

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCILTuesday March 1, 2005
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 P.M.

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

ABSENT: Tommy Tseng

GUESTS: Mike Cohn, Melinda Dudley, Colleen Honigsberg, Nathan Lam, Derek Lazzaro, Jerry Mann, Paul Marian, Emmanuel Martinez, Brian Neesby, Tina Park, Saba Riazati, Roy Samaan, Debra Simmons, Yousef Tajsar, Joseph Vardner, Sara Bastomski

I. A. Call to Order

- Palma/Saracho called the meeting to order at 7:11 P.M.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Corella passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Wood asked to add a Special Presentation by the Coalition for Marriage Equality.
- Tripathi asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Vu asked to move up the Resolution in Support of the United States Students Association's (USSA) Campaign on the Federal Budget and Appropriations to directly after the newly added Special Presentation by the Coalition for Marriage Equality.
- Gruenberg asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Nathan Lam, Election Board Chair, asked to move his Election Board Updates and the Approval of the Proposed Changes to the USAC Election Code to be dealt with immediately after all the Special Presentations.
- Palma/Saracho commented that there was already a Special Presentation listed on the agenda to be made by some of the undergraduate members of the ASUCLA Board of Directors (BOD). Consequently, with regard to the Special Presentations, he said that that they would be give in the following order: First, the Special Presentation by the Coalition for Marriage Equality; Second, the Special Presentation by the undergraduate BOD members, Third, the Special Presentation and the Resolution in Support of the USSA's Campaign on the Federal Budget and Appropriations, and, Fourth, the presentation by the Constitutional Review Committee concerning proposed amendments to the USA Bylaws. Palma/Saracho said that, immediately following all the Special Presentations, the Election Board Chairperson, Nathan Lam, would present information on, and seek Council's approval of, several changes he is recommending to the USAC Election Code.
- Martinez moved and Wood seconded to approve the Agenda, as amended.
- Lee 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

February 1, 2005

- Lee moved and Avila seconded to approve the Minutes of February 1, 2005.
- Tripathi called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of February 1, 2005 were approved, as submitted, by Acclamation.

IV. Special Presentations

Coalition for Marriage Equality

- Sara Bastomski said that she was here to speak with USAC about any support that they could offer the Coalition for Marriage Equality and also to ask that they consider approving a resolution on marriage equality. Bastomski said that the Coalition had been founded at the beginning of the quarter, and their ultimate goal was to legalize same-sex marriage in California. She said that the Coalition recognized that this was a major goal, so they wanted to create a strong foundation at UCLA. Bastomski said that the Coalition's first event had been held on Valentines Day, and said that they had worked to create a voter database of interested students. She said that the next event would be on March 8, and the theme would be UCLA Students Supporting the Legalization of Same-Sex Marriage. Bastomski said that she was here because the External Vice President and General Representatives offices supported the Coalition, but she wanted to get the support of the remaining 11 USAC officers. She reiterated that they wanted to get a resolution in support of same-sex marriage approved by USAC, and that she would be bringing the resolution to Council's next meeting.
- Palma/Saracho asked Bastomski what she would need in the form of support or endorsement.
- Bastomski said that she was unfamiliar with the process, but said that the Coalition would like to be able to cite USAC as a supporter.
- Wood asked if they were looking for volunteers.
- Bastomski said that there was an email list that people could be a part of, and she handed out some sign-up sheets.
- Palma/Saracho said that Council has passed already approved two resolutions authored by the Queer Alliance and suggested to Bastomski that she might want to look at them for wording and format.
- Wood recommended that Bastomski might also talk with CalPirg members because she thought they were working on some of the same issues.

ASUCLA Board of Directors Updates – Gustavo DeHaro, Emmanuel Martinez, Tina Park, and Yousef Tajsar

- Tina Park, undergraduate representative to the ASUCLA Board of Directors, said that the BOD had met last Friday. She said that it had been a very brief meeting, and it had mostly been about marketing for the proposed Student Services fee. She said they also worked on the budget for next year. Park said that there would be an Entities Committee Meeting on Friday, and encouraged USAC officers to attend.
- Emmanuel Martinez, undergraduate representative to the ASUCLA Board of Directors, said that they were in the process of looking for a new Executive Director for the BOD, and that they had just about finalized the list of applicants they wanted to interview. He said that USAC and GSA officers would be able to participate in the interviews with the candidates.
- Yousef Tajsar, undergraduate representative to the ASUCLA Board of Directors, said that the Board members appreciated the support of Council members and other student groups regarding the proposed Student Services Referendum. He said that the language for the Referendum had been finalized, and he was hoping that it could be presented to Council as an action Agenda Item for next week's USAC meeting.

- Emmanuel Martinez said that he was also sat on the ASUCLA Services Committee. He said that he was getting more involved with the development of ASUCLA's Social Responsibility Policy, and asked if anyone on Council would be interested in adding to, or critiquing, the language that would be proposed to the Board by the Committee. Emmanuel Martinez closed by inviting Council to come to ASUCLA's Services Committee meetings.
- Tripathi asked if the GSA had seen the language of the proposed Student Fee Referendum.
- Tajsar said that they had seen the same language, and that the only reason it was presented to GSA before it was presented to USAC was because GSA's election was held earlier than USAC's, so they had an earlier deadline to meet.
- Regarding the search for an Executive Director, Gruenberg asked what the timetable was for making their selection.
- Emmanuel Martinez said that he could not release that information, but said that one would definitely be chosen by the end of the year.

Special Presentati on on USSA's Campaign on the Federal Budget and Appropriations – Jeanne Biniek and Roy Samaan

- Jeanne Biniek, the University States Students Association National Affairs Director, said that she had been working on the Federal Budget.
- Roy Samaan, Appropriations Director for the External Vice President's Office under John Vu, explained that the appropriations process begins with the president proposing a budget. Samaan said that this budget then went to the House and the Senate to be voted on. He said that there was a Joint Budget Resolution by April 15th, after which the budget would be sent back to each respective governing body. Samaan said that the budget was referred to the House and Senate Subcommittees on Labor, who then reviewed it. He said that the President is to sign the final budget by October 1st.
- Biniek said that Council had been given highlights on some of USSA's specific programs and proposals. She said that they wanted to increase the Pell Grant, which was important because low-income students often relied on this grant entirely for their tuition. Biniek said that USSA wanted to ensure the availability of adequate funding for higher education. She said that, while more money had been promised for the Pell Grant fund, it was at the expense of cut-backs to other resources. Biniek said that students could be forced to go to private lenders if the government does not continue to make adequate financial aid available, and this was disadvantageous for students. Biniek said that USSA also wanted to increase the funding for LEAP, which is another grant program for low-income students.
- Samaan drew Council's attention to a graphic which depicted the cyclical nature of Economic Stats, Education, and Employment. He said that the danger of eliminating federal funding was the removal of the ability for low-income students to attend institutions of higher learning.
- Biniek said that a lot of people qualify for these sources of funding, but there was not enough funding to meet the needs of every applicant. She said, at tonight's meeting, they were asking Council to approve a Resolution in support of USSA's Campaign on the Federal Budget and Appropriations. Biniek said that she had emailed council about an informational meeting that would be held on Thursday from 7:30 to 9:00 p.m. in Boelter Hall. She said that they also had postcards that they wanted everyone to have their staff fill out in support of what USSA is asking. Biniek pointed out that there were three postcards on each page, and explained that one would be sent to the Senate Committee, one to the House Committee, and one to the Congressman who represents the district in which the signatory lives.
- Villarín said that the cuts to LEAP were in direct correlation to the cuts to the Pell Grant.
- Williams asked if USSA had given any suggestions on other resources that could be cut, because he thought such action might strengthen USSA's campaign.
- Biniek said that one of the members of USSA was an analyst and was working on that.

- Nelson said that a couple weeks ago it had been broadcast that the Governor had gone to D.C. to get funding for California, and asked if there had been any working with the governor on this.
- Biniek said that advocates had been involving the governor in communication about this.
- Samaan said that this weekend UCSA and CSSA would be working together to make sure that students who want to be involved in higher education would be able to.

Proposed Amendments to the USA Bylaws – Anneli Villarin and the CRC

- Villarin passed out spiral-bound booklets to council which presented the Proposed Amendments to the Undergraduate Students Association Bylaws, as recommended by the Constitutional Review Committee. She said that the first section included the CRC's proposed amendments to Article VI of the USAC Bylaws. She said that the second section of the booklet presented proposed Funding Guidelines for the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF) and for the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF).
- Villarin said that, since these were proposed Bylaw changes, they were being presented to Council for information at this meeting, but would not be voted on until a subsequent USAC meeting.
- Villarin said that she had invited Jerry Mann and Debra Simmons to attend this meeting to help her explain the proposed amendments and to assist in answering any questions Council members might have. She asked council to turn to the page entitled, "Undergraduate Students Association Funding Guidelines," which was right after Page 16. Villarin said that, immediately following the Funding Guidelines title page, there was a graph which shows what the changes would look like. Villarin said that, under the proposed amendments to the Bylaws, two new funds would be created: the Student Government Operational Fund and the Student Organizations Operational Fund. She said that the two Operational Funds would, in effect, be providing base budget funding for the categories of (a) USAC Officers and Commissioners and (b) undergraduate registered student organizations. She said that CRC's goal was to ensure that all available funds will be used more efficiently under this structure than they have in the past. Villarin said that the SGOF would have a total allocation per year of \$35,000; and the SOOF would have \$150,000 per year. Villarin said that programs would continue to be funded through the USA Programming Committee. Villarin said that what CRC has tried to set up for the student organizations was a funding process wherein allocations could be made each quarter, with a bigger percentage of the available funds being allocated in Fall Quarter. Villarin said that, with this quarterly allocation structure, groups could apply for funding during the quarter when they were most active. Villarin said that there would only be one hearing, which was when they applied for the Operational Fund, effectively the new Base Budget Fund. She said that subsequent allocations would reflect ideas about how funding had been used for the previous allocation. Villarin said that other things on the graph to pay attention to included Capital Items, as council should want to pay attention to where the surplus funding went. She said she felt that allocating funds from Surplus for Capital Items was less important than allocating Surplus funds for programming. Villarin said that Contingency funding would continue to be a weekly source from which offices and groups could obtain funding. She said that the pages after the graph presented details on all of the funding sources, and outlined what would be covered by each. Villarin said that the guidelines that the CRC had created for the two new operational funds would set a precedent for guidelines that would be needed in the future if additional funding committees were established. Villarin said that this brought them to the proposed amendments to the Bylaws. She said that all of the proposed additions were in **bold** and the language the CRC was recommending to be removed was in ~~Strikethrough~~. Villarin said that they were proposing the removal of all language regarding "Officially Recognized Student Organizations (ORSO), and replace it with the new description of eligible organizations. She said that language incorporated the

- requirement to have a signed Non-discrimination statement on file with the Center for Student Programming.
- Palma/Saracho asked if any of the funding criteria had changed.
 - Villarín said that the criteria had not been changed, but she pointed out that they did move to another section the items entitled, “Capping of Expense Line Items” and “Maxing of Expense Line Items.”
 - Ohara said that they had also clarified what “Minimum Criteria” meant, since confusion over this requirement had caused some problems during the Base Budget Funding process earlier this year.
 - Villarín said that they had added two items, one of which was entitled, “Quality of Presentation” and another that was entitled, “Advance Planning for Programming.” She elaborated that the one on Advance Planning would prevent retroactive funding of programs. Villarín said they had also changed Item C.6.c. regarding Appeals to read that a three-fourths vote of Council would be required to overrule any Committee decision.
 - Tripathi asked what the requirement was before.
 - Villarín said that there was not a stipulated guideline before. Villarín then went on to state that they had clarified the language regarding Formal Records of Hearings, and she proceeded to read the exact language aloud. She said that it not only clarified exactly what the definition was on formal records of hearings, but also would prevent future problems with groups trying to get the personal notes of the committee members. Moving on to item 6, Villarín said that they had removed the possibility of an amended proposal. She said further that petitions for appeals would have to be filed within 2 weeks of USAC’s decision. Villarín said their clarification of the language on appeals would prevent the kind of confusion that occurred this year as to when the 2-week period actually began. On another matter, Villarín said that, because there had been concern about overworking the Budget Review Director, the CRC decided to create the new position of Assistant Budget Review Director. Villarín said that they had also recommended the mention of USAC under appropriations since it was done primarily through the Finance Committee.
 - Palma/Saracho asked her to clarify her last point.
 - Villarín said that USAC would now have to approve the Finance Committee’s Allocation Recommendations. She said that they also wanted to make sure that groups who had not been funded in the past could still be funded in the future.
 - Villarín said that, under “Procedures”, they had changed the process regarding allocation of Surplus Funds. She said they also put in language allowing the Finance Committee Chairperson to make a recommendation on the amount USAC should allocate to augment the USA Programming Fund and the Capital Items fund. On page 15, Villarín said that they had proposed changes concerning Financial Reports and Records. She said that under the proposed changes, evaluations would be made by funded groups to help future funding boards determine amounts that should be recommended.
 - Palma/Saracho asked if a group received funding for a quarter, whether or not they would be receiving a funding report in the next 30 days.
 - Villarín said that a report would be generated at the end of the quarter.
 - Wood said that she thought the CRC had done a great job, and that all the recommended changes were well thought-out and were all for the better.
 - Tuttle also acknowledged the work that the CRC had done. He said that he did, however, want to comment on the proposed changes on Page 8 under the Formal Records of Hearings section. He said he was concerned that there would be no transparency in the deliberations, and it could be difficult to maintain a perception of fairness. Tuttle said that this is something that would go out there for a few years, and he asked that council give some thought about the desire of their constituents to know what took place during the deliberations. He said that he had other observations that he would share with Villarín prior to the meeting at which Council would be voting on the proposed amendments.

- Jerry Mann, Student Union/Student Support Services Director, said that he had been working with the USAC Guiding Documents for quite a while, and said that the effort this year's CRC had put into the proposed changes, and the results these changes would bring, were really great. By way of historical background on the subject, Mann said that several Supreme Court Decisions had placed a lot of restrictions on the use of mandatorily collected fees, particularly as they were allocated through the Base Budget process. Mann said he thought that the CRC's proposals provided an excellent formula for giving USAC offices and registered undergraduate student organizations access to funding on a timely basis. He elaborated by saying that CRC's proposed changes would allow for groups to apply for funding throughout the year, which would be particularly beneficial to those groups that weren't in place until later in the year. He said further that the proposed changes would also help to spread out the work of the Budget Review Committee over a more extended time period.
- Palma/Saracho said that he agreed that a lot of the changes were good ideas, but said that, since these were rather radical changes, he wondered whether they might be difficult to implement.
- Mann said it was his opinion that these changes would not be difficult to implement. He explained that, actually, one very positive aspect of the proposed changes was that the committee would use line items as a guideline for the amounts allocated. He said that a process could be created in which groups could be funded directly, rather than through the budget transfer system that is being used right now. Mann said that the key factors that would be looked at were whether or not groups were doing what they said they would do with the money and, if they were, then they would continue to be eligible for funding.
- Debra Simmons, Student Government Accounting Division Manager, said that it was a very feasible plan.
- Derek Lazzaro, Daily Bruin Reporter, asked if a copy of this proposal could be sent to the Daily Bruin.
- Villarín gave him her copy.
- Lazzaro also asked if the budgets would be approved on a quarterly basis, and he asked if there was a mechanism to prevent the funds from being depleted too early.
- Villarín said that, with the proposed model, more money would be allocated during Fall Quarter and then lesser amounts would be allocated in Winter and Spring Quarters. She said that there would certainly be a system in place to make sure that there would always be funding available.
- Tuttle asked, with reference to Page 7 under Capital Item Funds, what the material effect would be on the amount of funding in relation to years past.
- Simmons said that would depend on the guidelines created by the funding committees.
- Tuttle said that his concern was that there could be an unintended consequence of reducing the amount that could be spent on Capital Items. He said he agreed that Programming was important, but said it was his opinion that capital items were also important for council.
- Mann said that he understood Tuttle's point, but said that, historically, \$25,000 was a reasonable amount for Capital Items.
- Williams agreed that Capital Items were important and recommended that Tuttle's point be considered.
- Palma/Saracho said that Capital Items for the same type of item could only be applied for every 18 months, and his personal logic was that the CRC's proposal would work. He said that he thought it was better to prioritize funds for Programming over funds for Capital Items.
- Nelson recommended that something be included to ensure that funds would be available to Council to cover any emergency situations. He said he felt that, as long as there was a mechanism to change the guidelines in a time of need, the proposed guidelines should be okay.

- Mann said that there was already a provision which addressed Nelson's concern. He referred to the language, "at least 15%", which establishes a floor rather than a ceiling for the amount that council could use.
- Gruenberg said that the committee had done a good job. He asked, with regard to the Student Organizations Operational Fund, if student groups that were not funded in Fall Quarter could still apply in Winter and Spring.
- Villarin said that they could, with a full application. She said that CRC had also discussed the carrying over of all unallocated funds. Villarin said that anyone had other questions, they could contact any of the members of the CRC. She pointed out that all of their emails were listed in the front of the booklet she had distributed.

Gaulton Arrived

V. Old Business

A. Election Board Updates /

B. *Approval of Proposed Changes to the USAC Election Code

- Lam said that Council's decision at last week's meeting to use MyUCLA for their elections required updating certain sections of the Election Code. He said the primary change would be to remove the "less-than-24-hour voting on MyUCLA" which is currently stipulated in the Election Code (E-Code). Lam said that he was proposing this specific change, but had not printed out this proposed change yet because it was such a simple one. He then went over some other amendments to the E-Code amendments that he was proposing. First, he said that he had added definitions regarding signboards to make that information more clear.
- Gruenberg asked if they would be voting on all of the proposed changes together, or whether they would be voting on each proposed change separately.
- Tuttle said that, since the E-Board Chairperson has said these were relatively minor changes, he thought that it would be fine to vote on them together. He said that, if someone wanted to take a separate vote on a particular proposed change, this could be handled on a case-by-case basis.
- Lam said that in Section C.5., he had clarified the term "Student Organization Signboards". He said that some rules had been created about how signboards could be used. Lam said that these were not new changes, but rather he was now putting into writing the way that the code had been interpreted last year on this matter. He said that the most important change was that endorsement slips could be attached to boards, but only during the campaigning hours.
- Palma/Saracho asked if this included candidates' signboards.
- Lam said that it did. He then pointed out a line that had been crossed out, which had been a typo. Lam said that where an article was referenced he had now corrected it. He said that there had also been additions under "Candidate Responsibility for Campaigners." Lam said that it seemed unfair that candidates had to be responsible for everyone that was campaigning for them. Lam said that he had outlined the changes, and he had added a statement which said candidates were responsible for the campaigners if they were endorsed campaigners by the candidate.
- Tuttle suggested that this point be clarified to say, "at the request of the candidate", or something that made it clear whether or not the candidate had actually endorsed a campaigner.
- Lam said that he had considered this, but he wanted to make sure that nobody could campaign falsely for a candidate, while breaking the rules, in an attempt to get the candidate in trouble.
- Tuttle said that Lam was the policymaker, but what one ends up with in the language is that a candidate can still be held responsible for people that they had not asked to campaign for them. He said that, on the face of it, this language made candidates culpable for anyone campaigning on their behalf, even without their sanction.
- Lam said that the reason he had chosen the language that he did was because of the definition in the dictionary of the phrase "on behalf of".

- Cohn suggested using that language along with the phrase, “with the approval of the candidate”.
- Lam said that another thing to note was that campaigners who broke the rules were all investigated. So there was no guarantee that a candidate would be sanctioned, particularly if they were not in the wrong.
- Tuttle asked what would happen if there was an inadvertent breaking of the rules.
- Lam said then it was not “on behalf of” a candidate.
- Tripathi said that perhaps it was better to have a definition of the word ”behalf” included in the code.
- Lee then read from the American College Dictionary which defined the word “behalf” as “in the best interest of”.
- Lam said that perhaps the best idea would be to follow the suggestion made by Mike Cohn, the E-Board Advisor.
- Lee, reading again from the American College Dictionary, said that “on behalf of” also means “as an agent of.”
- Tripathi said he thought that the best thing would just be to say “with the approval of the candidate.”
- Lam said that the loophole in Tripathi’s suggestion is that people campaigning without the explicit approval of the candidate could break the rules, and then the candidate would not be sanctioned because there was no official “approval”.
- McLaren said that the clearer this could be made the better.
- Villarín asked if council was proposing to add “On behalf of the candidate and/or with the approval of the campaign.” She said that she thought it was important to make the language as clear and inclusive as possible.
- Tripathi said that the language already included that.
- Villarín said she thought that it was better to be redundant than to be unclear.
- Gruenberg suggested that the “or” be removed.
- Villarín said that this would require all campaigners to be approved by the campaign and the candidate.
- Gruenberg said that if council is adding the “and/or”, then it would allow the approval of the campaign without the candidate.
- Villarín thanked Gruenberg for insulting her intelligence. She said that using the “or” would still require the approval of the candidate.
- Tripathi said that the use of the “or” would allow for the ignoring of the first item, so he asked that it not be used.
- McLaren said that the language already included the approval of the campaign and the candidate. She said that perhaps the whole “on behalf of” item should be dropped. She said that the main issue was whether or not the candidate had approved the student to campaign for them.
- Lam said that the reason he had used “behalf” was because the bigger picture was what was important here.
- Palma/Saracho asked if it should be changed to “acting as an agent of the candidate.”
- Cohn said that, ultimately, it was not a major issue. He said that, when complaints are filed, the factors that E-Board investigates are the intent and goal of the rule-breaker, so the wording was not something to get too wrapped up about.
- Tuttle asked if there was any objection to using “as an agent of”. He then asked if the E-Board could issue sanctions against independent organizations or people.
- Lam said they could not, but rather that all sanctions are taken against the candidates.
- Tuttle asked if there was anything to prevent E-Board from taking sanctions against an organization or a student.
- Lam said that there was an article in the E-Code that addressed this.
- Palma/Saracho suggested that the language could be left as it is for now, and that a friendly amendment could always be made later, if necessary or desirable.
- Lam said that, back on the first page of the E-Code, there were also some additions to the Eligibility section. He said there were two loopholes which could be exploited by slated candidates. Lam elaborated on this comment by saying that a candidate who

belongs to a slate is automatically campaigning for the entire slate and, in addition, if slates wanted to have more than two campaigners at a time, then their slate-mates could sign them in. He said that his solution to this would either be to allow anyone to campaign or to allow only UCLA students to campaign. Lam said that he chose the latter, as he believed that non-students did not have a vested interest in the undergraduate elections, so they should not be entitled to campaign. He said that, although this might appear to be a limitation on Free Speech, to see it as that would be a bit of a misinterpretation of what the E-Code was. Lam explained that the Election Code was not a law, but rather it was an agreement that all candidates must sign on to. He said that the agreement was supposed to make the entire process easier, and there is nothing that would allow people to come from off-campus to campaign. Lam said that another issue that had been brought up was an attempt to make it easier for independents to campaign against the slates. Lam said that this would require an enormous change to the E-Code, and there were a number of reasons for this, but he would not go into it unless council really wanted to know.

- Paul Marian asked why the E-Code does not officially recognize slates.
- Lam said that the purpose for not recognizing slates in the E-Code was because that could create an impression that candidates were expected to set up slates.
- Marian asked why candidates who were slated could be identified on the ballot.
- Lam said that they were not identified on the ballot.
- Marian said that slate members had identified themselves in prior elections with such things as quotes around their name, and other such identifying marks.
- Lam reiterated that slates were not mentioned in the Election Code for the reasons he stated earlier, as well as to maintain a comfortable atmosphere for independent candidates.
- Cohn said that this issue was discussed every year and, historically, the USAC officers and the Election Board Chairs always agreed that they did not want to establish a precedent for the creation of slates. He said that, if a decision was made to recognize slates in the Election Code, that recognition would be hard to undo. With respect to the question that Paul Marian raised about slated candidates identifying themselves on the ballot in some particular manner, Cohn said that the denotation of slates has evolved to only allow the use of official University names, rather than nicknames, but candidates were still able to identify themselves with such features as brackets or punctuation.
- Palma/Saracho said that the requirement to use official University names could sometimes hurt candidates because they were known to their constituents by some other, less formal, name.
- Lam said that there has to be a way for people to use their creativity on the ballots to be recognized.
- Lazzaro said he felt that any systematic attempt to identify candidates could not be allowed. He said that everyone understood what the quotes meant, so a systematic change could remove the establishment of slates on the ballot.
- Gruenberg said that one idea was that campaigners be required to have identification on them at all times, and he asked Lam how he saw this being applied during the campaign itself.
- Lam said that it would be up to the discretion of the E-Board.
- Gruenberg said that the reason he asked was that it would be hard to distinguish a non-UCLA student from a UCLA student.
- Martinez said that university policy required students to carry identification on them at all times.
- Nelson said that there had been problems in the past with fraternity alumni hanging around campus and carrying on old ways. He said that the student who was the IFC President at the time solved that problem by requiring members to carry I.D.s. Nelson said that it is important to think about the residual effects of the campaign. He said that a Bruin would have to live with any inappropriate actions taken by his or her campaigners during the campaign.

- Lam said that there is a bias in this rule against people that do not look like students, but there is no way to really enforce this. He said that maybe spot-checks would be a good idea.
- Tuttle suggested that such a process should be avoided because of race and class issues. He said, however, that as long as everything was even across the board, it would probably be okay to conduct spot-checks.
- Cohn said that right now a lot of these were situational comments. He said that this was still a learning process, and one of the things that the E-Code has is that it does not point out its own flaws, but rather responds to problems. Cohn said that it is not the job of the E-Board to hunt down problems, but rather to respond to them as they arise.
- Martinez moved and Vu seconded to approve the proposed changes to the USAC Election Code.
- Gruenberg said that there was a discussion on who could campaign, and asked if there were any precedents that had been set in past years.
- Samaan said that there had been a case last year, and the general consensus was that Universities had the right to restrict the people on their campuses.
- Tripathi proposed a friendly amendment to change the words “on behalf of” to “as an agent of”.
- Martinez and Vu both accepted the friendly amendment to change the words “on behalf of” to “as an agent of”.
- Gruenberg said that there might be a rule for secondary amendments that would keep council from having to vote on the first amendment.
- Villarín suggested not removing the statement, but rather saying “on behalf of, or as an agent of”.
- Palma/Saracho said that he thought this was redundant.
- There being no further discussion, Council voted to approve the proposed changes to the USAC Election Code, as amended, with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Before the Election Board Advisor, Mike Cohn, left the meeting, McLaren announced to Council that Cohn was the person who provided the trays of brownies for USAC’s meeting.
- Lam concluded by announcing that application forms for positions on the Election Board were available on the E-Board office door. He said that applications were due Wednesday of Ninth Week, specifically March 9th.

VI. Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

VII. Fund Allocations

- Corella said that 1 of the 5 recommendations was made via her discretionary authorization.
- Avila moved and Gruenberg seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
- Tripathi 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.

Bruin Partners

Requested: \$860.00
Recommended: \$430.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$430.00 for the partial cost of Transportation for the Winter Quarter Transportation from March 7th to March 10th.

Asian American Tutorial Project**Requested: \$92.00****Recommended: \$72.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$72.00 for the cost of Parking Fees for the Field Trip to the California Science Center to be held on March 5th.

USA Financial Supports Commission**Requested: \$700.00****Recommended: \$100.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$100.00 for the cost of Supplies for Daisy Day on March 8th.

Undergraduate International Relations Society**Requested: \$1,434.00****Recommended: \$ 434.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$134.00 for the cost of Facilities and \$300 for the cost of Graphics for UIRS Presents: Michael Dukakis, held on February 28th.

Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity**Requested: \$867.75****Recommended: \$350.00**

In compliance with the discretionary authorization granted to her in the 2004-2005 Finance Committee Guidelines, Corella recommended the allocation of \$350.00 for the Honorarium for African Consciousness Week Part 1.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

Financial Supports Commissioner – Alex Gruenberg

- Gruenberg said that tomorrow would be the last day to submit FAFSA's. He said that the workshops last week had gone well. Gruenberg also said that ASUCLA was considering a Fee Increase, and OCHC had taken a position of inquiry. He said that one thing being considered was to increase the value of the meal coupon from On-Campus Housing, and that his office was looking into getting that done. Gruenberg also said that he was sponsoring the Fragile Hopes screening, which would be held in De Neve Auditorium. Gruenberg concluded his report by announcing that his office was planning a trip to D.C.

Facilities Commissioner – Pavan Tripathi

- Tripathi said that he had gotten more emails from UC Merced about student government information. He asked if anyone wanted to give them some input on how a government should run. Tripathi also said that he had not done anything with the Office Space Allocation Committee, but he would be emailing people about it. Lastly, Tripathi said that he was looking into the issue of additional safety resources for the campus perimeter jogging path.

External Vice President – John Vu

From External Vice President John Vu's Weekly Report to Council

UCSA

- California Statewide Budget Summit will be this Saturday; a statewide effort between UCSA, the California State Student Association (CSSA), and the California Student Association of Community Colleges (CalSACC)
- Board meeting will be this weekend at CSU Channel Islands
 - We will be debriefing on the UC Lobby Conference and setting plans of action for the rest of the academic year; we'll keep you posted and have a report when we come back
- Policy Impacts

- The California Hope Endowment
 - Its mission is to improve accessibility to public colleges and universities by increasing the number of Californians who attend colleges or universities and receive degrees
 - This bill could potentially strengthen outreach/academic preparation programs (K-12), increase availability of advanced placement and courses fulfilling the A-G requirements, increase financial aid (due to fee hikes and textbooks), improving counseling and coordination between community colleges and universities, and improving counseling at colleges and universities; Thus an increase of access to students of low-income economic backgrounds.

UC Regents

- Met with Jodi Anderson, student regent and discussed potential and definite items of discussion/action at the next UC Regents meeting
 - Return To Aid: Currently the Larry Hershman, board chair says that the Legislative Analyst Office, a nonpartisan organization that oversees fiscal spending on all California entities, advised the UC not to increase their spending on Return to Aid. Recently the Regents decreased Return to Aid funding from 33% to 25%. It will be very unlikely that this will return to the 33% level this year.
 - Campus Rotation: The Regents are discussing the possible plans of holding one meeting at every campus within the next four years
 - New Regents: There are currently three new appointments awaiting to happen, as well as the confirmation of Regent Ruiz.

USSA

- Legislative Conference will be happening March 18-22, 2005 at Washington DC. At this conference, we will be having workshops on nationally impacting issues on students, such as the Higher Education Act Reauthorization, the Appropriations, the DREAM ACT, and much more. In addition, there will be lobby workshops and time for students to prepare for their lobby visits on March 22, 2005 and chances to network with students from around the nation.

Upcoming Travel/Events

- UC Regents meeting @ UCLA, March 16-17, 2005.
- USSA Legislative Conference @ Washington DC, March 18-22, 2005.
- Sacramento visits, March 28-30, 2005.

Questions to John Vu after his report:

- Tripathi asked if the Legislative Office had given a reason for their recommendation.
- Vu said that it was purely a budget issue.
- Samaan said that the last change that was made by the Regents was \$6 million and, though this sounds like a lot, it is not much at all, and this is a disingenuous answer.
- Lee asked where the Regents Meeting would be on campus.
- Vu said that it would probably be at Covell Commons.

Internal Vice President – Darren Chan

- Chan said that it was in the interest of this council to increase its interaction with other on-campus entities. He said that there had been interest expressed in increasing the level of communication between the branches of student government, and that GSA was interested in opening the lines of communication with USAC. He said that another student organization Council could reach out to was the Student Alumni Association (SAA). Chan asked council if anyone would be interested in attending a meeting to talk about how the various groups could work together, and also about how to use limited budgets to do large scale programming on campus. Chan asked who would be available on Wednesday from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. He said that at this first meeting, they would discuss whether or not they would continue to meet on a regular basis. Chan said they had told him that they would like to have their voice heard on this council.

- Gruenberg asked that Chan extend them an invitation to attend USAC's meetings as well.
- Palma/Saracho said that he and Martinez would be in class during that time block and could not attend the meeting.
- Chan asked who would be available. He said that he wanted to make sure that, if all of SAA was present, that at least a majority of Council members could be there.
At least 5 Council Members indicated that they could be there.
- Tuttle cautioned that, if there was a quorum of Council Members at this meeting, they make sure that no decisions are made.

President – Allende Palma/Saracho

- Palma/Saracho thanked everyone that could make it to the student forum with the Chancellor. He said there had been a good turnout, especially considering the limited notification about the forum. He said that a lot of issues were discussed and that it had been very informative. He also said that the Chancellor had been very up front in his remarks to the students as well as in his responses to their questions. On another matter, Palma/Saracho said that this Saturday, he and the GSA President, Jared Fox, would be sitting in on the Student Regent Interviews. He said that there were about 20 or so Applicants. Palma/Saracho then said that, on Sunday, he and his Interns had gone on a Toxic Tour of Southeast Los Angeles. He said he had been on the tour before, but that there had been updates since the last time he went. With regard to his interns, Palma/Saracho said that they were trying to coordinate an all-USAC staff get-together. He said that they were still working on the venue and the date, but it would likely be March 10th or 11th in the Grand Salon. He added that the interns were being very creative about this social event, and said it might even be a costume party. Palma/Saracho concluded his report by saying that he would be attending the ASUCLA Entities Committee meeting this week.

IX. New Business

A. *Resolution in Support of the United States Student Association's Campaign on the Federal Budget and Appropriations

- Vu asked council if they had any questions or comments on this Resolution. There were none.
- Avila moved and Villarín seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of the United States Student Association's Campaign on the Federal Budget and Appropriations.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution in Support of the United States Student Association's Campaign on the Federal Budget and Appropriations with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

B. *Resolution in Opposition to Changing the Structure of Undergraduate Student Government from a Commission-Based System to a Senate-Based System

- Palma/Saracho said that, basically, this was a resolution in opposition to changing the structure of undergraduate student government at UCLA.
- Martinez said that the last "Resolved" should be changed to read "Finally" rather than "Further".
- Gruenberg said that, last week during the presentation in opposition to the proposed change, 9 elected members of Council and 1 Ex-Officio member had signed on to the opposition to this Resolution. He said that, it was his opinion that this group must have had a meeting the day before last week's Council meeting. Gruenberg said that, in his assumption was correct, there were a lot of problematic implications to this, the first of which was that several Council members had not been invited. He said that it was out of order for certain Council members to make a decision like this without notification to all Council members and to the press. Gruenberg said that, when Council doesn't work together, everything else falls apart.

- Palma/Saracho said that, as one of the principal authors of this Resolution in opposition to changing the structure of student government, there had never been a quorum meeting on this matter. He said that the largest meeting had been of four people, and always in an informal setting.
- Gruenberg said that the criteria for being involved in this discussion were curious. He said that he was not sure what the criteria were to decide who would be shown this proposal, or who would even be told about it.
- Palma/Saracho said that no-one was invited to take part in this, rather it was a collection of people who had expressed concern to him about the proposed change. He added that a lot of other issues that are developed don't always take place in council meetings, and people that have different ideas aren't always incorporated in things. Palma/Saracho said that the three Council members who were not involved in this matter had not been excluded but, rather, just hadn't expressed interest or concern to him about the matter.
- Tripathi said, with regard to the fifth "Whereas", he felt that BruinGO! should not be identified as a USAC program.
- Villarin said that she would hesitate to remove it, because a former USAC General Representative had worked hard to make sure that BruinGO! had been adopted by the Council.
- Martinez agreed with Villarin, saying that when the Chancellor tried to eliminate BruinGo! it was USAC's work that maintained it.
- Palma/Saracho said that it was true that this could be misinterpreted, so Council would have to use its discretion to decide whether or not it should be included.
- Martinez said that perhaps the word "preservation" or "continuity" or "maintenance" could be used.
- McLaren suggested "development and expansion".
- Tripathi said that was better. Moving on, Tripathi said that, under the fourth "Whereas" on the second page, he had a problem with the statement that a Parliamentarian is not a necessary position to have in student government.
- Palma/Saracho said his response to that objection was that a Parliamentarian already existed within USAC's structure.
- Tripathi said that he would argue that the Chair is not the Parliamentarian by default. He said that to say that having one is unnecessary is unfounded. Tripathi said that if it allows a student to become more involved in student government, he thought there was nothing wrong with it.
- Villarin said that having a Parliamentarian would remove the need for Dr. Tuttle. Villarin said that a student who is knowledgeable could always come to the meetings, and cited Joe Vardner as an example. Villarin said she thought that the title was not that important, and neither was having it as an official position.
- Tuttle said (with a smile) that, for fear of wandering the streets on Tuesday Nights, he hoped that Council would keep him around.
- Martinez moved and Vu seconded to approve the Resolution in Opposition to Changing the Structure of Undergraduate Student Government from a Commission-Based System to a Senate-Based System.
- Neesby asked if any Resolution could be approved without due notice in accordance with the USAC Bylaws. He also said that he believed that this Resolution came from a secret meeting. Neesby said further that, whether or not it was a meeting in the traditional sense, according to the Brown Act it is treated as a meeting because a resolution came out of it, even if attendees acted as intermediaries.
- Palma/Saracho reiterated that there was never a meeting of quorum. He said that some communication took place over email, and some took place in small groups.
- Neesby said that because of intermediaries, transactions that take place away from the Council table are in violation of the Brown Act and this was a procedural issue. He directed anyone interested to Article 5, Section 3 of the Brown Act.
- Tuttle said that he was not yet decided. However, he said under Special Action Items, additions to the Agenda must be made by a 2/3 majority. Tuttle said that what he saw under Special Orders allowed for this to be made an Action Item under a 2/3 majority.

- Neesby said that his response would be that this was not an addition to the Agenda. He said that there was already a Resolution, so this was not a Special Order situation, but rather an Action Item issue.
- Tuttle said that the Bylaws allowed for "Special Items", which he thought included Action Items.
- Neesby said that he could see Dr. Tuttle's point.
- Tuttle asked Neesby if he would agree that it would be up to the discretion of the Chair to allow this or not.
- Neesby said that the Chair might have the prerogative to say that this constitutes a Special Order.
- Tuttle said further that the paper trail was here, even 'though the item itself was handed out just a few minutes ago.
- Villarín said that she was thinking the same as Dr. Tuttle about the section of the Bylaws regarding additions to the Agenda. She commented further that, because Neesby and Vardner were strong supporters of the proposed changes to the structure of student government, they had an interest in seeing this Resolution fail.
- Palma/Saracho said he believed that Council should make the decision as to whether or not this matter could be dealt with at tonight's meeting.
- Tuttle said that the situation cries out for a ruling of the Chair. He said that this is a fairly close call, so the Chair may want to give serious consideration and reflection before making his ruling.
- Palma/Saracho said that his general feeling was that it was important to have Council consider this action tonight, and it was important for Council to let their constituents know how they feel about the proposed structural change. He said that USAC's voice was absent from the petitioning that was taking place right now, and the students deserved to know how USAC felt about the petitioners' position.
- Palma/Saracho then ruled that this should be considered a Special Item of the day and that a 2/3 majority vote should confirm this.
- Tuttle said that the Chair may vote to determine the outcome, if necessary. He said that, by his count, at least 7 votes were needed to confirm this.
- Palma/Saracho said that he did not feel that this item needed to be discussed any further, and asked that Council take a vote.
- Council voted to make the Resolution in Opposition to Changing the Structure of Undergraduate Student Government from a Commission-Based System to a Senate-Based System a Special Item with a vote of 8 in favor, 1 opposed, and Palma/Saracho abstaining.
- Martinez moved and Villarín seconded to approve the Resolution in Opposition to Changing the Structure of Undergraduate Student Government from a Commission-Based System to a Senate-Based System.
- Vu Called the Question. There being no objection to Calling the Question, Council moved to a vote.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution in Opposition to Changing the Structure of Undergraduate Student Government from a Commission-Based System to a Senate-Based System with a vote of 6 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Palma/Saracho recommended publishing a full-page advertisement in the Daily Bruin.
- Martinez moved and Vu seconded to publish a full-page advertisement of the Resolution in Opposition to Changing the Structure of Undergraduate Student Government from a Commission-Based System to a Senate-Based System in the Daily Bruin.
- Gruenberg said that there is a clause in the Election Code which prevents the spending of USAC funds on an election-related item once the election process had begun. He said that he did not want to abridge the Election Code, and read from the section that supported his opinion as to why this expenditure was not allowed.
- Tuttle said that one possibility would be for Council to make a decision, pending the approval of the Election Board Chair, who had already left the meeting.

- Nelson said that since the E-Board Chair was not here, he thought it would be unwise to undercut him. Nelson agreed with Tuttle's suggestion that this should go to the Election Board Chair and then to the Judicial Board to make sure that it was okay with both Boards.
- Tuttle said that Council should be careful about comparing one code to another. He also said that there existed the remedy of the Super-Super Majority.
- Palma/Saracho said that this was a good suggestion in case it was not in compliance with the Election Code.
- Tuttle said that, if the motion stated, "pending approval by the Election Board Chairperson", and the motion is approved, it would mean that the advertisement could be submitted to the Daily Bruin as soon as the Election Board Chairperson said it was in compliance with the Election Code. He said, further, that the voice of the Council should be heard.
- Council voted to publish a full-page advertisement of the Resolution in Opposition to Changing the Structure of Undergraduate Student Government from a Commission-Based System to a Senate-Based System in the Daily Bruin, pending approval by the Election Board Chairperson, with a vote of 6 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
- Palma/Saracho said that this would be sent to the Election Board Chairperson for review and approval.

X. Announcements

- Vu said that there would be an Awareness Week focusing on the events transpiring in Darfur. He said that there would be more events coming up, and passed around flyers.
- Gruenberg said that his website was not up yet, but it looked really good.
- Tuttle said he wanted to stress to the Chair of the Constitutional Review Committee that, on the issue of Minimum Criteria, one item about education turned out to be a knockout case. He said that he did not have an easy solution, but it should at least be looked at. Tuttle said that council should look at the way this was written.
- Gruenberg asked Villarin whether suggestions concerning the proposed amendments to the Bylaws should be directed to her.
- Villarin said they should.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Corella passed around the attendance sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Martinez moved and Lee seconded to adjourn.
- Vu called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 11:05 P.M. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker