

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday March 16, 2004
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00pm

MINUTES

- PRESENT: Ambrosio, Chen, Chiang, Gaulton, Kozak, Lam, Lawson, McKesey, McLaren, Nelson, Nguyen, Palma/Saracho, Schreiber, Tuttle, Wynn
- ABSENT: Grace, Husse-Jerome, Kaczmarek, Williams
- GUESTS: Janina Montero, Lisa Raigosa, Crystal Lee, Paul Marian, Roy Samaan, Mikhail Tran, Aaron Young, Caroline Diaz, Kathy Tomlinian, Sarah Tin, Sara Taylor, Kian Bolori
- I. A. Call to Order
-McKesey called the meeting to order at 7:10pm.
- B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet
-Chen passed the Attendance Sheet around.
- II. Approval of the Agenda
-Palma/Saracho asked that an action item be added to Fund Allocations regarding Appeals for the UASF CS Mini Fund.
-Kozak, McLaren and Ambrosio asked to be added to the Officers and Members Reports.
-Kozak asked to add to New Business a Resolution in Support of the Diversity Requirement.
-Schreiber moved and Ambrosio seconded to approve the Agenda, as amended.
-McKesey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the Agenda, as amended, with 9 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- III. Approval of the Minutes
***January 13, 2004**
-Schreiber said that, on Page 4, the Community Service Commissioner is referred to as "she" instead of "he".
-Husse-Jerome moved and Palma/Saracho seconded to approve the Minutes of January 13, 2004, as amended. Council voted to approve the motion with 8 votes in favor, 0 against, and 1 abstention.
- *January 27, 2004**
-Schreiber moved and Kozak seconded to approve the Minutes of January 27, 2004, as submitted. Council voted to approve the motion with 8 votes in favor, 0 against, and 1 abstention.
- IV. Special Presentations
Election Calendar
-Samaan pointed out that this version of the Election Calendar had a couple of things that are different from prior years. Specifically, he said that the voting hours have been restricted to focus voting on the campus. He said that there are still some details left to work out.
-Lawson said that last year's elections didn't have a similar time restriction on voting. He said that, to his recollection, a great deal of voting was done after midnight.
-Samaan said that the E-board will publish a Voters' Guide to educate the voters. He said these restrictions are designed to have more voting done on campus where it's more difficult to tamper with the votes.

- Lawson said that, when he is on campus, he doesn't normally use My.UCLA. He said he felt that most students use My.UCLA when they are at home.
- Palma/Saracho asked if the election was held for three days last year.
- Samaan said that that is proscribed by the Election Code.

Student Welfare Office Space Issue

- Chiang announced that members of the SWC staff would be making a presentation to Council concerning SWC's need for more office space to conduct their numerous projects. A large contingent of the SWC staff then proceeded to perform a rap song entitled "It's Gettin' Tight in Here!" When the presentation was over, Chiang made a presentation which detailed why SWC needed more space. She said that a large number of people come to the SWC office on a daily basis to work on their projects. She said that, in 1986 SWC had 6 committees which put on 7 to 8 events. She said that SWC now has 13 committees that put on 30 events. She said they currently have more than 100 staff members. She said that SWC's office space has stayed the same since 1986. She said their commission continues to grow every year, and they need more space to work on their programs. She said that they have been exploring the possibility of switching offices with the General Representatives, and that she has been working on this with Tutram Nguyen in Nguyen's capacity as Chairperson of the Office Space Allocation Committee. She said that nothing has been decided yet, and that she was presenting this information so that Council would be aware of what is happening.

Hunger Clean-Up

- Sarah Tin said that the Hunger Project is working with CalPIRG on Hunger Clean-Up Day which is a one-day event that raises money for Habitat for Humanity in an effort to alleviate the problems of the homeless. She said that they provide meals, clean shelters and do other things of this nature.
- Schreiber said that they need help in publicizing this event, and that he was hoping that some of the other USAC offices could help fund publicity.

Facilities Commission Website

- Mikhail Tran said that the Facilities Commission website is an ongoing project. He said that it is used to inform people about the Facilities Commission. He said that the goals of the Facilities Commission with this website are to promote awareness of the USAC Facilities Commission, to provide for student interaction and to inform students about the projects and goals of the Facilities Commission. He said that this website can also be used to provide technological capabilities to other offices. He said that the page has an attractive design and it constantly updates. He said that it is informative and fun, and that it is easy to place feedback on the site. He said that the site is flexible and expandable. He said that there is a transportation information page about various modes of transportation to and from campus, a page which informs people about on-campus areas that are undergoing construction, a page which lists places to study, and a safety information page.
- Lam asked how the website is being publicized.
- Nguyen said that they are trying to put a notice on My.UCLA about it.

V. Appointments

- There were no Appointments this week.

VI. Fund Allocations

***Contingency**

- Chen said that she was presenting a total of four allocations to Council.
- Palma/Saracho moved and Schreiber seconded to approve the Fund Allocations.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 8 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

UCLA Interfraternity Council**Requested: \$4,059.73****Recommended: \$1,610.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$1,610.00 for the full cost of Registration for the Western Regional Greek Conference to be held April 1 - 4.

CSC/Vietnamese Language and Culture**Requested: \$900.00****Recommended: \$450.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$450.00 for the partial cost of Facilities for the VNLC Spring Retreat to be held March 26 - 28

Office of the External Vice President**Requested: \$14,275.25****Recommended: \$ 4,056.50**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$4,056.50 for the cost of Facilities for the United States Student Association Legislative Conference to be held March 26 - 30.

Project Bruin Hope**Requested: \$3,524.89****Recommended: \$ 960.00**

FiCom recommended the allocation of \$960.00 for the full cost of Facilities for the Spring Break Helping Underprivileged Children in Tijuana to be held April 1 - 4.

***Appeals Regarding UASF CS Mini Fund Allocations**

- Palma/Saracho said that there are two appeals concerning the CS Mini Fund Committee for Council to consider tonight. He said that one is from the Soze Project and the other is from Bruin HOPE. He said that no representative from the Soze Project has shown up yet, so Council would hear from Bruin HOPE first.
- Aaron Young, of Bruin HOPE, said that several groups, including theirs, were denied a hearing by the CS Mini Fund Committee because they were told that their application was not turned in to the correct location. He said that they had placed their application into the folder labeled CS Mini Fund that was outside of the CS Mini Fund office. He said that the guidelines state that the application must be turned in to the CS Mini Fund Committee Chairperson no later than the specified deadline. He said that no specific location is noted in the CS Mini Fund Committee Guidelines. He said that Bruin HOPE had learned that, on a previous occasion, other groups had been shown leniency for similar mistakes. He said that Bruin HOPE is a community service project that takes place over Spring Break and, for that reason, cannot change the date of their project in order to apply for funding at a later time period.
- McKesity asked if Council would be deciding on whether to reopen the CS Mini Fund hearings for Bruin HOPE.
- Lisa Raigosa, ASUCLA Student Support Services staff liaison to the Community Service Mini Fund Committee said it was her understanding that, if Council decides that the CS Mini Fund Committee had violated their guidelines, then an emergency hearing would be held to consider Bruin HOPE's funding proposal.
- McKesity asked if the application had been handed directly to Crystal Lee, the CS Mini Fund Committee Chairperson.
- Young said that it was placed in the folder outside of the CS Mini Fund office. He said that Lee said that she had received it before the deadline.
- Ambrosio asked if Young knew the basis for certain groups being shown leniency in the past.
- Young said that he was told in an email that some groups had been shown leniency during the first application process of this year.
- Lawson asked if Young felt that Bruin HOPE was treated differently from other groups.
- Young said that he felt that other groups were given hearings during Fall Quarter even though they had committed similar violations.

- Kozak asked if the confusion came because the guidelines gave one location where the applications should be turned in, and a CS Mini Fund flyer gave a different location.
- Young said that that was the case.
- Palma/Saracho said that Lee would now have time to respond.
- Lee distributed to Council Members a written response that she had prepared. She said that, in her presentation, she will address each grievance in the appeal. She said that Bruin HOPE should have been aware of where to turn in their application. She said that they had communicated by email before the deadline, but that Bruin HOPE still turned the application in to the wrong location. She said that it would be inconsistent to grant Bruin HOPE a hearing when other groups were denied a hearing for similar reasons.
- McKesey asked if there was a folder outside of the Mini Fund office that was labeled CS Mini Fund.
- Lee said that there is such a folder. She said that that is where blank applications are left for the groups to pick up.
- McKesey asked if Lee had received Bruin HOPE's application by the stated deadline.
- Lee said that she found the application, by chance, shortly after the deadline.
- Palma/Saracho commented that Young had stated in his presentation that Lee had told him she received the application on time.
- Lee said that she was not sure that she used that wording. She said that she is not sure that it was on time. She said that she brought the application before the Committee and told them what had happened, and they voted not to grant Bruin HOPE a hearing.
- Schreiber asked if the committee can change their guidelines without the approval of Council.
- Raigosa said that the guidelines can be changed by Council only at the end of the USAC calendar year. She said that the rule that the applications had to be turned in to Mailbox 41 was an interpretation of the guidelines. She said that that was deemed the easiest manner in which Mini Fund could be sure that they received all of the applications by the deadline.
- Lawson asked what the current financial standing of the CS Mini Fund is.
- Lee said that they allocate 15% of their funds during each of the five funding cycles. She said, in that way, they have some money left over to take care of situations such as this one.
- Lawson asked if groups were shown leniency during the first funding phase.
- Lee said that they generally show a group some leniency the first time that they apply during the year. She said that, after that, the Committee is less lenient. She said that every group receives leniency during the first funding period.
- Lawson asked why no leniency was shown in this case.
- Lee said that the circumstances during this funding process were unique. She said that several applications had been turned in to incorrect locations. She said that some were found before the deadline and others were not. She said that the Mini Fund Committee felt that it would be unfair to punish those groups whose applications were not found in time while not punishing the other groups who made the same mistake.
- McKesey asked how many other groups turned their applications in to the wrong location.
- Lee said that there were four other groups that made the same mistake.
- Chen asked if the location that the applications were to be turned into was noted on the applications.
- Lee said that it was noted on the applications.
- Chiang asked if there would be any way to fund the group in time if Council granted Bruin HOPE a hearing.
- Lee said that the CS Mini Fund Committee would do their best to get everything in order on time.
- Raigosa said that there would have to be a special hearing. She also stated that there enough money to fund Bruin HOPE should a special hearing be held. She said that they don't normally fund retroactively, but that an exception may have to be made in this case.
- Kozak asked if the money that Bruin HOPE requested from Contingency would lower the amount that they would need from the CS Mini Fund
- Young said that the amount needed would not be less. He said they would need the same amount.
- Palma/Saracho asked if there was a sign on the door of the CS Mini Fund office, or anything that said where to turn the application in.

- Lee said that all of the literature, and the application itself, said to turn the completed application in to mailbox 41.
- Chiang asked if granting an appeal to Bruin HOPE would reopen the process to every group that was denied for a similar reason.
- McKesey asked what the deadline is on the appeal process.
- Raigosa said that an appeal has to be filed within two weeks.
- Lawson asked what would happen if the group did not receive this funding.
- Young said that it would put them in a bind. He said that they would have to find the money elsewhere. He said that there is no set way for them to do this.
- Nguyen asked for clarification on whether, if Council approved this appeal, there would be a special hearing for Bruin HOPE or a reopening of the process for all groups denied.
- McKesey said that it would just be a special hearing for Bruin HOPE.
- Nguyen asked how this would affect the Mini Fund Committee members during Finals Week.
- Lee said that it would depend on several factors. She said that they would make do.
- Chiang asked if this would change the amounts allocated to the other groups who had been approved for funding.
- Lee said that it would not. She said that they have money set aside for situations such as this.
- Lawson moved and Kozak seconded to accept Bruin HOPE's Appeal concerning the decision of the CS Mini Fund Committee to deny them a hearing.
- Lawson said that he was not making this motion on the basis of any mistake that the CS Mini Fund Committee made. He said that, instead, he is doing it because he wants to see this program succeed.
- Chen said that there has to be a reason justified by the guidelines in order to grant an appeal. She said that the reasoning of Council shouldn't simply be that they want to see a program succeed.
- Lawson said that he believed that, while the CS Mini Fund Committee did not intend to be inconsistent, they may have been somewhat inconsistent in this situation.
- Palma/Saracho said that he agreed with Chen, but thought that Bruin HOPE may have been under the false impression that they would have a hearing.
- Lee said that she emailed Bruin HOPE and told them that she received the application, but that they should not expect to have a hearing.
- Kozak said that she thought that the CS Mini Fund Committee acted with integrity and honesty, but that there was a lot of confusion and that it may be appropriate to grant this appeal based on that fact.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to accept the Appeal of Bruin HOPE with 3 votes in favor, 1 against and 5 abstentions.
- McKesey said that Bruin HOPE would be granted a special hearing. She said that the next group making an appeal was the Soze Project. She said that there was no representative from the Soze Project at this meeting.
- Lee said that the Soze Project's grievance is that they turned their application in to the Finance Committee Chairperson, Priscilla Chen. She said, for that reason, they were not granted a hearing. She said that, later on, it was discovered that the Soze Project had not turned in an evaluation of a previous event that the CS Mini Fund Committee funded. She said that groups that are funded by the CS Mini Fund Committee are required to turn in an evaluation of the event within two weeks after the event in order to be considered for funding in the future. She said that, even if the CS Mini Fund Committee had held a hearing for the Soze Project, they would not have received funding based on their failure to turn in the required evaluation.
- Lam asked if this requirement is noted in the guidelines.
- Lee said that it is.
- McKesey asked if any group that failed to turn in such an evaluation was granted a hearing.
- Lee said that no group that failed to meet that requirement was granted a hearing.
- Lawson moved and Nguyen seconded to deny the appeal of the Soze Project.
- Palma/Saracho asked Chen if the Soze Project had turned their application in on time.
- Chen said that she did not recall.

- Palma/Saracho asked Chen if she gave the Soze Project any indication that it was OK for them to turn their application in to her.
- Chen said that she did not. She said that she told the Soze Project representative that she would leave their application on the desk. She said that she gave the Soze representative no indication that she was the correct person to turn the application in to.
- Palma/Saracho asked Lee when she received the Soze Project's application.
- Lee said that she found the application on Tuesday, the day of the hearings.
- Ambrosio asked if the CS Mini Fund Committee would be able to deny the Soze Project a hearing on the basis of the missing evaluation, even if Council approved the appeal, since the missing evaluation is not a part of the grievance.
- McKesey said that she was not sure.
- Palma/Saracho asked for a point of clarification. He asked if the evaluation was for a previous project and was required prior to their application for funding for another project.
- Lee said that that was correct.
- Tuttle said that a motion in the affirmative that was voted down would be more appropriate than a motion denying the appeal.
- Lawson retracted his motion.
- Lawson moved and Palma/Saracho seconded to accept the appeal of the Soze Project.
- Raigosa pointed out that the CS Mini Fund Guidelines require a three-fourths vote of Council to overturn a decision of the CS Mini Fund Committee.
- Tuttle asked if the abstentions made in the previous vote would count in the affirmative. He said he believed that would be determined by a ruling of the President in her capacity as the Chairperson of the Council meeting.
- Ambrosio said that, according to Robert's Rules of Order, since the majority of the votes, ignoring abstentions, were in the affirmative, then the abstentions would be counted in the affirmative. He said that that would effectively make the previous vote 8-1-0.
- Tuttle said that he still thought that, since the wording of the guiding documents are not clear on this, it would still be appropriate to have a ruling from the Chairperson.
- McKesey said that the previous decision in favor of accepting Bruin HOPE's appeal will stand.
- McKesey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to reject the appeal of the Soze Project with 3 votes in favor, 6 against and 0 abstentions.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

General Representative – Art Ambrosio

- Ambrosio said that he has been speaking with the CCP to get a student initiated class started. He said that he's currently working on connecting some CSC and CPO groups with the Epidemiology Department.

Academic Affairs Commissioner

- Kozak said that she has an update on the experimental college proposal. She said that her office has been participating in talks with the administration about making the experimental college a legitimate part of the university. She said that they also had a minimum progress meeting today. She said that, next week, she will be meeting with Judy Smith about placing a student representative on the committee that is dealing with minimum progress. She said that her office is working on a survey about the effects of minimum progress.

Community Service Commissioner

- Schreiber said that CSC has T-shirts available, and encouraged everyone to buy at least one. He said that, this past weekend, he and some of his staff attended the COOL Conference at the University of Pennsylvania. He said that members of his staff attended a total of 40 workshops, and that his staff also put on a few of the workshops themselves. He said that they were able to do a lot of networking.

Internal Vice President

-Palma/Saracho said that he has an update on the budget situation. He said that students may be charged the Out-of-State Resident's fee if they exceed 198 units. He said that some members of the administration believe that Expected Cumulative Progress is good because it helps people graduate before surpassing these caps. He said that the same administrator also said that he wasn't aware of a retention problem. He said that SFAC may ask that the student fee that they collect be increased. He said that SFAC is facing a \$1 million deficit and they may need to raise the fee in order to maintain the services they provide.

President

-McKeseey said the College Honors Day will be on April 13 and 14. She said that they would like USAC to table on those days. She said that she and Palma/Saracho had gone to the ASUCLA Board of Directors Entities meeting. She said that they hope to have a presentation on what they learned there. She said that, yesterday, she had dinner with UC President Dynes and other administrators. She said that they accomplished quite a bit. She said that they didn't get the answers they wanted, but they did hear that other campuses had committed to funding Student Initiated Outreach. She said that Council should work on getting the same commitment from UCLA. She said that she sent out an email in response to the funding guideline discussions that are going on. She said that she would like to gather input from UCLA student organizations on the proposed amendments.

General Representative – Josh Lawson

- Lawson said that the Bruin Republicans and Bruin Democrats are in the process of issuing a statement that they would be willing to pull their petition if USAC would pass a similar Bylaw amendment.
- Chen asked if a special election could still be held.
- Samaan said that if a petition with the required number of valid signatures is submitted, the Election Board would have to hold a Special Election within 15 days.
- Tuttle asked if the 15 days started after the certification of the signatures, or after the presentation of the signatures.
- Samaan said that it starts when the signatures are turned in. He said that, if not enough signatures are validated, the election would not be held.
- Lawson said that he only mentioned this because it would give Council more control over the language.

ASUCLA Representative – Pat McLaren

-McLaren said that, in response to some of the suggestions made by Council members concerning the USAC website, she has several updates to report. First, she said that they are working on getting all USAC-approved Resolutions up on the site. Second, they are working on putting up a history of USAC. Third, they are discussing the possibility of putting up a survey that the Academic Affairs Commission is developing. With regard to a suggestion that there be a link to USAC's site on My.UCLA, she reported that she had found out that such a link already exists. However, because it is buried in a long list of other links, she has contacted My.UCLA administrators to request that a new category be created specifically for the two UCLA student government bodies.

Administrative Representative – Berky Nelson

- Nelson said that he has had a number of students approach him to ask about the registration of organizations as Officially Recognized student organizations (ORSOs) rather than Independent groups. He said that the lines of demarcation that the CSP uses are fine. He said that the issue is, instead, the availability of funding. He said that, from what he can see, without having spoken to UCOP or UCLA Administration, is that USAC needs to make their funding available to all registered organizations, regardless of their status.
- Palma/Saracho asked if religious and political groups are still restricted from becoming ORSOs.

- Nelson said that he thinks the better question would be whether or not an Independent group can receive USAC funds. He said that, if a religious club wants to hold a viewpoint neutral event, funding needs to be made available to them. He said that the same goes for political groups. He said that if changes are made to the CSP classifications, then much more will be changed besides funding.
- Palma/Saracho asked why an Independent group that wanted funding couldn't become an ORSO.
- Nelson said that a lot of things are necessary for a group to become an ORSO. He said that, if they become an ORSO, they would be representing UCLA and would therefore be held to a higher standard.
- Chen said that other campuses don't have a distinction between ORSOs and Independent groups.
- Nelson said that he was concerned less about what other campuses do, and more about whether or not what CSP does works. He said that there have not been many students lined up saying that they don't like Independent status. He said that funds must be available to them. He said that the easiest way for this to happen is for USAC to change their guidelines.
- Chiang asked if Independent groups would be eligible for base budget funding as well.
- Nelson said that he would think that USAC could decide on who they sponsor. He said, that as a department, they can decide who gets their money. He said he thinks that the only thing that would need to be changed is access to the Programming Fund.

VIII. Old Business

- There was no Old Business this week.

IX. New Business

***Approval of UCSA Statement of Principles Relating to UCOP Fee Policies**

- Palma/Saracho moved and Kaczmarek seconded to approve the UCSA Statement of Principles.
- McKeseey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 8 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.
- Schreiber asked if they could talk about publishing these principles next quarter.
- Kaczmarek said that he thought the final revisions of these principles would be done soon. He said that it may be more effective for USAC to simply sign on to these principles rather than publishing them.

***Resolution in Support of Federal Recognition of Same-Sex Marriages**

- Kian Bolori, Chairperson of the Queer Alliance, said that a Constitutional Amendment against same-sex marriages would basically make homosexuals second class citizens. He said that President Bush and Vice President Cheney are building a campaign around discrimination. He said that it is crucial for the campus community to know that USAC stands against such an amendment. He said that the Queer Alliance will be having an educational campaign on this subject.
- Palma/Saracho moved and Kozak seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of Federal Recognition of Same-Sex Marriages.
- McKeseey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 8 votes in favor, 0 against and 1 abstention.

Office Space Allocation Committee

- Nguyen said that she had met with McLaren and Chiang, and had decided against opening up opening the entire Office Space Allocation process. She said it was her opinion that the need of the Student Welfare Commission for more space could be treated as a special case. She said that Chiang has been talking with the three General Representatives and with the President of the Transfer Students Association, and they are working out an agreement.

***Resolution in Support of a Diversity Requirement at UCLA**

- Kozak said that this resolution is different from the previous one that Council saw. She said that it has the same goal, however.

- Kozak moved and Nguyen seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of a Diversity Requirement at UCLA.
- McKeseey asked if there was any discussion. There being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 8 votes in favor, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

X. Announcements

- Gaulton said that the Welcome Week 2004 Committee is coming together. He said that he wants input, and that he hopes that all of Council will work on this major event.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Chen passed around the Attendance Sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Palma/Saracho moved and Ambrosio seconded to adjourn the meeting.
- Lam called for adjournment by acclamation. There being no objection to acclamation, the meeting was adjourned at 9:48 pm

XIII. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,

Stephen Araiza
USAC Minutes Taker