FINAL

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday May 23, 2006
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

Final Meeting of Outgoing Council Members

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

ABSENT: Sassounian

GUESTS: Adriana Ahumada, Samer Araabi, Peter Bautista, David Burns, Marivell Caba, Terence Chan, Stacy Chang, Cynthia Chen, Tina Cheng, Ravi Dehar, Constance Dillon, Shaun Doria, Julia Erlandson, Andy Green, Caitlin Harvey, Tanzib Hassain, Anat Herzog, Joe Iniguez, Tamaron Jang, Matt Knee, Steven Ly, Jerry Mann, Jesse Melgares, Janina Montero, Sherlyn Mossahebfar, Tina Park, Gabriel Rose, Carlos Saucedo, Nat Schuster, Noa Simehoni, Debra Simmons, Tommy Tseng, Elizabeth Vega, Allie Weinstein

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

          - Election Board Chair Anat Herzog asked to be added to the Special Presentations.
          - Kaminsky removed the Special Presentation on the Importance of Recognizing PETM.
          - Hawkins, Kaminsky, Zai, and Pham asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
          - Pham moved and Doan seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
          - Council voted to approve the Agenda, as amended, with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

III. Approval of the Minutes

          April 18, 2006
          - Kaisey said that on page 4, under the fifth comment from the top, she had been referencing her *father*, not her *grandfather*.
          - Biniek said that on page 5, on the third line from the top, *illegal* should be changed to *undocumented*.
          - Tuttle said that on page 7, under his Member Report, *Czechoslovakia* should have been *Czech Republic*.
          - Biniek said that on page 7, under her Officer Report, *Karen Liu* was actually *Carol Liu*.
          - Kaminsky said that on page 12, under the last line of the first Announcement, the Sudan Rally at the Los Angeles Federal Building went until *7:00 pm*, not *5:00 pm.*
          - Kaisey said that on page 13, under the third-to-last Announcement, *Bruin MA* should have been *AMSA*, or *the American Medical Students Association (AMSA)*.
          - Pham moved and Hawkins seconded to approve the Minutes of April 18, 2006 as amended.
          - Council voted to approve the Minutes of April 18, 2006, as amended, with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

April 25, 2006
- Vardner said that on page 9, under New Business Item F, *Kaitlin* should have been *Caitlin Nunn*, and also asked that her name be corrected in the Guest Attendance.
- Kaminsky said that on page 10, under Old Business Item A, in the second comment, he said that *would be* should be changed to *looked to be*, and *have to ask USAC again* should be changed to *have to dip into USAC Surplus again*.
- Sargent said that on page 10, under Old Business Item A, in the third comment, he said that *foundation* should be *UCLA Foundation*.
- Neesby moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Minutes of April 25, 2006 as amended.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of April 25, 2006, as amended, with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

May 2, 2006
- Zai said that she had not been absent from the meeting.
- Doan said that on page 1, under her Officer Report, she had said *that not much had happened* in the last week.
- Kaisey said that on page 5, under New Business Item B, she asked that *all* be struck from the sixth line down, and said that *OSAC* should have been *OCHC*.
- Kaminsky said that on page 6, under New Business Item B, in the second comment on the page, Resident *Advisors* should have been Resident *Assistants*.
- Kaisey said that on page 6, under New Business Item B, in the last comment, On Campus Housing *Association* should have been the On Campus Housing *Council*, and said that perhaps they were not *lazy*, but rather *apathetic*.
- Sargent said that on page 6, under the first Announcement, on the ninth line down, he thought there had been a poor job *integrating the programs.*
- Wood said that on page 6, under the second Announcement, she had concluded the discussion by saying that *there was no need for a resolution, as she would write a letter to the UCLA Alumni Association.*
- Doan said that on page 7, under the first Announcement listed, Julian Demonzo should have been Julian *D'Avanzo*.
- Pham moved and Vardner seconded to approve the Minutes of May 2, 2006 as amended.
- Council voted to approve the Minutes of May 2, 2006, as amended, with a vote of 9 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

IV.   Special Presentations

Recommended Changes to Student Organization Operational Fund (SOOF), Terence Chan
- Terence Chan from SOOF said that he would be talking with Council about some proposed changes to SOOF. He said that this would consist of SOOF Feedback, a proposed timeline, SOOF Money Distribution, and more. Chan said that there were over 100 proposals per cycle, at 25 pages each, so there was a lot for the reviewers to go through. He said that quarterly feedback was given, and recently groups had been found to be resubmitting the same proposals over and over again at each of the three reimbursement deadlines. Chan told Council that the Spring Allocations for 2006 would have been $38,000, but because of the Fall Closed Accounts it was over $50,000. Chan explained that the Center for Student Programming (CSP) was in charge of the coordination of funding deadlines, explaining programs, explaining the need for other funding sources, and teaching students that they should provide realistic requests under the Line Items. Chan told Council that the Student Organizations had been complaining about the SOOF process in feedback that they had given. He said that there were pros and cons to the current system, and the SOOF Committee thought that they could improve the system by addressing these. Chan said that the proposed solution was that there be only two funding cycles, and also would allow for the applications to be done electronically online. He said that the proposed cycles would have the Student Government Operational Fund (SGOF) starting in July, SOOF starting in September, the Fall USA/BOD Programming Fund in October, and the rest of the funds to follow. Chan showed Council that he had already outlined the specific dates

of the different deadlines for the proposed funding cycle, and said that although some of the deadlines would be sooner under the proposed system, it would work better overall. He added that he had confirmed all of this with Debra Simmons from Student Government Accounting, and she had said that the proposed system would work. Chan said that they had tried to make the timeline such that the dates were well spaced out, with some being early and others being later.
- Tuttle asked about the notifications, to which Chan said that the Finance Committee and the Budget Review Committee would cover the expense of advertising this information to Student Groups in the Daily Bruin. He said that groups would also be notified through their CSP advisors.
- Tuttle asked if groups would be given funding before their allocations, to which Chan said that groups would be able to publish recruitment advertisements before the actual allocation. Simmons added that the groups would be reimbursed for these advertisements pending their funding.
- Tuttle asked what happened if the groups were under-reimbursed for these advertisements, to which Simmons briefly said that the groups took that risk by buying an advertisement prior to the approval of their SOOF Allocation. Wood added that the groups could also use summer funding or contingency for this expense.
- Vardner said that the logical step seemed to encourage groups to apply for Fall Contingency to pay for those advertisements, and asked which Contingency Fund that would come from. Simmons said that it would come from Summer Contingency.
- Chan moved on with the presentation, and showed Council the number of groups that had been funded in the last year and how much they had each been funded. Chan explained to Council that under the new system, the average score for returning groups and new groups would also be more comparable. He reminded Council that this year the allocation caps had been set to 3/7 in Fall and 2/7 in both Winter and Spring Quarters. He said that next year the total amount available to groups in SOOF would be less, and said that they had worked out a system that would make the allocations comparable in all three quarters. Chan also talked about Line Item Caps, saying that the SOOF adjusted cap had been $4,317.00. He said that out of the groups applying, 41 had managed to hit this cap. He added that the caps for Winter and Spring had been slightly lower since there was less funding to give out. Chan said that his recommendation would be to adjust the Fall cap, since too many groups had hit the cap, keep the Winter cap, since no groups had hit it, and lower the Spring Cap slightly, since two groups had hit the cap. He said that the recommended Cap for the entire year would now be around $11,300.00.
- Smeets asked if the Line Item Caps would also be advertised so that the groups would know to apply toward those caps. Chan replied that the fear with advertising the caps was that groups would just apply for the exact cap, potentially inflating their proposals and requests. Neesby said that his worry was that if the cap went unadvertised, the pattern seemed to be that the more a group asked for, the more they were allocated, and asked how much the caps would be advertised. Chan said that the caps would not be advertised at all, but a typical proposal amount would be advertised so that groups knew what ballpark to aim for.
- Chan moved on to the SOOF Guidelines, saying that the amended copy was attached to the Agenda Packet. Chan said that major additions included the defining of "operational" in I.A., ensuring that organizations be notified about the calendar and amounts available in IV.D., ensuring that the hearing format be explained in IV.H., adding the funding calendar in VI., adding of the SOOF priorities in VII.B., completion of the explanation of the SOOF Process in VIII.D.f., explicitly stating what is not funded in IX.D., adding the stipend stipulations in IX.F., stating the deadline for the recommendations in IX.I., changing the BRC appointment date in III.E., changing that proposals do not need to be typed in VIII.A., changing the minimum days prior to deadline to meet with CSP Advisors in VIII.B., changing the requirement regarding signatures in IX.C., and lastly explaining the changes in the evaluation process in X.B.d. Chan also said that some items had been taken out of the guidelines, including VI.B. He said that another minor change was the changing of the language in VI.C.14.a. Chan said that this left the BRD with the tasks of placing the advertisements to advertise the changes, hold budget workshops for the student organizations, hold the workshop for the incoming Council, modify the applications, and revise the SGOF and USA/BOD guidelines. Simmons added that the

workshops might be held in person, or could be posted on the internet, such that people could teach themselves by watching a PowerPoint presentation at their leisure.
- Doan asked if there were groups that had ever applied for funds and then not later registered with CSP. Chan said that since their CSP advisor had to sign off on the proposal, such that they really had to also register with CSP when that time came.
- Vardner said that the budget committee had to be appointed before June 15th, and asked if that was the whole committee. Chan said that it was. Zai asked when Chan's term ended, to which he said that it ended the 30th, but that he would be helping with the transition.
- Wood thanked Chan for the presentation and for all his hard work. *Council applauded Chan.*

Election Code
- Herzog said that she had been validating signatures for the potential Senate Proposal Special Election, and said that there were not enough signatures, so there would not be a Special Election. She said that she had been given the petitions, and they had input every name on every petition into a spreadsheet, including names and the pages and lines on which they appeared. Herzog said that the first round of elimination had eliminated those students whose Student IDs were incomplete, had given fake names, or were otherwise incomplete or false. She said that they had then alphabetized the names to find duplicates, and had been able to eliminate more duplicates that way. Herzog said that they had then checked the Student ID numbers, and said that they had eliminated names based on that. She said that the process was not yet complete, though based on the rate of disqualification, Election Board projected that they would be short by between 200 and 300 signatures. Herzog went down a long list of the reasons that the names had been invalidated, including illegibility, graduation since signing, fake Student ID Numbers, duplicates entries, and more. She said that they would go through all the pages and give a complete report to the incoming Council.
- Wood thanked Herzog for all her hard work.
Council applauded Herzog and the Election Board.

V.   Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

VI.   Fund Allocations

*Approval of Contingency Fund Allocations
- Villasin said that $23,281.84 had been requested form Contingency Funding, with $9,669.89 recommended for allocation. She said that upon making this recommended allocation, the running total in Contingency Funding would drop from $4,369.30 to --$5,300.59. Villasin said that there had been no Capital Requests, so the balance for Capital Requests remained at $3,365.11, not $2,224.12 as incorrectly indicated in the Agenda Packet.
- Villasin pointed out to Council that funding was needed to cover the deficit at the present meeting. Villasin recommended transferring $2,215.00 of the $3,365.11 remaining balance in the Capital Item fund to the Contingency Programming Fund to help cover the deficit of over $5,000.
- Simmons asked if this was for the current proposals, to which Villasin said that this was the present week's allocations and in anticipation of the allocations the new Council would have to make at the next meeting.
- Sargent asked if it was true that there would still be a deficit, to which Villasin said that there would, but there was still the possibility of additional accounts being closed and funds being transferred. Sargent asked what the deadline was to transfer those funds, to which Simmons said that it was June 16th.
- Tuttle asked what was being proposed to cover the shortfall, to which Villasin said that it would be to transfer Capital to Programming. He asked how much was in Capital, to which Villasin said $3,365.11. Villasin said that there was enough to cover the deficit at the present meeting. Wood clarified that this would be enough to cover the present week's allocations, and also

$2,215.00 of the next week's allocations, but there was still $1,050.00 that would be needed to meet the full proposed allocation at the next meeting.

- Sargent asked if the incoming Council had power to move those funds at the next meeting, to which Villasin said that they could not. Sargent asked what her recommendation was.
- Wood said that if Council wanted to transfer the remaining $1,050 from the Capital Item Fund to the Contingency Programming Fund to help cover the deficit, then Council needed to decide that at the present meeting.
- Ly asked how much was needed at the next meeting, to which Villasin it was $2,315.00.
- Neesby said that as long as all the offices transferred their remaining budgets then the deficit would be covered.
- Wood said that the incoming Council would not be able to transfer funds from their office accounts. She said that there were two issues. She said that the first was approval of these recommendations. Wood said that the other was the recommendations at the next meeting, for which it would be nice if Council would transfer their remaining balances before the next meeting.
- Sargent said that if Council could not make up for the entire deficit, then they could always decide not to fund the total, but to fund based on the remaining balance.
- Ly said that Academic Affairs Commission would transfer $1,500. Vardner said that Facilities would transfer $150.
- Wood said that everyone needed to look into how much they needed to transfer, and she believed that they would be able to come up with the rest.
- Malik said that the Community Service Commission could transfer $1000, so there was no problem for the next week.
- <u>Vardner moved by Unanimous Consent and Doan seconded to transfer $2,315.00 from the Capital Item Fund to the Contingency Programming Fund.</u>
- <u>Neesby objected.</u>
- Neesby suggested that, per Villasin's suggestion, they leave $100 in the Capital Item Fund such that the next Council's hands were not tied. Villasin seconded that idea.
- <u>Neesby amended Vardner's motion by Unanimous Consent and Doan seconded to transfer $2,215.10 from the Capital Item Fund to the Contingency Programming Fund instead of $2,315.10.</u>
- Sargent said the motion could also always be pending the approval at the next meeting. He said that the dollar amount could be left blank, it was a conditional transfer.
- <u>Neesby amended his motion and Doan seconded to make the recommended allocation conditional based on the approval by the next Council.</u>
- Tuttle asked if this was pending that allocation by the next Council, to which Vardner said that it was. Wood said that it would be good if there would be money in the fund if the next Council needed it.
- <u>Vardner withdrew his motion altogether.</u>
- Neesby suggested transferring all but $1,150.00.
- <u>Neesby moved to move all funds from capital to contingency except $1050.00.</u>
- Wood recommended the new Council take a look at this based on the recommendations at the next meeting, and if they decided to make these allocations, then they could do that.
- Sargent worried that they were empowering the next Council to do things that they simply could not, as they would not yet have signatory powers. Simmons said that Sargent was right, and Council should transfer what was available in the Capital Item Fund to the Contingency Programming Fund, with the offices making up the difference in programming.
- Vardner said that the $1,100.00 item was a Capital Item Request, such that moving everything meant that there was nothing to pay for that request.
- Wood asked what Simmons was advocating, to which Simmons said that they should move all the funding into the Contingency Programming Fund, and then simply allocate Capital Item Requests from that fund.
- <u>Neesby withdrew his motion.</u>
- <u>Vardner moved and Doan seconded to consolidate the Capital Item Fund and the Contingency Programming Fund under the Contingency Programming Fund.</u>

FINAL

- <u>Council voted to consolidate the Capital Item Fund and the Contingency Programming Fund under the Contingency Programming Fund with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.</u>

VII.   Officer and Member Reports

Campus Events Commissioner – Jason Kaminsky
- Kaminsky said that Shorttakes, the UCLA Student Film Festival, would be on Thursday. He passed around the fliers for it, and said that some of the films were going to be really good. Kaminsky asked who wanted to come as a VIP, and some people raised their hands. He also said that during the next week OZMA would be performing in Westwood Plaza, and Phantom Planet would also be playing on Friday night. Kaminsky said that there would also be a film shot on campus shown after the Council Meeting, and said that all this information was also available on the CEC website.

VIII.   Fund Allocations (cont'd)

*Approval of Contingency Fund Allocations (cont'd)
- Villasin said that Council had not actually voted to approve the current week's contingency.
- <u>Neesby moved and Pham seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.</u>
- <u>Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.</u> *Vardner was out of the room.*

IX.   Officer and Member Reports

Student Welfare Commissioner – Tracy Pham
- Pham said that the quarter was winding down, but there would be a cooking class on Wednesday night in Bradley International from 7:00 – 9:00 p.m. She said that volunteers were welcome to come. Pham also said that UCLA Run/Walk had been on Sunday, and it had been great to have everyone there supporting her.

General Representative #1 – P.C. Zai
- Zai said that Women for Change Week had been really awesome. She said that the support this year had been the largest ever, saying that it had been great working with everyone on the event. Zai also said that she and Pham would continue working on the Campus Safety Fair even after Council.

Cultural Affairs Commissioner – Todd Hawkins
- Hawkins said that Jazz/Reggae was coming up Memorial Day Weekend. He said that they were in desperate need of volunteers, and said that there would be a volunteer orientation on Friday. Hawkins said that volunteering was really fun, and said that there were lots of cool freebies for volunteers. Hawkins said that the UCLA Jazz Ensemble would also be performing, and said that pre-sales were already at over 1000 tickets, which was a huge increase on past years. Hawkins said that Week 9 would finish out the year with Eclectic Open Mic night. He also said that they would be hosting movies in Meyerhoff Park on Thursday starting at 6:00 p.m., with a showing of Mad Hot Ballroom. He said that there would also be free food and snacks. Hawkins said that the pre-festival event it would be in the James E. West Alumni Center from 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. on Saturday, and had been a collaboration effort between the CAC and the UCLA Alumni Association.
- Vardner asked about the latest with the letter that had been sent out by Ronnie. Hawkins said that Ronnie had spoken with him, and they had decided that Ronnie would be the voice of the campus on this issue. He said that they seemed comfortable with bringing Ronnie, and said that there would be no anti-gay or hate material being performed at the festival. Hawkins said that if he did perform any anti-gay or hate material, then they would all stand together to try to blackball him in the campus performance circuit.

- Tuttle asked what they were talking about. Hawkins said that there was an article that had been written in TIME magazine regarding the homophobic and anti-gay nature of much new reggae music. He said that someone wrote a Viewpoint in the Daily Bruin with regard to such an artist headlining the UCLA festival, which was the point at which Hawkins had contacted the label to make sure that the allegations and charges had been dropped. Hawkins said that he had been assured that this had been taken care of, as the artist was not going to perform such material. He said that Ronni Sanlo, director of the LGBT Center, had said that there had been requests to "un-invite" this artist by the LGBT Community. Hawkins said that last year there had actually been a blacklist published by the national LGBT association which included the headliner of last year's Jazz/Reggae, but it had gone off just fine.
- Sargent said that the last message he had gotten from Sanlo indicated that the artist had not retracted any past words or apologized for them, which was all that Sanlo personally wanted.

External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek
- Biniek said that the house had passed the budget, which had not been good for the students. She said that last week had also been the UC Regents Meeting, which had been a bit of a circus with all of the various issues being brought up. She said that Dynes' resignation bad been asked for, the UC Workers' Union was there, and many other strange things went down. Biniek said that one positive thing was that the UC Regents had an honest discussion with the President about what they needed from him. She added that she had also set up meetings with two of the UC Regents, one to talk with about admissions, and one to reach out to one of the newer regents who had thus far not really met with any students. Biniek said that the budget included the 75 million for the buyback, money for the 2.5% enrollment growth, no funding for the labor centers, and many other points. Biniek said that the deadline for all bills to pass the Senate Appropriations Committee was Thursday, and there were many bills still pending. She said that this included the student compact, and hoped that the vote would take place by Thursday. Biniek passed out voter guides put out by UCSA, and said that they were very helpful. She said that it was a publication of answers to questions posed to candidates in the June 6th primary election. Biniek said that these guidelines were also available online. She said that applications for the system-wide committee were also due on Friday, with 4 or 5 positions still available out of the 35 total. Biniek said that with regard to divestment, the bill had passed the appropriations committee, and the DAC would be rallying in Sacramento before the assembly voted. Biniek lastly said that her office had electoral action training over the weekend.

Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan
- Doan said that everyone had gotten an invitation to the ASUCLA Open Forum, and said that the RSVP date was either soon or had actually passed. Doan also said that she had met with Montero's office to talk about the Committee on Disabilities, at which point she had found out that the contact person had been changed and the information had never been transferred.
- Sargent asked when Council would be talking about general transition issues, to which Wood said that she would discuss that.
- Doan said that she would be announcing the new SPS director on July 1st. Tuttle asked what SPS was, to which Doan said that it stood for Student Psychological Services. Tuttle also congratulated Doan on figuring out what had happened with the Committee on Disabilities. He also said that there had been a presentation on SHAC by the Vice Chancellor Montero, and said that she had made a request that those appointments be made rapidly, and suggested that Doan pursue this with her successor.

President – Jenny Wood
President Jenny Wood's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes.
Questions and Comments followed Wood's report.
- Sargent asked Wood about diversity, to which Wood said that she thought that the student organizations most affected by the lack of diversity would ensure that the diversity issue continued on as important.
- Neesby asked what the Sunday transition thing was, to which Wood said that was installation, which was more official, and said that she was sure McLaren would talk about it.

- Vardner asked that people be sure to move things out of their offices that were theirs, not things that belonged to USA.

X.   Old Business

A. *Amendments to OSAC Guidelines
- Neesby said that OSAC had met for 5 to 6 hours on Sunday, and one of the big issues that had come up with was USAC Sponsorship. He said that the agreement had been that commission-sponsored organizations that were vital to the survival of commissions be kept in their offices. He explained that those particular groups' offices would be assigned to that commission, such that the commission could then allocate that space to the group. Neesby said that for USAC-Sponsored Organizations, it did not guarantee Office Space, but it did give them extra "points", to be used by OSAC in the decisions regarding the assignment of Office Space. Neesby said that these changes were in Article V.B and C and Article IV.L Neesby said that another change had been to codify the allocation, which stipulated that allocations would come with a time limit, not to exceed five years. He said that this too would be deferred to OSAC to determine those allocation times.
- Biniek said that the reason OSAC would be able to vary the length of office space allocation was based on Doan's example of how the Bruin Democrats and Republicans would only need Office Space every fourth year.
- Sargent asked if it was feasible that all the offices could be reallocated for another five years such that this would become a non-issue, to which Neesby said that it was.
- Neesby said that there were also some changes to the grammar as noted in the Bylaws. He said that there was one more change that had not been discussed by OSAC. Neesby said that the first issue had been the timeline issue. He said that currently the timeline meant that all the decisions were consolidated into the Summer months, and suggested that the deadlines, as decided by OSAC, be pushed back to Winter for the applications to be due. Neesby explained that this would allow for USAC to use both Winter and Spring Quarters to make these decisions.
- Tuttle asked who had been at this Sunday meeting. Neesby said that the timeline suggestion had been his, but that the other recommendations were consensus. Tuttle said that as he always said, changes to space should be done by consensus such that people agreed. He added that this issue depended on the continued discussion of these issues, and said that there were certain groups who ultimately depended on their office space in Kerckhoff. Tuttle asked how this newly proposed process would affect those groups like ASU and MEChA, whose admission numbers were getting their teeth kicked in. Biniek replied that there was disagreement on this issue, but the proposal said that these groups would get extra "points", but he personally felt that there was a need to protect these groups.
- Tuttle said that a key element was the formula, and said that he did have some concerns about these groups' being able to maintain their office space.
- Sargent asked if this solely applied to student group offices and not student government offices, to which Neesby said that it did. Sargent asked why USAC offices were not included, to which Neesby said that the justification was that with the commissions, there was a need for the office space, as the commissions would go with that space. Sargent agreed, saying that people were elected with the expectation that they deserved, and would get, an office. He said that if space was an issue, then it should be all-or-none, such that USAC offices were also subject to review and re-allocation. Neesby said that he saw both sides of the argument, but since these individuals were elected by the students, they needed a space where they could be found and met with.
- Vardner said that, actually, in the language of the OSAC guidelines, USAC offices were given office space, though it was not stipulated that each was given an individual office.
- Tuttle said that putting the elected offices' space on the table could lead to destabilization of the government. He said that elected officials should have space to operate from, and this government needed their space.
- <u>Vardner moved and Neesby seconded to Approve the Amendments to the OSAC Guidelines.</u>

- Vardner said by reviewing and re-allocating Council members' office space, he could foresee the possibility that a supermajority of Council could kick an opposing Council member out of his or her office.
- Jerry Mann said that OSAC had existed for a long time, and said that to his knowledge, no office had ever been changed as long as he had been at UCLA. He said that in light of these guidelines, he didn't understand how the issue of what specific offices occupied be addressed. Mann said that there needed to be some mechanism. Neesby answered that OSAC would still be the group that dealt with that. He said that the guidelines only ensured that USAC Offices had space, but the allocation and those decisions were left to OSAC itself.
- Sargent said that he cared less about USAC moving offices, but rather about the precedent that this set, which was to say that certain groups had a right to offices. He said that there were student advocacy groups that were vital to the functioning of USAC, and he worried that these changes would sever or weaken that alliance.
- Wood said that her point was similar to Sargent's, and said that the recommendations destroyed a long-standing partnership of advocacy. She said that to limit the role of those advocacy groups by limiting their resources was unjust, as they had worked for years to get to the point that they were at. Wood said that her understanding was that there would be priority given to these groups, not "extra points". She said that to her, priority implied that these groups would essentially be ensured space.
- Zai said that another thing OSAC had discussed was the very nature of sponsorship. She said that although there were specifics, it was very difficult to argue against an organization on campus. Zai said that there were hundreds of religious groups, for example, and it would be unfair to sponsor one of the groups without sponsoring the others.
- Neesby clarified, saying that his understanding from the OSAC meeting was that the USAC Sponsored groups would be given a "boost", which was the idea that there would be some type of bonus points given to those groups in allocation.
- Simmons asked how the phones would be handled, to which Neesby said that the numbers could be transferred if a group transferred offices, and if they lost their office space then there would be several months that the allocation would be known for before the actual transition took place.
- Biniek said that she felt like there were still a lot of outstanding issues.
- <u>Biniek moved and Malik seconded to table Approval of the Amendments to the OSAC Guidelines.</u>
- Kaminsky said that he felt like the document under discussion was much better than what was already in effect. He said that perhaps the proposed document was not perfect either, but at least approving it would allow the next Council to have a head start on further improvement of the system.
- Neesby made a point of order, saying that a table to motion was not followed by discussion, such that it needed to be immediately voted upon. He said that it was a killer motion.
- Tuttle said that the length of the tabling motion could be discussed.
- <u>Council voted not to table Approval of the Amendments to the OSAC Guidelines with 3 votes in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.</u>
- Vardner said that, as he who wrote the initial document, he agreed with Kaminsky that the document was still a work in progress, such that OSAC and the next Council could continue to work on it. He said that changing extra points back to priority also made sense.
- <u>Vardner moved and Kaminsky seconded to change "extra points" to "priority" on the bottom of page 2 of the OSAC Guidelines.</u>
- Ly asked why priority was being used, to which Vardner said because it was purposefully vague.
- <u>Council voted to change "extra points" to "priority" on the bottom of page 2 of the OSAC Guidelines with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.</u>
- Vardner said that one thing the document did not address was that there should be future development toward the creation of more space within Kerckhoff. He said that the idea was that some groups did have space, but there should be much more space and also some communal.
- <u>Kaminsky moved by Unanimous Consent and Vardner seconded to fix the numbering of Articles VII and VIII on pages 3 and 4 of the OSAC Guidelines.</u>

- <u>Wood asked if there were any objections to fixing the numbering of Articles VII and VIII on pages 3 and 4. There being none, the numbering of Articles VII and VIII was corrected on pages 3 and 4 of the OSAC Guidelines.</u>
- Tuttle made a Point of Order that the approaching vote was going to need a 2/3 vote for approval, which meant that the President could vote not only to break a tie, but also in order to sway the 2/3 vote.
- Sargent asked what the vote needed to be to approve this, to which Wood said it would be 8.
- Biniek said that her problem was that the document said that USAC offices were better than all the other student groups, which was unfair. She said that her office depended on the work of the Commission Sponsored Groups and also the other groups that supported the Commissions.
- Tuttle said that the reason there were 8 votes needed for 2/3 was because there was one council member missing.
- Neesby said that the President should vote only in constitutionally required 2/3 votes.
- Tuttle said that he thought it was clear that the Bylaws and the Constitution and the Guidelines were all part of the same entity as referenced in the rules.
- <u>Vardner called the question.</u>
- <u>Council voted to approve the Amendments to the OSAC Guidelines with a vote of 9 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.</u>

B. *Amendments to the Election Code
- Neesby said that he had taken out the classroom announcement item, since that was the highly contested one.
- Wood clarified that the only change was from a 2/3 vote to a majority vote. Neesby said that the other one was the signboard issue.
- Herzog said that, with regard to the candidate signboard issue, there had been a unanimous agreement with this proposed changes, and said that there was no need for discussion. She said that with the 2/3 vote issue, she personally felt that a majority vote was the best way to go in this particular instance. She said that this was because this document had to be rewritten and re-approved each year, and had to reflect the opinions and concerns of the current Council. Herzog said that this was separate from the Constitution and the Bylaws, so it should stay majority, not change to 2/3.
- Wood said that with that said and with the interest of staying consistent with only making election board endorsed changes. She said that this meant that the only issue voted on should thus be the signboard issue.
- Herzog disagreed, and said that she would like it written into the Election Code that the Election Board was responsible for forwarding all recommendations to Council prior to those changes being made. She said that earlier in the year, individuals on Council had preconceived notions about what they wanted to see with the Election Code, and said that those would not happen if those changes instead had to come from Election Board.
- Ly asked Herzog if she was suggesting that all changes had to come through the Election Board. Herzog said that she thought the Election Board should forward changes to Council, such that changes must be funneled through the Election Board. She said that Council could suggest changes for Election Board to take under review.
- <u>Neesby moved and Smeets seconded to approve the proposed changes to the Election Code.</u>
- Neesby said that he and Herzog agreed that this document was unique, and there was no way that the E-Code should be voted on by majority alone because a rogue majority could potentially change the Election Code to sway the results of the election in their favor. Neesby said that if the changes were good changes, then they would get the 2/3 vote.
- Vardner said that he'd seen a couple of elections, and the code was going to change every year, because it was never going to be a perfect document. He said that he liked the idea of a 2/3 vote, because it meant that the changes were good. Vardner said that when he had been chair, he had been forced to implement some very bad decisions by the simple majority of Council, which had specifically targeted certain constituencies on campus.
- Kaisey said that she did not want to see the document abused, as a simple majority should not be so easily amended.
- <u>Kaisey called the question.</u>

- <u>Biniek objected and Neesby seconded to Kaisey calling the question.</u>
- Biniek asked why this was being brought up right now, as it was the exact opposite of the changes to the OSAC guidelines. She said that this kind of action would spread clout around this document.

End of First Dictation File

- <u>Neesby called the question.</u>
- <u>Council voted to approve the proposed changes to the Election Code with a vote of 7 in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 abstentions.</u>

IX.   New Business

A. *Proposed Amendments to USAC Bylaws Article VI.C.14.a(4) concerning Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) written evaluation
- Chan said that he also wanted approval of the Student Organization Operational Fund (SOOF) Guidelines, but was not on the Agenda.
- <u>Vardner moved by Unanimous Consent and Neesby seconded to approve Chan's proposed changes to the SOOF Guidelines.</u>
- Chan said that these changes were to the evaluation process, which previously required that groups had to reapply each quarter but now wouldn't.
- Mann said that Bylaw changes required 7 days, so this could not be voted on at the present meeting. Wood said that Chan needed to submit these changes in writing such that they could be voted on at the next meeting.
- <u>Vardner withdrew his motion.</u>

- <u>Vardner moved and Zai seconded to add the Approval of the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) Guidelines.</u>
- <u>Council voted to add the Approval of the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) Guidelines with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.</u>

C. *Student Organization Operational Fund (SOOF) Guidelines
- Chan said that these had already been talked about, but were also attached to the Agenda.
- <u>Vardner moved and Hawkins seconded to approve the Student Organization Operational Fund Guidelines.</u>
- <u>Council voted to approve the Student Organizations Operational Fund Guidelines with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.</u>

B. *Approval of the USA Spring 2006 Runoff Election Results
- Herzog read aloud the individuals that had been elected in the runoff election.
- <u>Doan moved and Kaminsky seconded to approve the USA Spring 2006 Runoff Election Results.</u>
- <u>Vardner called the question. Council voted to approve the USA Spring 2006 Runoff Election Results with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 abstentions.</u>
- Tuttle asked that Herzog attach the precise results of the runoff election to the Minutes as an official addendum.

X.   Announcements

There were no Announcements this Week

XI.   Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the attendance sheet.

FINAL

XII.   Adjournment

     - Biniek moved and Vardner seconded to adjourn.
     - Zai called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by
      Acclamation. Vardner objected.
     - Council voted to adjourn at 10:20 pm with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

XIII.   Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker