

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

Tuesday March 8, 2005  
417 Kerckhoff Hall  
7:00 P.M.

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

ABSENT: Chan

GUESTS: Bridget Smith, Kristen Thompson, Saira Gandhi, Matthew Sablove, Christina Kaoh, Nathan Lam, Jerry Mann, Brian Neesby, Tracy Ohara, Melinda Dudley, Narges Zohoury, Saba Riazati; Yousef Tasjar; Tyson Evans, Gabriel Rose, Roy Samaan, Debra Simmons, Joe Vardner

I. A. Call to Order

- Palma/Saracho called the meeting to order at 7:12 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*Corella passed around the Attendance Sheet*

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Wood asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports, and also requested to move up the Resolution Reaffirming Support of Same-Sex Marriages to before Special Presentations.
- Martinez asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Avila asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Vu requested to move the Resolution on Divestment from Sudan to just after Special Presentations.
- 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

**February 8, 2005**

- Avila said that on page 7, the amount raised had been \$1,400, not \$2,400.
- Martinez said that on page 7, the concert mentioned in his Officer Report had been from 8:00 to 11:00 p.m. He also said that the policy meeting he had referenced was the University Committee on Education Policy.
- Wood moved and Avila seconded to approve the Minutes as amended.
- Lee called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of February 8, 2005 were approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

**\*Resolution Reaffirming Support of Same-Sex Marriage**

- Wood said that Gabriel Rose was present to share information about the resolution with council.

- Gabriel Rose said that he was the new President of the UCLA chapter of The Student Coalition for Marriage Equality here on campus. He said that his group's sole goal was to legalize same-sex marriage in California. Rose said that discrimination based on sexual orientation is the last form of discrimination still legal in the United States. He said that he is seeking to create a grassroots movement to get college students involved in this campaign, and asked council to approve a resolution in support of his, and others', efforts. Rose said he felt that a campus which stands for justice and decries inequality of any kind should endorse his efforts, and asked that council approve this resolution.
  - Wood said that there are a number of statistics on the resolution. She said further that she believed it was important for UCLA and USAC to take a strong stance on this issue in light of the strong presence of the LBGT community and also the recent suicides which occurred at UCLA.
  - Palma/Saracho said that he was really impressed by all of the work done by this new organization. He said that their efforts were admirable, and he applauded their work and efforts here on campus. Palma/Saracho agreed that this was one of the most important issues going on at this time.
  - Gruenberg moved and Villarin seconded to approve the Resolution Reaffirming Support of Same-Sex Marriage.
  - Council voted to approve the Resolution Reaffirming Support of Same-Sex Marriage with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
  - Rose also requested that USAC publish an advertisement in the Daily Bruin to advertise their support of this resolution, and asked what the earliest date was that the resolution could be published.
  - Palma/Saracho said that Friday would be the earliest possible date.
  - Rose said that would be fine.
  - Wood moved and Vu seconded to publish a full-page advertisement of USAC's support of the Resolution Reaffirming Support of Same-Sex Marriage in the Daily Bruin on Monday, March 14<sup>th</sup>.
  - Council approved the publication of a full-page advertisement of USAC's support of the resolution in the Daily Bruin on Monday, March 14<sup>th</sup>, with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
  - Rose closed by saying that The Student Coalition for Marriage Equality was a volunteer-based organization, and said that he really wanted to build a state-wide base of students in support of this issue. He said that this issue would probably come up in the 2006 election, and hoped that it would be approved this year.
- Gaulton Arrived*

#### IV. Special Presentations

##### **Education on the Situation in Darfur – John Vu**

##### **\*Resolution on Divestment from Sudan**

- Vu asked the students who were at the meeting to present information on this Resolution to introduce themselves to Council.
- Bridget Smith said that she was a member of the Darfur Action Committee (DAC) and the Social Justice Alliance (SJA).
- Kristen Thompson said that she worked with the DAC and with UNICEF at UCLA.
- Saira Gandhi said that she was here on behalf of the DAC.
- Christina Kaoh said that she was with the SJA.
- Matthew Sablove said that he was active with the DAC.
- Bridget Smith began by saying that the Darfur Action Committee submitted this proposal for Council's consideration and approval. She said that she had come before Council last quarter about the Taco Bell issue, and remarked that Taco Bell had since agreed to pay their workers a full minimum wage. With regard to the Darfur Resolution, Smith said that there was a major conflict going on right now in Darfur, and that the United States had labeled it as Genocide. Smith then gave some

- background on the continuing decline of the situation in Darfur, which finally ended in a war. She said that the government of Sudan had now begun aerial bombardments.
- Thompson read some of the statistics from the fact sheet that she had handed out to Council which set forth the large number of people who had been killed or displaced. She said that only 20 percent of the affected people were receiving aid.
  - Smith said that, on an international scale, nothing was really happening about these critical problems in Darfur. She said that it might be more effective to push the government of Sudan financially by removing the funding that they received from private businesses. She pointed out that UCLA had played a pivotal role in ending apartheid in South Africa, and said she believed UCLA could do the same thing to help resolve the crisis in Darfur. Referring to the language of the Referendum, she said there was a major correction to be made. She explained that, whereas 70,000 people had died at the time the Resolution was initially drafted, the number of deaths had since increased to 300,000.
  - Wood said that previous events that had been taking place on campus to educate students on the crisis in Darfur were really impressive and informative.
  - Martinez agreed, and said that it was great to see students interested in global issues.
  - Palma/Saracho asked the presenters if there was anything they wanted to add with regard to the Resolution itself.
  - Thompson said she felt the Resolution spoke for itself, and that it set forth everything the presenters wanted it to accomplish.
  - Martinez moved and Tseng seconded to approve the Resolution on Divestment from Sudan.
  - Council voted to approve the Resolution on Divestment from Sudan with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
  - Tseng moved and Martinez seconded to publish a 1/3-page advertisement in the Daily Bruin on Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>.
  - Council voted to publish the Resolution on Divestment from Sudan as a 1/3-page advertisement in the Daily Bruin on Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
  - Tuttle said that he had been to one of the programs, and had been impressed by what he saw. He asked what the situation was in the United Nations' Security Council, and what those implications were.
  - Matthew Sablove said that the United Nations had not classified this as Genocide. He said that if this were to happen, then their response would change accordingly.
  - Thompson said that four or five of the powerful members of the United Nations sell arms to Sudan, and also receive oil from Sudan. She said that, consequently, they were reluctant to take any action against Sudan. She said that, right now, there were about 2,000 African Union Forces in the area, but that was the only occupying force.
  - Tuttle said that, right now, the UN was two votes away from taking action on this matter. He said that what was at stake here was hundreds of thousands of lives.

#### **Transportation Update and Discussion – Joe Vardner**

- Vardner said that a lot had happened since the last time he spoke with Council. He said that some good news was that, next year, there would be no increase in student parking fees. Vardner said that the only thing that would increase would be the daily rate, which would go up to \$8. He said that Transportation Services was able to refinance its debt, so the other fees would not be increased. Vardner ended his opening statement by saying that Transportation Services always tells him that parking at UCLA is still cheaper than other schools in the area.
- Villarín asked who had done this research, saying that she knew that UCLA was definitely more expensive than Santa Barbara and Berkeley.
- Vardner said that these were the Transportation Service's numbers for comparable permits.
- Villarín asked him to check on these numbers.
- Vardner said that he would.

- Martinez said he knew that other campuses did not have similar parking fee structures, and asked if Vardner could get this information.
- Vardner said he would. He then moved on to talk about the progress with Metro (formerly known as the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA)). Vardner said that UCLA was still in negotiation with Metro, but should have a transit program set up with them to take effect in Fall Quarter. He said that the addition of this system would definitely benefit students in getting to campus. Vardner said that the only issue was how this would be subsidized. He said that, right now, the Santa Monica Blue Bus was subsidized for each swipe of a Bruin Card. Vardner said that Metro did not use the same technology, so other options needed to be explored. He said that it is likely that UCLA will pay a flat subsidy to Metro, with Transportation Services paying 50%. He said that the cost to students would work out to about \$36.
- Palma/Saracho asked how the transfer system between these different bus lines would work.
- Vardner said that the pass which students would buy from Metro would be an unlimited pass, for buses and rail lines, for an 11-week period. He said that it would be good to partner with Metro because BruinGO! would begin on the weekends when Metro was not operating. He added that students would have to pay only 25 cents after swiping their card to ride each time. Vardner said that bike lanes were being worked on as well. He said that new ideas were being explored, with nicer bike storage options, and also the eventual regulation of bike traffic on campus. He explained that these things should all be finalized by Spring Quarter. Vardner then moved on to report on a positive shift in how Transportation Services deals with students. He said that Transportation Services would be revamping their website to make it more user-friendly. He said the website would be sectionalized, so it would be easier for students to navigate. He added that a lot of the Transportation Services Advisory Board (TSAB) members were happy with the website ideas, and would be holding a focus group to help guide the development of the website. Vardner said that Transportation Services needed people who were knowledgeable to help take over next year. He also said that students are already looking for housing for next year, and that they will be tying their housing location into available transportation options. Vardner also announced that next year there would be an additional student seat on TSAB. He said that this new seat would alternate yearly between GSA and USA, with USA getting the extra seat next year. Vardner said that a study was also being done to evaluate the parking meter charges with the possibility of increasing the amount of time without increasing the charge. Vardner said he thought it was ridiculous that the cost of the meters is the same for all 24 hours. He said he thought the least they could do was lower the charges for both early morning and late night hours. Vardner said that, the bad news he had to report was that the Hilgard Bus Terminal has been closed during nights and weekends simply because the neighbors had complained. Vardner said that the worst thing was that tire-slashers had been installed to operate during night and weekend hours to keep the bus drivers from using the terminal as a turnaround. He said he thought these steps were taken for the wrong reasons, and also that these changes unfairly penalize UCLA's students and staff.
- Palma/Saracho said that he thought this was an important issue to fight, and it was ridiculous to inconvenience students and campus employees because of a small amount of noise. He also said that it was hard for working-class people to get to and from work. Palma/Saracho said that many of the people who used that terminal work on campus as well as in the very homes of the residents who complained about, and lobbied for, the closing of the terminal.
- Vardner said that this was true, and it is not only the terminal that was closed but also the three stops on the way.
- Williams asked if the sheet had a quote from Jack Powazek, explaining why the University had allowed the closing of the terminal.

- Vardner said that Powazek had actually fought to keep the terminal open, and said that nighttime and weekend operating hours were the existential line drawn in the sand by the University, and UCLA would not give in to the neighbors any further.
- Palma/Saracho asked if some members of the Administration wanted to close it and others did not. He also asked whose decision it ultimately was to close the terminal.
- Vardner said Jack Powazek and two other Administrators had made the final agreement.
- Palma/Saracho asked if the bus lines were fighting this since they were losing riders.
- Vardner said that they had been pretty silent, as they used to come onto campus, and the new set up actually worked better for them. He said that they were happier with this move.
- Williams asked if the terminal was closed now and asked when Powazek had made this statement.
- Vardner said that the statement was in reference to the University not closing it any further, and yes, that it was closed on nights and weekends right now.
- Tuttle asked if any neighbors had young people that used those buses.
- Vardner said that he doubted that those neighbors ever used buses.
- Tuttle suggested that maybe the younger people in that neighborhood be sought out to help support the students. He said that this could change the complexion completely. Tuttle said that there were plenty of people over there that used the buses, and asked if Vardner might find some way to survey that situation.

V. Appointments

*There were no Appointments this week.*

VI. Fund Allocations

- Corella said that two of the five recommendations were via her discretionary authorization.
- Corella said that for Alpha Omega Alpha, the Total Amount Requested of \$75 was correct, but the Total Amount Recommended for Graphics should have read \$25.
- Ohara asked Gruenberg if his office was sponsoring the Cambodian Film Screening, even though the name of his office was not printed on the flyers.
- Gruenberg said that the flyers had been printed before his Commission became a sponsor of the event.
- Tseng moved and Avila seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
- Lee 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.

**Community Service Commission**

**Requested: \$258.00**

**Recommended: \$172.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$172.00 for the partial cost of Transportation for Project SET to be held on March 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup>.

**Alpha Omega Alpha**

**Requested: \$75.00**

**Recommended: \$25.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$25.00 for the partial cost of Graphics for the Dance Marathon Fundraiser held February 24<sup>th</sup>.

**Muslim Student Association (MSA)****Requested: \$9,429.09****Recommended: \$4,500.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$4,500.00 for the partial cost of an Honorarium for College Day to be held on March 12<sup>th</sup>.

**USA Financial Supports Commission****Requested: \$600.00****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 Graphics for the Cambodian Film Screening held March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**MEChA de UCLA****Requested: \$1,000.00****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 cost of Transportation for the 12<sup>th</sup> Annual Raza Youth Conference held on March 5<sup>th</sup>.

## VII. Officer and Member Reports

**Academic Affairs Commissioner – Eligio Martinez, Jr**

- Martinez said that he was in the Office of the UC President in Oakland yesterday. He said that the Math Initiative going on Statewide was in response to the shortage of Math and Science teachers in the state. Martinez said that, if every major in Math or Science were hired as a teacher, there would still be a shortage in California. He said that the Governor was trying to get this initiative approved by 2006, as it was part of the compact he had made with educational institutions. Martinez said that the other thing going on was a discussion on changing the admissions criteria. He said that a lot of professors were saying that students needed more math or science, but it had been brought up that, if there were another course requiring a lab, the Colleges and Universities would not be able to meet this need.
- Tripathi asked if the idea of the program was to get more high schoolers majoring in Math and Science, or to increase the number of math and science majors in the universities.
- Martinez said that it was both. He said that a lot of the majors now go through a special training after graduation, and said that the model used at the University of Austin was being followed.

**Student Welfare Commissioner – Jason Avila**

- Avila said that yesterday had been their ROLLAIDS event, and that about \$1,000 had been raised for children affected with HIV to go to Camp Laurel. Avila also said that the Total Wellness Newsletter had also been printed, and he passed copies around to Council.

**General Representative #1 – Jenny Wood**

- Wood said that the Volunteer Source, a website that would enable students to gain access to community service opportunities, would be up at the beginning of Spring Quarter. Wood also said that she had a lot of Application Forms for the upcoming Dodgeball Tournament.

**General Representative #2 – Anneli Villarin**

- Villarin said that planning for the Women's Collective workshops was well underway. She said that a lot of the workshop subjects had been finalized, as well as the facilitators for each session. Villarin said that she was working on a list of the people

that she wanted to invite, including Vice Chancellor Montero. She said she was adding an entertainment session and said that, coincidentally, Tori Amos would be appearing at Royce Hall that night. Villarin said that she was trying to get in touch with Amos to see if she wanted to perform, present, or do anything to take part in the Women's Collective. Villarin said that her list of UCLA students to be invited was already close to 100 names. She said that the venue would hold up to 500 people. Villarin said that the General Representatives' Office and the Alumni Association would be sponsoring an Anti-War speak out in Bruin Plaza tomorrow from 12:00 to 1:00 p.m. on the two-year anniversary of the United States invasion of Iraq. Villarin said that there would be performances and speakers. She said that other schools and cities would be holding anti-war rallies at the same time.

- Avila asked what interested people should do if they want to help plan the Women's Collective event.
- Villarin said that the planning committee meets at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesdays in the General Representatives office, so anyone who was interested in helping should come to that meeting.
- Tuttle asked what the date of the event would be.
- Villarin said that it would be on April 23<sup>rd</sup>.
- Tuttle asked why that date.
- Villarin said it was linked with Working Women's Day.

#### **External Vice President - John Vu**

- Roy Samaan initiated the report of the EVP's Office by saying that there had been a meeting this past weekend of the Statewide Students Association. He said that there had been delegations from the UCs, the Cal States, and the Community Colleges. Samaan said that they had discussed how they could work together to make sure that higher education is a top priority in the administration. He said that a couple of regional alliances had been made to help bring people together to coordinate efforts on a regional level. Samaan said that today had been the citywide election, and said that efforts were being coordinated to pursue the Action Agenda Items. Samaan said that at the meeting last week, UCLA had one of the largest delegations to the State Legislature. He said that in the coming weeks, each UC would be setting up district lobby visits to share the problems students were experiencing. Samaan also said that the Regents would be here at UCLA next week. He said that this would be Finals Week for most schools, or Spring Break for others, and joked that this might be a conspiracy by the Regents to prevent lobbying by the students. Samaan then passed out contact information for the Regents in case people wanted to fax letters to them. He said that the Regents had voted in November to increase fees and decrease aid, and this issue would be up for discussion again. Samaan said that the EVP's office had been working closely with Jodi Anderson to make sure that the Regents understood just how negatively this affected the students. Samaan asked Council to make sure that all of their offices worked on Fax-In day to Faxes a lot of letters.
- Vu said that he would be emailing letters to everyone which they could personalize and then mail directly to Vu then moved on to present his weekly written report:

*From External Vice President John Vu's Report to Council.*

#### **UCSA**

- Attached is the UCSA Board of Director's report
  - Budget Summit
  - Statewide Actions
- Excess Fee Units (ask Monica/Liz for finalized votes)
- Regents Fax-In
- Budget Discussion

#### **USSA**

- Last Thursday, EVP office and the UCLA Governmental Relations office hosted a lobby workshop, teaching students about the Higher Education Act

Reauthorization, the budget process, and how to lobby. These are useful skills for future in-district and in-office visits.

- Legislative Conference; will provide a report during first council meeting of Spring Quarter

#### Upcoming Events

- Local Elections, Today!
- UC Regents Meeting @ UCLA, March 16-17, 2005.
- USSA Legislative Conference, March 18-22, 2005.
- UCSA April Board of Director's Meeting, April 1-3, 2005.
- Womyn of Color Conference @ UCSB, April 8-10, 2005.

#### **President - Allende Palma/Saracho**

- Palma/Saracho introduced two of the interns from the Presidential Internship Program, Aliya Hussaini and Jesse Melgares.
- Hussaini said that the interns were making arrangements for an all-staff USAC banquet which would be held this Thursday from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. in the Student Activities Center.
- Melgares said that there would be activities, food, and a theme where students from each office would select a theme and wear costumes that represent their theme. He said that the prize for the winning office would be that Palma/Saracho would sing a song for them.
- Vu said that he had some songs ready if there would be a Karaoke Competition.
- Melgares said that they had extra invitations with them for any office that didn't get one.
- Palma/Saracho said that everyone was invited, including staff, and that the interns were trying to get everyone to attend and participate.
- Tseng asked what kind of food would be served.
- Hussaini said that there would be all types of food.
- Palma/Saracho moved on to say that the Leadership Development Sessions for his internship program were drawing to a close, and that the last session would be held this coming Friday from 2:00 to 6:00pm in Ackerman Grand Ballroom. He said that a locally famous organizer would be at the final session to speak on how leaders can take care of themselves. He said that all of his interns had been doing a great job and he hoped that, from this point on, they would be busy working in the offices of other student leaders. On another matter, Palma/Saracho said that he would be speaking and meeting with the Regents to discuss Return to Aid. He said that, right now, it only existed in registration fees, but they would talk more about it at the meeting.

#### VIII. Old Business

##### **A. ECP Task Force Updates**

- Tseng said that there were a lot of things to talk about. He said that the three large items that would be addressed were (1) The significant points in Judith Smith's Documents, (2) the Preliminary Data Analysis, and (3) the Plan of Action! Tseng said that the Open Records Request had been sent on February 18, 2005, and that he had picked up the information yesterday had been promised to him. Tseng then moved on to presenting the information, but cautioned Council that he had not double-checked these findings because he had not had enough time to review the documents thoroughly. Tseng said that the documents included an ECP Background, the concept of ECP, the Arguments for ECP, how members of the Administration were contradicting themselves, how ECP applied to the larger picture, and what the College is planning to do. Tseng presented some statistics to Council about the minimum progress requirement of other comparable Colleges, which showed that UCLA was tied for the fewest units per quarter in the year 2000.
- Martinez said that UCLA had previously required only 12 units per quarter.



- Tseng said that the preliminary discussion on the ECP Requirement had taken place in 2001. He said that the ECP Requirement had been proposed by Vice Provost Judy Smith as a solution to increase workload and decrease time to degree. Tseng told Council some of the reasons that had been given in favor of ECP, most of which had to do with the amount of funding that UCLA received per student. Tseng said that the same reasons had been given in letters to school officials and departmental chairs, and that the language was verbatim with the language used in the reasons given by Vice Provost Smith. Tseng said that, according to the Administration, the reasons for having ECP now are funding and access. He said that the number of full-time enrolled students had been increasing since the ECP initiative. Tseng said that Smith had cited this increase as resulting from adding new students, not by placing the ECP restriction on them. Tseng then told Council that, in a 2004 email, Judith Smith admitted that it would be difficult to say that ECP or re-uniting the lower division courses had any effect during the period between 2000 and 2004. Tseng said that Smith contradicted herself, sometimes talking about increasing students and other times talking about access. Tseng said that the Chancellor had told Council on Governance Day that he had not prevented ethnic data from being distributed. Tseng said that Judy Smith had told him that ethnic data were not available but, actually, the Chancellor had asked for this very information. Tseng then showed Council the information that he had just received, which included ethnic data regarding percentages of students on ECP probation. He said that this information was outdated, as it was the first check done on ECP. Tseng said that these statistics showed that ECP worked to push out the very students who worked the hardest to gain admission to UCLA. He said that the larger context is that UCLA has been asked by UCOP to increase Full Time Enrolled Students (FTES) to increase the number of students. Tseng said that ECP was being used to increase graduation rates. He said that students are taking an increased workload because of ECP, and this was expected to continue into 2010. Tseng said that, right now, the College wants to increase the gross allocation of Graduate Students FTE from 415 to 600, and increase Summer Enrollment FTE by Summer 2010.
- Martinez said that UCLA was trying to get more revenue from Summer Sessions, and said that all of the money that came from Summer Sessions went to UCLA. He said that, in the coming years, however, this money would go to UCOP who would then redistribute it to the various UCs.
- Tseng said that the third goal was to decrease the College's undergraduate population by 9% during the academic year.
- Palma/Saracho asked what happened to Tidal Wave II.
- Tseng said that he did not think it existed anymore.
- Martinez said that Smith had also said that UCLA has already enrolled all of the students needed to reach the Tidal Wave II goal.
- Tseng said that as he saw it, the University was trying to push more students into summer school to raise more revenue. He said that enrollment would also be limited in the larger majors. Tseng said that enrollment would be decreased by 1,714 FTES for the college during the academic year. He also said that this is a huge contradiction since ECP is so often cited as a source of access for students. Tseng said that Smith does not have any information about how much money UCLA is receiving from UCOP for the implementation of the ECP requirement.
- Martinez said that, based on the reduction in class sizes and the cutting of Teaching Assistant staff, it was apparent that UCLA was not receiving more money.
- Tseng turned the presentation over to Wood to talk about the effect of ECP on students.
- Wood said that they had created a new acronym for ECP: Extremely Crappy Policy. She went over some general findings, telling council how many students had been affected by ECP, how many students were not aware of ECP, about the impact on students who had to sacrifice grades to meet the ECP requirement, and more. Wood also went over the ethnicity data regarding ECP, pointing out that the most affected groups were some of the same students who struggled the most to gain admission to the University. She also showed Council statistics which showed a negative correlation

- between the level of family income and how likely students were to be affected by ECP. Wood then showed council a correlation between the number of hours worked by students and the likelihood of their being put on a status of "ECP Probation" or "Subject to Dismissal."
- Williams asked if these data could be compared to old data, because it could otherwise be argued that ECP actually improved these statistics.
  - Tseng said that he did not have any of the older data. He said that this information had an additional standard, which meant that students could be on multiple forms of probation.
  - Palma/Saracho said that these new terms were being introduced, but were applicable because these terms are ones that students would be able to identify.
  - Wood then showed Council statistics on the number of community service hours provided by students which showed that 70% of students who worked or volunteered 26 to 30 hours per week were, or had been, on ECP Probation.
  - Gruenberg asked how many students this survey included.
  - Wood said several hundred. Wood told Council that a plan of action had been created which included events and activities taking place all through Spring Break. Wood said that she would be contacting student organizations and scheduling presentations to educate their members about ECP. She said that Week 1 of next quarter would be the Student Education Campaign and a presentation to the Faculty Executive Committee. Wood said that, Week 3, there would be a Student Advocacy Collective and other education and advertising. She said that this would be followed by more presentations, leading up to the vote by the Legislative Assembly.
  - Tseng remarked that he had not started out looking for all the things he found, but he did find that ECP does not contribute to access for students. He said that members of the Administration, themselves, do not seem to understand the effects of ECP, and he is tempted to question their intentions. Tseng said that this is just another example of how important it is to hold the Administration accountable.
  - Tripathi asked if it would be possible to get a demographic printout of the students affected.
  - Palma/Saracho said that there are charts available for everything that had been cross-tabulated.
  - Tuttle asked what the impact of ECP was on the faculty. He said that this might be a good thing to find out. Tuttle said that he had heard something about increasing workload and, although this survey covered student interests, it might also be interesting to find out how it the ECP Requirement affected Faculty members. Tuttle also asked what the impact on access would be if ECP were discontinued tomorrow.
  - Martinez said that, with respect to ECP, a lot of Faculty members did not know what it was. He said that a lot of classes were being cut down in size, and a lot of Professors may not understand why this is happening. Martinez said that the Faculty might need to start teaching more classes to meet the needs of the ECP-affected students.
  - Tseng said, in response to Tuttle's second question, that students are supposed to have benefited from ECP. However, he said that it had not done anything to improve access, so he did not see how it benefited the students.
  - Palma/Saracho said that a lot of the Administrators had all attributed the increased graduation rate to the fee increases.
  - Tuttle said that he remembered a meeting where that had been said, but all he was suggesting was that ECP's effect on access should be investigated. He said that the students had obtained significant information, and he recommended that they present this information to the Faculty. Tuttle also said that the contradictions made by busy people often came out of misunderstanding, and he saw that in the email correspondence. He explained that this is unavoidable, and encouraged Council to be careful in citing misunderstandings as attempts to mislead.
  - Williams said that this was ultimately an Academic Senate Policy. Second, he said he thought it was important to separate personal convictions from the ECP information they had obtained. Williams recommended that Council focus on presenting the

substantive information they have on ECP, and avoid making personal remarks against Judy Smith.

- Palma/Saracho said that Tseng had done an outstanding job. He said that this was seriously incredible information. Palma/Saracho also said that the emails that stood out to him were the ones where the Administration admitted that ECP was not working, not the ones where there were misunderstandings. He also said, with regard to the ethnic data, he understood the importance of not getting personal, but pointed out that this fight had been going on since well before Governance Day. Palma/Saracho said that the Student Retention Center has said that ECP needed to be investigated for its application to students based on demographics. He said that, when SRC was trying to get this information, they were given a lot of “runarounds” which implied that data on demographics did not exist. Palma/Saracho said he felt that Smith had lied to Council, telling them that the demographic data was confidential, and could not be given to them. He said he understood the potential for confusion, but said that the ultimate outcome was that students depend on this information, and it was not made available to them. Palma/Saracho then cited a specific example, by saying that there are less than 40 American Indians at UCLA and, based on the information Council now had before them, 40% of those students are on ECP Probation. He said that the information that had been withheld directly applies to the students, and it was not right that Council had to threaten legal action in order to get this information.
- Gruenberg said that he agreed with Palma/Saracho’s sentiments, and said that, ultimately, policy change would depend on the statistics. He urged Tseng to double check the information to make sure that everything is correct before making any allegations. Gruenberg also said that it would strengthen the case if all the specific information were made available. Lastly, he asked how many students total were subject to dismissal because of ECP.
- Tseng said that there were only three students who had been dismissed because of ECP, and that he had in the packet information on the number of students who were Subject to Dismissal because of ECP.
- Tuttle said that he did not know all the details about getting the information, but there was a lot of material there. He pointed out that someone had made the decision to give this information out, and urged council to understand that one does well to read the whole document and look at the whole story. Tuttle said that it is always interesting to learn about people’s internal communication, but it should be given a serious examination, so that it would be treated fairly. Tuttle made a second point that there is a serious issue of policy, and encouraged council to get into robust discussions with people on the other side of this debate.
- Tseng said that when the Public Record Request had been sent out, Smith responded to him with what she called “all the information she had”, which clearly was not everything. He said that if this was the case, then she was in violation of public record laws. Tseng said that the administration had not done any formal research.
- Tuttle said that there is a voice not in the game, and that was the access population who were still in high school. He said that council should think of these people and then ask whether or not this policy helps them. Tuttle said that if this policy does not help them, then this would make a very useful point.
- Palma/Saracho said that access has always been cited as a reason for ECP. He said that it was his personal opinion that it was actually all about the university getting money. Palma/Saracho said that he thought ECP had been implemented to get more FTE students, and even though these numbers were going up without ECP, the policy had not been removed. He said that he thought the students always carried out the fight for access, and he knew that he cared more about access than the Regents, the Chancellor, and any administrators. Palma/Saracho said that it is a legitimate approach if the university wants to increase access, but they should be demonstrating to the Regents as well. He said that ECP was not increasing access.

- Tuttle said that the issue of access has a variety of different approaches. He said that the Chancellor had brought up the access issue, setting aside the financial issue. Tuttle said that whether or not one is irritated by the argument, it was a public policy issue. Tuttle said that, in the end, it might be a marginal public policy call.
- Tripathi said that he had some comments for outside of the meeting, but he observed that a lot of council agreed that having a lot of people put on probation was a bad thing. He asked if there were any statistics about the students who continually went on and off of ECP probation.
- Tseng said that there were statistics about the number of times students had gone on ECP probation.
- Wood said that in 2004, there had been 296 students who had been under ECP Subject to Dismissal Status. Wood briefly summarized the presentation by saying that ECP has not been effective in increasing FTEs, and that it has reduced access to the College.
- Palma/Saracho said that it is great that council had all of this information now. He said that, in fairness, this information should have been provided to Council when it was first available. Palma/Saracho said that the ECP Task Force has taken a fair approach to ECP, but it is also important to examine the effects of this policy on the student body. He said that it is necessary that something be done to change this.
- Martinez said that when ECP went into effect, the administration said that students would not actually be dismissed because of ECP. He said that this was untrue, as three students had been dismissed two years after the policy's implementation.

**B. \*Constitutional Review Committee's Proposed Amendments to the USAC Bylaws**

- Villarin said that the most significant change that she had made since last week was that she added actual language that allowed the Finance Committee to distribute money through the Discretionary process, which had formerly not been in the Bylaws. She said that the committee now has to decide at the first meeting the exact amount to go to the Student Government Operational fund. Villarin also said that a change had been made to better outline how one should fill out a budget proposal.
- Mann said that it makes sense to remove this from the Bylaws because it is more of an instruction than a mandate. He said that this was a better way to outline the process for everyone who applies for funding.
- Villarin said she had made the changes that were agreed upon at the last Council meeting, and that the document before them tonight was the revised one, ready for Council's approval. With regard to the matter of quorum for the Budget Review Committee, she said that, because the BRC would be operating throughout the entire year under these new funding guidelines, it seemed unfair, and perhaps unworkable, to require that every BRC member be present to establish quorum. Villarin said that the quorum requirement has now been changed so that it parallels all of the other funding bodies.
- Gruenberg asked about the decision to set aside 50% of the funds specifically for programming.
- Villarin said that this was an attempt to prioritize programming.
- Gruenberg said he understood this, but asked why it was necessary to actually denote this in the Bylaws. He said he thought it might be unwise to do this in case some of that money was needed to go elsewhere.
- Villarin said that, right now, there was a \$150,000 fund that could be used to offset any financial catastrophes. She said that it would be a slap in the face if Gruenberg did not give Mann enough credit to plan for such a situation.
- Palma/Saracho said that there was also a clause that would allow council to override this decision, if necessary.
- Gruenberg said he recognized that, but still worried that it might not be the best idea to earmark a specific amount for Programming.
- Villarin said that it sets a precedent for councils to be more proactive and anticipate the programming needs of the students.

- Mann said that the percentages were based on historical allocations that had been made by USAC, and reinforced Palma/Saracho's statement that they could be changed, if necessary.
- McLaren said that the historical data, the increasing numbers of student groups, and the increasing need for programming funds were all considered when these changes were recommended.
- Palma/Saracho said that this would certainly set a new precedent by setting aside so much money for programming. He said that this could help to avoid some of the problems that were coming up this year because of a lack of programming funds.
- Ohara said that she compared last year's and this year's funding, and said that the number of groups that were receiving funding was increasing, so more money would be needed for future programming.
- Tuttle said he remained concerned about what was described on Page 8 as "confidentiality during deliberations." He again stressed the importance of transparency with public governing bodies such as this Council. He said that the difference is in fairness, and his general point was that it was important to stay ahead of the curve and make funding more accessible to those groups which used to be identified as Independent groups.
- Martinez said that, having been on the Budget Review Committee, he did not see how much clearer they could make it to the applicants. He said that closed sessions were held to protect the committee members and also to make sure that they are not pressured or influenced by non-committee members.
- Tripathi agreed with Tuttle's issue. He then said that he had a problem with Page 9. He asked how the Bylaw that required funding appeals to occur within two weeks of the announced allocations would work.
- Villarín said that the two weeks would begin as soon as Council presented the Base Budgets.
- Tripathi said that there is no official vote or mechanism to prevent an allocation made by the BRC.
- Villarín said that USAC could call something a misuse of funds, and USAC could regulate this. She said that it was found under the Funding Guidelines.
- Tripathi said, even with that, he thought it would be good to add a phrase which said something like "upon presentation to council".
- Mann confirmed that USAC does not approve all allocations, and suggested that they might consider adding a phrase about "a presentation to Council" on the allocations that had been made.
- Palma/Saracho said that this might be a good idea, but said he thought that the two week period for appeals should begin when the groups find out how much money they have been allocated.
- Tripathi suggested that it be changed to read, "when the allocations are made public."
- Ohara reminded Council that there is a Mandatory Meeting which all groups must attend at which the funding committee distributes to each group written information on the amount they have been allocated. She suggested that this meeting could, essentially, mark the beginning of the two-week period for appeals.
- Lee added that, when organizations are going to be denied funding, they usually find out even before the Mandatory Meeting. She said that this brings in the complications that the CRC was dealing with about groups who complained that their two weeks was cut short.
- Palma/Saracho asked if anyone had a suggestion about how to change it.
- Wood said that she thought they should consider emails as the notification method.
- Lee said that the Community Service Mini Fund does not send out emails.
- Palma/Saracho said that every funding body held a Mandatory Meeting, and asked if there was any reason why that couldn't be the beginning of the two-week period.
- McLaren concurred with Palma/Saracho's recommendation and said that, even if groups are denied funding, they could be notified in writing at the Mandatory Meeting, which

- could then be the beginning of the two-week period within which appeals must be made.
- Simmons suggested that the Daily Bruin be used as the official notification to begin the two-week period.
  - Ohara said that wouldn't work because of the time delay in having advertisements printed in the Daily Bruin.
  - Lee said, in addition, that the CS Mini Fund was always trying to save money, so they kept their advertising to a minimum.
  - Tripathi suggested that both USAC's approval and the official notification be added to the language.
  - Mann suggested that the funding body's decision be unstruck and/or the notification of the organization be added. He said that it would be difficult to nail down the two-week deadline, plus groups would always be able to find a reason that they missed the Mandatory Meeting.
  - Palma/Saracho suggested that this be unstruck and kept for consideration.
  - Vu commended the CRC's effort. He emphasized that one of the major improvements that had been made was that organizations who can't, or don't, apply during the Fall Quarter funding period will now be able to apply in Winter and/or Spring.
  - Gruenberg also commended the efforts of the CRC. He brought attention back to the confidentiality clause, however, saying that he understood the reasoning behind it, but said he was concerned that it might not be the best way to do this. Gruenberg said that it is the responsibility of Council to provide students with the knowledge that the process is open. He said that keeping the process open would protect the integrity of the BRC. Gruenberg said that when the process is closed, it sets a bad precedent. He said that there might be a better way to phrase this.
  - Tseng compared USAC's budget process to a court case or a public trial, saying that such things as hearings and testimony are open, but deliberations are closed to protect the process as well as the jurors. He said that bad decisions might be made, but the need to protect the funding bodies from lobbying and pressure is paramount in importance.
  - Martinez said that there is not really a compromise. He said that, essentially, everything was out there for the students to read and, no matter where they look, there are going to be certain things they can't find out about. Martinez said that he has been kicked out of closed sessions of committees because deliberations are always confidential.
  - Gruenberg acknowledged that a lot of entities had closed sessions, but said he thought the jury analogy was not so applicable. He explained his comment by saying that, on the Hill, an applicant is asked to leave the room, but the deliberations are still open. Gruenberg said that what he was looking for was the exact reason why it was better to hold the deliberations in closed session.
  - Ohara said that there had been a unanimous vote to hold funding deliberations and decisions in closed session. She asked Gruenberg, hypothetically, if he would feel comfortable voting against groups who were right there when he cast his vote. Ohara then said that they would be using new feedback forms to obtain information from all of the student organizations.
  - Avila said he agreed with Tseng's analogy to a court trial.
  - Palma/Saracho said that almost everything is included in the information which is given to the groups, and he could not comprehend how a group could not understand why they were not funded. Palma/Saracho said that the only thing a group might not know is who spoke for or against them. He said that deliberations are held in closed session because everyone has a direct purpose, and nobody should feel that they are being devalued. Palma/Saracho said that people should not be looked at unfavorably because of what they say during deliberations. He said that, if things were too open, then the process could become too personal, and it could cause a lot more suspicion and divisiveness. Palma/Saracho said that, as much as he would like to see the minutes from the meetings of higher-ups in State Government, he recognized the need to keep certain information private.

- Tuttle said that arguments had been made on both sides. He said that privacy was important as well as the analogy to other campus groups. Tuttle remarked, however, that the students elected the majority of the members who serve on the Budget Review Committee. He added, with regard to the lack of transparency, that a meeting of the Big 5 heads of California did not constitute a meeting of an actual governmental body, but a caucus or informal group. In contrast, he said that the Budget Review Committee was not an informal group. He ended by saying that, if something controversial did happen, it always leaked out.
- Palma/Saracho responded by saying that the Legislature debates on numbers that have already been established. He said that the final agreement happens here in the presence of council.
- Tuttle said that, to be fair to the other side, he had not thought about bringing up caucuses, who were allowed by state law to debate things in private. He said that he did not think that this committee was analogous to the caucuses, however.
- Tripathi said that transparency comes with USAC's right to debate the decision. He said that these other funds that were not approved were less political, but to deprive the campus of the debate on the budget issue was to do a disservice.
- Gruenberg said it was his experience that closed sessions should be voted on. He said that it was not publicized that closed sessions were taking place. Gruenberg said he thought it was a bad precedent to close off access to the deliberations. Gruenberg said that Council, at tonight's meeting, had been criticizing Judy Smith's private emails, and now Council was arguing to hide information about how students' fees were being spent.
- Martinez said that he felt insulted by Gruenberg because he had put a lot of work into the Academic Senate. He invited Gruenberg to talk to anyone on the Academic Senate who would confirm this.
- Vardner said that he had been kicked out of TSAB meetings, and this was something that he did not want USAC to emulate. He said that he loved the feedback given at the end of the funding decisions, but agreed there was something to be said for having all the information available. Vardner said that he did recognize the risk of lobbyists being in the room, but reminded Council that only voting members could speak, let alone vote.
- Villarín said that the CRC did not fall within the boundaries of the funding issue. She added that Brian Neesby had been present at all of the meetings, and had spoken without right, almost to the point of being a voting member. She said that she would have felt very compromised by the presence of lobbyists during funding deliberations.
- Vardner asked what the problem was with allowing the ejection of people from the room.
- Villarín said that was easier said than done.
- Gaulton said that with all things, the most important factor is that the end result be true. He said that when something becomes too convoluted, it takes the best people to figure out just what is being done. Gaulton said that the presence of one person could totally compromise the system.
- McLaren said that she was not aware that the CAC, CPC, and SFAC held closed sessions. She asked for more information on their process because she felt it might help put this debate to rest.
- Palma/Saracho said that SFAC was one of the largest funding bodies. He said that their sessions are completely closed, and sometimes the minutes-taker was even asked to leave. Palma/Saracho said that it is important for people to feel free from lobbying or scorn, as people have been punished later for their stances on issues. Palma/Saracho said that people need the security of deliberations within a vacuum to protect the members of the committees. He said that he has seen people kicked off of a committee because of having voted the wrong way. Palma/Saracho said that he has also seen members of Council lobbied, and told that they are either with or against an applicant.
- Samaan said that he sits on SFAC, and lobbying need not be a vocal exercise. He said that, even having a representative from an applying unit present is a form of silent

- lobbying. Samaan said that people on funding boards needed to have the freedom to say how they felt.
- Wood moved and Vu seconded to approve the Constitutional Review Committee's Proposed Amendments to the USAC Bylaws.
  - Palma/Saracho said that he understood what those in favor of open sessions were saying. However, he said that he felt like people thought that a watchdog was needed over voting members of funding committees. Palma/Saracho said that the only thing that will come from opening sessions is that people will examine everything said by committee members and everything will be examined for bias or corruption. He said that USAC has the ability to question the objectivity of members of the funding committees. Palma/Saracho reiterated the comments in favor of closed sessions for deliberations.
  - Tripathi said that the funding board should at least have the option of being open, on a issue of principal. He said that there should be no problem with the chairperson having the right to allow open sessions. Tripathi said that, if it should be left to the experts to decide whether or not to fund, then they should also be able to decide whether or not to go into closed session.
  - Lee said that could raise concerns about why a committee went into closed session for certain issues and remained open for others. Lee also said that, as a former Chairperson of the CS Mini Fund, she would feel very uncomfortable if she had to speak against one of her programs in an attempt to remain unbiased. She said that she has had instances where people have taken her constructive criticisms personally, and she has feared her social life being put into jeopardy before.
  - Vu Called the Question.
  - Tripathi objected to Calling the Question.
  - Council voted to Call the Question with a vote of 7 in favor, 3 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
  - Palma/Saracho reminded Council that a friendly amendment had been proposed regarding language that appeared on Page 9 to remove the strikethrough and add "the notification of the organization". He said that those amendments had not, however, been included in the motion on the table which now had to be voted on.
  - Tuttle explained that the options here were either to defeat the motion, then make those changes and vote on it again, or that someone who voted in the affirmative to call the question could recall their vote to make the amendment.
  - Vu proposed suspending the Bylaws.
  - Palma/Saracho realized at this point that there had been no second to the Calling of the Question.
  - Tuttle said that the Chair could now rule that the vote to Call the Question had been Out of Order because it lacked a Second or, if the Chair wanted, he could reopen discussion.
  - Palma/Saracho said he felt that the consensus of the Council was that there was more to be discussed on this matter before proceeding to a vote.
  - Palma/Saracho ruled that the Calling of the Question had been Out of Order for lack of a Second, and he reopened discussion on the Motion to Approve the Constitutional Review Committee's Proposed Amendments to the USAC Bylaws.
  - Tripathi brought up the minimum criteria on Page 6 of the Bylaws. He said that a lot of groups had been disqualified this year because of the word "Educational" within the Minimum Criteria. Tripathi said that he thought the use of the word "educational" should be clarified or broadened to include outside of the classroom. He said that a lot of clubs do not provide anything in the academic sense but, nonetheless, added extracurricular value.
  - Wood said that no groups had been eliminated from funding because they were not academic.
  - Ohara said that this was true. She said that in the hearings, each group had been asked how they promoted academic success. Ohara said that no groups had actually been denied funding because of not being academic.



- Tuttle said he had realized, after reading the whole sentence, that it provided an opportunity for the funding body to make a judgment call. He said that is the important aspect to look at. Tuttle said that the more he thought about it, the more he realized that there was room in the Bylaws for groups of a non-academic nature to still be funded.
  - Mann said that he had originally drafted this language a long time ago, and the problem was it was like trying to draw a lasso around something that was hard to define. He said that this wording allowed a degree of flexibility to a committee to either narrow their focus or to expand it. Mann said further that sometimes guidelines and Bylaws are written in an intentionally vague manner.
  - Wood said she felt that the criteria could be interpreted in several ways, but the bottom line was that the criteria were very well stated. She said that the bottom line was that students would be able to talk to the BRC and USAC Council members to figure these things out before the actual funding period began. Wood said that the larger issue was making funding more accessible to students.
  - Wood Called the Question, including a Friendly Amendment to the language on Page 9, to reinstate the text that had been struck-through, and to add the phrase, “ the notification of the organization”.
  - Tripathi said, on behalf of student groups, that his main concern was that, even if they did not provide an academic value in accordance with Minimum Criteria, they would be considered to have value and importance at UCLA.
  - Avila seconded to Call the Question.
  - Tripathi objected to Calling the Question.
  - Council voted to Call the Question with a vote of 7 in favor, 3 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
  - Council voted to Approve the Constitutional Review Committee’s Proposed Amendments to the USAC Bylaws with a vote of 8 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
  - Tripathi moved and Gruenberg seconded to table the remainder of the action items.
  - Gaulton asked how long the remaining items would take.
  - Lam said that the Elections Calendar item would be super short.
  - Lee said that she would need some time to present her reasons for changing the Election Calendar schedule that the Election Board was proposing.
  - Lam said that the Calendar needed to be approved by Council before Spring Quarter began.
  - Tuttle suggested that the Chair could propose a 10-minute discussion on the issue, after which they could table the item until the next meeting, or they could vote on the item. He said that tabling the item would run the risk of Council not meeting quorum at next week’s meeting and, therefore, being unable to approve the Calendar before the Spring Break began.
  - Palma/Saracho asked the Council to continue meeting, and to try to get finish the Agenda items before adjourning.
  - Gaulton said that, putting a time limit on the presentation might rob people of the right to say what they need to say.
  - Palma/Saracho said that all he was asking was for everyone to be brief.
- Avila left the meeting*
- McLaren suggested that Council set a time limit with the understanding that it could be extended.
  - Palma/Saracho said that he recommended trying to hold to a reasonable time limit.
  - Council voted down the Motion to Table with a vote of 3 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention.

**C. \*Decision on Publishing Resolution in Opposition to Changing the Structure of Undergraduate Student Government from a Commission-Based System to a Senate System**

- Palma/Saracho said that, last week, Council had a discussion about whether or not to print the Resolution in Opposition to the Changes to the USAC Structure last week. He said that there had been a dispute as to whether or not publishing this fell under campaigning, which could not be funded. Palma/Saracho said that he and Lam had since talked.
- Lam said that this was a pretty “hairy decision”. He said that it came down to a technical distinction, and he had scoured the E-Code to learn about the issue. Lam said that he had talked to his advisor, Mike Cohn, who had confirmed what Lam thought. He said that they had agreed that USAC funds could be used, since the part of the E-Code that might bar this indicates that USAC cannot oppose a proposed amendment. Lam said that since an amendment had not been proposed, it would be allowable for USAC to publish this. He said that this is the same reason why the people in favor of the restructuring are not required to submit the proposal to USAC directly. Lam said that documents that were not proposed amendments were not considered candidate literature, and thus could not be regulated under the E-Code.
- Neesby asked when this would become an official proposal.
- Lam answered when it was submitted to USAC.
- Neesby said that his understanding of the E-Code was that this had become a proposal as soon as he submitted it to Lam for consideration in the upcoming election. He said that funds could not be used in any part of an Initiative, and being that this had been presented as an Initiative, a Resolution against it could not be funded.
- Lam said that it was not considered an Initiative yet.
- Neesby said that he thought it had become an Initiative.
- Gaulton said that it was similar to the process for becoming a candidate in which, the step of picking up a candidate application did not make someone a candidate because they didn’t actually become a candidate until they turned in their signed petitions, and the petitions were validated.
- Palma/Saracho said that Council had agreed to publish the Resolution as a one-page ad in the Daily Bruin, pending Election Board’s approval, so he said he would move forward in getting the Resolution published.

IX. New Business

**C. Election Board Updates**

- Lam said that the calendar for the Election had been established, and the only issue was that the first items might not happen.
- Lee said that the problem with the Community Service Commission (CSC) was that they had to have their first meeting third week, and this would be after the Election Board’s mandatory Orientation meeting. She said that she could not have an in-house candidate until after that day, and asked if everything could be moved back a week. Lee said that even that would only give the CSC two days, but that would still be enough.
- Lam asked what she wanted moved back.
- Lee said everything.
- Palma/Saracho said that would make everything happen pretty late, and asked if the CSC had always done it this way.
- Lee said that was how the CSC had always done it this way. She said that, even if the date were moved up, they still might have trouble making quorum to choose a candidate.
- Wood asked how the CSC had done its nominations in previous years. She said that the Election Calendar from last year had been the exception because it was pushed back last year. Wood continued by saying that the timetable Lam is recommending for this year’s election is the timetable that USAC normally followed. Wood said that, since

- the timetable E-Board has set up for this year is the typical timetable, she questioned whether CSC had always chosen their candidate the same way.
- Gruenberg asked Lam if moving the schedule would be possible.
  - Gaulton asked if just the orientation could be moved.
  - Lam said that he could do that, or Lee could just have everyone interested in running attend this meeting.
  - Gaulton said that the people could still turn in their candidate packet, and then drop out of the race if they lost the in-house nomination.
  - Lee said that when people turn in their application out of CSC they don't want to have any in-house competition.
  - Gaulton said that the only change would be that some people would have to do the paperwork and then drop out later.
  - Lam said that he wanted to leave the calendar the way it was because everything on campus had already been reserved. He said that new rooms would have to be reserved and everything.
  - Tuttle suggested that Lam consider not moving everything, but simply moving the meetings under consideration. He said that doing that would prevent bumping everything back.
  - Lee said that if the candidate orientation were moved to Thursday then that could be dealt with. She said that she really didn't want multiple people from CSC showing up to the meeting.
  - Lam said that he could move the meetings.
  - Tuttle said that if Tuesday and Thursday were flipped then it might work. He said that this would save the hassle with the rooms.
  - Lam said that the problem with flipping Tuesday and Thursday would be that the endorsers of candidates might have a problem with who was running.
  - Wood reiterated moving the meetings to Thursday and Friday.
  - Martinez said that at the orientation, the only thing that happens is candidates are told what they need to do, and asked why the CSC could not send all of their potential candidates.
  - Vardner said that there was a logistical problem.
  - Samaan said that the endorsement meeting is usually less than an hour, and council should not strain themselves so much over this issue.
  - Palma/Saracho said that people who don't go to this meeting are actually taken off the ballot.
  - Gaulton said that it is imperative that the orientation takes place before the endorsement hearings.
  - Wood moved and Villarin seconded to approve the Spring Election Calendar with Endorsement Hearing II taking place on Wednesday, April 28<sup>th</sup>, Endorsement Hearing III taking place on Thursday, April 28<sup>th</sup>, and Campaigning Beginning Friday, April 29<sup>th</sup>.
  - Tripathi asked Lam what the definition of "Campaigning Begins" on April 28<sup>th</sup> was.
  - Lam said that the definition included flyering on Bruin Walk and other large-scale campaigning operations.
  - Tripathi said that it might make more sense to allow campaigning immediately after the candidate orientation.
  - Wood said that it is very taxing on candidates to be campaigning, so it might be hard to increase campaigning times.
  - McLaren asked how many days candidates would have to campaign before the election itself.
  - Palma/Saracho said that campaigning usually starts the Friday before the election.
  - Martinez said that if someone has two weeks to campaign then it becomes a huge imposition on Facilities Management.
  - Gruenberg said that the leaflet days are still limited, which would not impose on Facilities Management. He said that since candidates are in active campaigning after

orientation, candidates would only have three days to campaign, not including the weekend.

- Palma/Saracho said that his question was the definition of campaigning.
  - Lam read the definition of campaigning aloud.
  - Vardner said that the Election Code states that the E-Board Chair is to determine the campaigning schedule.
  - Tripathi said that most campaigning happens the first day, but it would make sense to give the students more time to make an informed decision.
  - Gaulton asked if expense accounts would be needed before the signboards went up.
  - Samaan said that they should be due at the same time.
  - Lam suggested that this be tabled since there were so many issues that still needed to be addressed.
  - Gruenberg said that this should be tabled, since that is what the E-Board Chairperson recommends.
  - McLaren suggested that, before voting to table this matter, it would be a good idea to determine whether Council will be able to meet quorum next week.
- A snap pole indicated that all members would be able to attend next week's meeting.*
- Wood withdrew her motion and Villarin withdrew her second.
  - Tripathi moved and Lee seconded to table the Approval of the Spring Elections Calendar and the Approval of the Amendment to the next Council meeting.
  - Council voted to table the Approval of the Spring Election Calendar and the Amendments to the Election Code until the next Council meeting with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

#### X. Announcements

- McLaren said that she made copies of the page that was missing from the February 8<sup>th</sup> USAC Minutes, and was distributing them to Council to approve or amend.
- Martinez said that there would be a basketball tournament on Friday if anyone wanted to come and help fundraise.
- Gaulton said that "Closer" would be shown on Wednesday and Thursday for \$2, and he said that next week would be Sneak Week.
- Gruenberg said that there would be a free screening in De Neve on Wednesday Night. He also said that he was working on USAC's Book Lending program, as well as in conjunction with the Books for Africa program.
- Palma/Saracho reminded council to tell their staff to come on Thursday to the All-USAC Banquet at the Student Activities Center

#### XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*Corella passed around the attendance sheet.*

#### XII. Adjournment

- Martinez moved and Tripathi seconded to adjourn.
- Wood called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 12:36 p.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Michael Keesler  
USAC Minutes Taker