

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday August 5, 2003
417 Kerckhoff Hall
6:00pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Chen, Chiang, Eastman, Husse-Jerome, Kaczmarek, Lam, Lawson, McKesey, McLaren, Nelson, Palma/Saracho, Tuttle, Wynn

ABSENT: Gaulton, Grace, Kozak, Nguyen, Saldaña, Schreiber

GUESTS: Zara Bukirin, Robert Salonga, Mike Chien, Art Ambrosio, Bob Naples, Janina Montero

- I. A. Call to Order
-McKesey called the meeting to order at 6:23pm.
- B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet
-Chen passed the Attendance Sheet around.
- II. Approval of the Agenda
-Kaczmarek asked that the items under New Business and Old Business be changed to discussion items rather than action items.
-Kaczmarek moved and Lawson seconded to approve the Agenda, as amended.
-McKesey 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
***June 17, 2003**
***July 8, 2003**
***July 22, 2003**
-Kaczmarek said that on page 4 of the July 22nd minutes the section that says "ASUCLA proposed a contingency that included two student fee referenda" should read "ASUCLA proposed a contingency that included one student fee referendum".
-Chen said that at the top of page 2 of July 22nd minutes the reference to a correction for the Sigma Lambda Gamma recommendation should instead refer to the Sigma Pi recommendation. She said that the portion of the minutes that lists the Finance Committee's recommendations should also be changed to reflect that change.
-Chen also said that on page 4 of the July 8th minutes the line that reads "Chen said that she was not able to speak to anyone from Zeta Psi in person" should instead read "Chen said that she was not able to speak to anyone from Panhellenic in person".
-Husse-Jerome moved and Lawson seconded to approve the Minutes from June 17, 2003 as submitted, and to approve the minutes from July 8, 2003 and July 22, 2003 as amended.
Council voted to approve the motion with 6 votes in favor, 0 against, and 0 abstentions.
- IV. Special Presentations
Janina Montero, Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
-Janina Montero introduced herself as the new Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. She said that she just wanted to stop by and say hello. She said that she wants Council to know that she would like to return and meet with them on a regular basis to discuss matters that are important to students.

- Lawson asked Montero how Council could contact her.
- Montero said that she basically has an open door policy. She said that Council Members could contact her secretary and schedule a meeting anytime. She said that at first she may wish to have people who know more about the situations being discussed than she sit in to help with the meetings.
- McKesey thanked Montero for attending the USAC meeting, and said that she would like to meet with Montero in the future.

V. Appointments

- There were no Appointments this week.

VI. Budget Review Committee

- McKesey asked if anyone would like to make a motion to approve the allocations recommended by the BRC so that discussion could begin on the item.
- Palma/Saracho moved and Kaczmarek seconded to approve the Base Budget Allocations, as recommended by the Budget Review Committee.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion.
- Bukirin said that the BRC had a presentation on the Budget Review process. She said that she would first like to speak a little on the background of the process. She said that the Base Budget is meant to fund the day-to-day operations of a group, USAC office, or USAC commission. She said that the BRC this year was composed of Chen, Schreiber, Lam, Nguyen and herself. She said that they made several attempts to help the groups through the process. She said that the due date for the application was extended for a week. She said that the BRC also met early in the process, long before the applications were due, so that they could be certain to make their criteria clear to all the groups that applied.
- Lam said that the BRC worked to inform as many groups as possible of the Base Budget Process. She said that they took out advertisements in the Daily Bruin and notified groups through email that the process was taking place. She said that the effectiveness of these methods of notification was evident in the increase in the number of applicants from 53 proposals last year to 74 proposals this year.
- Chen said that the BRC wanted to ensure that the process was fair and, therefore, set out their priorities as soon as possible. She said that this meant that the groups that applied were aware of the BRC's priorities and could act to meet those priorities.
- Bukirin said that \$233,058.69 was allocated to the offices and groups that met the criteria to receive funding. She then delineated all the steps in the BRC calendar. She said that during Week One of Summer Session A, the BRC set their priorities. She said that applications were then due during Week Three. She said that the Budget Hearings took place during Weeks Four and Five. She said that the BRC held its deliberations during Weeks Five and Six, and that the budget allocations were scheduled to be approved this week, which would be Week Seven. She said that the Base Budget Criteria Questionnaire followed the same basic format as last year. She said that the maximum score that a group could receive was 35 points. She said that the first component of that score was that the group met the minimum criteria set forth by USAC's Constitution and Bylaws. She said that if a group did not meet those minimum criteria, they were not funded. She said that there was then a scale set up for the BRC's priorities. She said that 25 of the 35 points came from satisfying those priorities. She said that the other 10 points were derived from the quality of the group's proposal and hearing. She said that each group hearing was allocated a 20-minute time slot. She said that each group was given 2 minutes to make an introductory statement, which was followed by a 10-minute question and answer session, and then a 1-minute closing statement. She said that if the BRC felt, from their review of the applications, that the group did not meet any of the criteria, they were given an opportunity to explain at the hearing how they felt they met the criteria. She said that when the time came for the BRC to deliberate, each proposal was examined thoroughly. She reiterated that groups that did not seem to meet the minimum criteria were not funded.

She said the BRC had a reason for each group they decided not to fund, and that those reasons were set forth in a document she was handing out to Council at the table. She said that some groups would be better served by applying to other funding sources. She said that only one group, Moochfish, was not an ORSO and therefore could not be funded for that reason. She said that Sigma Lambda Gamma and the Undergraduate Film Organization both failed to meet the established deadlines and were not funded for that reason. She said that the BRC would be sending an email to each group that was not funded, and the email would include a list of other funding sources to look in to. She said that the groups that were funded were then ranked according to the average score they received. She said that the average score was arrived at by adding up the scores given to a group by each member of the BRC and then dividing that number by five. She said that, in cases where a BRC member had some involvement with a particular group, that BRC member recused himself/herself from scoring that group. In such cases, the total score was divided by the number of members that had not recused themselves. She said the BRC then determined that the mean amount given to groups should be \$3,884.00 and that the maximum amount given should be \$6,600.00. She said that they then set the groups in a tier system and decided on ranges of funding for each tier. She said that individual line items were then funded according to the rank of the group. She said that the BRC also set internal caps on the amount that they allocated for each line item, with the maximum being three-fourths of the original cap for each line item. She said that the only cap that was not reduced in this manner was the advertising cap. She said that the BRC reduced the caps because of the number of groups that applied. She said that they tried to assign the money that a group was allocated to that group's top priorities. After that, they moved on and funded non-prioritized line items. She said that they tried to fund the non-prioritized line items as fully as possible but, of course, lent more weight to those items that were prioritized by the groups. She said that the lowest scoring groups were funded according to the line items that they made the strongest argument for.

- Art Ambrosio introduced himself as a member of the Community Service Commission. He said that Schreiber could not attend tonight's meeting but prepared a written statement. He said that the statement had been passed out to Council and expressed Schreiber's confidence in the allocations recommended by the BRC.
- Tuttle asked if any of the groups that received funding were not ORSOs or if any were politically or religiously affiliated.
- Chen said that all of the groups were checked against a list of ORSOs provided by the Center for Student Programming. She said that only one group that applied, Moochfish, was not an ORSO, and that they did not receive funding.
- Lawson asked how much the point system was based on the hearings.
- Bukirin said that 25 points came directly from the proposal, and the hearings only helped in that respect. She said that 7 points came from the quality of the application and 3 points were based directly on the hearings.
- Lam said that each priority was set early so that groups would be aware of them.
- Husse-Jerome asked if the point totals would be available for review.
- Chen said that the totals are at the back of the agenda packet.
- Husse-Jerome said that it is unfortunate that out of 60 groups only 19 scored lower than the Financial Supports Commission.
- Lawson said that when he received the agenda packet, he was shocked that, out of all of the Council Members' Offices, only the two members that ran under the SURE slate scored in the lowest tier funding category among the USAC offices. He said out of the over \$2 million collected in student fees, the offices that students elect were not given priority. He said that he also found it discouraging that USAC offices that already have a high level of support directly from student fees under the referendum, would receive the most funding from the BRC. He cited the fact that the EVP's office would be receiving \$80,000 directly from the BRC. He said that was a large disparity between the funds given amongst the General Representative's offices. He said that he questioned if General Representative 3

turned in his application on time, and in spite of this received over \$1,000 more than the funding that General Representative 1's office received. He said that he understands that the point system is subjective by its very nature, but that he thought the process was unfair to the SURE Council Members. He said that the programs that he put forward in his application were programs that had been endorsed directly by the students in the past election, and that it was unfair that USAC decided that those programs shouldn't be adequately funded. He said that the programs that his office applied for would have altered the kind of programming that has marked USAC programming, in the past, for the better and that it is unfortunate that he would not be able to do so now to the extent that he would like to.

- McKese said she thought that Lawson was drawing conclusions. She asked Lawson if he had any questions for the BRC.
- Lawson asked why his office and the Financial Supports Commissioner's office scored in the fourth tier.
- Chen said that much of Lawson's proposal was for gifts and T-shirts. She said that last year the General Representatives received far less funding.
- Palma/Saracho said that he didn't think it was fair to bring slate politics into this discussion. He said that the independents on the BRC had similar scores to the offices which received low scores.
- Lawson asked if one of the General Representatives was late in submitting their application.
- Bukirin said that the proposal was submitted on time, and the only thing missing were the signatures, so the BRC allowed him to have it signed without penalty.
- Wynn said that the officers are elected to serve all the students, and she thought it was inappropriate to bring political affiliations into this discussion.
- Tuttle asked if the same criteria as last year were used in determining the minimum criteria.
- Chen said that the minimum criteria the BRC used were specifically stated in USAC's Bylaws and that any USAC funding source is required to hold groups it funds accountable to those criteria.
- Tuttle asked how the stimulation of debate, on a group's part, was measured.
- Lam said that that was usually based on what was said in the proposal.
- Bukirin said they wanted to be sure that the stimulation of debate was an important part of the group's function. She said that if this function was not clearly stated in the proposal, then the group was given a chance during their hearing to provide more in-depth information on this point.
- Husse-Jerome said that she did not want in any way to attack the manner in which the BRC funded groups. She said that she was disappointed, nonetheless, that the lower-than-expected allocation would greatly affect her office.
- Lawson said that he agreed that slate affiliation should not play a major role in the budget process. He said that that was his point and that an average student looking at this budget would have to assume that slate affiliation played a major role in the distribution of funds. He said that the budget could easily be perceived in a bias manner. He said that he proposed nontraditional approaches to eliciting student involvement and was disappointed that he received such a small budget, and that there was so little support from the BRC for non-traditional programming by USAC that his office would be putting on.
- Kaczmarek said that there are no recognized slates or political parties on campus. He said he thought that any comment about such slates or political parties should, therefore, be ruled out of order.
- Lawson said he didn't think that the discussion should be limited based on the comfort level of Council Members. He said that if Council were to rule slate discussion out of order, as well as its effects on USAC, Council would have to regulate that no Council Member could wear a T-shirt with his or her party affiliation on it. He said that no one has the power to regulate that.
- Wynn said that she would like to move on to a vote.

- Tuttle advised McKesey to be cautious in ruling comments about slates out of order. He said that a gag order could be a dangerous road to take. He said that the remedy to such comments would be to have another member of Council comment on it, as has been done so far.
- Wynn said that she would like to commend the BRC on the work that they've done.
- McLaren said she would like to give special props to Bukirin for the time and effort she committed to the entire Base Budget Process. She commented further that, even 'though Bukirin wanted to participate in the USAC Retreat, she chose instead to spend that weekend preparing her Base Budget presentation to Council so that it would be clear, concise and thorough.
- McKesey asked if there was any further discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the Base Budget Allocations, as recommended by the Budget Review Committee, with 5 votes in favor, 2 against and 0 abstentions.
- McKesey said she agreed that references made to slates in such discussions were irrelevant, distasteful and out of order. She said that Council appoints the BRC, and Council approves their priorities in advance. She said that she would also like to say that the BRC did an excellent job in preparing the base budgets for this year.

VII. Fund Allocations

*Contingency

- Wynn moved and Kaczmarek seconded to approve funding the Nikkei Student Union in the amount of \$450.00.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion.
- Palma/Saracho asked if this is Summer Contingency or Contingency for the academic year.
- Chen said that Summer Contingency had ended and that the guidelines for the academic year Contingency Fund process are now in effect.
- There being no further discussion, Council voted to approve funding for the Nikkei Student Union with 7 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- Chen said that IFC requested \$3,200 for the same booklet that the Panhellenic Council received funding for last week. She said that since it is the same booklet it may be a questionable allocation. She said that there are also some discrepancies in the numbers IFC provided.
- Lawson moved and Kaczmarek seconded to table any allocation to the Interfraternity Council for the Guide to Greek Life booklet until IFC could be contacted for further information.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion.
- Palma/Saracho asked what the discrepancies in the numbers were.
- Chen said that there were some discrepancies between the figures each group listed for the total cost of the publication. She said that she was also unable to determine if the guide had already been printed.
- Piper said that she spoke with the CSP Advisors for the two groups and was told that the booklet was at the printers, but had not been printed yet.
- Lawson moved and Kaczmarek seconded to call the question.
- McKesey asked if there was any objection to calling the question. There being none Council voted, with 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions, to table any allocation to the Interfraternity Council for the Guide to Greek Life booklet until IFC could be reached for further information.

Nikkei Student Union

Requested: \$606.88

Recommended: \$450.00

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$450.00 for the partial costs of Facilities for the INC Retreat.

Interfraternity Council

Requested: \$3,200.00

Recommended: \$0.00

FiCom made no recommendation for an allocation to the Interfraternity Council for the Guide to Greek Life booklet.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

President

-McKesey said that two important things have happened since Council last met. She said that Council had had its retreat. She said that they got a lot of work done there and made several good plans. She said that she had also attended the 56th annual USSA Student Congress with a 12-person delegation. She said that the major subjects of discussion included the Higher Education Appropriations Act and CRECNO. She said that she was elected the Vice-Chair of the People of African Decent Caucus. She said that UCLA had a very strong delegation. She said that her office has also been planning for Welcome Week.

Internal Vice President

-Palma/Saracho said that he now has an office manager to handle the agenda and other things. He reminded Council that any items in the agenda need to be in to his office by the Thursday before to the meeting. He said that the ARC has had some trouble meeting and may have to appoint a Vice-Chair to preside over meetings that he cannot attend. He said there are still a few positions on the Chancellor's Advisory Commissions to be appointed as well as two CAC appointments and one CS Minifund appointment remaining.

External Vice President

-Kaczmarek said that he has an update on the situation in Burma. He said that Congress has voted to ban the import of goods from Burma. He said that the UC system will experience an additional 5% increase in tuition beyond the other increases made so far this year. He said that Student Initiated Outreach will suffer a 50% budget cut. He said that Students will have to work hard to fight for Student Initiated Outreach. He said that the UC system is also delaying the construction of UC Merced. He said that the USAC Retreat went well. He said that the USSA retreat also went well. He said that 12 delegates attended the retreat including three council members: Lam, McKesey and himself. He said that four members of their delegation were elected to positions on the USSA board. He said that Lana Shamma was elected Chair of the Golden Pacific Region and John Vu was elected Vice-Chair of that same region. He said that McKesey was elected the Vice-Chair of the People of African Decent Caucus and that he was elected Chair of the State and System Student Association Coalition. He said that that position will place him on the executive board. He said that USSA plans to work on the Higher Education Reauthorization. He said that immigrant rights will also be a major issue. He said that the Get Out and Vote campaign will also be stressed. He said that they want to press that campaign for the 2004 election cycle.

-Lawson asked what kind of resources USSA could offer UCLA for the Get Out and Vote campaign.

-Kaczmarek said that they would provide voters guides and other materials for the campaign. He said that they would also provide other assistance as needed.

IX. Old Business

ASUCLA – Strategic Union Initiative

-Kaczmarek said that it has been agreed that a Committee will be formed to discuss the initiative. He said that he is working on a resolution to address USAC's concerns. He said that they will invite GSA to do the same. He said that this is just more of an announcement for now and that's why he removed it as an action item.

-McKesey said that the resolution would be in the Agenda of the next meeting. He said that the next meeting of the Strategic Union Initiative Committee will be on the 22nd which is after the next meeting.

- Tuttle asked if anyone had checked to see if such a Committee would be in violation of the open meeting act.
- Eastman said that it does not seem that there is any intention to make this Committee meeting a closed meeting. She said that that should make most, if not all, legal concerns moot.

X. New Business

2003-2004 Academic Year Priorities

- Kaczmarek said that he will have a formalized list of the priorities ready for the next meeting.

XI. Announcements

- Eastman said that ASUCLA is going to begin making energy conservation efforts once again. She said that the cost of energy is increasing, especially at UCLA, where energy is produced using natural gas. She asked that Council members try to limit the use of their air conditioners. She said that she would keep Council aware of the energy situation.

XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Chen passed around the Attendance Sheet.

XIII. Adjournment

- Chiang moved and Lawson seconded to adjourn the meeting. There being no objection, the motion was approved with 7 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions and the meeting was adjourned at 7:54 pm.

XIV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,

Stephen Araiza
USAC Minutes Taker