

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday November 26, 2002
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Clark, Cordero, Dahle, DerManuelian, Diaz, Harmetz, LaFlamme, Lam, Leyco, Neal, Nelson, Tuttle, Wilson, Yu

ABSENT: Grace, Eastman, McElwain, McLaren, Styczynski

GUESTS: Debra Simmons, Georgine Piper, Robert Salonga, Menaka Fernando, Andy Jones, Chris Hauck, Bobby Matsuishi, Emerson Lego, Sophia Kozak, Ghaith Mahmood, Eric Tang, Yousef Tajsar, Hanish Rathod

I. A. Call to Order
-Dahle called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet
-DerManuelian passed the Attendance Sheet around.

II. Approval of the Agenda
-Clark asked that a presentation by Students for Global Peace and Justice be added. She also asked that the action item Approval of the "Resolution in Solidarity with the People of the World in Support of True Global Peace" be moved up to just after that presentation.
-Dahle said that the Appointments set for this meeting would be tabled.
-Neal asked to strike the item Statement of Principles Concerning New Fee Policy under New Business.
-Wilson asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
-Dahle asked if there were any objections to approval of the Agenda, as amended, by consent. There being no objections the Agenda, as amended, was approved by Consent.

III. Approval of the Minutes
***November 5, 2002**
***November 12, 2002**
-Dahle asked if there were any changes or edits to the November 5th or November 12th Minutes.
-Cordero said that on page 3 of the November 12th Minutes under the Internal Vice President Report the line that ends "curriculum vitae from the Vachas Students" should end "curriculum vitae of the candidate for the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs position."
-Dahle asked if there were any further changes to the Minutes.
-There being none, Cordero moved and Lam seconded to approve the Minutes of November 5, 2002 as submitted and the Minutes of November 12, 2002 as amended. Council voted to approve the motion with 10 votes in favor, 0 against, and 0 abstentions.

IV. Special Presentations

Students For Global Peace and Justice

-Emerson Lego, from the Students for Global Peace and Justice, introduced himself and thanked Council for allowing them to speak. He said that the fact that they were present is an indication that democracy works. He said that UCLA has had a long history of political activism. He said that the Students for Global Peace and Justice came to Council with the best interests of humanity in mind. He said that in the 1970s there was a nationwide

movement for peace, especially at the universities. He said that during the 1980's, UCLA student activists were the catalyst of a strike against apartheid in South Africa. He said that as students the UCLA community has worked actively to address the needs of students and people.

- Sophia Kozak said that the Students for Global Peace and Justice urge Council to vote in favor of the anti-war resolution. She said that in a short amount of time several student groups have come out against a possible war and signed their resolution. She said that it is imperative that the voices of the students be acknowledged. She said that the students stand united and strong before Council asking that this resolution be passed. She said that a vote against the resolution or an abstention would be a vote against the students and for war.
- Dahle said that he would prepare a speakers list. He said that discussion on this issue would be limited to 30 minutes.
- Andy Jones, of the Bruin Republicans, said that all he sees is a demand for a childish response. He said that Council is not the correct place for this type of action. He said that there is no doubt that Hussein is killing people. He said that it was irresponsible of the three USAC members who brought this matter before Council to consider such an action. He said that Council is not an international organization and is not the place for this sort of vote.
- Dahle asked if anyone else wanted to speak.
- Ghaith Mahmood said that he was born in Iraq and saw members of his family incarcerated and killed. He said that he refuses to allow other people to speak on his behalf. He said that the Students for Global Peace and Justice didn't come to Council to ask that a tyrant be left in power. He said that the truth is that the US sanctions are hurting the Iraqi people. He said that as far as the issue on whether or not Council has a right to pass this vote goes, there is no doubt that a war would affect students. He said that the friends and families of students would be shipped off to fight and that the educational budget allocations would be downsized in favor of military spending. He said that this is an educational issue and a health issue. He said that this is a holistic issue. He said that to say that this is not USAC's purpose is incorrect.
- Lego said that it is naïve to say that students would not be affected by a war. He said that students have already been directly affected. He said that students have been taken out of classes and questioned and that their files have been given out.
- Eric Tang said that he takes fault with the idea that it is not the students' responsibility to get involved in foreign affairs. He said that this is a democracy not a dictatorship. He said that it was the people who called for the end of the Vietnam War not the politicians. He said that to say nothing would be betraying everyone. He said that the time to speak is now.
- Lam moved and Diaz seconded to approve the Resolution in Solidarity with the People of the World in Support of True Global Peace.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 5 votes in favor, 0 against and 5 abstentions.

V. Appointments

- The Appointments for this week were tabled.

VI. Officer and Member Reports

- Dahle said that, because the Finance Committee Chairperson had stepped out of the room, Council would proceed with the Officer and Member Reports and then would consider Fund Allocations when DerManuelian returned.

President

- Dahle said that the Town Hall meeting with Councilman Weiss had been held Monday night. He said that it was a good program. He said that he is still in the process of thinking of programs for next quarter.

Internal Vice President

-Cordero said that the ARC would have the appointments ready by next week.

External Vice President

-Neal said that he has been going through the applications for the new UCSA position. He said that he is also in charge of the UCSA Budget Committee.

Campus Events Commissioner

-Wilson said that there are three sneaks coming up 10th week, Analyze That, The Hot Chick and Just Married. He said that his office has also found a recipient for the Jack Benny award but that it was a secret. He said that the award presentation would be on February 12th in Royce Hall.

VII. Fund Allocations

- DerManuelian said that there were three requests, two of which were discretionary, and one of which FiCom was submitting to Council for consideration. He said that the last request on the sheet was approved last meeting and could be taken off.
- Cordero asked if that was the \$5600 request.
- DerManuelian said that it was turned in late and he approved part of it under his discretionary authorization because of time issues.
- Cordero moved and Lam seconded to approve the Fund Allocations.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 10 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

UCLA Dance Marathon

Requested : \$551.94

Recommended: \$150.00

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$150.00 for the partial cost of Graphics for the UCLA Dance Marathon.

USAC Office of the President / Nation to Nation

Requested: \$5600.00

Recommended: \$300.00

DerManuelian authorized the allocation of \$300.00 upon his own discretion in compliance with the 2002-2003 USA Finance Committee Guidelines for the partial cost of Supplies for the 8th Annual International Thanksgiving Dinner.

Queer Alliance / Mishpacha

Requested: \$280.00

Recommended: \$200.00

DerManuelian authorized the allocation of \$200.00 upon his own discretion in compliance with the 2002-2003 USA Finance Committee Guidelines for the partial cost of Facilities for the UCLA vs USC Queer Softball Game.

VIII. Old Business

-There was no Old Business this week.

IX. New Business

***Approval of the No Fee Increase Resolution**

-Neal said that the previous year UCSA had been able to work with the Cal State Student Association and the Community College Student Association to stop any increase in student fees. He said that it was a very hard fight and that it will prove harder this year when there is not an upcoming election. He said that UCLA total costs were compared to

four other similar institutions, including Chapel Hill, the University of Virginia and the University of North Carolina and that UCLA was the most expensive.

- Dahle asked if the part of the resolution which reads “four comparison institutions” could be changed to “similar institutions” since Council is not sure which four institutions this resolution is speaking of.
- Neal said that he would not feel comfortable doing that.
- Cordero asked what the chances were of the UC system avoiding a fee increase.
- Neal said that the chances were slim much like last year, but that it was still passed last year. He said that several important figures in the state government have come out against a fee increase.
- Harmetz moved and Neal seconded to approve No Fee Increase Resolution.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 10 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

***UCSA Budget Approval**

- Neal said that he has two roles on the UCSA now. He said that as the EVP of USAC it is his job to sit on the UCSA Board and as the Vice Chairman of the UCSA he is in charge of the budget and the employee policy. He said that he did not prepare this budget but that the previous year’s Vice Chairman had.
- Dahle said that some of the numbers on the budget were wrong. He said that Berkeley only gave UCSA \$10,000.
- Neal said that this was the projected budget as of September.
- Dahle asked why the UCSA was running \$17,000 in deficit.
- Neal said that there is a difference between a deficit and debt. He said that debt is borrowing money. He said that a deficit is just going beyond a year’s budget. He said that the UCSA has \$90,000 set aside just in case all of their funding falls through. He said that beyond that they have saved \$40,000. He said that the UCSA wants to use that money to fund a building process as well as to fund stipends for the Chairman and Vice Chairman positions since the leaders have more work this year. He said that this was done on the advice of the UCSA Executive Director. He said that the board then decided to include stipends in the budget.
- DerManuelian asked why UCLA pays so much into the UCSA budget.
- Neal said that, in 2000, UCLA undergraduates approved a referendum which would have given \$1 to UCSA and \$1 to USSA, per student per quarter. He said that UCOP approved the UCSA allocation in full, with ten cents of the dollar to go for travel. However, UCOP approved only \$.09 of the USSA allocation, with the understanding that those funds were to be used specifically for travel to USSA meetings. He said that UCSA is pushing for other campuses to bring up similar referenda.
- Cordero asked what the Council on Student Fees will be responsible for.
- Neal said that there are percentages on the side that give that information.
- Harmetz asked if the UCSA has ever gone into deficit before.
- Neal said no. He also said that he believes this is the healthiest budget that the UCSA has ever had.
- Harmetz asked if the UCSA was planning on continuing this deficit.
- Neal said that there is only a one year commitment.
- Harmetz asked if, since Neal would be setting the budget next year, he would prioritize a deficit proposal.
- Neal said that it is always the goal of those setting a budget to aim for a balanced budget.
- Dahle asked how many organizations have voted this budget down.
- Neal said that he wasn’t sure. He said that it was about three.
- Dahle asked how many have approved it.
- Neal said that he didn’t know.
- LaFlamme asked how much was in the UCSA savings.
- Neal said \$130,000.
- Thai Lam asked what the difference was between italicized numbers and bold numbers.

- Neal said that the italicized amounts have already come in.
- Thai Lam said that he was sure that Berkeley only approved \$10,000.
- Neal said that this was just a provisional budget.
- Dahle asked why 3 associations refused to pass this budget.
- Neal said that there was a desire not to go into deficit and that some pointed out a lack of clarity on why UCSA was going into a deficit and that many associations didn't like the added stipends.
- Leyco asked Neal to repeat who prepared this budget.
- Neal said that the previous Vice Chairman of UCSA had prepared the budget.
- Dahle asked if the stipend added this year was effective immediately.
- Neal said that it was, but only for this budget cycle. He said that the stipend was brought forward based on the extra work of the two leadership positions. He said that he and the Chairman stepped out of the meeting and the rest of the board discussed the matter and approved the stipends.
- Leyco asked if there was any discussion about giving stipends to the other members of UCSA.
- Neal said that there was not.
- Thai Lam said that under Other Expenses there is a section that says wine/dine but that student fees could not be used for the purchase of alcohol.
- Neal said that there is no wine involved, and that that is just an expression used for taking important people out to dinner to impress them.
- Yu asked for clarification on whether the budget refers to staff benefits and salary and is not speaking of students.
- Neal said that the UCSA has a professional staff. He said that they have an Executive Director, a Field Director and other professional positions.
- Dahle asked what has changed from the previous year to cause a deficit.
- Neal said that the UCSA has a greater amount of savings due to cost cutting measures the previous year and grants. He said that since they have those savings and their income has not gone up they want to spend from those savings. He said that they are hiring for a new position and are adding stipends for the Chairman and Vice Chairman
- Dahle said that USAC has savings but that that doesn't necessarily warrant the use of those savings.
- Neal said that according to USAC's By-laws it cannot run in a deficit and that UCSA is different.
- DerManuelian said that he doesn't feel that the UCSA has provided Council with a professional budget. He said that since they employ a professional staff, higher quality is to be expected.
- Thai Lam said that he sees no pension fund, and asked if savings were liable for pensions.
- Neal said that the UCSA does not provide pensions.
- LaFlamme said that this budget seems to be very stripped down and asked if that was normal.
- Neal said that this is what he received.
- LaFlamme said that it was a choice to use savings in the manner that they did. He asked if the UCSA had considered increasing their repayment on loans.
- Neal said that that can be considered next year.
- DerManuelian asked what the UCSA's employee turnaround rate was.
- Neal said that it was about two years and that was normal for a student organization.
- DerManuelian asked if anyone working for UCSA had been there for more than five years.
- Neal said that the UCSA usually has a 5 year cap on employment so that the staff doesn't become too far removed from the students.
- DerManuelian asked how many people the UCSA employed and how much they were paid.
- Neal said three and that they would be adding a 4th this year. He said that their salaries are confidential.
- Tuttle said that he doesn't believe that salaries in an organization funded by public money, such as the UCSA, could be confidential.
- Harmetz asked if UCSA had a committee to look into the budget each year.
- Neal said no but that there was a special ad hoc committee to look into people's problems with the budget this year.

- LaFlamme asked if this budget would be returned to the UCSA if the UCs didn't approve it.
- Neal said that if three-fourths of the organizations don't approve the budget then UCSA has to look at it again but they are not required to make any changes.
- Dahle said that two weeks ago at the presidents meeting this had been one of the main issues. He said that a lot of people are unhappy with the UCSA. He said that they weren't happy about the stipends and the deficit. He said that UCLA's Graduate Student Association (GSA) voted against this budget. He asked what reasons they had given.
- Neal said that this budget was passed by the EVPs of all of the UCs. He said that later people came up with problems with the budget. He said that there was a reason that the EVPs passed the budget and that he feels that there has been a misunderstanding.
- Hanish Rathod, the GSA Vice President of External Affairs, introduced himself and said that he had been asked to come to USAC and explain the GSA's position. He said that he agrees that there is a difference between a debt and a deficit but that the UCSA is trying to balance this year's budget by dipping into their savings. He said that using savings to balance a base budget is highly irregular. He said that if a man has a \$10,000 a year salary and rents a new apartment for \$12,000 a year based on the fact that he has \$5,000 in savings, he is not thinking ahead. He said that it is also not sensible to implement stipends in a year when the budget is in deficit. He said that the two prior Chairs of UCSA have come out against the stipend. He said that the members of the UCSA are members because that is what they want to do and because it is a prestigious organization.
- LaFlamme asked what the GSA's vote was.
- Rathod said that the GSA was unanimously against the budget.
- Neal asked if the members of the GSA get stipends.
- Rathod said that they do, but that no one gets more money for sitting on a committee. He said that the GSA was also upset that, if the GSA objected to the budget, the UCSA did not have to address their concerns. He said that it is UCLA's student money, yet the UCSA still has no obligation to hear their concerns.
- DerManuelian asked how long GSA discussed this matter.
- Rathod said that they discussed it for about 15 to 20 minutes. He said that much of the discussion revolved around an e-mail to the GSA president that basically said that UCSA would do as they pleased with their budget.
- Neal said that they are dealing with economic principles here. He said that they are spending from their savings to invest in the future. He said that this is a one time allocation and that the UCSA Board can vote to overturn it next year. He said that in the face of a state budget deficit the UCSA made sure that student fees did not increase. He said that the UCSA will now have someone permanently at the UCSA Chairman's office. He said that his responsibility as the EVP is to sit on the UCSA Board and to do nominal duties. He said that his responsibility as Vice Chairman of that Board is much greater. He said that he oversees the budget and staff evaluations. He said that for this he receives \$250 a month in compensation.
- Rathod said that he would like to add that the UCSA is a good organization. He said that they lobby and helped to prevent a rise in student fees. He said that the GSA is not upset about what UCSA does, but they want to see UCSA keep their finances in line.
- Diaz asked if it was possible to get a budget that was broken down farther.
- Neal said that it was.
- Harmetz asked how long USAC has to approve or not approve this budget.
- Neal said that the only stipulation is that the EVP has to bring the budget before their Council within a month. He said that they had met that deadline.
- Rathod said that the EVP is supposed to present the budget at the meeting directly after it was passed and is supposed to report back to UCSA within 30 days.
- Tuttle asked if it was fair to say that the additional salary caused by this new position at UCSA would cause a significant increase in expenses.
- Neal said that it was.
- Tuttle asked what the new position was.

- He said that the person will work at the Chairman's office to lobby at the state level and to monitor the UCSA offices.
- Tuttle asked if this new employee's contract includes a stop clause after one year or if action would have to be taken against the employee to let them go. He said that the bottom footnote also reads that \$21,549 worth of Accounts Receivable has been received, and asked if it looks like the remaining balance will arrive soon. He said that he believes that there will be more concern if it seems that this deficit will roll over into next year. He asked how the UCSA handles employee bonuses.
- Neal said that it is stipulated in the new employee's contract that it is a one year position. He said that the Chairman's and Vice Chairman's stipends are also to be reviewed after one year.
- Tuttle said that he feels that more annotation would be helpful.
- Neal said that the bonuses are a percentage of the employees salary.
- Dahle clarified that the stipends will only last a year.
- Neal said that after a year they can be reevaluated.
- DerManuelian said that if Council decides to table this item he would like to see, at the next meeting, a broken down budget, a salary breakdown, and updated figures for each school's contribution to UCSA.
- Cordero moved and Diaz seconded to table the UCSA Budget Approval.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 10 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

***Approval of Proposed use of Student Fee Referendum Funds**

- LaFlamme requested a five minute recess.
- There being no objections, Dahle called a five minute recess at 8:27 pm.
- Council reconvened at 8:37 pm.
- Dahle asked if the BRC was ready.
- Levi said that the BRC had met twice and could not come to an agreement. He said that he personally apologizes for that. He said that each member of the BRC would present proposals to USAC to consider. He said that his proposal is that the best course of action is to allocate the money to the same groups at the same percentage used in the original process.
- Dahle said that he thinks that it would be best to have everyone pass out their proposals and let Council look them over for the next meeting.
- LaFlamme said that his proposal requires some explanation.
- Dahle said that those who wished to explain their proposals could.
- Cordero asked what the general feeling of the student groups was.
- Levi said that he spoke to nine groups and six think that new groups should not be added to the process. He said that three groups believed that new groups should be included and that all of the groups that he spoke to were groups included in the original process this year.
- LaFlamme said that his proposal is that for now the groups involved in the original budget process should be given their percentage of the funds. He also said that there is a recurring problem each year when new groups are formed in the middle of the academic year. He said that, separate from this budget issue, Council should make a change to its By-laws which sets aside some amount of money, each year, to be allocated to mid-year groups so that they can receive funding in the future.
- Yu said that her proposal is that the difference be taken between the amount of the 2001-2002 base budget and 2002-2003 base budget and that that amount should be divided up among the groups from the original 2002-2003 budget process according to the percent that they were given at that time. She said that the rest of the money should then be opened up for a new budget process that includes new groups and old groups and in which the old groups would present supplemental materials that demonstrate a need for the additional funding.
- Dahle asked if they would be making the individual budgets of each of the groups the same as they were last year under that proposal.
- Yu said no, that the total amount of the budget pool would be made the same.

- Clark said that they would take the difference in the overall budget between the two years and divide that amount up according to this year's percent.
- DerManuelian said that his proposal is to take the money and divide it into two funds. He said that he would basically double the total budget for the original process's groups with one fund. He said that the money in that fund would be distributed based on a Fall Quarter progress report. He said that the old groups would not have to go through a whole new process, but would have to provide the BRC with an update on their financial status to justify their financial need. He said that, through a new budgeting process, the rest of the money would be given to groups that did not apply for the original budget process.
- LaFlamme said that he thought that their job at this time was just to set out how the allocations would be made and not decide on the actual method that would be used.
- DerManuelian said that that was just an overview of how he would handle the allocations.
- Clark said that her proposal is that a whole new budget process should be carried out with this new money, open to both the original groups and any new group that wants to be included. She said that there should be a criterion added for the new process, which would prioritize the groups that applied during the original budget process. She said that the original groups should not have to submit a new proposal, just supplemental material that demonstrates additional financial need. She said that essentially this means that there will be a new budget process, much like the original one, but that includes two new priorities, whether or not the group was included in the original process and whether or not the group demonstrates adequate financial need.
- LaFlamme said that as he understood it this was just to be a general recommendation on how to split up the funds and that the recommendation on how to split up those funds between individual groups would come later. He asked if Clark was specifying a method in her proposal.
- Clark said that she is just recommending a method to split up the funds and the weight of each of the items she mentioned could be decided on later.
- Diaz moved and Harmetz seconded to table the Approval of the Proposed use of Student Fee Referendum Funds.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 10 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- Dahle said that he would be calling a special meeting on December 3rd to make appointments, approve contingency requests, approve the criteria for the use of Student Fee Referendum funds, and approve the UCSA budget.
- Harmetz asked if the BRC could meet with the applicants by then.
- Cordero said that he hoped it would be possible.
- Simmons suggested that the BRC look over the USAC By-laws.

X. Announcements

- There were no announcements this week.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- DerManuelian passed around the Attendance Sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Lam moved and Cordero seconded to adjourn the meeting. There being no objection, the motion was approved with 9 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions and the meeting was adjourned at 8:59 pm.

XIII. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,

Stephen Araiza

FINAL

APPROVED: January 7, 2003

USAC Minutes Taker