

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 21, 2004
417 Kerckhoff Hall
6:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Avila, Bhuiyan, Chan, Gaulton, Gruenberg, Lee, McLaren, Martinez, Nelson, Ohara, Palma/Saracho, Tripathi, Tseng, Tuttle, Villarin, Vu, Williams, Wood

ABSENT: Kurita

GUESTS: Eric Barba, Brian Neesby, Tina Park, Roy Samaan, Nicolas Taborek, Joseph Vardner

I. A. Call to Order

- Palma/Saracho called the meeting to order at 6:09 P.M.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Ohara passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Villarin asked to be included in the Officer/Member Reports.
- Gaulton asked to be included in the Officer/Member Reports.
- Martinez asked to be included in the Officer/Member Reports.
- Avila told council that he, Tripathi, and Gruenberg would have to leave the meeting at about 7:00pm because of a conflicting obligation. Therefore, he asked that the Action Items be dealt with before the Officer/Member Reports.
- McLaren said she would like to clarify that this would include the two Appointments and the two items under New Business.
- Palma/Saracho said that all Action Items on the Agenda would be dealt with before the Officer/Member Reports.
- Martinez moved and Tripathi seconded to approve the Agenda.
- Vu called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the Agenda of September 21st, 2004 was approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

III. Approval of the Minutes

September 7, 2004

- McLaren said that under the attendance section, Ohara and Neesby were not present at the meeting.
- Nelson said that on page 6, 10 lines from the bottom, where a comment that he made read, "had plenty of resources", should read, "Could benefit from the liberalizing of resources."
- Wood moved and Tseng seconded to approve the Minutes as amended.
- Villarin called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of September 7th, 2004 were approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

July 24, 2004

- Palma/Saracho said that he wanted to bring back up the minutes of July 24. He said that these had been approved on September 7th, but Ohara had not been present at that meeting. Since during the meeting of the 24th she participated in the extensive presentation by the Budget Review Committee, she should have been consulted before

- approving the minutes from that meeting. Palma/Saracho said that he would like to submit the minutes for re-approval.
- Ohara said that on page 6, the minutes should have read that the system allowed for groups to get up to 15 points. Ohara also clarified that the hearing was an opportunity to ask groups about their proposals and organization in general. She said that at the end of the hearing, if the committee did not feel that they met minimum criteria, they were not given funding. She said that the hearing had been an opportunity for groups to prove themselves if they hadn't in their proposal; a second chance, if you will. Ohara also talked about the point system referenced on page 5. She said that the points were used to determine how much funding a group would receive.
 - McLaren asked if Ohara could either state these changes very slowly and clearly or if she could submit them in writing so they could be put into the minutes accurately.
 - Ohara said that she would email the changes to McLaren after talking about them now. She said that the wording on page 6 implied that the BRC had mainly looked at items 1 and 2 in determining minimum criteria, when in actuality they looked at all 10 points of the bylaws. She said that she wanted to make it clear that the Bylaws meant educational benefits, and she apologized if she had worded this incorrectly during the presentation. Ohara said that the exact words were, "providing opportunity for educational benefit", not "academic value."
 - Gruenberg asked Ohara if she was clarifying what she said or actually adding to the minutes.
 - Ohara said that certain points were simply not emphasized enough. She said that she was now trying to clarify it more. Ohara went on to talk about page 8, where she had spoken about the number of students benefited by organizations. She said that this was not taken into account as to whether or not a group was funded. Ohara said that this was simply used as a means of trying to estimate membership fees that may be collected by groups, thus alleviating them of some need for funding. She said that the number of students benefited was also used as a criterion for funding, as a way to gauge whether an organization reaches out to the entire campus. Ohara said that this is what she had initially been trying to convey. She said that she had also been trying to clarify the questionnaire handed out to the groups. Ohara said that where the form showed the number of students benefited by a given group, this number was not added to the total score.
 - Tuttle made a Point of Order. He said that there were two levels of discussion here. Tuttle said that first of all, he had not had time to fully go through what was in writing to see if the alterations proposed were clarifications or additions. He said that the second point was that further discussion should be carried out to determine what should be changed to the former minutes and what should be added on to tonight's record.
 - Palma/Saracho suggested that perhaps the best way might be if Ohara could write down the changes that she wanted and then present them to council. He said that if they were then approved, they could appear twice, once in the former minutes and again here in the new minutes. Palma/Saracho recommended that the minutes be tabled until the next week.
 - Gruenberg agreed and asked if Ohara could make notations where changes are sought after.
 - Ohara said that she would do it.
 - Martinez moved and Gruenberg seconded to table the Minutes of July 24th, 2004.
 - Martinez called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of September 24th, 2004 were tabled by Acclamation.
 - Tuttle made a Point of Order that this was the *reconsideration* of these minutes, as they had already been approved.

IV. Appointments

Communications Board

- Chan said that there were several appointments for today, and passed around the candidates' applications. He said that the first person up for appointment was Chase Flemming for the Communications Board. Chan said that the Appointments Review Committee (ARC) was very pleased with his knowledge of student media, and also that he is aware of how the board functions. Chan said that Flemming had worked with the Daily Bruin and also UCLATV, and he stood out to the ARC in that he was enthused and wants to get involved. Chan said that Flemming is a third-year student, and has been involved as an Intramural Chair for his Fraternity and also as member of a financial planning club. Chan reminded council that this is a two-year appointment, and said that Flemming had been personally recommended by the former Communications Board Chair.
- Lee moved and Martinez seconded to approve the appointment of Chase Flemming to the Communications Board for a two-year appointment.
- Villarin called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked for any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the appointment of Chase Flemming to the Communications Board for a two-year appointment was approved by Acclamation.

Judicial Board

- Chan said that the next person up for appointment was Christine Canute, whom the ARC had interviewed earlier today. According to her application, the primary goal of her appointment was to make sure that USAC actions are in line with its own constitution. Chan said that Canute was involved with Circle K, and that she was the financial coordinator of another group. He added that she wants this position to be an opportunity for students to learn more outside the classroom.
- Gruenberg asked if council had received a copy of her application.
- Chan said that he had received it after the Agendas had already been printed. He had brought some extra copies, though, and passed them around the table.
- Gruenberg asked if these were the 5th and 6th justices for Judicial Board that council would be appointing tonight.
- Palma/Saracho said that this was the case.
- Martinez moved and Villarin seconded to approve the appointment of Christine Canute to the Judicial Board.
- Lee called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the appointment of Christine Canute to the Judicial Board was approved by Acclamation.
- Chan said that the final person up for appointment was Darryl Molina. Chan said that she is very involved in many things, and is not at all one-dimensional. He said that Molina just got involved with activism all over campus, including the Student Worker Front, Student Law Association, and working for the Assistant Dean of the UCLA Law School. Chan said that she is a very well rounded candidate, and that she told the ARC that she wants to see fairness in cases, and also wants to make students aware that Judicial Board exists.
- Tseng moved and Martinez seconded to approve the appointment of Darryl Molina to the Judicial Board.
- Villarin called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the appointment of Darryl Molina to the Judicial Board was approved by Acclamation.

V. New Business

- Palma/Saracho said that, in the interest of time, council would go ahead and discuss Item "B" first.

B. *Setting of the USAC Meeting Time for the Academic Year

- Palma/Saracho said that the meetings would begin on a regular basis, but that council needed to set the official time. He asked for recommendations.

- Tripathi said that he preferred 6:00 p.m.

- Gruenberg said that he preferred 7:00 p.m.

- Palma/Saracho asked if there were any actual conflicts.

- Villarín said that she had class on Tuesdays until 6:00 p.m.

- Tuttle said he thought that it was good to continue with Tuesdays and in the same room.

- Palma/Saracho asked for an informal poll.

The results of the informal poll showed that council was evenly split between meeting at 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

- Palma/Saracho asked the non-student members to also vote.

This yielded a vote of 8 to 7 in favor of a 6:00 p.m. meeting time.

- Nelson said that on the one hand, the ability to comprehend is always better earlier on. However, if the body of council wanted later, then they should not meet earlier just because of the Administrative Representatives.

- Villarín said that she had class until 5:50 p.m. at Bunche Hall, which was cutting it very close for her.

- Vardner made the point that it would be hard for her to prepare in that time.

- Martinez said that he too had class until 5:50 p.m.

- Gruenberg proposed 6:30 p.m., as a compromise between the two times.

- Villarín said that would be okay.

- Palma/Saracho said that he really likes to begin meetings on the hour.

Another informal poll showed a vote of 7 to 5 favoring meeting at 7:00 p.m. rather than 6:30. It was agreed that council would indeed meet at 7:00 p.m., on Tuesdays, in Kerckhoff 417 during the academic year.

A *Discussion and Decisions Regarding Whether or Not to Hear Base Budget Appeals

- Chan said that everyone should have a copy of the Base Budget Appeals that had been submitted by campus groups. He said that at a meeting with Harbottle and Palma/Saracho, he had made sure that the denied groups had in fact failed to submit proper documentation in applying for Base Budgets. Chan said that they had wanted to make sure that everything discussed was presented to council, since this is a new process for everyone. Chan said that, first off, all of the denied groups were appealing. Second, he said that those same groups failed to submit proper applications in the first place, even though a list of documents required was listed in the appeal. Chan said that there had been some confusion, as there was a deadline by which groups had to appeal. He said that this deadline was based on the email sent out notifying groups of being funded or denied. He said that officially, the deadline would be Tuesday, 2 weeks following the Base Budget recommendations. Lastly, Chan said that some groups did not reference appropriate grounds for appeal, even though the grounds for appeals are listed in the bylaws. He said that the remaining groups that qualified for appeals and did everything correctly were listed on a sheet in the Agenda Packet.

- Gruenberg asked if Chan could walk council through the process that would happen if a group's appeal were to be heard.

- Palma/Saracho said that first council would receive the notice that the group would be appealing. Then, he said, that group would be presented to council by the Internal Vice President. Palma/Saracho said that council would then

vote on whether or not to hear the appeal. He said that at the following meeting, the group itself would come to the meeting, and it would make its case. Palma/Saracho added that the Budget Review Committee (BRC) would also make its own case, and council would finally vote on whether or not to fund the group that appealed.

- Gruenberg asked if council would effectively be overturning the decision of the BRC.
- Palma/Saracho said that for right now, the decision was only whether or not to hear the appeals. He reminded council that Chan had just gone over the groups who properly filed their appeals, and said that council would have to now decide whether or not to hear these appeals .
- Nelson asked if there were still funds remaining with which to fund these groups.
- Palma/Saracho said that he was unsure if their remedies called for funding, or for a complete redistribution of the Base Budget funds.
- Ohara said that there is always the Programming Fund; She said that much of the funding requested is for programming, and there are still ways for groups to get this money without a Base Budget.
- Nelson said that he only asked because there needed to be money to give to these groups if their appeals were going to be heard.
- Ohara said that there is no money left in the Base Budget pool.
- Williams asked how much would be needed to fund these groups based on what was given to the other groups.
- Villarín said that \$4,400 was the cap, so for 6 groups the most it could be would be around \$25,000.
- Gruenberg reminded council that they were only voting on whether or not to hear the groups. He said that council does not need to act upon all of these remedies. Gruenberg then said that he was unclear as to the deadline of when the groups could appeal, and asked again when were the groups were notified.
- Lee said that the bylaws say that appeals must be no later than 2 weeks from the publication of the decision. She said that the decision went out Tuesday at 10:00 p.m., so the final deadline would be two weeks since then.
- Gruenberg asked if groups were ever told that it was Wednesday.
- Lee said that this was not the case.
- Palma/Saracho said that council should go down the list and see which groups should have their appeals heard.
- Tuttle said that as he understood the process about whether to accept an appeal, to actually overrule the decision of the BRC would require a three-fourths majority.
- Gruenberg said that he wanted to clarify before voting. He said that in his opinion, the 3 groups who did not meet the deadline should be thought about carefully before deciding to hear their appeal. However, Gruenberg said that groups that fell into the other categories, even if they did not submit any or all of the required documentation initially, or did not submit proper grounds for appeal, should still be heard.
- Chan said that instead of council having to read all of the appeals, the handout was just a breakdown. He said that it only shows council what was received, and it does not say in the bylaws that these groups should not be granted an appeal.
- Lee said that the Bylaws do not indicate what happens if the appeal requirements are not met, rather the bylaws indicate all of the things that are needed for an appeal.
- Wood agreed with what Lee said.
- Villarín did as well.
- Gruenberg made the point that the six groups who met all of the criteria should obviously be heard. He also noted that a good thing to do would be to have a

discussion with all of the groups about the Base Budgets. Gruenberg said that this would help to clear up a lot of the misinformation floating around campus. He said that this would also be a way of seeing if the groups are serious about these appeals. Gruenberg said that this is an example of due process. Lastly he noted that the BRC did a thorough job, so they should have the right to defend themselves, and to express that to the groups that are appealing.

Gruenberg then reminded Council that he had a prior obligation, and he left the meeting.

- Tripathi moved and Wood seconded to hear the appeal of the Association for Computer Machinery.
- Palma/Saracho pointed out that their grievance was on procedural error, like many of the other groups. He speculated on the possibility that the appealing groups worked together.
- Tuttle said that if anyone did not have the chance to look at the packet and read the grievances over, then council should do so in a recess before voting on the issue. Noting silence at the table, Tuttle assumed that everyone had, in fact, reviewed the packet.
- Palma/Saracho asked if anyone would like to take a recess to re-review the packet. Upon no indication, Palma/Saracho said that he hoped that Ohara would talk about the procedural errors of the appeals.
- Tripathi asked if that was a discussion to be held during an actual appeal, or to have right now.
- Palma/Saracho said that since the groups had already submitted the appeals, council needed to talk about potential procedural errors now.
- Tripathi said that, since all of the appeals are essentially identical, council should be able to talk about them all at once.
- Tuttle read from the Bylaws about the rules for appeals. He then asked Chan if he had informed the groups of the fact that this discussion would be taking place, in accordance with one of the procedures for appeals.
- Chan said that he had not.
- Tuttle said that the problem this presented was that the groups did not know to be present at this meeting to speak on their own behalf.
- Palma/Saracho said that last year if council decided to hear appeals from the groups, then they were asked to come and present their cases.
- Tripathi worried that if council had a discussion about the validity of appeals now, it may inadvertently bias council against the groups during the appeal hearings themselves.
- Lee said that the BRC presentation to be held later was more informational and less about addressing the appeals. She said that this presentation came about because the BRC just wants to clarify what might have been misunderstood.
- Tripathi asked for an example of a misunderstanding.
- Villarín said that if one read through the appeal packets, then they would know that the groups are alleging that the BRC did not understand "Minimum Criteria". She said that the BRC would like to show council, with the presentation, that the Minimum Criteria Set is actually from the bylaws. Villarín added that this was not a procedural error.
- Tripathi said that this presentation sounds like a defense of the BRC, and this would be unfair because they would be presenting their case before the groups were even present.
- Villarín said that it would not be a defense; rather it was a clarification about the BRC's definitions.
- Lee said that not only are non-USAC people confused, but there are student leaders who work with USAC that are also confused. She said that the BRC wants to make sure, before the appeals are heard, that everyone understands

the process, the bylaws, and the interpretation of the latter. Lee again reiterated that this would not be a defense.

- Ohara agreed with everything Lee said.
- Palma/Saracho said that he understood where Tripathi was going, and he understood what he was saying. However, he also said that he knew about the BRC presentation and did not see it as a defense or pre-emptive strike against the appealing groups. Palma/Saracho said that based on what had been said, he felt like council should hear these groups' appeals.

Pavan Tripathi excused himself and left the meeting.

Jason Avila excused himself and left the meeting.

- Palma/Saracho suggested that council have the presentation now, before they decide about whether or not to hear the appeals.
- Gaulton said that he was unsure whether it was good to have the presentation. He said that even if council didn't see it as a defense, others might view it as such.
- Williams asked if the presentation could change people's ideas about who to hear appeals from.
- Palma/Saracho said that it could.
- Williams said that the presentation should then be made after the vote instead of before.
- Ohara said that perhaps she did not understand fully, but she thought that the discussion would be contained within USAC. She said that she felt like the entire case of the appealing groups was presented in writing in everyone's Agenda Packets.
- Tuttle said that the troubling part was that the Bylaw provision stated that the groups should have been notified and able to make a presentation at this meeting right now. He said that they had a right to be there even though council was just deciding whether or not to hear the appeals. Tuttle said that in the Bylaws, there is language where it states "notified of chance to come to funding committee or body meeting..." He said that there is the possibility of an appeal with Judicial Board if council decides not to hear appeals.
- Villarín said that she and Ohara were had been planning to go through the appeals with the BRC to determine what kind of information the BRC should then present to council. She said that if council decides to hear the appeals of groups simply because they followed procedure, then this ignores the time and effort of the BRC.
- Chan said that council needed to remember that their job is to make decisions to best serve the students. He said that the BRC took the extra step to inform the groups, make sure that they knew alternatives, educate them about appeals, and more. But, he said that in the spirit of council's view by the student body, it is not so much that the conditions for appeal must be just, rather the fact of the matter is that the money has all been allocated. Chan said that their appeals are possibly to seek further clarification. He said that in order for council to be thorough, they should address the issue adequately enough so that future councils do not have the same problems.
- Gaulton said that Villarín was right, that council must determine whether or not the evidence was justified. He said that just because the procedure is followed, a group does not automatically get an appeal. Gaulton said that council needed to learn more about that before they vote to hear the groups. He said that the BRC could explain this, and asked that they be heard.
- Villarín said that if the appeals have no merit, why should USAC hear them.
- Chan said that the point he was making was that he had confidence in the BRC and the process that they used. He said that he had confidence that they gave each group what was deserved, but if there are this many groups claiming the same thing, then as the body that represents them, it is council's duty to hear them out.

- Villarin asked if groups had not qualified, then why should council have to hear their appeals anyway. She said that it would be possible for the BRC to sit down with these groups and explain why they had not been funded so that they would be better prepared next year. Villarin said that the BRC even asked for comments and concerns from the groups. She took the stance that granting an appeal to a group with no merit set a bad precedent.
- Bhuiyan agreed with Villarin that the hearings may not need to take place just because groups applied for an appeal. He said that after the presentation, they could address whether or not a proposal should be heard.
- Lee said that council should not simply grant appeals for fear of criticism. She said that everyone was here to uphold the Bylaws and set a certain standard for all, not lower the bar.
- Nelson said that this was the first time council had done this, and asked that they think about the precedent they will be setting. He said that there would always be conflicting opinions about funding allocations. Nelson elaborated by saying that the key question Council Members should be asking is not whether all criteria have been met, but whether the criteria are adequate.
- Wood said that she would like to hear the presentation for clarification on Minimum Criteria.
- Palma/Saracho said that initially he felt torn, as it is not right just to give an appeal to groups if they turned in the papers. On the other hand, he said, groups should have the right to present their cases. Palma/Saracho said that their whole case is that the minimum criteria that the BRC used was not what was written in the Bylaws, but this was pretty consistent across the other groups.
- Villarin asked Nelson if he wanted to see if the individual applications had merit.
- Nelson said that there is a subjective opinion of the committee, and if one juxtaposes this with those who were funded, then there is a problem. He said that with a funding board he had dealt with, procedural errors were checked for, and if found, then groups had been refunded.
- Villarin showed council how the BRC had scored each application. She also noted that the meetings that the BRC had were recorded, in terms of keeping up with minutes and procedure, all the way to the point of writing down the individual notes.
- Gaulton asked about the deliberations.
- Villarin said that the deliberations were kept confidential, like juries and other funding groups on campus.
- Ohara said this is done to make sure decisions are made without any of the BRC members feeling uncomfortable about expressing themselves if their opinions would be under scrutiny.
- Nelson had heard complaints about public hearings, and said that if groups were dead-set on funding, they might come to these hearings to intimidate the BRC into funding them. He said that everyone must understand that the decisions should be made in a comfortable setting to ensure impartiality.
- Lee said that even though deliberations were confidential, the process was all presented and recorded.
- Ohara said that Minimum Criteria were specified in the Bylaws. She said that a questionnaire was given to the groups, and they were also shown the PowerPoint presentation. Ohara said that the groups all focused on Article VI.C.4.b.1. of the Bylaws, but she said that this was actually not applicable.
- McLaren said that the Bylaws required that the Internal Vice President notify the groups that their appeals would be decided upon at this meeting. She questioned whether council might have missed a step in notifying the groups.
- Lee said that with the CS Mini Fund, this was how it was done last year, and the groups did not come to the meeting where their appeals were decided on.

- Chan said that he interpreted that point in the Bylaws to mean that at this meeting, council would decide whether or not to hear the appeals, and then he would notify the groups that were not to be heard that they did not need to attend the appeals hearing.
- Palma/Saracho said that 11 groups appealed and 6 included all of the paperwork. He said that council did not decide whether or not they appealed on proper grounds. Palma/Saracho reminded council that there was a motion on the table, and said that everyone probably felt one way or another at this point. He asked council if anyone wanted to Call the Question.
- Wood Called the Question with regard to the motion on the table to hear the Base Budget Appeal of The Association of Computing Machinery.
- Gaulton Objected to the Calling of the Question.
- Council overruled Gaulton's objection with a vote of 8 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Council then voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of The Association for Computing Machinery with a vote of 1 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.

- Tseng moved and Chan seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Alpha Epsilon Omega.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Alpha Epsilon Omega with a vote of 0 in favor, 9 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Villarin moved and Martinez seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of the Transfer Student Association.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of the Transfer Student Association with a vote of 0 in favor, 9 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Tseng moved and Lee seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Nation 2 Nation.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Nation 2 Nation with a vote of 0 in favor, 9 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Wood moved and Tseng seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Asian Greeks of UCLA.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Asian Greeks of UCLA with a vote of 0 in favor, 9 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Martinez moved and Lee seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of the Ballroom Dance Club.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of the Ballroom Dance Club with a vote of 0 in favor, 9 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Villarin moved and Tseng seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of the United Arab Society.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of the United Arab Society with a vote of 0 in favor, 9 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Lee moved and Martinez seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Eta Kappa Nu.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Eta Kappa Nu with a vote of 1 in favor, 8 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Tseng moved and Lee seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Pre Medical Asian Pacific American Medical Students Association.

- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Pre Medical Asian Pacific American Medical Students Association with a vote of 1 in favor, 8 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Lee moved and Wood seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA) – Phi Beta Lambda.
- Chan said that he wanted to be on record stating that he had the utmost confidence in the BRC. He said that he is not taking sides, rather his vote is motivated by a desire for a better process. Chan said that he does not discount the work of the BRC. He stated that there is a reason why the option for presenting an appeal exists in the Bylaws, and, if anything, hearing the groups would be upholding the Bylaws, not lowering the bar. Chan said that no one on council would object to the BRC, especially after they did all this work. However, he asked if council was doing a service or a disservice to the groups by hearing the appeals. Chan said that he thought it would not detract from the work of the BRC or hurt the groups to be able to make their appeals.
- Wood said that, referencing Chan, she felt that there are not grounds for a hearing based on documentation and knowledge of the appeals. She said that there are other ways in which the funding process can be improved upon, and a hearing is not the best way to go about addressing those suggestions.
- Lee said that she did not mean to imply that hearing the appeals would be lowering council's standards. Rather, she had meant that hearing appeals without merit would be lowering standards.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA) – Phi Beta Lambda with a vote of 1 in favor, 8 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Lee moved and Martinez seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of the Lebanese Social Club.
- Chan said that his intention was not to prolong the council meeting. However, he said that after Wood referenced exploring alternatives, he realized that if these alternatives were to be explored, then that might change his mind.
- Samaan said that when true change is sought, the worst way to do it is through a hearing, as the discussion often ends with that hearing.
- Ohara said, with regard to Chan's statement, that she and the BRC already met with the groups that were denied funding and explained to them why they did not receive any money. She said, in addition to that, copies of the PowerPoint presentation that the BRC made to Council were available in the Student Government Accounting Office for anyone who wanted one.
- Chan said that he knew she had met with all the groups.
- Gaulton raised a Point of Order that this should not be discussed right now.
- Chan said that this would be heard by USAC, not by the Judicial Board.
- Lee said, addressing Chan's remarks, that almost all of the appealing groups were in attendance at the workshop BRC held for groups that were denied funding. She said that, at this point, it is up to the groups to take the initiative if they want to come and talk about getting other funding.
- Palma/Saracho said, in defense of Chan, that the last time he tried to talk to the groups, they were pissed off and antagonistic from the start. He said that perhaps they were personalizing the denial of funding to their groups more than they ought to. Palma/Saracho suggested that council schedule a meeting with these 11 groups so that another discussion could be held.
- Chan said that if council took that last step of explaining everything to the groups, then council would be fulfilling its obligation to the students, and doing what they needed to do.
- Villarin asked if Chan would come to that meeting.

- Chan said that he would. He said he felt that, if the BRC did this one thing more, then it would make the process complete.
- Martinez said that the BRC had worked since late July, and asked how much more they really had to do. He said that it is not the BRC's job to inform every single group and explain why they did not get funding. Martinez said that if they cannot come to the meetings, then they should not be appealing. He said that it is time for the members of BRC to move on and work on other areas.
- Lee said that this had been a long process. She said that every few weeks, they would think that they're done, only to have the process prolonged once more.
- Palma/Saracho said that if this last thing is not done to help curb hard feelings, then the groups may go to the Judicial Board. He said if that happened, it would delay the process further, and was likely to result in an even more combative and negative situation between the groups and the BRC.
Palma/Saracho said that he agreed with Chan that the BRC should take this one last step to complete the process.
- Lee said that she is always willing to keep going. After all, she said, she had already put in an extra 200 hours.
- Wood said that she was all for helping out.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of the Lebanese Social Club with a vote of 0 in favor, 9 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Tseng moved and Martinez seconded to hear the Base Budget Appeal of UCLA Robotics.
- Council voted against the motion to hear the Base Budget Appeal of UCLA Robotics with a vote of 0 in favor, 9 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Palma/Saracho asked for a show of hands regarding a meeting with the groups that were denied funding. He said that he would exempt the BRC members from having to attend an additional meeting on this matter, and said that he and other Council Members would meet with the groups in question.
Chan, Bhuiyan, Tseng, and Vu agreed to join Palma/Sarcho in meeting with the groups that were denied funding.
- Villarin said that, in the spirit of "going the extra mile", she would feel bad if she was not part of the last step in the process.
- Palma/Saracho asked what time would be good to have this meeting.
- Wood said that it should be after the coming weekend.
- Villarin suggested Tuesday, the 28th, at 6:00 p.m., before that night's USAC meeting.
Martinez and Wood were both unavailable at that time.
- Ohara said that the meeting should be held sooner rather than later so as not to leave the groups waiting.
- Gaulton said that he couldn't come anytime this week.
- Wood suggested Friday morning or afternoon, depending on the convenience of the groups.
Martinez and Palma/Saracho had a commitment on Friday morning.
- Palma/Saracho suggested from 12:00 – 2:00 p.m. on Friday, September 24th.
He said that the group leaders should be called, not just emailed, since this is short notice. Palma/Saracho said that, in the meantime, Council would work on their presentation for the groups.
- Ohara asked council if they had any questions for the BRC that would help them in preparing for their meeting with the groups.
- Wood asked if the BRC had shown to the groups examples of proposals the BRC rated as "Excellent."
- Ohara said that they had done that.

- Palma/Saracho asked that council be informed once the meeting time was finalized.

VI. Special Presentations

Welcome Week Proposal – Jenny Wood

- Wood went over UCLA Welcome Week 2004, as she passed out a handout about the various events that were being offered.
- Gaulton spoke first about the concert at 7:30 p.m., saying that the first 5,000 students would be admitted, and that tickets were available at the Central Ticket Office.
- Bhuiyan said that Monday was convocation, with a barbeque in Wilson Plaza from 5:00 – 6:30 p.m. He said that there would be speakers during this time period, first at Pauley Pavilion from 3:10-3:50 p.m. Bhuiyan said that these would include Janina Montero, Chancellor Carnesale, Palma/Saracho, Professor Andrea Gettis, and also a performance by the UCLA marching band,
- Wood said that the volunteers needed to check in people at the games, and said that each office needs to sign up for at least one game. She added that council needed to be sure that their games were staffed at all times, and she passed around a sign-up sheet for events and games. Lastly she told council to let her know if any of the offices wanted an extra table or anything out on the field.
- Palma/Saracho said that Wednesday is also Governance Day, and that breakfast would be provided. He told council to be there when they could, and said that they would have a question and answer session with the Chancellor.
- Wood said that there might be another meeting during the week to figure out the last minute details, and there would be a walkthrough of the carnival field tomorrow morning at 9:00a.m. She asked council if anyone was interested in helping plan the USAC Open House.
- Chan said that he would help.
- Palma/Saracho also offered to help. He asked if there was any cost for the Carnival that council should know about.
- Gaulton said that he didn't want speculative estimates, but requested that he be notified only when the exact amount was known.
- Wood said that there was a cost which would not be covered by the Base Budgets. She said that in the past, USAC has contributed to this.
- Palma/Saracho asked if this would be paid for afterward or beforehand.
- Gaulton said that everything would be paid for up front, and the total would be brought to council later. He said that lots of advertising was going out, in student housing, on the website, and simply by word of mouth.
- Wood asked if anyone would work on an advertising committee for this.
- Gaulton said that members of Council could work on this, especially if they got people from their offices to help out.
- Lee asked if the fliers were ready.
- Gaulton said that they would be ready soon.
- Wood said that if anyone had free time on their hands and would like to go around and advertise, feel free to go for it.
- Vardner suggested that IFC help by distributing fliers during move-in week.
- Palma/Saracho said to get a list of people who can help and send it to Wood.

VII. Fund Allocations

There were no fund allocations this week.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

Academic Affairs Commissioner – Eligio Martinez Jr.

- Martinez said that he would be speaking with Judy Smith about the Experimental College, which was slated for establishment by winter quarter. He said that next week he had a long list of events and things to get done. Martinez said, as a result of this, he might not be at next week's Council meeting.

Campus Events Commissioner – Jason Gaulton

- Gaulton said that he had been talking with Michael Moore about coming during October, but he was not sure if the program would be financially viable. Gaulton said that Moore is asking for a \$20,000 Honorarium, and to reserve the Los Angeles Tennis Center (LATC) is upwards of \$40,000. Gaulton pointed out that this could indicate a total of well over \$50,000, and at a ticket price of \$5 per student for 6000 people, this would be a loss of \$20,000.
- Wood asked why the LATC was so expensive.
- Gaulton said that it was probably more like \$30,000, but the big things to consider are security, ticket-taking, production cost unrelated to electronics, and other things too. He added that the event was planned for noon, and he didn't think that 6000 students could come to a noon event.
- Villarín asked if sponsors had been sought.
- Gaulton said that they had not, and unfortunately at this point there was not enough time to get a sponsor and submit the proposal.
- Nelson said that if it is a fiscal situation, to make sure that this is clear to the students and to Moore. He told council that at another university, the decision to bring Moore was overruled by the chancellor because the program was too one-sided.
- Gaulton said that if Moore dropped his honorarium request of \$20,000, then it would still be risky to break even.
- Nelson said that council should ask Moore if he will decline the honorarium, that way if he refused then it was him instead of the students preventing the event.
- Palma/Saracho said that Gaulton should try, but that if Moore wouldn't come it would be okay.
- Gaulton said that he would email Moore tonight and see.

General Representative #3 – Anneli Villarín

- Villarín said that on September 11th, she attended the first meeting of Tour Los Angeles. She said that she went with Wood, and that they had walked through downtown Los Angeles, the Garment District, the Jewelry District, visited the Labor Center, and even rode on the Los Angeles Subway. Villarín said that it had been a cool and eye-opening tour, and said that she had talked to Martinez and the AAC about cosponsoring "See L.A.", a city tour. Villarín said that Bhuiyan and her office were also interested in cosponsoring an event together, and had decided on November 1st as the date. She said that there would be a concert, and that they were trying to tie it to the Rock the Vote campaign.

External Vice President – John Vu

- Vu said that he had spent the last two weekends at UC Berkeley for a UCSA board meeting, and that they had voted to take a stance on Proposition 66, the Three Strikes Law. He said that there had also been a resolution passed recommending Dolores to become one of the new UC Regents. Vu said that two UCLA undergraduates had been appointed to committees on UCSA at the meeting as well. He said that Adam Harmetz would now serve on the Information Committee, and Jeanne Biniak would work with the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee. Vu said that this week, he would be visiting UC San Francisco for a UCSA Executive Committee Meeting, where the goals for the year would be set. He said he would also be there for the September Regents

meeting to “whiteline”. Vu added that Palma/Saracho and Martinez would be speaking to the Regents about Eligibility for all of the Universities of California.

Internal Vice President - Darren Chan

- Chan said that this past weekend he had gone with Lee to USC and met with representatives from many local schools. He said that the purpose of the meeting was to plan for a conference to be held in November. Chan said that workshops would be held there about programming, how to obtain financing, student activism, and student support. He said that this conference would be a great chance for students to get involved.
- Tseng asked what the purpose of the conference would be.
- Chan said that the idea was for schools in the area to come here to UCLA to learn about USAC’s governing process and projects.
- Lee said that this was through the Regional Center, and that the theme was merging service and activism. She also said that this was a great opportunity for all of LA to come together and work towards one goal. Lee said that at the conference, they would come up with a project that all schools can work on together.
- Wood asked if any student who wanted to come would be able to.
- Lee said that the conference to be held on November 6th was geared toward a smaller audience, and that invitations would be sent out to people on campus.
- Tseng asked what kind of project she envisioned.
- Lee said that it would be something on the scale of Get Out the Vote. She said that perhaps it would have to do with voter education. Lee also said that the planning meeting for the conference would be on October 9th, and that the final details would be determined there.
- Chan said that his office was trying to recruit student leaders from the other campuses to attend the conference.

President - Allende Palma/Saracho

- Palma/Saracho said that last week he had a conference call with the Presidents Council to discuss the upcoming UC Regents Meeting. He said that the meeting would be Wednesday night, following a dinner that the regents put on for the council. Palma/Saracho said that this would be a good opportunity to talk with them about the concerns regarding raising the GPA required for admittance to a UC. He said that he would be leaving later that night for San Francisco with Vu and Martinez. Palma/Saracho said that the meetings began at 9:15 A.M. the next day, so he was not sure how much sleep they would all get. He also noted that Vu would be “whitelining”, which meant that he would be able to personally lobby the Regents. Palma/Saracho said that other things discussed in the conference call included fee increases, the graduate school situation, health care, admissions, and eligibility. He said that the meeting with the presidents would be at 6:00 P.M., before the Regents meeting. Palma/Saracho also mentioned that Governance Day was coming up, and said that this would be a good opportunity for groups to talk to council. He said that on Governance Day, there would be a meeting with the Chancellor. Palma/Saracho said that the agenda for the rest of the meeting would come out soon so that everyone would know what was going to happen. With regards to parking, Palma/Saracho said that he thought he had given a parking application to everyone who needed one, but he said that if anyone still needed an application, they should let him know very soon. Lastly he mentioned that a Board of Directors meeting would be held on Friday with Pat O’Brian and that the situation with Taco Bell would be discussed.
- Williams said that Young brands and also people representing Taco Bell would be there.

IX. Old Business

There was no Old Business this week.

X. Announcements

- McLaren said that Georgine Piper from Student Government Accounting needed council members to complete the paperwork so they could receive their stipends for the summer.
- Chan said that he was still short \$70.00 from the USAC Retreat, and asked that anyone who hadn't paid yet to get the money to him as soon as they could.
- Samaan said that, on Sunday or Monday, someone or some people had vandalized the LGBT Resource center. He said that flyers in support of the LGBT Center had been printed and were being distributed to everyone who wished to display their support. Samaan asked that each Council Member take at least one of the flyers for display in a public location.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Ohara passed around the attendance sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Villarin moved and Lee seconded to adjourn.
- Villarin called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the meeting of September 21, 2004 was adjourned at 9:26 P.M. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker