

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Monday August 5, 2002
417 Kerckhoff Hall
4:00pm

MINUTES

- PRESENT: Clark, Dahle, DerManuelian, Diaz, Harmetz, LaFlamme, Lam, Leyco, Neal, Nelson, McLaren, Timmerman, Wilson, Yu
- ABSENT: Cordero, Eastman, McElwain, Styczynski
- GUESTS: David Chung, David Do, Jawelle Francisco, Ani Gasparyan, Charles Gross, Justin Levi, , Anica McKesey, Mohammad Mertaban, Amanda Patrick, Mahmud Penjwini, Vanessa Portillo, Kelly Rayburn, Robert Salonga, Sarah Schuter-Brown, Debra Simmons, Tiwache Watson,
- I. A. Call to Order
-Dahle called the meeting to Order at 4:15pm.
- B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet
-DerManuelian passed the attendance sheet around
- II. Approval of the Agenda
- Prior to Approval of the Agenda, Timmerman introduced Dr. Rick Tuttle and said that Dr. Tuttle would be serving as the Administrative Alternate for the coming year and that Dr. Nelson would be taking Timmerman's seat at the Council table as the Administrative Representative.
- Dahle asked if there were any changes or edits to the Agenda.
- Harmetz moved and Diaz seconded to approve the Agenda. Council voted to approve the motion with 9 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions and the Agenda was approved.
- III. Approval of the Minutes
***July 1, 2002**
***July 8, 2002**
-Dahle asked if there were any changes or edits to the minutes for July 1, 2002.
-Lam said that she was present at the July 1st meeting, and asked if her name could be placed as present.
-Clark said that she was also present at the July 1st meeting.
-Yu said that on page 3, under Student Welfare Commissioner, Yu should be changed to Leyco
-Dahle asked if there were any changes to the Minutes from July 8, 2002.
-Yu said that on page 2, under Officer and Member Reports, Student Welfare Commissioner should be changed to Community Service Commissioner. And that on page 4, under New Business-Welcome week activities, USAC's advisor should be changed to CSC's advisor.
-Diaz moved and Lam seconded to approve the Minutes of July 1, 2002 and the Minutes of July 8, 2002 as amended. Council voted to approve the motion with 9 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions and the Minutes from July 1, 2002 and the Minutes from July 8, 2002 were approved as amended.

IV. Special Presentations

-There were no special presentations this week.

V. Appointments

-There were no appointments this week.

VI. Fund Allocations

***Contingency**

-DerManuelian presented to Council the 18 contingency allocations he had made under his discretionary power. He also mentioned the mistake that was on the second page, there was a duplicate entry for the Student Welfare Commission.

-Back up documentation on all the contingency allocations is included in the documents for this meeting.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

A. **President**

-There were no reports from this officer this week.

B. **Internal Vice President**

-There were no reports from this officer this week.

C. **External Vice President**

-Neal said that he had returned from the USSA conference and he listed the four items that will be on USSA's action agenda this year:

- 1) Higher Education Act: directs how it functions and on allocations, includes programs in the Higher Education Act. He said it was important to work on this.
- 2) Voter Registration: elections are coming up and it is important to get students registered because their vote can sway an election.
- 3) Support HIV/AIDS conference
- 4) International Labor Day of Action: something that is put on every year, this year's focus is labor. He also mentioned how Latin American Students were sponsoring a drive.

He closed by saying that 12 people attended, and that it helped in leadership development. Five people became board members, and he became an executive member, being that he has sat on the board for 2 years. He mentioned several names of the people who went and what they will be working on.

-McLaren asked Neal to submit a copy of his comprehensive report for the record.

-Timmerman reminded the Council to be conscientious about use of mandatory fees and resources. He said that the International Day of Labor might not be University related, and if it isn't, they could not spend mandatory fees on this event.

-Neal said it was sponsored by students, and there was a labor coalition on campus, so he was sure it would qualify as University related.

-Timmerman reiterated that he should review the status of the event, to determine whether USAC mandatory fees could be used.

D. **Administrative Representatives**

-There were no reports for these offices.

VIII. Old Business

***Approval of Amendment to USA Bylaw Article VI.C.4.b.(6)(b)**

-Dahle asked if there were any questions concerning the Approval of the Bylaws

-Diaz said that he had began asking questions through the e-mail regarding his concerns with amending the bylaws. He added that he didn't think it was a good time to

- amend Bylaws since many of the student leaders were not around to give their input. He stated that there was no need to amend the bylaws because a clause had already been provided in the event that the Budget came into conflict with the total funds available. He also mentioned that it sets bad precedent.
- LaFlamme repeated that the current bylaws presented a loop hole for the groups to go through. He also stated that the majority of the student groups who were concerned with the bylaws that concern base budget funding would be on campus now because of the base budget allocations. He mentioned that this was something that he definitely saw the need to be changed. BRC and USAC as a whole could have problems as a result of this loophole.
 - Neal said that he did not see why it was necessary, and said it sets bad precedent. He added that if indeed a bylaw change was necessary, it should be done far in advance of the time that it would be implemented, and should be a well thought out process - not something that is thought of in the middle of the process or as they go along.
 - Timmerman said that changing bylaws during summer sessions was not problematic, Council has done it in the past. He mentioned that it was a slippery slope and problematic to empower subservient, or lesser bodies, such as the BRC to override part of the bylaws with BRC's guiding documents. He cautioned Council on the possibility of potentially being in a situation where the guiding documents are competing with each other.
 - Lam asked if groups knew when they applied that they would not always be allocated all that they are requesting.
 - LaFlamme said that according to the bylaws, the groups could conceivably request one dollar under the cap for a specific line item, and get more than the maximum allowed for each group.
 - Diaz said that when the caps were initially created, there was a reason why each cap was set and that it was according to some precedent. To change the guidelines because the issue was initially wrong would be like moving backwards.
 - Levi said that changing the bylaws for this year had nothing to do with this year but the fact that the bylaws were written when fewer student groups came up for funding. There is just not enough money to accommodate that any longer. This needs to be a permanent thing.
 - Harmetz asked that if approving the budgets without approving the bylaws would go against the budget itself. He said he sees this change as absolutely necessary and does not see a problem with changing it.
 - Neal said that understanding that the motion on the table was to Approve the Amendment to the USA Bylaw Article VI.C.4.b.(6)(b), he called the question. The motion was seconded by Harmetz. Council approved the motion with 5 votes in favor, 4 against, and 0 abstentions.

IX. New Business

***Approval of 2002-2003 Base Budget Allocations**

- Levi thanked the BRC, especially since they had encountered a particular problem, which was a much smaller amount of money to allocate than last year. When they were deliberating, they realized a way of having the process be as fair and equitable as possible. He mentioned that it seemed rather useless to compare groups that are big in size to those that are smaller. Each group was rated in terms of size and scope. Once that category was established, it was possible to categorize the groups. Similar groups were fitted with other similar groups. Two groups that the BRC decided not to fund were the Nigerian Student Association, and the UCLA Astrobiology Society because they turned in their applications very late.
- Dahle asked if any more proposals were presented late

- Levi presented the proposals and the BRC compiled justification of why they funded each group as they did.
- Timmerman asked if there had been any appeals.
- Levi said that appeals are done after USAC approves the Base Budgets
- Neal asked to see which member of the BRC had rated each group.
- Levi replied that all the BRC members rated every group.
- Diaz mentioned that his major concern was that most of the groups got major cuts, and that particular groups got major increases of about 118-200%. How was this decided and by whom.
- Levi said that this process was determined unanimously by the BRC.
- Diaz asked how the process was decided and by whom.
- LaFlamme said that the process was decided through an over-the-table discussion. One where everyone decided what went where and how.
- Neal asked that if at the time of the hearings all the methodologies were implemented or if they were implemented as they went along. He also mentioned that he would like to know what criteria were used during the meeting.
- Levi said that the only thing decided after the hearings was the clustering system.
- McKesity, the ASU Chair, asked how size and scope were determined. She also mentioned that at her hearing, scope was not addressed at all.
- Levi said that scope was addressed at every hearing.
- McKesity asked how the measuring of scope could be accurate when it could always be made up by whomever is asked.
- Levi said that certain judgement calls were made concerning the accuracy. He mentioned that one of the groups that came up for funding gave an outrageous number which the BRC felt was not an accurate representation of what the real scope was and hence accommodated for such a discrepancy.
- McKesity asked if it would have been better for the groups and the BRC to distribute the processes and the methodologies implemented before the actual hearings. She mentioned that this would make it a much fairer process.
- LaFlamme re-addressed the question of size and scope in saying that in considering size and scope, BRC was called upon to look into those potential errors. The BRC tried to look at a group's specific programming and events and see how each was able to reach out to the campus. He mentioned that this money was the money of all the students of UCLA.
- Neal asked how important the hearings were to the deliberations process.
- DerManuelian said that the hearings were an integral part of the deliberations process because it was the only way, beside the proposal, of knowing more about many of the groups that came up for funding.
- Yu stated that the hearing was the only way to know a group, which was integral in determining how the money would be properly allocated to reach a diverse group of people.
- Neal said that it was highly unfair that certain methodologies were not presented to them at the time they were preparing their proposals.
- DerManuelian said that everyone had their fair share of time at the hearings to mention everything they wanted about their group.
- Diaz re-introduced his concern of consistency and how the groups were treated. He asked how consistent could the process be if the process itself was not clearly defined. If no documentation could be provided, how could the committee provide consistency, when it did not provide certain standards for the hearings.
- Neal said that size and scope were not the same.
- Clark said that something she found throughout the process was that the process did not apply equally to every group.
- Penjwini, former MSA Chair, asked Council to define scope.
- Levi defined scope as being the students on the UCLA campus that benefited from the group's programming.

- McKesey said that they have been told different things from different people. She asked what would happen in the event that a group's staff was very small but it benefited the entire campus.
- LaFlamme said that that was the understanding the members of the BRC were going by when making their deliberations in an attempt to allocate as much money back to the students as possible.
- DerManuelian said that the members of the BRC anticipated all these questions which is why they put a lot of thought into this whole process and a lot of care was taken. Most of the ratings each member of the BRC gave were close, considering how they came from different backgrounds. He said that he thought that this process was as objective as it could possibly be.
- Timmerman suggested to council that someone should move to approve the Base Budget Allocations.
- Levi said that the category system which the BRC devised was a system that prioritizes the questions on the questionnaire. The point system determined the allocations, based on the questions and on the issue of size and scope.
- Tajsar, a representative from MSA, said that the scope was something important that was implemented after the hearings.
- Levi interjected in saying that scope was something variable.
- Tajsar said that how could so much importance then be given to something so variable such as scope. He asked for the BRC to give their rationale.
- Levi said that it was all stated and understood in the proposal and that all of the members of the BRC had some knowledge of most of the groups.
- Nelson said that Council was on the horns of a dilemma. He addressed Council in asking them if they felt that the BRC members were consistent in their evaluations of each group or if they felt that each committee member was bringing their own feelings to the table...was there more accord than dissonance? He asked if there could be some area of compromise. He asked Council if they felt all the groups were treated fairly, given the finite resources. He suggested that Council that rather than focus on size and scope, they should consider whether there was a sense of consistency.
- Diaz questioned the BRC if indeed there was consistency, given that there was no clear process of what the methodologies were. He asked the BRC if there were official minutes taken at the deliberations, or at any meeting where these methodologies were discussed.
- Levi said that all the methodologies were discussed in closed sessions and that no official minutes were taken of the deliberations.
- Diaz said that with no clear methodologies, and no clear understanding of the process, the entire process has become questionable
- McKesey asked if all the groups met all of the funding criteria.
- Levi said that two groups did not meet two of those criteria.
- Penjwini asked if then the groups are at the whim of the BRC.
- Neal said that this discussion was not meant to attack individual members of the BRC, but the process by which they determined the allocations and how the committee inconsistently funded different groups. He re-questioned the committee if indeed the hearings were important. And if indeed they were, why were the questions that were asked inconsistent.
- Yu said the evaluation process was determined depending on how groups were serving a certain population. The programming and the numbers were not arbitrary numbers given to certain groups. This was an important process. She mentioned that the same five questions were asked at the hearings, and size and scope, or an idea of it, was addressed in every single proposal.
- LaFlamme said that the criteria were developed by taking all the student groups into consideration. The BRC then went back to get the collective information, and

- went forth and rated each group. All the knowledge was collected through certain questions asked.
- Penjwini said that it seemed as if the whole variable of size and scope was very subjective in the fact that many organizations got severe cutbacks, and a few other organizations got substantial increases.
 - Levi said that the BRC and Council should not be considering last year's allocations.
 - Penjwini said that in the fact that the percentages are included, then in some way, last year's allocations are considered.
 - Levi re-iterated what size and scope meant. He said that size was the number of people in your group and that scope was the number of people that benefited from the group, on campus.
 - LaFlamme repeated that Council and guests should be wary of considering last year's allocations. He said that the budgets all add up, and that differences are everywhere. He also said that last year's process was questionable in that there were errors in the allocating of funds.
 - Gasparyan, the Armenian Students Association Chair, said that she did not understand what all the discussion was accomplishing in that everything was explained in the proposal.
 - McKeseey said that the whole process was flawed and that it was a disservice to the groups.
 - Gasparyan said that she thought that the process was subjective.
 - Levi then introduced last year's statistics on the allocations and said that last year, 63.8% of the funds available for allocation were distributed among the top seven student groups. He mentioned that this was not fair in that student fees belong to all the students, and that this was not even supposed to figure in any decision-making for this year's allocations.
 - Timmerman advised that a motion needed to be made.
 - LaFlamme moved to approve the 2002-2003 Base Budget Allocations. The motion was seconded by Harnetz.
 - Yu interrupted the motion in saying that she wanted to make several changes to her numbers reported on the amended Methodology Results Page, where the ratings were reported.
 - Timmerman asked if this would affect the motion directly. If it did not, he suggested that Yu wait until action was taken on the motion that was on the table.
 - Clark also mentioned that there were numbers that she wished to alter on the amended Methodology Results Page.
 - Yu said that these changes would not change the groups from the categories that they have been placed in because they were averaged by the entire committee.
 - Neal asked if LaFlamme's motion could be reconsidered.
 - Timmerman said that there were only three procedural things that could be done when a motion is on the table.
 - 1) It is tabled for a later meeting
 - 2) It is Approved
 - 3) It is Overruled
 - Neal mentioned the idea of possibly having a Friendly Amendment.
 - Timmerman said that there was no such thing as a Friendly Amendment.
 - Neal repeated that he thought it was a possibility.
 - McKeseey asked if these were discrepancies, or decisions by individual committee members that occurred after the fact.
 - Nelson asked Council if there was a concern with the changing of the numbers, if it was a result of their knowledge of the fairness of the process.
 - Dahle asked the BRC if they felt the process was fair.
 - Levi said yes.
 - DerManuelian said yes.
 - LaFlamme said yes.

- Yu said that it seemed as fair as it could get, considering the diverse groups.
- Clark said that reflecting on what she has now seen, it seems very unfair.
- Neal asked if it was possible for this motion to be tabled.
- DerManuelian asked if this would freeze the accounts.
- Simmons said that all the student group accounts were frozen until September due to the installation of the new Fund Accounting Software taking place at the SGA office
- Timmerman asked if this is always the case
- Simmons said yes.
- LaFlamme asked Council if he could withdraw his motion.
- Timmerman said that the motion needed to be tabled, that a motion could not be withdrawn.
- Levi continued by saying that any member of the BRC may make changes to the allocations.
- Diaz requested minutes of some form that stated how the process was developed and actual records by the time Council reconvened at the table.
- McKesey asked what would happen in the event that there was no consensus within the BRC.
- Levi said they had decided their implementation of the process by unanimous vote.
- Neal moved to table the Approval of the 2002-2003 Base Budget Allocations until the BRC can re-examine their process. The motion was seconded by Diaz. Council approved the motion and with 6 votes in favor, 2 votes against, and 1 abstention.

X. Announcements

- DerManuelian said that he plans to periodically audit the USAC accounts, and will give more information on that later. He also said he would be putting on funding workshops for groups in the coming year.
- Penjwini asked when the Base Budget Allocations would be brought back to the table.
- Dahle said that the BRC will contact Council when they are ready.
- Timmerman mentioned that Council needed to have workshops in which they educated themselves in the protocol of the meetings.
- Penjwini asked again when the BRC would bring back their new results.
- DerManuelian said that they would bring it back to council as soon as they could, following completion of their review.
- Harmetz mentioned that there might be a need for a new more flexible protocol to be practiced at the meetings besides Robert's Rules. He mentioned that he would be more than happy to chair a committee to evaluate and recommend a meeting protocol.
- McKesey then asked if it would be useless to mention the inconsistencies within the allocations.
- Dahle said that the BRC would return when they had completed their review.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- DerManuelian passed out the Attendance Sheet

XII. Adjournment

- Clark moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Lam. Council approved the motion with 9 votes in favor, 0 against, and 0 abstentions. The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Pedro Alejandro Gomez
USAC Minutes Taker