chen asked if he could elaborate on one aspect of the show that he's put thought into, something tangible, and how he would execute that aspect of the show, for which he'd be the director. Mr. Patel said he didn't feel the term quote "director" was something he'd hold. He would be appointed as "director," as the By-laws state, but he felt he would be more of a facilitator, and many times, just a committee member, an equal voice with all committee members. He would also like groups to present themselves outside performances. Art was powerful but had its limits. He thought it would be good to have a fair-type set up, and have a community dinner afterwards. The budget for Hip-Hop In the Park was \$7,500 last year. They asked for \$900 from the Senate. Everything else from grants, donations, and sales. One thing he was considering was to move From All Perspectives to Wheeler or Pauley, which would allow for performers of groups to table and have groups show what else the groups did besides performing.

Ms. Hussain moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded by Ms. Tran. Ms. Dhar moved to recess for two minutes. Ms. Hussain rescinded her motion. The motion to recess was seconded by Mr. Tran and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed. Back in session, Ms. Chen moved to extend the recess by one minute. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Mairena moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded by Ms. Yang and failed by hand-vote 9-9-2.

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, Ms. Chen moved to go into debate. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. Ms. Pasco said the Chair would limit comments to a minute and a half, in order to facilitate debate and get out of there earlier.

Ms. Yang said she didn't know why there was such a big push to have a co-director of From All Perspectives. There was no co-director last year. She thought Mr. Patel was qualified and didn't think he needed a co-director.

Ms. Raffi said that no one was saying Mr. Patel was not qualified. But there was more than one vision for how this show and its relationship to the community could be handled. The Senate's duty was to appoint somebody. Mr. Patel was suggested by Ms. Winston, but there were other options. If a member of the Senate had expressed interest in another option, that would be brought up next week, and it made sense to consider both types of organizing the director position. It was to make sure everybody was heard, and that's why this should be brought up next week to consider all options.

Mr. Mairena said it was problematic that people have a pre-set decision when they have someone who was qualified. People were asking questions, but it was still ingrained that they were not going to approve the nominee. That was pushing an agenda. He didn't see the need for a co-director when Mr. Patel's vision would make everybody a "co-director." People who want to be co-directors could serve on the committee and have as much say as Mr. Patel had. The Constitution and By-laws call for a director being appointed to From All Perspectives. Mr. Patel should have a chance to be approved on his own without the need for a co-director.

Ms. Pasco said the Chair would entertain a motion to recess until the discretion of the Chair. It was so moved and seconded by Mr. Nahabet and Ms. Shah and passed with no objection. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Ms. Shah moved to table the appointment of Mr. Patel as From All Perspectives Director. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nahabet. THE MOTION TO TABLE THE APPOINTMENT OF MR. PATEL AS DIRECTOR OF FROM ALL PERSPECTIVES PASSED BY HAND-VOTE 15-2-3.

Ms. Shah moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Yang 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	Lyel Sakaue	Yishi Zuo
John Moghtader	Kifah Shah	

This meeting adjourned at 1:33 a.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary