

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCILFriday, June 17, 2005  
417 Kerckhoff Hall  
3:00 P.M.

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

ABSENT: None

GUESTS: Patricia Alfaro, Shaun Doria, Bryan Furukawa, Christina Kaoh, Janina Montero, Thanh Nguyen, Rita Qatami, Saba Riazati, Yousef K. Tajsar, Liz Vega

I. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 3:21p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*Villasin passed around the Attendance Sheet*

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Sassounian asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.

- Nelson said that he had a report to give, also.

- Biniek moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.

- Kaminsky called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Agenda was approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

III. Approval of the Minutes

*- There were no Minutes to be approved at this meeting.*

IV. Special Presentations

*- There were no Special Presentations this week.*

V. Appointments

-Wood said that, before Council began discussing specific nominees, she had some general comments to make regarding Appointments, overall. She said that she had met with many USAC officers this past week to discuss why they had not approved some of the nominees that were brought to the table at the June 7 meeting. She said that she did not hear any reasons which she felt warranted the defeat of her nominees. As a result, she said that she was forwarding the same four nominees who had not been approved at the last meeting. She said further that she felt the criticisms of her nominees that were made on June 7 represented discriminatory behavior and did not address the issue of the actual qualifications of the nominees.

-Tuttle said that, while he believed it was appropriate for the President to bring back the same nominees who were not approved on June 7 based on her view that there had not been adequate discussion of their qualifications, he also believed that a motion to return that nominee to the table would have to be made by someone who voted against the nominee. He said he felt this would be in accordance with Robert's Rules of

Order, and that any such motion would probably include the language, “ ..... *a motion to reconsider* “. Tuttle continued by saying that the Chairperson may have a different view than he has, and might feel that someone who voted in favor of the nominee might be entitled to bring the nominee back.

- Wood asked about precedent.
- Nelson cited a problem that arose during Elizabeth Houston’s term as President when Council consistently disapproved her nominees. He said that this had almost stalemated Council. Nelson continued by saying that the USAC President has the right to make appointments, and he felt that Council might not want to weaken the presidency because, no matter who is in that position, the USAC President represents, and speaks on behalf of, Council. Nelson stated further that this year’s Council has an opportunity that last year’s Council didn’t have, and that the opportunity was to learn how to work together and overcome differences. He said that this experience would be of great value to them, especially when they graduate and enter the “outside world.” Nelson reiterated his message that the success of each Council member would be directly related to their ability to learn to work through difficult situations together. Nelson also reminded Council that their responsibility was to serve the entire student body, and said it would not serve them well if they were considered to be uncompromising. He suggested that they not look to the State and Federal governments as role models. Nelson closed by saying that the precedent is that the USAC President makes the nominations.
- Wood asked Nelson if anyone could make a motion in this situation.
- Nelson said it was his opinion that anyone could make the motion.
- Wood asked if there were any other comments before proceeding.
- Nelson suggested that Wood ask if someone wanted to Move to Reconsider.
- Neesby, referring to Robert’s Rules, said that an issue they hadn’t discussed was whether this meeting was a “new session,” explaining that the rules differed depending on whether this meeting was considered a new session, or a continuation of the meeting of June 7. Neesby said it was his opinion that today’s meeting qualified as a “new session.”
- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to reopen consideration of Wood’s nominees.
- Neesby interjected that he believed there had to be a specific motion concerning each nominee.

**\*Campus Programs Committee (CPC)**

- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to approve the appointment of Thanh Nguyen to the Campus Programs Committee.
- Wood said she believed it had been unfair to raise concerns about Nguyen’s ability to outreach to student groups and pointed out that Nguyen’s qualifications were not that different than those of Sean Canullas who had been appointed to the CPC at the last meeting. She said that Nguyen had experience in coordinating very large on-campus programs, citing specific examples of Executive Director for two years of the Vietnamese Culture Night, Programming Coordinator for VSU’s Tet Festival Commemoration in 2003, and Co-Chair of the Asian Pacific Islander Graduation ceremony in 2004, all of which required her to be knowledgeable of the Campus Programming Committee’s process. Wood then asked if there were any other comments or questions regarding Nguyen’s appointment.
- Biniek said she thought that the issue was not necessarily whether a person had actual programming experience, but that the experience that is gained from the process is what counts.
- Vardner said that, after having more time to consider the nominee’s experience with both large and small programs, he thinks that she would probably be a good member of the committee. He then asked Nguyen what her plans were for outreach.
- Nguyen replied that she planned to use the Web site, the Daily Bruin, and signboards on Bruin Walk. She said further that she was open to any suggestions that Council Members have for her in this regard.

- Vardner then asked Nguyen how she would work with the CSP Advisor, Melissa Veluz-Abraham.
- Nguyen replied that, for every single event she had worked on, she had met with her advisor at least two times before the event to discuss her plans and what the program would need to be successful. She said she had also met with her after the program was held to evaluate how it went and what could be done to improve it in the future.
- Vardner then asked if Nguyen had any suggestions for groups that *don't* meet with their Advisor.
- Nelson, commenting on Vardner's last question, said that the Advisors couldn't force students to meet with them, and that the decision was up to the students. Berky remarked further that all Advisors' offices are open, including his, but that the responsibility is still on the students.
- Wood suggested that Council return to the motion on the table, and asked Doan to restate the Appointments Review Committee's recommendation on Nguyen.
- Doan said that the ARC had voted 3 in favor of Nguyen, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Than Nguyen to the Campus Programs Committee (CPC) with a vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

**\*Community Activities Committee (CAC)**

- Wood opened discussion by stating that, because Patricia Alfaro had not been able to attend the June 7 meeting, she was before Council for consideration at today's meeting. Wood then read highlights of Alfaro's qualifications, including her extensive experience as a mentor with Barrio Youth Alternatives (BaYa) and as Director of the Southeast Youth Empowerment Project (SeYE)Los Angeles. Wood said further that she felt that Alfaro's planned activities for the coming year were also relevant to her qualifications. Wood closed by reminding Council that the ARC had voted in favor of Alfaro's appointment with a unanimous vote of 3 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Biniek moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Appointment of Patricia Alfaro to the Community Activities Committee (CAC).
- Neesby asked about a statement in Alfaro's application which referred to Student Power.
- Alfaro replied that she was not referring to the Student Power slate, but rather to one of the programs she had coordinated which she felt represented a real example of the power that students have when they work together.
- Sassounian said she didn't think it was about an affiliation with the SP slate, but that Alfaro's inclusion of that language had made them question whether she could be nonpartisan. She said they just wanted to clarify that point before they voted.
- Biniek reiterated her support of Alfaro's appointment by stating that Alfaro was a very strong candidate for the CAC.
- Neesby asked, for clarification, whether the slate was actually called, "Student Power."
- Wood replied that it was not.
- Neesby said he was still concerned with the use of that terminology, especially since both words were capitalized and were followed by an exclamation point. He asked Alfaro if it was an intentional reference to the slate.
- Alfaro replied that it was not, and that it was just a coincidence.
- Neesby said he found it hard to believe that it was just a coincidence, and that he was just trying to get at the truth.
- Alfaro said that she was a very passionate person and that she uses exclamation points to express that passion. She said she agreed that it would not be appropriate to link CAC with the slate in any way.
- Tuttle said that he has been plenty of situations over the years where certain phrases get picked up and used by other groups.
- Vardner called the question.
- Neesby said he felt that his concern was one that needed to be brought up at the table for everyone's consideration before they took action on this appointee.
- Wood asked if there was any objection to the Calling of the Question.

- There being no objections, Council voted to approve the Appointment of Patricia Alfaro to the Community Activities Committee (CAC) with a vote of 10 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

**\*Budget Review Director**

- Wood went through the list of concerns that had been given to her by some of the Council Members who had voted against Qatami at the June 7 meeting, followed by her comments on why she felt their concerns were not valid.
- Biniek moved and Hawkins seconded to appoint Rita Qatami as USAC's Budget Review Director.
- Wood said that the overall concern of members who did not vote for Qatami on June 7 seemed to be focused on their perception of her as "unapproachable." Wood said that she had spoken with Qatami about this issue, and said that Qatami was very surprised with this assessment of her. Qatami referred to the favorable evaluation she had received as an R.A.
- Zai raised a Point of Clarification, and remarked that the only information from the evaluation which Qatami presented was positive.
- Qatami replied that she had not included the negative comments because they were not relevant to the issue of "approachability."
- Tuttle said he didn't think they should go down the road of using, and referring to, documents such as these that were "internal" documents. He said he didn't think that this approach should become part of the "standard."
- Qatami said she was very upset that people had charged that she was unapproachable. She said that she felt this was an attack on her character, which was why she thought it would help if she presented information from her evaluation.
- Kaisey expressed her concern that Qatami had been involved in student politics.
- Qatami replied that just about everyone around the table at this meeting had been involved in student politics.
- Kaisey said that the reason the issue was being raised with Qatami was because of the position for which Qatami was being nominated.
- Qatami said she would like to hear questions from Council to which she can respond.
- Kaisey assured everyone that her questions had not been "personal."
- Biniek said she thought the R.A. evals were valid sources and, based on that assessment, she believed that Qatami would be an effective Budget Review Director.
- Neesby raised a question about Qatami's objectivity, and alluded to a situation regarding the Bruin Democrats' Charter.
- Qatami said she did not see how her comments on this subject would be relevant to an appointment as Budget Review Director.
- Wood said that she had spoken to some people at the Alumni Association regarding the situation Neesby was referring to, and had been told that it had been "an Alumni-driven issue."
- Neesby then referred to an "away" message on Qatami's Instant Messenger which he quoted as, "So, Bruin Dems ... How's your charter ?"
- Qatami said she felt that Neesby was tapping into something that was irrelevant.
- Sassounian said the actual issue is not whether Qatami was behind it, or whether she sanctioned it.
- Sassounian said she felt that she could not vote for someone who would support such actions. She said further that she felt very strongly that Qatami's "away" message about dechartering the Bruin Democrats should not be taken lightly. Sassounian closed her remarks by saying she was not comfortable with supporting Qatami for the position of BRD.
- Qatami said she had no problem with any organization supporting any particular slate. She said she did it on a whim, and that she seriously regrets that she did so. She said she feels that every organization on campus has a right to exist.

- Zai said that Neesby and Sassounian had outlined her concerns. She said she hadn't heard the message herself, but does know people who were appalled, and others who were hurt, by it.
- Qatami said that she had not labeled the people who derided her during the campaign and said she would make a huge effort to demonstrate her neutrality. She said she didn't know who had expressed concern about approaching her, but said that she felt confident in being able to deal with this on a personal basis.
- Ohara suggested that Council step back. She said that Rita's outreach abilities are *very* strong. She said she wished that Qatami had thought about the problems her message might cause, but realized that was hind-sight thinking. Ohara pointed out that the main thing to keep in mind is that the Budget Review Director has just one voice and one vote. She said the Budget Review Committee's process is a collaborative effort, with every member having equal input.
- Sassounian said she didn't want to drag this out, but said she wanted to make her point through an analogy. She said that, if her Grandmother was seriously ill, and if someone had a message on their answering machine that commented derisively about her Grandmother's illness, she would not appoint the message-maker to a position that worked in Elder Care.
- Qatami said if Sassounian had spoken with anyone that has worked with her, Sassounian would know that she is not a biased person.
- Sassounian said she did not see Qatami as a biased person.
- Qatami said that she would not make a broad decision about Sassounian based on one thing she had done when she was 12 years old.
- Sassounian replied that the situation she referred to concerning Qatami's "away" message had occurred just weeks ago, not years ago, and said that it was not insignificant.
- Wood asked if anyone else wanted to speak on this matter before Council voted.
- Biniek, Tuttle, Zai, Neesby, Sassounian, Vardner and Tajsar all asked to be placed on the speakers' list.
- Biniek said it was her opinion that, no matter who Council appoints, there is likely to be someone who will object to something. She said that Council might never get a Budget Review Director if they take the position that the nominee must meet everyone's particular viewpoints. She pointed out that, as a Woman of Color and a Democrat, Qatami already represents two significant constituencies.
- Tuttle said that, since the situation that had been cited appeared to be in the context of the recent elections campaign, he asked everyone on Council to reflect on things they might have said during that campaign. Tuttle said that such situations happen all the time in politics. He said he recognized that it's not a very good thing when someone's feelings get hurt in the middle of a campaign, but also said that it would not be a good situation if individuals or groups did not apply for funds because they thought that the Budget Review Director was unapproachable.
- Nelson said that he and Tuttle had not discussed this matter earlier, but that they were certainly in agreement about how to deal with the situation. He said that one thing he can respect about politicians, even 'though many of them are nasty and many of them make wrong decisions, is that they always work together after an issue has been resolved. He asked that Council Members be as objective as possible when they come to a vote.
- Wood asked Sargent and Ohara what they thought were the most important qualifications for a Budget Review Director.
- Ohara said that they should select someone who will make sure that *all* programmers are well informed about what needs to be included in their applications for funding. She said that a lot of people can handle their own finances, but not everyone is willing and able to communicate and to teach about the process.
- Sargent said that, when he was on the Budget Review Committee, he didn't do much outreach, even 'though he understands that might be a very good thing to do. He said he would look for someone who is willing to commit the time and the effort to

- mentoring programmers; someone who understands how to budget; someone who communicates well; and someone who has basic knowledge of the student organizations that are likely to apply for funding.
- Wood said she refuses to appoint someone who is not qualified to do the job, and said this was why she had brought Qatami back as her candidate for Budget Review Director. She said that Qatami recognizes the need for outreach, has the ability to outreach, and has the time and energy to devote to her responsibilities. She said that, because this year's Budget Review Director will have to spend a lot of time educating student programmers about USAC's new funding process, she thought it was critical to appoint someone who was incredibly qualified and who could get started immediately. Wood then asked Qatami if she would be willing to write a letter of apology to the Bruin Democrats. Wood next echoed Tuttle's concern that Council not get stalemated on this appointment, especially since there were only two people with serious concerns. She then reiterated Ohara's comments about the major role and the voting power that the three USAC members of the Budget Review Committee have. Wood continued by stating that no other applicant for the BRD was as qualified as Qatami. Wood then began to comment on the qualifications of each applicant that she said the opposition wanted to appoint as BRD. With regard to the first one, she said that he had not included any information about his qualifications for the position.
  - Tuttle interjected that, before Wood continue, he would recommend that she not go into much detail because of the need to protect the anonymity of applicants that were not being presented for appointment.
  - Wood, heeding Tuttle's recommendation, then stated simply that there were no other applicants who were qualified to fill the position of Budget Review Director. She said that, per her evaluation of his application, she felt that the candidate that some members of Council preferred over Qatami was definitely not qualified based on experience and other important factors. She stressed the importance of getting someone in place immediately.
  - Sassounian, Vardner, Qatami, and Yousef Tajsar asked to be added to the speakers' list.
  - Neesby moved to close the speakers' list. Vardner seconded the motion. Council voted to close the speakers' list with 11 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.
  - Tajsar, undergraduate member of the ASUCLA Board of Directors, said it appeared to him that everyone on council had already positioned themselves on this appointment. He suggested that the only way they could get beyond such a stalemate was to learn to work together. Referring to what he perceived to be the rationale for opposing Qatami's appointment, Tajsar cited an incident which occurred about two years ago when the Bruin Republicans took a strong stance against MEChA. He said he thought this was a tricky road to go down.
  - Qatami echoed Nelson's remarks about the polarization on campus, and said she thought that the last thing USAC would want to do would be to continue such polarization. She said, further, that she had emailed five Council Members who were opposed to her appointment in an attempt to open communication with them, but that she had heard back from just one of them. Qatami closed by saying that she believed they needed to find some grounds for consensus.
  - Sassounian said that she was not making any remarks about the Bruin Democrats and that she was not making personalized arguments about Qatami's qualifications. She said she felt that Qatami shows a lack of respect for student groups, in general. She said she sees the need to have a Budget Review Director in place very soon, but said she felt that there should have been more consideration of the opposing views that were brought up at the last meeting about Qatami's qualifications.
  - Vardner said he agreed that their views about Qatami were not being seriously considered, but did feel that there was some room for compromise. He expressed his concern that a Budget Review Director should believe in the concept of funding everybody, and brought up the issue of the 40 student groups that didn't get any funding last year.

- Qatami responded by citing the range of experience she's had which are relevant to the responsibilities of the Budget Review Director, including: (a) working in the offices of the USAC IVP and the USAC President in the last two years; (b) working on the Base Budget for the USAC President's Office; (c) helping to coordinate the Student Advocacy Collective within the IVP Office; and (d) programming and implementing a number of programs through the Office of Residential Life. She said that, through all of these experiences, she had learned about basic funding policies and processes, as well as learning about undergraduate student organizations, in general. She said that, because of her experience, she understands the changes that have been made to USAC's funding process and would be able to communicate clearly what the minimum criteria are.
- Vardner said he would like to sit down with Qatami and talk with her about her views. He said he felt that the minimum criteria were not interpreted correctly last year.
- There being no further comments from the people on the speakers' list, Council moved to a vote on the motion that was on the table to appoint Qatami to the position of Budget Review Director.
- Council voted against the appointment of Qatami to the position of Budget Review Director with five votes in favor, 6 votes in opposition, and 1 abstention. The motion failed.
- Wood expressed her apologies to Qatami by stating that she felt the reasons for voting against her were unjustified. Wood said that she would be reopening the appointments process for the position of Budget Review Director.
- Nelson asked if anything would be lost if someone is not appointed soon to fill this position.
- Ohara replied that a lot of organizations have been waiting for the funding process to get started, and stated that she would not be available to fill the gap because she will be leaving the country soon and will be gone for a year.
- Nelson asked Wood if she had a candidate to bring forward for BRD.
- Wood said she knows of someone who is interested, but hasn't seen her application yet.
- Nelson asked further if there was something that could be put in place, such as a trial period, which would give someone the opportunity to get the process underway.
- Vardner said he agrees with Nelson's thinking on this matter, and said he thought it would be possible to make an interim appointment while, at the same time, announcing that the position was open for other applicants. He said he thought that the interim appointee could be removed by a 2/3 vote.
- Tuttle specified that it would have to be a 2/3 vote of Council's regular quorum. He commented further that perhaps they could have a trial period which would include a couple of regular meetings when they return in August, and have the trial run until about August 20<sup>th</sup>, at which time they could reconsider the appointment.
- Vardner read from the section in the USAC Bylaws about Interim Appointments.
- Neesby asked about the timetable on reopening the process.
- Tuttle replied that, if they decided to make an Interim appointment today, they would be appointing Qatami. He then asked if anyone on the majority side of the vote against Qatami would be willing to go with her as an Interim Budget Review Director. He commented that he thought it would be very difficult to get quorum during the next six weeks to resolve this matter. He said, further, that if the functioning of student government becomes disrupted, it could become a very serious problem. Tuttle then suggested the possibility of setting a "sunset" on an interim appointment by specifying a specific date on which the interim appointment would expire. He said he hoped that Council could reach some sort of compromise on this matter so that the funding process could move forward in a timely manner.
- Sargent raised the possibility of having the outgoing Budget Review Director, Ohara, train the newly appointed Finance Committee Chairperson, Villasin, in case Council is not able to reach a compromise regarding the appointment of a new BRD.
- Wood said that, after considering all the ideas that had been put forward during discussion of this matter, she wanted to designate Qatami as an Interim Budget Review

Director until the specified date of August 26 so that the allocation process for the Student Government Operational Fund would be covered, and could begin in a timely manner. Wood said that a permanent Budget Review Director could be chosen after the expiration of the interim appointment.

- Tuttle raised two points of clarification by asking (1) whether the interim designee would be eligible to apply for the permanent position, and (2) whether the President planned to reach out to seek other applicants for the permanent BRD position.
- Wood replied, “yes”, to both of Tuttle’s questions.
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded that Council take a five-minute recess.
- Council agreed to take a five-minute recess with a vote of 8 in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Council reconvened at 5:32p.m.
- Vardner said he thought they could come to a compromise, and pointed to the fact that they had voted down two nominees last week and appointed two of them today. He said that the Student Government Operational Fund process would undergo somewhat of a trial period anyway, because it is an entirely new approach to funding. He said that the experience they gain from that process will be invaluable. He then suggested that Council meet next week on this matter.
- Neesby moved that Council adjourn until next Wednesday, June 22<sup>nd</sup>, at 7:00p.m.  
Neesby said that, because this was a “privileged” motion, it did not require a Second.
- Tuttle called for the Orders of the Day.
- Kaminsky asked what the point was in voting to meet next week when only eight members of Council would be available at that time, and they could not meet quorum.
- Tuttle spelled out what he saw as the two options Council was facing if they made no decision at this meeting. He said those options were, (1) to have no Budget Review Director or (2) to designate an Interim Budget Review Director.
- Neesby cited a third option which would be to meet next week.
- Smeets said he felt that they needed another meeting.
- Tuttle and Nelson raised the issue of whether there was time to give adequate notification of the meeting Neesby and Smeets were recommending.
- Neesby said it was his opinion that the meeting he was proposing for next Wednesday would not be a “new” meeting, but would be an “adjourned” meeting. Neesby said further that Council also had the option to amend its previously adopted Summer Quorum.
- Tuttle asked how long an “adjourned” meeting might take.
- Neesby then suggested the possibility of adjourning this meeting and reconvening at 9:00a.m. on Saturday, June 18<sup>th</sup>.
- Sargent asked if Council could place a one-hour limit on the reconvened meeting.
- Tuttle suggested the possibility of meeting at 8:00a.m. on Saturday, the 18<sup>th</sup>.
- Zai said that presented a problem for everyone who was an R.A. because they had to be on duty at that time.
- Neesby moved and Doan seconded to adjourn this meeting and to reconvene the meeting at 8:00a.m. on Saturday, June 18<sup>th</sup>.
- Council voted to approved the motion with 9 votes in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
- Neesby moved and Doan seconded to postpone consideration of Qatami’s appointment as Interim Budget Review Director until the Saturday morning, June 18<sup>th</sup>, meeting.
- Council approved the motion to postpone consideration of Qatami’s appointment until the meeting of Saturday, June 18<sup>th</sup>, at 8:00a.m with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

**\*ASUCLA Board of Directors**

- Wood opened the discussion on the remaining undergraduate appointment to be made to the ASUCLA Board of Directors by stating that she’d like to review the reasons that Council Members gave for not supporting her nominee for the position, Cristina Kaoh. She said that one of the main objections expressed was that Kaoh’s views were too



- similar to other student members on the BOD. Wood said she believed that there are many different viewpoints on the BOD at present, and that Kaoh has a viewpoint on certain issues that may not be represented on the Board. As an example, Wood said that Kaoh has been involved with labor issues, and is very concerned about the service workers who work in restaurants across campus. She said, from Kaoh's work on the Taco Bell campaign, she had direct contact with the ASUCLA Board. Wood continued by saying that one of Kaoh's concerns was to make the Board more accessible to students. Wood ended by saying that Kaoh also felt that there were certain Licensing issues that needed to be dealt with.
- Vardner said that he had sat down with Wood and Biniek about what he wanted to see in an appointee to the BOD, and said he was puzzled that they didn't look for someone who was interested in building community. Vardner cited Welcome Week and Dance Marathon as programs that are becoming campus-wide events and said he thought that Wood might have nominated somebody who had been involved on the Hill with ORL.
  - Biniek asked Vardner if he was referring to a specific applicant.
  - Vardner said that he was not.
  - Sassounian said she felt it appeared that Vardner's position was being misunderstood. She said their position is that there are certain issues which would be in the interest of both USAC and the BOD, and that those interests would be served by appointing someone who has experience in community building.
  - Kaoh responded to Sassounian's statement by saying that labor was not her entire focus. She said that she was a member of a multicultural committee which had built bridges on campus. She said she saw the need to bring more social opportunities to the campus, and closed by saying that she engages in shared leadership and was more than willing to listen to the concerns of all students.
  - Sassounian said that Kaoh's response indicated that she would be willing and eager, but said she also felt that there were other applicants who have more experience in the issues she'd like to have represented than Kaoh has.
  - Neesby said his concern was that he has the right and the duty to make sure that he votes for the best available person for the BOD position, but said he feels he has been denied the opportunity to compare all the applicants for this slot. He said he concurs with Wood's right to appoint, but also feels that he has been given the views of only one person, Wood, on only one applicant. He closed by reiterating his statement that he wants to be able to compare all the people who applied for the BOD.
  - Tuttle said that the President is the appointing authority, and that Council was engaged in a balancing act that happens all the time in politics. He reiterated his statement that the President has the right to appoint, and closed by stating his concern that Council was going in circles on this matter.
  - Wood said, "Let's be honest here. You all know who applied, and you all know who you want. I think it's disingenuous of you to ask to see the applications."
  - Neesby said, on his own behalf, that he would like to see all the applications because there might be someone who was in the middle.
  - Sassounian said she thought that there has been a lack of response to legitimate claims that she and other Council members have stated. She urged Council to look at Wood's remarks to verify this belief. Sassounian continued by saying that she didn't see how Council could work together if her views and the views of others from Bruins United are not given serious consideration.
  - Wood said she heard and understood Sassounian's concerns, but said she felt that Sassounian kept making the same points. For that reason, Wood said she was retuning to a presentation of her reasons for supporting Kaoh for the BOD position. She said that Kaoh had not been affiliated with any slate, and also mentioned that Matt Bukirin also had not been slate-affiliated. As an example of Kaoh's open-mindedness, Wood said that Kaoh was not enthusiastic about having a bar on campus, but had stated that she was willing to listen to the opinions of those who wanted a bar, and to evaluate their views before making a decision.

- Vardner, concurring with Tuttle's earlier remark that Council was going in circles. Called the Question.
- Wood interjected that Council need to appoint someone to the BOD so that they could attend the Retreat that begins on Monday, the 21<sup>st</sup>.
- Nelson said that, during Elizabeth Houston's term as President, the BOD members were not appointed in time to attend the retreat.
- Wood, returning to Vardner's action, asked if there were any objections to the Calling of the Question. There being none, Council voted against the appointment of Cristina Kaoh to the ASUCLA Board of Directors with five votes in favor, 7 votes in opposition, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood apologized to Kaoh on behalf of her office.

**\*Finance Committee Vice Chairperson**

- Hazel Villasin, USAC Finance Committee Chairperson, apologized to Council for not providing them with information ahead of time on the student she was recommending to be appointed to the Finance Committee at this meeting. She then handed out copies of Bryan Furukawa's application. Villasin pointed out that, even though the agenda for today's meeting listed the appointment of a Finance Committee Vice Chairperson, she was not asking Council to fill the Vic Chair position at this time. She said that she did want, however, to ask Council to appoint Furukawa as a member of the Finance Committee today because she felt that she would need immediate assistance in the office this year. She said further that the appointment should be on an "Interim" basis, pending notification of open positions when Council resumes its regular meetings in August. Villasin closed by saying that Furukawa had served on the Finance Committee last year where he gained experience in the funding process and in assisting students with their funding applications.
- Vardner moved and Smeets seconded to appoint Bryan Furukawa as an Interim Member of the Finance Committee.
- Biniek stressed the importance of making this appointment today.
- Vardner told Villasin that he appreciated her recommendation that this be an Interim appointment which would allow consideration of other applicants when the appointments process is reopened in August.
- Sargent asked Furukawa what his commitments would be for the coming year.
- Furukawa said that he would be serving on the Board of the Nikkei Student Union (NSU) and would be involved in a number of programs and other responsibilities for that student organization.
- Sargent asked if Furukawa would recuse himself from voting on all funding applications that were submitted by NSU.
- Furukawa replied that he had abstained last year on all applications that were submitted by NSU, and that he would do the same in the coming year.
- Wood asked if there were any further questions or comments regarding Furukawa's appointment.
- There being none, Council voted to approve the appointment of Bryan Furukawa as an Interim Member of USAC's Finance Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

VI. Fund Allocations

- Villasin said that two student groups had applied for Contingency this week, and that the Finance Committee was recommending a total allocation of \$1,291.41.
- Vardner moved and Pham 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.

**Beta Alpha Psi, UCLA****Requested: \$1,569.23****Recommended: \$ 581.41**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$440.00 for the partial cost of Registration and \$151.41 for the partial cost of Transportation for Beta Alpha Psi's National Conference to be held August 4 – August 6, 2005.

**UCLA Future Business Leaders of America – Phi Beta Lambda****Requested: \$9,087.06****Recommended: \$ 700.00**

The Finance Committee recommended the allocation of \$700.00 for the partial cost of Transportation for the UCLA Future Business Leaders of America FBLA Institute of Leaders and National Leadership Conference to be held from June 28 to July 2, 2005.

## VII. Officer and Member Reports

**Administrative Representative – Dr. Berky Nelson**

-Nelson said that, this past Wednesday, he had attended the Third Annual Spring Undie Run. Nelson said that he was not a prude, but did want to express his concern that this event has been escalating every year, and that it has some growing problems. He said that there were approximately 3,000 – 5,000 participants and “audience”, and that someone had hosed the runners. Nelson said that there had been some complaints, and that the police department would be brought in to address the safety concerns and other issues. He referred to the event as “an accident waiting to happen.” Nelson said he had brought his matter to Council and would like them to come up with some suggestions because of the University's concern that students could be injured. He also asked that USAC use its influence with the organizers of the event.

-Wood said perhaps this could be discussed at a future meeting.

-Vardner said it was his understanding that there is a committee that is dealing with this matter already which included AVC Bob Naples and CSP Co-Director Kenn Heller, among others.

**Academic Affairs Commissioner – Michelle Sassounian**

-Sassounian said she was very happy to announce that Student Initiated courses had been officially approved, and that classes would begin in Fall Quarter.

-Wood congratulated Sassounian, and said she would be applying for one.

-Sassounian said she was looking forward to reviewing Wood's application.

## VIII. Old Business

**A. \*Discussion and Decision on Proposed Bylaw Amendments Regarding USA Funding Policies**

*Council lost quorum at 6:50p.m., and the remaining members recessed at 6:52p.m. with the agreement and understanding that they would reconvene the following morning, Saturday, June 18, 2005, at 8:00a.m.*

Respectfully Submitted,  
Pat McLaren  
Substituting for Michael Kessler  
The Incredible USAC Minutes Taker