

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

Tuesday April 5, 2005  
417 Kerckhoff Hall  
7:00 P.M.

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

ABSENT: Villarin

GUESTS: Caitlin Antos, Linda Chu, Mike Cohn, Gustavo DeHaro, Kristina Doan, Melinda Dudley,  
Farheen Malik, Janina Montero, Brian Neesby, Tina Park, Saba Riazati, Karen Salazar,  
Claudia Salcedo, Roy Samaan, Diem Tram, Joseph Vardner, Steven Ly

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

- Martinez asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Gaulton asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports, and also asked that an update on Campus Autonomy be added under Old Business.
- Gruenberg asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Bhuiyan asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Avila asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Martinez moved and Wood seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Lee called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Agenda was approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

III. Approval of the Minutes

**February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2005**

- Corella said that, on Page 4, under Fund Allocations, the Cultural Affairs Commission had withdrawn their request, so the recommended allocation should be Zero.
- Martinez said that, on Page 6, in Montero's response to a comment he had made, it should say that Martinez's proposal would "not" work rather than "now" work.
- Avila said that, on Page 13, under his Officer's Report, the "Wellness Letter" should be the "Total Wellness Letter"; that the word "Drug" should be removed from "Awareness Week"; and that the "workshop" would actually be just a discussion.
- Tripathi moved and Lee seconded to approve the Minutes of February 22, 2005, as amended.
- Avila called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of February 22, 2005 were approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

IV. Special Presentations

**Promoting Understanding and Learning through Service and Education (PULSE)**

- Diem Tram introduced herself to council as the Student Initiated Outreach Chair.
- Karen Salazar introduced herself, saying that she represented the Community Service Programs Committee (CSPC).
- Claudia Salcedo introduced herself, saying that she represented the Campus Retention Committee (CRC).
- Crystal Lee said that she would be participating in the presentation, too, on behalf of the Community Service Commission (CSC).
- Tram said that she was here to talk about the P.U.L.S.E. Referendum, and explained that PULSE stands for Promoting Understanding and Learning through Service and Education. She said that she would be introducing all of the items along with a history and an outline of the growth that the various groups had experienced. Tram said that education was critical; that society demanded the advancement of individuals educationally, socially, and economically. She said that, rather than addressing the problems faced by society, students were looking at budget cuts to educational systems on all levels. She added that, with the educational system reaching such dangerous extremes, students needed to take an interest in investing in their own education.
- Lee said that UCLA was built on the three pillars of Academics, Research, and Service. She said that service was important not only for the recipients, but also for teaching the students important things about giving back to the community. Lee said that, since UCLA was built on these three pillars, it is important to institutionalize service here at UCLA, because these service opportunities do cost a lot of money.
- Tram said that they were asking the student body to pass a referendum that would give money to the service communities here on campus. She said that they were asking for \$1.25 per student/per quarter for the Community Service Commission (CSC); \$4.50 per student/per quarter for the Student Initiated Outreach Committee (SIOC); \$0.50 per student/per quarter for the Community Service and Programs Committee (CSPC); and \$1.75 per student/per quarter for the Campus Retention Committee (CRC).
- Salazar said that the Community Programs Office was created in 1970 to bridge the gap between what was happening in the classroom and what was happening in the community. She said that the activities were student run, organized, and funded. Salazar said that, in the last 35 years, the CPO had grown a lot, and they now boasted more than 400 students involved, with more than 1,000 people benefiting from their services. She said that there had also been a growth in the demand for the services, which presented a problem because of increased needs for transportation. Salazar said that they had a fleet of 10 vehicles, which they allowed the volunteers to use free of charge. She said that they would need more vehicles in the coming years to meet the growing demand. Salazar said that CSPC was asking for \$.50 per student/per quarter to help fund these activities.
- Lee said that the Community Service Commission (CSC) was created because students felt that the university was not meeting the needs of the community. Lee said that CSC currently had 21 active projects, with more than 1,500 volunteers participating. She said that, since there are so many volunteers and it was also completely student run, this made the UCLA CSC the largest of its kind in the entire nation. Lee said that they were responsible for some of the largest projects at UCLA, including Welcome Week and Awareness Days. Lee said that the problem CSC was facing was that it owned only 8 vans, a very small fleet. She said that these were not sufficient to meet the needs of CSC's many projects, and they often had to resort to renting vans from expensive rental agencies. Lee said, in addition to that, two of the vans needed replaced because they were more than 10 years old. She reminded council that she had come to them last Fall to ask them to put money aside funds so that CSC could buy new vans. Lee said that 52% of CSC's Transportation funding came from the CAC, 13% from CSC, and they were in deficit for the remainder of the expenses.

- Salcedo said that the CRC had been created in 1988 in response to UCLA's low retention rates. She said that the motto of the group was "Each one, teach one". Salcedo explained that students help others through a peer-to-peer mentorship program. She said that the number of students who had benefited from these services had grown to 1,500, and the paid staff members had increased to 100. Salcedo said that the CRC was continually developing new services to help benefit the student body. She explained to council that the problem created was that services had increased in response to increased demand. She said that they were operating under unfunded university and state mandates. Salcedo said that the cost of living has increased, but that wages have not gone up. She said it was not that more money was being spent; it was simply that the deficit was building up over the years. Salcedo said that the CRC was asking for \$1.75 per student/per quarter to help provide students with the necessary support.
- Tram said that the SIOC was created in 1997 in response to the UC Regents' standing policies which ended the consideration of race and gender in admissions and hiring practices. She said that it was created because students saw the unique needs of these communities and sought to increase access. Tram said that the SIOC had been created through a similar referendum to the PULSE Referendum and had been able to keep up with its growth through that initial funding. Tram said that operational costs had increased significantly because of inflation. She said that now they end up with huge deficits because they are not receiving any more funding than they were when they were first established. Tram said that the SIOC was requesting \$4.50 per student/per quarter to help deal with this deficit. Tram then read testimonials from some of the students who were benefiting from the services offered by the student groups.
- Salcedo said that UCLA had a tradition of providing service to the community around them. She said that, with all of these important projects being under-funded, it was necessary to increase the revenue received from the student body. She reiterated that the main problem was insufficient transportation, and that their services benefited thousands of students throughout Los Angeles.
- Tuttle asked how soon this referendum had to be approved for it to be eligible to go on the ballot.
- Election Board Chairperson, Nathan Lam, replied "third week."
- Tuttle said that there was talk going on about increasing aid to students within the UC System. He said that a fee increase could result in students who receive financial aid taking a hit. Tuttle said it was his understanding was that there was a referendum being discussed at the Berkeley Campus which would raise a couple of dollars per student. He said that AVC Bob Naples was evaluating the Berkeley referendum to see if it was something that should be done here at UCLA. Tuttle said that it might be a good idea to keep this in mind during any budget discussions. He said that, if council saw this coming, he thought they should set aside an amount for financial aid, or scale back the amounts requested in the PULSE Referendum to make more money available for financial aid.
- Nelson said that he was concerned about the deficit that these groups were already running. He said that one thing he would be very cautious about was the issue of inflation. Nelson said that he knew what has been happening with gas price increases, and he asked the presenters if their groups had thought about things like that, and whether they had considered what the situation might be like five years down the road.
- Salazar said that, while it was unclear what policy would be implemented concerning Return to Aid, but it was her understanding that if there was a Return to Aid requirement, it would not be retroactive, but would begin next year.
- Palma/Saracho said that the issue of Return to Aid was still in the early stages of discussion. He said that, according to information he'd received from UCOP and UCSA, Council should not be planning for that at this point. Palma/Saracho said that those discussions were very much in their infancy.
- Tuttle said, based on the comments of both Salazar and Palma/Saracho, he gathered that the leadership on this issue was knowledgeable on the status. He said that what is

- trying to be done is to create stability for the future, and that everyone deals with the best information that they have at the time. He said, however, that it would be great if this only had to be done once rather than on a year-by-year basis.
- Palma/Saracho said that perhaps the question that the groups should answer is whether or not this was planning for the future.
  - Diem said the PULSE Referendum was indexed for inflation, based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
  - Nelson asked if the amounts the groups were asking for in the PULSE Referendum would take care of the existing deficit. He also said that he was worried about indexes, because a lot of fluctuation has taken place, but remarked that it never fluctuated *down*.
  - Palma/Saracho said it was his impression that most referenda were indexed on the CPI.
  - Nelson said that he had problems with organizations that got a set amount of money and spent all of it so that there was nothing to fall back on during hard times. He said that, when things are hard, someone is going to suffer.
  - Vice Chancellor Montero said that the discussions on Return to Aid were moving along rather briskly, with a decision hopefully coming out by May.
  - Palma/Saracho said that, when this matter was first being discussed a couple months ago, there was a lot of concern about how it might affect student interests. He said that, to change the process now, in the span of one week, would be nearly impossible to do. Palma/Saracho said he felt that Council should advocate for having the PULSE Referendum treated in the same way that ASUCLA's SAFE Referendum was being handled.
  - Montero said that it would be the responsibility of the Provost and the Chancellors to make sure that it was done in a way to result in strong pressure in moving this forward.
  - Tuttle said that this was situation was an example of what can happen in a decision-making process. He said that what he wanted to avoid was creating a policy over a six or seven-day period that would have very far-reaching effects. Tuttle said that there might be a difference between what came up earlier and what had yet to come. He said that to avoid having to do this a second time, he recommended having two plans outlined which would prepare them to move forward no matter what was decided on the Return to Aid matter.
  - Mike Cohn, Elections Board Advisor, reminded Council that the Chancellor had to approve the language of *all* referenda.
  - Tripathi asked if there was an expiration date on the PULSE Referendum.
  - Diem said that the cost of operation for all of these projects would continue to increase, so there would not be a sunset date on this referendum.
  - Salazar said that passage of this Referendum would provide stable funding.
  - Williams asked if the groups would consider removing the fee increase in case future state budgets contributed more funds to outreach programs.
  - Diem said that most of the projects were currently operating under a minimal budget. She said that outreach had faced cuts for two years in a row now, and all they were asking for was the bare minimum that they needed to continue doing what they have been doing.
  - Tripathi echoed Williams' comment that the state government might increase funding to outreach programs, perhaps within the next 10 years.
  - Salcedo said that CRC was the only group receiving state funding, so that factor did not apply for the other groups.
  - Tripathi asked what they would do if the needs were later met without this additional funding from the Referendum
  - Salcedo said that it was better for them to plan for a worst-case scenario, and then if they were funded in a best-case scenario, they would have a cushion.
  - Martinez said that, even if the groups were funded later, it would simply allow them to expand their outreach and help more students.
  - Samaan said that funds had been taken away from programs like SIOC and diverted elsewhere, so the possibility of money coming in to programs such as SIOC was a real

long-shot. He said that the trend has been to take money away from them to increase funding in other areas.

- Tuttle said that, if this funding were approved, then there would probably be a discussion by Council to decide whether or not to keep this level of funding constant, or to decrease it at a later date.
- Gruenberg asked that all the information used to generate the numbers they were presenting be included in the Referendum language when they submitted the final copy on Thursday.
- McLaren asked if the students who made the presentation on the PULSE Referendum could email the document to Michael Keesler, the USAC Minutes Taker, for his reference.

## V. Appointments

### **Election Board**

- Lam said that he had been trying to get an Election Board together in time to have information on his appointees go out with the Agenda for this meeting. He apologized that he had been unable to meet that timetable, and for bringing his nominees to Council at the last minute. Lam said that he wanted to appoint four E-Board members at this meeting, and that three of the four were in attendance to directly answer any questions Council might have for them. He said further that he had all four applications with him, and that they were available for anyone who wanted to review them. Lam then stated the names of his recommendations, and the positions to which he wanted to appoint them.
- Palma/Saracho asked if all of the appointees who were at the meeting could introduce themselves.
- Steven Ly said that he was a second-year student at UCLA, and that he had served on E-Board last year, and that he was applying to serve as the Logistics Chairperson for the coming election.
- Linda Chu introduced herself to council, saying that she was a first-year student with a double major in Political Science and International Development Studies. She said she had applied for a position on the Endorsements Committee.
- Caitlin Antos said that she was a fourth year Political Science major, and that she has worked with CHAMPS (a Community Service Commission project) for three years, one year of which she served as CHAMPS' Administrative Director. Antos said she had for the position of Election Board Vice Chairperson.
- Tuttle asked Lam if he also wanted to appoint the Investigations Chairperson at tonight's meeting, even though they could not attend.
- Lam said that he did, after which he passed around the application of Anat Herzog for the Investigations Committee.
- Tuttle asked the candidates if they were aware of the public trust that they held in their positions. He asked if they were aware that, whatever previous friendships they had, must be set aside for this job. He asked the candidates if they realized that many people at UCLA would stay local, and that any dishonesty on their parts would be spoken of for decades to come.
- Antos said that she would be able to carry out her responsibilities without outside or past influence.
- Chu said she understood that the most important aspect of her position as Endorsements Chairperson was to maintain impartiality at all times. She said that the way she would do this would be to continually stand back and look carefully at what she was doing so she could maintain perspective and avoid the mistake of being partial to one candidate or group of candidates over another.
- Ly said that he would be impartial.
- Tuttle said he was sure that Lam had already impressed these issues upon the applicants, and that he was recommending their approval based on their understanding of the need to be impartial.

- Lam said that Tuttle's assessment was correct. Lam then noted that he was still looking for someone to serve as the Publicity Chairperson for the Election Board.
- Lee moved and Avila seconded to approve the appointment of Caitlin Antos to the position of Vice Chair of USAC's Election Board.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Caitlin Antos to the position of Vice Chair of USAC's Election Board with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Avila moved and Vu seconded to approve the appointment of Linda Chu to the position of Endorsements Chairperson of USAC's Election Board.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Linda Chu to the position of Endorsements Chairperson of USAC's Election Board with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Tripathi moved and Wood seconded to approve the appointment of Anat Herzog to the position of Investigations Chairperson of USAC's Election Board.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Anat Herzog to the position of Investigations Chairperson of USAC's Election Board with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Avila moved and Vu seconded to approve the appointment of Steven Ly to the position of Logistics Chairperson of USAC's Election Board.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Steven Ly to the position of Logistics Chairperson of USAC's Election Board with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

VI. Fund Allocations

- Corella said that 3 of the 8 recommendations were via her discretionary authorization. *Chan left the room and was thus not available when the vote on Contingency Fund Allocations was taken.*
- Lee moved, and Martinez, Jr seconded, to approve the Contingency Fund Allocations as recommended by the Finance Committee.
- Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

**Nikkei Student Union (NSU)**

**Requested: \$450.00**

**Recommended: \$400.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$400.00 for the partial cost of Facilities for the Spring Staff Retreat to be held April 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>.

**Samahang Pilipino**

**Requested: \$750.00**

**Recommended: \$400.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$400.00 for the partial cost of an Honorarium for the Pilipino Cultural Presentation to be held on April 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Association of Computing Machinery**

**Requested: \$325.00**

**Recommended: \$225.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$225.00 for the partial cost of Graphics for the General Body Meeting to be held on April 18<sup>th</sup>.

**Asian Pacific Health (APHC)**

**Requested: \$738.00**

**Recommended: \$621.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$504.00 for the cost of Supplies and \$117.00 for the partial cost of Equipment for APHC's Spring 2005 Hypertension and Diabetes Risk Management program.

**Theta Xi Fraternity**

**Requested: \$1,011.00**

**Recommended: \$ 400.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$400.00 for the partial cost of Advertising for Spring Recruitment, held April 4<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Student Welfare Commission**

**Requested: \$320.00**

**Recommended: \$320.00**

In compliance with the discretionary authorization granted to her in the 2004-2005 Finance Committee Guidelines, Corella recommended the allocation of \$320.00 for the cost of Supplies for CRC – Finals Study Hall, held March 14<sup>th</sup> through 24<sup>th</sup>.

**MEChA de UCLA**

**Requested: \$2,879.97**

**Recommended: \$ 600.00**

In compliance with the discretionary authorization granted to her in the 2004-2005 Finance Committee Guidelines, Corella recommended the allocation of \$600.00 for the partial cost of Transportation for the MEChA National Conference.

**Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity**

**Requested: \$596.72**

**Recommended: \$273.36**

In compliance with the discretionary authorization granted to her in the 2004-2005 Finance Committee Guidelines, Corella recommended the allocation of \$273.36 for the partial cost of Transportation for Spring Recruitment, held April 3<sup>rd</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup>.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

**Student Welfare Commission – Jason Avila**

- Avila said that SWC's recent Blood Drive had collected 81 units. He said that since the idea of Books-For-Blood worked so well they might do it again in the future. Avila said that the film, Requiem For a Dream, would be shown next week. He said that SWC's Safety Fair would be held at the end of the quarter. Avila also said that SWC and the LBGT Center were working in collaboration on the issue of depression on campus, and ways to recognize and prevent it. He said that as the first of, hopefully, other collaborations to come, the screening would be followed by a discussion on destigmatizing depression. He said that this jointly-sponsored program would be held in DeNeve on April 20<sup>th</sup> at 6:00p.m. On another topic, Avila said that a concern had been raised because the Community Service Officers (CSO's) would not cross Hilgard when escorting women to their residences, leaving Sorority women vulnerable when returning home late at night. In closing, Avila announced quite excitedly that the Guest Host for this year's UCLA Run/Walk would be Topher Grace, from the cast of "That 70's Show."

**General Representative #1 – Jenny Wood**

- Wood said that the General Representatives were working on the Student Advocacy Collective. She said that there would be a meeting of this group Thursday of next week from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the Kerc khoff Second Floor Study Lounge. Wood said that she would be emailing all student groups on campus to invite them to this meeting. She said that one of the issues addressed would be Expected Cumulative Progress (ECP), as well as the rest of USAC's Action Agenda Items. Wood said that it was also a opportunity for students to inform one another about each others' programs. She said that she hoped many Council Members would be there and that they would also help to spread the word about the event. Wood also said that her office was

working on the Women's Collective which will be held on April 17<sup>th</sup>. She said that they were bringing together student groups to discuss issues addressing women. She said that it would allow the women present to talk about whether or not they wanted to create a campaign or a plan of action for the year. Wood also said that she was working with the Clothesline Project to help fund the events that they would be holding throughout the week. She said that Eve Ensler, author of *The Vagina Monologues*, would be there to speak. Wood also said one of the projects would be to publish a full-page ad listing Bruin Feminists in the Daily Bruin during the Women for Change Week. She said that the last thing would be comprehensive programming workshops. She explained that these would be back-to-back, and would include How to Program on the Hill; Educational Entertainment Programming, and information on USAC's new funding process.

- McLaren asked when Women for Change Week would be.
- Wood answered that it would begin on Monday, May 9<sup>th</sup>, and would continue throughout that week.

#### **Cultural Affairs Commissioner – Shantanu Bhuiyan**

- Bhuiyan said that there would be a noontime concert tomorrow by Grizzly Peak, which was a finalist for MTV's Best Band on Campus. Bhuiyan also said that WorldFest was coming up, and that the Jazz /Reggae festival would be held on Sunday and Monday of Memorial Day Weekend. He said that the media campaign would begin April 15<sup>th</sup>, and said they were very excited to report that India Arie would be their headliner for Jazz Day. He said that he was expecting about 2,000 visitors for Jazz Day and 18,000 for Reggae Day.

#### **Financial Supports Commissioner – Alex Gruenberg**

- Gruenberg said that he had office hours all week for the Book Lending Program, and that the hours were posted on his office door. Gruenberg said that the FSC had partnered with FORGE to collect and send books to Africa. Gruenberg reminded council that State and Federal income taxes were due April 15<sup>th</sup>, and said there was a group on campus that helps students complete the tax forms. Gruenberg said further that there was a coalition on campus to provide information to the students about financial aid, and how to obtain it.

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

- Martinez said that he had a series of meetings to discuss ECP and the Excess Fee Policy. He said that he thought the Regents would be approving it at the next meeting. Martinez said that the Faculty members were also discussing changing the Late Drop Policy so that the deadline for students drop a class without would be moved up to Fourth Week. Martinez said that he had also gone to a meeting where he learned about Academic Freedom. He said he found out that, in the UC System, it applies only to Faculty members, and that there are no policies to protect students or Teaching Assistants. Martinez said that the work group that held this meeting had been created to develop a policy to protect the Academic Freedom of students.

#### **External Vice President – John Vu**

- Vu said that he had gone to D.C. for USSA's National Conference where he attended a number of different sessions. He then asked Roy Samaan to share some of his experiences from the USSA Conference.
- Samaan said that he had a great time at the conference in bringing student issues to the Legislators. He said that he had met with the staff members of many Legislators to talk about issues facing students at this time. Samaan said that a lot of the people who work on Capitol Hill had no idea how many students would be seriously affected by the impending cuts in Outreach programs.
- Wood said that it had been an amazing experience to learn what the issues were and to be able to articulate them to our elected Representatives and their staff. She said that it

had also been a great opportunity to meet with other students from across the country and to find out what similar problems they were facing. Wood said that the workshops she had been able to attend were really interesting, particularly the one on reproductive choice.

- Tseng said that he went to a workshop on Disability and, while they usually talked about students of color gaining access to universities, this workshop had actually been a very enlightening seminar about access with regard to handicapped students. Tseng also said that UC students were in a very unfriendly budget climate, which meant that the Administrators might be spending money on things that students might not like.
- Palma/Saracho said that the most rewarding experience for him had been the Lobby visits, with each of the teams handling at least three. He said that, last year, they had not been able to get anyone to meet with them but, this year, there had been a lot of firm confirmations on the Action Agenda Items from the Representatives. Palma/Saracho said there had been a lot of support for their issues and that the Representatives and their staff had also given ideas on what Council could do to help move their items forward.
- Vu said that a total of 16 UCLA students had attended the National Conference. He said that UCLA usually brought more people to the Conference than other campuses did because a larger number of Senators represent the UCLA students.

*From John Vu's Weekly Report to Council:*

#### USSA

- The end of 10<sup>th</sup> week was met with an exciting visit to Washington, D.C. for USSA's annual legislative conference. We met with all of our 18 Legislators and are currently in the process of following up on these visits. We also attended several workshops on a variety of issues, including Students With Disabilities, Student Fee Increases, the Higher Education Act Reauthorization, Reproductive Rights legislation, Connecting Global and Local Issues, and Transgender 101.

#### UCSA

- This past weekend was the UCSA Board Meeting at UC Santa Cruz. Attached is the board report by Roy Samaan, the EVP office's California Project Director.
- We recently hired our new Assistant Organizer Director, Mo Kashmiri. Mo has had a lot of experience organizing UCSA campaigns, including the recall election in the Fall of 2003 and other UCSA campaigns of the past two academic school years. He is also a recent graduate from Berkeley's Boalt School of Law.
- Currently, the Legislative Committee is working on efforts to communicate with members of the State Legislature to apply pressure on the Regents to increase Return to Aid.

#### Lobby Visits

- During Spring Break, I also made a few follow-up visits with a few Legislators in Sacramento, including Speaker Nunez to follow up on UCSA's efforts to apply legislative pressure on the Regents to increase Return To Aid.

#### Upcoming Travels

- Womyn of Color Conference @ UCSB, April 8-10, 2005.
- Sacramento Lobby Visits throughout the months of April and May, leading up to the May revise.
- USSA May Board meeting @ Malcolm X Community College, Chicago, IL, May 6-8, 2005.
- UCSA May Board meeting @ UCSF, May 13-15, 2005.

#### **Internal Vice President – Darren Chan**

- Chan said that he had been talking with the board of the Student Alumni Association (SAA) to discuss ways for both bodies to work together. He said that the initiative behind this effort was the idea that both entities serve the same student body. Chan

said that there had been some concern brought up about how it would affect the dynamic at the Council table but, after talking with the SAA Board members, they made it clear that they do not want any political involvement. He said he hoped that he would be able to come up with a collaborative effort soon in which the two bodies could work together. Chan said that the main project that the IVP's Office would be working on is the Unofficial Guide.

- Kristina Doan, IVP staff member who is overseeing the project, said that the Unofficial Guide was going along very well. She said that there were more than 35 writers working on this, and that she had recently received all of their outlines. Doan said that she wanted to make sure that the articles were substantive and were backed by good sources, and that they were also "catchy" and fun for the students to read. She said that she had 10 Editors, one for each chapter. She said the Unofficial Guide committee had also checked out guides from other colleges for ideas and inspiration. Doan said that Bruin Walk would be hosting an online version of the guide on their website, and students would eventually be able to upload their own information. She also said that there would be an apartment section so students could find apartments more easily and read reviews about apartments, landlords, and the like. Doan said that the Guide should be done by the end of Spring Quarter, and all of it should be on the web page by the time school starts.
- Tuttle asked if this would be a printed publication.
- Doan said that it would be online first.
- Tuttle asked if this project was under the Communications Board or if it was under the Student Media. He asked if there was any oversight, or editorial control, over comments put onto this website.
- Doan said that the section on apartments was still under consideration, and the decision had not yet been made to have that information included. She said, however, that if they did decide to include this information it would have to be approved before it could be posted, in the same manner as Professor reviews.
- Tuttle said that there could be some serious issues if there were not appropriate internal controls.
- Nelson said that, in today's L.A. Times, there had been a comment about the fact that someone could sue a newspaper for simply printing the exact words that they spoke. He said that this precedent was dangerous because anyone could sue for whatever might be printed, even if it was completely true.
- Doan said that they realized all this and that was why the apartment section was still tentative.
- Samaan asked if anything about queer folks had been incorporated into the guide.
- Doan said that the romance section did have a section about coming out and referenced different groups and resources on campus.
- Tuttle said that these are the things journalists wrestle with all the time. He said that it could create a qualitatively new situation altogether. Tuttle said that it might be the sort of issue that should be considered carefully by student media and the council gathered here.
- Doan said that, although the IVP Office initiated this project, it could be set up as a separate entity.
- Chan said that, for those who would still be at UCLA next year, he wanted to see the Unofficial Guide reach its full potential. He said that, with the thought of making the guide even better, they were hoping to actually be allowed to go into apartments and houses in the North Village to take digital pictures so that students could see online what was available without having to spend a lot of time going from place to place to find out.

**President – Allende Palma/Saracho**

- Palma/Saracho said that, during 10<sup>th</sup> week, several members of Council had met with the UC Regents to talk about Return to Aid to make sure that the aid pool stayed at 33% instead of being lowered to 25%. Palma/Saracho said that a couple of the Regents

were now asking for there to be another way to make up this money. He said that two Regents had agreed to write letters saying that Financial Aid should be raised back to 33%. Palma/Saracho said that this difference equates to hundreds of thousands of dollars, and said that the average student was graduating with \$27 thousand in debt. Palma/Saracho said that he hoped with the aid of the Chancellors and some of the Regents the aid could be raised back up. He said that the goal was to find another way to deal with that shortage. Palma/Saracho said that he spent Finals week in D.C. where he had been able to talk to, and establish relationships with, students from 30 new member schools. On another matter, Palma/Saracho said that there had been a mix-up regarding parking permits for Spring Quarter and that the permit application forms had been lost in the mail. To compound that problem, he said that GSA's allotment had been delivered to his office by mistake. He said that, in spite of these problems, he now had permit application forms for anyone who wanted to purchase a parking permit.

## VIII. Old Business

### A. Election Board Updates

- Lam said that, at the last meeting of the Quarter, an amendment to the Constitution of the Undergraduate Students Association had been proposed. He said that, in order for this proposed amendment to be placed on the ballot, a minimum of 15% of all UCLA registered undergraduate students had to sign the petition. Lam said that, based on his count, the petitioners had not collected enough valid signatures to qualify the amendment for the ballot. Lam then outlined the process for determining the number of valid signatures. He said that the first thing he did was to count the number of actual signatures on the petitions. He said that this initial count resulted in a total of 3,948, one more than the number given to him by the group that sponsored and circulated the petition. Next, he said he determined the number of invalid signatures through the following sequence of steps: (1) Lam said that he first invalidated all signatures that were illegible; (2) he said he then invalidated all signatures that were repeats; (3) and then Lam said he eliminated all signatures that were on copies of the petition which did not have the required information on the top of the sheet. With regard to the signatures that were deemed to be illegible, Lam said that he had gone through all the petitions twice to ensure that his initial assessment was correct. (As an aside, Lam commented that his skill in reading names rapidly had increased dramatically over the first run-through). He said that, on this second pass, he validated some signatures that he had initially invalidated. Lam said that he used the UCLA Student Directory in this process, as well as a tool to figure out incomplete, or partially legible names, which also helped him validate some signatures that were invalidated the first time through.
- Lam then talked about what would have taken place if it had been decided to conduct what he referred to as "Phase 2". He said, if it would have been necessary, this phase would have consisted of a more careful inspection of all previously questioned names by going over the student ID numbers to see if they matched the names and were, therefore, valid. Lam said that he had not implemented Phase 2 because there were no longer enough signatures after the Phase 1 elimination process was completed. Lam said that the petitions would be made available to the public and could be viewed during Election Board office hours, as he wanted to make the process as transparent as possible. Lam concluded his report by saying that, even though the petitioners had not collected the minimum number of valid signatures to qualify the proposed amendment for a Special Election, it was his personal opinion that there were enough students supporting this issue that USAC should put the proposed amendment on their ballot for the General Election.
- Tuttle asked why Lam threw out only one of two duplicate entries.
- Lam said that it could have been an accident that they signed twice.
- Tuttle asked how short the petitioners had been.

- Lam said that there were 3,625 signatures remaining after Phase 1. He said that the number needed was 3,634, but he was sure that additional signatures would have been found to be invalid during Phase 2, where he would have checked names against ID numbers.
- Tuttle said it was possible that Lam could have used the Student ID numbers to validate some of the previously illegible signatures, and asked Lam if he had considered this possibility.
- Lam said that the problem with that approach was that an I.D. number could be intentionally entered next to an illegible name in the hopes of getting that illegible signature validated.
- Gruenberg thanked Lam for all the time and thought he had put into this matter. He then asked Lam if he had worked on this independently.
- Lam said that he had.
- Gruenberg asked if Lam had sought out any advice from Mike Cohn, the Elections Board Advisor, or anyone else regarding the methodology that should be used for the validation process.
- Lam replied that Mike Cohn had told him this was the best approach.
- Cohn said he thought that Lam had been incredibly thorough and fair, and that he had actually erred on the side of the signatories rather than on trying to subtract from the total.
- Gruenberg asked if Lam thought that checking the ID numbers of the 300 or so invalidated signatures would have yielded enough signatures to meet the required number.
- Lam said he had thought about that, but the names were so illegible that they were indecipherable.
- Palma/Saracho asked Lam if the illegible signatures were scattered among all the petitions, or if they appeared on certain sheets together.
- Lam said that the largest number of signatures that were invalidated were dis counted because they were illegible. Second to that reason, as a distant second, he said that two petition forms were invalidated because they did not have the required information about the proposed amendment at the top of each petition. He said that the next category of invalidated signatures was those that were duplicate signatures, and that these represented the fewest of those that were invalidated.
- Williams asked if they were talking about written signatures or printed names.
- Lam said that each person had to fill out the following information: their printed name, their signature, their SID number, and the date. He said that what he had been talking about up 'til now had been the printed name. Lam said that the names which were invalidated because they were illegible had been based on the printed names.
- Tuttle asked Lam what appeals would be available to the petitioners.
- Lam said that he thought they could take it to Judicial Board if they believed had grounds to do so.
- Tuttle said that one possibility might be for the matter to be legislated at the meeting tonight. He said that another remedy might be to take the case to the Judicial Board. Tuttle asked, however, if there was another remedy within the Election Board itself. He asked if there was anything that the petitioners could do, or if this was the final say.
- Lam said that he did not see this as something that needed a remedy.
- Tuttle asked how petitioners could logistically appeal this in the short amount of time before the upcoming election.
- Lam said that, given the time frame, he had spent enough time going over the signatures that he was comfortable saying that the Election Board had been thorough enough. He said it was his opinion that there was no way the petitions would be validated, because he believed that the count would only go down if he continued to validate them based on the Student I.D. numbers.
- Palma/Saracho asked Lam if it was his view that this was a closed matter.
- Lam said that it was.

- Gruenberg asked Lam if he had said earlier that he recommended having this proposed amendment to the Constitution be presented to the students for a vote which, in effect, would be an approval of the petitioners' proposal.
- Palma/Saracho asked if this was just Lam's opinion.
- Lam said it was just his opinion, but that he had recommended that the petitioners be granted their request to have the proposed amendment placed on the ballot.
- Gruenberg asked if this was his opinion as the Election Board chair or as an individual.
- Lam said that it was as the Election Board Chair, and as the one who had gone over all of the signatures. He said that he knew the petitioners did not obtain the required minimum percentage of registered undergrads, but it was still an awful lot of students who signed the petition.
- Gruenberg asked when the deadline for decisions about the ballot would be.
- Lam said that the Elections Calendar that USAC had approved on March 15<sup>th</sup> said that everything for the general election ballot would be due by Monday of Week 3.
- Cohn said that date referred to petitions. He said that Council would actually be approving the ballot at its meeting during Fourth Week.

### **B. Discussion on the Senate Proposal**

- Palma/Saracho said that there had been a lot of discussion at the last meeting about whether or not USAC had the right to put this proposed amendment to a vote at a Special Election or at the Spring General Election. He said that it had come to his attention that Council did not have that right but, after listening to Lam's presentation this evening, he felt there was really no need to hold a Special Election. Palma/Saracho reiterated Lam's statement that this was a matter that deserved some attention from council. He proposed, as a remedy, that the petition be given to USAC's Constitutional Review Committee (CRC) for review to determine if they would like to propose changes to the Constitution, which would then go to a vote by council for placement on the ballot, to then be voted on by the students at large.
- Nelson said that he was concerned about setting precedent. He said that when special consideration is given to a petition that comes up short on the number of valid signatures, this might give future councils ground to make similar decisions.
- Palma/Saracho said that he would not be endorsing the petition, but simply giving it to the CRC to discuss and report back to council.
- Gruenberg said that several members of the CRC were here, and asked them if they could suggest a timeline for reviewing this matter and bringing it back to Council.
- Chan asked what Council would be expecting the CRC to do when they met on this.
- Palma/Saracho said it was his view that the CRC would not be validating the petition, but would simply be looking at the language of the proposed amendment.
- Gaulton said he thought it might be wrong to allow the consideration of the proposed amendment since it did not obtain the required number of validated signatures.
- Gruenberg said that this was a bit of a different issue, as it was not recycling the petition to circumvent the findings of the Election Board Chairperson.
- Gaulton said that there were two different processes that could be used, and that one had been chosen, and it did not work out. He said that it seemed wrong to let it now go through the other process.
- Nelson said he respected the objectivity that was being presented here. He said, however, that he still felt the need to consider future potential scenarios that might occur. Nelson asked, for example, what would happen if the CRC wanted to put the proposed amendment on the ballot, but Council denied CRC's recommendation when it came to a vote. He said that this would only further delay the process.
- Tuttle said that he was not sure if there was an issue here that needed a vote. He said that the petitioners could seek out the Chair of the CRC, and then another route could be explored. Tuttle said that another option would be for the petitioners to go through the Judicial Board.

- Palma/Saracho said that Tuttle was right in that the petitioners should seek out the CRC if they want to be heard by them. He said that he should not speak on their behalf by taking it to the CRC for them.

### **C. ECP Task Force Updates**

- Tseng made a PowerPoint presentation to council about the ECP Task Force's findings. Tseng then added to the presentation that ECP was not breaking or reversing a trend, rather just slowing it down. He said that he thought the college was doing a good job to keep students taking classes, and explained that there was a saturation point where students would just not be able to take any more classes. Tseng also said that he had met with David Rigby, who told Tseng that the Academic Senate would probably like to see more data over a longer time span. He said that he disagreed with Rigby and thought that this information should be taken to the Academic Senate now.
- Palma/Saracho thanked the ECP Task Force for compiling this report showing all of the data which indicated that ECP was not only falling short on its expectations, but was actually being detrimental to the lives of the students. He said that USAC has even gone beyond simply finding a solution, because they had actually compiled all the data and the evidence. Palma/Saracho said that Council had even compromised by changing from their initial goal of making minimum progress 12 units to settling on 13 units.
- Wood said that she needed to review and edit the report more within the Task Force, but it should be ready for publication and distribution by next week. She said that another thing that would be discussed was changing from 13 units per quarter to 39 units per year.
- Tuttle asked about the financial aid issue.
- Wood said that a student would need 13 units each quarter to get financial aid.
- Tuttle asked Tseng who he had met with.
- Tseng said that he had met with the Undergraduate Branch of the Academic Senate.
- Tuttle asked what the impact of ECP was on the Faculty.
- Tseng said that he did not know.
- Tuttle said he thought they should try to get that information. Tuttle then moved on to the proposed moratorium on ECP. He asked if that idea had been mentioned to the Academic Senate.
- Tseng said that there was not specific data on how ECP affected the faculty. He said, however, that ECP requires teaching Faculty to carry a heavier workload.
- Tuttle said that there was a lot of support that could be garnered from showing that ECP negatively affected the Faculty.
- Martinez said that, in terms of how Faculty members are affected, they are being mandated to teach more classes because of the downsizing and cutbacks that have been taking place.

## **IX. New Business**

### **A. Campus Facilities Coordinating Committee Update**

- Gaulton said that the Campus Facilities Coordinating Committee (CFCC) had been meeting over the last several months to review the proposed changes to the Campus Outdoor Policy, specifically with regard to extending the hours when outdoor concerts with sound systems could be held. He said that Bob Naples had been sending out the new document along with a disclaimer saying that it was not necessary. Gaulton said that this had been an obstacle, but after meeting with Naples for an hour, he had agreed that it was a legitimate concern, and would be bringing it to Murphy Hall. He said that Naples would be getting a group of the CFCC together to present this case to those in power, and Gaulton said that he did not like this as it took power out of the hands of council. Gaulton said that, by the end of the meeting, the entire CFCC saw the value in this new code, and Jack Rabb had even pointed out that only the students were regulated, but the University was not.

## FINAL

- Palma/Saracho asked if Gaulton would be attending the meeting in Murphy Hall.
- Gaulton said that he hoped so, as he thought the Administrators would be doing the right thing by inviting him. He said that he had gone to the outdoor Roots show recently at USC, and hoped that UCLA would soon be allowed to hold similar outdoor events, with sound, in the evenings.
- Gruenberg asked what exactly the next step would be.
- Gaulton said that all he knew was that he needed to talk to the people who would be making the final decision, and the only name he knew from that list was Pete Blackman.

### X. Announcements

- Gaulton said that “Sahara” would be shown on Wednesday at 8:00 p.m., and “Fever Pitch” would be shown on Thursday at 7:00 p.m. He also said that they were having meetings about ways to improve the Campus Events Commission, and said they would appreciate input from anyone on Council who had recommendations for them.
- Lee said that this coming Thursday, from 9:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., there would be a clubbing event to raise funds for CSC, and that all the details were on CSC’s website.

### XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*Corella passed around the attendance sheet.*

### XII. Adjournment

- Martinez moved and Lee seconded to adjourn.
- Vu called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 11:02 p.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Michael Keesler  
USAC Minutes Taker