

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday June 7, 2005
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Biniek, Corella, Doan, Hawkins, Kaisey, Kaminsky, Malik, McLaren, Neesby, Nelson, Pham, Sassounian, Sargent, Smeets, Tuttle, Vardner, Williams, Wood, Zai

ABSENT: None

GUESTS: Khadeeja Abdullah, Chris Aquino, Diana Barbadillo, Peter Bautista, Kian Boloori, Matthew Bukirin, Tina Camarador, Sean Canullas, Rhommel Canare, Maegen Clark, Candice Daneshuar, Melinda Dudley, Paymon Ebrahimzadeh, Paimler Francisco, Shareeta Garret, Phoebe Grace, Andy Green, Justin Jiminez, Christina Kaoh, Marc Loresto, Steven Ly, Alex Madrid, Emmanuel Martinez, Morgan Miller, Lauren Miller, Thanh Nguyen, Jennifer Pavitroff, Rita Qatami, Saba Riazati, Jorge Rios, Roy Samaan, Adeste Siph, Julius Tovedo, Tommy Tseng, Berzin Valdez, Liz Vega, Hazel Villasin, Georgina Wakefield

I. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 7:19 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Corella passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Sassounian asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Kaisey asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Zai asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Vardner asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports. He also asked to move up Appointments because of time pressure.
- Wood said that she was adding appointment of the Budget Review Committee under Appointments. She said she was also adding, under New Business, an Action Item entitled Discussion and Decision Regarding Meeting During Finals Week.
- Doan pointed out that Action Items could not be added at the table, according to USAC's Bylaws.
- Wood said that it would be a Special Order of the Day.
- Biniek moved and Smeets seconded to add, as a Special Order of the Day, an item entitled "Discussion and Decision Regarding Meeting During Finals Week under New Business."
- Council voted to approve the motion to add under New Business, as a Special Order of the Day, an item entitled, Discussion and Decision Regarding Meeting During Finals Week with a vote of 5 in favor, 5 opposed, and 0 abstentions, with Wood casting the tie-breaking vote in favor of the motion.
- Neesby reminded Wood that a Special Order of the Day required a 2/3 vote, not a simple majority.
- Wood said that she would open discussion since a number of Council Members seemed to have a problem with the Agenda. She then asked those who voted against the motion to comment on why they voted as they did.
- Vardner said that he had a problem with putting an Action Agenda Item on the Agenda on the day of the meeting because he said he thought that it set a bad precedent.

- Wood said that she had spoken with Council members about putting the appointment of the BRC on the Agenda, and since it was a time sensitive issue, it was necessary to get these people appointed.
- Tuttle said that his advice was that a timely matter that needed to be addressed should be addressed. He said that if Council was going to get into procedural things this year, then it needed to be weighed vis-à-vis the responsibilities of the government. Tuttle said that the five who opposed might want to consider this. He said that if the meeting next week may not come to pass if the Agenda was tossed out here.
- McLaren pointed out that the vote might have been miscounted, because there were 12 voting members present, but only 11 had voted, including Wood.
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to reconsider the motion to add a Discussion and Decision Regarding Meeting During Finals Week under New Business as a Special Order of the Day.
- Tuttle said that, under Robert's Rules of Order, this was referred to as a "Clinch Motion". He said that, if this motion failed, then there was no more discussion to be had on the issue. Tuttle said that a motion to reconsider requires a majority vote in favor. He said that the motion thereafter would require a 2/3 vote to amend the Agenda under a Special Order of the Day.
- Wood again apologized for not putting these items on the Agenda earlier.
- Council voted to reconsider the motion to add a Discussion and Decision Regarding Meeting During Finals Week under New Business as a Special Order of the Day with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Doan said that she had opposed the amendment in the initial vote because she wanted to bring up the importance of putting things on the Agenda within the timetable that is specified in the Bylaws.
- Council voted to approve the Agenda, as amended, with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

III. Approval of the Minutes

May 17, 2005

- Neesby moved and Kaminsky seconded to approve the Minutes of May 17th, 2005.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of May 17th, 2005, as submitted, with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

IV. Special Presentations

Presentation on the Judicial Board – Chief Justice Maegen Clark

- Clark said that she wanted to bring Council up to date on the Judicial Board situation. Clark said that she had met with Nelson and Kenn Heller about the issue of the Judicial Board Advisor, and said that she would be making sure that communication with the University continued into the coming year. Clark said that the second issue was the rules of the Judicial Board. She said that she would be talking with Nelson about changing the rules, and said that doing so would require a majority vote within the Judicial Board. Clark said that her last point was that she was graduating, and she asked Council to appoint students to the four open positions in both a thoughtful and timely manner. She said that was about it, and asked if Council had any questions for her.

Clark left the room to Council's thunderous applause.

LGBT Community at UCLA, Officers of Queer Alliance

- Paymon Ebrahimzadeh introduced himself as one Chair of the UCLA Queer Alliance.
- Georgina Wakefield introduced herself as the Internal Vice Chair.
- Berzin Va ldez introduced himself as the Historian.
- Jennifer Pavitroff introduced herself as the Co-Chair of the Alliance.

- Ebrahimzadeh said that he was here to talk to Council about the importance of LBGT issues here on campus.
- Pavitroff said that there were several issues that they would be talking with Council about, and listed the sources that the information had been taken from.
- Ebrahimzadeh said that in the past year, the LBGT community had 3 suicides here at UCLA. He said that he was asking what this said about the community and about UCLA, and also what changes have happened and can happen to better the situation. Ebrahimzadeh said that right now the only resource for LBGT students was out of Student Psychological Services, run by Dr. Pat Alford-Keating.
- Pavitroff said that the next issue to discuss was Gender-Neutral Restrooms. She said that these were very limited, and said that they would like to see at least one gender-neutral bathroom and changing area in each building on campus. Pavitroff said that this problem could be solved by simply making changing areas with curtains. Pavitroff said that another issue at UCLA was gender-neutral housing, and many UC campuses had these, but not UCLA. She said that UC Riverside had facilities that allow for same-sex or mixed-sex housing and restrooms. Pavitroff said that there were lots of things that UCLA could do, including making floors in the dorms LBGT sensitive.
- Valdez said that right now the Ashe Center automatically assumes that patients are heterosexual. He said that USHIP Insurance also does not cover the hormones or surgery required by Transgender students to live the life they want to.
- Wakefield said that this year the LBGT Center had also been attacked twice. She said that while there had been an outpouring of support, nobody was really addressing the issue on campus.
- Ebrahimzadeh said that if UCLA does not seek out the factors that combine to create the atmosphere that lets these things happen, then there would continue to be issues like these. He said that the peak in suicides and attacks would only continue if not addressed.
- Martez said that LBGT issues need to be at the forefront of USAC's dialogue for change on campus. He also said that there should be financial support for the mentoring program, gender-neutral restrooms and changing areas should be institutionalized, there should be more housing options for LBGT students, and ASHE Center employees should be trained to better serve the needs of the LBGT community.
- Wakefield said that she thought if USAC took a stance on the LBGT issues here at UCLA, then the situation would improve greatly.
- Sassounian asked if any thought had been put toward LBGT Themed Housing. She asked if any backlash had been anticipated or if there had been any marginalization of the LBGT community.
- Ebrahimzadeh said that their research indicated that at other UC's there were no such problems. He said that on the contrary, students felt safer.
- Wakefield said that was why they were advocating simply adding a question to the housing application form.
- Biniek said that every year ORL gets together to have a conference. She said that the university in Boulder had a transgender student who had been an RA on what they called the "Rainbow Floor", and it had all worked out very well.
- Zai said that she was planning to work on advocating LBGT issues, and invited the group to her office to address these issues.
- Wood said that there were a number of Council members who wanted to work on LBGT issues here on campus, and said that this may all combine into an Action Agenda Item for the year.

V. Appointments

- Candice Daneshuar asked Wood if Council could do the Campus Programming Committee Appointments first, as she had to leave.
- Doan passed around a summary sheet which listed how the Appointments Review Committee (ARC) had voted on each appointee that had been forwarded to them.

- Wood explained to Council that she had reviewed all of the applicants for the positions that were being appointed tonight, and the candidates being brought before Council were by far the most qualified. She directed Council members to their Agenda Packets, where she had included a full report on each candidate. Wood said that there were five criteria for appointment to these positions, and she had made a list of how each candidate was qualified under each of these points. She told Council that the criteria were (1) demonstrates knowledge of position, (2) demonstrates broad and relevant leadership experience in serving the campus, (3) demonstrates ability to effectively advocate for the students, (4) demonstrates motivation, vision, and goals for the position, and (5) demonstrates ability to fulfill the responsibilities of the position. Wood told Council that for each candidate, she would explain why each person qualified under each of the five aforementioned criteria. *For the purpose of the minutes, and in the interest of saving space, only one point from each of Wood's five areas of qualification will be included*

Campus Programming Committee (CPC)

- Wood said that she had forwarded Candice Daneshuar to the ARC for appointment to the alternate position on the CPC. Wood said that Daneshuar was qualified because (1) she had a wide variety of involvements which ensured knowledge of the position, (2) she had been the president of Bruins for Israel, (3) she had extensive community service experience, (4) she understood that her position as a CPC member was integral in the life of students, and (5) because her variety of experiences on organizations as well as committees would ensure her ability to fulfill the responsibilities of the CPC.
- Neesby asked if the applicant would ever be speaking. He said that was almost more important to him than hearing what Wood and Doan had to say.
- Wood said that hearing her recommendation, the ARC's recommendation, and being able to ask the applicant questions during the ARC's interview should be enough.
- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Daneshuar with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. She listed some of Daneshuar's vast accomplishments, saying that the one drawback was that she had not programmed by herself but, since she was an alternate on CPC, Doan saw this as okay.
- Biniek moved and Hawkins seconded to appoint Candice Daneshuar to the alternate position on the Campus Programming Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Candice Daneshuar to the alternate position on the Campus Programming Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood said that she had forwarded Kian Bolori to the ARC for appointment to the Campus Programming Committee. Wood said that Bolori was qualified because (1) he had already served on the CPC for one year, (2) he had served on the board of the Queer Alliance, (3) he had represented the LBGT community well, (4) he had clearly outlined goals, vision, and motivation, and (5) his ability to fulfill responsibilities of the CPC Chair have already been shown by his prior experience on the committee.
- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Bolori with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. Doan said that the ARC was impressed with Bolori, and said that he had been able to give special attention to a great number of applicants that applied last year. She also said that the ARC had also been impressed by his intention to draw upon the expertise of the CPC Advisor.
- Neesby said that he was interested in experience and also about objectivity to student groups. He said that he knew Bolori had written Viewpoints against Bruin Republicans, and had also worked for Student Power. Neesby said that his concern was Bolori's ability to fund equitably.
- Wood said that she would let Bolori respond to Neesby's concern about his objectivity, but added that council's decisions needed to be made based on the qualification of applicants, not based on their past.

- Sassounian corrected Wood's remark by pointing out that "Objectivity" was one of the five criteria.
- Wood said that being opinionated did not prevent someone from also being objective.
- Neesby said that he did not like bringing this up, but as much as past politics don't want to be talked about, he felt he had to mention it.
- Bolori said that he did have personal politics, but he was objective and used criteria to seek out objectivity. He said that in the past, he had funded groups that he did not support, and intended to do so in the future if they met criteria for funding. Bolori said that Pam Cysner, the CPC Advisor, had also recommended him, and said that her opinion should be worth a lot.
- Wood reiterated that slate politics should never enter the discussion of approving candidates, and said that in terms of someone's ability to be viewpoint neutral, they should be able to be neutral regardless of political affiliation.
- Neesby thanked Bolori for his response.
- Hawkins moved and Doan seconded to appoint Kian Bolori to the Campus Programming Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Kian Bolori to the Campus Programming Committee with a vote of 10 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Wood said that she had forwarded Sean Canullas to the ARC for appointment to the Campus Programming Committee. Wood said that Canullas was qualified because (1) he had extensive funding experience with a variety of different programs, (2) he worked with high school outreach projects, (3) he had a history of working with a variety of different groups on campus, (4) he wanted to actively "further [his] ability to manage funds in a productive and efficient manner", and (5) his extensive programming experience would enable applicants to serve effectively as a CPC member.
- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Canullas with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. Doan said that the ARC had also seen a lot of experience that Canullas brought to the table.
- Neesby asked if Canullas could tell Council just how big Samahang Pilipino Culture Night was.
- Canullas said that there had been a cast of nearly 200 this year, with an audience of 1,700. He said that it was not just the performance, but also getting a feeling for Pilipino Culture in the process.
- Biniek moved and Pham seconded to appoint Sean Canullas to the Campus Programming Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Sean Canullas to the Campus Programming Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Wood said that she had forwarded Thanh Nguyen to the ARC for appointment to the Campus Programming Committee. Wood said that Nguyen was qualified because (1) she had applied for CPC funding numerous times for large-scale programs, (2) she had been a member of the Vietnamese Student Union Board for four years, (3) she had experience with coordinating and implementing campaigns, (4) she had clear goals of improving communication between CPC and student groups, and (5) she had extensive knowledge of funding sources and programming from her work with VSU Culture Night.
- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Nguyen with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. Doan said that the majority of the ARC had recommended Nguyen because of her experience with programming, and listed some of her experience.
- Biniek moved and Hawkins seconded to appoint Thanh Nguyen to the Campus Programming Committee.
- Council voted not to appoint Thanh Nguyen to the Campus Programming Committee with a vote of 5 in favor, 7 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Wood said that she was surprised by the vote, and asked Council if they might indicate concerns that they had with appointees before going to the vote. She said that they were going through all of their recommendations for a reason, and that should be the point of everyone's decision.

Community Activities Committee (CAC)

- Wood said that she had forwarded Shareeta Garret to the ARC for appointment to the alternate position on the Community Activities Committee. Wood said that Garret was very qualified, and told Council about some of Garret's accomplishments.
- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Garret with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. Doan said that the ARC had recommended Garret because of her experience with different responsibilities on campus and her ability to articulate her aspirations during the interview.
- Doan moved and Vardner seconded to appoint Shareeta Garret to the Alternate Position on the Community Activities Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Shareeta Garret to the Alternate Position on the Community Activities Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood said that she had forwarded Jorge Rios to the ARC for appointment to the Community Activities Committee. Wood said that Rios was qualified because (1) he promoted education and community development outside of Westwood, (2) he had experience with IDEAS, Immigration Rights Coalition, and other tutorial programs, (3) he understood the importance of community involvement in the students' development, (4) he believed that students should be educated and organized around issues of social justice and civic action, and (5) because he was confident that he would be able to meet the obligations of the position.
- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Rios with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. Doan said that the ARC had recommended Rios because of his experience with non-profit organizations, though they were worried about his time commitments. She said that he did not have experience that applied to the CAC itself.
- Vardner said that he thought this was actually a positive aspect. He said that it would be good to get an outside opinion from someone that had no experience with CAC.
- Neesby asked Rios to summarize his résumé.
- Rios said that he had worked with low-income UCLA students, and also with the DREAM Act, which helped students integrate into education in the United States. He said that he had also helped Low-Income workers acquire workplace skills through an outreach program.
- Neesby asked how Rios could alleviate any time-commitment concerns that Council might have.
- Rios said that he had loaded his schedule this year so that he would only be taking three classes next year. He said that he should have more than enough time.
- Smeets moved and Neesby seconded to appoint Jorge Rios to the Community Activities Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Jorge Rios to the Community Activities Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood said that she would move on to Khadeeja Abdullah, even though she was not present. She reminded council that it was not required of appointees to be present. Wood said that Abdullah was qualified because she (1) understood the importance of having no bias to one particular way of thinking, (2) was the Internal Vice President of the Muslim Students Association, (3) understood the importance of working with many different groups, (4) wished to promote groups to bring up educationally pressing issues, and (5) has fewer commitments for the coming year than she had when she was so successful the previous year.

- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Abdullah with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. Doan said that the ARC recognized both Abdullah's knowledge of and upbeat attitude about the CAC.
 - Neesby asked to table the appointment until Abdullah was present either later at this meeting or another meeting.
 - Zai agreed.
 - Vardner said that this might be a bad precedent to set, as someone might be extremely qualified but unable to attend a meeting at some later date.
 - Wood said that additionally, Council members had all been invited to these interviews, where they would have had the opportunity to ask these questions.
 - Neesby said that he just did not feel comfortable approving someone if he or she was not here. He said that he wanted the opportunity to ask questions. Neesby said that with regard to precedent, he was unconcerned because he anticipated a meeting next week where appointees could be approved.
 - Vardner said that the way this was supposed to work was that Council members were supposed to get the applications with the Agenda Packet the Friday before the meeting. He said that he thought they could get a commitment from the chair to follow this procedure in the future. Vardner concluded by pointing out that the appointment could be dealt with next week.
 - Sassounian asked if tabling this for next week would create a binding precedent.
 - Wood said that tabling because of absence would not set a binding precedent.
 - Neesby said that the precedent here was situational. He said that it would also just have been a motion to table, which meant that it could later be taken from the table at the current meeting were the person to arrive.
 - Tuttle said that his take on the issue was that tabling this would indicate that the majority of Council wanted to wait, and to do so would be making a policy decision. He also said that this would be creating a threshold of "excuse for absence", and said that this would need to be addressed at some point.
- Khadeeja Abdullah arrived at the meeting.*
- Neesby withdrew his desire to table the motion. He asked Abdullah to expand on her résumé.
 - Abdullah explained that she had gone to high schools to do peer advising. She said that she had been both a tutor and a mentor through this. Abdullah also said that she had worked in lower income areas and in incarceration settings. She said that in all of these areas she had done peer advising.
 - Malik moved and Kaisey seconded to appoint Khadeeja Abdullah to the Community Activities Committee.
 - Council voted to appoint Khadeeja Abdullah to the Community Activities Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood said that she had forwarded Patricia Alfaro to the ARC for appointment to the Community Activities Committee. Wood said that Alfaro was qualified because she (1) would promote new projects that outreach to communities not already serviced, (2) had written proposals, attended hearings, and secured funding through other sources, (3) had worked with youth from all of Los Angeles to implement A-G requirements in the entire LAUSD, (4) believed that students had a responsibility to help community members empower themselves, and (5) had various other commitments relevant to the CAC position.
 - Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Alfaro with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. Doan said that the ARC had recommended Alfaro because of her experience with CAC related projects. She said that Alfaro also had experience funding projects, and also with starting new projects.
 - Biniek said that one of the projects was an independent community service project, and Alfaro had gotten funding by herself from the community. She said that Alfaro had a lot of experience through this with reaching out to communities that had otherwise not been tapped.

- Pham moved and Hawkins seconded to appoint Patricia Alfaro to the Community Activities Committee.
 - Neesby asked where she was at the moment.
 - Doan said that the ARC had extended an invitation to these candidates to be present, but they had not explicitly been told that they needed to be here. She said she thought that it was unfair to leave these appointments pending since the candidates did not know that they needed to be here, especially on only one day's notice.
 - Neesby said that he did not want to burden the Council, but he would appreciate being given more time to review the applications, and the ability to question the candidates directly.
 - Biniek told Neesby to go ahead and ask the questions and perhaps Council could answer them.
 - Neesby said that he would like to know why the candidate had capitalized the words "Student Power" in her application.
 - Biniek said that the same thing had concerned her, and she was a member of the Student Power slate. She said that this was interesting because she did not know the nominee, so she was sure that there was no reference to the slate. Biniek said that she thought this reference was independent of USAC politics.
 - Tuttle said that Council was now discussing someone who was not here to "defend" herself. He said that it might be in the best interest of the nominating body to allow this person to speak on her own behalf. Tuttle said that it would be useful to protect her interest by delaying this appointment.
 - Hawkins said, with regard to questions for candidates, that since it was optional for nominees to be present at the USAC meeting, and since this was known by everyone, perhaps Council members who wanted to ask questions of the nominees should go to the interviews that are held by the ARC and ask the questions there.
 - Sassounian said that she would abstain from discussing Alfaro, but said that she did know her, and thinks that Alfaro is a great girl. She said, however, that if she did not know her, the application itself would have alarmed her at least to the point of abstaining from voting. Sassounian also said that, with regard to notice about attending the interviews, she had ten hours or less to plan to attend the interviews. She said that if the nominees were not going to show up for the vote, then Council members should be given more notice about attending the ARC interviews.
 - Doan said that since the deadline had been extended on the applications, she had not received the applications until Sunday morning. She said that she had done interviews all day Sunday and Monday. Doan said that in the future, the applications would go to the ARC at least four days in advance, and more than 24 hours notice would be given to Council members.
 - Neesby said that these circumstances were unusual since this was an expeditious appointment, and with that knowledge Council needed to make a better effort with this. He also said that accusations against an absent person should not be made, and said that he would have liked to ask these questions of Alfaro directly.
- A guest at the meeting told Council that Patricia Alfaro was at a funeral at the moment.*
- Wood again said that the applicants were being appointed based on their qualifications, not their slate politics. She said that this has been reiterated repeatedly, and to negatively talk about someone due to a certain organization or slate that they may have mentioned went against viewpoint neutrality. Wood said that looking at one's ability to be viewpoint neutral should be paramount.
 - Sassounian said that her points had not been negative against Alfaro, but her concerns were, in fact, directly in line with viewpoint neutrality. She referenced Wood's candidate qualification point 3, "Demonstrates ability to effectively advocate for the students", saying that she had read a statement in the application that raised a red flag regarding Alfaro's viewpoint neutrality.
 - Wood said that to say affiliation with a slate negates neutrality would be to indict many members of this very Council. She said that this whole conversation was out of order.

- Zai said that she did not hear people attacking anyone, and it was not a question of whether or not people could be viewpoint neutral.
- Neesby said that the point of viewpoint neutrality had been taken somewhat out of context. He said that it was important for a funding body to be viewpoint neutral, and he said that he felt he had the right to bring up those concerns with a nominee.
- Neesby moved to table the appointment of Patricia Alfaro to the Community Activities Committee.
- Tuttle asked if the motion was to table until next week.
- Neesby said that, according to the Bylaws, it would be put off until next week, but he could move to take it from the table later at tonight's meeting if Alfaro were to arrive.
- McLaren asked if the motion to table overrode the motion to approve.
- Neesby said that it did since it was a subsidiary motion.
- Tuttle asked if this was a motion to table either until the end of the meeting or until next week, because Robert's Rules said that tabling was a kill-motion.
- Neesby said that the Bylaws allowed for it to be taken from the table later tonight but, if it was not, it would automatically go to next week.
- Biniek encouraged Council to seek out Alfaro during the coming week to talk to her in case she could not come to the next meeting of council.
- Lam said that Council was going above and beyond the tried and true process, which did not require individuals to come to the meeting at which they were to be approved.
- Wood said that the point was well received because of the timely nature of the issue.
- Pham asked if interviewing the nominee on a speaker-phone would be sufficient.
- Neesby said that would be okay, and he would make a motion to remove the item from the table if Alfaro could speak with them on the phone.
- Vardner Called the Question, seconded by Neesby.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the motion to table the appointment of Patricia Alfaro with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Council voted to table the motion with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Associated Students of UCLA Board of Directors (ASUCLA BOD)

- Wood said that she had forwarded Christina Kaoh to the ARC for appointment to the ASUCLA Board of Directors. Wood said that Kaoh was qualified because she (1) showed in-depth understanding of the relationships between the members of the Board, (2) had been a member of the Social Justice Alliance, (3) had extensive experience advocating for students and workers, (4) had a clear set of goals to further the vision of the Board of Directors of ASUCLA, and (5) demonstrated the ability to fulfill the responsibilities of the position.
- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Kaoh with a vote of all three in favor, none opposed. Doan said that the ARC had recommended Kaoh because of her work with the BOD in the past and her knowledge of its workings. She said that Kaoh had also provided ideas about soliciting students about the role of the BOD on campus.
- Sargent asked if this was a two-year appointment.
- Wood said that it was.
- Sargent asked if Kaoh would be here for both years.
- Kaoh said that she would.
- Smeets asked why the Social Justice Alliance had specifically decided to target Taco Bell and not ASUCLA.
- Kaoh said that there were obviously many people who bought those tomatoes, but ASUCLA had policies protecting themselves from making such mistakes.
- Biniek said that in organizing a campaign, one must pick their targets. She said that taking on Taco Bell had been a smart move.
- Williams asked if Kaoh could attend the retreat.
- Kaoh said that she could.
- Vardner said that he saw she was knowledgeable, but his concerns lay in the viewpoint argued and the positions that Kaoh had taken on various issues. He said that he had

- been elected to this Council based on his opinions, and one of these had been to look into creating a campus bar. Vardner said that the point of view that he saw in Kaoh was similar to those of USAC's appointees to the BOD last year, and he would like to see a new point of view.
- Biniek said that people should be appointed based on their merit and accomplishments, not on their opinions on certain issues. She said that a good candidate will not let bias come into making decisions, but will make them based on the best interest of the students.
 - Vardner agreed with Biniek, but he argued that the Board set policy, and wondered if it was right to have such a one-sided representation.
 - Wood said that Kaoh was undoubtedly the most qualified person for this position, having more experience than any of the other candidates. She said that Kaoh's experience across the board, from leadership positions to working with Trademarks and Licensing, would allow her to bring her opinions to the BOD.
 - Neesby said that there is value in what Wood was saying, but there was a point to be made that policy was opinion. He said that to say opinion doesn't matter is wrong. Neesby said that he agreed with Wood that one person could not represent the whole student body, and because of that it would be best to create an environment of diverse opinion.
 - Wood said that she was simply advocating looking at an individual's qualifications.
 - Doan said that she agreed with Neesby because, using the example of the elections, Council members had been elected because of their opinions. She said that it was Council's job to make sure that there was diverse representation on the ASUCLA Board.
 - Tuttle said that last year he had noticed a pattern of undergraduate members of the BOD coming to Council to keep them informed about the Board's actions and plans. He asked if that commitment would be continued by this year's undergrad appointees to the Board.
 - Wood said yes, that they would be coming to meetings this year, as well.
 - Biniek pointed out that, in her application, Kaoh had, indicated her interest in making the Board more open to students, and to also seek their input. She also said that Kaoh was intending to work with Council to get their input on ASUCLA issues, and she was sure that this would create an even more diverse atmosphere.
 - Emmanuel Martinez from the ASUCLA BOD said that he was not speaking on behalf of any of the candidates, but it did not matter what political alliances the members had. He explained to Council that his political affiliation had never entered into any of the decisions or input that he made on the BOD. Martinez said that these individuals would be accountable to USAC, and Council could direct these individuals. He said that he had just wanted to clarify this.
 - Williams said that, actually, the Board required individuals to be fiduciaries to ASUCLA, acting in the best interest of ASUCLA, not necessarily of USAC.
 - Neesby said that he had not intended to offend, and piggybacked on Williams' comment that the chancellor had instructed Council that they could not direct any appointees.
 - Sassounian said that since the BOD was a two-year appointment with only four members, diversity of opinion and ideas at the table with regard to decision-making was clearly written into the Board's guidelines.
 - Wood said that, having read all of the applications for the Board positions, she was convinced that Kaoh had the most experience and the greatest ability to serve the student body. She said that it is incredibly important to have a qualified individual in this position.
 - Vardner agreed with Sassounian, saying that the opinion of this applicant was very important. He said that he also believed that Kaoh's opinion was already represented on the BOD and, while he encouraged the appointment of qualified individuals, he also wanted to act in the best interest of what he wanted to see changed.
 - Wood asked the BOD members to explain the responsibilities of the individual members.

- Martinez said that the responsibilities were first and foremost to serve as fiduciaries to ASUCLA. He said that they also had to ensure that the mission and the vision of the Association were fulfilled.
- Williams said that the Board of Directors sets the plan and the strategies for the Association.
- Wood said that Kaoh was very qualified, and that was why she should be appointed.
- Sargent said that he had been a part of the Council that had voted to make this a two-year term. He said that this was because it took that long for individuals to become knowledgeable of the Boards' structure and their role in it. Sargent said that he had also worked with the Disney Board of Directors, and a problem for them had been having too little diversity of opinion, so he recognized both sides of the argument which were being presented.
- Biniek said that setting a precedent that each opinion had to be present on the Board was not really appropriate. She said that the most important thing was to make sure that candidates could fulfill the requirements of the job.
- Neesby said that, while he would like to defer to the judgment of the ARC, he could not agree that Kaoh was, in fact, the most qualified candidate.
- Wood said that she could show Neesby all of the applicants, but this was a presidential appointment, and she assured Neesby that she had gone through every single application. She said that, in all honesty, she was also a little offended, as these were presidential appointments, and she knew a lot about what a good candidate was. Wood acknowledged that Neesby might disagree with her on this point.
- Neesby said that he had meant no offense.
- Lam said that he had stood before USAC some time ago just as Kaoh is now. He said that a question had been raised about his ability to be neutral, but that Council ended up approving his appointment because they realized that people who are appointed know they have a job to do that is separate from their other areas of involvement. Lam said that many analogies had been brought up, but he believed the important distinction here was that the elected members of this Council were supposed to be advocates.
- Sassounian said, to address Biniek's comment, it was her belief that there might be other applicants that may fit better into this role. She said that there might be different applicants with different viewpoints and ideologies.
- Biniek said the fact was that there was a qualified applicant being presented to them, and she thought that Council was taking a great risk if they voted Kaoh down based on their hopes that they would get a better candidate. Biniek reminded Council that this was a presidential appointment, and the student body had elected Wood to make these appointments.
- Vardner said that he recognized the presidential right to appoint, but he also recognized his right to approve or deny. He said that if students were really to be best served, perhaps students should be polled monthly on what they wanted from the BOD..
- Wood said, with regard to other students who applied, that no one had worked as much with the Board, done as much advocating, or had as much comprehension of the BOD as Kaoh.
- Neesby said that this was still a deferment to Wood's opinion. He said that, with reference to Biniek's comment, Robert's Rules of Order allowed for Kaoh to be approved later, even if not appointed tonight.
- Zai agreed, and asked if Council could look at the pool of applicants to determine whether or not they found Kaoh to, in fact, be the best candidate. She also said that the average student probably does not comprehend the power of the president to appoint, and that's why everyone was here.
- Hawkins said it was his understanding that the process begins with the president choosing someone, then forwarding that nominee to the ARC for its review and recommendation, with the nominee finally being brought to Council to be voted on. He said that the president has to choose the nominees because Council cannot choose them. Hawkins said he felt that Council was wasting time, and that they were not taking the timeline into account.

- Zai said that the people who were hesitant to vote on this position at this time did not want to vote down a good candidate, and she recommended that Council not force a vote at this time.
- Biniek moved and Hawkins seconded to appoint Christina Kaoh to the ASUCLA Board of Directors.
- Vardner urged Kaoh to be involved with Council, regardless of the result of this vote.
- Kaoh said that Council would be doing a disservice to her and to the BOD to only look at the issue of Taco Bell, as there were many more issues and responsibilities for a Board Member to deal with. She closed by saying she felt that there was much that she could bring to the BOD.
- Smeets said that nobody had questioned her stance on Taco Bell, but said that he was curious why she had addressed Taco Bell and not ASUCLA.
- Vardner Called the Question, seconded by Doan.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the motion to appoint Christina Kaoh to the ASUCLA Board of Directors with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- The motion to appoint Christina Kaoh to the ASUCLA Board of Directors failed to pass with a vote of 5 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Tuttle asked about the issue of reconsideration. He asked Neesby if it was his opinion that someone on the prevailing side would have to bring this issue back up in order for it to be reconsidered.
- Neesby said that it depended on whether or not a “session” was defined as one meeting, or if it was the duration of an entire year. He said that, if a session is a whole year, then the issue had to be reopened by a member of the prevailing side. He said that if a session is one meeting, then it could simply be brought up at the next meeting.
- Tuttle thanked Neesby for his clarification.
- Wood said that she had also forwarded Matt Bukirin to the ARC for appointment to the ASUCLA Board of Directors. Wood said that Bukirin was qualified because he (1) showed understanding of the fiduciary responsibilities of the board, (2) had been a mentor through the SPACE Outreach Project, (3) had been a coordinator of the P.U.L.S.E. Campaign, (4) had expressed concrete goals for his tenure as a BOD member, and (5) had stated that the BOD would be his first priority.
- Doan said that the ARC was also recommending Bukirin with a vote of two in favor, one opposed. She said that Bukirin was experienced from FiCom and also from Academic Affairs. She said that he was familiar with funding allocations, and was well prepared for the job.
- Kaminsky asked about the minority opinion on ARC.
- Doan said that the minority opinion resulted from a concern about Bukirin’s ability to interact with ASUCLA Administrators.
- Martinez said that Bukirin’s experience had prepared him for this role, as there was no way to become more experienced than by being on the Board itself.
- Bukirin said that he was prepared for this not by being directly connected to the BOD, but by having interacted with them since he first came to UCLA. He said that every time he shopped in the store or worked on funding allocations he was interacting with the BOD’s policies.
- Wood said that all of Council should agree that the role of the BOD is to represent the student body and to serve them. She said that working with ASUCLA administration is unimportant in comparison to the individual’s ability to interact with students. Wood said that Bukirin was clearly articulate and could work with the Board members.
- Sargent said that the Alumni Association had appointed two members to the ASUCLA BOD, and asked if Bukirin had any experience with funding.
- Bukirin said that being on Finance Committee had prepared him by having him look at applications, making sure that applications were complete and the applicants had a real need, all the while connecting this back to the students on campus.
- Neesby said that he was still a bit confused about the ARC’s minority opinion.

- Doan said that in a question about working with the Board of Directors, Bukirin had indicated that he had not.
- Biniek said that Kaoh was a very strong candidate precisely because of her answer to this question, and that Bukirin was also prepared and qualified.
- Sassounian said that had been weighed in addressing the last candidate, so perhaps that should not be a detractor in consideration of this candidate. She also said that she was a little shaky on what the criteria here were exactly.
- Biniek said that this was not a requirement; it was simply why Kaoh was that much more qualified. She said that the criteria are not whether or not the person is connected to the BOD, but just their ability to advocate. Biniek also added that, with regard to an earlier comment by Vardner, Bukirin would not have tunnel-vision, as he had not had experience working with the BOD, and would be bringing new ideas to the table.
- Smeets said that he had sat in on Bukirin's interview, and asked for some resolutions of Bukirin's about making Town Halls here on campus.
- Bukirin said that after working on the P.U.L.S.E. campaign, he did recognize how hard this was. He said that this was why he would like to use the resources of the BOD to make these larger Town Halls and do other outreach in the coming year.
- Wood pointed out on Bukirin's application where he had talked about the Taco Bell issue and the On-Campus Bar. She said that Bukirin supported the return of Taco Bell and the establishment of a bar on campus. Wood said that, having worked on such a successful campaign, Bukirin should not cause any concerns amongst the members of Council.
- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to appoint Matt Bukirin to the ASUCLA Board of Directors.
- Council approved the motion to appoint Matt Bukirin to the ASUCLA Board of Directors with a vote of 5 in favor, 5 opposed, 2 abstentions, and Wood breaking the tie.

Finance Committee Chairperson

- Wood said that she had forwarded Hazel Villasin to the ARC for appointment as Chair of the Finance Committee. Wood said that Villasin was qualified because she (1) understood the need for student organizations to take advantage of additional funding from SAFE, (2) would hold and co-program workshops with other USAC offices to specifically explain the funding process, (3) had worked in various student organizations, (4) had concrete plans to promote funding sources to student organizations, and (5) enjoys budgeting and working with numbers.
- Doan said that the majority opinion of the ARC had been to approve Villasin, with a vote of 2 in favor and one opposed. Doan said that Villasin was qualified because of her experience with the changes in the funding process and because of her ideas about how to improve the funding committees themselves.
- Sargent said that he was FiCom chair many years ago, and said that Villasin had a lot of campus involvement history. He said that the job is very time consuming, and asked if she thought that she could do the job to the fullest.
- Villasin said that she would be returning next year as a staff member, which would not be as time consuming. She said that her other commitments were not as time consuming, as they had optional events that she could attend.
- Sargent asked if she was in SPCN this year and if she was planning on doing it next year.
- Villasin said that she was not sure.
- Sargent asked if she knew how many members were on the Finance Committee, and asked how she was planning to make it larger.
- Villasin said that she wanted to increase the staff size.
- Doan said that she really liked how Villasin was planning to recruit from other accounting areas on campus. She said that she would like to see the funding body as a spectrum of people from different organizations, but all from accounting fields.

- Villasin said that she was planning on contacting the other FiCom applicants to find out if they would be interested in working with her next year.
- Vardner asked Villasin how she would make more groups knowledgeable about funding options.
- Villasin said that she was planning to create a brochure for student organizations to be available at CSP, in addition to utilizing the USAC website to make students more aware. She also said that she would ask CSP to contact her about any new organizations so that she could go over the funding process with them.
- Vardner said that, since contingency is supposed to be for small programs, he asked Villasin what she would be looking for in the applications.
- Villasin said that as long as groups meet the minimum criteria, she would follow the guidelines to see how well they need that funding. She said that she did not feel that student groups should be denied funding.
- Doan moved and Hawkins seconded to approve the appointment of Hazel Villasin to the position of Finance Committee Chairperson.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Hazel Villasin to the position of Finance Committee Chairperson with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Budget Review Director

- Wood said that she had also forwarded Rita Qatami to the ARC for appointment to the position of the Budget Review Director. Wood said that Qatami was qualified because she (1) had extensive knowledge of the funding application process due to involvement in two offices, (2) had extensive experience both working with students and serving on funding bodies, (3) had planned and implemented over thirty programs, (4) understood the importance of bridging the gap between student groups and USAC by increasing visibility of funding resources for organizations and their programs, and (5) understood the integral part of funding in the success of student programming.
- Doan said that the majority opinion of the ARC was to recommend Qatami for the position of BRD, with a vote of 2 in favor and one opposed. She said that Qatami had lots of experience both with programming and with funding, making her a good candidate for the position.
- Biniek added by saying that Qatami's ORL experience also included her work on the budgeting side, which meant that she had worked both on giving money out and also in budgeting.
- Sargent asked how involved Qatami would be next year.
- Qatami said that she would have enough time, saying that she would only be in the pre-law society and the United Arab Society.
- Wood said that Qatami had the time to spend on this position, and that she had confidence in Qatami's ability.
- Neesby asked Qatami whether or not she had specifically tried to revoke the Bruin Democrats charter.
- Qatami said that she was sure everyone had used AOL Instant Messenger. She said that the removal of the charter had been referenced in "away" messages, but she had not gotten involved until several days into the ordeal. Qatami said that she had not really been involved, and was unsure of what the eventual outcome had been.
- Vardner asked what the message was.
- Wood said that Qatami could answer that question if she chose, but Wood was sure that it would not compromise her objectivity.
- Qatami said that a lot of people used away messages to blow off steam, and this would not have any influence on her position. She said that she knew over 40 groups had been denied funding last year, and she wanted every group to get funding this year. Qatami said that it was her job to help students and to make sure that they were successful.

- Smeets said that some groups were not funded because they did not serve off campus, and asked Qatami how she felt about student groups who served their constituency, but not the community.
- Qatami said that she had noticed how many groups that had not been applying, on account of knowing that they would be denied due to those patterns. She said that she wanted to ensure that these very groups knew their eligibility to be funded through outreach. Qatami said that it is not only important to communicate to the student groups through workshops, but CSP advisors should also be educated. She said that it should be her job to make sure that the students be told why they were not funded or how they did not meet minimum requirements.
- Sargent said that unlike the FiCom chair who has the right to offer discretionary funding, the BRD is not actually a decision-maker.
- Qatami said that she still thought it was her job to bridge the gap between USAC and student organizations. She said that in addition to that, she wanted to make sure students knew how to tap into funds.
- Biniek asked, as a Resident Advisor, how Qatami thought her residents felt about approaching her.
- Qatami said that her experience as an RA had prepared her for this position because of how important it is to be objective with roommate conflicts. She said that if students ever feel that their RA is being biased then it defeats the very purpose of the job.
- Wood said that there were very few BRD applicants, none of whom had ever sat on a funding body, and none of whom had ever worked with USAC to any degree. She told Council that Qatami was the only applicant that could possibly do this job.
- Vardner said he felt that what happened with the Bruin Democrats was that some people had tried to kick a group off of campus. He said that this disturbed him greatly.
- Wood reminded him that Qatami had nothing to do with that.
- Vardner said, rightly so, but the topic should never be treated lightly.
- Wood thanked him for his point, but said that it was irrelevant to this discussion.
- Doan said that ORL Funding was very different from USAC funding, and asked Qatami how she saw them as different.
- Qatami said that ORL funding was not completely open, as applicants were required to step out during deliberation.
- Zai said that when she was on Arts Council, she had been allowed to sit in on the deliberations, while only the applicant had been asked to leave the room.
- Qatami said that the funding was very different, and said that she had extensive experience since she had been on both sides of the funding process. She said that she had also experienced a more comfortable and more objective process through open deliberations. Qatami said that the real point here was to address more student concerns. She said that what needs to be done is to address more student needs. She said that she wanted to institutionalize a formal report for funding and applicants. She said that this would allow them to have a greater picture of the system, because in the end she was an advocate for students.
- Vardner asked if any of the experience she had was off campus or off the hill.
- Qatami said that she had worked on a program through the IVP office called Fear Factor, and she had helped coordinate this both in Kerckhoff and in Ackerman.
- Hawkins moved and Pham seconded to appoint Rita Qatami to the position of Budget Review Director.
- Wood acknowledged the underlying concern about the Bruin Democrats, and asked if anyone had any more questions.
- Neesby said that he did not know of any validity to the allegations or the response, so he would defer to Wood.
- Vardner said that he was simply responding to the lightness with which the issue was addressed at this table.
- The motion to appoint Rita Qatami to the position of Budget Review Director failed with a vote of 5 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention.

- Wood apologized to Qatami, saying how qualified she thought she was. She also urged Council to weigh the qualifications of a candidate rather than their particular affiliations.
- Sassounian responded to Wood's remark that slate politics were influencing decisions at the table, saying that she was offended by such a suggestion.
- Wood noted the point, and apologized, saying she had not intended any offense. She said that her issue was that there were only a few minor concerns brought up during the discussion of Qatami, and did not understand why the vote had come out the way that it did.
- Kaisey moved and Vardner seconded to take a recess.
- Council voted to recess at 11:10 p.m. with a vote of 9 in favor, 3 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood called the meeting back to order at 11:20 p.m.

Office Space Allocation Committee

- Wood said that she thought these appointments were out of line with the Bylaws, and wanted to talk with Vardner about this before making these appointments.
- Sargent said that the Bylaws made it pretty clear that this was the president's prerogative, and if she didn't want to approve, then it had to wait.
- Neesby said that there needed to be a motion to table this.
- Vardner said that the Bylaws were in conflict with the stated responsibilities set out for the Facilities Commissioner. He said that he has been a strong advocate of activating the Office Space Allocation Committee, and that he has already been contacted by many student groups regarding the issue. Vardner said that the criteria for this committee were based on a Supreme Court Ruling, and while there was risk in allocating, he still felt that it was important to appoint the committee now so that they could start figuring out how they would be going about their job. He said that this committee could look at the guidelines, figure out if they need to be changed, and then follow through on those decisions. Vardner said that he would move to approve Kaminsky, Malik, and Zai.
- Wood said that she really thought this was a discussion that needed to be hashed out more. She said that the Bylaws said in many instances that the president had the right to appoint this committee, while the Facilities Commissioner had the right to make recommendations. Wood said that she did not want to rush into any appointments, and said that they should talk more about this. She said that it would also be good to wait for the ASUCLA Entities Committee to first meet, and while it was good to engage in proactive behavior, she also thought that they should come to some consensus about this.
- Tuttle said that, independent of any parliamentary procedures at hand, he was not aware of any previous Judicial Board cases that applied to this issue. He said that there are two conflicting sections of the Constitution itself where, according to one section, the Facilities Commissioner recommends appointees for Council's approval but, according to another section of the Constitution, the President is to make all of the appointments. Tuttle said that this could be viewed as just language, but when one goes into the Bylaws, there are sections subordinate to the Constitution that force the debate on who ultimately makes these appointments. Tuttle said that there are several parliamentary approaches. He said that one might be for Vardner to have a conversation with the president outside the meeting. He said that the other option would be for the chair to make this ruling Out of Order, which would put Council into a vote about whether or not to overrule the chair. He said that if that was overruled, then this could essentially go to the Judicial Board. Tuttle said that this gets incredibly complicated, because the remedy could be found in a Judicial Board ruling, although it could become truncated and then still more complicated. Tuttle then said that there was the final option of the supermajority, which could overturn the ruling of the Judicial Board. He concluded by pointing out that there was no motion on the table.

- Neesby said that the way he read the Bylaws, the appointments should go under the Appointments Review Committee.
- Tuttle said that he might have had something to do with that, as some years ago he had encouraged that each individual appointee be weighed on their own merit, rather than to appoint a clump of people at one time. He said that Wood was correct to call out Vardner's motion, based on precedent, but that Vardner could to overrule the chair on that point.
- Hawkins moved to table the Appointment of the Office Space Allocation Committee.
- Neesby said that tabling is a subsidiary motion, so a motion first had to be made whether or not this could be done.
- Sargent asked why the chair was hesitant to appoint these individuals.
- Wood said that the committee should have all of the information about space allocation before they take any action. She said that there needs to be a lot more research about this, because a portion of the space which was now occupied by USAC is being claimed by GSA under the mandated 2/3 - 1/3 allocation rule. Wood said that this needed to be worked out with the ASUCLA Space Committee and the Entities Committee, and she thought that it was inappropriate to appoint OSAC before that time came. She acknowledged that there may never be *all* of the information, but there would certainly be a better understanding in August. Wood again said that she thought there needed to be more individual discussion on this.
- Sargent said that Wood had covered everything, but pointed out that the Office Space Allocation Committee is a Standing Committee, and said that the Standing Committees could not do anything without the approval of USAC.
- Wood said that there was vague language in the Constitution, but she would like to have conversations about this outside of Council.
- Biniek said that she thought everything Vardner had suggested could still be done without the committee. She said that those people could still be involved.
- Vardner said he thought that the issues Wood brought up could better be addressed by having OSAC in place. He said that interactions with ASUCLA and GSA could only be helped by having a committee in place to address those issues. Vardner said that by the very nature of this issue, it would be moving very slowly, and the only way that it could work would be if it made very careful decisions. He said that any decisions or recommendations made by the committee had to come back to Council, and said that he saw no problem in having the committee in place. Vardner said that this issue would be hard to work on over summer if there were no committee to do the work. He said that he did want to talk with Wood more about this, but wanted to move forward with his agenda.
- Vardner moved and Neesby seconded to appoint Jason Kaminsky to the Office Space Allocation Committee.
- Wood said that she was no expert on the Constitution or Robert's Rules of Order, but her recommendation to Council was to remove this appointment from the Agenda until adequate dialogue had occurred.
- Biniek asked why Kaminsky was being recommended.
- Vardner said that Kaminsky, Malik, and Zai were the ones interested.
- Tuttle, to reiterate what he had said a couple weeks ago, recommended that Council move ahead very slowly. He said that it is important to gather as much information as possible before taking any action. Tuttle said that Williams had agreed with this recommendation last week, and said that space issues were very important. He said that what might seem like a good idea at the time may end up being a mistake if Council moved ahead too quickly. Tuttle agreed that the Facilities Commissioner should get the strongest consensus from the Council, and said the president had asked for discussion on this issue in order to obtain such consensus. He said that Vardner may have the votes tonight, but the best thing to do would be to get the broadest consensus possible. Tuttle said that Council may regret decisions done around consensus tonight, and hoped that Council would think carefully about this. He said

that the exact criteria used to make this decision would be carefully examined if this went to Judicial Board. Tuttle pleaded with Council to wait on this issue.

- Biniek moved and Pham seconded to table the appointment of Jason Kaminsky to the Office Space Allocation Committee.
- Wood said that she thought there were people around this table with more experience that might be better suited for this committee. She specifically cited Doan as one of the Council members who should be sitting on OSAC based on her particular expertise. Wood said, however, that she hadn't really thought this through yet.
- The motion to Table the Appointment of Jason Kaminsky failed with a vote of 4 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Vardner said that it was a legitimate concern of his to make this appointment, and that he was given the power to do so in the Constitution. He said, however, that because there seems to be a much deeper issue, he would withdraw his motion to appoint Kaminsky to OSAC just so long as OSAC appointments were on the agenda as an Action Item at the next council meeting.
- Pham asked if it was possible to draft something about what OSAC would be doing.
- Vardner said that he would be getting into that next week.
- Biniek said that confusion was just another reason to wait on the appointments to OSAC.

Budget Review Committee

- Wood said that she was recommending Zai, Hawkins, and Malik for the BRC.
- Zai declined her appointment to the BRC.
- Wood said that she still thought Zai would be great on the committee, and told council that she had a number of different experiences on campus with Clothesline Project, Vagina Monologues, Men's Rowing, and other endeavors. She said that sitting on the BRC would allow Zai to understand how to identify with student organizations, and said that that Zai's summer schedule coincided with the funding dates and requirements. Wood said that Hawkins had a lot of experience both with programming and with creating huge proposals. She said that he had a lot of experience both applying for and managing funding. Wood said that Malik oversaw 22 projects, and said that she had to review every proposal by those 22 groups. She said that this was very similar to what the BRC would do, and she would be an ideal selection.
- Biniek asked why Zai did not want to do this.
- Zai said that she was concerned about her time commitments in the fall. She said that she had a lot of programming goals in fall in addition to being a Resident Advisor and in the Marching Band. Zai said that she thought there were other people who were very interested, particularly Smeets. She added that RA training would start September 9th, with 12-hour-days lasting two weeks.
- Biniek moved and Pham seconded to appoint Farheen Malik to the Budget Review Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Farheen Malik to the Budget Review Committee with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, with Malik abstaining from voting.
- Biniek moved and Smeets seconded to appoint Todd Hawkins to the Budget Review Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Todd Hawkins to the Budget Review Committee with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, with Hawkins abstaining from voting.
- Wood said that her next recommendation would be Smeets, per Zai's recommendation. She said that she recognized Neesby's strengths, but said she intended to appoint him to the Constitutional Review Committee.
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to appoint Ryan Smeets to the Budget Review Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Ryan Smeets to the Budget Review Committee with a unanimous vote (including Smeets) of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

VI. Fund Allocations

- Corella said that there were only two applications, both of which were for graduation celebrations.
- Vardner moved and Sassounian seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
- Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Asian Pacific Coalition**Requested: \$2,200.00****Recommended: \$1,700.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$1,500.00 for the cost of Facilities and \$200.00 for the partial cost of an Honorarium for the 2005 Asian and Pacific Islander Student Celebration to be held on June 19th, 2005.

MEChA de UCLA**Requested: \$4,800.00****Recommended: \$2,400.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$2,400.00 for the partial cost of Graphics for the 2005 Raza Graduation to be held on June 19th, 2005.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

Community Service Commissioner- Farheen Malik

- Malik distributed a comprehensive information packet on the Service Record Process and Verification. She said that an idea had been brought up to create a service transcript for people to present to graduate schools. Malik said that she had been working on this project over the last year, and said that a pilot program would be run in the coming year.
- Tuttle said that this was a terrific idea, and was delighted by what the CSC was doing. He said that if this pilot worked and was then broadened, the potential existed to create the model to give credit to those that had spent so much time on these volunteer endeavors. Tuttle said that he thought the idea was great at its conception, and it was great to see its continuing development.
- Malik said that, ultimately, she thought this would be handled through the Registrar's Office. She said that there would be four levels of verification, which would determine how many hours of credit went on the transcript.

General Representative #3 – Marwa Kaisey

- Kaisey said that she wanted to tell Council that she had been appointed to oversee the planning of the Welcome Week Fair. She said that if anyone was interested in working with her to let her know. Kaisey also said that she had hired her staff, with six project directors and five general staff members.

General Representative #1 - Zai

- Zai reminded Council that sensitivity training this year for the RA's would be going to new levels. Zai also told Council that she had finished hiring her staff. She also said that if anyone would like to sit through a safe-workplace training then they were all welcome. Zai said that the General Representatives would be hosting Open House this year, and they had some new ideas about how to improve upon past ideas.
- Wood reminded Zai that the Student Alumni Association wanted the Kerckhoff Art Gallery for some of their events, and told her to talk to them about integrating the Open House.

Facilities Commissioner – Joseph Vardner

- Vardner said that he was still working on recruiting his staff. He also said that he was getting ready for Welcome Week, saying that he wanted to create a “Taste of Westwood”, inviting merchants on to campus. He explained that one of his big goals was to help rebuild the Westwood community. Vardner also told Council that Transportation Services Advisory Board had decided that Parking would be reviewed and examined on a top-down scale, evaluating and potentially changing everything about the way parking was done here at UCLA. Vardner said that he had also been talking with UCLA Happenings, and they would be trying to make MyUCLA more user-friendly. Vardner told Council that Recreation had also offered USAC a free workout on the Ropes Course, which he thought would be a lot of fun.
- Pham asked if there was a maximum of how much could be done.
- Vardner said that he thought it was limited to one day, but they were also offering a one-night camp-a-thon followed by the ropes course. Vardner said that the other good news about recreation was that a new appointment had been opened up to USAC. He said that as of this week, the University Recreation Advisory Board Committee was formally being created. Vardner also said that the UC’s have signed an agreement making all UC students eligible to use the recreation facilities of any UC. He said that students would be subject to the policies of each university, and students would be eligible for reduced rates. Vardner said that he had also been talking about Campus Sustainability, and would be working with Student Housing. Vardner also said that he was talking with ORL about running an experiment next year to make sustainability more visible. He said that the idea would be to advertise about turning off lights and taking shorter showers, and hopefully they would see energy savings in the coming year.
- Biniek said that one thing that they had been talking about was ways that On-Campus Housing could lower its costs, and this might be one avenue.
- Vardner said that another thing that might have implications for students is that every UC was asked by the Regents to turn in how much they thought they would owe in debt. He said that the legislature would then look at that cap and divide it amongst the campuses. Vardner said that there would be major programming cuts to UCLA and also freezes on construction projects because of funding problems. He hoped, however, that this would also help generate interest in sustainability.
- Kaminsky asked if the sensitivity education would be for staff in addition to the RA’s.
- Vardner said that he was working on that.
- Wood said that she had talked to many Council members, and many people were concerned about Sustainability. She said that this too might become an Action Item.

Academic Affairs Commissioner – Michelle Sassounian

- Sassounian said that this was a really big week. She said that she had two votes coming up, one on the Faculty Council and another on the Academic Senate. Sassounian said that she had gotten a lot of good responses from the Administration about the Student Initiated Classes, and was hoping that the student-taught courses would be approved. Sassounian also said, with regard to the ECP is sue, that she had met with Pat O’Brien, Executive Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences. She said that if there were any meetings set up with the Administration or the Academic Senate, she needed to be notified, based on her responsibilities as stated in the Bylaws. Sassounian said that includes any future meetings that may have been scheduled before she assumed office.

External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek

From External Vice President Jeannie Biniek’s Weekly Report to Council:

I. National Affairs

- I received materials about the USSA Foundation’s GrassRoots Organizing Weekends (GROW). These trainings provide students with the skills to address issues on our campus and build our organizations around the principles of direct-action organizing. GROWs can be structured to provide

either basic skills or address specific issues. For example, in the winter of 2004 we hosted an LGBT GROW (the first ever in the nation). I plan to host one of these trainings either fall quarter or early winter, and would like any members of Council who would be interested in co-hosting this or know of student organizations that would interested to let me know.

2. California Affairs

- There will potentially be a special election this coming fall on several ballot measures. Anyone interested or experienced in GOTV campaigns let me know so we can make sure to get students registered, educated and voting in the case that the Governor announces an election.
- Anyone interested in receiving weekly legislative news updates via email please let me know.

3. Office

- Staff hiring is underway. We are holding interviews this week for all of the director positions.

4. Upcoming Events

- Education Finance Model Steering Committee meeting: June 16th at UCOP office in Oakland

Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan

- Doan said that she had mostly been interviewing both for her office and for the ARC. She thanked the other members of the ARC for their help, and said that if anyone had any additional suggestions for how the ARC could improve to let her know. Doan asked Council to please have Agenda Items to her by 5:00 p.m. on Thursdays.

President – Jenny Wood

From President Jenny Wood's Weekly Report to Council:

1. Thanks to everyone for coming to breakfast with Patricia O'Brien & Nancy Ortiz
 - We will be meeting with Happenings Committee to recap the effectiveness of this campaign
 - CEC, CAC, Facilities, Pres, Gen Rep 3, anyone else want to be involved?
2. Expected Cumulative Progress Campaign
 - Presentation to the Faculty Executive Board this Friday June 10th
 - Meeting with Patricia O'Brien on June 16th
 - Academic Affairs & President's Office will be dialoguing before these meetings
3. UCLA Foundation Board of Governors
 - UCLA Foundation Board of Governors deals with large sums of private donations and consists of influential alumni who
 - Strengthening our Foundation Proposal to be discussed on June 13th from 4-6pm
 - This proposal includes a restructuring of the governing bodies and removing the ex-officio student member from the board of governors as well as centralizing fiduciary responsibility and bylaw and elections voting power into one body instead of two
 - I'll be meeting with the Chair of the Foundation Board of Governors before June 13th to discuss these issue
 - Please let me know if you have any other input regarding this matter
 - Board of Governors meeting to vote on this restructuring will occur on June 22nd
4. Student Alumni Association Meeting
 - Met with Marie Howell, President of SAA and discussed ways to work more with SAA
 - Marie will be the USAC liaison through the President's Office and SAA would like a member of Council to also serve as an SAA/USAC liaison and serve on the SAA outreach committee

- Must be available before Council meetings and volunteer at SAA events
- SAA would like to be involved in the Open House day of Welcome Week and possibly Carnival
 - Possible display in the art gallery for SAA for Open House
- She was very supportive of the Student Advisory Council
- SAA calendar will be emailed to me and I will forward to the rest of Council. SAA recommended that we co-program as much as possible instead of detracting from the success of all events by hosting events that are very similar with one another near the same time
- SAA will be reaching out to USAC soon for help planning fairs during the Beat 'SC/Homecoming Week
- 5. Meeting with Editor of Chief of the Daily Bruin Charles Proctor
 - Editor's vision is to tighten up coverage
 - For USAC, they will should cover more issues/campaigns instead of meetings
 - New editor – Sean Bishop
 - Assistant editor – Sarah Taylor, Melinda, Derek Lipkin
 - Wants to open communication between USAC and Daily Bruin and encouraged us to dialogue often, especially with USAC reporters
- 6. Staff Recruitment
 - Interviews held all day tomorrow
 - Decisions will be made on all Executive Staff, Committee Chairs, as well as most committee members. Recruitment will continue in the fall.
- 7. Presidential Appointments
 - Plan to forward the remaining appointments to Kristina by Aug 9th

Questions and Comments followed Wood's Report:

- Malik asked if Wood had been talking with Doan about the Presidential Appointments, or if Wood was just forwarding names to her.
- Wood said that she had spoken with her about the process, but not about any particular individuals.
- Kaminsky said that he had met with Charles Proctor, Editor-in-Chief of the Daily Bruin, who had told him that he was very interested in hearing any concerns or suggestions from Council regarding USAC's representation in the Daily Bruin.
- Malik asked more about the Student Alumni Association Fair.
- Wood said that they wanted to have an event to get the word out about SAA and USAC, centered around themed days during Beat 'SC Week.

VIII. Old Business

A. *Decision on Summer Meeting Schedule

- Wood said that since so many people would be gone throughout the summer, it would make sense not to have meetings from next week until August 9th.
- Neesby said that his one concern was the budget process. He said that the Student Government Operational Fund was approved between June 1st and July 31st. Neesby said that this money would not become available until next year. He said that if these numbers were not approved before August 1st then Council would be in violation of the Bylaws.
- Wood said that she thought the rules were confusing, and should be clarified by the CRC this year. She said that she thought what was being proposed was allowed by the Bylaws.
- Neesby said that the BRC would be meeting from June 1st to July 31st, according to Article VII, Subsection B, where it outlined fiscal periods that USAC had to fulfill certain duties. He said that he was not sure if Council should care about this, but they were the Bylaws.
- Wood said that she was unclear what he was talking about.

- Vardner said that there was no way to make budgets by the end of June. He said that he thought Council would be operating in the spirit of the Bylaws for the BRC to meet over the summer and then approve the allocations during the first meeting back in August. Vardner said that this would make these funds available for spending starting in August.
- Neesby said that he thought that would work, though he was cautious about going against a Bylaw.
- Wood said that there were so many things a “budget process” could entail that she felt it would be fine to deal with this at the first meeting in August. She also said that portions of the Bylaws obviously needed to be revisited.
- Biniek said that if the BRD were approved next week then there would have to be a special meeting to approve the guidelines.
- Wood said that the guidelines could be approved next week, and seeing the timeliness of the guidelines it was important to process them quickly. She said that a special meeting could be called to address that one issue, so her recommendation was that both outgoing and incoming finance chairpersons talk with Council next week.
- McLaren asked what Wood was talking about.
- Wood said that she was talking about the calendars for the BRC.
- Corella said that Finance Committee and the BRC had certain caps, which would be set over the summer, and then had to be approved by Council.
- Biniek moved and Hawkins seconded to recess from June 15th to August 8th.
- Doan said that her concern was that she would have a hard time meeting next Tuesday. She asked if that recess could be changed to Saturday to extend the possibility of meeting through finals week.
- Wood made a friendly amendment to make the recess beginning on June 18th.
- Council voted to approve the recess from June 18th to August 8th with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

B. *Decision on Summer Meeting Quorum

- Wood said that she felt that the quorum should be maintained at nine voting members of Council, and she said that Council would be dealing with many important issues in August, and would like to see as many Council members present as possible.
- Neesby asked if there was any time where there might be a problem with this.
- Wood said that she did not foresee any.
- Tuttle asked if there could be an exception during the recess window for an emergency meeting. He said that Wood might want to make a footnote exception since there may not be quorum on June 18th and August 8th.
- McLaren said that the normal Summer Quorum was seven, and worried that by keeping it at nine, Council might be hindering their ability to act during the year, and worried about making two different numbers in one summer.
- Tuttle agreed with Wood about the need to have the most people there possible, but suggested that she set the quorum at seven in case there were unforeseen problems that prevented people from making it to meetings.
- Vardner agreed with Tuttle to have a little leeway. He said that if there are seven people, great, if there are more than seven, even better.
- Vardner moved and Kaminsky seconded to set the Summer Quorum at Seven Voting Members of Council.
- Neesby said that in August there were very important issues, and said that there should be a higher quorum. He said that he would be for having a lower quorum during the recess and a higher quorum during the late summer months. Neesby said that the Bylaws allowed for voting on the normal quorum to start on August 9th, with the summer quorum automatically being dropped to seven.
- Vardner said that his concern was still that people might disappear unexpectedly during those last months of summer.

- Wood said that since there would be at least 11 people around in late August, having the quorum at 9 would be a way of keeping Council accountable for showing up to meetings.
- Neesby said that Council was being paid for the summer months, so they did have a responsibility to the students. He said that with a quorum of seven, four people could potentially be determining budgets. Neesby said that nine was a much safer number.
- Biniek agreed that it was important to have a quorum of nine during the summer, because she did not feel comfortable taking action with such a small number.
- Tuttle asked what the count would be during the recess period.
- Wood said that she did not have it all memorized, but there were times when there were less than seven people, but also times that there were more than nine. She agreed with Biniek that if there were an emergency meeting then Council members would be able to step-up and make it to the meeting. Wood also told Council that they could still stay in touch over the summer without actually holding meetings.
- Biniek moved and Neesby seconded to amend the motion on the table to setting the Summer Meeting Quorum to Nine Voting Members of Council.
- Vardner declined the motion to amend.
- Council voted to amend the motion on the table to setting the Summer Meeting Quorum to Nine Voting Members of Council with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Neesby called the question, seconded by Zai.
- Council voted to call the question with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Council voted to set the Summer Meeting Quorum to Nine Voting Members of Council with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

C. Discussion about Welcome Week

- Kaminsky said that Welcome Week would be called Bruin Bash, with a carnival, tabling, a movie, and a dance. He said that what needed to be discussed was who was working on what. He said that Kaisey and Vardner would be doing the fair along with the General Representatives. Kaminsky said that he would be meeting with those people soon.
- Vardner said that he had been working with the marketing committee. He said that right now there was outreach to students about programming at the fair. Vardner continued to outline how the marketing committee was working on Welcome Week. He said that he wanted Council's opinion on using Surplus Funds for helping with the advertising.
- Wood said that she thought it was a bad precedent to spend surplus funding for programming. She said that it was only for emergencies like the CSC van that had no brakes. Wood said that instead they should draft a proposal and turn this in to the Finance Committee in August. She said that it is problematic to take money out of surplus for programming.
- Neesby asked how soon the money was needed.
- Kaminsky said that the money was needed two weeks after finals.
- Wood said that it could be applied for through Contingency's discretionary funding.
- Neesby said that the Finance Committee Chair needed to be approved by Council.
- Wood said that voting on the committee members by Council was a formality, but was actually not required.
- Sargent read aloud from the Bylaws that the Finance Committee Members did, in fact, need to be approved by Council.
- Kaminsky asked if two offices applied to Contingency for discretionary funding, would double the discretionary maximum to \$1,200.
- Sargent said yes, essentially, that each office could get \$600.

- Wood said that it would be enough combined.
 - Vardner said that he thought that would be an acceptable solution.
 - Biniek told Wood that she would work on Open House too.
 - Wood said that she also wanted to establish a finance subcommittee for Welcome Week. She volunteered herself.
- Vardner, Kaminsky, and Kaisey all also expressed interest.*
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to take a 5-minute recess.
 - Council voted to take a 5-minute recess with a vote of 9 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Council went into recess at 1:34 a.m.*

IX. New Business

Council reconvened at 1:39 a.m.

A. Discussion of Proposed Bylaw Amendments Regarding USA Funding Policies

- Wood said that her request to Neesby concerning this discussion was that, if some sections were easily understood, would he please just tell people to read the information at their leisure.
- Neesby replied that he would follow Wood's suggestion, then began to provide an overview of the changes he was proposing for certain sections of the USAC Bylaws. He said that, with regard to USA Bylaws Article VI.C.4., he had cleared up what he considered some vagueness in the description of the Minimum Criteria to be used by all funding bodies (VI.C.4.b.c.d.e.) He said that he had done this by setting up subsections and rearranging some of the information in order to present the criteria in a more logical sequence. Neesby said that his first proposed change concerned "Viewpoint Neutrality" because he felt that the current wording could be misinterpreted.
- Biniek asked why it said both "Content and Viewpoint Neutral."
- Neesby said that the wording was based on a Supreme Court decision which determined that religious groups, which are not viewpoint neutral, would otherwise have been denied funding. Neesby then pointed out the changes he was proposing to language which had been the rationale for disqualifying a number of organizations from being allocated funding last year. He said that his proposed language would entitle groups that do not have an "academic" component to be funded. Neesby said that he was also recommending changes to the language which allows for each funding body to develop other guidelines as approved by the Undergraduate Students Association Council.
- Wood reiterated what Neesby had said, saying that the number of students served did not make sense as a source of Minimum Criteria.
- Kaminsky asked where they were looking.
- Neesby said that they were on Page 6 of the document he had handed out at the table, and said that he thought the language was now much clearer.
- Zai asked what the definition of "the number of students served" was.
- Wood said that was something that should be up to the discretion of the student organization.
- Neesby said that he had also added that the proposal had to include both the number of students involved in the group, and the number of students served by the group.
- Sargent said that, substance aside, there were not going to be any funding allocations before August. He asked if this item was for "Notice" and if Neesby was asking that it be presented to Council for "Action" at the next meeting.
- Neesby said that he wanted it to be an "Action item at the next meeting."
- Wood said that the Budget Review Committee would be working during the summer, and stressed the importance of everyone understanding "Minimum Criteria" to the best of their ability.
- Sargent asked Wood if she agreed that this issue needed to be addressed before Council recessed for the summer.
- Wood said she agreed that it did.

- Neesby said that those had been the big changes. He said that the other changes were small and minor, mostly changing a word here or there. With regard to the changes he was proposing for USA Bylaws Article VI.C.9.a.b., Neesby said that, because the position of Assistant Budget Review Director had been added, he had put in the new position as well as a description of the Assistant BRD's role and responsibilities which specified that they would Chair the committee only in the absence of the BRD, upon written authorization from the BRD.
- Wood said that it might be good to review these documents over the next week and then talk about them at the next meeting. She said that these changes could still be made before the funding hearings. Wood said that Kaisey could also communicate with the rest of the BRC over the summer. She recommended that everyone read over these documents before next week so that they could be discussed at the meeting. Wood also recommended to Council that they talk with one another about this. She said that a great thing to do while taking a break from studying was to pull out the Bylaws.

B. Discussion of Proposed Election Code Amendments

- Wood said that Lam had to leave, and Council could either talk about the proposed amendments to the Election Code now or look over them during the next week and talk about them at the next meeting.
- Neesby said that he saw no reason to have an Action Item about this next week since it was not a time-sensitive issue.
- Wood said that she would talk with Lam about meeting over the summer.

C. *Discussion and Decision Regarding Meeting during Finals Week

- Wood said that she thought everyone agreed that Council should meet next week, but there was no consensus about when to meet or what to discuss. She asked everyone to take out his or her schedules. Wood said that the options would be Thursday morning, afternoon, or evening, or Friday morning, afternoon, or evening. She said that she would take a straw poll on each time frame to see how many people were available. Wood said that mornings would go until 3:00 p.m., afternoons would be from 3:00 until 7:00 p.m., and evening would begin at 7:00 p.m.

A Straw Poll indicated that the afternoon of Friday, June 17th, was best for the most people.

- Wood said that she also wanted to talk about the meeting agenda. She said that her suggestion would be to talk about (1) Proposed Bylaw Changes, (2) BRC Guidelines and Calendar, (3) CAC, CPC, BOD, and BRD appointments, (4) OSAC, and maybe the Sustainability Resolution and proposed Election Code Amendments.
- Tuttle said that Vardner had the parliamentary right to bring the OSAC discussion back at the next meeting.
- Keesler told council that he would not be able to be at any meetings between Wednesday, June 15th, and Wednesday, June 22nd.
- McLaren asked, with a sly smile, who would like to take the minutes in Keesler's absence. *Nobody volunteered.*
- Pham suggested recording the minutes and then having Keesler type them up.
- Vardner moved and Sassounian seconded to hold a Special Meeting of Council on Friday, June 17th, at 3:00 p.m.
- McLaren asked if the Daily Bruin would be willing to run an announcement about the Special Meeting.
- Vardner said that they should be able to.
- Biniek called for Acclamation. Wood asked for any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, Council decided to hold a Special Meeting on Friday, June 15th, at 3:00 p.m. by Acclamation.

X. Announcements

- McLaren asked Council to be sure to read the handout about the voicemail system and to talk with her or SGA if they have questions about it.
- Smeets said that he had sent out an email about Hide-and-Seek in the Sculpture Garden for the coming Thursday night, and asked that everyone please respond by the next day.
- Kaminsky said that The First Citizens Brigade would be performing the next night.
- Kaminsky said that the California Sustainability Coalition would be giving a presentation the next day at 3:30 in Kerckhoff Grand Salon.
- Biniek said that she had the new hire forms for Council. She said that unfortunately there were only 12, so someone would have to get their own from SGA. She said that everyone also needed two forms of identification.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Corella passed around the attendance sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Vardner and Kaminsky seconded to adjourn.
- Smeets called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 2:18 a.m. by Acclamation.

Exhaustedly Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker