

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

Tuesday, February 25, 2003  
De Neve Plaza Room  
7:00pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Clark, Cordero, Dahle, DerManuelian, Harmetz, LaFlamme, Lam, McLaren, Neal, Pearlman, Styczynski, Tuttle, Wilson, Yu

ABSENT: Diaz, Eastman, Grace, Leyco, Nelson

GUESTS: Menaka Fernando, Debra Simmons, Gideon Baum, Justin Levi, Dria Fearn, Dylan Tyagi, Kris Nacwamendhal, Fritz Schirmers, Joel Abramovitz, Jenny Wood, Emily Whichard, Michelle Sivert

I. A. Call to Order  
-Dahle called the meeting to order at 7:16 pm.

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

II. Approval of the Agenda  
-Cordero asked that the approval of the Resolution Regarding "No Increase in On Campus Housing" be moved to just after the Approval of the Agenda.  
-Cordero asked that Officer and Member Reports be moved to after New Business.  
-Styczynski, Harmetz, LaFlamme, Leyco and 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. New Business

**Resolution Regarding "No Increase in On Campus Housing Fees"**

- Cordero said that he would like to change line two of the resolution to read "strengthen" instead of "enhance".
- Tuttle asked what the alternative to a fee increase would be.
- Michelle Sivert, the OCHC Chair, said that this resolution is more a recommendation to the administration to actually look for alternatives to increasing the fees.
- Tuttle asked what would be given up if resources had to be shifted around.
- Neal said that there are people paid to find solutions and that it is not the students burden to find alternatives for the Administration.
- Tuttle said that this is an easy vote but that it would be stronger if there was some sort of solution attached to it.
- Sivert said that this resolution is meant to bring the issue to the table so that everyone can work together to find a solution.
- Pearlman said that he agrees with Neal to an extent but asked what would happen if the housing office decided to cut programming or student staff support. He said that then it would be a student problem. He said that a few years ago they were told that fees would cap at \$13,000 or \$14,000. He said that the housing office probably has a different number now. He said that OCHC should be aware of that.
- Sivert said that they sat down with the administration to work out a budget. She said that the only option they were given besides a fee increase was a cut in services. She said that OCHC

wants the resolution to help them in working together with the administration to find a better solution.

- Cordero moved and Lam seconded to approve the Resolution Regarding “No Increase in On Campus Housing Fees”, as amended.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion, as amended, with 11 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- Cordero moved and Lam seconded to publish the Resolution Regarding “No Increase in On Campus Housing Fees” in the Daily Bruin as a half page advertisement on Tuesday, March 4<sup>th</sup>.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 11 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- DerManuelian asked if Cordero could forward a copy of the resolution to him.
- Cordero said that he would.

#### IV. Approval of the Minutes

##### **\*January 14, 2003**

- Dahle asked if there were any changes or edits to the Minutes from January 14, 2003.
- Yu said that her one of her comments on page 8 should be changed to “She said that CAC has given...”.
- Cordero moved and Diaz seconded to approve the Minutes from January 14, 2003 as amended. Council voted to approve the motion with 10 votes in favor, 0 against, and 1 abstentions.

#### V. Special Presentations

- There were no Special Presentations this week.

#### VI. Appointments

- There were no Appointments this week.

#### VII. Fund Allocations

##### **\*Contingency**

- DerManuelian said that there is a lot of money left in the Contingency Fund. He said that there will be over \$80,000 more after the new base budget process is completed. He said that the reason that groups aren't getting more money than they are is because they are not turning everything in correctly. He asked Council to speak with groups that they had relations with and tell them to contact him before they turn in their requests. He said that he would be happy to answer their questions.
- Leyco said that the date of the Education not Devastation program would be changing. She asked if that is alright.
- DerManuelian said that that would be alright.
- Neal asked if DerManuelian could start putting the amount requested on his contingency recommendations again.
- DerManuelian said that he would.
- Harmetz 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 11 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- McLaren asked if they would be approving the contingency requests that were not approved at USAC's last meeting due to the absence of quorum.
- DerManuelian asked if they could be added to the agenda.
- McLaren said that she thought they could be covered under the general subject of Contingency.
- Cordero said that some of the programs have already taken place.
- DerManuelian asked if it would be proper to deal with those programs that have already taken place.

- McLaren said that there may be some question about that. She pointed out that the applications were turned in to the Finance Committee on time so the student groups were not at fault.
- Cordero said that he agrees but wondered if it would be against USAC's Bylaws to approve programs that have already taken place.
- Neal said that, since the applications were not turned in late, he thought this should not be considered retroactive funding.
- Wilson moved and Lam seconded to approve the Fund Allocations from February 18, 2003.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none. Council voted to approve the motion with 11 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

#### **Muslim Student Association**

##### **Recommended: \$400.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$400.00 for the cost of Honorarium for College Day on March 1<sup>st</sup>.

#### **Queer Alliance**

##### **Recommended: \$1,059.15**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$1,059.15 for the cost of Facilities, Supplies and Honorarium for the Winter Quarter Social and Resource Fair on March 7<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Student Welfare Commission**

##### **Recommended: \$2,000.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$2,000.00 for the cost of Honorarium for the Education not Devastation program on March 5<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Pilipino Recruitment and Enrichment Program**

##### **Recommended: \$300.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$300.00 for the cost of Programming for a Day in the Life of a Pilipino College Student on February 28<sup>th</sup>.

#### **MEChA de UCLA**

##### **Recommended: \$450.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$450.00 for the cost of Transportation for the Chicana Retreat.

#### **\*Approval of Capital Items Allocation Recommendations**

- DerManuelian said that there a couple of things that need to be gone over. He said that two of the Capital Items Request allocations may be questionable. He said that the first is from the Financial Supports Commission. He said that their application was finished early but was turned in late. He said the second questionable allocation was to Golden Key. He said that he was involved in creating the application and that he signed it. He said that he recused himself from discussing or voting on the allocation. He said that he wanted Council to know about that before they voted.
- Neal asked why many groups were not allocated the amount they asked for when there is so much money in the contingency account.
- DerManuelian said that many groups were making excessive requests so FiCom set an internal cap of \$1200 on computers. He said that they let CSC go over the cap because they were getting two computers.
- Cordero asked what the UCLA Shooting Club would be using the freezer for.
- DerManuelian said that the application stated that the freezer would be used to store compressed air capsules.
- LaFlamme asked if it was just a normal mini-fridge.
- DerManuelian said that it was and that it would be stored in the John Wooden Center in a locker.
- Neal said that he would be moving to fund all approved groups at the full amount of their request.

- DerManuelian said that that would be completely overruling FiCom. He said that a lot of the recommendations were lower than the requests because of frivolous spending.
- Neal moved and Cordero seconded to approve the full amount requested by each group that was approved for funding by the Finance Committee.
- Simmons said that some of the items requested were not allowable expenditures.
- Neal made an amendment to his motion, which Cordero accepted, that those items that are not allowed according to the financial guidelines would not be funded.
- Harmetz said that this is a bad precedent. He asked DerManuelian how long FiCom spent reviewing these applications.
- DerManuelian said that they spent 3 to 4 hours.
- Harmetz asked if DerManuelian agreed with the recommendations of his committee.
- DerManuelian said that he did.
- Simmons said that any money left over from the Capital Items process would roll over into Contingency. She said that groups would be able to request more from Contingency.
- Neal said that it is not his intent to belittle the work of the Finance Committee. He said that it is within Council's prerogative to either increase or decrease the allocations recommended by FiCom. He said that the groups helped USAC pass the Fee Referendum and they should get something back from it.
- Pearlman said that the fact that the money is there does not mean that it should all be spent. He said that he would not be willing to override FiCom without looking at the applications.
- Neal said that he wanted to put this issue on the table to see that the groups get proper funding. He said that there are a number of groups that feel that Council should work to maximize the amount of funding they give.
- DerManuelian asked if only those groups approved for funding in the first place would be funded.
- Neal said yes. He said that they would also receive only the part of their request that was allowable.
- Tuttle asked if they would be funding at the amount recommended by FiCom.
- Neal said "no", that they would fund the full amount requested by the groups.
- Levi asked DerManuelian if that would wipe out the Capital Items account.
- DerManuelian said it would not.
- Simmons said that if the full amount of the request is given it may give the groups a false impression of what they may buy.
- Tuttle said that this is worrisome. He said that on one hand there is a desire to fund the groups as much as possible. He said on the other hand the people who voted for the Fee Referendum probably thought there would be some scrutiny over how the money was distributed. He said that to make a blanket vote to increase all of the groups funding without even looking at their applications would be a bad move.
- Neal said that Council could vote his motion down if they disagree with it.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council rejected the motion with 1 vote in favor, 6 against and 4 abstentions.
- Harmetz moved and Pearlman seconded to approve the recommendations as submitted by the Finance Committee.
- LaFlamme said that he wanted to bring up the fact that his application was turned in late. He said that his last three weeks have been very busy. He said that the application was prepared early but he let the due date slip his mind. He said that Council should know that before they voted on the allocations.
- Neal said that he is fine with accepting LaFlamme's application. He said that there were some groups that weren't approved for funding in the Queer Alliance. He said that the Queer Alliance shares several computers to serve many students. He said that even though they share a single office it is not unreasonable for each group in the office to request a computer.
- DerManuelian said that one representative came to him with six applications. He said that of the six applications four of them were exactly the same. He said that he felt that since they had one computer in the office already allocating them funds for two more would be fair.

- Neal said that many groups have other groups that work with them or under them. He said that that does not mean that those groups do not have individual needs.
- Wilson said that he understands Neal's position. He asked what the best solution would be.
- Neal moved to amend the motion to include funding Blaque and Queer Alliance at the same level that Mishpacha and La Familia de UCLA were funded.
- Dahle asked Harmetz if the amendment was friendly.
- Harmetz said that Council could vote on it.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the amendment with 8 votes in favor, 0 against and 2 abstentions.
- Council voted to approve the motion, as amended, with 11 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

#### VIII. Old Business

##### **\*No Student Fee Increase Resolution**

- Pearlman moved and Harmetz seconded to approve the USAC Resolution Against Raising Student Fees and Cutting Student Services.
- LaFlamme asked if he could have a moment to read the resolution.
- Lam said that she has been talking to students and she would like to get more student input on this resolution.
- Pearlman said that this was based on the resolution that Lam sent to Council the week before.
- Cordero asked if there was any opposition to tabling this until next week.
- DerManuelian said that this would be the third week that this item was tabled. He asked if the issue could be hammered out at the table.
- Pearlman said that Cordero has been trying to get the committee on this resolution together for weeks. He said that everyone was invited to the meetings about the resolution.
- Wilson said that he thinks that Lam's argument is that the students haven't had any input on the resolution.
- Tuttle asked if Council was sure of the fact on page 2 that states "Whereas, the UC Regents and Administrators failed to consult of illicit student opinion regarding their recent decision on student fees."
- Kaczmarek said that the Governor announced mid-year budget cuts and the Regents had a special meeting right after that. He said that the meeting was during winter break and that the students had little notice and could not mobilize.
- Dahle said that his only concern about tabling this item again would be that it would print late in the quarter.
- Cordero said that printing concerns should be secondary to content concerns.
- Wilson said that Council could consider a special meeting later this week.
- Pearlman said that normally he would agree. He said though that given the time already spent coming up with this resolution another delay would be excessive. He said that everyone was invited to the meetings. He said that three weeks has already been spent on this resolution.
- Lam said that she never received an email on when and where the committee was meeting.
- LaFlamme asked if the students she spoke with have expressed interest in the resolution.
- Lam said that they have.
- Dahle said that, by the end of this meeting, he wants a time set for when the Committee can meet again.
- Pearlman said that he would withdraw his motion if everyone could agree that the resolution would be approved by next Tuesday.

#### IX. New Business

##### **\*Approval of Mid-Year Base Budget Allocations**

- Levi said that some groups from the original process are not included because they did not submit the application form. He said that the telephone line item was removed and redistributed

- among other line items. He said that only ten new groups applied. He said that the Budget Review Committee was never able to meet.
- Cordero asked if the recommendations were made without quorum.
  - Levi said that three members of the BRC were present. He said that he would understand tabling the item but action needs to be taken on it soon.
  - Cordero asked if there was a cap of \$2000.
  - Levi said yes.
  - Neal said that some of the caps used were not previously discussed by Council. He said he thought that many of the groups should have received more.
  - DerManuelian said that he would agree with raising the amount given to Jazz Reggae. He said that other than that this is a mid-year allocation and it's going to groups that missed their first chance.
  - Neal said that he wants the amount that groups get to be consistent. He said that he thinks they should all have equal access to funding.
  - Levi said that over the summer there was \$90,000 available for the original set of groups. He said that there is now \$30,000 available for the ten new groups. He said that he wanted to keep the allocation proportional between what the new and the old groups got. He said that he believes that most of the money won't be spent.
  - LaFlamme said that he thinks it would be fair to raise the cap to \$4,000. He said that the first process, over the summer, had a cap of \$4,000 and that that cap has essentially been doubled because of this new money. He said that since the new groups are getting an allocation in the middle of the year it would be fair to use \$4,000 as the cap.
  - DerManuelian said that there is ample funding available for the groups elsewhere. He said that it would be a disservice to the original groups to raise the cap in this way.
  - Neal moved and LaFlamme seconded to approve funding to the newly funded groups at twice the amount recommended.
  - Tuttle said that he would reassert his point that this is other peoples' money. He said that there should be some sort of review of the groups rather than simply doubling their money.
  - Levi said that his primary concern is getting groups their money. He said that the newly funded groups tend to be small groups. He said that there are a few large groups included. He said that many of these groups would have gotten much less if they had come up for funding over summer. He said that simply doubling their allocation would be unfair to the groups involved in the original funding process.
  - LaFlamme said that Levi has a good point.
  - Neal said that he understands Levi's point, but he thinks that some groups do deserve more. He said that Council does not have time to review each group.
  - Simmons said that Council should keep in mind the fact that the groups only have three months to wait before next years budget process begins.
  - Harmetz asked if doubling the allocations would give some groups more than they requested.
  - Levi said that there is a good chance of that but that he is not sure.
  - McLaren asked what the maximum amount that groups who participated in the original process could get.
  - Levi said \$8,000.
  - McLaren said that doubling the recommendations for the new groups would place their cap at \$4,000 because there are only three months left in the year, so this should not be thought of as funding for half a year.
  - Harmetz made a friendly amendment, which Neal accepted, to allow groups to receive funding only up to what they requested.
  - Yu said that there would be three groups that would receive more money than they requested if they were given double the recommendations.
  - Levi said that they would be giving NSU and ACA \$4,000. He said that they would not have gotten that much if they had been involved in the summer budgeting process.
  - Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 8 votes in favor, 1 against and 1 abstentions.

- Neal and LaFlamme seconded to approve the rest of the allocations, for the previously funded groups and offices, as recommended by the BRC.
- Pearlman made a friendly amendment, which Neal accepted, to include an allocation of \$940 to the Facilities Commission.
- 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 Revision to USAC Election Code**

- Vardner said that everyone should have the proposed changes to the Election Code (E-Code). He said that there is a mistake in Article I Section A.3 as pointed out in Kaczmarek's letter to Council.
- DerManuelian asked Kaczmarek if this letter represents the official stance of the UCSA.
- Kaczmarek said no that it was his personal opinion.
- DerManuelian said that it should not be on UCSA letterhead. He said that should be clarified.
- Kaczmarek said okay. He said that there are three areas of his letter to read over. He said that it includes his recommendations on the changes to the E-Code.
- Vardner said that he agrees with Kaczmarek's first point that the Daily Bruin is a widely read newspaper. He said that in light of the rising costs of advertising in the Daily Bruin he thought it would be more effective to use a combination of the Daily Bruin and My.UCLA to make announcements.
- Neal said that he is worried that it says that the E-Board could advertise through any medium. He said that that could be anything.
- Vardner said that that is a valid concern.
- Neal said that his recommendation is that it should include both the Daily Bruin and My.UCLA announcements.
- Vardner said that he agrees with Kaczmarek's next point. He said that he would like to leave in a section that gives instructions in the event of a paper ballot. He said that he would have liked to have seen these recommendations earlier. He asked Kaczmarek if he had any suggestions on the wording of the section.
- Kaczmarek said that they could unstrike Section A.2. and add "In the event of a paper ballot..."
- Vardner said that would be fine. He said that his next changes, which Kaczmarek disagreed with, were developed based on Kaczmarek's temporary E-Code changes for the special election during his year as E-Board Chair.
- Kaczmarek said that his intent was to point out that the use of email to campaign may not be appropriate.
- Cohn said that using the campus email system to campaign is not a problem but using a campus computer to campaign is a violation.
- Vardner said that the next point, Article IX Section A.2, was mentioned two weeks ago. He said that his recommendation here is to overturn Council's ability to overrule decisions of the E-Board. He said that the Judicial Board would still be able to overrule E-Board's decisions.
- Pearlman said that it is not uncommon for Council Members to be involved in elections. He said that this is the Judicial Board's job.
- Neal said that he believes this change would be against the rules set forth in the Constitution.
- McLaren said that the only way to change the Constitution is a vote of the entire student body.
- Vardner said that he would withdraw that change.
- Vardner said that Article IX Section B.2 is important. He said that during an election an E-Board decision is time sensitive. He said that in the event that quorum can't be achieved in 24 hours a decision is still necessary. He said that there is currently no quorum in the E-Code. He said that he inserted it.
- LaFlamme asked if the executive committee handles the case and the chair decides on the penalties.
- Vardner said yes.
- Tuttle asked Cohn's opinion.

- Cohn said that he would remove that change. He said that he thinks that Vardner's past experience on the E-Board would make this change seem reasonable. But he said that looking back over all of the years this issue has not really been a problem.
- Vardner said that he stands by his recommendation.
- Neal asked if there could be a straw poll taken on the subject.
- Dahle asked how many Council members were in favor of the original Article IX Section B.2., before the proposed changes were made.
- 8 members were in favor of the original version and 2 were in favor of the changes.
- Vardner said that with regard to the expense limits he has seen a memo from the UC Counsel notifying the UC campuses of recent court rulings on spending caps. He said that the memo is not a directive. He said that it encourages Student Governments to contact their Campus Counsel on the matter. He said that he contacted the UCLA Campus Counsel's Office and that the person he talked with agreed that the changes he was proposing complied with current rulings and constitutionality issues.
- Neal asked if USAC's current E-Code was constitutional.
- Vardner said that it was not. He said that it is unconstitutional to limit a person's personal contribution, or the contribution of their family, to their campaign.
- Neal said that he would like to hold off on this issue. He said that he would like to see this portion of the E-Code tabled.
- Tuttle said that he thought that would be prudent.
- Cohn said that he agrees that more time should be spent on this subject.
- Neal moved and Styczynski seconded to approve the changes to the Election Code as amended at the table, with the exception of Article V Section D.1.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 9 votes in favor, 0 against and 1 abstention.
- Cordero asked when the election calendar would be ready.
- Vardner said that it would hopefully be ready in the next week.
- Harmetz asked if it would include operational changes, such as time blocks on IP addresses.
- Vardner said that that is not a part of the E-Code. He said that it would be discussed either as an announcement or as a part of the final ballot approval.

**\*Resolution in Support of the Lecturers Union (UC-AFT)**

- Cordero moved and Leyco seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of the Lecturers Union.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion.
- Pearlman said that he would like to note that there are perks to working at UCLA.
- There being no further discussion, Council voted to approve the motion with 10 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- Harmetz moved and Cordero seconded to publish the resolution as a half page advertisement in the Daily Bruin on Tuesday, March 4<sup>th</sup>.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion to publish the resolution with 10 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

**\*Resolution to Support the UC Nuclear Free Campaign (Statement of Unity)**

- Michael Cox said that he was there to speak about the UC Nuclear Free Campaign. He said that Nuclear Weapons are a major issue. He said that an effort should be made to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. He said that the Bush administration has removed the US from the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty. He said that we are telling people to do as we say and not as we do. He said that the US must decrease their cash of Nuclear Weapons to be credible. He said that the UC Nuclear Free Campaign believes that we should protect human rights. He said that we must stop the creation of further weapons. He said that since the creation of the Los Alamos Facility the University of California has been in charge of it. He said that the creation of the first nuclear bomb was the result of work by scientists from UC Berkeley. He said that the bombs made there were used to blow up



Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He said that UCLA and the UC system should lead the way in reducing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

-Pearlman said that he would like to deconstruct some of the points in Cox's argument. He said that Bush's withdrawal from the ABM Treaty was a presidential prerogative to withdraw from a treaty that was not ratified by Senate. He said that a treaty must be ratified to become a law. He said that he agrees that the world is proliferating but he said that he thinks that nuclear weapons promote stability in a nuclear world. He said that in many cases when we could have used nuclear weapons we choose not to. He said that the Korean War is one such example. He said that biological weapons, which spread indiscriminately, could be a larger threat than nuclear weapons. He said that he thinks that it is important that the University of California be involved in nuclear research. He said that under the Non-Proliferation Treaty the US and Russia have dismantled more nuclear weapons than expected. He said that the UC should be involved in researching every possible aspect of the world including nuclear energy.

-Neal moved and Lam seconded to approve the Resolution to Support the UC Nuclear Free Campaign.

-Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being no further discussion, Council voted to approve the motion with 9 votes in favor, 1 against and 0 abstentions.

-Harmetz moved and Styczynski seconded to publish the resolution as a half page advertisement in the Daily Bruin on Tuesday, March 4<sup>th</sup>.

-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 called a recess at 10:51.

-Council reconvened at 10:55.

#### X. Officer and Member Reports

##### **President**

-Dahle said that he and GSA President Charles Harless had spent the last weekend reviewing applicants for Student Regent. He said that his office would be tabling at Sproul Hall tomorrow. He said that they would have a petition against any fee increase.

##### **Internal Vice President**

-Cordero said that his office is starting a petition against student fee increases and cuts in outreach. He said that he has started drafting a resolution about BruinGo!.

##### **External Vice President**

-Neal said that the UCSA Students of Color Conference will take place this weekend. He said that anyone who is interested is welcome to attend.

##### **General Representative – Michelle Styczynski**

-Styczynski said that Operation Clean Sweep is coming up on March 2<sup>nd</sup> from 9 am until they're done. She said that they are looking for volunteers. She said that she is co-programming this with Shelley Taylor the president of the North Village Improvement Committee and LaFlamme. She said that she also has a project in the works for Spring Quarter with the Hammer Museum. She said that she is working with the new Communications Director Steffen Boedeker to bring students down to Westwood and to the Hammer Museum.

##### **General Representative – Adam Harmetz**

-Harmetz said that his office is finishing up a report about the Quarter vs Semester debate. He said that it is not comprehensive but that it is a good summary. He said that he encourages Council members to read it and get back to him.

##### **Financial Supports Commissioner**

-LaFlamme said he has been updating his website. He said that it is pretty easy. He said that he would recommend that everyone do it. He said that the Online Housing Database contract has been signed. He said that he had helpful input from the Daily Bruin. He said that he wants to create a campus funding sources workshop. He said that the Book Lending Program is coming up.

#### **Student Welfare Commissioner**

-Leyco said that last weeks blood drive went well. She said that they collected 250 pints of blood. She said that 150 people came out for the bone marrow test this weekend. She said that the Dead Prez concert has been postponed until next quarter.

#### **Campus Events Commissioner**

-Wilson said that Ok Go would be performing in the Plaza with Souls of Mischief on Friday. He said that, Monday at noon, the Juliana Theory would be performing. He said that the name of the comic book convention , IPEX, would be changing next year but they haven't chosen the new name yet. He said that he had sent an email to everyone concerning the actions Campus Events has taken regarding the advertisement that Council discussed before. He said that he demoted the person who created the advertisement to intern level. He said that everything that the person in question produces from now on must go through him to be approved.

#### **Community Service Commissioner**

-Yu said the Education in Action Event was today from 6:00 to 8:30 pm. She said that it dealt with the history of Community Service and how it affects the educational system. She said that there was a Health Fair at the Our Lady of Peace Parish. She said that they had a good turnout and that it was very successful.

#### **Administrative Representative**

-Tuttle said that the South Asian Youth Conference is coming up. He said that students from India, Pakistan and other Southern Asian countries would be present. He said that the hot spots of the world would be finding common ground and that it should be very interesting.

#### **Facilities Commissioner**

-Pearlman said that OSAC would be meeting next Wednesday at 4:45 pm.

### XI. New Business

#### **Discussion of Selection of Next University of California President**

- Kaczmarek said that Student Advisory Committee met on Monday, February 3<sup>rd</sup> to decide on criteria for the selection of the next UC President. He said that the criteria decided on were personal scholarship, understanding of student issues, experience with the UC mission, forward thinking, understanding of the University, effective advocate and effective communicator. He said that he would like to know what Council values the most.
- Harmetz said that he values an understanding of student issues the most.
- Wilson said that he agrees with Harmetz and would also place value on an effective advocate.
- Kaczmarek said that the president is important in deciding academic policy and providing academic guidance.
- Cordero said that he thinks it is also important to have a forward thinker.
- Neal asked what the time line is.
- Kaczmarek said that they want to issue something in the next week. He said that the Regents are in the fact-finding stage. He said that the University of California is the number one research institution in the world. He said that this is an important position. He said that they want to have a person in the position by July or August. He said that they are establishing a list of acceptable candidates.
- Styczynski said that she would like to see an effective communicator in the position.

- Cordero said he wants someone who will take a stance on the issues.
- Kaczmarek asked that Council enter a closed session to discuss possible candidates for the position.
- Pearlman moved and Leyco seconded that Council enter closed session.
- Harmetz made a friendly amendment, which Pearlman accepted, that Amy Lucas, the OCHC representative to USAC, be allowed to stay during the closed session.
- Dahle asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 9 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- Council entered closed session at 11:45 pm.
- Council reconvened at 11:52 pm.

## XI. Announcements

- There were no Announcements this week.

## XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- DerManuelian passed around the Attendance Sheet.

## XIII. Adjournment

- Cordero moved and Lam 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 11:54 pm.

## XIV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,

Stephen Araiza  
USAC Minutes Taker