



ASUC Student Union Board of Directors Agenda & Minutes

Friday, January 15, 2021

9 AM | Virtual Meeting via Zoom |

<https://berkeley.zoom.us/j/96835755368?pwd=N1RrZC9ud2V3UmpqTXB5MGRHUDdTz09>

Title	Name	Present
ASUC Student Union Board Members		
Title	Name	
Chair	Brian Zhou	Yes
Vice Chair	Michelle De Guzman	Yes
ASUC President	Victoria Vera	Yes
ASUC Executive Vice President	Melvin Tangonan	Yes
GA President	Luis Tenorio	Yes
GA Internal Vice President	Liz Lawler	Yes
Undergraduate Representative	Kevin Yi	Yes
Graduate Representative	Martin Siron	Yes
University Representative	Emily Liu	Yes
University Representative	Fabrizio Mejia	Yes
Faculty Representative	Greg Aponte	Yes
Faculty Representative	Jennifer Miller	Yes
ASUC Student Union Executive Director		
ASUC Student Union Executive Director	Bahar Navab	Yes



Community Agreements

- Everyone participates, no one dominates - share airtime
- Honor time limits; staying on schedule is everyone's responsibility
- Speak your truth without blame or judgment
- Articulate hidden assumptions; challenge cherished beliefs
- Listen for understanding - inquire (ask) before you advocate (persuade)
- Remain open to outcome and innovation
- Critique ideas, not people or actions
- Recognize participants' contributions
- Be fully present at meetings and prepared
- Have fun!

Call to order at 9:05 am

- | | | |
|------|---|---------|
| I. | Approval of the Agenda and Minutes | 1 min |
| | A. Kevin moves to approve agenda; Martin seconds | |
| II. | Public comment | 5 mins |
| | A. Carolina Flores: Here to vocalize Latinx Caucus' support of the LRC proposal on the 4th floor of MLK | |
| | B. Ana Medel: 1st Gen student who struggled and couldn't find a place where they belonged. Tries to be a resource for current first years, but believes there needs to be institutional support | |
| III. | Chair updates | 3 mins |
| | A. Conversation about broker models. No other major updates. Have not received updated versions of proposals that are up for consideration. | |
| | B. ASUC and GA waived the \$250k that is typically collected from the ASUC Student Union | |
| IV. | Executive director updates | 15 mins |



A. [Director Updates](#) - New format (see attached)

1. This is a place for Directors to add updates and share highlights, concerns, etc. Will be shared out to the Board in advance in case there's anything the Board wants to discuss in the meeting.

B. Event space models

1. One of the options for the 4th floor of MLK is to convert it back to event space. There are two different models for what it would look like to make the 4th floor event space again that have been shared with the Board. We will also be presenting a new events pricing model in the upcoming months. Both models presented show what reservations would look like if we gave student organizations the space for free but limited the amount of time groups could have the space, or if we charged for staffing costs and didn't limit the amount of RSO bookings. Estimating a minimum of \$60k revenue to continue to fund Events Team and free resources for students. Bahar recommends converting the 4th floor to event space. It serves over 1400+ RSOs, allows for more flexibility in a few years if the Board wants to change what the space is used for, and also helps us generate revenue in the meantime.
 - a) Fabrizio: When it was previously event space- did it generate positive revenue flow?



- b) Kirsten: To her knowledge, the Student Union was not tracking that data by individual spaces when the 4th floor was an event space, so it's hard to track that data.
- c) Kevin: With either option A or B how will we prioritize the annual reservations for students/outside reservation if we'd also like the 4th floor as an available option for those reserving pauley as potential breakout space
- d) Tiffany: We currently do this in our model, and try to collaborate with the LEAD Center and have policies to make our event spaces more equitable. Examples include working with groups to book spaces in advance, and also our 5-2-1 policy that helps more groups get space.
- e) Bahar: Also taking into consideration our current financial situation, this model also allows for us to better fund our Events Team, and they primarily serve student groups.

C. Security Model Shift

1. We are re-examining our safety and security models. We are a very public building and attract all sorts of visitors. Our immediate response had been to increase our CSO and SPO presence. That model has its own drawbacks and concerns and so we are exploring with UHS a partnership to have social workers rather than relying on UCPD. We're still in the planning stage, with



hopes to implement in upcoming year(s).

D. Broker Engagement

1. Find vendors for our spaces in Eshleman and MLK. Have a couple brokers we are exploring. We do still have a vendor interested in Eshleman.

V. Budget updates 5 mins

- A. Kirsten: We have been working on a timeline where we thought the budget would be due by the end of January. However, we know that timeline is going to be pushed back fairly significantly, probably to sometime in March. We will be revising our timeline accordingly for FY22, and that will be shared with the Board once we have the confirmed dates. The Board, Finance Committee, and the LSP Committee all need to approve before it can be submitted.

VI. Reports and recommendations from committees 5 mins

A. [Organization & Governance](#)

1. No current updates; did not meet since end of last semester

B. [Business & Finance](#)

1. Did not have a formal meeting, but have not received any updated versions of the PMC or LRC proposals, so any vote that takes place will be based on the proposals linked in the agenda

C. [Operations & Facilities](#)

1. Did not meet in January; no update.



VII. [PMC proposal](#)

10 mins

- A. Bahar: This was tabled from the previous two meetings.
- B. Katelyn: We are proposing that the Publications and Media Center's student employees (who manage rental equipment and other projects) report to the Creative Programs Department within the Student Union, rather than continuing to report to the LEAD Center. This was delayed so we could get feedback from the PMC, but as far as I know, we haven't heard back. A decision needs to be made soon though in order to account for budgets.
- C. Megan: Some folx within the ASUC reached out and I believe they did not hear back either. This doesn't change the function or structure of the chartered program, just the student employees and who they report to.
- D. Melvin: A couple questions about how the Student Union would pay the student staff, and how student governance will remain with the student publications.
- E. Katelyn: Paying the student staff would come out of our operating budget, but we don't plan to change the structure of the Publications and Media Board; it just changes who the Publications and Media Center report to.
- F. Bahar: Important to note this doesn't change anything about the chartered program, just the reporting lines for the student staff.
- G. Liz: Does this help the LEAD Center as far as costs and staffing time?
- H. Kirsten: The PMC has \$15k funding allocation from CACSSF to pay for



student staff positions, but it would certainly help the budget and staffing time for the LEAD Center.

- I. Bahar: Daniel Choi (LEAD Center Director) and Marissa Reynoso (current PMC supervisor) both support this transition
- J. Fabrizio motions to approve this proposal; Kevin 2nds
- K. 7 yes votes; 4 abstain
- L. Fabrizio motions to go back to budget updates; Brian seconds
- M. Fabrizio motions to add 5 more minutes to public comment; Luis opposes; 6 yes votes
 - 1. Brian acknowledges Fabrizio to speak before public comment
 - 2. Fabrizio: Wants to recognize the situation we have been put in of either supporting revenue generation or the LRC proposal, and a lot of people support LRC and this is a really difficult and unfortunate situation

VIII. Public comment

5 min

- A. Ana Medel: Wanted to take time to speak on behalf of her RSO who has frequently struggled to find space. Turning the 4th floor of MLK into an event space would still make it difficult for her group to find space.
- B. Nick Araujo: This has been on the agenda for several weeks, and we don't want to frame this as a burden on the SU. This is something we have worked on for several years and worked with multiple partners and found that this was the ideal space for the LRC proposal. The space



would allow us to serve Latinx students immediately, and also gives us time to find a more permanent solution. I'm concerned that this fall as we're coming back to campus, we will have the largest Latinx population on a campus that does not have space for them. We are ready to pay for the maintenance costs and work to have a shared relationship with the Student Union on this project. We have worked on everything the SU has asked us to provide, and we are hoping to be able to move forward with this proposal. If there is still debate and discussion that needs to happen, I ask we delay the vote again for another month in order to have those discussions.

IX. Budget updated continued

5 min

- A. Bahar: The binding agreements talk about how campus departments who are housed within the ASUC Student Union pay for their space. The MOUs say that departments should be paying for their own facilities and maintenance costs, and we have currently been covering those costs. We are looking at how to get funding for those costs, rather than the Student Union continuing to pay those costs.
- B. Kirsten: The term of revenue generation in regards to the 4th floor. The use of the 4th floor as event space will generate revenue compared to the LRC proposal, it doesn't create additional revenue that could be used at our discretion, but rather that money would be used to cover the costs of the Events Team since we currently do not have the money fully fund the



team and event spaces for students.

- X. Direction on 4th floor MLK (vote required): 10 mins
- A. Greg: Wants to reiterate Fab's point but also wants to say it is an unusual position to be placed in. Agree in principle with having this organization represented. The problem is that this cannot be a compartmentalized position; we have to look at it within the context of campus. Campus has avoided making a decision by placing this on students to lobby and on us to make the decision for campus. This puts us in a difficult place because there are other obligations that we need to meet. Is there a way to make this decision in a way that is connected with campus, and not an isolated decision.
 - B. Bahar: I appreciate that comment, and there's also an opportunity here with the pandemic and seeing how people are able to work from remote locations, and how can we think creatively about space?
 - C. Luis: How much of a deficit are we in now based on not charging student for events?
 - D. Bahar: The events team is not funded generally speaking - we have patched it together in part by asking Lower Sproul to temporarily cover the cost and partially by covering it through other revenue sources. We have covered \$400-\$600k in events costs from other sources for the last 3-4 years
 - E. Michelle: I primarily deal with real estate, not space allocation, but I will



say that I support having more space for affinity groups on campus. I also think once we are able to come back to campus, people will want those in person interactions and I feel like it is less likely that people will want to keep working remotely. We're also looking at which spaces on campus are seismically safe which means more spaces will be brought offline. I don't think there will be relief on the space crunch in the near future.

- F. Luis: I think the value of having separate conversations with administrators is really important. When I try to talk about community space, I get pointed to different people who oversee different aspects of space allocation and providing services. It makes sense to have a meeting with every stakeholder to be in a single space to talk about the processes. I think having that meeting would be in everyone's interest
- G. Brian moves to extend time for discussion by 10 minutes; Martin seconds
- H. Greg: Is there a time when campus brings everyone together into one room to talk about how to best utilize space?
- I. Michelle: It's very diffuse. There are groups that look at spaces on campus, a capital project committee, and SACI. Decision making is spread out.
- J. Greg: Should this be taken to CAPRA to talk about space allocation and long term planning for space utilization?
- K. Bahar: I think it's also important to note that we can support or encourage admin to be responsible for finding LRC space and emphasize the values



we believe in and we should, but it's also not the SU's responsibility to play the role of space accountability for University admin - we should be advocates

- L. Liz: If the Board says no to having the LRC proposal be approved, can the ASUC go to campus and override the decision?
- M. David Robison: No, the ASUC and GA have agreements with campus about how space is used and allocated, and one thing that could come up would be changing that allocation by changing the 4th floor into a student programming space rather than a commercial revenue space. It would be more complicated than simply overriding a decision, but they would have to consider how that decision would impact the financial status of the Student Union.
- N. Luis moves for the plan for the 4th floor of MLK to be used as an event space as recommended by the Executive Director; Victoria seconds
- O. Liz moves to table this vote until February in order to give the Board more time to review the Event Services model; Melvin seconds; Greg objects
- P. Greg: If we postpone this, there need to be concrete things we need to decide upon so that it doesn't just keep getting pushed back. We need to be able to support the unit as well as students.
- Q. Victoria: For me, I don't think we should postpone the vote based on conversations I've had with administrators. There isn't an institutional framework to have these conversations. I also want to remind folks that



this is bringing up a lot of larger conversations at the university but also want to bring people back to our duties as Board members. It has been hard for me to balance this as a member of the ASUC, a student, and a Latinx student too.

R. Brian: It feels like the Board has been put into the position of being the “bad guy” here, but it’s really a failure on the institution’s part to make these decisions themselves.

S. Liz retracts her motion.

T. Luis moves for the plan for the 4th floor of MLK to be used as an event space as recommended by the Executive Director; Emily seconds; Fabrizio objects

U. Michelle: I think it’s unlikely that the commitments we would like from the university will not be done by the next Board meeting

V. Emily: It seems like every Board member supports this proposal, but we are struggling with the actual allocation of space.

W. Vote: 7 yes votes; 5 no votes; motion passes

XI. Closed session 15 mins

A. Fabrizio moves to support Pepsi contract extension; Kevin seconds; motion carries

B. Martin moves for the Board to sign the statement in regards to Pepsi contract extension; Fabrizio seconds; motion carries

Useful links for today:



ASUC
Student**Union**

102 Sproul Hall MC #2430
Berkeley, CA 94720-2430
510-642-4641

University of California, Berkeley
asuc.berkeley.edu

[Minutes from SU Board vision meeting](#)
[PMC Letter of Intent](#)
[LRC Proposal](#)