

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday April 19, 2005
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 P.M.

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

ABSENT: Chan

GUESTS: Vahe Akopian, Luis Arellano Jr., Denise Del Cid, Jesús Gonzales, Raffi Kassabian, Armen Keshishian, Matthew Kiaman, Hrug DerManuelian, Janina Montero, Marisol Olea, Armen Yedalyan, Claudia Salcedo, Maricela Meza, Diem Tran, Saba Riazati, and at least 50 other guests associated with various student organizations who attended in support of the P.U.L.S.E. Referendum. Represented organizations included: Samahang Pilipino, Muslim Student Association, Queer Alliance, Asian Pacific Coalition, Vietnamese Student Union, African Student Union, Jewish Student Union and MEChA

I. A. Call to Order

- Palma/Saracho called the meeting to order at 7:39 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. He also said that the Resolution in Support of the Reform of Expected Cumulative Progress (ECP) had been the wrong version, and passed out the updated one.
- Lee asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Gaulton asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- McLaren asked that approval of the Minutes of March 1, 2005 be tabled.
- Palma/Saracho said that he would be adding a Special Presentation from the Armenian Students Association (ASA). He also asked for a Special Orders of the Day to add an Action Item to the Agenda regarding Approval of the Resolution Acknowledging the Armenian Genocide. He said that a two-thirds vote was required to add an Action Item to the Agenda at the table.
- Tseng moved and Martinez seconded to add to the Agenda an Action Item entitled, "Resolution Acknowledging the Armenian Genocide."
- Council voted to add the Resolution Acknowledging the Armenian Genocide to the Agenda as an Action Item with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
The Resolution Acknowledging the Armenian Genocide was added under New Business as an Action Item.
- Palma/Saracho also said that he would be moving Old Business Item B, Approval to Place P.U.L.S.E. Referendum on the Ballot for the USA Spring 2005 Election, to after Special Presentations.
Old Business Item B, Approval to Place P.U.L.S.E. Referendum on the Ballot for the USA Spring 2005 Election, was moved to directly after Special Presentations.
- Wood asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.

- Martinez moved and Lee seconded to approve the Agenda, as amended.
- Vu 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 because Approval of the Minutes of March 1, 2005 was removed from the Agenda .

IV. Special Presentations

There were no Special Presentations this week.

V. Old Business

B. *Approval to Place P.U.L.S.E. Referendum on the Ballot for the USA Spring 2005 Election

- Claudia Salcedo introduced herself, saying that she was at the meeting on behalf of the Community Activities Committee (CAC), and passed out the P.U.L.S.E. Referendum Proposal to council.
- Maricela Meza introduced herself to council as a representative of the Campus Retention Committee (CRC).
- Crystal Lee, USAC Community Service Commissioner (CSC), said that she was part of the referendum as well on behalf of the CSC.
- Diem Tran introduced herself on behalf of the Student Initiated Outreach Committee SIOC.
- Salcedo said that there was a difference in the wording from that which had been passed out last week.
- McLaren asked if this had been changed since April 15th, which was the version included in the Agenda Packets.
- Salcedo said that the only changes since then had been the additional footnote and the conclusion. She said that the major change was the various amounts being requested.
- Meza said that she had spoken with Bob Naples, and said that he had told her that it would not be possible to include newly established committees in the same referendum as already established ones. Meza said that she thought that including the CSPC in the referendum could alleviate some of the transportation needs.
- Lee said that the CSC had been asking for \$1.25, but was now only asking for \$0.75, since most of her projects also went to the CAC for funding. She said that they had decided to scale down the amount of money that they were asking for so that all of the projects would have access to that funding through the CAC.
- Salcedo said that the CAC had also scaled down, hoping that the chancellor would make up the difference. She said that she hoped that the 40 thousand needed would come from the chancellor, and meanwhile the committee had committed to fundraise to meet the deficit that would no longer be eliminated in the referendum. She said that she would be going to the university as well as to the students.
- Tran said that SIOC had been asking for \$4.50, but was now only asking for \$3.75, as they had factored in a lot of things. She said that the university had supported SIOC, and this was seen both through the matching of referendum funds in years past by the chancellor, and his support last year in the budget crisis. She said that matching the support that the students had shown would be seeking to continue collaboration with the university, and did not feel comfortable asking the students for 100% of the deficit.
- Salcedo said that the other change was with Return to Aid. She said that it was not previously clear as to whether or not this referendum would be subject to aid. Salcedo said that the recommendation from the University of California Office of the President

(UCOP) was that this referendum was subject to return to aid. She asked if there were any questions.

- Nelson asked what the first reduction in requested amount had been.
- Salcedo said that the Community Service Programming Committee (CSPC) had been removed, which would have been an additional \$0.50
- Nelson asked what the second change was.
- Salcedo said that they had added the CAC, which was an additional \$0.75
- Tran said that the referendum total was now \$6.50.
- Palma/Saracho said that he thought it very honorable that the P.U.L.S.E. folks were working on this, though he thought it wrong to approve one referendum on the ballot and not the other. He said that he was still in communication with UCOP to overcome this, and said that the language should be approved, but it should be subject to change.
- Saba Riazati, Daily Bruin reporter, asked if this referendum had an expiration date.
- Martinez moved and Villarín seconded to put the Promoting Understanding and Learning through Service and Education Referendum (P.U.L.S.E.) on USAC's Spring Elections Ballot.
- Tuttle asked if that motion included the Return to Aid footnote.
- Martinez said that it did.
- Council voted to put the Promoting Understanding and Learning through Service and Education Referendum (P.U.L.S.E.) on USAC's Spring Elections Ballot with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Palma/Saracho said that it would be placed on the ballot pending the working out the small changes in the referendum language.
The one hundred or so people in the room applauded Council's decision.
- Salcedo thanked Council for taking this action tonight in favor of place the P.U.L.S.E. Referendum on their ballot. She said that a lot of students are involved in these programs, and that many others in the community benefit from their services.
- Palma/Saracho encouraged P.U.L.S.E. representatives to speak with the Election Board Chairperson to make sure that this was placed on the ballot without any problems.

VI. Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

VII. Fund Allocations

- Corella said that there had been seven applications for Contingency funding this week. She said that \$12,000 had been requested, and that the Finance Committee is recommending total allocations of \$7,000.
- Martinez asked whose Knott's Berry Farm tickets council was being asked to pay for.
- Corella said that it was for Best Buddies, a project under the Community Service Commission.
- Lee said, for clarification, that the funds would pay for tickets for the service recipients, not for the UCLA students who are active in Best Buddies.
- Lee moved and Tseng seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
- Wood called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations were approved by Acclamation.
- McLaren interjected that Avila had asked her to have his name added to the Officer and Member Reports because he was arriving too late to do it himself. She apologized that she had not remembered to do this at the beginning of the meeting.
- Palma/Saracho asked if anyone objected.
Upon hearing no objections, Student Welfare Commissioner Jason Avila was added to the Officer and Member Reports.

Best Buddies UCLA

Requested: \$370.00

Recommended: \$150.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$150.00 for the partial cost of Tickets for Knott's Berry Farm for May 14th, 2005.

Best Buddies UCLA

Requested: \$250.00

Recommended: \$110.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$110.00 for the partial cost of Registration Fees for the Best Buddies International Leadership Conference to be held on April 29th, 2005.

MEChA de UCLA

Requested: \$1,269.46

Recommended: \$ 644.07

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$244.07 for the partial cost of Transportation and \$400.00 for the cost of Lodging for the Border Tour to be held from April 22nd to 24th, 2005.

UCLA Run/Walk: Student Welfare Commission

Requested: \$5,567.93

Recommended: \$2,667.93

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$1,193.93 for the cost of Facilities, \$500 for the cost of an Honorarium, \$500 for the cost of Graphics, and \$474.00 for the cost of Advertising for UCLA Run/Walk to be held on May 22nd, 2005.

Hui O 'Imiloa – UCLA Hawaii Club

Requested: \$4,388.00

Recommended: \$2,945.09

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$2,135.76 for the cost of Facilities, \$474.00 for the partial cost of Advertising, and \$335.33 for the cost of Graphics for the Na Moku Kaulana – Luau 2005, to be held on April 30th, 2005.

UCLA Teo-Chew Association

Requested: \$125.00

Recommended: \$125.00

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$36 for the cost of Setup Staff, \$45 for the cost of House Staff, and \$44 for the cost of Technical Staff for the OCA College Career Workshop to be held on April 19th, 2005.

Vietnamese Language & Culture (VNLC)

Requested: \$490.11

Recommended: \$490.11

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$490.11 for the cost of Graphics for Cinema Symposium 2 held on November 7, 2004.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

Office of the General Representatives – Tseng, Wood, Villarín

- Wood said that the Women's Collective had been this past weekend, and had been sparked by a day of guest speakers. She said that they had come up with a collective campaign to pursue which revolved around women's health and their rights to particular health services. Wood said that they would be working on campus to make sure that the Ashe Center was prepared to deal with queer and other gender identity

issues. She said that, on the national level, they would be working to make sure that women's reproductive rights are protected.

- Villarín said that it had been a wonderful event, and said that they would be working on it throughout the year. She also noted that they would be holding the event again next year.
- Wood said that they had also talked about the Diversity Requirement, and said that the participants had committed to working on it. Wood also said that, tomorrow, there would be a workshop with the Finance Committee starting at 2:00 p.m., another workshop on programming at 3:00 p.m., and a session at 4:00 p.m. where they would provide information on the new Base Budget funding process for USAC Offices and registered undergraduate organizations.

Campus Events Commissioner – Jason Gaulton

- Gaulton said that the Campus Facilities Coordinating Committee (CFCC) had met recently and had discussed the issue of nighttime programming. He said that a large-scale concert was scheduled for the 28th from 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. Gaulton said that this did not mean that there would be guaranteed access to nighttime events in the future, but that it was considered somewhat of a test case. He added that the event would need to go over flawlessly for such opportunities to come in the future. Gaulton said that he would, unfortunately, be in New Orleans at the time, and would not be able to attend this special event. He said that he could use all the manpower he could get, and asked all interested Council Members to volunteer some of their time to help ensure that events like this could keep happening. He said that they would announce the name of the headliner very soon. Gaulton said that the \$2 movie this week would be "Meet the Fockers". Gaulton also said that there would be a Civil Disobedience Speak Out this week.
- Palma/Saracho said that it sounded like this it was a victory for students to be able to hold an evening outdoor concert, and asked if this could have been done last year.
- Gaulton said that it was a victory, as he had tried to accomplish this last year, but had been turned down. He said there were legitimate reasons in the past for shutting down outdoor evening concerts, so he was doing everything possible to avoid such situations with this upcoming event. Gaulton reiterated his remark that, even if the event went well, it was still not a guarantee that the Outdoor Policy would be modified to allow evening concerts in the future.
- Palma/Saracho asked what the CFCC's position is on this issue.
- Gaulton said that they were all in support of modifying the Outdoor Policy, but said that if the amended Policy appeared to hinder their programs in any way, he felt they would begin to oppose outdoor evening events sponsored by CEC.

Community Service Commissioner – Crystal Lee

- Lee said that this week was Advocacy Week, with the emphasis being on Child Abuse Awareness. Lee said that there would be a screening of "The Sleepers" as one form of programming, and said that it was a good movie which followed the lives of four boys. Lee said that there would also be a bake sale on Thursday, with the funds going to Project MAC, which worked with neglected teens. Lee also said that Parental Involvement Through the Arts (PITA) would be held May 16th, and the service recipients would be brought onto campus for workshops and performances. She said that each year there was a theme, and this year's would be "It's a Small World". Lee said that she needed more groups to fill the schedule, and asked council to let her know of any groups that could help out. Lee closed by saying that CSC's year-end banquet was being planned, that the dinner would be really fancy, with chicken, salmon or vegetarian options. She said that tickets bought in advance would cost \$17, and those sold at the door would cost \$20.

Academic Affairs Commissioner – Eligio Martinez Jr.

- Martinez said that he had gotten a report from the Chair of the Academic Senate which indicated that several members opposed the Excess Unit Fee Policy. On another matter, Martinez said that the UC System was in the process of conforming their calendars because they wanted to be sure that all the campuses that were on the Quarterly system and all that were on the Semester system were on the same timetable. Martinez ended his report by saying that he would be meeting with Judy Smith to talk about the Late Drop Policy and also ECP. He said that they had researched Late Drop Policies from other campuses, and had found out that some campuses had Drop Deadlines that were even later than UCLA's.

Student Welfare Commissioner – Jason Avila

- Avila said that he had sent an email to everyone about participating in the UCLA Run/Walk. He suggested that Council should put a team together, and that each USAC office and commission should also organize a team. He said that the restaurant, South Street, had agreed to donate 10% of their Monday evening profits to Run/Walk, so he asked everyone on Council to eat there on Monday evenings from now until the event takes place. Avila then passed around a monthly calendar of SWC events, and pointed out that the first event – Movie Night – was tomorrow evening. He said that, next week, there would be a health symposium with a focus on basic health issues.
- Tuttle asked about the Depression Symposium which was listed on SWC's monthly calendar.
- Avila said that there would be a workshop, followed by a movie, hopefully followed by a discussion. He said that the participants would be a group of students who come together to talk about depression in the hopes of de-stigmatizing the issue of depression.

External Vice President – John Vu

- Vu said that he would be involved this week and next in a number of meetings pertaining to outreach. He said that there would be a presentation made to the Regents, and pressure put on them, regarding Return to Aid. Vu said that he was also preparing for the upcoming Regents meeting in May, with the main actions centered on various issues. Vu said that, within USSA, they were in the process of hiring new staff, particularly in the field of LBGT relations. He said that amendments and changes were also being made to the Bylaws.

President – Allende Palma/Saracho

- Palma/Saracho said that he had met with AVC Naples twice now about the Return to Aid issue. He said that, right now, they were waiting to hear back from UCOP about what they could do on the issue. Palma/Saracho said that the RTA issue was new to students, and a discussion was necessary to explain to them what they were doing and investing in. He said, secondly, any referendum at this point would be penalized by not adhering to a set date put out by UCOP. Palma/Saracho said that PULSE would probably have presented this sooner if they had known, and to have two of these referenda on the ballot with different standards would be inequitable. He said that a policy that was uniform needed to be set and outlined. Palma/Saracho said that, to change the rules in the middle of the game set a bad precedent, and it did not help either of the referenda. He said that, overall, he thinks that everyone wants both of the Fee Referenda to get a fair shake. Palma/Saracho said that he would be drafting a letter to UCOP and the Administration to explain why UCSA had taken a position on this matter. He said that this is why it was important that the language for the PULSE Referendum be tentatively approved, so that the only change that would need to be made was to the footnote, depending on what happens next week. Palma/Saracho said that the other issue he wanted to report on was the recent UC workers' strike. He said that they were striking to lobby for a living wage and also to obtain advancement opportunities. Palma/Saracho said that he had spoken with Janina Montero today about

these issues, and said that the meeting had been a little tense at times. He said that he did come away from the meeting with the belief that they had gotten the Chancellor's attention to their concerns. Palma/Saracho said that UC Berkeley's new Chancellor, Robert Birgeneau, had lent his support to the workers, and UCLA students simply wanted the same kind of commitment from their Chancellor. Palma/Saracho said that this was not too much to ask from the University, and that it was realistically possible. He said that there would be a meeting at 10:00am on Thursday between the Chancellor and the workers to discuss the workers' plight.

- Melinda Dudley from the Daily Bruin asked if the press could come to that meeting.
- VC Montero responded to Dudley's question by stating that Palma/Saracho had asked for a meeting with the Chancellor, and said that not every meeting the Chancellor had with the students was open. Montero recommended that Palma/Saracho meet with the Chancellor and that he then provide relevant information to the student media.
- Palma/Saracho said, lastly, that this Thursday there would be a number of events in remembrance of the Armenian Genocide. He then asked if *New Business Item B, Resolution in Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide*, could be dealt with at this time because the guest presenters were all at the meeting now.

There were no objections to Palma/Saracho's suggestion, so New Business Item B, Resolution in Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide was moved to after Officer and Member Reports as the next matter on the agenda.

IX. New Business

B. Resolution in Recognition of the Armenian Genocide

- Armen Keshishian introduced himself to council as a member of ??O (Alpha Epsilon Omega), the Armenian Fraternity.
- Armen Yedalyan said that he, too, was a member of ??O, and that his name was also Armen.
- Hrug DerManuelian introduced himself as an Alpha Epsilon Omega Alum, and mentioned in an aside that he had served as USAC's Finance Committee Chair a few years ago.
- Raffi Kassabian said that he was the President of ASA here at UCLA, and had come to the meeting to ask USAC to approve a Resolution in Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide. Kassabian said that this year's remembrance was especially important because it was both the 90th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, and because of the genocide that is currently being carried out in Darfur. He said that USAC had approved similar resolutions in years past, and pointed out that the only difference in this year's request was that they wanted the remembrance to be one week long instead of just one day. Kassabian said that another slight difference was that this year's Resolution was being co-sponsored by ASA and ??O.
- Lee moved and Tseng seconded to approve the Resolution in Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution in Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide.
- Kassabian asked if Council would be willing to pay for a full-page ad in the Daily Bruin next Tuesday. He explained that he was requesting a larger ad than is usually run because of the fact that this year's remembrance is for an entire week, instead of just for one day.
- Martinez moved and Tseng seconded to publish a full-page ad in the Daily Bruin on Tuesday, April 26, of the Resolution in Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide.
- Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to the motion.
- There being no objections, Council approved the publishing of a full-page ad in the Daily Bruin on Tuesday, April 26, of the Resolution in Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide.
- Kassabian completed his presentation by saying that more than 400 students had turned out for the candlelight vigil last Thursday evening. He said that there would be a silent march this week as well as other commemorative events.

X. Old Business

A. Election Board Updates

- Lam said that he was sure everyone wanted the list of candidates, and said that it would be posted on the bulletin board outside of the E-Board office some time tomorrow. He thanked everyone who had attended the candidate orientation meeting this week, and said that the endorsement hearings would be tomorrow night. Lam said, in addition to this, that the Election Board was further expanding its staff. He said that the new students would be staff assistants, not Chairs of specific committees, so they did not have to be appointed officially. He then introduced Richard Meng and Sharon Hing.
- Palma/Saracho asked Lam for clarification on whether leafleting hours were time-restricted.
- Lam said that, traditionally, leafleting had been permitted from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., but said that there was actually no language in the E-Code regarding the issue. He said that his inclination would be to allow leafleting at any time that candidates wanted to leaflet. He said that, if any violations did occur, the most common and likely penalty would be to limit campaign time.
- Palma/Saracho asked if this decision was up to the Election Board.
- Tuttle asked if candidates and their supporters could be leafleting right now.
- Lam replied that they could not be, because the leafleting period had not begun.
- Tuttle, commenting on Lam's statement that the traditional hours for leafleting had been from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., asked if students could technically campaign at all hours of the night.
- Lam said that his hands were tied on that matter because there was nothing in the Election Code which said that the hours were to be restricted.
- Tuttle said that he was bothered by this because it could allow students to become worn out from campaigning for hours and hours, without end. He asked when Lam when campaigning had begun.
- Lam said that campaigning began Fourth Week, but that leafleting could be done only on three specified days during Sixth Week.
- Tuttle asked if there was anything that Council could do to codify what had been traditional and customary regarding the leafleting hours.
- Lam said it was his opinion that the 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. limit had been in everybody's best interest. He said that what Tuttle has suggested could probably be done, but his concern was that the candidates had already signed a form stating that they had read and understood the Election Code. He said he thought it would be unfair to impose a new rule at this point.
- Tuttle said that Lam had made his point, but stated that students had other things to do and classes to attend.
- Palma/Saracho agreed that unlimited leafleting set up the potential for violations.
- Tuttle said that everyone knew the numbers, and some of the elections were very close. He worried that campaigners might push themselves to get those extra votes.
- Palma/Saracho asked Mike Cohn, the E-Board Advisor, if the change to the E-Code that they had been discussing could be made at this time.
- Cohn reiterated Lam's comment that the candidates had already signed off on the Election Code as it now stands, but said that, if a decision was made to add specific hours to the E-Code, proper notification should be given, and said that this would have to be done by next week. Cohn said that the 9:00am – 5:00pm hours had been in place for many years, and said he was surprised to learn that they were not actually contained in the Election Code.
- Palma/Saracho asked, in the event that students campaigned during hours outside of the tradition 9:00am – 5:00pm period, would the Election Board Office have to be open during all hours in case there were grievances to be filed.
- Lam said that any grievances would have to be brought to the E-Board the next day.

- Villarin said she thought that the responsible thing to do would be to step in and codify the hours in the E-Code. She said, from the standpoint of one who had run for office, it was a very taxing thing to be campaigning from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. as it was, and that extending the hours to 6:00am – Midnight, or worse, would make it impossible. She said that elections were held during a very active time in the year, and it would be helpful not to put unnecessary burdens on those who were running, or those who were involved in the campaigns. Villarin said she thought there was plenty of time to notify the candidates if the E-Code was modified to include the specified hours.
- Lam said that, if this was going to be done, it should be done no later than the next USAC meeting.
- Cohn said that, if it was the will of the Council, then they could do a “straw poll” tonight to see if it was likely that the change was going to be made so that the candidates could be alerted to the potential of this impending codification of the hours.
- Palma/Saracho said that they could take a “straw poll”, or even have a Special Order of the Day. He said that another option would be to defer the matter at this time. He then asked for opinions from Council Members.
- Tripathi asked if the Approved Calendar specified 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
- Lam said that it did not.
- Wood said she thought that Council should have a Special Order of the Day.
- Gruenberg said that there might not be an emergency to do this tonight.
- Tuttle said that his guess was that it would be better to take a Straw Poll tonight to prepare the candidates than to have a Special Order of the Day because there should be time to allow opportunity for comment on the subject. He said that he had very little doubt that there would be quorum next week, and said that this could be done then. Tuttle said further that, since this was set in a competitive arena, it would be better to do this in a more formal manner. He said that if a Straw Poll showed support tonight, then the candidates could be advised. Tuttle said that the word “likely” ought to be omitted from the wording. He said further that the candidates should definitely be notified about the results of the Straw Poll.
- Lam said that the reason for the time restriction on leafleting, but not on campaigning, was because “campaigning” was too hard to define. He said that, with regard to modifying the Election Code, he requested that Council either do it as soon as possible or not do it at all. Lam said that he had worked very hard last Quarter on cleaning up the Election Code because he did not want to be faced with making any last-minutes changes this Quarter.
- McLaren asked if, for the Straw Poll, Council would be asked simply whether or not they wanted restrictions on hours of campaigning, or if they would be voting to codify specific time limits.
- Tuttle recommended that they specify time limits. He said that if Council decides to do this, they should be as specific as possible so that the results of the Straw poll would provide better information to pass along to the campaigners.
- Palma/Saracho said he thought that Council should have a Special Order of the Day because the best time to notify the candidates about any possible changes would be at the Endorsement Hearings on Monday. He said that would be more formal and could be provided to everyone at about the same time.
- Cohn recommended that, if a change was made to the E-Code, that Lam should ask every candidate to sign-off that they are aware of the E-Code amendment.
- Tuttle said that the remedy was that reconsiderations could be made later. He said that, when Council moves this rapidly on something that is so contentious, it made him anxious, but he acknowledged that this was a very important issue.
- Palma/Saracho recommended to Council that there be a Special Order of the Day to limit leafleting hours, and pointed out that this would require a 2/3 vote for approval. He said that, after having heard all the arguments, he saw many good reasons to do this as soon as possible.

- Wood moved and Martinez seconded to have a Special Order of the Day, to add to the Agenda New Business Item C, Limiting of the Spring 2005 USAC Election Leafleting Hours.
- Council approved adding Limiting of the 2005 USAC Election Leafleting Hours as New Business Item C with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Tuttle asked if the two new members of the Election Board that Lam had introduced this evening, the Administrative Assistant and the Publicity Chairperson, had to be approved by Council.
- Lam said that these positions were not “official” positions, and therefore did not need to be approved by Council.
- Tuttle asked if these students had been advised about the importance of impartiality in their positions.
- Lam said that he had advised them, and that they understood the need to be impartial.
- Tuttle asked the E-Board Chair through the President to the new appointees, whether or not they understood that their reputation for 40 years was at stake here.
- Palma/Saracho reiterated Lam’s statement that appointees to these positions did not have to be approved by Council.
- Tuttle said that he was doing this through the E-Board Chair for just that reason. He again asked, through the Chair to the lady, if she understood the far-reaching implications of her role and actions.
- Sharon Hing replied that she did.
- Tuttle then asked, through the Chair to the gentleman, if he understood the far-reaching implications of his role and actions.
- Richard Meng replied that he did.
- Lam, in closing, said that he would not be at the Council meeting next week because of the Endorsement Hearings which would be held in Moore 100 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

C. ECP Task Force Updates

- Tseng said that there had been a press conference today about ECP, and he thanked Gaulton and Wood for their supportive comments. He said that some of the bigger news outlets had not been there, but that it had still been a success. Tseng said that, on April 29th from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., they would be making a presentation to the Academic Senate to impress on them the need to modify ECP. He said that he was beginning to collect petitions against ECP, which was good news. Tseng also said that, at a Student Worker Front action in Murphy Hall, the Chancellor had agreed to meet with them on the matter. He said they expected the Chancellor to ask the ECP Task Force to collect more data and to postpone any proposed changes for several more years. He said that the Task Force intended to fight any such request. Tseng ended his report by saying that he would be taking a leave of absence from the ECP campaign in the coming weeks, and would be deferring his responsibilities to Martinez.

XI. New Business

A. *Resolution in Support of the Reform of Expected Cumulative Progress

- Palma/Saracho said that a new draft had been passed around, because the one in the Agenda Packet had been superceded.
- Martinez said that one correction needed to be made to the final “Resolved” because the word “until” should be deleted. He said that the Resolution represented Council’s stance, and it incorporated information on the survey and other research done by the ECP Task Force.
- Tripathi asked Martinez to outline the changes.
- Martinez said that there were a lot, and that each one should be looked at individually.
- Nelson asked how many units there were in each course, typically.
- Nelson said that in one of the Resolved, he had asked to change 4-5 units, but not 3-4. He asked Martinez why this had been singled out.

- Wood said that, after reading through all of the free responses on the survey, they found out that students had been frustrated by the fact that the GE classes were worth more units than the upper division classes. She said that the Task Force was simply asking for University Departments to reevaluate this matter.
- Palma/Saracho said that the upper division classes all tended to be 4 units, with the 1-unit classes being special seminars which were conducted in addition to classes.
- Tripathi asked what the implications were of the complete moratorium which the ECP Task Force was requesting.
- Martinez said that they had asked for a complete moratorium because they thought the Faculty might say that there had not been enough time to evaluate the Policy if not given this extended period of time.
- Tripathi asked Martinez if the Task Force was asking for "Minimum Progress" to revert to what it was before ECP.
- Martinez replied that Minimum Progress and ECP were two separate things, and that the proposed moratorium would just be on ECP.
- Tripathi asked if there had been an effort to extrapolate to the entire campus rather than just the surveyed group. He asked if there had been an analysis done that would allow the findings of the ECP Task Force to be generalized for the student body.
- Wood asked Tripathi if he was saying that the Task Force should survey the entire student body.
- Tripathi said that was not what he meant, and explained that he was asking if they were going to extrapolate information from the existing data and generalize it as a representation of the whole student body.
- Palma/Saracho said that the Task Force had made the decision to present the actual information they had obtained from the survey rather than to make potentially inaccurate generalizations. He said further that it would be difficult to generalize because there had been open-ended questions, and it would be hard to establish causation.
- Tripathi said that his reservation was that a lot of these statements were very general, and it was hard to determine whether the policy negatively affected the entire student body.
- Tseng said that the members of the Task Force were confident that the survey was representative of the student body at large, and said that they had done a statistical analysis to make sure that this was a valid assumption.
- Wood said that the Task Force had worked with the Student Research Center and had been told that the populations which took part in the survey had been representative of the undergraduate student body. She said, based on that opinion, it might be okay to say that ECP was negatively affecting the entire student body, but she said they decided on the side of being even more accurate by specifying just the survey respondents.
- Tripathi said his concern was that the data presented and highlighted in the Resolution could be used to say that the overall quality of life had been decreased because of ECP. He said further that his main concern was that a lot of the information was inconclusive. He said he thought that, rather than asking for a moratorium, Council's focus should be on improved academic planning. He said it was his understanding of this Action Item was for Council to make sure that students were aware of these issues rather than trying to pull causal results from the data from which they would invoke change.
- Martinez said it was his understanding that Council had been asked by their constituents to do something about ECP. He said that, out of respect for those constituents, he believed that Council needed to take a stance.
- Lam said that the point of a random sampling was to obtain a representation of the student body. He said that 15% of a population is almost always going to provide an accurate representation. Lam said that, with as many respondents as there were, he thought it was a stretch to say that it was not representative.

- Palma/Saracho said that he would agree with Tripathi if fewer students had responded but, since there had been so many, he felt that the statements in the Resolution were accurate. He said that, having so many respondents legitimizes the work done by the members of the ECP Task Force. Palma/Saracho cited a survey that had been conducted which had been “UC-Wide”, and said that they did not even get 4,000 students to respond.
- Tripathi said that his concern was not with the sample as much as with the conclusions drawn from the data. He said his point was that ECP was not necessarily a terrible policy if it helps students stay on track, and maybe the idea should be that students are here to be students. Tripathi said that perhaps Council should be educating students about ways to work on this entire issue instead of just getting rid of it.
- Wood said that, in addition to the survey data, a lot of research had been done which showed the adverse effects of ECP, and no data showing that ECP was effective in helping students. She said that, in addition to the fact that ECP was harming students, there was no reason not to put a moratorium on this Policy. Wood said that it made no sense to her to simply do an educational campaign on ECP, as they had already done that. She said their efforts in educating students about ECP were reflected in the survey results.
- Tseng said that, in addition to the results of the survey and the research, he thought there were also internal documents within the Administration which indicate that ECP has been ineffective. He reiterated the point that ECP is hurting students, and it was not doing anything good for students. Tseng said that it was the responsibility of this Council to serve the needs of the students, and the moratorium needed to be sought.
- Gruenberg said that his understanding of the re-uniting was that the idea was to increase upper division worth so that ECP could be met.
- Palma/Saracho said that it was also to help meet Full-Time Enrollment Status (FTE). He said that only 90% of students were meeting FTE. Palma/Saracho said that it worked out for some students whose majors offered 5-unit courses.
- Gruenberg said that he was a double major, and he took an average of 16 units right now, from four upper division classes. He said that if the units were increased, then he would suddenly be taking 20 units.
- Palma/Saracho said, for that very reason, UCLA had not done a campus-wide switch. He said that this was why they were asking the departments to re-unit only the deserving classes. Palma/Saracho said that there would be a compromise, like taking 13 units, so the university could get that FTE requirement. He said that different recommendations would come into play with the re-uniting. Palma/Saracho said that making the resources more available to the students would be in their best interest. He said that the university wins because students would be taking a full load, and students would win because they would be meeting FTE.
- Gruenberg said that if some departments began re-uniting, then the college would have to reexamine units as a whole.
- Palma/Saracho agreed that the point which Gruenberg just made should be looked at, because students to take a specific number of classes to fulfill a major.
- Martinez said that it was foolish of Tripathi to call this data inconclusive while, at the same time, defending a policy which was backed by no data. He said that Tseng and Wood had collected all of the data.
- Wood said, in response to Gruenberg, that she agreed with his concerns, but said that the Task Force was not specifying which departments needed to re-unit. She said that it would be the option of each department to reexamine course loads. Wood said that ECP’s recommendation was not a faulty one.
- Tseng said that this needed to be looked at in the context of the educational goal. He said that ECP was designed to save money, and students are not here to save the University money, they are here to get the best education possible. Tseng said that maybe the unit cap should be increased.

- Palma/Saracho said that there might simply be philosophical differences here so, unless there was a specific recommendation to be made, he asked that the matter be brought to a vote.
- Gruenberg asked that the first “Resolved” on the second page reflect an averaging of 39 units per year rather than 13 each quarter.
- Martinez said that it had formerly been 12 units each Quarter.
- Palma/Saracho said that the language suggested that there must be 13 units per Quarter.
- Wood said that this issue had been brought up before but, after discussing this with the Task Force, they decided to present language which recommended that ECP be checked on a yearly basis. She said that they also used this language because they wanted to adhere to the standards set for financial aid.
- Palma/Saracho asked for someone to make a motion or to Call the Question.
- Lee moved and Wood seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of the Reform of Expected Cumulative Progress.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution in Support of the Reform of Expected Cumulative Progress with a vote of 10 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood said that they would not be asking that an ad be published in the Daily Bruin at this time, but said they might make such a request later.
- McLaren recommended that someone proofread the Resolution carefully, especially if they planned to publish it, because she had noticed places where words were in reversed order.

C. Limiting of the USA Spring 2005 Election Leafleting Hours

- Palma/Saracho said that his advice was to limit hours because the process of campaigning was already strenuous enough. He said further that he was concerned that extended hours might result in campaigners putting added pressure on students to vote. Palma/Saracho said that there was a good reason why there have traditionally been limits set on campaigning hours. He said further that he felt unrestricted leafleting could have terrible implications. Palma/Saracho recommended setting hours to leaflet on leafleting days from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. , and from 9:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. on the last day of voting.
- Gruenberg agreed with Palma/Saracho’s recommendations, but said that the wording needed to be very specific , especially if done here tonight at the table.
- Palma/Saracho asked Lam if there was a section in the Election Code where he thought this could be added.
- Lam said that it would go in Section V.C.6.a., and he read that section to Council. (The specific descriptions of each reference are as follows: Section V. Candidate Election Campaigning; Section V.C.: On-Campus Campaigning; Section V.C.6.: Distribution of Campaign Literature and Endorsement Slips. Section V.C.6.a. specifically addresses the issue of campus leaflet days.
- Palma/Saracho proposed the language “the first two days of leafleting will take place from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., with the last day of voting taking place from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.”
- Lam said that the E-Code does not require that any of the days be on Election Day, and said perhaps they could add a clause to extend the hours to 7:00 p.m. if the last day fell on Election Day.
- Wood suggested that language be added which would give the Election Board the discretion to set the hours, rather than to define specific hours in the E-Code.
- Palma/Saracho said that sounded like a very good idea. He then suggested, “The Election Board has the discretion to determine the leafleting hours.”
- Lam suggested that the language be, “The specific leafleting hours will be set by the Election Board.”
- Villarín asked if it would be Lam’s recommendation to use that discretion to have the hours be 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on the first two days, and 9:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. on the last day.

- Palma/Saracho said that there were two issues here, and recommended that they proceed with consideration of Lam's recommended language.
- Wood moved and Villarín seconded to add to Section V.C.6.a. of the Election Code the language, "The specific leafleting hours will be set by the Election Board."
- Council voted to approve the motion to add to Section V.C.6.a. of the Election Code the language, "The specific leafleting hours will be set by the Election Board" with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Palma/Saracho asked if Council had any recommendations for what those hours should be like this year.
- Lee moved to set the USA Spring 2005 Election leafleting hours from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday and Wednesday, and from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Thursday.
- Tuttle asked Lam if he had a time in mind of when he would be informing the candidates of this addition to the Election Code.
- Lam said that he would inform them at the Endorsement Hearings next week.
- Lee retracted her motion, making it a recommendation.
- Palma/Saracho recommended that notification be made by Lam at the Endorsement Hearings, and also recommended that the Election Board have a form for candidates to sign, acknowledging that they had received notification of this addition to the E-Code.
- McLaren asked if Lam thought it was necessary to indicate that the Election Board would set specific leafleting hours if there was a Runoff Election.
- Lam said that it would be taken for granted if there was a runoff.

XII. Announcements

- Corella passed around the revised funding applications. She said that a lot of the changes had to do with the language of the amendments to the Bylaws and the Funding Guidelines. Corella said that, instead of "Officially Recognized Student Organizations" it now just read "Student Organizations". She also said that the application period would now have a rolling timeline, which meant that, so once the money runs out, there would be more for that fiscal year.
- Lee said that the Community Service Commission had voted to take on a new project, and that she would be bringing that to Council for their approval at the next meeting.
- Tuttle asked what the project was.
- Lee said that it was called, Reaching Bigger Goals, and its focus was on social issues in elementary schools.
- Bhuiyan said that, Thursday night, Eclectic would be from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. in the Kerckhoff Coffee House, and next week would be Hip-Hop Awareness Night from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. in Ackerman Grand Ballroom, featuring members of the industry and UCLA Professors. Bhuiyan said that there would be many other events next week and, after listing them very rapidly, he told Council that they were all posted on the CAC website. He closed by saying that, all next week, there would be a display on the Armenian Genocide.

XIII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Corella passed around the attendance sheet.

XIV. Adjournment

- Avila moved and Tseng seconded to adjourn.
- Wood called for Acclamation. Palma/Saracho asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 10:01 p.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler, USAC Minutes Taker