

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday January 24, 2006
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

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

ABSENT: None

GUESTS: Combiz Abdolrahimi, David Burns, Faith Christiansen, Jonathan Curtiss, Jordan Decker, Constance Dillon, Shaun Doria, Julia Erlandson, Tyler Johnstone, Matthew Knee, Judy Lin, Andres Loera, Allison Norman, Noa Simahoni, Debra Simmons, Pavan Tripathi, Liz Vega

I. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Smeets asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Kaminsky amended the Agenda to have the *Approval of 2004-2005 Surplus Available for Allocation in 2005-2006 moved to directly after Fund Allocations.
- Vardner removed the Sustainability Concentration Update from New Business.
- Biniek amended the Agenda to have the Special Presentation by USAC's USSA Representative be done whenever Tina Park made it to the meeting.
- Wood reminded Council that there was a 15 minute limit on discussion items, and said that the Senate discussion would proceed with an alternating discussion of pros and cons.
- Biniek moved and Kaminsky seconded to approve the amended Agenda.
- Council voted to approve the amended Agenda with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

III. Approval of the Minutes

January 10, 2006

- Biniek said that in her officer report, she had been referencing *USSA*, not *UCSA*.
- Vardner said that on page 2, he had not called for *Acclamation*, but rather for *Approval by Unanimous Consent*.
- Biniek moved and Sassounian seconded to approve the Minutes of as amended.
- Smeets called for Acclamation. Kaminsky objected to calling for Acclamation.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of , as amended, with a vote of 10 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

IV. Special Presentations

Book Lending Program, Financial Supports Commission

- Smeets said that the Book Lending Program had needed to be overhauled, as the office only had 600 books, and most were outdated. He said that he and his staff had gone through all of the books, and had donated all of the outdated books to thebookman.org. Smeets said that they had

been allocated money thanks to the Academic Success Referendum and a 20% discount by the student store, and had used these to spend \$2,500 on updating and restocking their library. He said that they had tried to buy books that were so expensive that many students could not afford to buy, and books that were not updated or changed annually. Smeets said that they had lent out many of these books, and were using an honor system to make sure that students would return the books at the end of the quarter. He said that a list of the books in FSC's inventory had been created on the FSC website, and students could look at the list to see if their books were available and if they had been checked out. He added that, for books that had been checked out, many students were willing to share, and had volunteered their contact information on the FSC website.

- Biniek asked if students on Financial Aid had priority over others. Smeets said that all students were treated equally, and anyone was eligible to check out a book.
- McLaren asked if there were any stipulations in the honor-based return system that addressed the issue of books being returned in reusable condition. Smeets replied that, in addition to tracking contact information, they also track the condition of the books.
- Williams asked who helped FSC put all this together, to which Smeets replied that McLaren had given them a lot of help. Smeets also said that they now had an improved system of cataloguing and tracking the books, and said that, prior to this system, many books that were checked out were just forgotten about and were not reclaimed.
- McLaren added some information about the bookstore that Smeets and his committee had found where they could donate books that were no longer in use at UCLA. She said that the store, known as "thebookman.org" was almost completely managed and run by volunteers, many of whom were senior citizens. Smeets added that "thebookman", Herman Irvin, had connections to community colleges and could get books sent to Africa and Baghdad.

UCLA B-Legal - Jonathan Curtiss and Pavan Tripathi

- Curtiss said that he wanted to talk about legal downloading services that would be offered to students in the coming weeks. He said that this information would be disseminated once the contracts were signed, but for now this was an early look. Curtiss said that they would soon be offering iTunes, Mindawn, and CDigix music download software. He said that a test would be done in the residence halls in Winter Quarter 2006, with a campus-wide rollout in Spring 2006. Curtiss said that, essentially, they were working to protect students by giving them an attractive legal alternative to illegal file sharing.
- Tripathi said that this whole process had begun with surveys in the residence halls in the past two years. He said that the survey results indicated that the students would support the plan if UCLA was not increasing student fees and not taking money from other student services. Tripathi said that this would be done by the university offering the service to students through a voluntary sign-up, with fees paid by the individual user. Tripathi said that iTunes would be exactly like the stand-alone program was, only buying it through UCLA would allow 5% of the cost to go back to the university.
- Curtiss said that Mindawn specialized in royalty and licensing, and students could download songs and then copy or burn them. He said that unlike iTunes, Mindawn charged by the minute, with 10 minutes of music going for \$.99. Curtiss said that one of the coolest things about Mindawn was perhaps that student bands could upload their music to Mindawn and distribute it. Curtiss explained that Cdigix was made up of CTrax and CFlix. He said that the service would allow students to download music permanently, or for a flat fee to have access to the entire library, but only for as long as the account was kept active. Curtiss said that CFlix had subscription-based TV channels, pay-per-view rentals, and a monthly subscription service.
- Tripathi said that each of the services would provide their own technical support. He said that, additionally, CDigix would employ two students here at the university to help with support and marketing.
- Curtiss said that students' privacy would also be protected. He said that UCLA would identify students only as affiliated with the university, and the companies providing the services would not be permitted to solicit students unless the students first set up an account with them.
- Tripathi said that these contracts would last for only one year, and review would take place at the end of that year.

- Curtiss said that these services would rollout through a UCLA -based web portal. He said that this would ensure that students got the discounted rates and that the funds came back to the university.
- Doan asked how much this has curbed illegal sharing at other schools, to which Curtiss said that most of the information was anecdotal. He said that things were changing right now, though, with people getting sued, Supreme Court cases, and more.
- Sassounian asked what the incentives were for students to set up their accounts through UCLA, to which Curtiss replied that some of the proceeds would come back to the university. Kaminsky asked if this was how the other campuses were proceeding, to which Curtiss said that he thought UCLA was the only campus where a portion of the fees would be coming back to the university.
- Sargent pointed out that this was also being done to protect the university, which was important for Council to understand. He also asked if this meant that ASUCLA would be affiliated with these companies, to which Curtiss said that was not the case, but rather the university would be distributing this money back to the students.
- Curtiss said that UCLA, by comparison, was very benign in its regulation of peer-to-peer sharing. He said that other universities had completely shut-off peer-to-peer, or completely tracked online activity. Curtiss said that, at UCLA, only repeat offenders were penalized through the Dean's office.

Senior Class Gift Committee – Zai

- Zai said that one of the first big senior gift events would be on Wednesday from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., which was free In-n-Out. She said that the minimum requested donation was \$20.06. She said that students who donated at least the minimum amount would get an iTunes gift card and a T-shirt.

USSA, “Stop the Raid on Student Aid! Once and for All!” – Jeannie Biniek

- Biniek said that Budget Reconciliation was used to approve tax cuts or changes to entitlement programs like Medicaid. She said that in 2005, Congress had decided to cut over 30 million dollars from these programs. She said that Budget Reconciliation would change interest rates for student loans, establish a guaranteed fee on student loans, and jeopardize the management of federal student aid.
- In response to a question by Nelson, Biniek said that they were expecting the defeat of Budget Reconciliation based on the recent votes that had been taken on the issue. She said that each time they voted, the bill had come closer to defeat, with the most recent vote ending in a tie-breaker. Biniek said that they expected this trend to continue, with the bill being defeated in the end. She also said that there would be a negative impact on California individually. Biniek said that the USSA Day of Action would be January 31st, and encouraged students to call-in.
- Sargent suggested that Biniek work the parent angle, which often might be more effective when the cost of education was the issue.
- Tuttle said that he had just read about Kansas State, and the president had made an indication that he did not think that there would be a cut in student aid. He said that it was clear to him that the people following the discussion were strongly affected by the discussion. Tuttle said that there might be people in the government that Biniek could speak with who would support the students' position on this issue.

V. Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

VI. Fund Allocations

- Villasin said that \$11,596.57 had been requested from Contingency this week, with \$6,636.40 recommended for allocation. She said that upon Council's approval of FiCom's recommendations, the running total in the Contingency Fund would drop from \$15,943.02 to \$9,306.62.
 - Vardner commended the Finance Committee on making sure that the proper documentation was provided by each group before FiCom decided the amount to recommend.
 - Hawkins moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
 - Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- The Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations are attached to the minutes.*

VII. New Business

A. *Approval of 2004-2005 Surplus Available for Allocation in 2005-2006

- Simmons, after saying that she had analyzed everything related to last year's surplus funding, handed out to everyone a copy of her surplus analysis. Simmons then walked Council through all the relevant information and explained it to them, step by step. She pointed out that last year's \$17,732.67 had been added to the Surplus account, which now totaled more than \$300,000.
- Vardner asked that, if there was another situation such as occurred with Welcome Week, would the money be taken out of Surplus. Simmons replied that it would.
- Tuttle said that, in his experience, it had been unusual for such a high percentage of the surplus funds to be earmarked for USA Programming and Capital Items. He said that he was not comfortable with USAC having less than \$100,000 in Contingency, and cautioned Council about setting aside such a large amount of money that they couldn't touch.
- Vardner asked how much was in the Reserve Fund for emergencies, to which Simmons said there was just under \$200,000.
- Vardner asked how Capital Items would be handled, to which Villasin replied that it would be done on a first-come, first-served basis.
- Sargent asked if the vote at this meeting would lock-in a specific amount of money, to which Simmons said that it would.
- Vardner moved and Biniek seconded to approve the 2004-2005 Surplus Available for Allocation in 2005-2006.
- Wood commented that the recommendation to earmark funds specifically for programming had been done very consciously because there had been an increased need for programming funds. Sargent expressed his concern about locking-in so much money.
- Tuttle said that his concern was based on the fact that there were other options for finding more programming money.
- Neesby said that, as he understood it, changing the Bylaws would not allow Council to unlock the funds after this vote, but that there would have to be an additional vote to actually transfer the funds elsewhere.
- Vardner asked, since this was money for the entire year, whether or not this would be carried over into the Summer and Winter Quarters. Several individuals explained to Vardner that this was just supplementing the programming funds that were already available.
- McLaren mentioned that, in recent years, there had been a declining number of requests for Capital Items and an increasing need for programming funds.
- Council voted to approve the 2004-2005 Surplus Available for Allocation in 2005-2006 with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

Financial Supports Commissioner – Ryan Smeets

- Smeets said that his office had been very busy this week, holding longer office hours in order to help students with the approaching FAFSA deadline. He said that they would also be holding FAFSA workshops on the Hill, and would extend their office hours again as the deadline nears.
- Sargent asked how attendance had been at these events, to which Smeets said that the turnout had been good.

Facilities Commissioner – Joseph Vardner

- Vardner said that this Friday there would be a Transportation Services Advisory Board (TSAB) meeting about the parking changes. He said that there would be a presentation to Council on this on February 14th. Vardner also said that March 3rd would be a Best of Westwood in Bruin Plaza, with Westwood Businesses invited onto campus. He said that businesses would also be given the Golden Paw award, based on several different measures. Vardner said that the goal was to bring students and Westwood businesses closer together.
- Sassounian asked if more parking spaces would be made available this year. Vardner said that UCLA could not build any more parking spaces for the next four years, based on a contract made with the city. He said that UCLA was the second largest traffic generator in the city. Vardner said that there had been a number of parking spaces made available at the new graduate student housing.
- Smeets asked about the internal review regarding underclassmen lying on their parking applications, to which Vardner said that the results had been staggering.

External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek

- Biniek said that at the UC Regents Meeting the Regents had voted not to divest from Sudan due to insufficient information from UCOP. She said that there had been very specific instructions laid out, with a committee being formed to investigate the potential for divestment. Biniek said that this committee would come up with the best proposal and then present that to the UC Regents in March. She said that it could be as simple as divesting from direct holdings in certain Sudanese companies, or as complicated as divesting from indirect holdings in Sudan-affecting companies. Biniek said that there was a lot of support by the Regents to move forward, and many of them wanted to take action quickly. Biniek said that the Regents also discussed the possibility of raising law and medical school fees to market values, and about general increases in student fees. She said that they had also committed to fund academic preparation programs. Biniek said that the UCSA meeting was on the coming weekend, and told Council some of the issues that they would be dealing with. She said that they were asking for personal testimonies about how students were affected by fee increases. She said that she would also be making a presentation at the next Council meeting about fee increases. Biniek lastly said that travel grant applications would be due next week.
- Neesby asked if there would still be a distinction between in-state and out-of-state tuition for graduate school since it was being brought up to the market rate of the private schools.

Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan

- Doan thanked Council for coming to the On Campus Housing meeting. She said that they had been very happy that Council was trying to reach out to the Hill. Doan said that she had sent an email out for those members of both USAC and OCHC who had been unable to attend the meeting. She said that the email could also be distributed to student groups to disseminate information shared at the meeting. Doan also told Council that her office would be sending out Accountability Questionnaires to all Presidential Appointees to make sure that they were attending committee meetings and carrying out their committee responsibilities. She said that her office was also working on a sustainability guide, which would be distributed to various groups about how to keep UCLA green.
- Tuttle asked if the Communications Board would be consulted about the Accountability Questionnaire, to which Doan replied that the questionnaire was just a way of finding out whether USAC's appointees were remaining active.

President – Jenny Wood

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

Questions and Comments followed Wood's Report.

- Vardner asked Wood if she would add his email to the mailbox request sign-in sheet which is in the Communal Space.
- Wood pointed out an error in her report by saying that the "Thinking Globally Acting Locally" event would take place on February 25th and 26th.

IX. Old Business

A. USA Senate Proposal

- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded that USAC hold a Special Election for the UCLA undergraduate student body to vote on the Amended Senate Proposal.
- Neesby said that the most recent change to the proposal had been regarding the standing committees, which would allow for the establishment of ad-hoc committees. He said that the vote tonight would be whether to place the item on the ballot. He said further that it would require a 66.6% vote to be approved.
- Wood announced that the format for discussion of the motion would consist of pro and con representatives, speaking alternatively.
- Neesby said that, because he had stated his position in favor of the Senate when he met with almost every member of Council individually, he would not have very much to repeat during the discussion at this meeting. He did say, however, that he believed the main argument in favor of voting for the motion on the table was the fact that the students would be given the opportunity to vote on whether or not they wanted the Senate system. Neesby reminded Council that, last year, a petition to place this issue on the ballot had come very close to obtaining enough signatures to qualify it. He said further that 400 signatures had been disqualified for various reasons, but he believed that many of those should have been counted because, according to his review, 75% of the disqualified signatures were legitimate. Neesby continued by saying that, in addition to the fact that students deserved to vote on this matter, the main reason in favor of the Senate System itself would be increased representation. He said that, for years now, Council has been disproportionate to, and unrepresentative of, the student body. He said that whichever slate carried 51% of the vote ended up with a supermajority on Council. Neesby said that using the Hare Voting system would guarantee a more representative student governing body. Neesby said that he understood there was a lot of concern about the future of the Commissions, and said that, even though the Commission system would be altered, it would not be ruined. Neesby ended by saying that he also understood that there were concerns about the efficiency of the proposed new system, but remarked that, perhaps taking a little more time to review and approve items might be a good idea.
- Wood said that she believed the Senate system would increase bureaucracy, and would be terribly inefficient. She said she also thought that the Senate process would delay and decrease student groups' access to funding. She said that this had been the experience at other campuses, where students had to lobby Senators for funding, which then would have to go through contingency. She said that such an extended process could potentially take weeks, and might prevent some groups from even being able to program at all. Wood then directed Council's attention to a statement made by UCSD Senator Ted Combs which expressed his extreme dissatisfaction with the Senate system at UCSD. She said that another reason for her opposition to the Senate system was that slates would sometimes run uninformed candidates just to get a majority on the Senate. Wood said that what she has heard as the main reason students at UCLA disliked USAC was because they thought USAC was too political. She said she believed that changing to a Senate system would make student government even more political than it is under the current system. Wood also told Council that other campuses which had implemented the Senate system were seeing an increase in slate domination, which was precisely what they were trying to get away from.
- Sassounian moved and Smeets seconded to extend the time limit on the USA Senate Proposal Discussion by 20 minutes.

- 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 by 20 minutes.
- Tuttle raised a Point of Parliamentary Procedure by saying that, before Council arrives at the vote on whether to place the Senate Proposal on the ballot, it might be wise to consider what the margin of the vote would need to be. He said that USAC's Constitution allows the President to vote only in the case of a tie, or when their vote could affect the results in a 2/3 majority situation. He said that the vote to place this matter on the ballot would need to be a 2/3 majority, but what would need to be considered was, "2/3rd's of what". As an example, Tuttle raised the question of how abstentions would be considered. He said he had brought this up at this time so that Council was aware this would have to be resolved before the vote was taken.
- Neesby said that he felt there was a problem with the pro-con type of presentation. In response, Wood said that she wanted to keep the system of alternating pro and con statements, but would allow neutral comments at any time.
- Sassounian spoke in favor of the Senate, saying that, in the Ted Combs quote, the analogy that he gave about the Senate System was an incredibly skewed view. She said that, any time that one side was consistently in power, and had a supermajority, there was definitely going to be a group of students that was unrepresented. Sassounian said that checks and balances were what made this country great, and said she challenged Combs' opinions regarding student representation.
- Biniek spoke again in opposition to the motion saying that, if Council approved the motion at this meeting, they would have to fund a Special Election, which would be very costly. She said that thousands of dollars would have to be spent on the election, and that student groups who applied for funding would have to go wanting. Biniek said further that changing the structure of student government was a very important decision, and she didn't think it should be made in a Special Election because Special Elections usually have a low voter turnout. She said she felt that trying to get this proposal to the students as a Special Election was a politically-motivated attempt to have this major change to the governmental structure approved "under the radar."
- Smeets spoke in favor of the Senate, saying that he did not see a Special Election as a waste of funds, but as a responsible way to present this issue to the students for a vote. He said that Council's responsibility was to the student body, and said that more than 4,000 students had asked, through a petition, to vote on this matter last year, but had not been allowed to do so. Smeets said that the statements that were made regarding uninformed candidates were wrong. He said that the depoliticizing of student government would allow for non-slate candidates to gain a seat on the Senate.
- Hawkins spoke in opposition to the Senate, saying that student organizations did not need more hoops to jump through when they wanted assistance from their student government leaders. He said he thought the Senate structure would cause more problems for student groups, and he did not want that to happen.
- Sargent said that he did not see any consensus developing on this matter, and suggested that perhaps there needed to be further discussion before a vote is taken. He said that, after he had served as a Council member at UCLA, he served as a Senator when he was in graduate school. He said that, personally, his experience as a Senator had been horrible. Sargent said that he has a great deal of respect for the Commission form of government, and had tried to get it established at his graduate school to replace the Senate system. He said that, in order for the Senate proposal to be approved, two-thirds of the students who vote would have to vote in favor of the change. He said that he might be wrong, but he just couldn't see that happening. Sargent ended by saying that there might be some changes that could be made to the existing structure, but he did not see the student body voting to change the entire governmental structure.
- Neesby spoke in favor of the Senate, saying that the funding process under the Senate structure would be very similar to the process currently in use. He said there would still be a funding committee, and votes by three sponsors would be needed to approve the funding. He said that there was no lobbying needed to receive funding. With regard to the cost of holding a Special Election, Neesby said that the students who supported this change last year had already asked for the nearly \$5,000 that would be needed for a Special Election. In addition, he said that changing to the Senate system would mean that there would be one less election needed every

year, which would result in decreased costs. Neesby said that he disagreed with the statement that the Senate supporters were pushing for a Special Election because they wanted to get it passed “under the radar.” He said it was his opinion that the proposed change would get a higher than usual turnout at a Special Election because students would pay more attention to the potential Constitutional change. In response to the comment about uninformed candidates, Neesby said that, as it is now, he felt that there were students who could do a good job on Council, but were unable to get elected. He said he thought it was not a bad idea for the average student to be represented on the student governing body. He said that if average students were chosen, then the slates would intrinsically be depoliticized.

- Kaisey moved and Vardner seconded to extend the time limit on the USA Senate Proposal Discussion by an additional 15 minutes.
- Kaminsky called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the time limit on the USAC Senate Proposal Discussion was extended by an additional 15 minutes.
- Villasin spoke in opposition to the Senate, expressing her concern that the Finance Committee would become politicized under a Senate system.
- Kaminsky expressed interest in closing the speakers list, saying that it seemed like most of the points that could be made had already been made. Following Kaminsky’s comment, Nelson and Vardner asked to be added to the existing speakers list.
- Tuttle reminded Council that, before they arrive at the vote on whether to place the Senate Proposal on the ballot, they should talk about what the two-thirds vote was. He said that, with 13 members eligible to vote, a two-thirds majority for approval would require nine votes in favor. He pointed out that someone might abstain, and said that the Chair was the one who would make the ruling should such a situation occur. He reminded Wood that she had already set a precedent ruling on this issue.
- Tyler Johnstone asked to be added to the Speakers List, but Wood said that the list had already been closed. Sassounian noted that she would also like to be added to the list.
- Kaminsky moved and Biniek seconded to add Sassounian and Johnstone to the Speakers List.
- Hawkins called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, Sassounian and Johnstone were added to the Speakers List.
- Kaisey spoke in favor of the Senate, saying that she had been elected to represent the student body, and she thought it was terribly unfair to override by nine votes the request of 4,000 students to place this matter on the ballot last year.
- Kaminsky said that, in his opinion, the latest Senate proposal was a much stronger document than the earlier versions had been. He then said that he knew everyone was taking the position they were because of ideology, not because of slate politics. Kaminsky said he thought that it was really important for the Council structure to continue. He said that, as a Commissioner, he had had the opportunity to look at an amazing amount of legislation. He said that one of his major concerns about the Senate proposal was that the Commissions would still exist, but they would not be working cooperatively as they do now under the existing structure.
- Doan spoke in favor of the Senate, saying that she understood the need student groups had for funding, but said that Council was still functioning alright. She said that there would obviously be funding caps under the new system, as groups would always ask for more funding than was available to be given out. Doan said she supported the plan to have this matter decided at a Special Election because it would be a one-time-deal.
- Wood reiterated her opposition to the Senate, saying that she felt the Commission system worked really well. She gave examples of the things that the Commissions had accomplished in the past year, including coordinating the efforts of a number of student organizations in holding the Hurricane Katrina Relief Dodgeball Tournament and other such important efforts. Wood said she was worried that Senators with no staff or budget would not be able to participate in comparable actions.
- Smeets spoke in favor of the Senate, saying it was wrong to say that the Senators would be unprepared to govern. He said that the Senate would bring together students who would work together in learning how to serve the undergraduate student body. Smeets also said that the issue of stipends was ridiculous, because student leaders should be willing to serve the students even if they did not receive a stipend. He also said that, as a Commissioner, he had felt overworked

and spread too thin. Smeets said he felt that the people who were in opposition to having the students vote on this matter were the ones whose slate had dominated this Council for the last ten years. He said it was his hope that Council would represent *all* UCLA students, not just members of their political slate.

- Biniek spoke again in opposition to the Senate, saying that she felt the Senate system would create an elitist form of government. She said that, included in the delegations to the most recent Regents meeting were students from two UC's that had the Senate system. She said they knew they were there to represent the students from their campuses, but they didn't seem to have any idea about what to do. She said they weren't very effective at Regents meetings because they didn't have experience in budget planning. She said it was easy to say that the Senate would be a more representative governing body, but it was her opinion that what was more important was for students to go out and represent themselves. Biniek said that UCLA always sent huge delegations to the Regents meetings, but only a few members of the delegation were elected officers, while others were students who were there to support the issues that were important to them.
- Sassounian spoke in favor of the Senate, saying that she felt that the current system was the elitist one. She said that the Senate system is a "grass-roots" system. He said that, for years, there had been a supermajority on Council, and there had really been no opportunity for discussion or deliberation. Sassounian said that the Senate movement itself had been started by students who felt unrepresented by their student Council, therefore she felt it was inherently wrong to say that the Senate would be unrepresentative of the student body.
- Tyler Johnstone introduced himself to Council by saying, "I'm someone who voted for you." He said that he had been working on the Senate proposal to make it a better proposal, but said that he thought it would be a good idea to delay voting on it until it had been improved even more. He said he thought it would be better to work towards getting the entire Council to support the proposal before it was taken to the students for a vote. Johnstone said that the turnout for a Special Election would be smaller than for the General Election, and he thought this issue would not get lost on a General Election ballot but would, instead, be a central issue. He said that one thing he really liked about the Senate proposal concerned improved access to information. Johnstone remarked that, as it is now, USAC's Agendas are not posted on their website, and the Minutes that are posted were not up to date.
- Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to allow two more students to be added to the Speakers List.
- Tuttle said that he saw this as a ruling of the Chair as to whether or not to allow additional speakers, and said that the motion to overrule would need a simple majority.
- Neesby amended the motion to read, "...to overrule the Chair and reopen the Speakers List."
- Kaminsky said he thought it was unlikely that any new information could really be brought to this discussion.
- Council voted to overrule the Chair's decision to close the Speakers List with a vote of 7 in favor, 5 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Faith Christiansen and David Burns were added to the Speakers List*
- Vardner moved and Smeets seconded to close the Speakers List.
- Sassounian called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to calling for Acclamation. There being none, the Speakers List was closed.
- Neesby spoke in favor of the Senate, saying that the allegation that the Senate would be an elitist system seemed wrong. He said that he did not see it as a bad thing that Santa Barbara had taken their whole legislative body to a Regents meeting. He said that he did not see how anyone could call the Senate system elitist while also worrying that only 400 votes could elect a Senator. Neesby said that representation was very important because, at UCLA, there were students who had gone unrepresented for years and that, before the present decade, there were many groups that went unfunded completely. He said that it was wrong to always have a supermajority on Council that could overrule Judicial Board cases if they saw fit. Neesby also said that he thought that students would always prefer to have more representation, and would very much appreciate the right to vote on what they had asked to vote on.
- Wood spoke in opposition to the Senate, saying that to imply that Council had not represented students was totally bogus. She said that the achievements of USAC were unparalleled

nationwide. Wood said that USAC had the largest Community Service Commission, the largest Jazz/Reggae Festival, and numerous other accomplishments that had been made by Commissions over an expanded period of time. She said that the system in place now is really great, and to change it would be to destroy something that is really great.

- Vardner spoke in favor of the Senate, saying that he did not see any reason why there would be an end to Commissioners working together. He also said that, under the current structure, Council members are terribly overworked and spread too thin. Vardner said that he would love to hear potential solutions to these problems, but had not heard any in the last year. He said that it was ludicrous to say that the Senate would intensify slates, as the problem with the current system is evident at this very meeting. Vardner said that, as it is right now, whichever slate carried 51% of the vote completely staffed Council. He said that he had not heard any other ideas.
- Faith Christiansen introduced herself by saying she was President of Bruin Republicans, was on the Academic Freedom Committee, and was on Smeets' staff. She said that she was a Kenyan resident and that she personally opposed the Darfur divestment campaign. Christianson said that she wasn't concerned about bureaucracy being increased because she felt what was more important was the separation of powers. She said that, as it is now, it's like the legislative, executive, and judicial branches are all in one body. She also said she feels that there's no accountability. Christianson said that Neesby had been working on this proposal for more than a year, and she strongly supported his proposal. She said that it was erroneous to say that students would not be able to learn the Senate system, because she and other students had learned how to work within the Council structure.
- David Burns introduced himself as a transfer student who was being pushed out as quickly as possible. He said that he had only one year to get involved with this Council, and he represented 25% of the student body. Burns said that what he saw as most important was access, and said this was long overdue. He said that people think Community College students are dumb, but he had learned quickly how the Senate system works.
- Nelson commended Neesby for all the time and effort that he had put into this matter, and also commended Wood for all of her time and effort, as well. Nelson said that there is no perfect government, and said that the vote tonight would probably be based on slates. Nelson urged Council members to make sure that their vote was not based on ego, but on what they personally believe. Nelson gave several examples of situations that have taken place under the current Administration in Washington which he felt were wrong, and he cited them as examples of things he thought Council members should not emulate. He expressed concern about several references in the proposal, and asked, for example, what "an executive decision" meant. Nelson said that he was also concerned at a reference in the documentation to "a speedy and public trial." He said that students come to college to learn, experiment, and grow, and if someone took the job so seriously that they would put someone on public trial, then that was a problem. Nelson said that he did not want Council to "miss the forest for the trees". He said he felt that UCLA had one of the best student governments around, even though he was worried at the same time about what got done. He ended his remarks by saying that, to this Council's credit, they had done more for students than any Council he had seen before them.
- Council voted not to hold a Special Election for the UCLA undergraduate student body to vote on the Amended Senate Proposal with a vote of 7 in favor, 5 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

X. New Business (cont'd)

D. Shared Governance

- Nelson said that he had prepared a document regarding Shared Governance which he would send out to Council that set forth reasons why it would be appropriate to give students a vote on the committees they serve on. Nelson said that decisions of the UC Regents supercede on such matters, and said he recognized that it might be better to have this discussion at a subsequent time. He said that there would be a meeting taking place later in the week, after which he would know more on this matter.
- Sassounian said that she was making sure that her Academic Appointees were attending their meetings and upholding their obligations. She said that she would also be meeting soon with the

Chair of the Academic Senate. Sassounian said that students who serve on Academic Senate committees have been instructed to express their opinions, even 'though their views were not being counted as votes. She said that some committees were now recording the student "views" but were not counting them as "votes."

- Tuttle said that it sounded like real headway was being made, and he urged that each appointee work towards getting their position included in the actual vote count. He said that this process could be initiated by speaking with the Chair, who could then stipulate that the vote be recorded, 'though not counted. Tuttle said that getting this record established might help in bringing about the students' right to vote on the committee.
- Vardner said that, in the School of Engineering, there were undergraduate and graduate representatives to the department meetings, and asked if there was something similar in the College of Letters and Science. Sassounian answered that it varied by department.

E. USAC Concentration Updates

- Wood passed around the Queer Student Rights and Respect Concentration Update. She listed for Council the 9 original goals, the 2 changes to those goals, 9 updates and progress on those goals, and the 3 initiatives that needed to be implemented.
- Sargent told Council that the Alumni Association was looking into rekindling the Queer Alumni Association.
- Zai asked Wood when the next Queer Student Concentration meeting would be held, to which Wood replied that there really hadn't been any large meetings, but more one-on-ones between the offices that were spearheading certain issues. Zai said that she felt like this wasn't really a concentration, but more like a platform issue being dealt with by two offices. Wood suggested that they talk about this outside of the table. Zai said that she was having trouble getting in touch with certain leaders, and felt like she was being locked out of this project. Wood said that she would try to set up a large meeting where everyone could meet together.

XI. Announcements

- Smeets said that his office would be holding a FAFSA workshop on Wednesday.
- Biniek said that she had information on the Judicial Administration Fellowship Program if anyone was interested.
- Hawkins said that Eclectic would be taking place at 7:00 p.m. in Kerckhoff Coffee House on Wednesday, January 25th.
- Kaisey said there would be a poker tournament on Saturday, January 28th, with a 15 dollar buy-in and proceeds going to Dance Marathon.
- Vardner said that there would be a Base Budget meeting the night of Wednesday, January 25th.
- Zai said that Amnesty International was showing "Child Soldiers" on Thursday, January 26th, at 7:00 p.m. in Moore 100.
- Pham said that the Center for Women and Men offered self-defense classes for women. She explained that the classes were open only to women, because the Center was worried that, if men were in the class, some women might have flashbacks and hurt the men.
- Vardner said that he was working on a newsletter to send out if anyone wanted to include a blurb.
- Kaminsky said that on Thursday and Friday, January 26th and 27th, the CEC would be showing "Everything Is Illuminated", and on Tuesday, January 31st, they would be hosting author Andy Greenwald.
- Wood said that her publicity team was putting together a newsletter to send out, and said that anyone who wanted to include a blurb should let them know. She also said that the internships were going really well, with some projects being initiated that might include various offices of Council. Wood also said that her office was working on campus safety.
- Vardner said that if any interns would like to participate in recycling that they come to him first so they could coordinate their efforts. He said he was recommending this because it really hurts projects when a number of different groups contact the same administrator about the same issue.

XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the attendance sheet.

XIII. Adjournment

- Sassounian moved and Kaminsky seconded to adjourn.
- Zai called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 10:59 p.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker