

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday August 24, 2004
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Avila, Bhuiyan, Chan, Gruenberg, Harbottle, Lee, McLaren, Martinez, Palma/Saracho, Tuttle, Vu, Williams, Wood

ABSENT: Gaulton, Kurita, Nelson, Tripathi, Tseng, Villarin

GUESTS: Tracy Ohara, Tina Park, Georgine Piper, Roy Samaan, Debra Simmons, Joseph Vardner, Narges Zohoury

I. A. Call to Order

- Palma/Saracho called the meeting to order at 7:38 P.M.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Harbottle passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Avila moved and Gruenberg seconded to approve the agenda.

- Palma/Saracho asked if there were any changes or additions to the Agenda. There being none, he asked if there were any objections to approval by consent. There being none, the agenda was approved, as submitted, by consent.

III. Approval of the Minutes

- There were no minutes this week for approval

IV. Special Presentations

USAC Delegation to UCSA

- Vu spoke about UCSA. He said that it was a coalition of all UC Associated Students, graduate and undergraduate. Vu also noted that another Congress had been held at UC Santa Barbara (UCSB) after the USSA Conference.

- Park said that this congress had been more intense, with a greater diversity of people. She said she had learned how to interact with different types of people. Lastly Park told council that UCLA had sponsored an item that ended up passing despite being a greatly debated issue

- Samaan said that it had been a great experience to work both with so many of the UC's and also with Graduate students. He said that many UC's are facing the same issues that UCLA is, and he hoped that by working together they can eliminate most of the problems.

- Park said that the delegation had the opportunity to meet with some members of the UCLA Graduates Student Association (GSA). She said that this had been cool because the two groups rarely worked together despite their shared interests.

- Vu said that congress addressed 3 different action items. They were (1) Get Out The Vote, (2) Higher Education Activation Authorization, and (3) to increase eligibility. On the third item, Vu said that the goals were to increase eligibility to the UC's. He said that right now the eligibility is set for 12.4% of High School students to be eligible, but that UCSA would like to raise this to 15%. Vu also said that this applied to local students, whose eligibility was 4%, though UCSA aims to raise this to 8%. He also said that a goal of the education item was to establish a summer program. Vu said

that since the action items have now been set, the next thing is to await the board's plans for how to see these action items to their completion. Vu said that these efforts will continue until February when the Legislative Conference takes place, and it was here that students would lobby the state legislators on the latter two action items. Vu said that he would continue to update council more throughout the year.

- Samaan said that with regard to the "Get Out The Vote" action item, USSA and UCSA are trying to build an infrastructure of voters. That way, when students lobby at the Legislative Conference, the Legislators will feel like the lobbyists represent a substantial voting body.
- Vu told council that UCLA had sponsored the eligibility item.
- Park said that the eligibility item had been highly disputed because of ambiguities about just what a "15% eligibility rate" actually meant. However, she said, by the end of the conference UCLA won and the item passed.
- Samaan said that there had been confusion between the rate of eligibility and the rate of admission.
- Tuttle asked if UC Merced had accepted the invitation to join UCSA.
- Vu said that they were thinking about it, and that he had met the student who wants to be the president. He said that UCSA is currently having a think tank to decide how Merced should be structured.
- Tuttle asked Vu if UCLA should be the campus to reach out and build new chapters of USSA at community colleges and state schools. He said that USSA is a power structure, and it could be even more powerful if more people were brought into their ranks. Tuttle also said that with regard to UC Merced, UCLA might want to have someone reach out and play a role in its recruitment. He said that UCSA should make more chapters; more allies.
- Vu said that an internal goal of USSA was to build coalitions. He said that in the past, there was a coalition of the Los Angeles Colleges. Vu said that working to bring this back was in progress right now.
- Tuttle said that this was the place and time for branching out.

V. Appointments

- Palma/Saracho said that, like at last week's meeting, the nominees that he was presenting to council had been forwarded to the ARC several weeks ago, but the ARC had been unable to interview them. He said that the applicants are all incredibly qualified and very interested in working, and he was therefore bringing them to council for approval.

Outreach Advisory Board

- Martinez moved and Bhuiyan seconded to approve the appointment of Aylene Villarin to the Outreach Advisory Board.
- Martinez called for Acclimation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclimation. There being none, the appointment of Aylene Villarin to the Outreach Advisory Board was approved by Acclimation.

Advisory Board for the LGBT Resource Center at UCLA

- Chan moved and Martinez seconded to approve the appointment of Paymon Ebrahimzaden to the Advisory Board for the LGBT Resource Center at UCLA.
- Martinez called for Acclimation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclimation. There being none, the appointment of Paymon Ebrahimzaden to the Advisory Board for the LGBT Resource Center at UCLA was approved by Acclimation.

Financial Aid Policy Committee

- Gruenberg moved and Martinez seconded to approve the appointment of Ragini Sarma to the Financial Aid Policy Committee.

- Vu called for Acclimation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclimation. There being none, the appointment of Ragini Sarma to the Financial Aid Policy Committee was approved by Acclimation.
- Vu moved and Wood seconded to approve the appointment of Vanda Suvansilpaket to the Financial Aid Policy Committee.
- Martinez called for Acclimation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclimation. There being none, the appointment of Vanda Suvansilpaket to the Financial Aid Policy Committee was approved by Acclimation.

VI. Fund Allocations

- Harbottle said that there was only one contingency application for this week. She said that the application was well prepared, missing only some of the items on the sheet. Harbottle said that the Finance Committee had only given half of the requested amount. Lastly, she noted that from now on, allocations would be coming from the 2004-2005 budget, and that the guidelines would be staying the same.
- Wood moved and Chan seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
- Wood called for Acclimation. Palma/Saracho asked if there was any objections to approval by Acclimation. There being none, the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations were approved by Acclimation.

Project W.I.L.D, CSC

Requested: **\$545.40**
Recommended: **\$215.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$215.00 for the partial cost of Facilities for the Project WILD Director Retreat to be held from September 17th to September 19th.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

Internal Vice President - Darren Chan

- Chan said that he would be meeting with the Center for Community Learning tomorrow. He said that he would be discussing the Regional Center Planning Committee. Chan said that Tina Park was also working with him on this. He said that, basically, they are working with nine other schools in the area to promote community service, and to determine to what capacity the office will be working on programming. He also said that they are working to get word out to students about opportunities to get involved, opportunities to get financial assistance, and lastly ways to get academic credit. Chan said that at the meeting tomorrow, he would find out how his office will be working with that center. Also Chan said that he would be meeting with the former Director of Mardi Gras to discuss the possibility of bringing that event back to UCLA.
- Williams asked Chan if he was referring to Dave Lowenstein.
- Chan said that he was, and thanked Williams for his assistance by mentioning Lowenstein's name. He said further that his discussion with Lowenstein would focus on such matters as financial issues, general concerns, and the need to meet with University Administrators and area residents. He said that bringing back Mardi Gras is a main goal of the IVP Office, so they would be devoting a lot of time to this. Chan said, however, that if Lowenstein doesn't think it is feasible to bring Mardi Gras back, then Council should probably focus its energy and resources on other endeavors. Chan finally said that he would be meeting with Vice Chancellor Janina Montero tomorrow to see how the IVP Office's can work with the administration to see how their efforts can be synergized.

President - Allende Palma/Saracho

- Palma/Saracho said that he has been working a lot on the upcoming retreat. He reminded council that everyone was supposed to turn in their \$15 by today, but guessed that many people had forgotten. He asked everyone to get his or her money to Chan as soon as possible. Palma/Saracho asked Chan to explain the food situation.
- Chan said that there would be five meals prepared by council over the course of the weekend. He said that he wanted 2 council members working on each breakfast, and 3 on each lunch and dinner. Chan said that he would have assigned people to the various meals, but was ignorant of their "culinary abilities", so he asked for volunteers for each meal. The meal assignments are as follows.

Saturday Breakfast - Bhuiyan and Martinez

Saturday Lunch - Wood, Gruenberg, and Tripathi

Saturday Dinner - Lee, Tseng, and Palma/Saracho

Sunday Breakfast - Vu and Avila

Sunday Lunch - Gaulton, Harbottle, and Chan

Chan continued by asking for each meal group to provide their shopping lists to him by Thursday night. He said that he would be going to Costco first thing on Friday morning. Chan asked council *not* to bring \$15 for food, but rather to bring a blank check to the retreat on Friday, which they could fill in once he knew what the exact breakdown would be. Chan noted that there were two vegetarians, and asked if there were any more special food considerations.

- Wood asked Chan that he try to keep the cost of food to a minimum.
- Palma/Saracho continued with his Officer Report by asking council to be sure to send him the name of the guest that each council member would be bringing so that a final list could be established. Palma/Saracho said that he needed the names by tomorrow, and told council to tell their guests that they too would be chipping in with paying for and preparing the food. With regard to transportation, Palma/Saracho said that there were 29 seats thanks to CSC's four vans and Wood's car. Palma/Saracho said that Chan, Bhuiyan, Lee, he, and Wood would be driving. He said that all the vans were leaving at 6:00p.m., and Wood would leave at 7:30p.m. for those who needed to leave later.
- Avila said that he could drive if an alternate is needed.
- Palma/Saracho said that he needed descriptions of each office and of their plans for the coming year. He said that he had only received one or two. Palma/Saracho said that this was basically what each office is doing or working on. He told council that if any of them would be needing a projector or anything else, to please let him or Chan know so that the equipment could be gotten in time. Palma/Saracho said that he needed the descriptions of work from everyone by tomorrow or Thursday at the absolute latest.
- Wood said that she would be sending out directions to everyone.

VIII. New Business**A. Proposal to allocate a portion of CSC Surplus to purchase a van**

- Lee said that she wanted to use funds to purchase a new van for CSC. She said that some of them are 8 or even 10 years old. She told council that there was also more information on this in the Agenda Packet. Lee said that they had a 15-passenger van that, due to a new law, cannot be driven by almost all students because it now requires a special class of driver's license. She also said that one van was notoriously called "**Death Trap**", after its brakes completely failed on two separate occasions. Lee said that after the brake pads had been replaced, someone else took it out and the brakes failed again, this time while going down a hill. Lee said that it was fixed again but pleaded with council to approve the funding to get a new van. She acknowledged that it's hard to save money but said that a new van is really needed. Lee said that they couldn't get enough money this last year to replace all the vans. She said that they had replaced the 11-passenger, but not the Death Trap or the other

one. Lee said that she wanted to reserve 10 of the 16 thousand dollars in the CSC surplus so that next year they can get another new van.

- Georgine Piper, Student Government Accounting Analyst, said that the vans cost 21 thousand dollars each. She said that, due to a new regulation, CSC is not allowed to buy a used van. Piper said that, however, if council can reserve these funds, then perhaps CSC can petition the university to lease a third van.
- Chan asked if **Death Trap** was being taken to the retreat.
- Lee said that it was not.
- Tuttle asked who had the keys to **Death Trap**.
- Piper said that she had them.
- Tuttle asked that the keys be pulled and the van not used.
- Piper said that it was still being used on short jaunts. She said that Fleet Service did a complete test on it, and they swear it is working fine. They recommended that if people are still uneasy, that they not take it on long distance trips.
- Tuttle asked when **Death Trap** was next scheduled for use, and where students could get a Van if they couldn't get one from CSC.
- Lee said that students would have to go to Enterprise, which charges the same amount as Fleet Service, which is too expensive for most student groups.
- Piper said that **Death Trap** has been used on the last three weekends.
- Tuttle continued to express a mounting concern. He said that he didn't want to see anyone getting killed over not replacing a van. Tuttle said that this issue needed to be dealt with and, as a matter of honor and pride, reminded everyone present that Bruins don't drive cars held together by bubble-gum.
- Palma/Saracho said that this money should certainly be put aside.
- Georgine said that if this money is put aside now, then there will be enough to get the second van and hopefully lease the third.
- Martinez moved and Chan seconded to allocate \$10,000 of CSC Surplus to purchasing a van.
- Vu called for Acclimation. Palma/Saracho asked if there was objection to approval by Acclimation. There being none, an allocation of \$10,000 of CSC Surplus was designated toward the purchase of a new van.

A. Approval of the Base Budget Allocations

- Tracy Ohara, Budget Review Director, began the presentation by saying that, this year, the BRC had received a total of 134 applications for Base Budget funding. Of that total, BRC was presenting its recommended allocations for all 13 USAC Offices that applied, and for 78 of the 121 Student Organizations that applied. Ohara pointed out that the BRC is not recommending funding for 43 of the Student Organizations that applied.
- Harbottle went over the calendar for the Base Budget hearings with Council. She said that Week-1, the BRC guidelines were approved by council. Harbottle said that proposals from student groups were due, giving them several weeks to get them in. She said that the hearings were held during Week 5 and Week 6. Harbottle said that the BRC deliberated during Weeks 6, 7, and 8. She said that Week 9, this week, the recommendations were submitted to Council for approval. Harbottle also said that, later in the week, the BRC would hold a meeting for groups that did not receive funding to explain why and to give them information on other funding sources they could apply to.
- Ohara said that a sample questionnaire had been passed around in the agenda packet on June 29 for Council to review. She said that this questionnaire had been filled out by each BRC member for each group applying for a Base Budget. She said that a point system was used to rank the groups based on the quality of their proposal and presentation and determine their financial need, in addition to the organizations' ability to meet each of the five Priorities. The

point system did not determine the eligibility for funding. Ohara said that priorities had been assessed on a five-point scale. She directed Council to turn to page two in their agenda packets to follow along with what she was talking about. Ohara said that this system allowed for groups to get up to 15 points. She also said that each hearing was scored by the BRC to see how well prepared each organization was, and how thorough their answers were to the questions that were asked by the BRC regarding their proposal and organization.

- Harbottle said that the BRC had originally planned to allow up to 20 minutes for each group's hearing, but because of the unusually large number of groups that applied, they had to reduce each hearing to a maximum of 15 minutes. She said that most groups had broken their presentations into a two minute introduction, followed by a 10 minute Q&A session conducted by the BRC, and finished with a one minute closing. Harbottle said that, at the end of each hearing, the BRC handed out a feedback form to the group so the applicants could give input to the BRC on how they felt things were handled.
- Lee said that the deliberations took place after all of the hearings were completed. She said that, before the hearings, the BRC went through each proposal and checked them for errors, miscalculations, and non-fundable items. Lee said that all non-fundable items were then subtracted from the total that the group was requesting. Lee quickly explained that USAC's Bylaws prohibit funding of certain items. She said that, after correcting the miscalculations, the BRC calculated the revised line items, and each BRC member made a list of groups they thought didn't meet minimum criteria. Lee said that the BRC then proceeded to discuss these groups one by one. She said that any decision to not fund a group was reached by consensus and that all decisions were made unanimously.
- Ohara said that after all the proposals and hearing notes were carefully looked over, a list of groups that did not meet all ten points of the minimum criteria was made. She also said that the majority of the groups denied funding fell under Reason A and groups had to offer some academic [educational] value which would benefit the entire campus. She added that this value could not be construed as informal discussions, but there needs to be a real discussion to stimulate academic [educational] dialogue. Ohara said that this criterion eliminated sports teams who made the argument that they talked about current events after practice. She said that this kind of informal chat does not meet the criterion.
- Lee passed out proposal examples. The first example was of a proposal they rated as "Very Good". Lee said that sometimes it was hard to differentiate between proposals. She said that this first example was well thought out and executed. Lee said that the group had listed every single item in a breakdown, that no vagueness was present and that the numbers added up correctly.
- Ohara added that the descriptions were well thought out, which demonstrated the importance of the program to them and to the university.
- Lee then passed out an example of what was rated as a "Good" proposal. She said that their program narrative and description were good, but not as good as the first example BRC presented. She said that the narrative explained why their program was important and valuable. However, Lee said that the proposal was not rated as "Very Good" because of a lack of details and a lack of invoices. Lee then passed out an example of what the BRC rated as a "Poor" request. Lee said that it was hand written, not very professional looking, and said that the narrative was very brief and lacked detail. Lee said that this particular group had asked for money for unspecified locations, and that the group guessed the amount that these would cost. She said that, all together, these factors led to the BRC rating this request as "Poor".

- Harbottle directed Council's attention to Table 3 in the Agenda Packet. She said that the groups on this list were not approved for funding because they did not meet the criteria for Base Budget funding. She said that the reasons for not qualifying included failure to attend their hearing, general problems with their applications, and other reasons as described on the second page of Table 3. She said that most of the groups did not meet minimum criteria for reason A (Did not meet the University's minimum criteria in stimulating on-campus discussion and debate on a variety of issues as set forth in USAC Bylaws Article VI, Section C.4.b(1)). Harbottle said that only 5 of the groups were denied funding because they either missed their hearing or failed to schedule one altogether. Harbottle said that the groups that were not granted Base Budgets were encouraged to apply for Contingency funding later. She also said that, since some of the groups served the interest of some Council offices or commissions, they should also apply directly to those groups (she gave the Community Service Commission as an example.)
- Ohara said that Base Budgets are for on-campus programming, so groups that went off campus to deliver services or hold their events did not qualify.
- Harbottle said that the groups were ranked for funding based on their average score across the entire BRC ratings. She added that groups denoted with an asterisk in the agenda packet were not done in this way because certain BRC members might have a conflict of interest. Those BRC members recused themselves from voting on those groups, so those groups' scores were averaged across the other BRC members' ratings. Harbottle said that the mean Base Budget given to student organizations was \$2,198.00. Harbottle explained that this was determined by dividing \$171,076.00 by 78, the number of groups that were allocated funding. She said that the amount of \$171,076.00 which was allocated to student groups, combined with the \$48,961.00 that was allocated to USAC offices, resulted in a total of \$220,037.00 allocated by the BRC. Harbottle said that \$4,400.00 was the most given out to any one group. She then said that groups were ranked on a bell curve, so that many groups were granted amounts close to the mean, with few at either pole. Lastly, Harbottle explained that individual line items were funded based on the score received by the group.
- Ohara said that the BRC reallocated amounts to ensure that groups were not funded for line items not requested. She said the BRC also made sure that the amount a given group was allocated matched up with the number of points that group received. Ohara said that caps had been established for each line item as well.
- Harbottle cited the example of the Cultural Affairs Commission which was given one of the larger allocations. She said that caps were adjusted for each line item. Harbottle then cited the example of the Taiwanese American Union, which received a medium allocation, to show how some of these caps applied directly to line items.
- Ohara moved on to the allocations themselves and said that Table 1 lists the groups in alphabetical order and sets forth the amount requested and the amount allocated to each.
- Harbottle said that Table 2 was arranged in order of funding, with some dips as a result of groups not requesting certain items. She reminded council that the BRC cannot fund that which is not asked for.
- Tuttle congratulated the BRC on an excellent presentation and a job well done. Tuttle said that this was a historic moment, in that last week's meeting marked the first time that an Independent group had been funded out of Contingency. Tuttle then asked how many groups applied for Base Budget funding.
- Harbottle said that 134 applied this year.
- Tuttle asked how many applied last year.
- Harbottle said that around 60 applied last year.

- Tuttle asked how many Independent groups applied.
- Harbottle said that 24 Independent groups applied.
- Tuttle asked how many of these were funded.
- Harbottle said that 9 Independent groups were funded.
- Tuttle asked what percentage the Independent groups were given in relationship to the amount they requested. He said that by his math, there were 46 *new* groups this year that requested funding, including Officially Recognized Student Organizations (ORSO's) and Independents.
- Harbottle acknowledged that there were some new applicants this year, but said she was unsure of the exact number.
- Tuttle said that he would like to see equity given to these groups, and said that other people would also be interested in this. He also asked if the BRC could provide him with a hard copy of the excellent presentation they had given at tonight's meeting.
- Ohara said that she would take care of giving that information to Tuttle.
- Tuttle raised an open question, not a pointed question, as to why so many groups were turned down for reason A. He said that, of the Independent groups, 9 of the 24 that applied were approved. However, Tuttle pointed out that the language for reason A was supposedly taken directly from USAC Bylaws, but he noticed that there was a difference in the language presented here. Tuttle asked if this was a summary of the wording.
- Lee said that this was so.
- Tuttle returned to his open question, and said that he had heard the term "academics" in regard to reason A, as well as something like "enhances general curriculum of the University". Tuttle said that many of these Independent groups were turned down for reason A, which was that they needed to "provide opportunity for the educational benefits, social enrichment, etc." He said that he was not sure if the language implied "academics" in the strictest sense, or if an extracurricular activity might provide enough learning in and of itself. Tuttle said that since this was a criterion for exclusion, he anticipates that there will be appeals from groups that were denied funding based on this criterion. He thanked council for their work and devotion, but cautioned the BRC that appeals were likely to be made.
- Williams asked if someone could cite an example of a group that was traditionally funded, but had received less money this year because of an increase in the number of groups requesting funding.
- Piper said that an in-depth analysis would have to be done. She said that each year the Base Budget allocations are approved as a whole, so it would be difficult to single out a specific group.
- Palma/Saracho made a Point of Order and asked if someone would like to place a motion on the floor before continuing discussion.
- Wood moved and Avila seconded to approve the 2004-2005 Base Budget Allocations.
- Gruenberg shared in the appreciation to the BRC. He asked if the methodology, the process by which they determined allocations, was the same as in years past.
- Lee said that it was so.
- Gruenberg asked if dividing the caps into fourths was standard.
- Harbottle said that it was similar to past years, but the bell curve had been a new addition.
- Gruenberg asked how many students were benefited by the groups.
- Ohara said that the number of students benefited was used to get additional information on each group because it is included in the minimum criteria and it allows the BRC to determine if the organization reached out and catered towards the entire campus. The actual number the organization provided to the BRC was not added to the organization's total score, as it may seem when

looking at placement of the question about the number of students benefited on the questionnaire. She said that the number of students benefited was also used in order for the BRC to estimate how much the organization gets from membership fees.

- Lee added that some organizations receive member fees or dues, so larger groups may need less funding.
- Palma/Saracho asked if this was included in the description of the group on their applications to the BRC.
- Harbottle said that was usually the case.
- Gruenberg asked if the groups excluded under item A were ranked at all.
- Lee said that all groups were rated and given a score, whether they qualified or not.
- Gruenberg then asked when the decision that a group did not meet minimum criteria occurred.
- Ohara said that this decision was made after the hearing.
- Harbottle said that the BRC asked almost every group the first two questions.
- Gruenberg asked if every group explicitly said "no" in response to the questions.
- Lee said that some groups did, in fact, explicitly say that they did not meet criterion A. She said that others had to be decided upon by the committee.
- Tuttle said that he wanted to be sure of the numbers, and proceeded to go through them one-by-one. He said that, as he understood it, 134 groups applied this year; 60 groups applied last year, all of which reapplied this year; 74 new groups applied for funding this year, 24 of which are Independents, and 50 are not Independents; and, of the 24 Independents, 9 received funding, and 2 were denied funding based on their failure to schedule a hearing. Tuttle explained that his reason for reviewing these numbers so closely was to see if Independent groups had been disadvantaged in relationship to the Officially Recognized Student Organizations (ORSOs), or if any groups were disadvantaged because it was the first time they had applied for Base Budgets.
- Palma/Saracho asked Tuttle how far he was intending to go with this.
- Tuttle said that he only wished to point out that the numbers appeared to be much better than if the Independent groups were funded on a 22 to 2 ratio.
- Palma/Saracho said that it was dangerous to assume why some groups were not funded. He also said that some groups who were formerly funded were not funded this year, so it becomes dangerous to over-generalize.
- Tuttle said that he was trying to make the point that what those two sets of groups (the Independents and the first-time applicants) have in common is that they did not apply for funding last year.
- Wood said that this was not necessarily so.
- Tuttle clarified for the record that a lot of groups were funded, but the difference between Independent groups and ORSOs that were funded was comparable.
- Palma/Saracho said that the fact that some groups were funded over others spoke to their applications and preparation, not to a bias that existed with regard to the difference between ORSOs and Independent groups.
- Gruenberg said he had reviewed the records on at groups that were funded last year but not this year. He said that he only saw one, a Greek organization. Gruenberg said that he wanted to re-address criteria A. He said that the wording on page 2 of Table 3 was different from the wording in the Bylaws. Gruenberg also said that he read some of the applications and he that they were good. Gruenberg said that, after reading a number of the applications, he was hesitant to think that some of these groups had no educational value.
- Lee said that the entire application was looked at as a whole, and then a particular reason for exclusion was decided upon.

- Gruenberg said that he thought too narrow of a scope was used with regard to criteria A. He said that the stress was on "academic" value to the community, and groups will come back to appeal because of this. Gruenberg asked whether or not the BRC had any concerns about this. He challenged BRC to say whether or not these groups were truly that different.
- Lee said that all groups were fully and completely evaluated. She said that criteria A was not referred to until after the hearings. Lee said that groups were scored fully after the hearings, and then if the BRC agreed that a group did not meet minimum criteria, they came to a consensus about not granting that group Base Budget funding.
- Gruenberg asked if every group received a score.
- Martinez said that each group was scored regardless of whether or not they met minimum criteria.
- Ohara said that this process was what directed the line of questioning during the BRC hearings.
- Gruenberg asked about the meeting to be held tomorrow (Wednesday, August 25).
- Lee said that, because the Base Budget allocations had to be approved by USAC, the groups would not find out what their allocations were until after tonight's council meeting.
- Gruenberg asked if denied groups would be given their scores and comments.
- Ohara said that this information is usually kept confidential.
- Lee said that it needs to be taken into account that each group had its own hearing. She said that this was their "time to shine" and the hearing was weighted very heavily. Lee said that if a group with a great proposal did not perform well during the hearing, then this raised a red flag.
- Gruenberg thanked the BRC, saying that the presentation was very good and had answered some of his questions. He apologized for the intensive questioning, but said that groups would want to know why they did not receive funding.
- Ohara said that she met one-on-one with at least two groups to show them how to qualify for funding. She said that these groups had not qualified for Base Budget funding last year and came to meet with her to see how they could get funding this year.
- Martinez said that the process to figure out which groups were eligible was a lengthy process.
- Bhuiyan said that of the 43 groups that were not funded, only 22 were denied funding based solely on criterion A. On top of that, he said, of the remaining 20 groups, 5 were denied funding for reasons other than criterion A.
- Palma/Saracho said that there have been many opportunities for organizations to prove that they met the minimum criteria. He said that a group could totally tailor itself to qualify for funding. Palma/Saracho also said that they could have met with Ohara beforehand to get her guidance. Third, he said that groups had been given information on how to prepare applications in order to do it right. Finally, Palma/Saracho pointed out that if the group's application did not seem to meet minimum criteria, the BRC gave them the opportunity to state their case during their hearing. Palma/Saracho said he thought that many groups would appeal, and that it was important for them to understand the basis on which appeals can be made because the process was clearly defined in USAC's Bylaws. He also said he thought it was important for groups to learn more about the funding application process so they will do it right next year and be sure to be granted funds. Palma/Saracho said that if a group wanted to do a closed program, there are still funds that they can apply for. He said that they could also get money for their programs by applying for Contingency funding. Also, Palma/Saracho said that council had been talking about objectivity and subjectivity, and as a council member he can say that

both are used. He said that the BRC members are students, like the rest of us, and that they have to make judgment calls. Palma/Saracho said that the BRC has to make sure that minimum criteria are met by the groups. He said that they gave the groups many opportunities to qualify, and that BRC did everything in their power to ensure that eligible groups could receive funding.

- Tuttle asked the BRC if they were satisfied that they had conducted themselves in a viewpoint-neutral way.
 - *All members of the BRC nodded their heads and quietly indicated agreement that they had conducted themselves in a viewpoint-neutral manner.*
- Tuttle asked if there had been any joking or dismissive attitudes between them about the groups receiving funding.
 - *Members of the BRC, as a group, responded that they did not make jokes and had not been dismissive in any way.*
- Palma/Saracho pointed out that there is a definite distinction between something which is "content neutral" and something which is "viewpoint neutral", and said he thought that what Tuttle had meant to say was "content neutral", not "viewpoint neutral."
- Tuttle concurred with Palma/Saracho's distinction, and thanked him for drawing it to Council's attention. Tuttle also asked that all documents be retained, whether they be involved in the student process or not. He said that a file should be made to show that this was done.
- Lee said that every hearing was on tape and that these tapes had all been saved.
- Palma/Saracho reminded council that the BRC members recused themselves of influencing any decisions in which they might have a conflict of interest. He then asked if there were any more questions or comments. Seeing and hearing none, Palma/Saracho called for a vote on the motion on the table.
 - Council voted to approve the Base Budget allocations with 7 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Palma/Saracho thanked the BRC for all their hard work and long hours.
- *Council applauded the efforts of the Budget Review Committee.*
- Gruenberg said that he had abstained from voting because he had not had the opportunity to look at many aspects of the Base Budget allocation process. He further said that he would have liked to be able to review the notes on the hearings and the deliberations. Gruenberg stressed that it was not his intention to insult anyone with his questions and comments. He said he thought his concerns were valid ones.

IX. Old Business

- There was no Old Business this week.

X. Announcements

- Palma/Saracho said that the approaching weekend was that of the retreat. He also said that Nelson would be coming on Sunday to conduct an icebreaker after Murphy's Maze. Palma/Saracho reminded everyone that they were meeting at 6:00p.m.on Friday to leave for Palm Springs. He told everyone to bring their sleeping bags and whatever else they needed for the weekend.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Harbottle passed around the attendance sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Martinez moved and Gruenberg seconded to adjourn.
- Wood called for Acclimation. Palma/Saracho asked if there was objection to approval by Acclimation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 9:47 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker