

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday March 15, 2005
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 P.M.

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

ABSENT: Corella, Gaulton, Nelson, Villarin

GUESTS: Chris Aquino, Mike Cohn, Gustavo DeHaro, Brian Neesby, Tina Park, Saba Riazati, Roy Samaan, Yousef Tajsar, Joseph Vardner, Narges Zohoury

I. A. Call to Order

- Palma/Saracho called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

In Corella's absence, Aquino passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Palma/Saracho said that E-Board wanted to move up their updates to before Officer Reports.
- Wood moved and Martinez seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Tseng 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

There were no minutes this week

IV. Special Presentations

There were no Special Presentations this week.

V. Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

VI. Fund Allocations

- Aquino said that 2 of the 9 recommendations were discretionary. He said that there is one organization which is not included in FiCom's list of Recommended Allocations but, because their event takes place during Spring Break, FiCom wanted to bring it to Council for consideration tonight.
- Palma/Saracho gave some background on the matter by saying that members of Bruin Hope, CSC's newest project, had approached him about funding for their event. He said that Bruin Hope had not been able to turn in their application in time for FiCom to include it in the Contingency Recommendations for this meeting. He remarked that

this was a good group that had done lots of good things since they started last year. Palma/Saracho said that, because Council would not be meeting during Spring Break, they would not be able to consider Bruin Hope's funding needs until after their event had taken place.

- Aquino explained that Bruin Hope's Application was turned in two weeks before their event, in keeping with Contingency guidelines. He said the problem is, because Council won't be meeting next week, they would not be able to approve the request before the event takes place.
- Martinez raised a question about the recommended allocation for MEChA, asking if the total should be \$2,100 or \$1,000.
- Aquino said that the mistake was in the amount for Honorarium, which should be \$200 instead of \$400, so the recommended amount of \$1,000 is correct.
- Tuttle asked if Council needed a Special Order to add Bruin Hope to the list of recommended allocations.
- Tuttle asked if the problem was that FiCom had not seen the Bruin Hope application at the time they were making their recommendations.
- Wood said that it was.
- Tuttle said, in that case, this probably required a Special Order. He said that it seems, as a practical matter, the Finance Committee has the ability to bring this forward, so Council could add this to the list of recommended allocations with a Special Order. Tuttle said that the Special Order would require a 2/3 vote, and that would be 2/3 of the voting members in attendance.
- Palma/Saracho said that he, too, thought this was a good idea, and said that a copy of Bruin Hope's complete application was available if anyone wanted to review it. Palma/Saracho then called for a Special Order.
- Martinez moved and Vu seconded to add Bruin Hope to the Finance Committee's list of Recommended Allocations for approval at the March 15, 2005 meeting.
- Gruenberg asked if the Funding Guidelines explicitly stated what happens in a situation that doesn't meet the two week deadline.
- Aquino said that the Finance Committee Chairperson can use their discretionary authorization.
- Gruenberg said that it seems that Council would be setting a precedent if they approved funding for a group without waiting the two weeks.
- Wood said that the issue was not that Bruin Hope did not meet the two weeks lead time prior to their event but, rather, that Council will not be meeting during Spring Break and, therefore, would not be able to approve the allocation before the event itself.
- Gruenberg asked, if this happened again, would the Finance Committee be willing to fund a group in full, rather than through their limited discretionary authorization.
- Palma/Saracho said that this should not be seen as a precedent, but rather an exception. He said that, because Council would not be meeting during Spring Break, he recommended this course of action to the Finance Committee. He said that, if a similar situation occurs in the future, he felt the Council should use their best judgment on a case-by-case basis.
- Gruenberg asked if Council needed to look at the Bylaws to make sure this was being done correctly.
- Tuttle asked what section of the Bylaws would be looked at.
- Gruenberg said he didn't know specifically, but said he was sure that somewhere in the Bylaws it specified that groups had to have their applications in two weeks in advance.
- Palma/Saracho said that he felt pretty certain that the 2/3 Super Majority protected this action. He said that any changes to the Bylaws could be made with a 2/3 majority, and said he felt this corresponded to the vote begin required to approve this proposed action.
- Tuttle said that he would continue looking for the answer, and he would bring it back up with a motion for consideration. He said that if the group is funded tonight, and then there is a problem later, it could be grounds for a Judicial Board appeal.

- Palma/Saracho said that Dr. Tuttle's concern was noted, and reiterated his statement that Council had the power to take this action, with the required vote.
- Wood read Article VI from the Funding Guidelines.
- Tuttle asked what section she was reading from.
- Wood said Section D.

Avila arrived at the meeting.

- Palma/Saracho said that he believed this decision was ultimately up to Council.
- Martinez Called the Question, seconded by Vu.
- Council approved the motion to add Bruin Hope to the Finance Committee's list of Recommended Allocations for March 15, 2005 with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Tseng moved and Vu seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations for March 15, 2005.
- Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations for March 15, 2005 with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Interfraternity Council

Requested: \$4,889.40

Recommended: \$1,762.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$440.00 for the partial cost of Registration Fees, \$922.00 for the partial cost of Transportation, and \$400.00 for the partial cost of Accommodations for the Western Regional Greek Leadership Conference 2005 to be held April 7th through 10th.

UCLA Panhellenic Council

Requested: \$3,760.10

Recommended: \$1,762.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$440.00 for the partial cost of Registration Fees, \$922.00 for the partial cost of Transportation, and \$400.00 for the partial cost of Accommodations for the Western Regional Greek Leadership Conference 2005 to be held April 7th through 10th.

Victory Campus Ministries

Requested: \$4,656.90

Recommended: \$1,850.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$1,450.00 for the partial cost of Airfare and \$400.00 for the partial cost of Accommodations for the Campus Harvest Conference to be held from April 1st through 3rd.

MEChA de UCLA

Requested: \$2,100.00

Recommended: \$1,000.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$800.00 for the cost of Facilities and \$200 for the partial cost of an Honorarium for the 6th Annual Raza Day to be held April 8th and 9th.

UCLA FBLA-PBL

Requested: \$1,906.00

Recommended: \$ 865.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$440.00 for the partial cost of Registration, \$225.00 for the cost of Graphics, and \$200.00 for the partial cost of Advertising for the FBLA -PBL State Leadership Conference to be held on April 1st and 2nd.

Indian Student Union

Requested: \$671.00
Recommended: \$ 75.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$75.00 for the partial cost of graphics to produce a program for Sandesha to be held on March 22nd.

World Arts and Cultures Undergraduate Society

Requested: \$3,136.65
Recommended: \$2,000.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$500.00 for the partial cost of Graphics and \$1,500.00 for the partial cost of Supplies for the WAC Smash! to be held from April 27th through 29th.

Vietnamese Language and Culture (VNLC)

Requested: \$1,000.28
Recommended: \$ 366.28

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$215.00 for the partial cost of Facilities and \$151.28 for the cost of Supplies for the Spring Retreat to be held from March 25th through 27th.

Bruin Hope / Community Service Commission

Requested: \$4,127.32
Recommended: \$1,563.50

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$1,563.50 for the partial cost of Transportation for Project Bruin Hope's Spring Break Retreat to be held from March 28th to March 31st.

Erin Go Bragh

Requested: \$500.00
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 partial cost of an Honorarium for St. Patrick's Day 2005 held on March 11th.

Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambios Social

Requested: \$877.00
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 an Honorarium for the Anti-CAFTA Forum and CAFTA's Gendered Effects held on March 9th.

Project South-Los Angeles Evening Tutorial / CSC

Requested: \$3.50
Recommended: \$3.50

In compliance with the discretionary authorization granted to her in the 2004-2005 Finance Committee Guidelines, Corella recommended the allocation of \$3.50 for the cost of Transportation for the La Brea Tar Pits Field Trip held March 12th.

VII. New Business

A. Election Board Updates**1. *Approval of Spring Elections Calendar**

- Lam said that last week there were four items that council did not get to. He said the first one concerned the problem one of the Council members had with some of the dates on the Elections Calendar. He said that, because of

- logistical issues, it was much harder to change the dates than to keep them, so the dates were the same as they were last week.
- Gruenberg asked how Lam was defining “campaigning.”
 - Lam said that campaigning usually starts before the election and, traditionally, began when students put up their sandwich boards on campus. He said that, for this election, the day that campaigning begins is the day that those boards go up, Thursday morning.
 - Gruenberg asked if candidates could advertise their candidacy prior to that date.
 - Lam said they could not, and reiterated that this was how it had always been.
 - Gruenberg asked Lam if he thought this was the most effective timetable.
 - Lam said acknowledged that it was a restriction, but pointed out that it also alleviated stress on the candidates, which was a positive factor.
 - Martinez moved and Vu seconded to approve the Spring Quarter Elections Calendar as presented by the Election Board Chairperson.
 - Gruenberg said that the Mandatory Candidate Orientation meeting was set for the week before, and he did not understand why candidates could not start campaigning right away. He said that there are 24,000 students, he thought it would be more beneficial for the candidates to start campaigning earlier.
 - Lam said that it was customary to start campaigning after the endorsement hearings, and said he did not see any reason to change that schedule.
 - Mike Cohn, Election Board Advisor, said the only thing that was restricted was active campaigning where campaigners could wear such things as campaign buttons and T-shirts, and distribute campaign items and materials.
 - Palma/Saracho asked if this was how it was always done.
 - Cohn said that it was.
 - Palma/Saracho asked what this meant for websites.
 - Cohn said that groups or individuals could put up websites, but an individual candidate or campaign cannot be advertised on websites before the official date to begin campaigning, in accordance with the Elections Calendar.
 - Tuttle asked if Cohn’s statements were in accordance with Lam’s views.
 - Lam said that they were.
 - Tuttle said that he wanted to establish a record here.
 - Lam said that the important distinctions were between public and private expressions of candidacy.
 - Tuttle asked about the websites.
 - Lam said that the websites can go up earlier but, according to Article V. Section C.8, the use of unofficial websites is strictly prohibited. He said that, if there is a website for a slate and they want to add the candidates’ names to it, they would have to comply with the timetable in the Elections Calendar regarding official campaigning.
 - Tripathi said that he remembered putting up signboards on Sunday night last year.
 - Cohn said that it was usually done on Thursday night. He said that the schedule had been modified last year because of The Los Angeles Times Book Fair. As a result, the boards went up on Sunday.
 - McLaren asked what the hours for campaigning would be.
 - Lam said that there were specific hours for leafleting but, as soon as the boards go up, campaigning could go around the clock.
 - Council voted to approve the Spring Elections Calendar as proposed by the Elections Board Chairperson with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

2. *Approval of Amendment to Election Code Regarding Listing of Candidate Names on the Ballot

- Lam said that the next item had to do with the orientation of candidates. He said that concern had been expressed about members of slates modifying their names on the ballot as a way to advertise which slate they were part of. Lam said that he was proposing an amendment that would require candidates to use their official name as it's listed with the Registrar's Office. He said his proposed amendment would also bar specific attempts to identify slate members by adding such things as asterisks, or quotes, to each slated name. He said that derivatives of ones name, in case someone was known by a nickname, could also be used.
- Tripathi asked what happened to someone whose nickname was nothing like their original name.
- Lam said that the candidate would have to use the name as listed with the Registrar's Office.
- Tseng asked what he could list because his name with the Registrar is in Chinese, but he goes by Tommy.
- Lam said that he had proposed the word "modification" in the language instead of "nickname", in an attempt to encourage candidates to use their registered names, or something close to it. He said that the decision was ultimately up to the E-Board, and it was used to discourage slating.
- Tripathi asked if this would be up to the discretion of the Election Board Chair.
- Palma/Saracho said that the Election Board Chair essentially makes a decision on all such issues.
- Wood moved and Avila seconded to approve the Proposed Amendments to the Election Code Regarding the Listing of Candidate Names on the Ballot.
- Tuttle said that, since the discretion of the E-Board Chair was at issue, he thought it was important to discuss this matter further. He asked Lam if he would allow the use of a nickname that candidates were known as, and that people who know them are accustomed to.
- Lam said that he would.
- Tuttle said that he just wanted to make sure, as he had not heard Lam state that in his earlier remarks. Tuttle said that this was a change from what was said earlier, and he just wanted to make sure that it was in the record.
- Palma/Saracho said that it was in the code that a person could run for office so long as they were registered with the UCLA Registrar's Office. Palma/Saracho said that he did not think anyone would try to abuse this system.
- Avila Called the Question, seconded by Tseng.
- Council voted to approve the Proposed Amendments to the Election Code Regarding the Listing of Candidate Names on the Ballot with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

B. *Approval to Place S.A.F.E. – ASUCLA Student Union Fee Referendum on the Ballot for the USA Spring 2005 Election

- Yousef Tajsar, Undergraduate Member of the ASUCLA Board of Directors (BOD), began by saying that the language for the proposed referendum was in their Agenda packet. He said that what the ASUCLA Board of Directors (BOD) was asking Council was simply to approve placing the Referendum on the ballot for USA's Spring 2005 Election. Tajsar said that they were not seeking Council's endorsement at this time. He said that the Supplemental Ballot Information, which is also in their Agenda packet, provides historical information about ASUCLA, along with details about what a fee increase might accomplish. He said that there has been an increasing level of communication among all entities of ASUCLA, said he saw this as a very positive development which would continue throughout the coming years. Tajsar closed by

- saying that this was a good referendum, and he felt the students deserved the opportunity to discuss it and decide for themselves.
- Tripathi asked if there was already a plan in place to teach students about why this fee was needed.
 - Tina Park, Undergraduate Member of the ASUCLA Board, said the Referendum is part of a larger plan that includes educating students about just what ASUCLA is, and what services it provides for students. She said that, the next step after this initial educational phase, would be to explain the need for the fee increase.
 - Emmanuel Martinez, Undergraduate Member of the ASUCLA Board, said that other educational events were being planned, such as Town Hall meetings where Board Members could present information and respond to students' questions.
 - Tuttle said that since this would be taking place during the regular election period, he suggested that the Board members check with the Election Board Chairperson to be sure they're going about it in the right way. He said that a lot of time could potentially be wasted if this was done in the wrong way.
 - Tajsar responded by saying that he and other members of the BOD had talked with Mike Cohn precisely because they wanted to make sure that this was done correctly.
 - Lam thanked Tuttle for raising that concern. He said that, according to the E-Code and Regental Policy, any fee referendum language had to be approved by the Chancellor before it can be placed on the ballot.
 - Tajsar said that the Board would be submitting this to the Chancellor for his approval, but they wanted to first present the proposed language to USAC and GSA for their input.
 - Park said that the Chancellor knew that this would be coming to him.
 - Tuttle asked who their main contact in the Administration was.
 - Tajsar said that Steve Olsen and Janina Montero both sit on the Board's Joint Operating Committee, so they have already seen the Proposed Referendum and know about the Board's plan.
 - Williams said that they had been working closely cooperation with the Chancellor's office and, if USAC took action tonight to place the Referendum on their Spring Ballot, ASUCLA was prepared to submit the document to the Chancellor immediately for his review and approval.
 - Wood asked what the general student response had been.
 - Tajsar said that they had not yet begun to talk to the undergraduate student organizations. He said that they had talked some with some members of the On Campus Housing Council, and had received some valuable insight from them.
 - Park said that they had also talked with members of the California Sustainability Coalition, and had received positive feedback.
 - Emmanuel Martinez said that there had also been informal discussions with some ASUCLA student employees.
 - Williams said that all of the student groups who had been presented with the information had been very responsive and were very supportive. He said that there was still a lot of work to be done but, pending USAC approval, it would be done.
 - Martinez moved and Vu seconded to place the S.A.F.E. - ASUCLA Student Union Fee Referendum on the ballot for the USA Spring 2005 Election.
 - Palma/Saracho said that, as a student who sat on the ASUCLA Entities Committee, he was aware that ASUCLA had developed the language for this Fee Referendum based on a lot of input from students. He said that, while Council usually opposed fee increases, and that this was a particularly hard time to ask for fee increases, it really was not on Council to decide whether or not this referendum should be approved. Instead, he said that it ultimately should be up to the students to determine if they want to tax themselves. Palma/Saracho closed by saying that the ASUCLA Board has done a great job in soliciting input from various sources, particularly UCLA undergraduate students.
 - Gruenberg asked if there was a provision about the fee expiring, with the possibility of being renewed.

- Tajsar said that there was a clause which stated that the Board of Directors had the power to discontinue collection of the fee if it generated more revenue than was needed.
- Emmanuel Martinez said that the clause did not say that the fee would expire, but it did say that the students would get to re-vote on the fee if the student representatives lost majority control of the Board of Directors in a restructuring.
- Park said that it was part of the idea of transparency, to make sure that students knew what they were investing in.
- Palma/Saracho said that he thought this was a great precedent to set.
- Tajsar said that, if the structure of the BOD changed, it would be important to ask the students whether or not they want to reinvest under new leadership.
- Council approved placing S.A.F.E. - the ASUCLA Student Union Fee Referendum on the Ballot for the USA Spring 2005 Election with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Martinez said that he was working on a Social Responsibility Policy, and asked that anyone who had suggestions for the policy to email him soon so their ideas could be included. Martinez said that there had not been a policy on social responsibility for many years, and he and others were working to bring it back.
- Williams reiterated that this was still considered a draft, and they were still seeking input.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

External Vice President - John Vu

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

USSA

- Legislative Conference in Washington DC: workshops on the Higher Education Act Reauthorization, lobby clinics (labor, organizing, student fees), caucuses; Jeannie Biniek, National Affairs Director will be the delegation leader
- Student Labor Week of Action, March 25-29, 2005
 - Commences on Cesar Chavez Day and ends on the anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s assassination. Both men were strong advocates for the Labor community
 - UCLA will need to reschedule to next quarter since this falls during our finals and spring break weeks

UCSA

- Currently doing following up with lobby visits from last month
- Sacramento Lobby Visits during Spring Break to follow up with UCSA-proposed bills and on the UC Lobby Conference

UC Regents Meeting

- Thank you to all those who sent in signed forms for the UC Regents Fax-In days!!!
- Action=With the Regents decision on cutting financial aid and increasing student fees, students systemwide will host a funeral for the Death to Education. There will be a coffin, signifying the death to education and flowers, too. Please come to for Public Comment if you can on Wednesday at 10am and/or Thursday at 9:55am in Covel Commons.
- Public Comment: 10 students from UCLA

Upcoming Events

- UC Regents Meeting, March 16-17, 2005 @ UCLA.
- USSA Legislative Conference, March 18-22, 2005 @ Washington DC
- UCSA Board of Directors meeting, March 31-April 2, 2005 @ UC Santa Cruz
- Womyn of Color Conference, April 8-10, 2005 @ UC Santa Barbara
- McLaren said that she thought CalPirg had a coffin they might let Vu borrow.
- Lam said that the Environmental Coalition used to have a coffin, but it was long gone.

- Martinez asked if the pallbearers were supposed to dress in black.
- Tripathi asked if Return to Aid had been decreased.
- Vu from that it had, from 33 percent to 25 percent.
- Tripathi asked if it had fallen as a total gross sum.
- Palma/Saracho said that what was decided was the amount that went to educational fees. Student fees had gone up, but Return to Aid was not going to compensate for those fee increases. He said that this did not affect the overall way that it came out of tuition.
- Tuttle said that the dollar amount and the cost per student had gone up, so the students would still be worse off than they were before.
- Vu said that the bottom line was that students were paying more and getting less.
- Palma/Saracho said that this situation forces students to go after private, high-interest loans.
- Tuttle said that, looking across the board at ratios such as students -to-faculty and how it's all paid for; there are a lot of interesting things to be seen. He said that one could get a pretty good snapshot, because the University of California remains one of the great public universities in the world.

Internal Vice President – Darren Chan

- Chan said that the Unofficial Guide to UCLA was well on its way. He said that the sections were coming along well and, assuming that Bruinwalk Version 2 would be going up in Spring Quarter, one area that his office would need help with would be putting together the off-campus housing component. Chan said that they have some good ideas of how they want the off-campus housing guide to look. He said that what they are trying to do is make this guide as comprehensive as possible so that students would not have to walk up and down the streets to find apartments. Chan said that they were trying to give them more than just price information, but also pictures and other extensive information. He said that this would be one of the more intense sections of the website to develop. He invited everyone on Council to help on this project by submitting information to him to include in the Unofficial Guide. Chan said that he would be sending out an email with detailed information on this.
- Palma/Saracho said that he knew this would be a very intensive project. He said he also knew that something like this had been done some years ago by a USAC Financial Supports Commissioner. He said that the old FSC project might be a good jumping off point for Chan so that he did not have to reinvent the wheel.
- Gruenberg asked if Chan had talked with the community housing office yet because, if not, he could help Chan get in touch with them.

President – Allende Palma/Saracho

- Palma/Saracho said that he wanted to thank everyone who came to the all staff banquet on Thursday, and he gave special thanks to Bob Williams and ASUCLA for providing the food. He said that they might hold another get-together like this at the end of the year. Regarding the Presidential Internship Program, Palma/Saracho said that last Friday had been the last of their Leadership Development Sessions. He said that many of the interns were still interested in working in USAC offices, and also they were interested in meeting with one another to work together in an ongoing basis. He added that Council members were invited to participate in these upcoming meetings. He said he would be meeting with Regent Sherry Lansing to discuss Return to Aid being added to Fee items.

IX. Old Business

A. ECP Updates

- Tseng said that, after last week's presentation on ECP, he had given the Daily Bruin some of the information. Tseng said that he had done additional research over the last weekend, and had learned that the Time to Degree had decreased, but had now leveled

off, showing that ECP had little to do with access. He said that this information would be presented to the faculty soon.

- Eligio Martinez said that, in the last couple of weeks, they had been meeting with members of the Academic Senate, to share information with them and make sure that they knew what was coming.

X. Announcements

- Avila said that he was selling the coolest bracelets in town to support UCLA Run/Walk, and he had some with him for anyone who wanted to buy one, or more.
- Brian Neesby said that he had the necessary number of signatures to have the Student Senate Proposal put on the ballot, and he presented them to Council and to Lam. He handed Palma/Saracho the signed petitions, and said that he also had a .pdf of them on a disk if anyone wanted them in that format.
- Palma/Saracho said that he was not sure if there was enough time to get the signatures verified prior to the election.
- Neesby said that there was, as he needed to allow 15 days, and the ballot did not have to be finalized until Second Week according to the USA Constitution.
- Palma/Saracho asked Lam if the 15 days included Spring Break and weekends.
- Lam said that there were a lot of things about this scenario that are not accounted for and would have to be interpreted.
- Cohn said that, in the past, the 15 days had been interpreted as school days. He also said that the Election Code did not allow the gathering of signatures during Finals Week or during Quarterly breaks.
- Palma/Saracho said that these signatures would have to be verified, and asked Lam when there would be time for this.
- Neesby said that he assumed Lam would make a determination, and that he would work with Lam from there on. He said that, either way the 15 days was interpreted, the election would need to be held Second Week or Third Week.
- Wood asked how much a Special Election would cost, and asked if the Student Senate election could be held in conjunction with the General Election.
- Cohn said that the larger issue is whether or not MyUCLA would be available to host on-line voting at the time. He said that MyUCLA provides its services at a very low cost but, with its limited resources, it would be a matter of whether they could handle two separate elections within such a short time span. Cohn said that Lam would have to ask MyUCLA about this before a final decision could be made.
- Tuttle asked Neesby if he was looking at the USAC Constitution with regard to the time limit.
- Neesby said that he was referring to the Election Code with regard to the 15 days.
- Tuttle said that it was probably useful to decide which guiding document they were looking at, because the Constitution is the trump card, and it contained some language on the subject. He said that he was not agreeing or disagreeing with either side, but said he felt it would enrich the debate if everyone was looking at the same language. Tuttle also said that he had not had time to examine the Student Senate proposal, so he asked, if the proposal were approved, when the Student Senate structure would take effect.
- Neesby said that, if logistically possible, he would see it taking effect for the Spring 2005 General Election.
- Tuttle asked if there was clear language to that effect.
- Neesby said that the petitions for a Student Senate structure proposed amendments to the USA Constitution and, therefore, would take effect immediately if passed.
- Tuttle said that, unless there was specific language to this effect, the decision could end up with the Judicial Board.
- Lam said that, first off, the idea of 15 days is a bit ambiguous because sometimes it is in reference to all days and sometimes it refers only to school days. Lam said, secondly, with regard to holding a Special Election during Second or Third Week, he did not

think that the Election Code had precise guidelines for this kind of situation. He said that the problem with holding a Special Election in hopes of having the new structure initiate in the Spring 2005 General Election, is that the 2005 General Election process has already begun. He explained that it would be a nightmare to try to restructure the General Election midway through the process.

- Neesby said he understood the logistical problems that existed, but said if those could be surmounted, then USAC's Constitution required that the Special Election be held. He said that the Constitution was a contract between the student government leaders and the students at large, so he believed that his recommended timetable should be doable. Neesby said that he was not sure exactly how it would work out, but said that USAC and the Election Board Chair would have to talk with MyUCLA, and the Chancellor would have to be talked to, and it would have to happen one way or another.
- Wood reiterated her question regarding how much it would cost to run a Special Election, and also asked where the money would come from.
- Cohn said that a ballpark figure would be \$5,000.
- Tuttle said that Neesby had called this a proposed amendment to the USA Constitution, and asked if this was, in fact, an amendment.
- Neesby said that it was an Initiative which called for an amendment to the Constitution.
- Tuttle said that he was looking at the section of the USA Constitution that addresses Initiatives, and asked if he was looking in the right place.
- Neesby said that he was referencing Article X.
- Tuttle said, for clarification, that Neesby thought he was working under the section in the Constitution designated as Article X. (*entitled Bylaws*), Section A. (*entitled Proposal*); subsection 2. Tuttle then read aloud Subsection 2 which addresses amendments proposed by student petition. He said that he was trying to make sure that he and Neesby were looking at the same reference.
- Neesby said that he was referring to Article X, but was looking at Section A. *and* Section B. (*entitled Ratification of Proposed Amendments*). He explained that Article X.A.2. said that the validity of the signatures must be determined at least seven days prior to the submission of the proposed amendments for ratification by the Association, and that Article X.B. presented a different timetable for ratification.
- Tuttle said that the validity of the signatures had to be verified in 7 days, and asked if Neesby saw this as independent of the 15 days.
- Neesby said that he saw it as within the 15 days.
- Tuttle read section B, and asked if Neesby agreed that the validating body was Election Board.
- Neesby said that he did.
- Tuttle asked if the Election Board had received the petitions 7 days ago.
- Neesby raised the question of how the term, "Association" should be interpreted.
- Tuttle said that he was looking at the Initiatives section, and said that there was the question of the 15 days and the 7 days to decide if one was inclusive or exclusive.
- Palma/Saracho said it was important to agree on when the clock starts. He wondered what timeline the Election Board had for doing this.
- Tuttle said that, from reading the text, he thought it was saying that the validity of the signatures must be determined 7 days before the submission. He said that there has to be a 7-day window after the approval of the confirming body. Tuttle said that this item argues that the 7 falls within the 15.
- Neesby said that if any constitution were looked at, the name of the association was outlined in the constitution itself. He said it was his interpretation that the "Association" was the student body and the vested body was Council. Neesby said that if this was for the approval of the "Association", then that was the students.
- Lam said that Neesby was correct, that there were 15 days and that the 7 days happened within that time. He said that the petitions were submitted, and the vote must come 15 days after that. Lam said that the 7 days must come before that 15 were up, but that it did fall within the 15.

- Tuttle said he agreed, but reminded council that there could be conflicting sections within the constitution.
- McLaren asked, for clarification of the amount of time allowed for validating the signatures.
- Lam said that he was interpreting 15 days as 15 school days, and 7 days as 7 school days. He said that the implementation of the election must entertain the possibility that this proposed Initiative to amend the Constitution passes. Lam said that what he was concerned about was all the logistical issues of changing this election in the middle of its process.
- Palma/Saracho said he saw the problem that, even if this proposed amendment were approved during Second Week, when all of the candidates had turned in their signatures, what would happen to those candidates. He said that the amendments would require a complete rewriting of USA's Constitution and Bylaws. Palma/Saracho asked why Neesby felt that this should be a Special Election when a general election was already being held.
- Neesby said that he had chosen a Special Election in terms of the practicality.
- Palma/Saracho asked why it could not be held in the General Election.
- Neesby said that he thought it would be more likely to pass in a Special Election. He said that, politically, it would be harder to pass in a General Election.
- Martinez said that he saw this Senate Proposal as irresponsible and politically motivated.
- Neesby said that he wanted the Student Senate to be in effect next year, and that was another reason for having the Special Election.
- Wood asked why Neesby thought it would be easier to pass in a Special Election.
- Neesby said that the realities of the issues would be clouded if other issues were addressed at the same time. He said that the issue itself would become clouded if it were voted on along with the candidates in the General Election.
- Martinez said that this seemed self-serving, and he questioned why this was happening now. He said that, if Neesby feared this failing politically, then he was not trying to serve the best interests of the students.
- Neesby said that he understood that concern, but this was not a selfish endeavor. He said that he has had to drop two classes and his GPA has fallen because of all the time he has spent on this. Neesby said he thought that this proposed change in governmental structure would serve the students best, but he understood that people might disagree. He said that his intentions were pure.
- Palma/Saracho said that he agreed with Martinez that Neesby's insistence on a Special Election did seem to be selfishly motivated.
- Wood said that, regardless of how she felt about a Student Senate, she thought it was ridiculous to try and implement it within two weeks. She said she did not think this was the best way to serve the student body. Wood said that she felt it would be extremely difficult to rewrite the guiding documents and find students to run for all the new positions in such a short period of time. She also questioned the expenditure of \$5,000 to run a Special Election. She said that if Neesby's intention was to truly serve the student body, he would not be insisting on holding a Special Election.
- Tseng asked Neesby if he would run for office under the new structure.
- Neesby said that he thought Tseng's question was unrelated to this discussion, but replied by saying that he would be running for office either way.
- Tseng asked how Neesby would handle the need to change the Constitution and Bylaws.
- Neesby said that the current documents would be rolled over, and that it would then be up to the Senate to revise the documents, with a 2/3 majority vote to approve. Neesby said he recognized that there were plenty of logistical considerations.
- Tuttle asked if Neesby agreed that amendments would be submitted to the voters in the next major election unless a Special Election was approved by USAC in accordance with Article X.B.2.
- Neesby said that this contradicted Article X.B.1 and the Election Code.

- Tuttle said that there were clauses that appeared to be contradictory, and reiterated that all such clauses were subject to interpretation. He said that there appeared to be the possibility of this coming in the next major election.
- Wood said that Tuttle had raised a lot of important questions. She asked, since the signatures on the petition had not been verified yet, if the 15 days started after the verification.
- Tuttle said that Lam had spoken earlier about the problems this presented, and he urged Lam to put such thoughts aside and just do his job. He said that Election Board members should refrain from commenting on how this would impact them, and should focus, instead, on doing what was required of them by the USA Constitution.
- Lam said that it was his job to implement this election and the results of this election, unless of course the E-Board Chair position was written out of the Constitution.
- Tuttle said that his plea was that there was a ministerial job to be done. He said that Lam had made the comment that there was a 7-day requirement. Tuttle said that he was not sure how verification worked, but he told Lam to do the best he could to do his job.
- McLaren raised a Point of Information, asking how the verification process worked.
- Cohn said that there were several ways to do it but, in general, it involved the Elections Board Chairperson, the Elections Board Advisor, the Dean of Students, and others.
- McLaren asked how many signatures had been collected.
- Neesby said that they collected almost 4,000, and that they needed 3,634 to qualify the measure for a vote.
- McLaren asked how long it would take to verify that many signatures.
- Cohn said that it depended.
- Tuttle said that people could be deputized to do this, and that the petitioners were entitled to having proper process followed.
- Palma/Saracho said he thought that there should be no pressure put on Lam, as the days were usually interpreted as business days, and there was only one day of instruction left before Finals and Spring Break.
- Tuttle said that he did not agree or disagree.
- Gruenberg said, on another matter, that the Book Lending Program had partnered with Forge, a group which was collecting books to send to Africa. He said that FSC would be donating their outdated text books to the cause.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

In Corella's absence, Aquino passed around the attendance sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Martinez moved and Wood seconded to adjourn.
- Lee called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker