

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

Tuesday October 11, 2005  
417 Kerckhoff Hall  
7:00 p.m.

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

ABSENT: McLaren

GUESTS: Eric Barba, Cynthia Chen, Melinda Dudley, Gwen Litvak, Steven Ly, Jerry Mann, Janina Montero, Jenalee Oberfell, Roy Samaan, Carlos Saucedo, Shant Taslakian, Narges Zohoury

I. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*Villasin passed around the Attendance Sheet*

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Neesby asked to move New Business Item A, Criteria for Approval of Resolutions, to before Old Business and the resolutions themselves.
- Biniek suggested removing the discussion from the Agenda altogether. She said that council had just gotten this an hour earlier.
- Kaisey asked to move Old Business all the way up to before Special Presentations because of time constraints. Biniek said that the presenters would have to leave early, so she agreed that they should go before the Old Business.
- Pham and Smeets each asked to be added to the list of Officer Reports.
- Wood said that she was removing the Special Presentation by the Student Advisory Council.
- Wood took council to a vote on the amendment to the Agenda of removing the Special Presentation by the Student Advisory Council.
- Council voted to amend the Agenda by removing the Special Presentation by the Student Advisory Council with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Wood said that the next amendment would be the removal of the New Business Item A, Criteria for Approval of Resolutions. Neesby called for a discussion. He said that this had been put on the Agenda previously, and although it needn't be an action item, he would like to at least have a discussion. In response to a comment by Wood, Neesby said that the Resolutions on the table that night could be amended and approved. There was discussion about the differences between approving and amending the amendment. Biniek said that it would be too hard to discuss the criteria for approval since Council had not had time to review the documentation. After additional give-and-take, Wood took the issue to a vote.
- Council voted not to remove New Business Item A, Criteria for Approval of Resolutions, with a vote of 4 in favor of removal, 6 opposed to removal, and 1 abstention.
- Neesby said that the next amendment to the Agenda would be to move New Business Item A, Criteria for Approval of Resolutions, to earlier in the meeting. Biniek said that it would be hard to have a discussion about the criteria for approving a resolution before actually addressing the Resolutions. Neesby countered that he wanted to establish the criteria before any more resolutions were passed, beginning with tonight's meeting. He said that this needed to take place and need to be discussed.
- Wood argued that creating criteria would restrict council's voting, and each person had the right to direct their own votes. Sargent disagreed, offering funding as one example of a vote based on

- criteria, saying that it would not force anyone's hand to have guidelines. Wood disagreed, saying that funding was a totally different issue.
- Hawkins brought up the point that it would not make sense to create a new set of criteria just before voting on several important resolutions. Neesby again explained that he was not asking for this to be an Action Item at this time, only a discussion item. He said that he did not think the issue needed to be voted on, but he did want council to start thinking about that.
  - Tuttle reminded Neesby that he could make this an Action Item with a 2/3 vote. Tuttle asked Neesby if his proposed criteria were voted on and approved at this meeting, was it his idea that there would be a Point of Order by the chair to rule out discussion on the resolutions, or would it be to hear the arguments, and then decide whether or not to invoke the guidelines. Neesby replied that his intent was to create guidelines for the approval of resolutions. He said that this would be a standing policy, and would be treated as any standing policy. Neesby said that his legislative intent was not to limit discussion, but to establish a burden of criteria.
  - Biniek said that this had been discussed last week and the day before, and to put this in front of the council with less than 24 hours notice would be to impose the criteria on council before taking a vote on the resolutions that are on tonight's agenda.
  - Biniek called the question. Neesby objected to the calling of the question.
  - Neesby said that nobody would be forced into a vote, and everyone could still vote as they wished, but the discussion did need to happen to establish parameters on the approval process for resolutions.
  - Wood took Council to a vote on whether New Business Item A, Criteria for Approval of Resolutions, should be moved on the agenda to be dealt with before Old Business.
  - Council voted to move New Business Item A, Criteria for Approval of Resolutions, to before Old Business with a vote of 7 in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
  - Wood took Council to a vote on approval of the Agenda, as amended.
  - Council voted to approve the Agenda, as amended, with a vote of 7 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

### III. Approval of the Minutes

*There were no Minutes this week.*

### IV. Special Presentations

#### **UC Admissions, BOARS Representative Eric Barba**

- Eric Barba, undergraduate representative to UC Admissions, introduced himself to council. He said that the UC system, especially the Los Angeles campus, was in a diversity crisis. He said that the committee he serves on is responsible to the UC system concerning admissions and eligibility issues. Barba said that the parameters the committee sets are to be adopted by all of the UC campuses and adjusted accordingly. He said that the committee consisted of one faculty representative from each of the UC campuses, one Chairperson, one Vice Chairperson, one graduate representative, one undergraduate, and many analysts and ex-officio members. Barba said that access to higher education would always be important and controversial. He said that the paradigm had shifted toward admission policies, but they were still working to recognize the importance of diversity. Barba said that access and diversity were major problems right now. He said that one of the significant concerns was to know whether or not the UC was meeting its standard for access, based on the guidelines set forth in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Barba said that the Regents wanted to admit a student body that was high in achievement and was representative of the diversity of the state of California. He said that, in response to this, a method had been developed to analyze student demographics and compare them to statewide demographics to determine how well the state was represented by the University of California system. Barba said that the guidelines for the UC were that one must match the other. He said that Latinos, Blacks, and, to some degree, Whites, were underrepresented by the University of California in relationship to statewide demographics. Barba said, in addition, that the students whose parents did not attend college were also being underrepresented. He said that their new goal was to "democratize access to higher education." Barba said that the UC system had withdrawn from the National Merit Scholarship Program, which had been a big deal, as the PSAT was often

given much weight in admissions. He said that this had been dismissed because of the unrepresentative sample of students who took the PSAT. Barba said that it had been determined that the PSAT was not a good indicator of academic success, and that it was culturally skewed. Biniek added that most institutions that UCLA compared itself to were also not participants in the National Merit Scholarship Program. Barba said that last year they had also adopted a new set of criteria for admissions by exception. He said that this was used to admit athletes who were not academically eligible, fine art students who were academically ineligible, or other “diamonds in the rough.” Barba said that BOARS had made the guidelines for admission by exception, allowing for a maximum of 6% of students to be admitted by exception. He said that the students admitted by exception were later evaluated, based greatly on first and second-year GPA performance.

- Tuttle asked if Barba had found that male students were now trailing female students, to which Barba said that they had been for almost a decade now.
- After some nudging by Wood, Barba moved on to what he said would be his last point, which was that the GPA boost that students got for taking honors and AP classes in high school was being reevaluated. He said that Advanced Placement and Honors classes were barely predictive of performance in college. Barba said that they were looking at the policy and now thinking about limiting the point boost of Honors and AP courses, and possibly removing it altogether. Barba said that what council could do would be to understand campus policy, and make sure that their delegates to the University Admissions Committee were competent and also that their appointees made regular reports back to council. He also challenged council to conduct their own analyses, and to try to find further steps to alleviate the admissions crisis.
- Doan asked if BOARS was looking at the new SAT. Barba replied that they were, but right now they were looking at a new kind of curriculum-based testing.

*Vardner arrived at 7:48*

#### V. Appointments

*There were no Appointments this week.*

#### VI. Fund Allocations

- Villasin said that \$6,700.11 had been requested over the week, and \$1,826.00 was being recommended for allocation, taking the balance in Contingency Funding from \$42,500.63 to \$40,674.63.
- Biniek 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.

*The Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations are attached to the minutes.*

#### VII. Officer and Member Reports

##### **General Representative #1 – P.C. Zai**

- Zai said that she was currently in communication with the On Campus Housing Council (OCHC), and campus relations would be kept open. She said that this was National Coming Out Week, after which she listed a number of ways in which her office was working on related issues. First, she said she would be setting up a campus safety meeting and would be meeting with Nancy Greenstein from UCPD. Zai said that they would be talking about the STOP program in high laptop use areas. She said that there were some problems with the “gotcha programs”, but the problems were being worked out. She said further that they were working on self-defense classes on the hill that would be open to all UCLA students. She ended her report by saying that the Center for Women and Men had a lot of resources they would be using, and that the Center would also be working on a sexual assault informational session.

##### **Campus Events Commissioner – Jason Kaminsky**

- Kaminsky said that CEC just had a retreat at Big Bear which had gone very well. After passing out flyers about the coming week's CEC-sponsored events, Kaminsky said he would be meeting with the group Invisible Children. Kaminsky also said that they would be working with Vardner on sustainability issues. He said that they were trying to have a concert with Death Cab for Cutie on November 10<sup>th</sup> as a fundraiser for the Katrina Relief effort. Kaminsky closed by telling Council that someone stole a Campus Events A-Board which was on the hill.

#### VIII. Special Presentations

##### **UCSA – Jeannie Biniek, Roy Samaan, Jeanalee Obergfell,**

- Jenalee Obergfell and Roy Samaan introduced themselves to council. Obergfell started reading their PowerPoint slide show to council, beginning with the UCSA Mission Statement. Samaan outlined some of the services that UCSA provides for students, emphasizing their ability to pool resources on behalf of students and work on their behalf. Samaan said that UCSA was a system-wide coalition of associations, representing 200,000 students and employing a five-member full-time staff. Obergfell outlined some of UCSA's resources. Samaan continued reading aloud to council, outlining some of UCSA's accomplishments. Biniek interjected that many of the things UCSA accomplishes result from combining the strength of the students as a whole, represented by UCSA. Obergfell continued, outlining some of UCSA's more recent victories, including prevention of fee hikes and building student electoral power. Samaan said that they were currently working on prioritizing higher education, and had doubled Annual Lobby Day attendance, gaining lots of media attention. Obergfell said that another recent victory was the creation and pending adoption of a GSHIP system. Samaan said that the action items for the coming year included again freezing student fees, building student electoral power, and restoring financial aid. Tuttle told council that UCSA had been created by UCLA Student Government leaders who preceded them.

#### IX. New Business

##### **A. Criteria for Approval of Resolutions**

- Neesby said that in creating these guidelines, he believed that speaking on behalf of the entire student body was a huge burden to prove. He said that this burden should lie with the authors of resolutions to show how they related to students. Neesby said that he also believed that if the issue was a partisan issue, it would not represent a significant portion of the student body because of the on-campus partisan split. He said that he also wanted to make sure that resolutions directly affected students. Neesby said that this meant that students had to be affected because of their status as students, not because many students belonged to affected groups. Neesby also said that he wanted to limit what council should be doing, because he did not think they had the right to pass every resolution brought before them. Neesby said further that, when Council passes a resolution, he feels they are obligated to follow through on any actions that the resolution sets forth. He closed by saying that his remarks covered the various sub points that are in his list of criteria.
- Tuttle pointed out that, when resolutions are approved and are published in the Daily Bruin, paid for with student-fee funds, there are legal ramifications to be considered. He expanded on his point by saying that, if a partisan resolution is approved and published, perhaps it would be necessary to have a reference to the pros and cons and, preferably, to counterarguments.
- Biniek told council that she, too, had created criteria for approval of Resolutions, and then stated them as follows: Resolutions have to be (1) University Related, (2) Supported by members of the UCLA community, and (3) non-partisan. Biniek said that resolutions should outline who would be affected and how. She said that supporters must also be provided by the sponsor of a resolution. Biniek added that positions that tend to favor one political party over the other should be avoided.
- Nelson said that this seemed to be boiling down to a strict versus loose constructionist perspective. He said that his understanding was that the citizens of California paid taxes to subsidize education for students, and there was a learning process that went on because these students were the future of the state. Nelson said that UCLA students were the "elites", which bore a burden. He said that many people did not vote, and many voters did not think.

- Wood said that the time limit Council had placed on this discussion had expired, and suggested that they move on to the next agenda item. Neesby attempted to raise a Point of Order, supported by Vardner, but Wood called for a motion on the first Resolution under Old Business.

#### X. Old Business

##### A. \*Resolution in Opposition to Proposition 74

- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to approve the Resolution in Opposition to Proposition 74.
- Neesby made a Point of Order that the limit of discussion was only on Action Items, and pointed out that his item on criteria for resolutions had been amended to a discussion item during the approval of the Agenda.
- Tuttle suggested overruling the chair's decision to move past the Discussion on Criteria for Approval of Resolutions.
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to overrule the chair's decision to move past the Discussion on Criteria for Approval of Resolutions.
- Biniek remarked that everyone who had asked to be placed on the speakers list had spoken, and that there were no other names on the list.
- Sassounian reminded Wood that Council had always added time before or after the limit was passed, and that it had never been an issue.
- Council voted to overrule the chair's decision to move past the Discussion on Criteria for Approval of Resolutions. with a vote of 8 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention.

#### XI. New Business

##### A. Criteria for Approval of Resolutions (cont'd)

- Wood asked for a motion to extend the discussion.
- Neesby said that they didn't need a motion to extend a Discussion Item.
- Wood then asked for a motion to limit the time of discussion.
- Neesby moved and Kaisey seconded to set a time limit of 15 minutes on the Discussion on the Criteria for Approval of Resolutions.
- Council voted to set a time limit of 15 minutes on the Discussion on the Criteria for Approval of Resolutions with a vote of 8 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Wood said that when students come to Council with resolutions, sponsored by at least three Council members, she thinks that Council needs to consider all such resolutions. She said it was her opinion that setting criteria would limit council's right to vote on the resolutions, and that she firmly believe that everyone should have the right to vote their minds.
- Neesby said he felt that questions needed to be raised, and that the best way to do that was with an educational effort. He said that with the education guidelines, he didn't see how Council could sponsor the proposed Resolution against Proposition 74 anyway.
- Wood raised a Point of Clarification by saying that the criteria Neesby was proposing would not apply only to the resolutions that were on tonight's agenda.
- Neesby agreed with Wood's statement, but said he still thought that council should direct their efforts to educating the student body.
- Sargent said that he did not want to limit council's ability to vote, but at the same time he didn't see much difference between Neesby's criteria and Biniek's criteria.
- Doan said she felt that the points listed under Criteria 1 were subjective, but she thought the the points made under Criteria 2 and Criteria 3, which had not been discussed at all, were actually very important. She said that they would ensure that council was following its guiding documents and other relevant laws.
- Sassounian said that, in reading the criteria, she was reminded that she had not run for her position on a Democratic or Republican ticket. She said that it was not relevant to her position. Sassounian said that she felt it was important to institute some kind of criteria, although she was undecided about strict or broad interpretation. She added that, when Council approved resolutions, they spoke for the entire undergraduate student body.
- Biniek said that Council members were advocates for students, and they had power and a responsibility to the students. She said that if people can think for themselves then they could vote for issues the way that they wanted to.

- Samaan said that many people were talking about council's responsibility, and it would be naïve of council to assume that the people in power were not interested in finding out where students stood on issues.
- Tuttle said his thought was of the First Amendment issue of the people who did take a stance and were elected, nonetheless. He said that a gag resolution could be used to prevent a vote if members felt that a resolution was inappropriate. Tuttle said he recognized there was language inherent in the criteria that applied to the First Amendment.
- Wood said it seemed that everyone was in agreement that the resolutions should not be partisan. She said that, with regard to affecting students, she thought it was naïve of council to address only those issues that directly affect students and to ignore other important issues.

## XII. Old Business

### A. \*Resolution in Opposition of Prop 74 (cont'd)

- Malik said that UCLA students interacted with K-12 students on a variety of levels, including those students who might be future Bruins. Malik said that the students were also affected by their teachers, and that Proposition 74 would adversely affect teachers. She said that this proposition failed to address real problems that face K-12 students.
- Biniek said that, as UCLA Students, she felt Council members had to make sure that their education was of a high quality and also was available to students throughout the entire state. She said it was important to protect teachers.
- Doan asked if council had checked into the legality of this resolution, with regard to using state resources to take a partisan stance.
- Biniek said that it was UCOP policy, not law, and it was regarding the use of student funding. This meant that the resolution, by UCOP Policy, could not be printed, but even that was contested.
- Mann said that student governments were subsidiaries of the university, and university policy prevented the use of university resources to support or oppose a ballot proposition.
- Neesby said that this seemed pretty clear, and even if it was just UCOP policy, there should be a discussion about whether or not to go against that policy.
- Samaan said that in 1999 there was a case about a student government against the UC Regents. He said that this case set a precedent in court for student governments to take a stance on issues such as these. Samaan said that since no resources had been spent on this, it would not be legally challenged.
- Kaminsky asked, rhetorically, that if no student fees were being used, and if the resolution was not printed, would anything really come of approving the resolution.
- Tuttle said that he had spoken with the administration to get their opinion on the use of mandatory fees to fund promotion of a stance against this resolution, and was told there would have to be reference to a counterpoint available to the student body. He said that there had not, however, been any instruction about not having a resolution period.
- Biniek and Wood stressed that council, as UCLA students, had only gotten thus far because of their K-12 teachers, and it was only fair to protect those teachers.
- Sassounian said that there were differences of opinion about what protecting teachers meant, and about what was best for K-12 students. She said that she did not agree with the content of the resolution, and said that she also had concerns about whether it was even an appropriate resolution for Council to be voting on. Sassounian said further that she was curious about the response to Kaminsky's concern about what would happen to this resolution if it were passed.
- Biniek said that the Daily Bruin could cover this meeting, or notices could be given on other publications out of offices, or just word of mouth.
- Neesby said that if the goal was to educate students, the resolution did not seem to satisfy that charge. He said that he thought Council would do better to educate students on what the proposition is about rather than to take one stance or another. Neesby said that, without even being able to publish, this was simply a waste of time.
- Wood took the issue to a vote.
- The motion to approve the Resolution in Opposition to Proposition 74 failed with a vote of 4 in favor, 7 opposed, and 0 abstentions. Kaisey was out of the room when the vote was taken.

**B. \*Resolution in Opposition of Proposition 75**

- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to approve the Resolution in Opposition to Proposition 75.
- Wood said that the proposition was detrimental to many workers on the UCLA campus. She said that it limited the rights of working-class individuals, thus hurting the student experience on campus.
- Biniek said that she would not be opposed to adding an amendment to explain the resolution, but said she thought that it would cloud the discussion. She said that the workers on the campus were integral to student life on campus. Biniek said she believed that students had to stand with them in solidarity because, if they were hurt, then students were hurt. Hawkins echoed Biniek, saying that students were part of the larger community.
- Tuttle said that council should not dismiss resolutions for fear of not being able to publish them. He said further that, if a resolution was approved but that funding for publication of the resolution was denied, there were other ways to get the information out.
- Neesby said that his understanding of the proposition was that union members would need to give annual permission for their union to spend part of their dues to take a partisan stance. He said that he did not know how this affected students, and the resolution went nowhere to outline that effect. Neesby also pointed out that, educating the student body, instead of taking a partisan stance one way or the other, would also be a better way to deal with this resolution.
- Zai said that she was personally against these propositions, but she did not like taking a stance on behalf of the students. She said that, even without an advertisement, the Daily Bruin would be printing information about tonight's meeting, and why else would council be addressing the resolution except for trying to influence students.
- Wood reiterated her position that council represents UCLA students, and they were elected to take stances. She said that unions would be effectively silenced by this proposition, due to all the extra hurdles that they would have to leap.
- Biniek said that corporations would not have to get the same kind of written permission that the proposition would impose on unions, and corporations spend 24 times what unions spend on lobbying. She also said that it is impossible to draw a line between students and other members of the UCLA community.
- Hawkins said that, although council members are students now, there was no telling what they would be later in life, and even they might be affected by this issue at some later date.
- Sassounian said it was inaccurate to say that, by opposing the resolution, council members were opposing students themselves. She said that she did not want to talk about the proposition itself, but about the appropriateness of using council's positions to oppose the proposition. Neesby echoed Sassounian, saying that council couldn't pass resolutions of that nature.
- The motion to approve the Resolution in Opposition to Proposition 75 failed with a vote of 5 in favor, 6 opposed, and 0 abstentions. (Vardner absent)

**C. \*Resolution in Opposition of Proposition 76**

- Biniek said that proposition 76 would allow for cuts to the education budget. She said that students were paying more and getting less, with co-payments at the health center and less funding across the board. Biniek also said that the proposition undercut voters, and removed the power of the legislature to check the governor. She said that this would negatively affect students because, until now, it had been the legislature that kept giving money back to students.
- Biniek moved and Pham seconded to approve the Resolution in Opposition to Proposition 76.
- Pham echoed Biniek, saying that students needed the funding that was being taken away. She said that this was something that council should focus on, and council needed to fight for students.
- Neesby said that there had been former cuts to education, but this was not actually a proposition regarding education funding. He said that he also saw this proposition as tenuously linked to students. Neesby said that resolutions like this opened the door for council to approve resolutions on any hypothetical situation in which they could draw an obscure link between the issue and students.
- Biniek said that she did see a threat to the budget, even if it took several steps to get there. She said that the reality was that there was a potential for students with increased electoral power to have an effect. Biniek said that it is necessary for council to come out against the resolution now rather than fighting it after the education cuts are proposed.

- Samaan said that one of the first things to go during “budget crises” was higher education. He also said that he was disturbed by council’s inability and unwillingness to take a stance. Samaan asked council where their heart was, and said that he was very disappointed by council’s apathy.
- Wood said she thought that statements about educating the student body were empty rhetoric, because Biniek was the only council member she knew of who had actually done things to educate the students.
- Tuttle repeated what he had already said about council’s ability to publish resolutions, pending approval and providing references to counter-arguments. He then read aloud to council the exact wording of the policy about using student funding for political items.
- Kaisey said, with regard to Wood’s empty rhetoric comment, Kaisey was actually working on creating a Town Hall on the Hill preceding the Special Election.
- Vardner also said that his office was busy working on facilities issues, but that they’d be getting to work soon on educating students.
- Pham again said that this resolution was something that she felt really strongly about. She said that if Council wasn’t proactive about the issue now, then someone else would have to try to fight it later.
- The motion to approve the Resolution in Opposition of Proposition 76 failed with a vote of 5 in favor, 6 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

### XIII. New Business

#### **C. Discussion of Conversion of ASUCLA Library into USA Multi-Use Space**

*Wood moved up the discussion of Conversion of ASUCLA Library*

- Carlos Saucedo and Cynthia Chen from the President’s Office proposed changing the ASUCLA Library into a multi-use communal office space with 30 mailboxes for student groups. Saucedo said that this would serve student groups that did not have any office space. Chen said that there would be codes assigned for copiers, faxes, and telephones, so that everyone could use them on separate accounts. She said that groups could sign up for times to use the facilities, or just drop in when it was free. She said that the total cost of the project would be less than \$20,000. Wood said that they had looked at the financial ramifications of this project, and they planned to get the funding from the money set aside for hardwiring Kerckhoff that had cost less than anticipated. She said that this would be providing a great service to student groups and, although there would be an annual cost of more than \$10,000 to maintain and service the space, that funding could be allocated from Surplus.
- Neesby asked if the logistics of this would be handled by the Office Space Allocation Committee (OSAC) and Facilities, to which Wood said that it would.
- Sassounian suggested getting more than the 30 proposed mailboxes, especially since they were relatively cheap.
- Wood said that the concern was having too many mailboxes, leading to high turnover and difficulty for the mail sorters. She said that the mailboxes would be for the more active student groups.
- Vardner said that he was working with Saucedo and Wood on this, and the project would be going through OSAC and Facilities, with the financial implications coming to Council.
- Sargent said he thought this was a great idea, but that he wondered what happened to all the materials that had been housed in the Library.
- Mann said that the library had been relocated to an office on the second floor of Kerckhoff, and would eventually be going digital.
- Kaminsky asked who would determine who got the 30 mailboxes, to which Wood said that OSAC would determine it. Tuttle pointed out that it would be very important to make the mailbox distribution content-neutral. He said that the federal courts would be watching this.

#### **B. \*Resolution in Support of the 2005-2006 UCSA Action Agenda**

- Biniek said that everyone had the resolution in the Agenda Packet. She said that it provided details of what UCSA is, what it does, and what “Action Agenda Items” are. Biniek said that the resolution included discussion of funding issues, voter registration, and advocacy efforts. She said that the resolution reflected that council supported the campaign.

- Kaisey asked how this would be communicated to the students, to which Biniek said that it would be through the Student Action Network.
- Neesby said he thought this was an example of a clearly relatable proposition.
- Hawkins moved and Kaisey seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of the 2005-2006 UCSA Action Agenda.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution in Support of the 2005-2006 UCSA Action Agenda with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. (Vardner was out of the room)
- Biniek moved and Hawkins seconded to publish a 1/3 page advertisement of the Resolution in Support of the 2005-2006 UCSA Action Agenda in the Daily Bruin.
- Sargent and Neesby asked about the necessity of printing the resolution in the Daily Bruin. Doan and Sassounian suggested that, instead of publishing the resolution, USAC create something different to run in the Daily Bruin which would teach students more about UCSA. Vardner suggested using half of the advertisement for the resolution and the other half of the space to teach students a little about UCSA.
- Biniek withdrew her motion to publish, saying that she would work on something better and would bring it back to council at a later date.

#### XIV. Officer and Member Reports

##### **Academic Affairs Commissioner – Michelle Sassounian**

- Sassounian said that she had her first staff meeting last week. She said that her staff was really excited, and one thing that she wanted to extend to council was to consider initiating a course about things that affected each member's office. Sassounian said that a faculty sponsor was needed to initiate a class, but that wouldn't be too hard with the connections that most council members had on campus.
- Biniek asked what the deadline was to create a class, and Sassounian said that the deadline was sixth week, with workshops about it during third week. She said that the application was on the USAC website.

##### **Financial Supports Commissioner – Ryan Smeets**

- Doan said that Smeets had to leave the meeting a little early, and had asked her to report that the Dodgeball tournament to raise funds for Katrina Relief has been set for November 4<sup>th</sup> from 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

##### **Community Service Commission – Farheen Malik**

- Malik said that her staff retreat had been held over the last weekend, and she had recently been receiving a lot of interest from students who want to join her staff. She announced that applications for the CS Mini Fund would be due later this month. She said she was working on setting up Community Service Day. Malik said that more than 700 people had participated in the Mayor's Community Service Day. She said that CSC would be leading a recycling drive, and would be working with Pi Kappa Phi on a Battle of the Bands.

##### **External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek**

- Biniek said that she had been at a meeting in Berkeley over the weekend. She said that there were 15 people in attendance, and they had talked about the UC Regents. She said that there would be another meeting coming up this weekend to talk specifically about Return to Aid. Biniek also said that the board meeting at UCSF was coming up later in the quarter. She said that, on October 19, there would be a USSA effort on Bruin Walk with prepaid phones so students could call members of the Board of Regents and urge them to vote against budget cuts. Biniek said that the Student Action Network would take place on the 26<sup>th</sup>.
- Tuttle asked what the Santa Barbara Press conference would be about, to which Biniek replied that it would be about the call-in day she had just reported on.

##### **Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan**

- Doan said that using the Hill to promote events was great, but there were certain guidelines that Council had to follow. She said that she had printed these guidelines for council, and then passed them around the table. Doan said that she hoped to compile this kind of information to

put on the CSP webpage. She also said that she had passed out a survey about the USAC webpage, as she had been getting a lot of complaints. Doan said that she would appreciate any input from council. She also said that she would be having meetings with the Peer Help Line to find out how USAC could help. Doan closed by saying that, next week, she would begin a dialogue about USAC sponsorship, as she wanted to be sure of what council was asking of its sponsored groups.

XV. Old Business

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

- Neesby said that the only two change since last time had been to VI.C.5.c.1.b, to add that the deliberative sessions now allowed the presence of a "UCLA Administrative Representative."
- Nelson said that this would be helpful, especially concerning any questions of impropriety that might be raised by the Judicial Board.
- Neesby made a friendly amendment to add UC something...
- Biniek moved
- With regard to item VI.C.5.c.2.a, Biniek said that perhaps it should read "and" instead of "and/or". Neesby said that it could be "and/or", because otherwise quorum could not be met without an ASUCLA member present.
- Tuttle said that the administrative representative would not count for quorum, but there were implications in this matter from the federal courts. Tuttle asked Neesby if the proposal continued to hold that a taped record be retained, to which Neesby said that it did. Tuttle suggested that the tapes be kept indefinitely rather than for a set amount of time.
- Biniek said that her concern was that Bylaws took effect immediately, and worried what the implications would be if council was technologically unprepared for such a Bylaw change.
- Neesby said that he thought it could be postponed until the technology was available.
- Neesby moved and Hawkins seconded to table the Bylaw change until technology was put in place.
- Tuttle asked Neesby if he could clean up the language between now and the next meeting, to which Neesby said that he would.
- Neesby amended the motion to table until technology was available to not exceed two weeks.
- Council voted to table the amendments to the Bylaws, section VI.C.5, for a period of no more than two weeks, with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

XVI. Announcements

- Wood said that she would be speaking at National Coming Out Week on Thursday from 6:00-8:00 p.m.
- Vardner said that his floor would be having interview workshops for the career fairs.

XVII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*Villasin passed around the attendance sheet.*

XVIII. Adjournment

- Biniek moved and Neesby seconded to adjourn.
- Kaminsky called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 10:43 p.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Michael Keesler  
USAC Minutes Taker