

FINAL

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday May 16, 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: Constance Dillon, Julia Erlandson, Anat Herzog, Jeanalee Obergfell

I. A. Call to Order

- Wood called the meeting to order at 7:13 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Biniek said that there was going to be a Special Presentation on the Student Compact. She also asked that the corresponding Resolution, New Business item A. *Resolution in Support of ACR 34, the Student Compact Resolution, could be moved up to directly after the Special Presentation.
- Sargent, Kaminsky, Sassounian, Kaisey, and Vardner asked to be included in the Officer and Member Reports.,
- Kaisey moved and Kaminsky seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Council voted to approve the Agenda, as amended, with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
(Three Council Members arrived late to the meeting)

III. Approval of the Minutes

April 11, 2006

- Smeets said that in the Attendance and in the Presentation in Support of Study Abroad in Israel, the girl referenced as "Shirley" was actually named "Shirlynn".
- Malik said that on page 4, under her Officer and Member Report, "MOA" should have been written "MOU".
- Doan said that on page 4, under her Officer and Member Report, Vice Chancellor Montero had been incorrectly identified as "Vice Chair".
- Doan moved and Smeets seconded to approve the Minutes of April 11, 2006 as amended.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of April 11, 2006, as amended, with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

IV. Special Presentations

The Student Compact, Biniek and Obergfell

- Biniek said that the Resolution was in support of a piece of legislation that UCSA had gotten introduced into the California State Assembly. She said that this was the compact that had been signed by the UC President, and this was a compact that the legislature would be passing to ensure the affordability of the UC system. Biniek said that it ensured that the cost of education

FINAL

would be based on what families could afford, not what the universities needed. She said that it ensured that Californians would have the ability to attend higher education in their own state. Biniek said that the compact ensured that the Regents had a holistic perspective toward education instead of a bottom-line approach that just focused on state funding. Biniek said that she and Malik had attended a conference and had gotten Regent Liu to sponsor the legislation. She said that the compact was non-binding, but outlined the priorities of the students so that the Regents would know what was important to the students. Biniek said that the resolution went through each of the priorities one by one, and then also stated that a letter would be sent to the UC Regents by the clerk of the assembly, sharing with them that this Resolution had been passed. Biniek said that several other campuses had passed similar resolutions, and explained that this was really a resolution in support of a resolution, as the assembly already had said resolution under review. Biniek read background information attached to the Resolution to Council.

Pham arrived

V. New Business

A. *Resolution in Support of ACR 34, the Student Compact Resolution

- Biniek read the Resolution aloud to Council.
- Malik moved and Neesby seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of ACR 34, The Student Compact Resolution.
- Biniek pointed out to Council that this was the first time that UCSA had actually authored and pushed through a piece of legislation, and it was really cool to see the whole process working.
- Nelson said that this was a great resolution, and that it was very timely. He said that there once was a time when students could be poor but work their way through school and graduate with no debt. Nelson said that the cost of education had exceeded that of inflation, and was glad that this issue was finally being addressed.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution in Support of ACR 34, The Student Compact Resolution with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

VI. Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

VII. Fund Allocations

- Villasin said that \$18,061.07 had been requested from Contingency Funding, with \$4,838.00 recommended for allocation. She said that an additional \$1,652.00 had been requested from Contingency via discretionary, with \$628.00 recommended for allocation. Villasin said that upon making these recommended allocations, the running total in Contingency Funding would drop from a total of \$4,786.95 down to \$-51.35 Villasin said that a total of \$1,612.89 had also been requested from Contingency in Capital Requests, with \$1,162.89 recommended for allocation. She said that pending this allocation, the remaining balance for Capital Requests would drop from \$3,386.71 to \$2,224.12.
- Neesby asked what was going to happen with a balance of \$-51.35. Villasin said that two USAC offices had transferred money after these numbers were published. Wood again reminded Council to transfer their funds so that groups could utilize them. Villasin also told Council that the groups that had applied this week would need another \$5,500 that had not been transferred yet.
- Kaisey said that her office had several thousand that could be transferred out.
- Villasin said that she also had not received any applications for Capital Items for the final cycle, so Council could transfer funds from Capital Items into Programming. Wood asked if Villasin recommended making this transfer immediately, and Villasin said that she did, because next week was the last chance.

- Wood asked when the new fiscal year began, to which Villasin said that it began on June 1. Villasin said that Monday would be the last day to request from contingency for the current fiscal year, though.
 - Wood told Council that their two options were to tell groups that the fund had run out or to transfer funds into Contingency.
 - Sargent recommended transferring all remaining funds from overhead and offices at the next meeting, and said that it would make sense because Villasin would still be around to oversee the transfer.
 - Neesby asked if it could be done as a Council, or if each office would have to do so individually. Villasin said that each office had to do it individually. Wood told Council to fill out a budget transfer form and bring it to the next meeting such that all remaining funds could be transferred to Contingency.
 - Biniek moved and Neesby seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
 - Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- The Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations are attached to the minutes.*

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

UCLA Alumni Association Representative – Todd Sargent

- Sargent said that he was working with Kaminsky on Bruin Bash as a joint venture between Campus Events Commission and the Alumni Association. He said that this was a first, as the foundation usually only supported facilities and other entities. Sargent said that this was interesting, because donors gave funds to the University for Different Reasons, and it would be interesting to see how this went. He also said that he would want to work with the Community Service Commission in getting the Alumni involved with community service on campus. Sargent also said that he wanted to work with institutionalizing Yield events, which took place between the time that students were accepted and the time where they actually came to the University. He said that this was apolitical, as these were students that had already been admitted, and there had to be ways to increase the percent that actually came to the school. Sargent said that he was planning to talk to the new Council on how this could be institutionalized, and thought it was a great thing for USAC to get involved with. He said that there might be a good opportunity for the SIAC to overlap here and utilize the alumni in getting these admitted students to actually come.
- Wood said that collaborating with the yield events that were already taking place might be a better approach rather than making new events. Sargent said that he agreed, but his approach was mostly geared toward involving the alumni.
- Sargent lastly thanked Wood for her letter to the Alumni Association encouraging the institutionalization of a second Alumni Representative to USAC.

General Representative #3 – Marwa Kaisey

- Kaisey said that the interns were working really well, and said that next week there would be a LAN party, where people hook up their computers and play video games. She also said that the interns were trying to put together a rally for the 99th anniversary. Kaisey lastly said that there would be a Town Hall on the Hill, and said that she would be sending out information to Council about that and other summer activities that people could get involved in.

Academic Affairs Commissioner – Michelle Sassounian

- Sassounian said that she just got back from New York where she had met with student leaders to talk about the UCLA USIE program. She said that some of her staff members had come along, and they had also done some transitioning, with the passing on of knowledge and closing the book on this year's office.
- Tuttle asked which schools were present. Sassounian replied that Columbia had been there, the Root College had been there, the IVY Council had been there, and NYU had also made an appearance.

Campus Events Commissioner – Jason Kaminsky

- Kaminsky passed out fliers to Council advertising the Tuesday night movies and also a Hip-Hop show coming up. Kaminsky said that he would be working with Sargent on Bruin Bash, and said that they were looking for sponsors. He said that one issue that had been brought up was that Move-In weekend was Rosh Hashanah, and said that the dates might be moved around.

Administrative Representative – Dr. Rick Tuttle

- Tuttle said that there was a Dashew Board Meeting taking place during the Council meeting, and apologized if he was in and out of the room during the meeting.

External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek

- Biniek said that this weekend would be the electoral action education weekend. She said that they would be planning their voter work for the weekend. Biniek said that they had approved questions for all the candidates relating to higher education, and said that this would allow students to select candidates based on their answers to questions pertaining to higher education. She said that the registration deadline had passed. Biniek said that there would be a UC Regents Meeting at UCSF Wednesday, and said that it might be interesting since some of the Regents had called for Dynes' resignation, and this meeting was the deadline. Biniek also told Council that she would be done with UCSA pretty soon.

Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan

- Doan said that if people were interested in Summer Tabling, Wednesday would be the last day to sign up for tabling at Summer Orientation Sessions. She said that the sign-up would be in Ackerman 2408 at 5:00 p.m., and said that this was a great place to get names of people because they were all freshmen or transfers who were all interested in getting involved. Doan said that she would be meeting with Monroe Gordon about the Financial Aid Policy Committee and the Committee on Disabilities. Doan told Council that the Student Psychological Services (SPS) interviews were going really well, and said that she had heard a lot of great ideas about how to change SPS and improve it. She said that one of the candidates had a drop rate of return clients of only 2% instead of the national average 20%. Doan also said that they would be outreaching to the different groups on campus, and had different strategies about how to be proactive and help more students.
- Kaisey asked if the USAC offices were automatically signed up for the Summer Orientation Sessions. Wood said that last year ASUCLA had set up a table for USAC in one of the more prominent locations. Kaisey said that she felt like she remembered that her office had specifically signed p for a table. Wood said that was not a bad idea, but ASUCLA would have a table.

Zai Arrived.

Vardner Arrived.

President – Jenny Wood

- Wood said that the Undergraduate Admissions Work Group was doing a lot, and had gotten a lot of information together. She said that this had happened as a result of pressure on the administration following press coverage. Wood said that Vice Chancellor Montero had been meeting with different student groups to make sure that everyone was working together on reforming admission at UCLA. She said that next week there would be some demonstrations by Arizona State University to address their feelings on admission numbers, and said that this was a way of engaging the public to make sure that UCLA was serving the public. Wood said that they were also getting more support from UCOP. Wood said that she had just met with Terrence Chan and Debra Simmons to make sure that SOOF was a student-friendly as possible, and said that it would hopefully allow student organizations to apply in the fall for the entire year, but to allow other groups to apply later in the year if they missed it. Wood told Council that the chancellor search was continuing, but she still was unable to talk about it.

FINAL

- Vardner asked if a criteria judging a group on minimizing their waste was being incorporated into the SOOF applications. Wood said that they were working to make the application process electronic, which would certainly cut down on waste.
- McLaren said that she and Jerry Mann had begun looking into systems that might allow for groups to apply to all of the funding sources electronically.
- Sargent suggested making the presidential appointments electronic this year.

Facilities Commissioner – Joseph Vardner

- Vardner said that three separate Westwood business groups had been founded while he was commissioner. He said that they were all good, but he was working on figuring out how to merge the three of them. Vardner said that the commission was also trying to reduce the amount of garbage produced when students move out every year. He said that they were currently kicking around ideas. He said that they might be working with student media to find a type of “Craigslis” for UCLA to list free furniture and whatnot for students to give or sell to each other instead of just putting them out on the street. Vardner said that the recycling program was going really well on the hill, and a lot of the captains were interested in taking the projects to their new buildings for the next year. He said that they would also be recycling the money generated by the program back into it in order to help the program grow. Vardner said that parking services had also revamped their parking allocation system, with points being given out for having children, being involved in community service, and new checks in order to cut down on fraud, since over 85% of all freshmen on the hill had lied on their parking applications this year.
- Zai said that the lines at parking were already pretty horrible, and asked if they would be worse. Vardner said that they might, but it would hopefully be more effective and accurate.
- Vardner said that parking services would also be exploring the option of charging different amounts in the parking meters based on the time of day that people were parked there.

- Wood said that Anat Herzog had to leave soon, so the next item Council would be considering was the Old Business matter concerning proposed amendments to the Election Code.

IX. Old Business

B. *Amendments to the Election Code

- Neesby said that he had sent out the proposed changes to Council. He said that the new changes were that there would be no classroom announcements for campaigns, that one could put a slate affiliation on their signboard but not the names of the other individuals in the slate, the leafletting hours, and an outlining of how the election code would be amended, such that it would require a 2/3 vote. Neesby said that he had made a document of the additional changes that he would like to see come about, but if they were submitted then it would be after he left, so he passed them out just as notification for the next Council.
- Wood said that she felt like there was some degree of necessity to wait on Election Code changes until after the election itself was over. She said that was a good opportunity to make changes because they could talk about what needed changing. Wood said that after the last election that was what they had done, and it had seemed to work very well. She said that since the current election was still going on it seemed like it would make sense to wait.
- Anat Herzog said that she agreed with Wood’s idea to wait, but at the same time she agreed with the changes that Neesby was proposing. She said that she would be alright with making these changes right away, but she understood why it might make sense to wait until the next meeting, after the election was over.
- Biniek said that it also seemed like a good idea to wait for the post-election committee because people would know that they were not politically motivated since the next election would be so far away. She said that even if the changes were good, then it might give the impression that the changes were politically motivated. Biniek said that the changes would be taken more seriously after the election.
- Neesby agreed with Biniek, and said that was why he had decided to wait on several of the changes. He said that he also agreed with Biniek in saying that it made sense to make these changes as a group, and said that was why he wanted to make the change to the code needing a

- 2/3 vote to change the document. He said that was the important one, and the other ones seemed so obvious that it seemed like it would not be a big deal to attach them.
- Tuttle said that the 2/3 business was troublesome. He said that he could see a decision arise where something had made sense in the past, but was no longer a good idea. Tuttle said that the consensus could be substantially above the majority without making the 2/3 cutoff. He said that there could be a problem if the 1/3 dissenters held on year after year such that Council was unable to crack the 1/3 block.
 - Sargent asked if there was a motion on the floor, to which Wood said that there was not.
 - Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to approve the changes to the Election Code as submitted.
 - Neesby responded to Sargent by saying that he thought a larger concern could arise when the Election Code bound both the minority and the majority, and the only way to protect the minority was by requiring a supermajority vote. He said that Council had gotten well over a 2/3 consensus on all of their Election Code changes, even the highly contested ones.
 - Wood said that the off-campus campaigning vote had not been 2/3, and Biniek said that the Single-Transferable Vote issue had not been 2/3.
 - Sargent said that his opinion was that there should be a super-majority on these things such that everyone agreed on them, though it might not make sense to bring them up at the present meeting.
 - Vardner said that he thought that the concern about making changes in the middle of the election was well-founded, as while this was well-intentioned, there were much more important things than making changes to an election that would be 12 months in coming. He said that it was the hope that someone from the previous election board carried over and became the new election board chair, but that was never a guarantee.
 - Herzog said that she agreed with everything that had been said, and she wanted to point out that she was requiring her entire staff to create a notebook for the students that would be taking their places on the election board next year. She said that it seemed like making these changes right away seemed like rushing it.
 - Tuttle said that it had been pointed out that it was tough to make these changes 12 months in advance, and wanted to point out that raising the vote needed to 2/3 would be even tougher. He said that one thing about the simple majority vote was that a faction had the ability to push through legislation that was highly contended.
 - McLaren said that one thing that occurred to her was that there was a provision in the Bylaws which said that the Election Board Chairperson was to be appointed in the Fall. She said that perhaps whoever is elected to president should make this appointment earlier so that the next Election Board Chair has time to work on this.
 - Williams said that the perception of taking this action would be that this was the smart Council that had perfected the Election Code, and now wanted to lock it in such that the next Council would have a hard time changing it. He encouraged Council to entrust the new Council. Williams said that to make it such that the new Council might be unable to change their own Election Code seemed a little funny.
 - Biniek said that Council had appointed their Election Board Chair in the fall, and that had worked out really well. She said that a Council that held themselves accountable to their Bylaws would see that this came about in years to come.
 - Neesby said that he and Tuttle obviously disagreed on the 2/3 vote issue. He said that if it took a 2/3 vote to change the Bylaws, which referenced funding and everything else, then it seemed equally important to have the 2/3 requirement in the Election Code. Neesby said that if there was a rogue majority then they could make willy-nilly changes not in the best interest of students, so he would still like to make these changes.
 - Wood said that these changes were a bit controversial. She said that she did not see much problem with classroom announcements, and they were talking about changing the Election Code without first having extensive conversations about the Election Code with the important people present for the obvious reason that they were in the middle of an election! Wood said that this seemed impulsive and wondered if this was being done in preparation for the next election that might be approaching.
 - Tuttle said that this was an interesting debate on democratic theory. He said that if there ever was a rogue majority, then the whole election code would become a free market. Tuttle said that the

- issue itself would be to hold the rogue majority accountable for changes that they have yet to make. He said that what he was worried about was what the 2/3 could do to political culture.
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to table the changes to the Election Code.
 - Vardner called the question on the motion to table the changes to the Election Code.
 - Council voted to table the changes to the Election Code with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
 - Herzog said there was a good chance that there would be an election 9th week on the Senate Referendum, and said that if it came up then she would be asking for money for that election.
 - Tuttle said that this might require some kind of a Special Order. He said that he had heard her say that there was no money for this election, and this went back to the very core of the government. Tuttle said that, if enough signatures were verified on the petition, then the money would have to come from somewhere to hold the election, and Council needed to figure this out immediately instead of waiting for the petition count verification. He said that there should be an estimate on the cost should be made, and that the possibility of a Special Election should be seriously discussed at this time.
 - Wood asked when the signatures had to be verified, to which Herzog said that there were six days remaining until the deadline for signature verification. Wood said, in that case, Council could talk about it at the next meeting. Tuttle said that he had heard an hour ago that there was no money, and said that they needed to talk about where the money would come from if a Special Election had to be held. He asked Herzog how much she thought it would cost to hold a Special Election. Herzog said the estimates she had heard were all around \$3,000.
 - Wood said she felt that this conversation could be held away from the table. Vardner added that, if all else failed, they could tap into the emergency funds.

A. *Amendments to OSAC Guidelines

- Neesby said that he had talked with Council about this already. He said that the big change was to make the allocations for three years, which seemed to make more sense. Neesby also said that one of the changes was whether or not USAC Sponsored Groups automatically got offices, and said that his interpretation of the Supreme Court Case was that it was not alright to guarantee these groups offices.
- Sargent said that he did not have any problem with the concept of revolving offices, and said that when he was a student, office space was allocated annually. He said that his question lay around procedure, and said that he did not see any rolling strategy to make these allocations staggered. Neesby said it was his understanding, pending approval of the Bylaw amendment he had submitted last week which would make OSAC an apolitical body, Council itself would determine the process. Sargent said that it was important to him that a phase-in strategy be included in this.
- Wood said that there had been an attempt to hold an OSAC meeting, but the meeting never took place. She said it seemed to her that some very significant changes were being proposed, and said that these proposed changes had not adequately discussed. She said that there needed to be substantive discussions about USAC-Sponsored Organizations, Commission-Sponsored Organizations, and many other factors that needed to be clarified. Wood suggested that this action be tabled as well.
- Neesby said he understood Sargent's logistical concerns, but Council seemed to always keep postponing these types of things, saying that they would talk about it outside of the meetings. He said there was no rule that said conversations needed to be held outside of the meeting, and said that nobody had emailed any of their concerns to him about the proposed changes. Neesby said that he wanted to talk about the concerns at the table, and if there were concerns that could not be resolved, then he would reevaluate the situation. He stressed the fact that he wanted to talk about the OSAC Guidelines at the table, at this meeting..
- Wood said that she had made attempts to talk with Neesby about this, and said she thought the whole problem here was timing. She said that when they had talked about OSAC Guidelines in the meetings they had been very productive, but there had not been any such meetings of late due to everyone's busy schedule.
- Biniek said that when OSAC had met, they had voted on the guidelines and they all agreed on how great that whole process had been. She said that Neesby had recently brought back up all of

the issues that had already been decided, and said this didn't really make sense to her. Biniek said that her concerns were about what would happen to the commission-sponsored groups, and also about what would happen to the allocation of resources. She said that student groups were better representatives to the campus than USAC was, which they had all seen with the JSU/MSA food program, and it was important to ensure that the groups were able to work and represent and serve their constituents. Biniek said that there could certainly be a better review of the groups, and said that Doan had put together a good plan to accomplish such a review. She said that Council should try to work with what they have in place before they decide to reject what they have in place.

- Tuttle asked Biniek if an agreement had been reached on the OSAC Guidelines, to which Biniek said that they had voted on them months ago. Tuttle said that he remembered that had taken place, and said that he had made a plea to Council to respect the sensitivity of the issue of space. He said he recalled asking a series of pointed questions at the end of the deliberations, to which people responded telling him that everyone was in agreement with the approved changes. Tuttle said that he felt as 'though he was now hearing a new deal being offered, and urged Council to be very cautious about doing this. Tuttle said that any time he had made a deal he had always fought for it. He said he thought that Vardner should have some interest in protecting what had been done months ago. He said that Neesby may have a good point regarding the possibility of a Supreme Court case, but to make a move from a majority to a 2/3 requirement should be done with much caution. Tuttle said that the business with criteria sounded abstract, but if there was not consensus then that raised concerns in him.
- Nelson said that in June he would have the opportunity to address professors and high school teachers who would be grading AP History tests. He said that what he would be talking about would be the Civil Rights Movement, and this had caused him to do some reading and research. He said that all of his readings seemed to say some of the same things, which was that the rise of the Civil Rights Movement had ultimately prompted an insidious campaign to roll back some of the changes that took place as a result of the movement. Nelson said that one of the ways this was being done was to talk about equality and opportunity, as these changes had been made following people dying in the streets to make these changes. He said that the way these things were being overturned was to disguise regression as progress. Nelson said that he had brought this up because there were certain groups that needed space more than others based on their shrinking numbers. He said that it made sense to talk about equal opportunity, but the actual truth was that anytime the privileges of the privileged were threatened, they then worked to erode the rights of the less privileged by disguising that as progress toward equality. Nelson said that he got concerned when he saw things being hijacked. He said that this country was being sold down the river, and he was concerned about the future leaders and the future of the country because of the current administration.
- Vardner said that his opinion was the exact one that he had given in January, which was that he agreed with Tuttle that there were certain groups that simply needed space. He said that this was not based on the number of constituents, but rather on the importance of the function that the group served on the campus. Vardner said that there was a process built into the guidelines that allowed for groups to be removed from office, but said that the only way right now for groups to be removed from an office would be if the group had completely disbanded. He said he thought that this was not a good policy because there are many groups on Campus that really provide an amazing service, and really could benefit from being given space. Vardner said that in addressing the proposed changes, they may not be the best version possible, but he did think that there was a middle ground somewhere.
- Biniek said that the one concern left over from the OSAC Guidelines discussion had been the process by which the offices were turned over or reassigned. She said that she did not think Council needed to talk about the USAC-Sponsored Groups, as there were much better changes that could be discussed.
- Neesby agreed that the outstanding concern was about the reallocation of space. He said that the OSAC Guidelines were better now than they had been before. Neesby said that the guidelines as proposed, without the sponsorship area, might be good. Neesby said that he would be interested in finding out what people felt about the proposed changes without the sponsorship section.

- Tuttle said that it seemed like the conversation at the table had just been a taste of what the conversations about the issue needed to be. Tuttle said that, in discussing the African Student Union, it was his impression that the African American Community was getting its teeth kicked in. He said that UCLA was becoming a national embarrassment with regard to the disappearance of African American students. Tuttle said that he would go where he knew there was clear consensus, which happened when people were committed to the same idea. He said that this was going to be much harder to do when the student base did not agree with the changes being proposed. Tuttle said that the one place that there did exist a base for underrepresented students was in Kerckhoff Hall, and it was important that the base be preserved.
- Wood said that it seemed like Council had discussed a number of the proposed changes, and it seemed evident that there needed to be more discussion on the issue, particularly with the commission-sponsored groups. She again said that it seemed like the vote should be delayed.
- Neesby said that he saw this as a point of the sponsorship issue being divisive.
- Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to approve the Office Space Allocation Guidelines as submitted.
- Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to split the vote into two votes; (1), the three year issue (OSA Guidelines Article V), and (2), the sponsorship issue (OSA Guidelines Article III.B. and Article IV.G.1.e.iii.).
- Neesby Called the Question on the Motion to Split the Vote in Two.
- Tuttle asked which one would be voted on first, to which Neesby said that he was planning to table the sponsorship issue first and then proceed with discussion on the 3 year issue.
- Tuttle reminded Council that this was a 2/3 situation. Wood clarified that the vote to split the vote would be a simple majority, but the votes to change required a 2/3 vote.
- Council voted to split the vote in two with a vote of 11 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to table the sponsorship issue (OSA Guidelines Article III.B. and Article IV.G.1.e.iii.).
- Biniek said that she thought the sponsorship issue could be voted down, as it had been discussed. Neesby said that he thought Council wanted more discussion.
- Vardner Called the Question on the vote to table the sponsorship issue (OSA Guidelines Article III.B. and Article IV.G.1.e.iii.).
- Council voted to table the sponsorship issue (OSA Guidelines Article III.B. and Article IV.G.1.e.iii.) with a vote of 9 in favor, 3 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

- Neesby moved and Doan seconded to approve the three year issue (OSA Guidelines Article V).
- Biniek said that her question was why Neesby had decided that the rotation should be 3-year, what discussions had gone on, if this was the best policy, what other ideas had been discussed, and how the concerns about people being shoveled in and out of offices had been addressed.
- Neesby said that any number seemed arbitrary, but three years seemed like a good idea because there needed to be some kind of consistency and sustainability for groups' offices. He said that at the same time, the current guidelines made it hard to ever remove a group from their office. Neesby said that 4 or 5 years seemed like way to long, and there really had been no other good reason to go with some number other than 3 years.
- Biniek said that it seemed like they were really only talking about one office after tabling the issue of the USAC Sponsorship. She said that it seemed like Council's time would be better spent finding more office space, though she understood that issue had been dropped in the meantime.
- Vardner said that he would be recommending to the next Facilities Commissioner that he or she look into how the offices were being used, because he thought that there could be more space found in already allocated space.
- Sargent again said that it seemed like there needed to be explicitly stated language about how the groups would be phased in and out, and how the new process would be implemented. He said that otherwise he did not understand how OSAC would decide which third of the groups would be shuffled out of their offices in the first year. Sargent cautioned Council about voting for this without making this explicitly clear.

FINAL

- Wood reemphasized that voting on policy without sufficient discussion that people did not understand was a bad idea, and encouraged that this be delayed until the concerns could be addressed and a good solution could be arrived at.
- Neesby responded to Sargent by saying that the idea of staggered terms was not a big deal, and said that he felt comfortable saying that OSAC could make the decision for who came under review in the first year. He said that the process by which that was done could be equitable and fair.
- Pham said that she felt like her office would be most affected by these changes, as SWC had two student groups in it, and said that it would be hard to have groups cycling in and out of her office.
- Sargent asked Neesby if he had looked at other schools where the proposed process worked well. Neesby replied that he could try to research that data and then they could vote on it at the next meeting. He said that he would appreciate it, though, if people would meet with him in the next week to discuss their concerns and indicate their preferences.
- Doan said that perhaps this would be a little harder to do, but said she had talked to people at other schools that had cycling offices. She said that a perfect example was the politically- based groups, which needed office space only during election years. Doan said that the three-year rotation system seemed to make sense because the standard college term was 4 years, and there would be some overlap of the group members as offices turned over. She said that this had not been critically looked at, and said that a system which allows for space changes to be done made a lot of sense.
- Kaminsky said that this was important to him, but it seemed like his vote on this issue would be affected by the vote on the sponsorship issue, and on how much space was actually available.
- Kaminsky moved and Biniek seconded to table the Motion to Approve the Three Year Issue (OSA Guidelines Article V).
- Vardner said, with regard to the idead of having a meeting to discuss this, that meeting was going to be held on Sunday night.
- Council voted to table the Motion to Approve the Three Year Issue (OSA Guidelines Article V) with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

X. New Business

B. *Bylaw “Housecleaning” Changes

- Kaminsky said that he had spoken with Sargent about some concerns. He said that potentially it was just institutionalizing certain things like Mardi Gras, SAA, ensuring that the Bylaws were all up to date on the events.
- Vardner moved to approve and Smeets seconded to approve the Bylaw changes as submitted.
- Pham moved and Vardner seconded to remove the institutionalization of her cooking class that no longer existed and also to move the sexual assault program.
- Council voted to remove the institutionalization of Pham’s cooking class that no longer existed and also to move the sexual assault program with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Malik moved and Vardner seconded to add VITA as one of the Institutionalized Student Organizations.
- Council voted to add VITA as one of the Institutionalized Student Organizations with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Tuttle said that he wanted to talk about the fact that striking Homecoming from the Bylaws would send that event to the Student Alumni Association. Kaminsky said that his office had not done a coronation ceremony, and that SAA had been doing Homecoming for the last several years, so this really was no longer even an issue. Tuttle countered that events like homecoming were huge symbols for a campus, and said that he had seen situations in which the symbolism of homecoming affected the school and its sporting events. He said that if this was taken out of the Bylaws and given over to SAA, then it might be hard for future Councils to get back into the event. Tuttle said that it was important that USAC make sure that homecoming was something

that represented the current student interests at heart. He said it would be easier to tweak the Bylaws than to reinsert homecoming at a later date.

- Neesby said that Kaminsky was able to do whatever events his commission felt like, and if he wanted to change the Bylaws then he could.
- Sargent said that a long time ago USAC had nothing to do with campus spirit. He said that back in 1993 USAC and SAA had agreed to work together on homecoming, and the next year USAC had written into its Bylaws its involvement in homecoming so that they could retain their foothold in large campus events. Sargent said that he was not sure when USAC stopped its involvement with homecoming, but they could still be involved with it without it being in the Bylaws.
- Kaminsky said that he understood the history, but it seemed like taking it out of the Bylaws would not preclude USAC's involvement. He said that it seemed worse to have it in the Bylaws and ignore it than to take it out and then get involved again.
- Neesby called the question on the Motion to Approve the Bylaw Changes.
- Council voted to approve the Bylaw Changes with a vote of 10 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

C. *Amendments to USA Bylaws Article IV (OSAC Composition)

- Neesby said that his idea was to make OSAC like Finance Committee in that USAC appoints the five-member committee such that it becomes an apolitical committee.
- Biniek moved and Vardner seconded to approve the amendments to USA Bylaws Article IV.
- Tuttle said that in the very last sentence it referenced the "usual procedure", and asked what that referenced. Neesby said that was to add members to OSAC by appointment, such that appointments took a simple majority vote while removals took a 2/3 vote. Tuttle pointed out that this was the usual procedure by USAC, not the usual procedure as outlined in Robert's Rules. He said that if it was not clear in the text then the default was to go backward in time in the documents, which then gave the decision to the chair.
- Neesby changed the language in USA Bylaws Article IV.E.2 to include the statement, "vacancies on the committee will be filled by procedures as delineated above."
- Tuttle said that it was important to establish clear text and a clear record of these decisions.
- Neesby moved by General Consent and Vardner seconded to change USA Bylaws Article IV.E.2 to "...by the Undergraduate Student Association Council. Vacancies on the committee will be filled by procedures as delineated above."
- Wood asked if there were any objections to the motion. There being none, USA Bylaws Article IV.E.2 was changed to "...by the Undergraduate Student Association Council. Vacancies on the committee will be filled by procedures as delineated above."
- Sargent said that he was confused about the motivation for making the committee outside of USAC. He said that he saw this as an abdication of USAC's responsibility to allocate resources. Sargent said that he had been troubled all year about how USAC glossed over the finance committee recommendations, and he saw this as similar practice. He said that Council used to be very connected to what was going on at UCLA. Sargent said that if there were going to be major changes made with office space, he thought it better to have these decisions made by the elected officers rather than by appointed students.
- Biniek said that the motivation was to depoliticize the decisions specifically because of how connected council is with the campus, which was the same issue as it was with the Finance Committee. Sargent countered that Council eventually had to vote on the issue, so why not be involved in the recommendations.
- Vardner said that he felt like there were already too many responsibilities on Council Members, so he saw outsourcing it, to a degree, as a good thing. He also said that he loved the depoliticizing aspect of it. Vardner said that it was also starting to mimic what was happening in larger governments like the City of Los Angeles, whereby highly controversial issues were outsourced to be depoliticized.
- Vardner called the question on the Motion to approve the amendments to USA Bylaws Article IV.
- Council voted to approve the amendments to USA Bylaws Article IV with a vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

FINAL

XI. Announcements

- McLaren passed out some information about the transition of USAC offices. She said that May 23rd would be the day of transition, with the Outgoing Council holding its final meeting, beginning at 7:00p.m. At the conclusion of the Outgoing Council's meeting, the newly elected officers will take the Oath of Office and will assume their seats at the Council table. The members of the Incoming Council will then hold the first meeting of their term. She said that there would be a formal Installation Ceremony on Sunday, June 4, with a reception following, so that family and friends can participate in the transfer of power from the outgoing members to the incoming members. She said she would be sending detailed information about the June 4 event to all outgoing and all incoming Council Members.
- Kaisey said that the Daily Bruin had run an article about the Kosher and Halal meals now available in the dining halls. She said that the program had come about much sooner than expected and was available at Bruin Café.
- Doan said that the Student Alumni Association would be putting on a Humanities Night in the James West Alumni Center at 7:00p.m..
- Zai said that the two sessions of the IFC LGBT Training had gone very well. She also said that this was Women for Change Week and passed around calendars. Zai also said that the Clothesline Project was going on, and that Take Back the Night would be on Thursday.
- Vardner said that the week after finals the Los Angeles Film Festival would be in Westwood. He said that people were trying to get more students involved and were looking for volunteers.
- Pham said that Sunday was going to be UCLA Run/Walk, and told Council to sign up if they hadn't yet. She said that there would be a lot of cool events going on and said that there would be lots of cool surprises and treats. Pham said that, on Wednesday, they would be handing out coupons for which Rubio's would be donating a percentage of their sales to Run/Walk.
- Wood said that the USAC Banquet was going to be held on Wednesday of 9th week, and said that she would be sending out an eVite. Kaminsky pointed out that was the night of the Chancellor's event.

XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the attendance sheet.

XIII. Adjournment

- Vardner moved and Sassounian seconded to adjourn.
- Vardner 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 10:22 p.m. by Unanimous Consent.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker

NOTE: This set of minutes was not completed in time for the 2005-2006 Council Members to review and approve them. Under such a circumstance the usual procedure has been to have the outgoing Internal Vice President review the minutes, make any necessary corrections, and then sign and date the document as "Reviewed and Approved." Unfortunately, the outgoing Internal Vice President was not available to review this set.