

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday November 29, 2005
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Pham, Sargent, Sassounian

GUESTS: Terence Chan, Constance Dillon, Julia Erlandson, Hovanes Ferikian, Steven Ly, Gwen Litvak, Diem Tran, Yune Tran

I. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Neesby said that the Hare Voting System Special Presentation would be postponed. He also said that the Senate Proposal should be a discussion item instead of an Action Item, and asked Wood if it could be moved up in the meeting. Wood said that she would put it after all of the Action Items, because the council members who serve on the Budget Review Committee will have to leave at 9:00p.m. to participate in the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) Hearings.
- Villasin asked if the approval of the SOOF allocations could be moved up, to which Wood said that it would.
- Neesby moved and Kaminsky seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Doan 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

November 1, 2005

- Biniek said that under her Officer Report on page four, “by nearly \$400 million” should read “to nearly \$400 million.” She also said that, on page three, in the fifth line from the top, under the USAC Student Empowerment Internships Special Presentation, “Community Outreach Center” should read “Student Initiated Outreach Center (SIOC).” Biniek lastly said that, under her Announcement on page seven, on the first line a “*speakout*” was being held on Proposition 73, not a “*discussion*”.
- Wood said that, under her Officer Report, in Vardner’s question immediately following her report, the “Student Affairs Meetings” should read “Chancellor’s Search Committee Meetings.”
- Doan said that, under her Officer Report, on the fifth line down, “Mandy Kathaway” was incorrect; that the woman’s name was “Mandy Hathaway.”
- Vardner said that, on page six, under New Business Item A, Resolution Against an Early On Campus Housing Contract Date, on the last line of his first comment, he had “never used that ‘d-word’ (dorms)”, implying that he requested its change to “*residence halls*.”
- Malik asked if her notes from the meeting could be attached to the record, to which Keesler replied that they could, and said she should get them to McLaren so they could be included with the bound documents.

- Kaminsky moved and Neesby seconded to approve the Minutes as amended.
- Biniek called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of November 1, 2005 were approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

IV. Appointments

***Financial Aid Policy Committee**

- Biniek said that she was forwarding Xiomara Bonitez for Appointment to the Financial Aid Policy Committee. She explained why she thought that Xiomara was qualified for the position, and outlined several of the various leadership positions that she has held on campus.
- Biniek moved and Neesby seconded to approve the Appointment of Xiomara Bonitez to the Financial Aid Policy Committee.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Xiomara Bonitez to the Financial Aid Policy Committee with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

V. Fund Allocations

***Approval of Contingency Fund Allocations**

- Villasin said that \$1,413.00 had been requested from the Contingency Fund, and that the Finance Committee was recommending total allocations of \$765.00. She said that, upon approval by USAC of the recommended allocations, the remaining balance in the Contingency Fund would be reduced from \$22,278.19 to \$21,513.19.
 - Malik moved and Neesby seconded to approve the Finance Committee's Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
 - Council voted to approve the Finance Committee's Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- The Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations are attached to the minutes.*

VI. Officer and Member Reports

External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek

- Biniek said that her office was meeting with Fabio Nunez's office to discuss the follow-up to the last UC Regents Meeting. She also said that they were planning to divide the UC Regents up between the campuses, and would be organizing efforts to use those campuses to target their assigned regents. Biniek ended her report by saying that they would continue working to combat the Budget Reconciliation bill.

Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan

- Doan said that she hoped Council had received her email requesting items for the calendar of events her office has developed, and she urged them to respond promptly. She said she thought that it was cool to have everything that USAC is doing all in one place. Doan said that USAC and OCHC had not been able to hold a joint meeting this quarter, but said she would work on setting up the meeting for the next quarter. Doan ended by reporting to council that the Unofficial Guide to UCLA was coming along well, with the written text being almost completed. She said that the information would be launched on the Bruin Walk website at the beginning of Winter Quarter. Doan also told Council that Tony Ta, USAC's webmaster, was working on the new prototype of the USAC website

President – Jenny Wood

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

VII. Special Presentations

Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) Winter Quarter Allocations Presentation

- All members of the Budget Review Committee participated in the presentation of the Winter Quarter Allocations process and recommendations.
- Smeets began by saying that 116 groups had applied, requesting a total of \$262,891.41 with a recommended \$38,401 for allocation. He went over the SOOF Calendar, and said that the last step would be Wednesday, when the groups would find out how much they were each allocated. Smeets said that the scores for the student groups were based on the quality of the proposal, the quality of the hearing, and the BRC priorities. He said that the score sheet allowed for each group to receive up to a maximum of 50 points.
- Hawkins said that a score sheet was used for groups that were applying for the first time, and said that the score sheet included minimum criteria guidelines to determine eligibility and sliding scales for the proposals and the hearings.
- Hawkins said that the score sheet for the returning groups was a little different, saying that these organizations were judged based on the strength of their evaluations. He said that, aside from that, the score sheet for returning groups was kept as consistent as possible with the score sheet for the first-time applicants.
- Hawkins said that the BRC had used a rubric defining the 1-5 scale for each priority. He said that the five-point scale was further broken down on a standardized scale specific to each priority.
- Malik said, with regard to the hearings, only groups applying for the first time received a hearing. She said that returning groups were assessed based on their Fall Quarter's performance as reflected in their evaluation. Malik said that the Hearing Agenda had been 20 minutes for Introductions, 3 minutes for opening statements, 10 minutes for questions and answers, and 2 minutes for a closing statement. She also mentioned to Council that the committee had sent reminders about the hearings to all groups that applied.
- Malik said that, during deliberations, each proposal was examined thoroughly for miscalculations. She said that the BRC subtracted items that could not be funded by student fees, and adjusted excessive requests according to the SOOF Adjusted guidelines. Malik said that the groups whose scores ranged beyond a 10-point margin were discussed by the BRC until the allocation of points was agreed upon and consistent across committee members.
- Malik said that groups were given a final score determined according to their average score, the sum of each BRC member's score, divided by the total BRC members' score.
- Tran said that the formula used in the allocation took into account the amount available, the SOOF adjusted amount, the organization's need, and the organization's performance. She reminded Council that the total amount for SOOF for the entire year had been \$134,410, and they had decided to allocate 3/7 in Fall Quarter, 2/7 in Winter Quarter, and 2/7 in Spring Quarter. She said that this meant that \$57,604 had been available for allocation in the Fall Quarter, but now there was only \$38,403 available for allocation.
- Villasin reiterated for Council the total amount requested and the total recommended for allocation, and added that, of the 116 groups that applied, 79 had been returning groups, 37 had been new groups, and 108 of the 116 were eligible for funding.
- Villasin said that only 8 of the 116 groups had not been funded. She said that this was because they either failed to submit the mandatory evaluation along with the proposal, were not undergraduate groups or did not have a majority of undergraduates in leadership roles, failed to meet minimum criteria, or failed to submit their proposal by the required deadline.
- Kaminsky asked about the story behind the late UNICEF application. Tran replied that UNICEF's application was five minutes late, as contrasted to the other unfunded late group, whose application was three days late. She elaborated that UNICEF was docked points on their application for turning it in late.
- Neesby asked what happened if a group did not turn in the mandatory evaluation form. Tran answered that they had all been reminded to turn in this form but, if they still did not turn it in, then they were not funded.
- Neesby asked what constituted an "extremely poor" application, to which Smeets explained it was just that, and then elaborated a bit on an "extremely poor" application..

- Neesby asked what the groups thought or knew about the funding cap, to which Tran said that they did not know.
- Doan asked if there were any groups that applied last quarter who did not apply this quarter, to which Tran replied that there were more than 30 groups that applied in Fall Quarter that did not apply in Winter Quarter, but she did not know why. Vardner suggested that someone try to follow-up with these groups, and make sure that they were not being unfairly hindered by this new quarterly funding process. Tran said that planned to do just that.

General Representative #1, PC Zai, arrived at the meeting.

VIII. Fund Allocations (cont'd)

***Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) Winter Allocations**

- Biniek moved and Doan seconded to approve the proposed Student Organizations Operational Fund Winter Quarter Allocations.
- Wood said that she thought changing the amount of the cap to match the quarter and groups' needs had been a great move. Neesby agreed, saying that he had spoken with Jerry Mann, who had also liked this new flexibility.
- Tran said that only four groups had reached the funding cap in Fall Quarter, so lowering that cap for Winter Quarter had made the distribution of funds more equitable.
- Council voted to approve the proposed Student Organizations Operational Fund Winter Quarter Allocations with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

IX. Special Presentations (cont'd)

Freshmen Survey Results – The Offices of General Representatives 1 and 3

- Yune Tran said that the survey had been given out to 129 freshmen and 23 transfer students. She said that the project was not monitored by any statistician, but had rather been conducted out of their own curiosity. Tran said that there had been 10 questions, which had been answered using a sliding scale. She said that the findings had been very interesting. Tran said that they had taken the mode rating for each parameter and divided it over the total number of respondents, to conclude what percentage of students had what typical (modal) experience. She then told Council about some of their findings, including feelings about Welcome Week, ORL, Campus Academic Resources, homesickness, signing up for classes, finding out about campus happenings, counseling resources, and of course, USAC. Tran said that there was also a free response question, which many students had used to talk about interests in communication and résumé-building skills.
- Kaminsky asked if the questions were clarified to the participants. Tran answered that the questions were more elaborate and clear; she had only made them simpler for the presentation to Council. She expanded by reading an example of one of the full, elaborate questions.
- Tuttle asked when the survey was conducted, to which Tran said that it had been done two weeks ago at the Town Hall on the Hill.

X. Old Business

A. *Senate Proposal

- Neesby said that he wanted to get to a point where people could at least make informed decisions about whether to be in favor of or opposed to the Senate. He said that he would be trying to be as available as possible so that he could have discussions with Council members away from the table.
- Kaminsky asked how soon the fully-updated version of the Senate Proposal would be available, to which Neesby said that the most recent version had been distributed already. He added that one important change had been a clarification that the Senate was not in a position to exercise power over the Executive Branch.
- Biniek said that she had read through the whole Proposal, and had a lot of comments and concerns. Biniek said that she didn't think the EVP would ever have the power to appoint

- UCSA directors. She also said that she had a question about funding for Academic Affairs, to which Neesby said that there were two or three referendum funds, some of which were for programming while others were for Council, and such differences would be outlined in the new Bylaws.
- Biniek asked about the veto powers of the Commissions, and asked what would happen if funding went to one commission despite some opposition. Neesby said that three commissioners would have to vote to veto that allocation.
 - Biniek asked why there were 20 senators. Neesby said that this had been based on UC Berkeley and UC Davis' numbers, and 20 seemed like a good number because each member would carry 4% of the vote.
 - Biniek said that the Senate would have the power to endorse or sponsor, and asked what Neesby meant by "sponsoring any organization." Neesby said that he would look at the exact wording, but he thought that the intention was to say that there was not to be any sponsorship of specific student organizations.
 - Biniek asked what an Executive Order or Memorandum was, to which Neesby said it was the ability to create action if the Legislature was too stagnant. He said that it could be overruled in the Senate, or directed by the Chancellor.
 - Biniek asked what a Presidential Proclamation was, to which Neesby explained that it was effectively a presidential resolution.
 - Biniek said that she had many more questions, but one of her biggest concerns was that individuals would be allowed to run for both Executive and Legislative positions. Neesby said that they could not hold both offices, but could run for both at the same time. Biniek said that she worried that this would lead individuals to run for as many positions as possible in hopes of just getting a position. Neesby said that it would be near impossible to campaign for two positions, and candidates would still be subject to the Hare voting system. He offered an example of when someone represented a huge constituency, and would allow voters to decide where they wanted the individual to go.
 - Biniek knew that time was running out, and just listed her remaining concerns without asking for them to be specifically addressed at the time. She said that she was worried about the president no longer needing to be a Junior, election hours being extended to 72 hours, and that only 60% would be needed instead of 2/3 to pass new Legislation.
 - Vardner moved and Smeets seconded to extend the time limit on the Senate Proposal Discussion by four minutes.
 - Kaminsky called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the time limit on the Senate Proposal Discussion was extended by four minutes.
 - Tuttle told Council that he would be "taking himself out of the game" with regard to the Senate Proposal. He said that he had made his viewpoints known, and left the issue to Council to decide.
 - Wood asked Neesby how he saw 20 people as significantly more representative than 13 on a campus of nearly 25,000 undergraduates. Neesby said that he understood her point, but what was more important was not the change in the number of leaders, but rather the change in voting, which would allow for more diverse representation. He said that the Hare Voting System would allow for independents, apolitical students, and anyone else to be on USAC.
 - Biniek said that the problem with the Hare Voting System was that on a campus of almost 25,000 undergraduates, where no more than 7,600 ever voted, individuals could gain positions on student government with very few votes. She said that there would be no incentives to represent the majority of students. Biniek said that right now, Council members knew that they were supported by at least 51% of the voters.
 - Neesby moved and Zai seconded to extend the time limit on the Senate Proposal Discussion by ten minutes.
 - Kaminsky called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the time limit on the Senate Proposal Discussion was extended by ten minutes.
 - Doan agreed with Wood's comments that a lot of the discussion was becoming cyclical, and actually more about the philosophy of ideas, and agreed that those discussions should take place

outside of Council. However, she said that she thought more members were needed. She said that ARC, for example, could only meet once a month because they were trying to coordinate the schedules of three people who were already terribly overextended. Doan said that Council members made sacrifices, missing classes or getting sick because of the job, and she affirmed that 13 people were simply not enough.

- Vardner agreed with Doan, saying that he had spent two weeks trying to schedule an OSAC meeting which had still been missing members. He said that he acknowledged Biniek's concerns, saying that some Senators could be voted in with low representation, but maybe that wasn't even such a bad thing. Vardner said that since the establishment of USAC, only one seat had been added to Council, and 15,000 students had been added to the undergraduate student body. He said that this contrast spoke for itself.
- Zai agreed with Doan and Vardner, saying that it was impossible for her to represent the whole campus as one of only three General Representatives. She said that the Hare Voting System may be imperfect, but it would certainly be more representative than the system in place. Zai said that last year, one individual who had carried a huge amount of the vote in the primary had lost by a landslide in a runoff, simply due to the problems with the system currently in place.
- Neesby said that the Senate System would correct the system currently in place, which right now frequently empowered a council where the president and 2/3 of the council all belonged to the same slate, allowing them to basically do whatever they wanted, even overturn Judicial Board Cases. He also said that there was a danger of a slate taking over the currently apolitical commissions.
- Wood said that she did not believe that a slate represents a single viewpoint, and she had personally seen a division of votes within a certain slate. Additionally, she said that every position was elected, and thus are all inherently political. She said that with regard to the overextension of Council, she said that there were better ways to alleviate the strain on Council, perhaps by additional appointments, and without hurting the system in place.
- Hawkins agreed with much of what Wood had said, agreeing that there were better ways to alleviate some of the overextension. He said that Council had a unique opportunity to work on so many different levels, and they had the ability to take students and fill those niches. Hawkins said that he spoke from experience and understood what it was like to try to oversee too many people, as he had worked on doing just that with coordinating Jazz/Reggae Festival.
- Neesby moved and Zai seconded to extend the time limit on the Senate Proposal Discussion enough to finish the President's Speaker's List.
- Biniek called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the time limit on the Senate Proposal Discussion was extended enough to finish the President's Speaker's List.
- Smeets said that he agreed that Council was overextended, and said that he supported the new system even though it would abolish his office altogether. He said that the Senate would allow for better representation, and he reiterated many of the points already made. Smeets said that what Council needed to do right now was create the best Senate Proposal possible, and then let the students vote on whether or not it would be better than the Commission-Based System.
- Litvak said that Council should remember that the United States Senate was based on the US Census, which often weeded out those who most needed representation, such as the homeless.

XI. New Business

There was no New Business this week.

XII. Announcements

- Doan said that boxes were scattered around campus to collect comfort-items for soldiers in Iraq. She said that many things were needed, especially for female soldiers.
- Malik said that a canned food drive was taking place. She also said that CSC was missing van 4261, and they had reported it stolen to LAPD.
- Hawkins said that the Jazz series was going on every Monday night in Kerckhoff. He also said that he was having a holiday party in his office on Wednesday, and invited Council to come.

- Kaminsky said that CEC would be showing sneaks 10th week, including “Grandma’s Boy”, “In the Outs”, and “Casanova”. He said that if anyone on Council wasn’t *overextended* (haha) to come watch one of the films.
- Kaisey said that the first Take-it-like-a-fan event would be on Wednesday.
- Zai said that Operation Bruin -Bear Security was in full-force, and invited Council to come hang out at night with the Bruin.
- Neesby said that the CRC would be meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday. He also said that the Shared Governance Task Force would be meeting on Wednesdays at 4:00 p.m.
- McLaren said that the new digital recorders had come in, and they would hopefully be in-use by the next meeting.
- Wood said that the CORO Fellowship had given her fliers, in case anyone wanted them.
- Wood took a straw poll about having a meeting 10th week, and it seemed like nobody wanted to because of upcoming finals, but it was decided that they would hold a meeting just for the purpose of approving Contingency Fund Allocations.

XIII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the attendance sheet.

XIV. Adjournment

- Biniek moved and Neesby seconded to adjourn.
- Malik called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m. by Acclamation.

XV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker