

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday April 4, 2006
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Kaminsky, Sargent, Sassounian, Villasin

GUESTS: Terence Chan, Anat Herzog

I. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The Attendance Sheet was passed around.

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Pham and Vardner asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Doan moved and Pham seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Zai 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

August 16, 2005

- Kaisey said that she had not been at the meeting, but was listed as present. She also said that since she had been absent, it must have been Kaminsky that seconded the motions at the top of the second page.
- Biniek said that on page 7, under her officer report, she had been referencing UCSA, not USSA.
- Keesler noted that there should be a hyphen at the beginning of Tuttle's comment at the bottom of page 10.
- Pham moved and Malik seconded to approve the Minutes of August 16th, 2005, as amended.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of August 16th, 2005, as amended, with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

September 20, 2005

- Biniek said that Roy Samaan should have been listed as a guest at the meeting.
- Sassounian said that she had been the one to make the opening comments on the discussion of the Appointments for the Committee on Undergraduate Relations and Admissions to Schools (CUARS) on page 2.
- Wood said that at the bottom of page 2, Gwen Litvak's position was "Wood's Legislative Liaison."
- Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to approve the Minutes of September 20th, 2005, as amended.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of September 20th, 2005, as amended, with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

February 14, 2006

- Biniek moved and Hawkins seconded to approve the Minutes of February 14th, 2006, as submitted.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of February 14th, 2006, as submitted, with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

IV. Special Presentations

USA/BOD Programming Fund Allocations, Terence Chan – Asst. Budget Review Director

- Terence Chan said that 50 programs had applied for funding as opposed to only 46 that had in the last year. He said that the Undergraduate Students Association Board of Directors (USA/BOD) was asked for more than \$500,000, and would be funding around \$220,000 of that from the Programming Fund.
- Kaisey told Council the names of the members of the USA/BOD Programming Fund Committee, saying that she and Wood were the USAC representatives.
- Chan reported on several changes that had been made to the funding calendar for Spring Quarter.
- Kaisey went over the score sheet with Council, saying that the things weighed in the funding decision included the minimum criteria, the quality of the proposal, the quality of the hearing, and the USA/BOD Programming Committee's Funding Priorities. She said that the maximum number of earnable points was 45, with all of the criteria scored on a sliding scale from 1-5. Kaisey also told Council about the format of the hearings, saying that they were rather brief, that each group was allowed to give an opening statement, to respond to questions from the funding body, and then to end with a closing statement.
- Chan said that the representatives were asked both general questions and more pointed questions based on their planned use for the funds and what they had prioritized with regard to their programming. He also said that groups that charged admittance to their events were docked 15% of the total allocation decided on. Chan said that, instead of taking this money back after the event was held, the 15% was instead redistributed to all the groups before the initial funding went through. Chan said that this hearing process was different from others because the deliberations were held immediately following the hearings. He said that the committee members had agreed that this was a much more effective way to do it, and they recommended making this a new standard. Chan said that during the deliberations they looked for miscalculations, subtracted out non-fundable items, and also used their own judgment to determine how much should be funded.
- Kaisey said that groups had been given a feedback sheet with suggestions for improving their applications in the future. She said that they had been advised to understand the guidelines better, to read all of the instructions, to complete the entire application, to provide all necessary documentation, to not rely solely on the USA/BOD Programming Committee for funding, to include price quotes with their corresponding sections, and to be prepared for the hearing.
- Chan said that a formula had been used to determine how much each group would be funded. He went over a couple of statistics, giving Council the score range, the average score, the amount allocated, the percent of requested funding, and percent of adjusted funding. Chan said that this year there had been more than \$266,000 to allocate, with roughly half coming from USA and half from the ASUCLA BOD. He said that this amount was divided between the BOD/SIF Fund and the USA/BOD Programming Fund. Chan said that 47 groups out of 50 had applied, and 45 of those were funded. He said that the reasons that some of the programs did not receive funding were because their event was not going to take place on campus, the group had withdrawn from the hearings, or they did not actually have an event at all.
- Pham asked why Greeks Advocating Mature Management of Alcohol (GAMMA) had an average score if they were not going to be funded. Chan said that they had been scored before the deliberations during which the Committee decided not to fund them.
- Vardner asked how many events were charging admission, to which Chan said that there were six. Vardner expressed his concern that the funding was to allow groups to put on programs and, by withholding 15% prior to the event might result in the group not having enough money to put on the program. He said that they might recoup expenses, but then that would be after the

program was over. Chan said that he had talked with Debra Simmons about the point that Vardner had just made, and that his concern had been addressed.

- Vardner asked how much money that unfunded 15% of the total had been for the six groups. Chan said that most of those groups had been asking for lower amounts anyway.
- Wood said that Council would soon be meeting to reflect on the funding process as a whole, and recommended that any suggestions be directed to Chan or the other members of the committee.

V. Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

VI. Fund Allocations

There were no Contingency Fund Allocations this week.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

Student Welfare Commissioner – Tracy Pham

- Pham said that SWC had held a Blood Drive on Monday when it was raining very hard and they had collected an unexpected total of 152 units! Pham also said that volunteers were welcome to take kids to the next “I’m Going to College UCLA vs. USC Track and Field meet. She also said that on April 11th there would be a panel on substance abuse with both peers and professionals. Pham lastly said that UCLA Run/Walk was coming up, and there would be a karaoke night at Westwood BrewCo on Monday evening, February 10th. She said that the theme this year would be “These boots are made for Run-Walking.”

External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek

- Biniek said that the Higher Education Act passed in the House last week had been handed over to the Senate since the last Council meeting. She said that there were a lot of negative aspects, including raising the authorized level to qualify for a Pell Grant. Biniek said that the Senate had the bill now, and there was not anything being done yet. She said that the deadline for the budget had also been extended, and UCSA would be authoring a resolution on the budget before it came to a vote. She said that the budget looked really bad, much like the President’s, and a lot of money would be taken from higher education. She said that changes had since been made to it, however, and a lot of money had been put back into the outreach programs. Biniek told Council that CalPirg would be having a press conference on Thursday on the Kerckhoff steps. Biniek also said that a commission had been formed to talk about the future of higher education in America. She said that one thing UCSA had done as a member of this committee was to make a tape of student testimonials. Biniek said that there was a lot of talk about immigration going on also, and anti-immigration bills were being talked about in the Senate and the House. She said that an amendment in favor of the Dream Act was added to the bill, but this was still very different from what was being done in the house. Biniek said that they would be trying to make sure that students at UCLA who wanted to send a message would be able to do so. She said that on Thursday, CalPirg would also be talking to managers of the two largest retirement index funds later in the week, and would be urging these funds to engage in targeted divestment from certain companies in Sudan. Biniek said that they would be making lobby visits in the coming weeks. She also explained that a process was being considered to protect the Regents from any negative effects following their decision to divest from Sudan. Biniek said that the state budget hearings would begin on April 18th, and there would be a press conference in Sacramento on the budget. Biniek said that, during Third Week, the EVP Office would be meeting with politicians about their districts that benefited from outreach. She also said that on April 22nd, the African American Association of Health would be having a 5k AIDS walk. Biniek lastly said that the Students of Color Conference was coming up.
- Kaisey asked about the “I’m Going to College” event, and Biniek gave some details about it.

Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan

- Doan told Council that Agenda items would now be going to Liz Vega instead of Jason Mizzell. Doan also said that the USAC's offer to have the student organizations store their signboards in the Communal Space in Kerckhoff over Spring Break had been a big hit, with a large number of organizations taking advantage of USAC's offer. Doan also said that she had been talking with Kenn Heller about sending out global emails to registered student groups to promote USAC events. She said that, after discussing this matter with Heller, they concluded that the best way to accomplish this would be to create a USAC listserv. Doan said that the way she envisioned the listserv right now would be to do it similarly to the way she had done it with USAC, where groups would get a comprehensive email once a week instead of sending out messages so frequently that groups might begin to ignore them.. She said this might be the best way to reach the groups and to ensure that all the information USAC wants to distribute to the groups actually gets sent out to them. Doan said that USAC could use the rest of this year as a trial period for the listserv, and said that she would be working on developing this during the coming week. Doan lastly said that they would be the new Director of Student Psychological Services was to be hired by July. She said the search committee had been reviewing applications from all over the Country, and that they were trying to get someone more oriented toward counseling services rather than towards clinical research.

President – Jenny Wood

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

Facilities Commissioner – Joseph Vardner

- Vardner said that the Undie Run had gone really well, and the new route had been a big step in the right direction. He said that there would be a debriefing meeting, where they would talk about the good, the bad, and the changes that they might want to recommend. Vardner said that they would also be trying to share ownership of the Undie Run with other student groups.
- Nelson said that one thing that had not been talked about was that there happened to be a police pursuit during the Undie Run, and it had actually turned into the North Village. He said that, if the route of the Undie Run had not been changed, students could have been hurt.
- Tuttle said that Vardner really did an amazing job with this one.
Council applauded Vardner.

VIII. Old Business

***Election Code Revision**

- Neesby opened by pointing out to Council that there were two versions of the Election Code Revisions in their Agenda Packet, and that the one with the numbered pages was his version, and the one without numbered pages was Herzog's.
- Biniak moved and Zai seconded to approve Herzog's version of the Amended Election Code.
- Herzog said that she wanted to make a couple suggestions after talking to people since the last draft. She said that most of the errors had been cosmetic, but there had been one large one that she wanted to bring up. Herzog said that Campaign Representatives and Campaign Participants had previously been separate, but they were really the same person. She said that she would propose that in all references, both should read "campaign participants". Herzog also said that on page 4, article II.A.1.d, each campaign was to have only one campaign representative, and all members of that campaign would be referred to as "campaign participants", including the campaign representative.
- Neesby moved and Biniak seconded to make all instances of "Campaign Representatives" be changed to "Campaign Participants" in Article II.A.1.d.
- Malik called for Acclamation. Vardner Objected.
- Vardner called for Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to calling for Unanimous Consent. There being none, Council approved the recommendation to change all instances of "Campaign Representatives" to "Campaign Participants" in Article II.A.1.d.

- Herzog also said that on page 3, Article I.B.2.c., it discussed the responsibility of the Investigations Committee to forward non-stampable campaign materials to Student Government Accounting, but there was no protocol for the time period in which that was to be done. She said she thought it would make sense to add that the forwarding of non-stampable campaign materials should be done “in a timely manner.” She suggested that someone move to amend that section of the Election Code to add “in a timely manner” after “Student Government Accounting.”
- Biniek asked if it was necessary for the Investigations Chairperson to do the forwarding. Herzog replied that it *was* necessary because it was related to the requirement of the E-Board to stamp campaign materials.
- Neesby asked if things were now non-stampable by candidates, to which Herzog said that they were.
- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to add to Article I.B.2.c. the words “in a timely manner” after the reference to “Student Government Accounting.”
- Zai called for Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, “in a timely manner” was added after “Student Government Accounting” to Article I.B.2.c.

- Herzog said that, on Page 6, in Article II.A.6., the Designated Campaign Representatives were not actually setting the amount, they were just signing an agreement to comply with the amount that was set. She said that the word “set” should be removed and should be replaced by the word “sign”.
- Vardner moved by Unanimous Consent and Biniek seconded to change “set” to “sign” in Article II.A.6.
- Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the word “set” was changed to the word “sign” in Article II.A.6.

- Herzog next said that on Page 8, under Article III.A.1.a., the definition of a petition conflicted with a later definition, so she said that it should be changed to “A legal document, accompanied by *the exact wording of the* measure or request, ... the Association” She also said that on Page 8, under Article III.A.3.a., it should instead read that “***All campaign participants collecting signatures are responsible for following all University rules ... or Constitutional amendment.***”
- Tuttle asked if Mike Cohn was on board with these changes, to which Herzog said that he was.
- Neesby moved by Unanimous Consent and Vardner seconded to change Article III.A.1.a. to, “***A legal document, accompanied by the exact wording of the measure or request, ... the Association***”
- Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, Article III.A.1.a. was changed to “***A legal document, accompanied by the exact wording of the measure or request, ... the Association.***”

- Neesby moved by General Consent and Vardner seconded to change Article III.A.3.a. to “***All campaign participants collecting signatures are*** responsible for following all University rules ... or Constitutional amendment.”
- Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by General Consent. There being none, Article III.A.3.a. was changed to read, “***All campaign participants collecting signatures are*** responsible for following all University rules ... or Constitutional amendment.”

- Herzog said that on Page 3, under Article I.B.2.e. she had misspelled the word “campaign.”
- Vardner moved by Unanimous Consent and Neesby seconded to correct the spelling of the word “campaign” in Article I.B.2.e.
- Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the spelling of the word “campaign” was corrected in Article I.B.2.e.

- Herzog said that on Page 4, under Article II.A.1.a., the word “the” before “USAC” should be removed.

- Pham moved by Unanimous Consent and Vardner seconded to remove the word “the” before “USAC” in Article II.A.1.a.
- Wood asked if there were objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the word “the” before “USAC” was removed from Article II.A.1.a.
- Biniek pointed out that Voluntary Campaign Spending Limits were stated to be “binding”, but said that they had been described otherwise in a prior reference. Herzog explained that her concern was the possibility of a candidate deciding to spend more than they had signed on to before that amount had been published in the Daily Bruin. She said that perhaps it should be wording to say something like, “...once published in the Daily Bruin.” Neesby said that he still thought non-binding should be removed, and they should change “Once signed” to “Once published.”
- Neesby moved by General Consent and Biniek seconded to change “once signed” to “once published” in Article V.B.4.1.iv.
- Tuttle asked if the campaign spending cap was set the moment it was signed off on. Herzog said that it was not, because it was a voluntary signature. She said that it was more of a time deadline than a funding cap. Herzog said that if a candidate chose to spend a certain amount of money, there was nothing to stop them. Tuttle asked what would happen if there *was* a cap which someone signed, and they then spent way over that cap in the closing days of the campaign. Herzog said that sanctions would be taken against that individual, resulting in possible disqualification from the election.
- Wood pointed out that there was a sanction for both those who sign-on to the voluntary spending cap and to those who spend more than the published amount.
- Zai said that if one signed the voluntary spending cap and that got submitted to Election Board, then they could potentially take that back. She asked Herzog to qualify this discrepancy. Biniek explained that there were two issues: one if an individual went over the voluntary cap that they had agreed to, and the separate issue of an individual spending more than the amount that was published in the Daily Bruin.
- Wood asked if there were any objections to approval of Neesby’s motion. There being none, “once signed” was amended to read “once published” in Article V.B.4.1.iv.

- Neesby said that on Page 6, under Article II.A.3.f., the word “the” should be changed to “by” before “USAC”.
- Neesby moved and Kaisey seconded to change “the” to “by” before “USAC” in Article II.A.3.f.
- Zai called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the word “the” which appeared before “USAC” was changed to the word “by” in Article II.A.3.f.

- Neesby moved and Kaisey seconded to correct the indentation on Page 8, Article III.A.3.d.i.
- Neesby called for approval by Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the indentation in Article III.A.3.d.i. was corrected.

- Biniek moved and Vardner seconded to extend the time limit on the discussion by 15 minutes.
- Zai called for Acclamation. Vardner objected to approval by Acclamation.
- Biniek called for approval by Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the time limit on the discussion was extended by 15 minutes.

- Wood referred to Page 16 and asked if, in Article V.A.3, the term “ballot proposition” included candidates. Neesby replied that one of the six ballot propositions was for candidates in an election.
- Vardner cited an example that, a roommate trying to persuade another roommate to vote was not considered to be participating in a campaign.
- Neesby said that on Page 12, in Article III.F.3., perhaps Council should add something about who decides which election is held and at what time. He said that he was thinking about whether an Advisory Vote date should be chosen by the petitioner or by Council. He said he thought that

- the election should be held at a date chosen by the petitioner so long as there was a 15 day advance notification.
- Herzog said that there had not, thus far, been anything about that for Advisory Votes. She said she thought that Neesby's addition was a fine one, with the stipulation that the 15 days should be after the approval of the signatures, not after the delivery of those signatures for approval.
 - Neesby moved by Unanimous Consent and Vardner seconded to make Article III.A.3.b. read: "If an Advisory Vote is proposed by student petition, the vote shall take place concurrent with any scheduled election that the petitioner chooses, provided that the signatures are validated at least fifteen days prior to the Election," and to have Article III.A.3.c. read: "If an Advisory Vote is proposed by vote of the USAC, the election shall take place concurrent with any scheduled election that the USAC chooses, by a majority vote, provided that the Election Board receives at least fifteen days notice prior to the Election."
 - Wood asked if there were objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the language in Article III.A.3.b. and c. was changed in keeping with Neesby's motion.
 - Vardner said that he was wondering if Council should require the same 2/3 vote for binding issues that they do for non-binding issues. Herzog said that the reason those numbers were used was because that was what they had been in the past. She said it seemed like a good number because these were things that should be very carefully considered before potentially flooding the ballot with Advisory Votes.
 - Neesby asked if Advisory Votes should be the same as Referendum votes. Biniek said that USAC decides on whether to have Advisory Votes so it follows that USAC would decide the terms of the Advisory Votes. Neesby said that his concern was about disagreement within USAC on when to hold the Advisory Vote. Biniek said that she thought the required percentage was part of the overall decision to have the Advisory Vote at all, so she thought it was a moot point, because 2/3 would probably vote anyway.
 - Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to extend the time limit on the discussion by 15 minutes.
 - Biniek called for Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the time limit on the discussion was extended by 15 minutes.
 - Kaisey said that she would like to integrate Neesby's proposed use of Single Transferable Voting into Herzog's version of the Election Code that was being worked on.
 - Kaisey moved and Neesby seconded to change Article III.F.4.a. and III.F.4.b. to Neesby's proposed wording, as attached to the Agenda Packet.
 - Kaisey said that, as much as she had enjoyed serving with her slate-mates this year, she recognized it was inequitable to have all three General Reps from the same slate. She said she thought it would speak to the basic concept of the General Representative position to set up a system that was more likely to result in a more diverse representation.
 - Wood said that she had spoken with Mike Cohn earlier in the day, and he had told her that changing the voting system this late in the process would be next to impossible.
 - Neesby said that he had spoken with GSA, which used the Instant Runoff Voting system. He said that they got enough information from MyUCLA to use the system. Neesby also said that he had talked to a friend from a community college where they used the Single Transferable Voting system. He said his friend had shared some of their documents with him and explained how their formula could work for UCLA.
 - Wood said that she did not understand exactly how the formula worked, or how the data could get plugged in, but she did know that Mike Cohn knows all about GSA's election process, and he was still saying that this system could not be implemented for USAC's upcoming election in the amount of time remaining. She said that it was Mike Cohn's job to advise Council on these types of issues, and he had said earlier today that it would be impossible to do at this time.
 - Herzog said that logistically, she felt very uncomfortable with plugging numbers into a formula she was not familiar with at this late stage. She said that she had met with Deborah Kearney from MyUCLA to brainstorm ways to make this new system a possibility. Herzog said Kearney had told her that it would be next to impossible to make a program change at this point. Herzog said that perhaps they would need to find a completely new way to collect data outside of

- MyUCLA, but there simply was not enough time to do that right now. She said that she agreed with the responsibility of Council, but it was also their responsibility to do something that was truly feasible.
- Smeets asked if MyUCLA was aware of the fact that USAC had a working formula, and all they needed was the raw data. Herzog said that she had spoken to the actual programmer who designed the system for USAC's elections, and he had told her that there just was not enough time to implement the new system.
 - Williams asked how the voters would be notified of a change such as this to the voting system. He also asked what kind of vote it would take to make such a change. Wood replied that it would take a majority vote. Williams then remarked that this could become a revolving door issue from year-to-year if the factions on Council were not in agreement.
 - Neesby said that he had talked to MyUCLA as well, and it had been his impression that they would be able to do the Single Transferable Voting system, but that the Election Board Chair would then have to apply the raw data to a formula. He said that, before ruling out this option, he wanted to be sure that it truly was logistically impossible. He said if it turned out that it was not logistically impossible, then he wanted to implement this new system. Neesby asked if Herzog had been told that MyUCLA could not provide the raw data. Herzog said that they had said that it was not feasible for this year's election.
 - Wood asked what exactly the raw data would have to look like to make this work. Neesby said that it would essentially be a tabulation of the leader in votes and the second, and so on. He said that it was more of a summation than a tabulation of every single voter.
 - Biniek said that she felt that the Election Board Advisor, the MyUCLA programmer, and MyUCLA as a whole were much more knowledgeable than GSA and Neesby's friend put together. She said that if Council was not 100% sure that this system was doable, then they shouldn't vote for it, because that would be a nightmare. Biniek said that it was certainly something that Council could talk about over the summer for the coming year's election..
 - Smeets said that he had talked to people at UC Berkeley, and it had sounded like this was doable.
 - Wood pointed out that Council was talking about making a policy change that they didn't even know was possible.
 - Malik said that she had been working for some time on getting the Student Service Record implemented, and she said if the Student Service Record could not be done through MyUCLA by Spring Quarter, then she certainly didn't think the change in the voting system was possible at this time..
 - Nelson said that he did not know who the MyUCLA person was that Herzog mentioned, but he said he was sure that they were apolitical. He said that he could, however, vouch for Mike Cohn, saying that Cohn was certainly apolitical. Nelson said that he believed that the Election Board Chairperson and the Election Board Advisor had thoroughly checked into what could be done, and if they said that something was not doable, then he had to believe that was the case. Nelson also added that USAC and GSA were very different, and the two groups had different interests entirely. He also said that although he was a little biased, he much preferred the way things were done at UCLA to the way things were done at Berkeley.
 - Neesby said that he thought this could be done logistically, but it seemed like it might be a stretch as far as letting candidates know. He said that he would let it go for now.
 - Kaisey withdrew her motion and Neesby withdrew his second.
 - Neesby said that he also wanted to remove the restriction on campaigners which said that they had to be UCLA students. He said that he thought this was in Article IV. Herzog said it was on page 18. Neesby said that the restriction was a logistical nightmare and also potentially illegal.
 - Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to strike Article V.B.1.b.i from the Election Code.
 - Hawkins said that he was not at the discussion, and while he understood bringing in great hordes of people to campaign, the elections were not public, they were private. He said that he found it very odd that individuals who were not part of this organization would want to come on campus and campaign. Hawkins also said that people who were not UCLA students really didn't know what was best for this campus, so they really had no business here.
 - Herzog said that at the last meeting this restriction had been called an anti-Transfer Student policy, and had put Council on the side of telling people to "shut up." She said that she did not

agree with either of these statements, and there was a lot of confusion about what students were being told. Herzog said that this was definitely not an anti-Transfer Student policy, and that Transfer Students could learn just as much about UCLA as fulltime students can learn, if they so choose. She said she felt that people who were not UCLA students were not invested in the outcome of USAC elections, but were just invested in the individuals they were campaigning for. Herzog said that she felt that such people were acting in their own interests, and that their actions had nothing to do with UCLA.

- Biniek called the question.
- Council voted to strike Article V.B.1.b.i. from the Election Code with a vote of 6 in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Council voted to approve the Election Code, as amended, with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Herzog asked Council to add Approval of the USA Spring Election Calendar to the Agenda
- Vardner moved by Unanimous Consent and Pham seconded to add the Approval of the Election Calendar to the Agenda.
- Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the Election Calendar was added to the Agenda by Unanimous Consent.

IX. New Business

***Approval of the USA Spring Election Calendar**

- Pham moved and Biniek seconded to approve the USA Spring Election Calendar, as submitted.
- Council voted to approve the USA Spring Election Calendar, as submitted, with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Campus Safety Update

- Kaisey said that there would be a Town Hall on Campus Safety on Thursday evening, April 13, from 6:00 to 9:00p.m. at which people from the Center for Women and Men would be presenting information about sexual assaults.
- Doan said that she would be meeting with Pham to try to set up a campus safety fair.

X. Announcements

- Vardner said that judging for the Golden Paw Award would take place on Monday, April 10th.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The Attendance Sheet was passed around.

XII. Adjournment

- Biniek moved and Pham seconded to adjourn.
- Vardner called for Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m. by Unanimous Consent.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker