

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday August 16, 2005
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Biniek, Hawkins, Kaminsky, Malik, McLaren, Neesby, Nelson, Pham, Qatami, Sargent, Smeets, Tuttle, Vardner, Villasin, Williams, Wood,

ABSENT: Doan, Kaisey, Sassounian, Zai

GUESTS: Susan Canullas, Faith Christiansen, Melinda Dudley, Justin Jimenez, Jerry Mann, Joline Price

I. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 7:14 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Villasin asked to add an Action Item for Approval of Contingency Funding. She apologized for this late notice, but said that she has been out of town and was unable to meet the regular deadline. Neesby expressed concern about the short notice and about the amount that was being recommended for allocation. Villasin and Vardner explained that the allocations were all made under the discretionary authorization that is granted to the Finance Committee Chairperson under certain specific conditions. Neesby said he would still prefer to delay this matter, so Wood suggested that the item be placed on the agenda for next week's meeting instead of this week's.
- Malik and Vardner both asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- McLaren said that there was another proposed change to the USA Programming Funding Guidelines that she would distribute at the time the item was up for Council's consideration.
- Neesby asked to amend the appointments of Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) and Judicial Board (J-Board) since no off-table negotiations had ended in agreement. He asked that the agreed-upon candidates be voted on and the others not be voted upon. Wood's response was that each candidate would be voted upon, and any individual problems could be discussed during those appointments.
- Wood said that she wanted to move the Sustainable Transportation Resolution and the related policy change to directly after the Minutes, the Transportation Services Advisory Board (TSAB) Appointments to before the Lesbian/Gay/Bi/Transgender (LBGT) Advisory Board Appointments, and the CS Mini Fund Appointment of Arife Raza to as soon as possible. Wood also imposed a five-minute time limit on discussion of each appointee.
- Qatami asked to add an Action Item on Line Item Caps for the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF) and the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF).
- Council voted to approve the amendments to the Agenda with a unanimous vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded that Judicial Board and SFAC Appointments be removed from the Agenda.
- Neesby explained that there had not been a proper negotiation, let alone a conclusion, on the Judicial Board and SFAC appointments, and he did not want to waste council time. Biniek countered that since there was a five-minute limit on discussion of each appointee it would not take up much council time.

- Vardner called the question.
- Council voted to amend the Agenda by removing the Judicial Board and SFAC appointments with a vote of 5 in favor, 3 opposed, 0 abstentions.
- Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Wood, Tuttle, and Pham expressed the opinion that it was unnecessary to remove the appointments from the Agenda since the appointees had been forwarded six days ago, and there had been ample time during which the ARC had met with the appointees. The issue of slate politics influencing decision was brought up, and since J-Board deadlines were approaching these appointments were time sensitive. Neesby's reply was that it would be worth waiting since J-Board appointments were lifetime, in addition to the fact that the Bylaw mandated time of notice was 7 days, not 6. McLaren and Wood pointed out that the Judicial Board currently does not have enough members to meet quorum, but had issues that needed to be dealt with. As for SFAC, three weeks had gone by since forwarding of the appointees.
- The motion to approve the Agenda as amended failed with a vote of 4 in favor, 4 opposed, with Wood breaking the tie, and voting against the motion.
- Biniek moved and Kaminsky seconded to amend the Agenda by putting the SFAC Appointments back on.
- Vardner said that his concerns about SFAC were that he was worried about the opinions represented by the SFAC appointees, but Wood said that she thought those concerns could be dealt with during the discussion of the appointments themselves.
- Council voted to amend the Agenda by putting the SFAC Appointments back on with a vote of 5 in favor, 3 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Biniek moved and Kaminsky seconded to approve the Agenda, as amended.
- Council voted to approve the Agenda, as amended, with a vote of 5 in favor 3 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

III. Approval of the Minutes

- Sargent said that since there were more than 100 pages of minutes and he had only received them Friday, he would like to table all four sets.
- Neesby moved and Kaminsky seconded to table the approval of the Minutes.
- Council voted to table approval of the Minutes with a vote of 4 in favor, 4 opposed, with Wood breaking the tie and voting to table the minutes.

IV. Special Presentations

Sustainable Transportation Commission

- Dorothy Le from Sustainable Transportation said that she had passed around a Resolution to council about sustainability in transportation at UCLA. She said that transportation was a good area to practice sustainability since many people don't think that there are any options other than cars. Le said that MoveUC had been formed to influence UCOP policy on transportation. She added that incentives had been created to increase options and create innovative programs. Le said that USAC would be very helpful if they passed the Resolution in favor of a very strong policy about decreasing fossil fuel usage and also about increasing usage. She said that GSA would also be asked to pass the resolution.

V. New Business

B. *Resolution in Support of Sustainability in Transportation

- Williams expressed his concern that the resolution sounded good, but there was no scale or context. Le's response, backed up by Vardner and Tuttle, was that while the ideas might not be adopted at face value, it would serve to send a message to raise the bar, giving examples such as UC Santa Barbara that already adhered to such guidelines.
- Kaminsky moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of Sustainability in Transportation.

- Council voted to affirm the Resolution in Support of Sustainability in Transportation with a unanimous vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Vardner moved and Pham seconded to publish a 1/3 page advertisement in the Daily Bruin 1st Week of Fall Quarter 2005.
- Council voted to publish a 1/3 page advertisement in the Daily Bruin 1st Week of Fall Quarter 2005 with a unanimous vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions..

V. Appointments

Transportation Services Advisory Board (TSAB)

- Wood read council her reasons for why Dorothy Le was qualified for TSAB. Pham spoke on behalf of the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Le. Lastly, Vardner spoke to his personal recommendation of Le.
- Biniek moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Appointment of Dorothy Le to the Transportation Services Advisory Board.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Dorothy Le to the Transportation Services Advisory Board with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Lesbian / Gay / Bisexual / Transgender (LGBT) Advisory Board

- Wood read council her reasons for why Carlos Saucedo was qualified for the LGBT Advisory Board. Biniek spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Saucedo. Lastly, Saucedo spoke of his personal reasons for wanting the appointment and goals for his term.
- Pham moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Appointment of Carlos Saucedo to the Lesbian / Gay / Bisexual / Transgender Advisory Board
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Carlos Saucedo to the Lesbian / Gay / Bisexual / Transgender Advisory Board with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Communications Board

- Wood read council her reasons for why Justin Jiminez was qualified for Communications Board. Pham spoke for the ARC, saying that they had voted 2-to-1 to approve Jiminez. Neesby asked about the minority opinion, to which Biniek replied that the concern was about a possible conflict of interest since Jimenez already worked with another communications group on campus. Lastly, Jimenez spoke of his personal reasons for wanting the appointment, and cited his goals for his term on the committee..
- Biniek moved and Smeets seconded to approve the Appointment of Justin Jiminez to the Communications Board.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Justin Jiminez to the Communications Board with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee

- Wood read council her reasons why Arife Raza was qualified for the CS Mini Fund Committee. Biniek spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Raza. Malik asked Raza why CS Mini Fund had not been her first choice. Raza explained that she wanted to serve on CS Mini Fund even though the BOD had been her first choice.
- Hawkins moved and Malik seconded to approve the Appointment of Arife Raza to the Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Arife Raza to the Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood read council her reasons for why Aliya Hussaini was qualified for the CS Mini Fund Committee. Pham spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Hussaini. Malik spoke on behalf of Hussaini, saying that she was going to be the president of a student organization next year, but that the time commitment would not be too much for her to handle
- Hawkins moved and Biniek seconded to approve the Appointment of Aliya Hussaini to the Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee.

- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Aliya Hussaini to the Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood read council her reasons for why Kiran Reddy was qualified for the CS Mini Fund Committee. Biniek spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Reddy. Malik spoke on behalf of Reddy, saying that he had already worked on Community Service Funding.
- Malik moved and Pham seconded to approve the Appointment of Kiran Reddy to the Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Kiran Reddy to the Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood read council her reasons for why Marie Imwinkelreid was qualified for the position of Chair of the CS Mini Fund Committee. Pham spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Imwinkelreid. Malik spoke on behalf of Imwinkelreid, saying that she had been an incredible project service director for CSC.
- Malik moved and Hawkins seconded to approve the Appointment of Marie Imwinkelreid to the position of Chairperson of the Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Marie Imwinkelreid to the Chair Position on the Community Service (CS) Mini Fund Committee with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Financial Aid Policy Committee

- Wood read council her reasons for why Michelle Yashar was qualified for the Financial Aid Policy Committee. Biniek spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Yashar.
- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to approve the Appointment of Michelle Yashar to the Financial Aid Policy Committee.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Michelle Yashar to the Financial Aid Policy Committee with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Information Technology Planning Board (ITPB)

- Wood read council her reasons for why Richard Meng was qualified for the Information Technology Planning Board. Pham spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Meng. Neesby asked why Meng wanted this position now but not earlier. Vardner, having worked with him in the past, spoke on Meng's behalf telling council not to worry about the late application.
- Biniek moved and Pham seconded to approve the Appointment of Richard Meng to the Information Technology Planning Board.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Richard Meng to the Information Technology Planning Board with a vote of 7 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Student Activities Center Board of Governors (SACBOG)

- Wood read council her reasons for why Teryn McElroy was qualified for the Student Activities Center Board of Governors. Biniek spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve McElroy. Vardner spoke personally of his endorsement of McElroy.
- Pham moved and Hawkins seconded to approve the Appointment of Teryn McElroy to the Student Activities Center Board of Governors.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Teryn McElroy to the Student Activities Center Board of Governors with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC)

- Wood read council her reasons for why Daniele Conde was qualified for the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC). Pham spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Conde. Vardner expressed concern about the lack of diversity of viewpoint that would be represented if Conde was appointed to SFAC. Further, he warned that not being given ample

time to talk about the applicant would force him to leave the meeting (*which would cause council to lose quorum*)

- Vardner moved and Biniek seconded to extend the discussion to 20 minutes on each SFAC appointment.
- Council voted to extend the time limit of discussion for each SFAC appointee to 20 minutes with a vote of 7 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Biniek asked that Vardner qualify what viewpoints were not represented and would not be met by Conde. Vardner and Conde entered into a lengthy question and answer exchange, later joined by Smeets, during which the two asked her about her priorities, what she thought about the students' needs, and about her personally. Conde answered all of these questions to what appeared to be their satisfaction, but Wood eventually interrupted the process, reminding council that all applicants had undergone an extensive evaluation process before being presented to Council. Vardner and Smeets continued to question Conde in a similar fashion, and Conde was backed up on some of her answers by Nelson and Biniek.
- Hawkins moved and Pham seconded to appoint Daniele Conde to the Student Fee Advisory Committee.

At 8:54 p.m., Brian Neesby walked out of the meeting, causing council to lose quorum before they could go to a vote on the motion.

- Wood, Nelson, Tuttle, McLaren, and Hawkins all expressed their concern about Neesby's action of leaving the meeting to break quorum, bringing up issues of dangerous precedents, personal responsibility, pointing out other important action items still to come in the meeting, and suggesting a recess to try to find Neesby and persuade him to return to the meeting.
- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to take a 10-minute recess.
- Council voted to go into a 10-minute recess with a vote of 6 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Council went into Recess at 9:02 p.m.

Council Reconvened at 9:16

- Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to table the appointment of Daniele Conde to the Student Fee Advisory Committee.
- Biniek and Wood said that Council knew that this appointment was coming, was very important, and had to be voted upon at this meeting since it was time sensitive. Vardner and Neesby countered by pointing out that it was important to have a diversity of opinion on SFAC, and said that the viewpoint of the candidate was already expressed on the committee by other appointees. They added that they had originally asked to postpone the appointment, and Neesby had even said that he would walk out of the meeting if his concerns were not heard beforehand. Pham asked if quorum would again be lost if this was not tabled, to which Neesby replied that it would.
- Kaminsky Called the Question.
- Council voted to table the appointment of Daniele Conde with a vote of 5 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Student Health Advisory Committee (SHAC)

- Wood read council her reasons for why John Alexiou was qualified for the SHAC. Biniek then spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Alexiou.
- Pham moved and Biniek seconded to appoint John Alexiou to the Student Health Advisory Committee.
- Council voted to appoint John Alexiou to the Student Health Advisory Committee with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood read council her reasons for why Paymon Ebrahimzadeh was qualified for the SHAC. Pham then spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Ebrahimzadeh. Ebrahimzadeh spoke on his own behalf, answering Vardner's question about his intentions by

saying that, among other things, he would be interested in conducting surveys to see how SHAC was serving different groups of students, and how best to contact students.

- Biniiek moved and Malik seconded to appoint Paymon Ebrahimzadeh to the Student Health Advisory Committee.
- Council voted to appoint Paymon Ebrahimzadeh to the Student Health Advisory Committee with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Wooden Center Board of Governors

- Wood read council her reasons for why William Clarke was qualified for the Wooden Center Board of Governors (WCBOG). Biniiek then spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Clarke. Vardner additionally spoke from personal experience with Clarke, endorsing him as an excellent appointee.
- Vardner moved and Kaminsky seconded to appoint William Clarke to the Wooden Center Board of Governors.
- Council voted to appoint William Clarke to the Wooden Center Board of Governors with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Wood read council her reasons for why Meagan Gorman was qualified for the Wooden Center Board of Governors (WCBOG). Pham then spoke for the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Gorman. Vardner additionally spoke from personal experience with Gorman, endorsing her as an excellent appointee.
- Vardner moved and Pham seconded to appoint Meagan Gorman to the Wooden Center Board of Governors.
- Council voted to appoint Meagan Gorman to the Wooden Center Board of Governors with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Wood read council her reasons for why Michael Keesler was qualified for the Wooden Center Board of Governors (WCBOG). Biniiek spoke on behalf of the ARC, saying that they had also voted to approve Keesler. Vardner additionally spoke from personal experience with Keesler, endorsing him as an excellent appointee.
- Biniiek moved and Kaminsky seconded to appoint Michael Keesler to the Wooden Center Board of Governors.
- Council voted to appoint Michael Keesler to the Wooden Center Board of Governors with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

VI. Fund Allocations

- *The Contingency Fund Allocations were tabled until the next meeting.*

VII. Officer and Member Reports

General Representative #1 – Zai

General Representative #1 Zai's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes.

General Representative #1 Zai could not be at the meeting and had sent Joline Price her Chief of Staff to represent her.

Facilities Commissioner – Joseph Vardner

Facilities Commissioner Joseph Vardner's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes.

Questions and Comments followed Vardner's report:

- Tuttle suggested that, to combat the neighborhood's intent to close the Hilgard Bus Terminal, one avenue to explore might be to speak with the children in those houses or the hired help that might use the terminal for getting to school or work.
- Kaminsky asked Vardner more about the prices of housing, to which Vardner explained that living on campus was currently the single most expensive housing option. He said, however, that the university had some very low rent rate apartments for students with families. Nelson added that there was a larger issue at hand about attracting graduate students to UCLA, which

was challenging with such a high cost of living. Vardner agreed, and also pointed out how disastrous the new graduate student housing was.

Community Service Commissioner – Farheen Malik

Community Service Commissioner Farheen Malik's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes. Questions and Comments followed Malik's Report:

- Tuttle said that he wanted to renew his plea not only to reach outside of UCLA, but also to help outreach right within our own community.

External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek

- Biniek said that UCLA had sent 23 people to the University of California Student Association (UCSA) Congress. She also said that they would be working on financial aid in the coming months, and also wanted to work on the upcoming special elections. Biniek said that they wanted to create polling places on campus so that it would be easier for students to vote on campus. Biniek said that a new president from Berkeley had also been voted in for the organization, and Biniek would be chairing the University Affairs Committee, while Samaan had been elected chair of the Campus Action Committee. Biniek explained that she would be working on what happens in the Regents meetings and Samaan would be working on what happens outside of the meetings.
- Vardner asked who was heading Get Out The Vote, to which Biniek answered that she had just lost her point person, so she would notify Council when that position has been filled. Tuttle asked that Biniek please stay in touch with Dr. Nelson and Dr. Naples on these issues in trying to find balance in what she should be working on and spending funds on.

Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan

Internal Vice President Kristina Doan's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes.

Internal Vice President Kristina Doan could not be at the meeting and had sent Liz Vega her Chief of Staff to represent her.

President – Jenny Wood

President Jenny Wood's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes.

Questions and Comments followed Wood's Report:

- Sargent asked if Wood had looked at appointing the Standing Committees, to which she replied that she would begin soon.
- Kaminsky told Wood that some of the Jewish groups had expressed concerns about their ability to come to the Student Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, some of which were scheduled for Saturdays, which was the Jewish Sabbath. Wood said that she would take that under consideration.
- Wood spoke on a personal note, saying that she thought it was irrational and irresponsible of council members to manipulate the timeline on when Council could vote on some of the appointments, after which she said that she would entertain a motion to have the SFAC appointments untabled.
- Biniek moved and Hawkins seconded to bring the SFAC Appointments from the table.
- Biniek asked if the discussions about the candidates were not going to take place at this table, then when would they take place. Neesby and Vardner explained that they wanted the ability to negotiate the appointments of SFAC, and said that it was not really necessary to speak about them here. They reiterated the importance of having a diversity of opinion on the committees, and though one could call it slate politics, the fact of the matter was that there were groups that felt unrepresented by this council. Wood explained that it is one's right not to vote for a candidate, but it is also one's duty to look at a candidate objectively for his or her abilities. Qatami acknowledged Neesby and Vardner's point, but said that when Neesby threatened to leave again if the issue was not tabled, then all the power was in one person's hands. Vardner acknowledged this, saying he hoped that would not have to happen again. At this point Tuttle thanked Neesby for returning to the meeting, but echoed what Nelson said in that there were dangerous precedents being set regarding parliamentary procedures. Biniek said, in support of the motion on the table, it was important to bring these appointments back up because they

needed to be made tonight, but Neesby again said that he wanted a negotiation. He said this might not be a perfect solution but, if a solution could not be reached, he would have to leave the meeting again. Wood expressed her feelings that to be criticized for not negotiating was both upsetting and untrue. She said that she had made many attempts to talk with council over the past weeks about the appointments. At this point Sargent suggested that council be frank in discussing real compromises that they would be willing to make. He then added that the entire discussion was actually out of order. Wood called the question.

- The motion to untable the Appointments of the Student Fee Advisory Committee failed with a vote of 3 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.

VIII. Old Business

A. *Approval of Proposed Bylaw Amendments to Article VI.C.5

- Neesby said that in talking with Wood, it did not seem feasible to have both tape recordings and transcriptions of the budget hearings. Jerry Mann clarified that, it was technically feasible, but that it would be very expensive to do that. He said that statement had not been removed from the version in the packet. Neesby outlined the different versions of the Bylaws that he had included in the Agenda Packet, saying that he had tried to put together a written version of every possible combination regarding tape recordings, transcriptions, and closed sessions versus open session. Vardner said that Council would need to discuss all the options before deciding which one to approve.
- Neesby said that his first choice would be to have hearings and deliberations open, with the option for the BRC to close the deliberations, and with tape recordings and transcriptions available from the hearings and deliberations. Biniak said that she felt funding procedures needed to be the same for all groups, and did not like the BRC having the option to go to closed session. Nelson, on the other hand, said that it would be good to separate funding bodies and their properties. Sargent said that he would like students to be able to come to the hearings but not sit in on the deliberations. He said that he thought USAC members should be entitled to sit in on both the hearings and deliberations. Wood expressed concern about having tape recordings available to the public.
- Mann said that there was an element of Bylaw changes that had been driven by court decisions and UCOP policies. He said that one thing to consider might be what was required of council by law. Mann said that funding was a difficult process, and there were often too many groups applying for too little money. He said that the allocations are then reviewed and are expected to be fair. Mann said that he was concerned about bogging down council's ability to function. He said he was concerned about the amount of time it would take to transcribe all the hearings and deliberations.
- With regard to transcriptions, Nelson said it was his impression that there might be a distrustful aspect to the funding process and said he thought it was not a good idea to transcribe these meetings. He said that people are human, and to looking at potential negatives might counter the positives of adding these new requirements. McLaren said that council could actually hire someone to transcribe all the hearings and deliberations, but it was an incredibly difficult and time-consuming task, and the outcome still might not satisfy the people who were skeptical of the process. Vardner interjected that he had not heard anyone speak out on behalf of transcriptions, so said he thought that idea could be buried.
- With regard to tape recordings, Wood expressed concerns about individuals' ability to be open and honest when they were being recorded. She said that council members might be afraid to take certain actions because organizations might blackball them. Wood also said that it was possible that council members could be ostracized because of their actions and could be harassed by hate e-mail or in person on Bruin Walk. Neesby said that he would bring back to council with a single option, since there was still so much to be decided upon.
- Neesby moved and Malik seconded to table Approval of Proposed Bylaw Amendments to Article VI.C.5
- Wood and Qatami thanked Neesby for the time and thought he had expended on this matter.
- Neesby called the question

- Council voted to table Approval of the Proposed Bylaw Amendments to Article VI.C.5 with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

USAC Retreat and USAC Welcome Week Discussion

- Wood asked to table this item.
- Vardner moved and Pham seconded to table the USAC Retreat and Welcome Week Discussion until next week.
- Kaminsky reminded council that there was a meeting the next day about these two events in Ackerman 2408.

IX. New Business

A. USA/BOD Programming Fund Guidelines

- McLaren said that council had a document in their packet that outlined the proposed changes to the USA/BOD Programming Fund Guidelines. She said new text was indicated in **bold** and language that was to be removed was indicated in ~~strike through~~. McLaren said that it had only recently come to Qatami's attention that she needed to be working on updating these guidelines, so she and Jerry Mann had assisted Qatami by updating some of the language and relocating certain sections to categorize them more logically. Mann said that he and McLaren had just done a little "housekeeping" to bring the language up to date and in concurrence with the Bylaws.
- Kaminsky asked who the BRC Vice Chair was, to which Neesby replied that the proper title for that position was Assistant Budget Review Director. Mann said that he would have this correction made.
- Vardner asked if notice was required on this item, to which Mann replied that this item could be voted on immediately at tonight's meeting.
- McLaren said that sections that had been relocated included a notation about where they had been taken from.
- Kaminsky said that the language in Article VII. J. left some leeway about whether or not people had to pay for events. Mann explained that this language was in the document because individuals who come to the Dance Marathon event have to pay, but are not necessarily participating. Mann said he would clarify this section by adding, "for entrance to the event".
- Wood asked about the statement in Article VII.I. that in certain cases, an allocation must be returned to the USA Programming Fund on a "pro-rata" basis. McLaren explained that this would apply in a situation where an event did not generate any net revenues, which does not occur very often.
- Referring to Article VI.E., Neesby pointed out that it gave priority to cultural and/or educational programs. He asked if any groups or programs had been left out. Nelson said that religious and political groups were not included. Neesby said that, under viewpoint neutrality, this might be an issue. He said that even if this clause did not remove certain groups from eligibility, it did establish a hierarchy. McLaren acknowledged that Neesby had raised a valid point, and said that the reference to cultural programs was included in error.
- Neesby moved to strike "cultural and/or" from Article VI.E. so that it read only "educational".
- McLaren accepted this as a friendly amendment.
- Vardner moved and Smeets seconded to approve the USA Programming Fund Guidelines, as amended, with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

B. Discussion of Proposed Amendments to the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) and the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF)

- Neesby handed out the documents and said that they would be discussed later. Qatami passed out something that was related, saying that she had also sent out an email regarding minimum criteria. She said that the items on her handout would be used to determine minimum criteria. Qatami said that, rather than eliminating a group because of failure to do a certain item, having a

- sliding scale would be useful so that judgment can be used. She said that after the committee met with the groups, they would be evaluated based on this new sliding scale
- Vardner moved and Neesby seconded to allot 10 minutes for the Discussion of Proposed Amendments to the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) and the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF).
 - Council voted to allot 10 minutes for the Discussion of Proposed Amendments to the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) and the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF) with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
 - Vardner said that he believed the minimum criteria needed to be recognized as a University regulation, not a USAC one. He said that the Bylaws allow for a sliding scale, but they may be flawed in this regard. Vardner also said that providing suggestions for a good application was good, but requiring too much from the groups might cause new groups to fall short. He said that USAC's goal was not to determine how good a presentation was, but rather to determine whether or not a student group would act in accordance with relevant guidelines.
 - Mann said that the task of establishing content neutrality was a daunting one, but it needed to be done. He said that a framework was made around a committee that had a well-done proposal. Mann said that it is impossible to determine whether a group with a good proposal will give a good presentation, but at least there is a common measure to compare the groups to one another. Wood agreed, saying that including the minimum criteria in the score sheets would help judge the groups. Qatami pointed out that, after having had the experience of holding hearings, it did seem that the eloquence of the proposal was correlated with the score that they would receive. Also, she said that the thing about the spreadsheets was that many groups had them in perfect condition, so it would be effective to have a sliding scale.
 - Neesby said that he thought the Bylaw wording was tricky, and he would be making proposals to the Bylaws that would clean up the language, changing minimum criteria around a little bit. He said that he had passed out some Bylaw amendments.

C. Discussion of Bylaw Amendments to Article VI.C.4.

- Neesby said that he had distributed his proposed changes to Article VI.C.4 of USAC'S Bylaws, and would discuss them at length at the next meeting.

E. *Line Item Caps for the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF) and the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF)

- Qatami said that she had been discussing the purpose of having line item caps for the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF) and the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF). She said that within BRC it had been decided that it would be more fluid if there were one lump sum. Qatami proposed that the caps be removed on the line items as well as the overall cap.
- Biniek moved and Neesby seconded to remove the Line Item Caps for the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF) and the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF).
- Vardner said that the caps were being removed for organizations and for Council. Qatami said that the way funding was allocated, a cap is really not allowed for, but that the BRC had voted to do 3/7, 2/7, 2/7 as the breakdown. Neesby clarified that the BRC still had guidelines for how much would be spent on certain items at certain times.
- Tuttle said that he recalled a policy reason for the caps being put in, thinking that it was to prevent overspending, to which Qatami explained that more groups would be receiving funding, but not as much as some smaller groups were formerly getting. She said that this would be the same formula that was used for USA Programming. Wood said that since these were BRC internal changes, the caps should be removed, and the decision should be left to the discretion of the BRC to decide whether or not the caps were necessary to make sure groups received equitable funding.
- Vardner asked what the safeguard was in the new formula to prevent some groups from getting all of the funding, to which Qatami said that a formula would still be used to calculate the amount of funding to ensure equitability.
- Neesby said that the problem lay in the line item caps, not the overall cap. He said that by removing the line item caps, the formula could be satisfied, but the overall cap could be retained

so that no one group got all of the funding. Wood, however, said that the problem was that the overall cap had been the sum of the line item caps, so it was a bit of an arbitrary number to settle on.

- Kaminsky said that his one concern in removing the caps was that the 3/7 rule would be gone next year.
- Vardner moved to amend the motion such that the line item caps were removed but the overall cap was retained.
- Biniek accepted the friendly amendment.
- Qatami said that the overall cap should also be examined after looking at how much groups traditionally get. Wood said that removing the overall caps would allow for groups to get more money if fewer applied for some reason. Tuttle said his problem with that formula was that, hypothetically, three groups could receive 3/7 of the funding. He said that would be disastrous. Qatami said that overall 100 groups usually applied, which made Tuttle's point moot. She said that there was a possibility of groups applying in mass in Spring Quarter, and without the overall cap they could be funded with the remaining funds. Wood lastly reminded council that they had the final say in approving budgets.
- Vardner called the question.
- Council voted to remove the Line Item Caps for the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF) and the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

X. Announcements

There were no Announcements this week.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the attendance sheet.

XII. Adjournment

- Biniek moved and Neesby seconded to adjourn.
- Vardner called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 12:14 a.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker