

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

Tuesday April 25, 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: Peter Aoun, Terence Chan, Paymon Ebrahimsadeh, Karume James, Janina Montero, Debra Simmons, Caitlin Nunn, Constance Dillon, Julia Erlandson, Dorothy Le, Saira Gandhi, Patricia Venereo

I. Special Presentations

**Student Affairs and the Student Health Advocacy Collective (SHAC)**

- Paymon Ebrahimsadeh from the Student Health Advocacy Collective (SHAC) said that he wanted to give Council a presentation about conversations that had been taking place between SHAC and Vice Chancellor Janina Montero. He said that there were things that they both saw as important for USAC to do and changes to be made in order to increase the effectiveness of SHAC on the UCLA campus. Ebrahimsadeh said that they had thus far assigned SHAC members to different areas of campus, but what they had realized was that students had trouble getting information because of a lack of communication between those different areas. Ebrahimsadeh said that new SHAC members would benefit from giving input into their own appointment by USAC. He said that it was also incredibly important to bridge the summer, which made it necessary that new SHAC representatives were appointed before the summer. He said that this was the first recommendation.
- Tuttle asked if Ebrahimsadeh was asking that each newly elected Council immediately appoint new SHAC representatives, to which Ebrahimsadeh said that he was. Tuttle asked Wood if that was actually doable, to which Wood said that it was.
- Ebrahimsadeh said that his second recommendation to USAC was that current SHAC Representatives be granted input regarding questions to be asked during the interviewing process for new SHAC Representative nominees. He said that Student Psychological Services (SPS) and the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) were two of the most important areas on campus for SHAC, and said that direct questions regarding those offices were necessary for the strongest SHAC representatives possible. He also said that they would like for the current SHAC members to be present at the interviews of potential new SHAC members. Ebrahimsadeh said that the third recommendation to USAC was regarding the limit of years served on SHAC. He said that currently the SHAC positions operated under a 2-year limit, and SHAC would like to explore the possibility of extending that to a 3-year limit.
- Sargent said that when he had been on Council, they had explored the option of extending certain positions, but the issue raised had been continuity with other committees. He said that the Bylaws, however, allowed for USAC to appoint individuals to a 3<sup>rd</sup> year, with the knowledge of that as such.
- Montero said that she had helped with organization of certain aspects in student health. She said that the administration was interested in SHAC taking a bigger role in advising the administration on both health *and* overall wellness. Montero said that they particularly wanted larger student input on OSD and SPS, and that would certainly be easier to do following the appointment of the new SPS director. She said that they wanted to give SHAC the opportunity to extend their reach.
- McLaren asked if someone was already working on the language that would be proposed to Council, since these were appointed positions instead of elected. She said that Council would want to see a draft of the specific expectations and requirements. Ebrahimsadeh said that they

would work on that. Wood clarified that McLaren was referring to the paragraph in the USAC Presidential Appointee booklet.

- Sargent suggested that Ebrahimsadeh also share this information with the incoming Council, as there was no guarantee that it would get passed on to the new Council.
- Wood asked if there was anything else in term's of USAC's support that Ebrahimsadeh and SHAC were looking for. Ebrahimsadeh said that perhaps there were conversations that needed to be had about training or whatever, but he didn't really know what USAC could offer.
- Montero suggested having the SHAC representatives sit in on some training with the Student Welfare Commissioner. Pham asked what kind of training they were looking for; like programming of professional. Ebrahimsadeh said that an overview of the different committees, how to work with the other representatives that were on SHAC, and anything else would all be useful and appreciated.
- Doan said that not all of the appointments were done at once, and asked if they were asking Council to directly appoint individuals to these proposed different areas or sectors of SHAC. Ebrahimsadeh and Montero said that was not the goal, but they would be interested in finding out about individuals' particular leanings or interests in applying for a general position on SHAC.

## II. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.

## B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*Villasin passed around the Attendance Sheet*

## III. Approval of the Agenda

- Pham removed Special Presentation B, UCLA Run/Walk.
- Kaisey removed Special Presentation D, Sustainability on Campus.
- Terence Chan asked to move \*Approval of Undergraduate Students Association 2006-2007 Budget to after its corresponding Special Presentation.
- Wood said that Special Presentation D, Sustainability on Campus, and New Business F, Resolution to Integrate Sustainability into the Undergraduate Students Association Council, couldn't happen before their presenters arrived at 8:30 p.m.
- Wood moved New Business item E, \*Resolution in Support of Greater Ethnic and Racial Diversity at UCLA to directly after its corresponding Special Presentation, C. Admissions Numbers.
- Hawkins asked to be included in the Officer and Member Reports.
- Pham moved and Kaisey seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Biniek called for approval by Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the Agenda was approved, as amended, by Unanimous Consent.

## IV. Approval of the Minutes

### **September 27, 2005**

- McLaren and Keesler explained to Council that these minutes were from the meeting where neither of them had been present, and that the minutes the Substitute Minutes Taker produced were much briefer and, actually sparser, than Council Members have been accustomed to receiving.
- Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to table the minutes of September 27, 2005.
- Biniek called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to tabling the Minutes of September 27, 2005 by Acclamation. There being none, the Minutes of September 27, 2005, were tabled by Acclamation.

**March 7, 2006**

- Simmons noted that Diem Tran was not included in the Attendance, and also that her name was also misspelled throughout the minutes.
- Tuttle said that on the bottom of page 3, during the discussion on the USA SOOF Spring Allocations, he thought that his question and Neesby's response were particularly important for the record. He asked Neesby if he had used any qualifiers in describing the funding of formerly Independent Groups. Neesby said that he thought he had said that their funding was "fair", as asked that "fair" be added after "funded" at the bottom of page 3.
- Wood said that on page 4, under USA SOOF Spring Allocations, in her last comment that she made, she had not described the organizations as "larger", and asked that "larger" be struck.
- Kaisey said that on the bottom of page 6, under the discussion on the Election Code, on the fourth comment from the bottom, she had not said "platform they most closely identified with", rather she had said "candidate they thought had the best chance of winning," and asked that it be changed.
- Pham said that on page 7, under her Officer Member Report, it had been a Multicultural Food *Event*, not a Multicultural Food *Awareness Event*, and asked that it be changed.
- Kaminsky said that on page 9, under his Officer Member Report, there had been around 140 total news reports, with around 40 held on the day of the event.
- Sassounian moved and Neesby seconded to approve the Minutes of March 7, 2006, as amended.
- Kaminsky called for Acclamation. Biniek objected to approval by Acclamation.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of March 7, 2006 with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

## V. Special Presentations

**A. Undergraduate Students Association 2006-2007 Budget – Terence Chan, Debra Simmons, Hazel Villasin**

- Simmons said that this budget was for August 2006 through July 2007. She said that it began with approval of the USA Budget, and then approval of the actual individual budgets in June. Simmons said that there was a section in the Agenda on how the funds had been distributed thus far, and added that Council was currently in the midst of the Budget. Simmons said that on the third page there was documentation of the budgetable income, and opened the floor for questions, hoping that Council was already familiar with the information.
- Neesby asked where it was articulated where the budgeted income for each office went. Simmons said that it was in the back of the packet. Williams explained that for ballots and referendums, the amounts were approved by UC President Dynes in a letter. Neesby said that he was just curious about which allocations were removable.
- Simmons said that the Administrative Overhead Expenses began on page 7. Chan went over some of the salaries included in the administrative overhead expenses, explaining the split between USAC and GSA. He said that for some groups they shared the cost, and for others there were set amounts or stipends for items and maintenance. Simmons told Council that the same phone line was shared by two departments, which explained why that was a little confusing in the documentation. Chan told Council that Election Board had a lot of expenses, and there were more this year than last year. He said that this was because they were supposed to be stipended monthly, though they had for some time been stipended quarterly. Simmons said that they also allowed for student groups to recycle their fees back into the account if some of the funding went unused.
- Simmons said that the University collected mandatory fees, and when students paid with a credit card, ASUCLA was charged for that. Chan said that telephones this year also were budgeted out of the overhead, instead of individually. He said that the new communal space was also included in the overhead this year.
- Biniek asked, with regard to General Notification Advertising, why \$6,000 was listed. Simmons explained that they had realized that more funding could be put into that than had been in past years. Biniek asked why it had jumped from \$1,500 to \$6,000, to which Simmons said that it had been grossly underfunded in the past.

- Biniek asked why the Election Board was only spending half of what was allocated. Simmons said that it could be because they were understaffed. Biniek asked if they needed to be allocated the full amount, or if perhaps that amount should be reduced. Wood said that she thought it might be because the new online voting was used, which was much cheaper, as well as online advertising being much cheaper than in the Daily Bruin.
- Smeets asked what the rate was for Judicial Board. Simmons said that was for graphics and supplies.

## VI. Fund Allocations

### **\*Approval of Undergraduate Students Association 2006-2007 Budget**

- Neesby moved and Pham seconded to approve the Undergraduate Students Association 2006-2007 Budget.
- Biniek asked about the payroll taxes, where the number proposed was much less than what had been asked for. Simmons said that rate was too low, and that not enough had been allocated in 2004-2005. She said that in 2005-2006 that had been corrected. Williams said that worker's comp had also gone up a bit.
- Williams said that the budget numbers were just a guide which could be adjusted if necessary.
- Council voted to approve the Undergraduate Students Association 2006-2007 Budget with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

## VII. Special Presentations

### **C. Admissions Numbers - Alternate Admissions Committee, Karume James**

- Karume James said that he was present to talk about diversity at UCLA. He said that diversity was important, and explained why to Council. James said that the numbers of underrepresented students at UCLA were staggeringly high. He said that the rates of underrepresented students at UCLA this year were as low as they had been all the way back in 1990. James said that UCLA held the record for being the most applied to university in the nation, and yet they still managed to admit an unrepresentative population. He said that this mirrored all of California, whose schools were among the most segregated in the nation. James added that the students who lived in poverty were also those that were least admitted into higher education. He then showed Council a map of Los Angeles, reflecting the breakdown of races, income, and accessibility to education. James told Council that UCLA was burdened by Proposition 209, which prevented them from considering race in the admissions process. He added that these patterns were similar to many other top schools in the nation, including Berkley, Notre Dame, and USC. James said that it was understood that students should be judged based on merit, not on demographics. He said, however, the idea of merit within the applicant pool was not reflective of the actual admission patterns at UCLA. James said that in comparison to UC Berkley, they far outweighed UCLA in their improving admission patterns with regard to minority admissions. He said that one factor to consider was the fact that the Chancellor of Berkeley put a large emphasis on maintaining diversity on campus. James said that there was more to students than just GPAs and extracurricular activities, and that those aspects should be considered as well in the application and admissions process. James said that the point he was trying to make was that UCLA was in a diversity crisis with regard to Blacks, Chicanos, Latinos, and Native Americans not being afforded the same opportunity to access UCLA. He said that the diversity crisis at UCLA limited the educational experiences of all students on campus, and the administrators must spearhead a reform of the admissions process.
- Kaisey thanked James for the presentation, and asked him if there were any steps being taken to actually encourage these students to come to the university. James said that there were a number of efforts being taken by student organizations, where they brought minority students to the university to give them a look at the campus.
- Zai said that James had compared UCLA to Berkeley, and asked if he had the numbers of minority students admitted to each of the universities. James said that he did not have the specific numbers but that he could research it.

- Neesby asked about the Diversity Day of Action, which was referenced in the resolution. James said that it would begin with a press conference, followed by a speak-out to educate the students about just what these numbers meant. He said that this would be at 11:00 on Thursday.
- Nelson said that the presentation had been excellent. He said that he was on the committee for McDonalds that gave \$2,000 scholarships to Latino and Black students. Nelson said that these were good students, and to see the trauma that they had to go through to get this far was amazing. He said that out of 80 applicants, maybe one would have both parents living at home. He said that there was little encouragement from the community, but these kids were doing what it took to get their education. Nelson said that a lot of these kids had nowhere to study, but were still working hard to get their work done to get these admissions.
- James said that a lot of students coming from such communities were amazingly qualified, despite these adverse conditions.
- Zai asked if James had the numbers for overlap in admissions between UCLA and UC Berkeley, regarding how many students applied and were underrepresented. Wood said that she was not sure that those numbers were given out, as that kind of information applied to specific individuals.
- Smeets asked James about the students who declined to say about their race, and how many of them were underrepresented minorities. James said that there obviously was no racial data on those who had declined to identify their race. He said, however, that a large portion of the applicant pool identified themselves as minorities, so those that declined to say probably did not factor in greatly.
- Biniek said that one didn't have to look around the classroom too hard to see that there were grossly underrepresented groups at this campus. Smeets said that he had just brought it up because he was a student of color who had declined to say so during admissions.

#### VIII. New Business

##### **E. \*Resolution in Support of Greater Ethnic and Racial Diversity at UCLA**

- Wood and Biniek read the resolution aloud, since it had changed somewhat since it was last presented to Council.
- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of Greater Ethnic and Racial Diversity at UCLA.
- Sassounian asked to amend the resolution to also focus on the retention of admitted students, as it seemed to her that retention of underrepresented minorities was also a problem. Wood agreed that it should be added, but disagreed with Sassounian about where it should be added to the Resolution. Sassounian suggested adding it to the first Therefore clause, but Biniek suggested adding a whole new clause.
- Sassounian suggested adding a clause before the first "Be it further resolved..." that read "Therefore USAC supports the efforts of students from unrepresented communities."
- Neesby asked if they were talking about yield or retention.
- Wood suggested adding a clause before the first "Be it further resolved..." that read: "Be it further resolved that USAC supports increasing the yield rate of students from unrepresented communities that are admitted."
- Sargent said that yield was very under-attended to by the university, and was glad that it was being added by Council.
- Wood said that the resolution should be specific, and asked Sassounian who she wanted to work on this. Sassounian said that this would be the responsibility of the Admissions Committee, not CUARS. She said that she wasn't exactly sure about who carried out these changes. She said that she thought CUARS would recommend the changes with the Admissions Office implementing them. Wood said that it was the Admissions Office who sought after students who had been admitted, though they had not been outreaching. She said that she thought right now too much funding was being spent on retention instead of yield.
- Biniek said that yield was important, but she thought what was more important was a statement being sent out about admissions at UCLA. She said that the larger issue was how USAC could ensure that the admissions policies and practices reflected the values held in this area. Wood

- agreed that was the focus of the resolution, as the problem was the admissions numbers, while the yield rate only compounded the problem.
- Sassounian moved and Neesby seconded to add “Be it further resolved that USAC supports efforts to increase yield rates of students from underrepresented communities that are admitted.” before the first “Be it further resolved...”
  - Council voted to add “Be it further resolved that USAC supports efforts to increase yield rates of students from underrepresented communities that are admitted.” before the first “Be it further resolved...” with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. Zai was out of the room
  - Neesby said that he was unfamiliar with what the SSUA Workgroup did. Wood directed him to the page in the Agenda Packet after the Resolution.
  - Kaminsky said that the fifth Whereas on the first page and the sixth Whereas on the second page seemed to be talking about the same thing, and suggested combining them. Wood said that the first was used to compare UCLA and UC Berkeley, while the other was trying to show the significance of the decrease in the diversity of admissions since 1997. Kaminsky said that he still thought that the two could be combined. Wood said that she could see how it seemed a bit repetitive, but that the points were different.
  - Sargent asked to entertain a motion to add “Be it further resolved that the USAC request the UCLA Alumni Association to pass a similar resolution in support of efforts to increase yield rates of students from underrepresented communities that are admitted.”
  - Biniek moved and Kaisey seconded to add “Be it further resolved that the USAC request the UCLA Alumni Association to pass a similar resolution in support of efforts to increase yield rates of students from underrepresented communities that are admitted.”
  - Sargent said that this was a good idea because USAC had the unique ability to recommend action by other entities on campus, and they should take advantage of that opportunity more often.
  - Council voted to add “Be it further resolved that the USAC request the UCLA Alumni Association to pass a similar resolution in support of efforts to increase yield rates of students from underrepresented communities that are admitted.” With a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
  - Sassounian said that she had found that it was better to speak diplomatically, and the first “Be it further resolved...” on the last page said “demand”, while she thought it would be better to say “request” or “promote.” Wood said that in this situation, where these numbers were declining year after year despite enormous efforts on campus, and the fact that Administrators and Faculty expressed the necessity of a Chancellor that promoted diversity, it was okay to make demands.
  - Biniek suggested saying “insist”, which was still demanding but less aggressive.
  - Williams suggested saying “expect”, and agreed that “demand” was a poor word choice. Wood said that she thought that “expect” was less active, and said that the word needed to imply action on USAC’s part.
  - Zai said that she liked “expect”, because it showed that USAC had been working with the administration on this, and “expect” put USAC as with the administration, instead of against them like “demand” would. Biniek added that since this was USAC’s university, they could have expectations of the administration.
  - Sassounian moved and Kaisey seconded to change “demand” to “expect” in the first “Be it further resolved...”
  - Council voted to change “demand” to “expect” in the first “Be it further resolved...” with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
  - Zai said that in the first “Be it further resolved...”, “bringing” was misspelled. Wood said that “progress” was misspelled in the fourth “Whereas,...” from the bottom on the second page. Neesby said that some places had “chican@s” and others had “chicano/a(s)”, but that all should be “chican@s”. Kaminsky said that “their” should be changed to “our” before “university” in the second-to-last “Whereas,...”
  - Biniek moved and Zai seconded to correct all the aforementioned typos.
  - Neesby called for approval by Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the aforementioned typos were corrected.
  - Tuttle asked if it was an issue of efficiency on the second page, in the fifth-from-the-bottom “Whereas,...” Wood said that it had not been changed or suggested for change. McLaren

- suggested making “achievement”, “achievements” in that clause. Nelson said that it was already correct.
- Neesby said that in the first “Be it further resolved...”, he was concerned with item (2). He said that his concern was that it might be bad to limit the chancellor search to only those that had been former chancellors and who had also increased the diversity at their campuses. Wood said that in terms of the track record, all of the chancellor candidates had been former chancellors of other universities. She said that in the last decade, there had been increases in many forms of diversity, including racial, sexual, economic, etc. Neesby asked if that could be clarified in the language, to which Wood said that it was intentionally vague.
  - Tuttle said that this might be a problem, as in California every university had gotten worse, so it might be better to talk about *efforts* to increase diversity. Wood said that with UC Berkeley, the chancellor had put more money into admissions to overcome Proposition 209 to increase diversity. Tuttle said that chancellors were trying all over the state but were getting clobbered. He said that there were very capable chancellors, and he would hate to see someone from another UC campus be eliminated for not increasing diversity despite their efforts.
  - Biniek said that efforts were no longer enough, and with the state of affairs, they needed a chancellor who could bring about action.
  - Neesby asked how many universities had increased diversity, to which Wood said that all of the UC’s had, with UCLA being the only one with declining numbers, thus bringing down the state average as a whole.
  - Biniek said that if one looked at the number of Asian students admitted in relation to the numbers of Black students, it was at the 69% rate at UCLA and 77% for Cal.
  - Kaminsky moved and Biniek seconded to add “in” after the comma in the third “Whereas...”
  - Sassounian called for approval by Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, an “in” was added after the comma in the third “Whereas...”
  - Smeets asked, under Diversity of Action, which groups had been contacted and would be involved in the event. Wood said MEChA, ASU, APC, Samahang Pilipino, SIAC and others were all involved. Smeets asked if these groups had been contacted by Wood’s office, to which she said that they had, and had all expressed interest in the event. Smeets said that the reason he had brought it up was because some student groups, such as the Bruin Republicans, had been neglected at a similar earlier event. He asked if this event was open to other groups, to which Wood said that other groups could definitely be involved. Wood asked to keep comments to the resolution, to which Smeets said that some groups felt left out, and he believed that needed to be said.
  - Neesby said that he and Tuttle recognized that there were people and administrators where there might be people who did not prioritize diversity, but there might also be the opposite effect of campuses where diversity had increased despite no efforts. He said that the committee would be able to see whether or not there was specific effort, and though this seemed nitpicky, he thought it was good to point out.
  - Neesby moved and Kais ey seconded to make (2) in the first “Be it further resolved...” read “has a track record of making an effort to bring about diversity.”
  - Biniek said that people who were applying were in the position of making efforts, and if they had not been making those efforts, then they were not right for UCLA. Neesby said that would be subsumed under the language. He said that his language would not preclude the consideration of individuals who had worked hard but been unable to increase diversity.
  - Zai said that it could be “has a track record of increasing diversity and making an effort to do so...” She said that might restrict the pool, though, so she was not sure.
  - Wood said that the committee would clearly be able to see if a candidate had not made any efforts. She said that there was an assumption in the preexisting language to encourage effort.
  - Tuttle said that it had just struck him that given the California problem; it sometimes took time for efforts to bear fruit. He said that he just did not want to exclude good candidates. Tuttle said that it was great that Council was making these efforts, as the situation on campus with Black students was a disaster. Wood said that the issue was not about holding Proposition 209 against potential chancellors. She said that if there was someone from the University of California, then they had to have shown their ability to overcome Proposition 209.

- Neesby withdrew his motion and Kaisey withdrew her second.
- Neesby moved and Doan seconded to make (2) in the first “Be it further resolved...” read “has demonstrated efforts to bring about greater diversity at his or her former university.”
- Biniek said that she just wanted to make sure that this was an action point, not a talking point.
- Neesby asked to make it clear through the record that there was a legislative intent
- Tuttle said that, to be fair, Chancellor Carnesale had made many efforts to bring about greater diversity at UCLA, and to say that it had just been words was doing a disservice. He said that Proposition 209 was a difficult thing to overcome, and to be dismissive of his efforts was a disservice to the fact of the matter. Wood said that may be true, but there have been many things that she heard he did including not prioritizing bringing about diversity, not putting extra funding into it, and not doing anything worthy of praise in the area whatsoever. Tuttle said that he knew the Chancellor had made various efforts, but Proposition 209 had been extremely difficult to override. He said he realized that Chancellor Carnesale might not have done everything that was asked of him, but he had definitely made repeated efforts.
- Council voted to amend Item (2) in the first “Be it further resolved...” to read “has demonstrated efforts to bring about greater diversity at his or her former University..” with a vote of 11 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Biniek requested a Role Call vote on the final language of the Resolution in Support of Greater Ethnic and Racial Diversity at UCLA There being no objection, the President polled each Council Member.
- The results of the Role Call vote are listed below:

Jeannie Biniek	Yes
Michelle Sassounian	Yes
Jason Kaminsky	Yes
Todd Hawkins	Yes
Kristina Doan	Yes
Tracy Pham	Yes
Farheen Malik	Yes
PC Zai	Yes
Marwa Kaisey	Yes
Brian Neesby	No
Ryan Smeets	No
Joseph Vardner	Yes

- The Resolution in Support of Greater Ethnic and Racial Diversity at UCLA was approved by a vote of 11 in Favor, 2 Opposed, 0 Abstentions.

IX. Appointments

*There were no Appointments this week.*

X. Fund Allocations

**\*Approval of Contingency Fund Allocations**

- Villasin said that Contingency Fund was first come first serve, and it would most likely be depleted by the next Council meeting. She said that they would still be reviewing applications, though, in the next week. Wood said that money from the Capital Items Fund could be moved into the Contingency Fund for the Summer.
- Neesby asked if Villasin recommended this, to which she said that she did, as there would be more applications with no funding.
- Villasin said that \$2,845.53 had been requested form Contingency Funding, with \$1,106.00 recommended for allocation. She said that an additional \$1,161.57 had been requested from Contingency via discretionary, with \$380.00 recommended for allocation. Villasin said that upon making these recommended allocations, the running total in Contingency Funding would

drop from \$12,672.92 to \$11,186.92. Villasin said that a total of \$1,377.93 had also been requested from Contingency in Capital Requests, with \$1,377.93 recommended for allocation. She said that pending this allocation, the remaining balance for Capital Requests would drop from \$14,061.13 to \$12,683.20.

- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations and the Contingency Capital Request Allocation Recommendations.
- Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations and the Contingency Capital Request Allocation Recommendations with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. (Pham out of room)

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

*The Contingency Capital Item Allocation Recommendations are attached to the Minutes.*

- Vardner pointed out to Council said that there were people present for the Sustainability Resolution that had not happened, and asked that the resolution be heard.
- Vardner moved by Unanimous Consent and Zai seconded to hear the Resolution to Integrate Sustainability into the Undergraduate Students Association Council.
- Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the Resolution to Integrate Sustainability into the Undergraduate Students Association Council was heard.

## XI. New Business

### **F. \*Resolution to Integrate Sustainability into the Undergraduate Students Association Council**

- Vardner said that this was a resolution about making UCLA greener and more sustainable. He said that the resolution detailed specifically how this would be brought about, including amendments to various programs, and the institution of a general sustainable attitude.
- Caitlin Nunn from the Student Welfare Commission said that she wanted to support the resolution, as lots of student groups were really interested in having this action taken.
- Vardner thanked Wood and Biniek for cosponsoring this resolution, as there had been some debate regarding the resolution.
- Wood said that there had been quite a bit of dialogue with the chancellor, and said that the new committee was being recognized at the highest levels of administration.
- Kaminsky said that Dorothy Le would want her support noted. He said that especially in light of Earth Day, it was important that USAC support those efforts now and forever.
- McLaren recommended that every reference to the "Undergraduate Student Association" should have "students" instead of "student" in every instance.
- Biniek moved and Malik seconded to approve the Resolution to Integrate Sustainability into the Undergraduate Students Association Council.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution to Integrate Sustainability into the Undergraduate Students Association Council with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions. (Pham was out of the room)

## XII. Officer and Member Reports

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

- Sassounian said that over the weekend she had taken a trip to UC Berkeley and had some meetings with Academic Affairs up there. She said that they had learned a lot, and had gotten ideas for how to get more support. She said that they had also gotten to meet with facilitators from Berkeley, and it had been very helpful to learn about how things were done there.

### **Cultural Affairs Commissioner – Todd Hawkins**

- Hawkins said that Hip-Hop Awareness was going on, and World Fest had been a huge success. He said that Hip-Hop Awareness Week was 6<sup>th</sup> Week, and all of the information would be officially released on Monday. He said that there would be galleries, performances, and

screenings. Hawkins also said that there were 33 days until Jazz/Reggae Festival, and a new group had just been added to the lineup.

- Smeets asked about Tommy the Clown, to which Hawkins said that he was coming on May 9<sup>th</sup>.

**External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek**

- Biniek said that she had gone to the USSA Board Meeting over the last weekend, and thanked Williams for the food. Biniek said that the House was supposed to have voted on the budget by now, but it had been delayed again. Biniek also said that she was meeting with UC President Dynes on May 4<sup>th</sup>, and in the same week she would be going to the UCSA Board Meeting to interview candidates for the UC Student Regent position. Biniek said that she had also been setting up lobby visits for the Student-Initiated Access Committee, and they were also taking part in the admissions response program on Thursday.

**Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan**

- Doan said that today had been Earth Day, and thanked all the offices for their support. She said that the second meeting for the Student Psychological Services director search committee had been held, and they had reduced the applicants down to only six. Doan said that the committee would be asking Council for their permission to make a formal presentation about the new director, and how he or she could work with the new Council to make mental health an important issue on campus. Doan also said that there had been a rotating director in the past, which is why there had been so much difficulty in communication between them and the Student Health Advocacy Collective. She said that the new director should be in by July 1. Doan also said that Williams' birthday was coming up, but he had requested no desert.

**President – Jenny Wood**

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

XIII. Old Business

**A. Discussion of Bruin Bash 2006**

- Kaisey said that ORL, ASUCLA, and IFC were already planning for Bruin Bash 2006. She said that they wanted to get a head start on sponsors this year, as funding had been the only big problem last year.
- Kaminsky said that his staff had been developing a sponsorship packet over the last month, and it would hopefully be done by Wednesday. He said that funding from Student Affairs looked to be the same as last year, so it was important to get lots of sponsors if they didn't want to have to dip into USAC Surplus again.
- Sargent said that the UCLA Alumni Association could probably help them to find Alumni who would be interested in sponsorship. He said this would be done through the UCLA Foundation..
- Simmons asked what had been done to sell this issue to the incoming Council. Kaminsky said that there had been some discussion about that, and said that they had been working to secure a certain amount of funding before the new Council took office. He said that it would rely on next year's council in the end, though. Kaisey added that the Greeks would be playing a bigger role in the next year.

**B. \*Approval of USAC Presidential Appointment to Campus Sustainability Committee**

- Wood said that this had been talked about at the last meeting, but there was now clarification from the Campus Sustainability Committee that they wanted it to be a Presidential appointment.
- Biniek moved and Pham seconded to approve the USAC Presidential Appointment to the Campus Sustainability Committee.
- Council voted to approve the USAC Presidential Appointment to the Campus Sustainability Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

## XIV. New Business

**A. \*Approval of Funding for Sustainable Program Award Review**

- Vardner said that his recommendation was to first take the allocation from Williams. He said that if Council tapped into Capital Items, then that should be done late in the year after all the requests were in.
- Wood asked if Vardner was asking to take back the Capital Item money that had already been allocated, and then get that money from Williams. Vardner asked Williams if that was okay, to which he said that was fine.
- Vardner moved and Neesby seconded to un-do the funding of the Sustainable Program Award from USA Capital Items Fund.
  - Vardner said that if Council did need to take capital money, it should be done much later, when no more requests would be coming in.
- Council voted to un-do the funding of the Sustainable Program Award from USA Capital Items Fund with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

**B. Discussion of Removing a Wall on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**

- Vardner said that he wanted to make sure everyone was on board with this, and the idea was to get rid of the wall in front of the facilities and IVP offices. He said that taking that wall out would open up the space and make the spaces more available. Vardner said that he had talked with Mann, and it seemed like it would work fine.
- Doan added that it was a safety issue, as those hidden offices had been the only two broken into in the last year. McLaren agreed with Doan, and said that it was really a safety issue.

**C. \*Review of Action Taken at USAC's April 18, 2006 Meeting Regarding the Vote Required to Amend USAC's Bylaws**

- Tuttle said that this had to do with the action taken at the last meeting, regarding the 2/3 vote. He said that after some review and research, along with some help from McLaren, it appeared that a change had been dropped from the Constitution in a revision in November of 1984. Tuttle said that he had been around at the time, and there had been an event at the Council table in 1982, which changed the name of the Student Legislative Council (SLC) to the Undergraduate Students Association (USA). Tuttle said that in the minutes of 4/20/82, a copy of the new Constitution was included, and Article V had been moved from the old Constitution. He said that the intention had just been to change Student Legislative Council to Undergraduate Students Association, but in the process, Article V had been moved over to Article IX, with some slight word changes. Tuttle said that with the help of McLaren and of good records, he saw what Council had passed on to the voters. He then showed Council the copy of the Constitution that had been published in the Daily Bruin in 1982, and also noted that the voice in Article V had been passive, while that of Article IX became active. Tuttle said that in going over years and years of minutes, and years and years of Daily Bruins, he had not found instance of Council intentionally proposing that a constitutional change be made changing the necessity of a 2/3 vote to amend the Bylaws. Tuttle said that it appeared to him that there had been a clerical error in the typing of the Constitution in November 1984 which led to the elimination of the section of the Constitution stipulating that a two-thirds vote is necessary to change the Bylaws. He said that the students had not voted for the elimination of that 2/3 requirement, and it was therefore his recommendation that Council take this under review, and if satisfied that the record is accurate, subsequently reconsider their motion to overrule the chair at the meeting of April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006. Tuttle also said that he thought the Constitution should be retyped, and the 2/3 vote requirement should be restored to its rightful place in the Constitution.
- Neesby said that he had also looked into the issue, and concurred with Tuttle.
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to reverse the amendments to the Bylaws made by Council on April 18th, which had been done improperly, and to retype the new Constitution per Dr. Rick Tuttle's recommendation.
- Council voted to reverse the amendments to the Bylaws made by Council on April 18th, which had been done improperly, and to retype the new Constitution per Dr. Rick Tuttle's recommendation with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

XV. Announcements

- Sassounian said that she had gone through the 1982 minutes, and read a Tuttle quote to Council, which was almost verbatim of the same questions that he still asked of potential appointees.
- Kaminsky said that this week the Campus Events Commission was kicking off its 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary with free movies for canned food. Zai asked if it was \$2.00 if people did not bring canned food, to which Kaminsky said that it was not. Kaminsky also said that bikes could be picked up at Dorothy Le's between 9:00 and 11:00 a.m. He said that the locks were available at Wooden.
- Pham said that Le had gotten Transportation Services to donate the locks. She also said that UCLA Run/Walk was coming up, and encouraged Council to sign up. Pham also said that the big Bruin Health Symposium was approaching, and a star from the food network would be there to do a live show. She also said that there would be a free CPR class offered, as well as a career fair.
- Vardner said that car towing was taking place on Levering, but Transportation Services would be paying for any damage to the cars as well as the ticket and towing fees.
- Wood said that May 1<sup>st</sup> was going to be International Worker's Day, and this was an especially important year because of the proposed legislation. She said that if Council wanted to commemorate the efforts of workers here and everywhere, there would be a rally that they could all attend.

XVI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*Villasin passed around the attendance sheet.*

XVII. Adjournment

- Malik moved and Vardner seconded to adjourn.
- Biniek called for approval by Unanimous Consent. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Unanimous Consent. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 10:21 p.m. by Unanimous Consent.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Michael Keesler  
USAC Minutes Taker