

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

Tuesday August 26, 2003  
417 Kerckhoff Hall  
6:00pm

MINUTES

PRESENT: Chen, Gaulton, Kaczmarek, Kozak, Lam, Lawson, McKesey, McLaren, Nelson, Palma/Saracho, Tuttle, Wynn

ABSENT: Chiang, Husse-Jerome, Eastman, Grace, Nguyen, Saldaña, Schreiber,

GUESTS: Ben Bergstrom, Janina Montero, Vice Chancellor Student Affairs, Brian Neesby, Robert Salonga, Daily Bruin

I. A. Call to Order  
-McKesey called the meeting to order at 6:08pm.

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

II. Approval of the Agenda  
-Kozak and Lawson asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.  
-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.

II. Approval of the Minutes  
Kaczmarek moved, and Kozak seconded, to approve the August 5, 2003 minutes.

Lawson said that he had several edits to make to the minutes. After distributing to all Council Members a copy of his proposed amendments, he began to make a verbal presentation and explanation of why he felt his edits should be incorporated into the August 5 Minutes. McKesey said that, since the proposed changes were rather lengthy, and the USAC Minutes Taker was not at this meeting, she thought it might be better to discuss the matter when the Minutes Taker would be available to check his notes.

In light of McKesey's suggestion, Kaczmarek moved, and Kozak seconded, to table the August 5, 2003 Minutes to the next Council meeting. There being no further discussion, the motion to table was approved with 4 votes in favor 1 opposed and 1 abstention.

IV. Special Presentations  
There was no special presentation at this meeting.

V. Appointments

Palma-Saracho said that the ARC met on August 15, 2003 to interview nominees for three committees. He said they unanimously recommended the appointment of Maricela Meza for the Regular position on the Community Activities Committee (CAC), Mariam Jukaku for the Community

Service Mini Fund Committee, and Michael Cox for the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Religion, Ethics and Values, and agreed that all three nominees were highly qualified.

Palma-Saracho moved, and Lam seconded, to approve the appointment of Maricela Meza as a Regular member on the Community Activities Committee. The motion was approved by a vote of 7 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

- Nelson asked when the ARC would be able to appoint the Alternate member to the CAC.
- Palma-Saracho replied that he hoped to have that done by the following Friday.

Palma-Saracho moved, and Lawson seconded, to approve the appointment of Mariam Jukaku for the Community Service Mini Fund Committee. The motion was approved by a vote of 7 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

Palma-Saracho moved, and Kozak seconded, to approve the appointment of Michael Cox for the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Religion, Ethics and Values.

Lawson asked why Cox was chosen for this committee.

Kaczmarek said Cox was chosen because of information the ARC obtained during the interview about Cox's awareness of ethical issues. Specifically, he said that Cox had attempted to put together a Student Initiated class on ethical issues.

There being no further questions, the motion to approve Michael Cox was approved by a vote of 7 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

Palma/Saracho apologized for the delay in completing the appointments process. He said there had been some problems in scheduling interviews when both the ARC members and the nominees were available to meet.

#### VI. Budget Review Committee

- Bukirin reported that two appeals of the Base Budget process had been submitted to USAC and that Palma/Saracho has them. Bukirin also reported that McKesey would be bringing to Council her nominees for the open positions on the USA/BOD Programming Fund Committee.

#### VII. Fund Allocations

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

- Chen said she had forgotten to put the date on the Contingency Requests that were before Council at tonight's meeting. She stated that, of the six requests, FiCom did not approve any funding to the Interfraternity Council because it would have been retroactive funding which is prohibited under the Contingency Fund Guidelines. She said further that, under her discretionary authority, she had approved an allocation of \$200 to the Raza Youth Empowerment Project for graphics and honorarium.
- Kozak moved, and Wynn seconded, to approve the recommended allocation of \$450 to Hanoolim for Facilities for their member training.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Lam moved, and Lawson seconded, to approve the recommended allocation of \$90 to Bruin Partners for supplies.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Lam moved, and Palma/Saracho seconded, to approve the recommended allocation of \$450 to CSC PREP for Facilities for the PREP Retreat.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Kozak moved, and Wynn seconded, to approve the recommended allocation of \$650 to Tinig for Programming for their Festival of Philippine Arts and Culture.

-McKesey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

**Interfraternity Council**

**Requested: \$2000**

**Recommended: \$0**

FiCom recommended no allocation because it would have constituted retroactive funding which is prohibited by the Contingency Fund Guidelines.

**Hanoolim**

**Requested: \$554.20**

**Recommended: \$450.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$450 for facilities for the Member Training to be held on August 29 – 31, 2003.

**Bruin Partners**

**Requested: \$119.00**

**Recommended: \$90.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$90.00 for the cost of supplies.

**CSC PREP**

**Requested: \$450.00**

**Recommended: \$450.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$450 for the full cost of facilities for the PREP Retreat to be held on September 8 to 10, 2003.

**Tinig**

**Requested: \$923.18**

**Recommended: \$650.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$650.00 for programming for the Festival of Philippine Arts & Culture to be held on September 6 -7, 2003.

**Raza Youth Empowerment Project**

**Requested: \$200.00**

**Recommended: \$200.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$50.00 for graphics and \$150.00 for honorarium for the Youth Empowerment Workshop to be held on August 16<sup>th</sup>.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

**President**

- McKesey said she had a number of important matters to report to Council. First off, she said that Governor Davis had held a press conference and issued a press release which said that, in addition to the recent increase in student fees of 35%, there might be another 5% increase. She said that she, Palma/Saracho, and Kaczmarek had spoken with many members of the press to express their concerns about further increases, and that the Orange County Register had included their statements in the article they ran on the subject.
- McKesey said that they were setting up a Leadership Subcommittee for internship training, and wanted to be sure that the views of all student leaders were represented. She said that Lam would be serving as her proxy, and would be playing a major role on the committee throughout the year.
- She reported that the UCLA Community Resource Center had sent a letter to UCOP dated August 7 demanding that outreach centers be established in minority communities. She said that,

under the CERC Initiative, ASU has been operating an outreach program in Inglewood, but their 3-year contract has expired. She said that UCLA Administrators have expressed their support of the program. She said that a letter had been sent to Vice Chancellor Franklin Gilliam and to Aimee Dorr requesting a meeting with Gilliam, but the earliest date he was available was September 12. She said that UC President Atkinson has gone to press conferences throughout the state highlighting UCLA's outreach efforts, but UCLA can't get a meeting with VC Gilliam. Nelson asked when the initial request for a meeting was made to VC Gilliam. McKesey replied that it was about a month ago. She said, at that time, VC Gilliam was on vacation, and they got the run-around. Then the facilitator was tied up, so they couldn't meet. Finally, a meeting was set for September 12, but Aimee Dorr couldn't be available then, and would not be available until after Fall Quarter classes begin. She said they were told that VC Gilliam wanted Aimee Dorr to be at the meeting.

- McKesey announced updated office hours, and said that someone from her office staff would be available from 9:00am – 3:00pm every day, beginning almost immediately. She said that lots of things will be sent out via email in regard to Council's Priorities.

#### **Internal Vice President**

- Palma/Saracho said that, with the budget cuts, SIOC is experiencing serious cuts in funding for their site visits. As a result, they will outreach to other sources for assistance such as 10<sup>th</sup> District Councilman Mark Ludlow's office.
- Regarding Proposition 54, he announced that he would be attending a press conference at 9:00am, Friday, August 29, at Martin Luther King, Jr. Hospital. He said that Assemblyman Herb Wesson would be announcing his opposition to Prop 54. He said he tried to get them to move the press conference to UCLA, but it was too late to change the location. He said there would probably be one on-campus later in the year. He said that a Prop 54 event will be held the week of September in the conference room of MALDEF, and that he would keep Council updated when he received further details.
- Nelson commented that a professor at UC Berkeley has done research on right-wing conservatives and one thing he determined was that these are people who dislike change. Also, they seem to think that, if there's imbalance, people will think that's OK. So, the belief that inequality is fine is one of the things that's driving Prop 54 proponents.

#### **External Vice President**

- Kaczmarek reported that he had not yet received a response from Chancellor Carnesale to his request that the Chancellor send a campus-wide email on voter registration. He said he would send a follow-up email, and would keep Council posted.
- He reported that, last week, he had participated in the UC Student Congress, sponsored by UCSA, and that there were 100-150 attendees. He said they discussed organizing for the Proposition 54 campaign, and other issues that will affect students in the coming year. He said he was elected Chairperson of UCSA, which is kind of like being student body President of all the Universities in the UC system. He said it was a big challenge and he was very excited about being chosen for this office. He said the Assembly and the Senate had a joint meeting about Proposition 54.
- He said that, on the coming weekend, there will be a statewide Affirmative Action Coalition meeting to plan their actions on Proposition 54.
- He said that he, McKesey and Palma/Saracho had attended the Governor's press conference, and nearly got kicked out. He said that the three of them had met with Vice Chancellor Montero last week.
- He reported that he, Palma/Saracho and Lam were part of the Voter Registration Coalition.
- He said he's in training with ORL now for the new role he will fill with them for the coming year.
- With regard to voter registration, Tuttle asked if everyone at the Council table was on board to conduct a thorough and effective campaign to register UCLA students. He pointed out that, with the registration deadline fast approaching, they would have to plan very carefully. He suggested that they check with the County Registrar's Office on the best

way to turn in all the completed registration forms. He recommended that someone should assume the responsibility for personally delivering all the completed forms to the Registrar's Office and getting them certified that they met the deadline. Without doing this, he said there's no way to be certain that they arrived in time. He asked who was in charge of the registration effort, and suggested they someone should be specifically designated to get the forms in on time.

-Palma/Saracho asked Tuttle if he would like to participate in their meetings. When Tuttle replied that he would, Palma/Saracho said he would notify him of the meetings.

#### **Academic Affairs Commissioner**

-Kozak presented several updates on her commission's projects. She reported that, as the Academic Affairs Commissioner, she sits on the Campus Retention Committee and the Student Initiated Outreach Committee. She said they will be focusing their efforts this year on the Minimum Progress Requirement and its impact on students. She said they are planning to make an educational presentation to USAC soon.

-She said that SIOC took a 50% cut in its budget, and their priority is to get enough money to ensure that their projects can be maintained effectively.

-She said there will be a class next Quarter regarding alternative admissions for next year.

-She said that the Diversity Requirement campaign is coming along.

#### **General Representative 1**

-Lawson introduced his Chief of Staff, Brian Neesby.

-He said he's working on a brochure which they could distribute during Welcome Week. He said he's gotten some good prices, and that they can get a full color brochure, on glossy stock, for two cents each. He said he needs a statement formal statement from every elected Council Member of about 100 words each. He said he also needs a picture from everyone, and that he needs to get it rolling asap, or it won't be ready in time for Welcome Week. Finally, he said he would like to include the list of USAC's priorities for the coming year.

-In response to Chen's question about what funding source was going to pay for the brochure, Lawson said it would probably be the Contingency Fund.

-Palma/Saracho told Lawson he could help him with the brochure, and that he had been tinkering with the brochures from prior Councils. He said he had copies of some old USAC brochures that McLaren had given to him.

-Lawson welcomed Palma/Saracho's offer of assistance.

-Chen asked Lawson what he wanted in the bio ... specifically, did he want it to be about the role their office plays.

-Lawson replied that it should be more about the individual ... such things as their vision and their goals for the coming year.

#### **Administrative Representative – Dr. Berky Nelson**

-Nelson said, as you probably know, the foreign students are severely screened to get into UCLA. As a result, he said the United States is getting a black eye because of what its government is doing. He said he would like the incoming international students to meet all the USAC members because he believed it would counteract the negative image the United States government is causing. He said that, by extending the hand of welcome, USAC members could establish life-long friendships, and could be excellent ambassadors.

#### **Administrative Alternate - Dr. Rick Tuttle**

-Tuttle said he plans to ask USAC and GSA to add a rep on their board from each group.

-Tuttle handed out copies of the current newsletter of the International Students. He called Council Members attention to the picture of the front of the newsletter of Dr. Berky Nelson and Dr. Joan Nelson, who he said personify the Ambassadors Program at UCLA

which provides host families for international students. He said that USAC was welcome to participate in the upcoming events of that program.

IX. Subcommittee Reports – Connectivity Committee

- Wynn referenced an item in the agenda packet which was an email exchange she had with Susan Swarts at ORL. She then handed out a copy of an email which contained updated information regarding a presentation USAC would be making at an ORL Training session on September 9<sup>th</sup>. She said ORL's schedule has been roughly laid out, but is not yet set in stone. She said that the time slot of 11:00am on the first day of training - September 9<sup>th</sup> – would provide a great opportunity for Council members to introduce themselves to ORL student staff, and to tell them about USAC's role on campus.
- Kaczmarek echoed Wynn's statement that this would be a great opportunity for USAC, and that there would be 350 focused, intense people at the training session.
- McKesey asked if everyone could make it at that time.
- Kozak said that she couldn't be there.
- McKesey asked the subcommittee members to prepare a list of suggestions for Council's presentation.
- Chen asked if the presentation was still scheduled to be held in Rieber Hall.
- Kaczmarek said that it would be held in the Northwest Campus Auditorium.
- Lawson said that if Council members wanted the USAC brochure to be done by the 9<sup>th</sup>, they would have to get their photos and their bios to him.
- Wynn asked if there were any additions to the agenda for the presentation that she had sent them by email.
- Chen asked if the Connectivity Committee members were making the presentation, or if they were just handling arrangements for the date and time.
- Wynn said she thought that Council as a whole should decide how to carry out the specifics of the presentation.
- Lawson asked if Council was at a place where that could be done right now, at tonight's meeting, or should the subcommittee decide.
- Wynn said she needs details to give to Susan Swarts at ORL.
- McKesey suggested that the Subcommittee designate people to be responsible for certain parts of the agenda, and then asked Council is that was cool with everyone.
- Tuttle concurred with Kaczmarek and Wynn that Council should come up with something great because this is a terrific opportunity for them to get information about USAC to a very large group of student leaders who will have contact with an even larger block of students who live in the Res Halls. He said the President and the Committee members might want to rehearse their presentation, or do a "walk-through" of it.
- Wynn said that was why she wanted Council to give lots of input and support.
- Tuttle said he thought that what she had done so far was terrific.
- Palma/Saracho said if they just had 30 minutes, instead of an hour, they might need to do a Power Point presentation.
- Chen said that she and Lam had worked up a presentation to make to APC about USAC, but they were never able to give it.
- McKesey asked if Chen and Lam could develop that idea and use it for the presentation to ORL. Chen and Lam replied that they could, and that they would.
- Kaczmarek asked if the Subcommittee could bring an outline of an agenda to next week's meeting.
- Wynn replied that they would do that.

X. Old Business

**\*Approval of 2003-2004 USAC Council Priorities**

- Kozak stated that, at their retreat, USAC came up with four priorities for the year: (1) Passage of a student-initiated Mandatory Diversity Requirement; (2) Repeal of the new Minimum Progress Requirement; (3) Defeat of Proposition 54 (CRECNO); and (4) To freeze student fees.

Kozak moved, and Lam seconded, to approve the four priorities for the coming year that USAC developed at their retreat.

- McKesey asked if there was any discussion of the motion.
  - Lawson said he approved of the priorities for the year, but said he thought that the Diversity Requirement statement should be expanded to include religious and cultural groups.
  - Palma/Saracho said that USAC's agenda for the year was to focus immediate attention on defeating Proposition 54.
  - McKesey encouraged anyone who had concerns about the Diversity Requirement to participate in Kozak's committee which was studying that issue.
  - Tuttle asked if there was a benchmark time for determining how Council is doing on their priorities for the year. He said he certainly encouraged them to set one if that hasn't already been done.
  - McKesey said the three Executive Officers, she, Palma/Saracho, and Kaczmarek, had taken responsibility for having Council meet the priorities they had set.
- There being no further discussion, Council voted to approve the motion with 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

**\*Approval of Summary Resolution Regarding the ASUCLA Student Union Strategic Initiative**

- McKesey introduced the agenda item by saying that the student officers who wrote this response to the ASUCLA Student Union Strategic Initiative were hoping that it would result in members of the ASUCLA Board of Directors reaching out to meet with USA and GSA leaders to address their concerns.
- Kaczmarek said that, as a starting point, they had come up with 16 recommendations as a proactive step towards a productive discussion with ASUCLA Board members. He said they thought this would lead to a more efficient use of everyone's time.
- Palma/Saracho said they were hoping this report would result in feed-back from ASUCLA and others. He said he hoped that all the Council members had taken time to read the response.
- Lawson replied that he had read it extensively and had also met with Jerry Mann for about an hour to get some historical background on the matter. Lawson said he thought that a lot of the concerns were valid, but he was concerned about using this approach. He said he wanted to use the strongest bargaining chips. He said he saw how USAC could feel that ASUCLA was circumventing them, but he wasn't sure that the response they were considering would produce the results they want. He said he believed that the document might have the effect they're seeking, but didn't think it would help in a bargaining process. He said he thought it was important to note that several of the programs included in the SUSI had been proposed and developed by undergraduate appointees to the BOD. He said he didn't think this step should be taken prior to meeting with members of the BOD because he thought it was a polarizing action. He concluded by saying that he agreed with every statement in the report, but would prefer to table it and then hold the report over the heads of the BOD. He said he thought USAC would have more bargaining power if they handled it that way.
- McKesey said she was very concerned that USAC had not had input into the Student Union Strategic Initiative last year. She said that ASUCLA was created by students to serve students, and she thought it was inappropriate for ASUCLA to allocate its resources such things as hiring more staff.
- Palma/Saracho reiterated the concern that there had been a lack of student input other than from the students on the Board of Directors. He said that members of this year's Council were prepared to present suggestions and recommendations to the BOD regarding SUSI.
- Lawson said he had spoken with one student Board member who told him that the BOD was not planning to proceed with the referendum they had been considering.
- Kaczmarek said this was the first time he had heard that the BOD was planning to take the fee increase off the table.
- Palma/Saracho asked if the referendum had been tabled because of other fiscal issues.
- Kaczmarek said he thought that the BOD was overstepping its bounds by planning to get more involved in programming events, and that they were intruding on a role that is already being handled very well by UCLA students. Regarding the critique of SUSI, and the 16 recommendations he, McKesey and Palma/Saracho had developed, Kaczmarek said that they wanted to present some fresh ideas for Council's consideration.

Wynn moved, and Lam seconded, to approve the Resolution Regarding the Student Union Strategic Initiative.

- McKesey asked if there was any further discussion on the matter.
- Palma/Saracho said that the spirit of the proposed response to the 2002 ASUCLA Student Union Strategic Initiative was to open negotiations on the matter. He said he felt it was Council's job and responsibility as elected student body leaders to take a stance on such issues. He said he felt the step they were proposing tonight was crucial before anything could move forward that would be in the students' interest.

Wynn called the question.

- McKesey asked is there was any objection to calling the question.
- Lawson objected to the calling of the question. He said that, from a student's perspective, he agreed with what the document proposes, but is still concerned that the timing of it is premature.
- McKesey said that one of the reasons they developed this document was so there wouldn't be a situation of USAC vs. ASUCLA. She said she felt they had made it quite clear that they wanted this proposal to lead to open negotiations between USAC and the ASUCLA BOD. She said their primary goal was to ensure that the interests of all students were represented. She said they also wanted to prevent any fee increase referenda from being placed on the ballot.
- Tuttle raised a Point of Information. He said he didn't quite understand something that appeared in the last clause of the proposed Resolution. Specifically, he asked what the word "reconsider" meant in the clause which read, "Be it further resolved that the Undergraduate Students Association will reconsider support of the Student Union Strategic Initiative pending official adoption or incorporation of the proposed recommendations by the ASUCLA Board of Directors."
- McKesey said it meant that, at a later date, USAC would consider support of the Student Union Strategic Initiative.

There being no further discussion, Council voted to approve the Summary Resolution Regarding the Student Union Strategic Initiative by a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

X. New Business

**\*Approval of USAC Ad Hoc Committees**

- Wynn said she would like to move this item to next week's meeting. There being no objection, Council agreed to consider the item the following week.

**\*Approval of 2003 Welcome Week Calendar**

- Lam said that the Welcome Week calendar incorporates everything Council members discussed at their Retreat, but there might be some changes. She also said that some of the events were still tentative. (A copy of the calendar is included in the agenda packet).

Lam moved, and Kaczmarek seconded, to approve the Welcome Week Calendar.

- McKesey asked if there were any comments or questions.
- Wynn said that the CAC Spoken Wordfest event listed for September 25 should be removed from the calendar.
- Gaulton said to remove the Pep Rally from the calendar listed for September 24 because the Athletic Department decided not to participate in this Welcome Week event.
- Nelson asked Gault who he had spoken with in the Athletic Department, to which Gault replied that it was Ken Weiner.
- McKesey asked if there were any further comments or questions before moving to a vote.
- Palma/Saracho asked about the Sunday evening concert.
- Gaulton replied (with a smile) that everything was in place, except the artist. He explained that a number of artists had turned them down, some were unavailable, and some wanted too much money. Plus, he said there were a lot of big festivals on that date at other locations where many of the groups they might have invited were already booked. He said he thought that, no matter who performs, the concert will be a success.
- Wynn said not to worry because there were still some open negotiations. She said they would keep Council updated.

There being no further questions, Council voted to approve the Welcome Week Calendar with 7 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.



**\*Approval of Summary Resolution Regarding USAC Presidential Appointee Accountability Guidelines**

-McKesey introduced the Resolution by saying that she wanted to have a formal document which would ensure regular communication between USAC and its appointees, and accountability of the appointees to their responsibilities.

Wynn moved, and Kaczmarek seconded, approval of the Summary Resolution Regarding USAC Presidential Appointee Accountability Guidelines.

-Lawson said he wasn't sure that Council had the authority to enact these proposed guidelines unless it was

done through amending the USAC Bylaws. He said further that he considered this to be an Ex Post Facto action because, when ARC interviewed nominees, they asked them if they could meet the stated requirements that were in place for the committee they were being appointed to at the time they were interviewed. He said that everyone who has already been appointed would be subject to review and possible removal from their appointed position based on rules that they didn't know about when they were interviewed. Lawson also said he didn't think that the Communications Board appointees should be included in these requirements because they are supposed to be independent. He also said he felt that the Judicial Board members should not be subjected to these guidelines. He said he thought the required number of presentations per Quarter was unrealistic, and that it would be better to have appointees provide written reports to Council rather than having to attend a specified number of meetings to make oral presentations. He said he was in favor of accountability, but suggested that the document be amended so that it would apply only to those students who were appointed after the resolution was approved. He said he thought it would be unfair and unjust to do it any other way.

-Nelson said he understood the genesis of the document on accountability, but he had a concern about the additional time commitment this would place not only on the student appointees, but on all student Council members, as well. He said that the primary reason students attend UCLA is to get an education. He said he felt that the requirements of these proposed guidelines would take a lot of time away from the time they all need for studying. He said he was also concerned that many very good students might not apply for appointed positions because there would be too many time commitments they would have to meet.

-Chen said that, as an appointee, she thought the guidelines were a very good idea because they would provide an opportunity for the appointees to meet with Council. She pointed out that most appointees don't have the opportunity to meet with Council on a regular basis as she has. She said she thought the guidelines were fine as they were presented.

-A suggestion was made that Council might consider lowering the number of meetings each appointee were required to attend.

-Lawson offered a friendly amendment to lower the number of meetings the Board Members would be required to attend from 6 meetings to 4 meetings. Wynn accepted the friendly amendment.

-Tuttle expressed concern about the time requirements. He said these requirements would add materially to the length of the USAC meetings which would impact on each Council member's time. He said, "Time is the coin of the realm." He cautioned them about requiring Comm Board appointees to be held to these guidelines, and asked them to think about how such requirements might appear in the student media, and how Comm Board members would feel about it.

-Kozak suggested the possibility of tabling the item so they could take the various suggestions into consideration. She said she was just throwing the idea out there as a possibility.

-Lawson offered another "friendly amendment" to remove the Judicial Board appointees and the Communications Board appointees from the document. Wynn declined to accept Lawson's "friendly amendment."

-With regard to the Communications Board members, Kaczmarek said they do not set policy, but are representatives of the two student governments. He said he thought it was a good idea for them to make reports to Council, and said that this should not imply that USAC was controlling them. He reminded Council that this item was on the agenda for last week's meeting at which Council did not

make quorum, but no one had brought any concerns to them until tonight. He said he felt these ideas could have been brought up prior to tonight's meeting.

-Lawson said this was the first time there was an opportunity to discuss the issues. Regarding the Communications Board, Lawson said that, because Comm Board members have a say in who is selected for various student media positions, such as Editors, Assistant Editors, etc., it was his opinion that they should not be included in the accountability guidelines that are being proposed.

-Stating that he wanted to get more input from the students who would be affected by these guidelines, Lawson moved to table them until the next meeting. Gault seconded the motion to table.

-Tuttle pointed out that the vote they were about to take was on whether to table the proposed Accountability Guidelines to a time certain.

-McKesey asked if there was any discussion on the motion to table. There being none, the motion to table was defeated by a vote of 3 in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 absentions.

-Addressing Kaczmarek's comment regarding court decisions that had been rendered concerning "no prior restraint" for college newspapers, Tuttle said that if publishers must come before the appointing authority with the possibility of being removed from office, it could be undue prior restraint which would take USAC down a slippery slope. He suggested that Council take time to consult with their appointees about this and other issues. He also reiterated his concern about the amount of time both the appointees and the Council members would have to commit to satisfy the proposed accountability guidelines.

-Palma/Saracho said he disagreed with the statements regarding removal of the Judicial Board and the Communications Board appointees from the guideline requirements. He said one of the reasons he felt so strongly about implementing the proposed accountability guidelines was because, during his first year on the Student Fee Advisory Committee, he had never been invited by USAC to report to them on budget issues that were before SFAC. Palma/Saracho went on to recommend that Council amend the criteria for removal from office to Items 1 through 4, eliminating Items 5 through 7.

-Kozak said she was concerned about the amount of time all the presentations would take. She said that if 24 committees were required to make a presentation each Quarter, that would average out to 2 presentations per meeting.

-Lawson pointed out that they had not amended the document to have Committees making presentations rather than individual appointees. He then calculated that, with approximately 70 appointees, there would be 5-6 presentations per meeting.

-Tuttle read the sections in the USAC Constitution and Bylaws which set forth the minimum requirements for removing appointees. He said that, for all appointees except Judicial Board members, the minimum required affirmative vote for removal is 2/3 of the voting members. For Judicial Board appointees, the minimum required affirmative vote for removal is 3/4 of the voting members of Council.

-Wynn said that, with all of the changes that had been made and discussed at the table, she would like to see a clean copy of the document before voting on it.

-Wynn withdrew her motion to approve the proposed Accountability Guidelines.

-Wynn then moved, and Lawson seconded, to table the Accountability Guidelines agenda item to USAC's next meeting, September 2, so that they could see the revised proposal. There being no further comments or questions, Council approved the motion to table with 6 votes in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

#### XI. Announcements

There were no announcements at this meeting.

#### XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Chen passed around the Attendance Sheet.

#### XIII. Adjournment

-Lawson moved, and Wynn seconded, to adjourn the meeting. There being no objection to consent, the motion was approved and the meeting was adjourned at 8:52pm.

#### XIV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully submitted,

FINAL

APPROVED: October 21, 2003

Patricia A. McLaren