

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday July 6, 2004
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00pm

PRESENT: Bhuiyan, Chan, Gaulton, Gomez, Gruenberg, Lee, Martinez, Nelson, Palma/Saracho, Tuttle, Williams, Wood, Villarin, Vu

ABSENT: Avila, Kurita, Tripathi, Tseng

GUESTS: Brian Neesby, Tracy Ohara, Tina Park, Roy Samaan, Aylene Villarin, Narges Zohoury

- I. A. Call to Order
 - Palma/Saracho called the meeting to order at 7:04 P.M.

- II. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- III. Appointments
 - Chan said that ARC had the privilege to meet with Palma/Saracho's nomination for Finance Chair, Lili Harbottle. He said that they found that she was definitely qualified for the position. He said that she had been the vice chair last year and had a lot of experience in that office and ARC had no reservations in recommending that Harbottle be appointed as Finance Chair.
 - Lee moved and Villarin seconded to approve Lili Harbottle as Finance Committee Chair.
 - Palma/Saracho asked if there was any discussion. Being none, Council voted to approve the motion with 10 votes in favor, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions.

- IV. New Business
 - Palma/Saracho said that there's been a lot of discussion concerning the base budget over the last few days. He said that he wanted Ohara to speak about the base budget process.
 - Ohara said that she had met with Deb Simmons and Georgine Piper of Student Government Accounting, Jerry Mann, and Pat McLaren, to discuss the feasibility of extending the deadline. Based on their information that an extension could be given, the Budget Review Committee decided that it would be best to extend the deadline to July 22nd at 5 PM. She said that the extension was needed so that BRC would have enough time to publicize to Independent groups that weren't aware of their eligibility. She said that there were various suggestions such as setting aside a certain amount, but the BRC figured that it wouldn't be fair for everyone. She said further that if there were to be two funding cycles, they wouldn't be able to use the same funding caps, and all the groups wouldn't be able to apply at the same time.
 - Palma/Saracho asked what the calendar looked like with the extension. Ohara said that the hearings would start on July 27th, at 9-11 PM after the council meeting. She said that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of that week, budget hearings would be held from 5:30-11 PM. She said that they have a hearing scheduled for August 3rd to hear any appeals to base budget allocations. She said that the base budget allocations would be submitted to USAC for approval at the council meeting on August 10th.
 - Wood moved and Lee seconded to approve an extension of the Base Budget deadline until Thursday, July 22nd at 5 PM.
 - Tuttle said that this is one of the biggest changes in 40 years, and a part of it is good faith: attempting to accommodate a situation where the Independent groups would not have had time in the current cycle. He said that the ORSO's faced funding after finals. He asked when the deadline was to apply. Ohara replied July 8th. He said that email notifications

went out late last week. He said that there were eleven days to create base budgets, about equal time to the original deadline. He said that in the normal budgeting process 10% of the \$700,000 is set aside for contingency. Gomez added that that is the number as of right now. Tuttle said that given the fact that people are away and hard to reach, he hoped to entertain the possibility of some amount (approximately \$20,000) on top of the normal \$70,000 to go into contingency, not to be set aside just for Independents, but for everyone to apply to when school returns to session.

- Wood said that as far as she knows, groups are most interested in funds for programming, so efforts should be more focused on that as opposed to contingency. She said that with the comprehensive programming workshops you could be sure it was advertised properly.
- Gomez said that the question would be when to end the setting aside of money, because contingency is an auxiliary fund.
- Tuttle said that it would be distinct from a \$20,000 or \$50,000 set-aside. He said that given the delay, it would be about comparable to the original base budget timeframe. He said that the Independent groups may or may not be at a disadvantage, but this gives some more money for relief, in roughly the proportions of ORSO's to Independents (7:2). He said that ORSO's can apply too.
- He said that on the matter of advertising he is for it.
- Villarin said that speaking from the BRC's point of view, \$20,000 is a huge chunk of the \$220,000 or so already allocated for base budget, and to subtract that amount they would have to go back and reevaluate their caps, which they've done extensive work on in the prior weeks. She said that going about that process once again will push them back further, because as it is they are delaying things for another two weeks. She said that to extend the application process and also reevaluate the caps forces all the student groups that have already calculated their budgets to go back and do it again.
- Gaulton raised a Point of Information as to whether the motion on the table referred to the calendar. Palma/Saracho replied yes. Tuttle replied that Gaulton's point was well taken.
- Nelson said that in the twenty-three years he's been responsible for the CSP, he can recall no more than five occasions when Independent groups wanted money. He said that his concern is that since they're dealing with an unknown, he would not want to see groups that have traditionally accessed funds be curtailed due to the unknown. He said that people can sue for whatever reason, and that the purpose is not to make people sue, but to make a good faith effort. He said that UCOP made it clear that they did not expect an overnight change. He said that whatever changes the BRC decided to make, he personally didn't want to see any group constrained. He said that if groups apply for funds and they run out, that would give an excellent gauge for next year.
- Palma/Saracho said that Nelson raised a good point. He said that what they've been asked to do this year is to make a good faith effort, but the UC understands that the decision came in the middle of a funding cycle, and they're only asking to try to provide something to deal with the situation at hand. He said that while thinking about the future, they should focus on this funding cycle at the moment.
- Gruenberg asked if there was \$220,000 allocated for base budget allocations, and if Tuttle had suggested that about \$20,000 of that be taken from base budget and placed in contingency. Tuttle replied yes. Gomez said that ten percent of USAC's overhead is put into the contingency fund, in the amount of approximately \$70,000. He said further that \$220,000 for base budget funds is a separate fund.
- Gruenberg asked if historically the contingency fund gets used up in its entirety. Gomez said that it usually gets used up by the end of the year.
- Gruenberg said that he has two concerns: it's possible that the groups understand that the money is accessible and may not apply for a base budget, causing groups to in general apply more for contingency, and in addition groups may not get their budget in applying for contingency. He said that putting more money in contingency may be a good way of keeping it alive during the year.
- Wood said that the contingency fund can only pay for a small portion of an event, so it doesn't really make sense to pour a lot of money into it, seeing as how it's not intended to pay for large portions of any kind of program. Gruenberg said that he understands that

- point, but thinks that there is some merit to transferring some money from base budget to contingency, just because more groups will be accessing contingency, because more and more groups will become aware of the process.
- Gomez said that it's in the Bylaws that 10% of the overhead costs goes into contingency, so it would require a change of the Bylaws or a special motion. He said that any student group interested in base budget funding is aware of the summer deadlines, and a two-week extension is sufficient to complete the process. He said that putting aside \$20,000 would be irresponsible of council, since \$20,000 is enough to fund a lot of groups. He said that in terms of contingency it would be in breach of the Bylaws.
 - Tuttle said that he's been told that often money is returned from surplus and reallocated to contingency. Gomez said that surplus is returned to capital surplus. McLaren said that Gomez is right – capital surplus is a bigger pot of money that is technically contingency; however, a priority is given to capital items such as computer equipment, etc. She said that it is primarily for capital items and seldom used for programming. Tuttle said that the point is that there are generally monies coming back, and everyone should be aware of it. He said that the idea of adding two weeks is a major step in assuring fairness in budgeting.
 - Bhuiyan said that all the contingency money is used up by the end of the year, but so is the base budget money. He said that one of the things that BRC wants to do is fund, for example, a full advertisement and not just part.
 - Martinez said that his concern with moving money from base budget to contingency is that usually all the money for base budget gets used up. He said that it's a matter of letting student groups know about all the different funding options that are available to them. He said that there are a lot of other funding options, and Council should make students aware of them.
 - Ohara said that Council is working with a bunch of hypotheticals, and base budget is mainly for the day-to-day needs of organizations. She said that were money to be set aside to contingency, it would take money away from organizations to conduct their day-to-day operations.
 - Gomez said that in an entire year a group can get only get \$12,500 through CPC for a year, but if a group goes for \$13,500, the \$1,000 extra could be obtained through contingency.
 - Wood moved to call the question. Palma/Saracho asked if there was any objection to the calling of the question. There was none.
 - Council voted to approve the motion to extend the deadline for Base Budgets to Thursday, July 22nd at 5 PM, with 8 votes in favor, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions.
 - Ohara said that they would ask for CSP's help in getting emails out to all the groups. She said that there would be an advertisement in the Daily Bruin next week, and it would be up on the USAC website, as well as on flyers posted around campus.
 - McLaren asked if there was a plan to run an advertisement in each of the Daily Bruins that would be released before the deadline. She asked if the emails and ads would be directed to all registered organizations. Nelson replied that the emails would be sent to all organizations that are registered and in CSP's database, and they would all receive it at the same time.
 - McLaren asked if there would be mention of the need for Independent groups to sign a non-discrimination form. Nelson replied that if that's the expectation they could put out info to that regard.
 - Martinez asked if two ads would be published per week. Ohara replied that the ads would be published in separate weeks.
 - Tuttle said that he still believed that overall, this council would be better off to set aside some funds in that neighborhood. He said that he hoped that Council saw the need developing, that they would implement a set-aside of some amount to prevent the reality or appearance of unfairness. He said that conceptually, it's a major change, and he congratulates the leadership, but he would be remiss to not state his position: first, set aside \$20,000, or second, if that doesn't carry, that the leadership keep in mind the other option and report back if that becomes necessary.

- Palma/Saracho said that he thanked Tuttle for his comments, but Council is operating under very hypothetical circumstances, and to divert funds from the base budget would hurt base budget funding. He said that it's already been cut substantially, and besides contingency there is also the CPC and CAC, and the focus is that USAC should try to widely publicize the availability of programming funds, so that groups know they have access to different funds. He said that by making a concentrated effort to increase awareness of programming, more people can be accommodated during this year. He said that what's being asked is that Council make an effort. He said further that the extended deadline would allow all groups two weeks to submit their applications. He reiterated his earlier statement that Council should emphasize to the groups that if things can't get done through the base budget, there are other funds available, such as CAC, CPC, contingency, etc.
- Gruenberg thanked Tuttle for his encouragement. He said that most people in the room are the head of a commission that will be receiving less money because of this development, and that that is hard to accept. He said that that should not be Council's perspective, because now that the system is more open there will be more groups applying, and Council needs to accommodate the fact that when money gets pushed out to more people, those who received funds before may receive less.
- Gruenberg moved to reallocate \$20,000 from the Base Budget to Contingency. With no second, the motion died.
- Nelson reiterated that the information sent out by CSP is supposed to declare that groups interested in receiving base budget money have until 5 PM on July 22nd to apply, and that they must be aware of the need to sign the non-discrimination form.
- Palma/Saracho said that what they've sent out so far is that groups that sign a statement of non-discrimination with CSP would be eligible for funding.
- McLaren said that having dealt with requests for CSP to send out broadcast emails, she has learned that the standard procedure is for Council to draft the message as clearly and accurately as possible, before sending it to CSP.
- Palma/Saracho said that the email he had received from Vice Chancellor Naples said that from the University's perspective, if a group signed the non-discrimination form, they would be eligible for base budget funding.
- Palma/Saracho delegated to Ohara the responsibility for drafting the email to send to Nelson, and the advertisement for the Daily Bruin. Ohara said that it would be doable within the next couple days.
- McLaren said that she'd be happy to work with Ohara on this project. Palma/Saracho said that McLaren had been very helpful and he'd like to thank her.
- Wood said that Council not setting aside \$20,000 was not designed to protect their individual budgets. She said that she thought it was an attempt to focus on making sure that groups are aware of all other funding sources, as opposed to dealing with hypothetical situations. Palma/Saracho said that he agreed. He said that to keep diluting the amount of money going in would make it difficult to do what base budget is supposed to do. He said that by keeping the total amount of funding in the base budget, they're helping the organizations that will apply. He said that that was the intent of the two-week extension. He said that it seems to come across that the base budget is the only funding, so council really needs to make an emphasis to use what they have and put that to the most use, so student groups know that if they want a specific thing they should go to the right funding source.
- Martinez moved and Lee seconded to adjourn the meeting. Council voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 with 8 votes in favor, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ben Moshe
USAC Minutes Taker