

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday February 22, 2005
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 P.M.

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

ABSENT:

GUESTS: Jeannie Biniek, Mike Cohn, Melinda Dudley, Ron Johnson, Nathan Lam, Thomas Lifka, Janina Montero, Brian Neesby, Saba Riazati

I. A. Call to Order

- Palma/Saracho called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Corella passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Avila asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports, and also requested that a Special Presentation on CPR be added to the Agenda.
- Wood asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Lee asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Gruenberg asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Palma/Saracho moved New Business to before the Officer and Member Reports.
- Martinez moved and Avila seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Wood called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Agenda was approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

III. Approval of the Minutes

January 25, 2005

- Avila moved and Martinez seconded to approve the Minutes of January 25, 2005, as submitted.
- Villarín called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of January 25, 2005 were approved, as submitted, by Acclamation.

February 15, 2005

- Avila moved and Martinez seconded to approve the Minutes of February 15, 2005, as submitted.
- Villarín called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of February 15, 2005 were approved, as submitted, by Acclamation.

IV. Special Presentations

Student Welfare Commission – CPR Sunday

Jason Avila and company performed a short skit for council about CPR, ending it with an invitation to all present to attend the SWC CPR Sunday on March 6th.

Financial Aid – Vice Chancellor Janina Montero, Assistant Vice Chancellor Thomas Lifka, and Director of the Financial Aid Office Ronald W. Johnson

- Montero said that a booklet on Undergraduate Student Financial Support at UCLA was being distributed to council. She said that the booklet provided the history and key policies on financial aid for undergraduate students at UCLA and other UC's for the period 2001-2004. She added that, following the presentations by AVC Tom Lifka and Financial Aid Director Ron Johnson, there would be time allotted for questions and answers.
- Assistant Vice Chancellor Thomas Lifka introduced himself to council. He said that a lot of the information in the booklet was self-explanatory, and said that the Basic Principles of UC's Educational Financing Model (EFM) were set forth on Page 3. Lifka said that the same rules have been governing financial aid at UCLA for about 10 years. He added that, prior to 1994, campuses could allocate funds however they wanted. He said that this resulted in all of the funds going to the neediest students.

General Representative Tommy Tseng Arrived.

- Lifka said that in 1994, there had been a change, which established guidelines as to where funds had to go. Lifka said that the current model, established that year, was the Educational Finance Model. He said that this model incorporated the total cost of education.

Administrative Representative Rick Tuttle arrived.

- Lifka said that, as a result of the framework established by the Educational Finance Model, the financial aid package offered to students by different campuses should look about the same. He stated, however, that there was a discretionary amount that could be used. Lifka said that this model was comprehensive, and that it was used to determine how much aid was needed and also the best way to allocate it among the campuses.
- Gruenberg commented that the allotments to the different campuses appeared to be very different.
- Lifka said that the amounts across the campuses were actually pretty similar, and said that the numbers were used to calculate the amount of financial aid that would be given to undergraduate students. He said that the amount of money allocated to each campus was based on the total need of the undergraduate students at a given campus. Lifka said that UCLA often got more funding than the other campuses. Lifka said that the amount of financial aid given to students was described as "manageable", meaning that it was an amount that students would be able to repay upon graduation. He said that the interest rate was roughly 7 percent. Lifka said that the amount of time students worked while going to college was also factored in, using statistics about students who worked and how much they worked. Lifka said that the current model assumed that students took the summer off. He said that amount of time UCLA students work averages about 8,400 hours during the school year. Lifka said that, currently, interest rates are very low, and a lot of students are applying for financial aid for this reason. He also said that, at the present time, UCLA was getting more than \$40 million dollars each year, which was more than its sister school UC Berkeley is getting. He said that this has allowed a lot of low-income students to come to UCLA for their education. Lifka said that aid was given to 37 percent of the UCLA students in the form of Pell Grants, which could only be given to students whose family income was under \$40,000 annually. He said he thought it was great that so many low-income students could attend UCLA.
- Tripathi asked how these numbers were generated.

- Lifka said that the UC Office of the President did the research. He said that a part of this came from the agreement made with the Governor and the State Legislature a couple of years ago.
- Biniek asked if the agreement with the Governor and the Legislature had affected the student fee.
- Lifka said that it did, but that this was actually the first year that the fee had been increased. Lifka said that if someone is on a need-based scholarship, then private scholarships are subtracted from the loan and the work expectancy.
- Johnson said that this was done to encourage students to seek outside scholarships.
- Lifka added that UCLA had a Scholarship Resource Center to assist students if obtaining financial aid.
- Tseng asked what happens when private scholarship money, combined with a needs-based scholarship, exceeds the cost of tuition.
- Johnson said that, unless the student can document additional need, then the needs-based scholarship would be reduced.
- Tseng asked if the surplus money could be used to pay off previous loans.
- Johnson said that it could not, unless there is a way to document other academic need. Johnson went on with the presentation to talk about grants. He said that there are a number of students who belong to the Automatic Zero Family Income Bracket. He added that these students automatically qualified for aid, but said that there were also students in the other income brackets who were able to receive funding. Johnson said that the average financial aid award is about \$11,925, though this number had a wide standard deviation. Johnson moved on to talk about the fact that a lot of grant money came in to help with financial aid for students. He said that about 62 to 63 percent of the students were receiving financial aid. Johnson said that this often surprised people, though it was completely true. He said that about 50 percent were receiving the UCLA student grant fund. Johnson then moved on to the Pell Grant on the next page, saying that it should be much higher than it was, but that it would be increased over the next five years. He said that more than a million students had received aid from this fund but, rather than this being a virtue, it was actually an indication of just how many students needed financial assistance. Johnson said that the loan program had not been funded for next year, and said that he had concerns that this program could be further eroded if the president chose to do other things on the grant side. Johnson said that the Cal Grant Program was probably one of the largest and most important to incoming students, as any student who had a 3.0 GPA or higher qualified. He said that this covered a large portion of the students, and that funding for this would be expected in the coming years. Under scholarships, Johnson said that there were a lot of different scholarships available, with most of them being need-based, and awarded to students for academic achievement. He said that there had been a movement to create more merit-based scholarships, but this came at the cost of need-based scholarships. Johnson said that work-study is an extremely important program, with about 6 million dollars awarded each year. He said that some of the policies had been changed to make the ratio of funding providers by the state and the federal government match, as the state tends to contribute less than the federal government. Lastly, Johnson said that the loan programs are another primary resource for financial aid, and the interest rates on those loans were extremely low, but would potentially be rising in the coming years. He said that, unfortunately, the loan amounts had not increased along with the increases in the cost of tuition. He added that the downside to this was that students had to borrow from outside, higher-interest sources.
- Palma/Saracho asked if the loan statistics included private loans.
- Johnson said they did, but reminded council that the majority of students were not getting private loans.
- Lifka said that it might seem surprising, but many students have been able to pay upon graduation.
- Johnson said that most of the students who received a University grant were the neediest.

- Jeanne Biniek asked how small this number was.
- Johnson said that this number was very small.
- Tripathi asked what the difference was between a private loan and a University loan.
- Johnson said that private loans were capitalized, with interest accruing if students deferred paying until after graduation.
- Tripathi asked if every student who wanted a loan could get one, and why students would ever need a private loan.
- Johnson said, as he had earlier, that the university could only lend a certain amount. He said that the problem was that a student could sometimes have a financial aid package that did not meet the full financial needs of the student. Johnson said that it was hoped that most students would take out a parent loan.
- Gruenberg asked what some of the main goals were that UCLA was targeting.
- Johnson said that one main goal was to increase the Pell Grant and particularly to increase the loan amounts for first year students.
- Lifka said that they worried about students defaulting on their loans, but that freshmen have usually been continuing into their sophomore year. He said, however, that given the state of the federal budget, the likelihood of the picture improving is very slim.
- Johnson said that a lot of students were worried about interest rates and other issues related to aid.
- Tuttle said that the Chair of the Appropriations Committee was in favor of aid.
- Johnson said that another effort was to have students write to UCOP to express their concerns about financial aid and to also work on getting the funding to the Universities increased.
- Lifka said that another great accomplishment was the number of low-income students at UCLA.

V. Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

VI. Fund Allocations

- Corella said that 1 of the 7 recommendations were via her discretionary authorization, and added that the Cultural Affairs Commission (CAC) had withdrawn their request, which was the first one listed on the cover sheet of recommendations.
- External Vice President John Vu arrived.*
- Tseng moved and Martinez seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
 - Villarin called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations were approved by Acclamation.

Cultural Affairs Commission
Requested: \$6,492.00
Recommended: \$ 0.00

As noted by the Finance Committee Chairperson in her opening statement, the Cultural Affairs Commission withdrew this request.

Cultural Affairs Commission
Requested: \$1,379.00
Recommended: \$ 400.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$400.00 for the partial cost of an Honorarium for the Jazz Series ongoing from January 24th to March 7th.

UCLA Armenian Students Association**Requested: \$1,480.67****Recommended: \$ 419.40**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$180.40 for the cost of Airfare, \$105.00 for the cost of Other: Room and Board, and \$134 for the cost of Facilities for the Panel on Genocide Denial to be held February 28th.

UCLA Armenian Students Association**Requested: \$1,523.00****Recommended: \$ 474.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$474.00 for the partial cost of Advertising for the Awareness 2005 event to be held on February 25th.

Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity**Requested: \$714.97****Recommended: \$509.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$440.00 for the partial cost of Registration and \$69.00 for the partial cost of Lodging for the Western Regional Leadership Convention to be held from March 17th to March 20th.

Community Service Commission**Requested: \$300.00****Recommended: \$100.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$100.00 for the partial cost of Transportation for the Women and Youth Supporting each Other event to be held on February 26th.

USA Financial Supports Commission**Requested: \$574.00****Recommended: \$300.00**

In compliance with the discretionary authorization granted to her in the 2004-2005 Finance Committee Guidelines, Corella recommended the allocation of \$300.00 for the partial cost of Advertising for the FAFSA Workshop to be held on February 23rd and 24th.

VII. New Business

A. *Resolution in Opposition to Excess Unit Fee Policy

- Martinez said that UCOP has proposed a new policy that would affect all California resident undergraduate students who enter as first year or transfer students beginning in Fall 2005. He said that it would limit financial aid to students who went over 110% of the allotted units. Martinez said that a lot of people in the university system had been in favor of it at first, but a lot of people now recognize that it may do more harm than good. He added that it might cost more money to enforce the policy than it would actually produce. Martinez said that the UC President wanted to implement it because it was part of the compact with the Governor, but now he, too, wanted to get out of it.
- Vu added that two weeks ago at the UCSA meeting, they came together in opposition to this policy. He also said that a lot of other campuses have published resolutions against it.
- Tripathi asked about the third "Whereas" from the bottom, and how it applied.
- Martinez said that studying abroad limited the number of units that a student could take, so when students came back, it tended to push them over the 198 unit cap. He explained that students had the option of going abroad, but they were limited in the number of units that they could get abroad.
- Nelson said that there were certain courses that had to be taken while abroad, and these might not apply toward a major.

- Tuttle said that this might be a case where the units would apply toward graduation but not toward a major.
- Martinez said that another thing to keep in mind is that many majors required 217 units, engineering being an example, which would automatically require these students to pay more.
- Palma/Saracho said that the projected revenue from this was policy was one million dollars, but he thought that it would not generate that much income. He said that another risk was that students would limit their education by not taking all the classes they wanted, simply because they couldn't afford the fee penalty.
- Martinez said that students could also have problems if they were given bad counseling which might cause them to not take a class that was needed for graduation, but which was offered only once a year. He said if the student missed the class, they might have to wait another year to take it, which could put them over the unit cap.
- Tseng asked if double-majors were exempt from this policy.
- Martinez said that "legitimate double majors" were exempt, but this was unclear and open to interpretation.
- Montero said that what Martinez was proposing might not work, as it was not about the money. She said that it sounds as if this is a major issue since it is part of the compact, so even if the campus was not okay with it, it might be necessary to maintain it.
- Tseng moved and Villarín seconded to approve the Resolution in Opposition to the Excess Unit Fee Policy.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution in Opposition to the Excess Unit Fee Policy with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Martinez requested that Council vote to publish the Resolution.
- Tseng moved and Vu seconded to publish the Resolution in a 1/3 page advertisement in the Daily Bruin on Monday, March 1st
- McLaren reminded Martinez that the names of the authors of the Resolution were not to appear in the ad.
- Martinez said he was aware of that, but thanked McLaren for the reminder.

B. *Discussion and Decision Regarding the Hours of the USAC Spring Election

- Lam said that the voting this year would be done online on MyUCLA. He said that last school year, Council decided that there would be a restriction set the voting hours. Lam said, however, that MyUCLA was unhappy about this, since all of their other services were 24-hour. He said that MyUCLA representatives have notified USAC and its Election Board Advisor the they would not host the election unless USAC removed the restriction on the voting hours. Lam said that, regardless of his opinion or the opinion of Council members, he proposed that MyUCLA host the USAC election because of cost and practicality.
- Nelson asked what the cost differential would be.
- Mike Cohn, Election Board Advisor, said that it would have cost \$50,000 to upgrade the old voting system that Council used to use. In addition, he said that the 7-year lease they had on the old voting machines had expired. Cohn said that there are a lot of private companies that would like to host USAC's election, but the lowest price offered was \$28,000. Also, he pointed out that USAC's election was, and should continue to be, an internal operation.
- Wood asked if there was a way to help secure the votes through MyUCLA if Council complied with their demands.
- Lam said that he thought there were a lot of things that could be done to secure the vote.
- Cohn said that MyUCLA, because of what the system provided, is under federal law that requires certain things of them. He said that no system is totally safe, but because of the sensitive information contained in MyUCLA, it was about as safe as it gets.
- Palma/Saracho said that one of the reasons for the voting time restriction was the hour restrictions on campaigning.

- Lam said that he thought it could pose a problem. He said that only a few people are in charge of overseeing the entire campus, and the Election Board relied on the opposing groups to bring complaints about each other to E-Board.
- Gruenberg said that he was of a different frame of mind. He said that he thought it was improper to limit students' access to voting, especially since the elections process lacked student interest. Gruenberg said that, at the election in Spring 2003, hundreds of students voted during the hours that were eliminated in last year's election. He said that the fear of someone doing something crafty during the late hours did not warrant removing those hours from the process.
- Villarín said that, in light of the ultimatum from MyUCLA, she thought it might be a good idea to increase the monitoring of the elections process.
- Tripathi said that was not necessary, because the election process two years ago had around the clock voting hours.
- Vardner said that there were more violations last year during the limited hours than there were two years ago when they had 24-hour voting. He said that the restrictions on campaigning were a result of the strain put on Facilities Management to clean up the mess made by candidates.
- Tuttle said that technical concerns should not drive Council's decision. He said that the cost benefit, however, is clearly in favor of following Lam's advice.
- Palma/Saracho said that, even though he did have certain reservations, he agreed with Tuttle that the cost/benefit strongly favored the use of 24-hour voting, using MyUCLA.
- Tripathi moved and Wood seconded to use MyUCLA for a 24-hour Election in Spring 2005.
- Council approved the motion to use MyUCLA for a 24-hour Election in Spring 2005 with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

C. Proposed Amendments to the USAC Election Code

- Lam said that he was handing out some recommended amendments to the Election Code, and asked that everyone review them and be prepared to vote on them at next week's meeting. Lam said that these recommendations were based on information he obtained by talking with last year's Election Board Chairperson, combined with his review of complaints that had been filed during last year's election. Lam said that the recommended changes were in bold type, and recommended deletions were indicated by strike-through. Lam said that he had defined a "Candidate Signboard" as something that is unattended, whereas a "Sandwich Board" is something worn or carried.
- Palma/Saracho asked if Candidate Signboards were the large ones that they posted on Bruin Walk.
- Lam said that they were, and that candidates could have only one Candidate Signboard. Lam moved on, saying that he was removing the allowance of up to two non-UCLA students to campaign. He said that there were three reasons for this: First, Lam said that it was a huge hassle for E-Board to keep track these people. Second, he said that the use of non-UCLA students made it unfair for Independents, because "slated" candidates could each bring two outsiders who might end up campaigning for the entire slate, not just for the candidate. Lam also said that slated candidates used fellow slate-members to sign-in their people. Lam said that the final reason for not allowing non-UCLA students to campaign was because they did not have a vested interest in the outcome of the election because they were not UCLA students, and ultimately did not have a right to tell UCLA students who to vote for.
- Villarín said that this was a good point because, if someone needed outsiders to campaign for them, it did not bode well for their support at UCLA.
- Avila agreed that students should be the ones to help campaign, since they have an interest in the outcome of the election.
- Palma/Saracho said that another reason is that it is hard to hold non-UCLA students accountable for their actions. He said that there had been problematic experiences last year, as it removed control from E-Board.

- Tseng also agreed and said that the proposed amendment did not prevent aid from family members, as they could still contribute with money or other support.
- Tuttle agreed, but expressed his regret about the proposed amendment for he thought that one of the fun things about coming to a public university was that a lot of the students were local, and it was nice to have the opportunity to meet each other's families. He asked that the Election Chair make sure that the language did not exclude the aid of family members in areas other than campaigning.
- Gaulton said that Bruin Walk was a celebration of free speech, and asked if candidates would be penalized for campaigning done by individuals that they did not sanction.
- Lam said that the language required that a candidate be held responsible for anyone campaigning for him or her. However, he said that he wanted to change this so that candidates would not be penalized for campaigners that he or she was not aware of.
- Gruenberg asked how Lam would prove that off-campus people were campaigning.
- Lam said that reports would be investigated and cases would be filed.
- Gaulton said that it was even problematic last year by limiting candidates to two people, because more than two people wanted to help. He said he thought that not allowing anyone from outside of UCLA to campaign would be even harder to enforce than the other option.
- Gruenberg said that he had the same concern as Gaulton. He said that, even 'though there were a lot of good arguments for limiting this to UCLA students, he said he really wanted to continue this discussion because he saw it as the most problematic change that was being proposed. Gruenberg said he did not think this was the best solution to this problem.
- Wood asked Gruenberg what his concerns were.
- Gruenberg indicated the same issues brought up by Gaulton, such as how a candidate would be sanctioned for ineligible campaigners. He said that this was hard to enforce and not necessarily fair.
- Villarín said, to address Gruenberg's concerns, that last year there was a case where a family member proceeded to make disparaging remarks to other candidates. She said that threatening students on campus should not be endorsed.
- Gruenberg said...
- Villarín cut him off, saying that he was out of order because she had not finished. She continued by saying that her younger sister had helped her last year, but that her sister was not handing out flyers on Bruin Walk. Villarín said that this conflicted with Child Labor Laws, aside from the fact that these children should be in school.
- Tuttle said that he was not necessarily pitching for campaigning on-campus, he simply wanted to make sure that the language did not exclude the assistance of family members in an off-campus apartment or something. Tuttle also said that, through the years, there have been many off-campus people who have helped.
- Palma/Saracho asked what the basic jurisdiction was for the E-Code to apply, with regard to helping candidates in off-campus locations.
- Lam said that the E-Code had no influence on actions that took place off-campus.
- Tuttle said that his concern was with the definition of the word "campaigning", so that it would allow assistance by outside sources.
- Cohn said that the E-Code was recently extended to the 90024 area code, as students were found advertising in the Village and on the Freeway on-ramps.
- Tseng said that the argument of freedom of speech should only go so far, since running for office was an agreement to abide by certain rules. He said that the First Amendment was written to keep the government from discriminating against certain groups. Tseng said that the E-Code affected everyone equally, so the First Amendment argument did not apply.
- Martínez said that people are censored every day, and if people cannot win with students in a student election, then they should not be in office.
- Tripathi said that he did not think verbal assaults would be stopped by prohibiting off-campus volunteers. Tripathi asked Lam what the problems were with slates, and said that perhaps the process could be helped by regulating slates.

- Lam said that he was not familiar with all of the arguments for and against the use of slates.
- Cohn said that slates were not included in the E-Code because they did help students. He said that it would present a disadvantage to candidates who did not want to be part of slates.
- Nelson said that Lam had done a good job to make this a student election. He said that it was not always understood as such. Nelson added, however, that before anyone comes up with a finalized copy of the E-Code, legal implications should be considered so that no one would be able to use the law against the E-Code in appeals.
- Gruenberg said that this was his concern as well; that the verbiage needed to explain the exact procedure and guidelines for these changes that were to be made. He also said that it is about thinking far ahead.
- Vardner said that he wanted to simply speak as a member of the organization, and said that he was jerked a little bit upon hearing that only two aids could be used. He said that even though UCLA was a community, it was not an island, with far reaching effects. Vardner said that candidates did not give up liberties by running, but rather they exercised them. He said that the E-Code existed because people had to go to endorsement hearings, and there was not enough time for this. Vardner said that another item is that the E-Code applies to everyone equally, so further sanctions should not be put in place for fear of someone having an advantage. He also said that candidates should not forfeit their freedoms, as USAC fights for freedom and liberty. Lastly Vardner agreed with Nelson about the legal implications, and added that there is no state that has ever passed such a restriction. He added that the regulation of slates would help close loopholes that allowed candidates to campaign early.
- Gaulton said that he agreed that people are censored daily. However, he said that the interesting thing about UCLA elections was that they were among some of the most intelligent students in the world. Gaulton said that council should not fear the effects of pre-schoolers influencing voting.
- Lam said that the final proposed amendment defined the use of student signboards. He said he did not add anything that was not already implied, but he did make it more explicit.
- Palma/Saracho asked how Lam could be contacted for questions.
- Lam gave council his cell phone number and email address.

D. Student Government Structure Discussion

- Palma/Saracho began by stating that the Constitutional amendments that have been proposed would replace the Commission-based system which has been in existence for about 40 years. He said that USAC had not yet responded to this proposal, but that he had a collection of the concerns of many members of council, and that he wanted to make a Power-Point presentation tonight about those concerns. Palma/Saracho said that the presentation would begin with an outline of some of the downsides of the proposed system, which included disempowered elected officials, increased inefficiency and bureaucracy, the unfeasible nature of it, and the lack of representation that would be created by the new system. Palma/Saracho said that the way things were set up now, each officer held a specific position which allows them to address a variety of student concerns and interests on campus. Palma/Saracho also brought up the fact that the argument that the Senate System would depoliticize the commissioners is inherently flawed because, since they would be elected also, they would be seen as political figures.
- Wood said that the Commissioners would be relegated to functioning as mere programmers, not researchers, advocates, or policy makers. She said that the proposed decision between programming and the various other commissioner responsibilities would seriously cripple the ability of elected undergraduate students to create positive change on behalf of their constituents..
- Lee offered the examples of CSC Advocacy Weeks, their 21 service projects and their campaign for Service Learning transcripts.

- Gaulton offered the examples of Campus Events' programming, advocacy on the UCLA Communications Committee, and their campaign for Campus Programming Authority. He also said that commissioners are able to be lobbyists through their programming.
- Wood said that the proposed changes would make four executives solely responsible for preparing the budget and for all major advocacy work. She said that this would decrease accountability, representation, and input by council. Wood also said that the proposal would eliminate the organizing space to carry out campaigns like ECP and the Diversity Requirement as well as events like Welcome Week. She said that the Senate would not be able to do things like this. Wood said that the creation of a Senate would disempower the student body, as it strips away the power to effectively fight for student rights. Wood moved on to talk about how the new system would also increase inefficiency and bureaucracy. She said that it would take an unnecessarily long time to reach all decisions. She said that a two-thirds majority vote is unrealistic, and would negatively impact the ability of student groups to program, develop leadership, advocate, and benefit from all services provided by the undergraduate student government. Wood also gave the examples of UCSC and UCSD, which were trying to change their governmental structure to emulate USAC's, saying that other campuses looked to our system as the perfect system.
- Tseng said the bureaucracy that would be created would cause incredible delays in decisions, and this increased inefficiency would have detrimental effects on the students.
- Wood said that simple things such as contingency allocations that the Finance Committee makes would be unnecessarily drawn out, making it very complicated for student groups to get the necessary funding that they need as programs and campaigns quickly approach. She added that Senators with no experience or proper background should not present resolutions and policy decisions. Wood also said that the new structure would be economically, structurally, and logistically infeasible. She brought up the problems of already limited office space, the implications of increased stipends, and the waste of time or money to hold a Special Election, as might be required.
- Palma/Saracho said that, right now, USAC receives stipends, but the proposed new structure would take even more money away from programming funding. He said the idea that the Senate would be taking more money away from the students seems irresponsible. Palma/Saracho also said that having to spend time and money on a Special Election would be a logistical nightmare.
- Lam said that, assuming this election would be independent of the regular Spring Election, he could start getting to work, and have an outline by Ninth Week. He said that it would be a little rough, but that it could be done. Lam said that if this decision were made next week, then there would not be enough time. He said that the Constitution requires an election to take place fifteen days from the submission of the signed petitions, but he did not think that the Election Code took this into account. Lam said that it would not be fair to anyone involved to negate the entire election to switch over to a totally new system.
- Wood said that the advisory core contains unnecessary positions. She said that Attorney General would highlight the lack of accountability within this system of government, the Office Space Director was already covered by the Facilities Commission, and the Parliamentarian was already covered by the chair.
- Tseng said that the proposed system would also include less representation. He said that there would be a very low threshold to victory, with little-supported students put into power, resulting in a special interest government. He said that there would also be no accountability, with disincentives to work on issues that affect all UCLA students. Tseng said that there would only be accountability between the elected official and the small group of constituents that elected him or her. He said that the responsibilities of each Senator would also be diluted. Tseng said that the Senate system creates more artificial titles but lessens substantive participation. On top of this, he said that it would allow for dual candidacy and discourage meaningful representation. By that, he

explained that someone could run for a position in both the legislative and the executive branches. Tseng said that if someone is passionate about a position, then they should run for it, not run for several so that there is a backup if someone does not get elected to his or her first choice. Tseng then moved on to talk about the Instant Run-Off Voting and how it would limit the democratic process. He said that there would be less opportunity to vote, and less opportunity to decide leaders. Tseng said that it would limit opportunity for discourse and discussion. He added that senators would have no accountability, as they would be elected by less than 5% of the population, again creating special interest leadership.

- Wood said that there are various examples of how people could be behind in primaries but then win elections, and she said that it is important for people to exercise their democratic rights. She said that this right would not exist under the proposed Senate System.
- Palma/Saracho said that the purpose of primaries was not so that people could vote twice. He said that the reason for a runoff was so that people could reevaluate the candidates and choose the best one suited to the role. Palma/Saracho said that voters could reevaluate people for what they stand for and choose the best one for the job. He said that after a primary, students could focus their decision on only two candidates.
- Tseng said that there would be no linkage between the voters and the potential candidates.
- Palma/Saracho said that it is not okay for someone to be voted into office by as few as 100 votes. He said that, under the current system, the President is able to speak for the entire campus. Palma/Saracho asked how a Senator could be respected without adequate support from the student body.
- Tseng said that the system would also not honor the intention of the voter. He said that since there is no link between the voters and the candidates, there is no connecting the wishes of the students with the Senators who would be elected. Tseng also said that too many candidates would discourage voters from taking time to learn about the issues of the election.
- Wood also said that the idea that slates would be nonexistent is false, as political parties still exist in the United States Senate. She said that a state of standstill could be created from non-agreement amongst the Senators.
- Palma/Saracho said that the bottom line is that this is a one-year position, serving 4-5 year constituents. He said that these constituents expect a speedy and expert response, and this would not be available under the proposed system.
- Wood said that UCLA's student government is a model for student governments across the nation.
- Palma/Saracho said that UCLA's student government was voted as the best in the nation, and questioned why the best needed to be changed.

The current system and the PowerPoint presentation was endorsed by President Allende Palma/Saracho, External Vice President John Vu, General Representative Jenny Wood, General Representative Anneli Villarín, General Representative Tommy Tseng, Academic Affairs Commissioner Eligio Martínez, Jr, Campus Events Commissioner Jason Gaulton, Community Service Commissioner Crystal Lee, Cultural Affairs Commissioner Shantanu Bhuiyan, Student Welfare Commissioner Jason Avila, and Finance Committee Chair Ma.Raissa Corella.

- Gruenberg thanked Council for the lengthy and in-depth presentation. He said that he wanted to reply, but was not prepared to respond to the wave of arguments made. Gruenberg said that perhaps those in favor of the proposed changes would present their views to Council at a later date, perhaps at the table, perhaps outside the meeting, but that the discussion would continue.
- Neesby said that he wanted to give a response, as the author of the proposal, but that there was not adequate time. He said that he could see that more than a majority of the Council Members already opposed the proposed changes, but he asked council to allow him to present the other side next week. Neesby said that he wanted to respond, particularly since he was not aware that this presentation was going to take place. He

- left it to the discretion of council to determine whether or not he could be put on the Agenda for next week.
- Palma/Saracho asked why a presentation had not been made already by the students who support these proposed amendments. He said that this proposal had been submitted just a couple of weeks ago, and Neesby was already circulating a petition on campus. Palma/Saracho asked why Neesby why he had handled this the way he had.
 - Neesby said that, from the editorials in the Daily Bruin, he was already aware of Council's strong opposition to his proposed change to the structure of student government. He said that, since he was not offered a chance to respond tonight, he was not sure if council even wanted to hear from him on the subject.
 - Villarin reiterated that she thought this was underhanded, politically motivated, and backhanded to do this without a proper presentation to council first. She continued to share her opinion of the proposal and of Neesby. Addressing Gruenberg's remarks, she said that if Gruenberg was for the increased bureaucracy, then perhaps he should continue the length of this meeting, as that was what meetings would be like in the future if a Senate system is established.
 - Martinez said that Neesby was hypocritical for doing this behind council's back. He said that he had worked in the Academic Affairs Commission, and gave his impassioned opinion about the proposal.
 - Avila said that everything he thought about the proposal was carefully thought out and critically evaluated.
 - Tuttle said that he was available if anyone wanted to talk more about this, as he was here when the commission system was created, and could offer some perspective if anyone was interested.
 - Wood said that she thought it was important for council to talk about this issue from all sides in whatever forum they thought most appropriate.
 - Avila agreed that council needed to make their opinions known so that students did not simply sign this petition without thinking about it. He said that it was important for everyone to understand the pros and cons of both sides.
 - Palma/Saracho said that it is an unfair assumption to say that council had not evaluated this critically. He said that a presentation should have been made earlier by the supporters of the proposed change but, since that did not happen, he had carefully examined whether or not these changes were a good idea before reaching a decision. Palma/Saracho said that he did not oppose this because of personal issues between him and Neesby; rather he had critically examined it and then decided to oppose the idea.
 - Neesby said he respected the comments made, but said he did not feel there was anything wrong with hearing the other side, too. He said he thought there should be either a presentation, a public debate, or at least a discussion of the proposed changes. Neesby said he did not know that this presentation would be on the Agenda, so he was not fully prepared right now, but if this would be his only chance to speak, then he would like to be granted that consideration.
 - Gruenberg said he did not think it would serve council best to talk about this right now. He joked that it was hard to battle a PowerPoint presentation, and said that this decision, were it put to a vote, is ultimately not something that the council would decide upon. Gruenberg said that there should be a forum to present both sides, and said it thought it would be more appropriate to have this discussion at another time.
 - Tuttle said that there was essentially a matter of procedure at stake here. He said the question is whether or not council wants to have this item on the Agenda for next week. Tuttle said that the procedure would be for Council to vote on whether or not to have another item for next week. He said that if someone wanted to move for Out of Order, then that would be a whole other issue.
 - Wood asked Neesby how many signatures he had and who was endorsing this.
 - Neesby said that there were between 2,000 to 3,000 signatures. He said that presentations had been made to the Greeks, the Jewish Student Union, On-Campus Housing Council, and the Daily Bruin. Neesby said that they were not committed to a Special Election, but that was a possibility.

- Palma/Saracho said that this was not a new issue, that it had come up before, and he recognized that Neesby had put a lot of time into this proposal. He said that he hoped everyone would examine this issue on both sides, as it was an important matter which had implications for a significant change.
- Neesby said that, if anyone wanted to talk to him further on this matter, they were welcome to do so.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

Financial Supports Commissioner – Alex Gruenberg

- Gruenberg said that FAFSAs would be due on March 2nd, and thanked council for welcoming the second presentation on financial aid. He said that he could hopefully answer additional questions. Gruenberg said that there were additional FAFSA workshops on the 23rd and 24th. He said that the Financial Supports Commission Website would be up by the end of the week.

Community Services Commissioner – Crystal Lee

- Lee said that this was the second Advocacy Week, this one being about Disability. She passed out handouts with both information and games so that people would actually keep them and use them. Lee said that the hot dog sale had been cancelled today on account of the rain, and that her office was filled with hot dogs, buns, and mustard.

General Representative #1 – Jenny Wood

- Wood said that the Tsunami Relief Coalition had raised more than \$10,000. She thanked Council for their support and help in this fundraising effort. Additionally, Wood said that her office would be working on Women for Change Week. She said that this is an event in May where women's groups work together to promote education and awareness. Wood said that the woman who wrote the Vagina Monologues would be coming to campus to speak.

General Representative #3 – Tommy Tseng

- Tseng said that there about 400 students attended the Student Labor Teach-In, and thanked council for their attendance and support.

Student Welfare Commissioner – Jason Avila

- Avila said that Super Sunday CPR Certification would be held this weekend, and passed out lifesavers to council. He said that the registration fee would be \$6, and said that he wanted everyone to sign up. Avila said that SWC's Blood Drive last week broke the previous record, and thanked everyone for their help. He said that the single-day record was set on Thursday with 164 units of blood collected. He also said that there would be a Blood-For-Books deal next quarter that would allow blood donators to skip to the front of the line in the bookstore. Avila told council that there would also be a workout program next quarter. Avila then said that the Crush-Grams were given out last week to promote UCLA Run-Walk, and that the UCLA Run-Walk committee would be going to a taping of The Price is Right. He also said that Roll-AIDS would take place on Monday evening in the Ackerman Grand Ballroom, and invited everyone to come by and skate for a while. Avila said that the Total Wellness Newsletter was looking great, and would be published very soon. He ended by saying that the film, Requiem for a Dream, would be shown on the Hill for Awareness Week, along with a discussion on the issue.

External Vice President - John Vu

- Palma/Saracho asked why the EVP office was not listed on the flyer.
- Biniek said because this affected everyone.

From John Vu's Weekly Report to Council:

UCSA

- Approving different policy proposals at next Legislative Committee Conference Call, this Wednesday
- Keeping track of policy proposals
- Next meeting will be at CSU Channel Islands, March 4-6, 2005 with Budget Summit attended by all three systemwide organizations-UCSA, California State Student Association (CSSA), and California Student Association of Community Colleges (CalSACC)
- Meeting with Karen Bass, our state assemblyperson to establish relationships
- Helping phonebank for Councilmember Jack Weiss's office

USSA

- Call-In day: Happened in solidarity with other campuses nationally and we made calls to all our elected national officials
- Higher Education Act Reauthorization (HEAR) hot dog sale
 - There will be a hotdog sale in Bruin Plaza this Friday between 11am-2pm, where the hotdog is really cheap, but each additional item (bun, ketchup, etc) will had additional costs. The message is that the total cost of attendance at a UC is more than just student fees, which is what the hotdog represents.
 - We're also going to be handing out information about USSA, HEAR, and financial aid (that's the educational part)
- In-district lobby visits happening next week
- Presidential budget and its impacts on students presentation during report next week

Other

- Helping phonebank for city councilmember's office

Future travels

- CSU Channel Islands
- USSA Legislative Conference: March 18-22, 2005

Internal Vice President - Darren Chan

- Chan reported that 47 students signed up work on the Unofficial Guide to UCLA, and that they held their first staff meeting last Thursday. He said that he was scheduled to meet with the Student Media Director to talk about getting space on the Bruin Walk site.
- Vardner reported that the Hilgard Bus Terminal was finally closed today because the rich residents nearby had complained about the noise. Vardner said that UCLA students were never considered in this matter. Vardner then spoke about the committee he had formed recently for UCLA students to meet with Westwood business owners to discuss how they could all work together to improve Westwood Village. He said the committee would offer students a direct line of communication to the business people. He said that about 30 business owners had been invited to meet with USAC officers as well as members of other student organizations. Vardner closed by saying that he would be giving updates on TSAB next week.

President - Allende Palma/Saracho

- Palma/Saracho thanked Berky Nelson for setting up the dinner tonight for the USAC officers and commissioners to meet with a number of University Administrators. He said that it had been a substantive meeting, and he had been pleased with the discussions that took place. Palma/Saracho said that one of the things they discussed were potential compromises discussed about outdoor, nighttime programming on campus. He said that Bob Naples would be talking about it at his next meeting. Palma/Saracho said that the leadership development sessions of his internship program were coming to a close. He said they would not be meeting this coming Friday because they were going on a Toxic Tour of Los Angeles on Sunday from 10:00am to 2:00pm. He said that everyone was invited to join them, and maybe they'd like to co-

program the event. Lastly, Palma/Saracho said that he was trying to schedule a Town Hall meeting with the Chancellor on March 1st, and said that he would be a co-moderator with GSA's President, Jared Fox.

IX. Old Business

A. ECP Task Force Updates

- Tseng said that his report would be two-part, starting with a glimpse of the data they had compiled from the responses of the 4,000 students who took the ECP survey, and ending with a discussion on the Public Records request he had submitted to Judy Smith. Tseng said that they found that more than 20% of the students who took the survey are unaware of ECP. He said they also found that 68% of students said that they have had to choose between getting good grades and meeting the ECP requirement. Tseng added that 62% of students have been negatively affected by ECP, and 42% of the students who were put on an ECP Hold were surprised when they discovered that this had happened.
- Nelson asked if the survey included a question about students who supported ECP.
- Tseng said that was not asked on the survey.
- Martinez said that there were some open-ended questions, some of which spoke to that issue.
- Wood said that students were not asked if they liked ECP.
- Nelson said that he was asking because, if there was not a question posed about students who like the way the current system is set up, then it gives the opposition something to grasp onto.
- Palma/Saracho said that a lot of the questions were designed to address different areas of impact, and they were trying to leave them mostly open-ended. He said that, hopefully, all of the data would be compiled by the end of the week.
- Gruenberg asked how many completed surveys there were.
- Tseng said that 2,708 students finished the entire survey, but more than 4,000 students had taken some of the survey.
- Palma/Saracho said that the numbers were pretty even, indicating that students had not stopped early, but rather omitted questions that did not apply to them.
- With regard to the second part of Tseng's report, he distributed copies of the letter that was sent to Judy Smith, and read through it quickly. Tseng then referenced his complete request for documentation from Judy Smith on ECP statistics. Tseng said he felt that Judy Smith was jerking him around, and said that he would pursue the issue to the fullest extent of the law. He explained that the five categories of documents that he was seeking included Information on Full Time Equivalent Students and Graduation Rates, Reasons for Implementation of Expected Cumulative Progress, Effectiveness as a Policy, Expected Cumulative Progress Requirement's Impact on the Students, and Expected Cumulative Progress's Effects on the University.
- Palma/Saracho clarified that this was not an attack on Judy Smith or her integrity, but council had been doing a lot of work to produce valid statistical information on the ECP Policy. He said that USAC was not trying to attack anyone, but they were also not willing to put up with anymore delays in obtaining the necessary information.
- Tuttle said that it would be a mistake to raise any integrity issues, as he had been on both sides of issues like this many times. He said to imply that someone is deliberately withholding information is a strong statement, and could be totally inaccurate. Tuttle said that it is important to consider other possibilities as, for example, a gap in the chain of communication.
- Tseng said that he had made a strategic move to take these steps without asking council, as he thought they would agree with it.
- Palma/Saracho said that if there had been a breakdown in the lines of communication, then perhaps this would rectify that. He said that, on Governance Day, Council was told that this information could not be given to them, and then they were told the

- opposite. Palma/Saracho said that it would be great if this information could finally be available by the end of the year.
- Wood added that Council would soon be lobbying professors. She said that if anyone wanted to submit a written testimonial regarding ECP then this would be helpful, and she would be requesting these formally through email.
- Avila asked if people could write whatever they think.
- Wood said that it would be explained in the email.
- Tseng said that the ECP Task Force would meet on Thursday, at 7:30pm in Conference Room 4.
- Avila asked Martinez if his right to participate in the ECP issue was still restricted.
- Martinez said that he could participate from this point on.

At this point in the meeting, Palma/Saracho announced that he had forgotten to appoint the USAC officers who would serve on the BOD Programming Committee for Spring Quarter. Because this item was not listed on the Agenda, the USAC Bylaws required a two-thirds vote to add it after the meeting had begun. As there were 11 voting members of council present, plus the president, a two-thirds majority is up to his discretion.

- Tseng moved and Martinez seconded to add to the Agenda, "Appointment of USAC Members to the Board Programming Committee for Spring Quarter."
- Council voted to add the Action Item on Appointments with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Palma/Saracho said that he was recommending Bhuiyan and Villarin to serve on the Board Programming Committee for Spring Quarter.
- Martinez moved and Tseng seconded to approve the Appointment of Shantanu Bhuiyan to the BOD Programming Committee for Spring Quarter.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Shantanu Bhuiyan to the Board Programming Committee with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Tseng moved and Avila seconded to approve the Appointment of Anneli Villarin to the Board Programming Committee for Spring Quarter.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Anneli Villarin to the Board Programming Committee with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

B. *Approval of 2003-2004 Surplus Available for Allocation in 2004-2005

- McLaren introduced the item by reminding Council that, when they initially discussed Surplus Available for Allocation, they considered the possibility of setting aside \$15,000 to install a keycard system in the undergraduate student offices in Kerckhoff. She said that, because there did not seem to be Council support for the keycard project, Student Government Accounting had revised the initial document by removing the keycard item and returning the \$15,000 to the bottom line. She said that Surplus Available for Allocation was back before them at tonight's meeting to discuss whether they wanted to set aside funds to hardwire undergraduate offices in Kerckhoff for internet access. She pointed out that, if Council decided against the hardwiring project, the amount of the proposed set-aside would increase the bottom line by \$22,000.
- Palma/Saracho asked if the decision on allocating the Surplus Funds was subject to Council's discretion.
- McLaren said that Council did have the discretion to determine how they wanted to allocate the funds. She said that, in recent years, prior Councils had voted to use at least a portion of the Surplus for Capital Items.
- Palma/Saracho said that he was thinking that it might be a good idea for Council to discuss whether they wanted to earmark these funds for Capital Items and suggested that they might want to discuss having these funds go towards programming, instead.
- McLaren said that Council certainly had the right to determine how the Surplus Funds Available for Allocation could be used. She said that, even though these funds have often been designated for Capital Items, the need for Capital Items might not be as great this year as the need for programming.

- Wood said that she agreed with Palma/Saracho that some, or perhaps all, of these funds might be better spent on programming rather than on Capital Items.
- McLaren said that Council did not have to make that decision tonight, but recommended that they not delay their decision for too long.
- Corella said that, when she met with Jerry Mann and Debra Simmons, they told her that one option might be to set up a special fund, similar to the Contingency fund, but they said it might actually be better to just have all the Surplus Funds allocated through the existing Contingency Fund process, which was one way of enhancing the amount available for programming.
- Tuttle inserted a note of caution, saying that Council leaders may want to consider the fact that they might take a financial hit somewhere down the line. He said that such a situation could occur because of lowered enrollment numbers, which would translate to decreased funding. Tuttle said that Council could ensure a cushion for years to come by taking such action now. He closed by suggesting that council try to calculate what Capital Items might be needed.
- Vardner asked McLaren if, in recommending the hardwiring of offices in Kerckhoff, the fact that UCLA will be setting up wireless stations in the building very soon had been considered.
- McLaren said that factor had been considered, but she pointed out that a downside is that the wireless stations would connect only to Bruin On-Line, whereas hardwiring would connect the computers to the ASUCLA network.
- Tuttle asked, as a Point of Information, what the exact purpose of this discussion was.
- McLaren said that they were discussing whether or not Council Members wanted to set aside funds to hardwire the undergraduate offices in Kerckhoff Hall prior to voting on the item entitled, "Approval of 2003-2004 Surplus Available for Allocation in 2004-2005."
- Tuttle clarified that he was not in opposition to the hardwiring, but was suggesting that Council think carefully before they approved a plan that would allocate all of the Surplus funds rather than setting aside a portion for a "rainy day."
- Wood asked if the hardwiring project included all of the USAC offices.
- McLaren said that it would include the offices of all of the student members of Council, as well as the offices in Kerckhoff which house undergraduate student organizations. She said that it did not include any of the GSA offices because, if GSA wanted to have their offices hardwired, the cost of that work would be funded by GSA.
- Villarín commented on Tuttle's suggestion by saying that, while she recognized the need to save money for a rainy day, she was also very concerned about the need to use at least a portion of the funds to support programming in Spring Quarter. She then apologized for being so nitpicky, but said she felt that the document on Surplus, which Simmons had handed out, should not have been distributed to guests, but only to Council Members.
- McLaren said that, actually, this was public information.
- Wood asked, with regard to the hardwiring project, if \$22,000 was the lowest available price.
- McLaren thanked Wood for raising that question because she said it reminded her that she had forgotten to provide that information. She elaborated by saying that, after conducting a walk-through of the project with two CTS reps and two vendors, she had received estimates from each vendor, with the lower estimate being \$19,000, and the higher one, \$24,000. After stating that University policy requires that projects be awarded to the lowest bidder, McLaren said she had put the proposed set-aside at \$22,000 to allow for potential delays and cost-overruns.
- Palma/Saracho said he realized that the hardwiring project was an expensive one, but said he believed it was worth the expenditure. He remarked that a lot of the student offices had problems with Internet access, and that many of them didn't even have access to the Internet. Overall, he said he thought it was a good long-term investment.
- Wood asked if this included the purchase of updated software.
- McLaren said that money to buy updated software would come out of another account.

- Wood moved, and Tseng seconded, to approve the 2003-2004 Surplus Available for Allocation in 2004-2005, including the set-aside of \$22,000 to hardwire all undergraduate offices in Kerckhoff Hall for Internet access.
- Council voted to approve the 2003-2004 Surplus Available for Allocation in 2004-2005, including the set-aside of \$22,000 to hardwire all undergraduate offices in Kerckhoff Hall for Internet access, with a unanimous vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

X. Announcements

- Wood said that Dance Marathon would be held this weekend, and invited everyone to participate.
- Villarin said that people should come morale for her.
- Bhuiyan said that there is an exhibit in the Art Gallery this week featuring an artist from Uruguay.
- Lee said that tomorrow would be a Day in the Life Workshop, and Thursday would be a screening of "I Am Sam." She said that both programs are part of Disability Awareness Week.
- McLaren said that there is a hoax email going around that looked like it was from ASUCLA computer support, and told council not to open the attachment because it would download a virus.
- Tuttle said that the Language Clubs at the International Center were very interesting in case anyone on Council might like to learn a new language. He also said that there were cooking classes at the Dashew Center that Council members were welcome to participate in. Lastly Tuttle said that the Ambassadors Program is a very interesting and is a cool place for people to get together and hang out.
- Palma/Saracho told Council about the Toxic Tour he and his office interns had taken in Los Angeles over the weekend

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Corella passed around the attendance sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Martinez moved and Avila seconded to adjourn.
- Tseng called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 12:32 p.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker