

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

September 26, 2006
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Araabi, Caba, Cendana, Dehar, Doria, Jang, Kaisey, Malik, McLaren, Nelson, Park, Price, Sargent, Saucedo, Schuster, Tuttle, Williams, Zai

ABSENT: Miller

GUESTS: Sandy Carrillo, Cynthia Chen, Sherlyn Mossahebfar, Roxanne Naanos, D'artagnan Scorza,

I. A. Call to Order

- Kaisey called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet was passed around.

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Zai asked to be included in the Officer and Member Reports.
- Saucedo asked Kaisey to remove the LGBT Center Appointments from the Agenda.
- Schuster moved and Araabi 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

There were no Minutes this week.

IV. Special Presentations

There were no Special Presentations this week.

V. Appointments

Community Service Mini Fund Chair

- Kaisey said that Arifa Raza had already sat on the CS Mini Fund Committee and had a good impression of exactly what the committee did. She also added that Raza had been recommended by the Community Service Commission.
- Malik moved and Park seconded to approve the Appointment of Arifa Raza to the CS Mini Fund Committee.
- Price asked what Malik thought about the applicant, to which Malik said that Raza had sat on the committee for two years and that she was well qualified to serve as the Chair of the committee.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Arifa Raza to the CS Mini Fund Committee with a vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Election Board

- Kaisey said that she was forwarding Sandybeth Carrillo for the position of Election Board Chairperson. She said that Carrillo had served on the Election Board last year, and that she was highly recommended for this position by last year's E-Board Chairperson, Anat Herzog.

- Schuster moved and Cendana seconded to approve the Appointment of Sandybeth Carrillo to the position of Election Board Chairperson.
- Park asked Carrillo if she had any recommendations for changes to the elections process. Carrillo said that she had attended the endorsement hearings, but not many people had come to the endorsement hearings or to the debates. She said that these events had not been well-advertised, and said that she wanted to increase student participation in the Election Board.
- Sargent asked Carrillo if she had ever worked on a campaign before, to which she said that she had not.
- Tuttle asked if Carrillo understood how poorly it would reflect on her for years to come if she violated any of the stringent rules regarding bias and partisanship. Carrillo said that she understood Tuttle's point and assured him that she would act with integrity at all times. Tuttle then asked if it took a 2/3 vote to change the Election Code, to which Kaisey said that it did. Tuttle next strongly recommended that Carrillo read thoroughly the edits to the Election Code that were made at the end of last Council's term. Tuttle ended his remark by welcoming Carrillo, and saying that it was going to be a heck of a year.
- Saucedo asked Carrillo about her other time commitments for the coming year. Carrillo said that she would be working on a project within the Academic Affairs Commissioner's office, was a director for Project Write, and also had a work study job that required ten hours a week. She said that she needed to take just five more units each quarter to graduate, which would allow her more time to focus on her other activities. Saucedo then asked Carrillo if she was committed enough to the role of Election Board Chairperson to spend the amount of time that the job required, or if she would prefer to be appointed to an Academic Senate committee. Schuster made a point of order that Saucedo's question was irrelevant given the fact that last year's Election Board Chair had also served on an Academic Senate committee.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Sandybeth Carrillo to the position of Election Board Chairperson with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Student Affairs Budget Review Team (SABRT)

- Kaisey said that Cynthia Chen was very qualified for the SABRT, having worked in several accounting firms and also having applied for funding multiple times in the past.
- Schuster moved and Zai seconded to approve the Appointment of Cynthia Chen to the Student Affairs Budget Review Team (SABRT).
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Cynthia Chen to the Student Affairs Budget Affairs Team (SABRT) with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC)

- Kaisey said that she was forwarding Sherlyn Mossahebfar for appointment to the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC). She said that Council had already had a chance to review Mossahebfar's application and had heard her about her qualifications from Kaisey's presentation at a prior meeting.
- Schuster moved and Caba seconded to approve the Appointment of Sherlyn Mossahebfar to the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC).
- Cendana asked Mossahebfar if she would be able to attend the SFAC retreat, to which she said that she would.
- Mossahebfar addressed Council, saying that she was an advocate of prioritizing certain allocations, including student health, campus retention, community service, and other issues, saying that she had sent an email to Council prior to the meeting which included more specific information on her priorities.
- Sargent asked if this was a two year appointment, to which Kaisey replied that it was a one-year appointment.
- Araabi asked what Mossahebfar thought were the current major issues to be dealt with. Mossahebfar said that there had been a number of cuts to the state budget which presented serious challenges for SFAC to overcome, and said that they were working to deal with the problem. Mossahebfar said she knew that a lot of the pressures created by budget cuts had been alleviated by SFAC in the previous year.

- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Sherlyn Mossahebfar to the Student Fee Advisory Committee with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

Student Initiated Access Committee (SIAC)

- Kaisey said that she was forwarding Roxanne Naanos for appointment to the Student Initiated Access Committee (SIAC). She said that Naanos had been strongly recommended by Matt Bukirin, Chair of SIAC. She said further that she had already communicated her concerns about SIAC to Naanos, and said that Naanos was here to answer any questions Council might have for her.
- Price asked Naanos what she would do to strengthen the relationship between USAC and SIAC. Naanos said that she wanted to give regular reports to Kaisey, and would also like to make intermittent presentations to Council at their meetings.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Roxanne Naanos to the Student Initiated Access Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Chancellor's Enrollment Advisory Committee (CEAC)

- Kaisey said that she had spoken with D'artagnan Scorza and, based on his work with the African Student Union, she believes he is very knowledgeable about the diversity crisis at UCLA and is committed to working on behalf of USAC to correct these injustices.
Park moved and Caba seconded to approve D'artagnan Scorza to the Chancellor's Enrollment Advisory Committee (CEAC).
- Sargent asked how often CEAC met, to which Kaisey replied that she didn't think it met very often. Sargent suggested that, since this appeared to be a key issue for Council, that the committee try to meet more often than it had in the past.
- Noting that Scorza was not in the room, Park moved and Doria seconded to place the motion to approve Scorza on the table until he arrived at the meeting.
- Council voted to place the motion to approve Scorza on the table until he arrived at the meeting with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Scorza arrived at the meeting immediately after the item was placed on the table.

- Zai moved and Park seconded to take the motion to approve D'artagnan Scorza from the table.
- Council voted take the motion to approve D'artagnan Scorza from the table with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Price asked Scorza about his interest in the Chancellor's Enrollment Advisory Committee. Scorza replied that he was looking forward to working with the Administration in bringing forward a long-term plan for addressing admission issues in the next ten years, with the goal of balancing cultural, social, and other communities which may not have been considered in the past.
- Schuster asked what Scorza meant by "other communities." Scorza said he was thinking of student organizations on campus such as the Bruin Democrats, the Bruin Republicans, the Queer Alliance, and other such stakeholders. He said he wanted to address the idea of what a student at a Land-Grant University should look like. Schuster then asked Scorza what he meant by a "Land-Grant University." Scorza replied that it was an educational institution for and by the people which was funded by the state. Schuster said it was *his* understanding that Land Grant Universities were mandated to include agricultural schools.
- Doria asked Scorza how he planned to accomplish the goals he had cited. Scorza replied that, as he understood it, his role as a committee member was not to push his own personal agenda, but to listen to others, to gather information, and to offer any insight or experience that might be relevant. He said the first step he would take would be to engage the various stakeholders in a dialogue.
- Dr. Tuttle said, in reference to the earlier comments regarding Land Grant institutions, that he saw the confusion and the moral dilemma that lead to the comments. He said that the Land Grant Act which was enacted by Congress in the 1860's established the land grant university concept. He said that the essence of Scorza's remarks referred to the concept that community

- service should have funding allocated for it. Tuttle said that this paradigm might present a new way to look at admissions, and it was well within the law.
- Doria said that Council had learned a lot at Student Governance Day, including the fact that Council's hands were really tied with regard to effecting change in the admissions process. Doria encouraged Scorza to look at the whole issue about what Council could and could not do. Zai said, as she understood it, the point the Administration made at Governance Day was that they could not legally say that a new admissions process was designed to increase diversity, but the Administration was hopeful that a new admissions process might result in increased diversity.
 - Price told Scorza that she really admired his willingness and interest in working with groups typically neglected in the discussion about admissions.
 - Council voted to approve the Appointment of D'artagnan Scorza to the Chancellor's Enrollment Advisory Committee with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
 - Nelson made the observation that he had seen many people come before Council seeking their approval, but he had never witnessed such astute questions and adept answers as he had observed at this meeting.
 - Kaisey said that there were only a few more appointments to be made and that they would be dealt with at the next Council meeting.
 - Kaisey then reminded Council Members that they had all agreed to not engage in things unrelated to USAC at the Council table, noting the various "Instant Messages" that were being sent around the table.

VI. Fund Allocations

Approval of Contingency Fund Allocations

- Cendana moved and Araabi seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
- Sargent asked if the quarterly allocation formula and running balance could be included on the summary sheet instead of the amount for the whole year. In the absence of the Finance Committee Chairperson, Kaisey said she would notify him to make the change that Sargent requested.
- Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Tuttle said that he thought there had been a tweaking of the quarterly formula for fund allocations.
- Williams said that Tuttle might be thinking of the formula for the Student Organizations Operational Fund allocations.

The Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations are attached to the minutes.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

Facilities Commissioner – P.C. Zai

- Zai said that she had attended a meeting in CSP on Monday hosted by Dr. Nelson which concerned modifications that were being made to the terminology and the process regarding sponsorship of organizations. She said that changes were being made to how groups were sponsored, and said these changes had been prompted by liability issues. She said events will now be "supported" rather than "sponsored" by USAC. She said that a "sponsored" group would have its liability covered, whereas a "supported" group would not. Zai said that this was a good thing to keep in mind.
- Price asked if this meant that there would no longer be USAC Sponsored organizations. Nelson said that the concept of sponsorship was out. He said that one example was fliers, on which organizations were previously required to note their USAC sponsorship. Nelson said that this would no longer be the case, and rather than being "sponsored" by USAC, they would simply be "supported" by USAC.
- McLaren asked Nelson if he knew when the new process would be formalized, to which he replied that it was still being worked on and would be in place reasonably soon as far as he

knew. Nelson recommended that he should be contacted if there was language in any of the funding documents that was problematic. He offered the example wherein Officially Recognized groups had to have a signed non-discrimination form on file with CSP. Nelson said this would no longer be the case, but now each particular funding board would be the one to request that form.

External Vice President – Tina Park

- Price asked Park what Council members could legitimately do about the elections in November, to which Park replied they could encourage students to register at their campus address. She said further that the Student Voter Coalition was working with ORL to allow them to distribute information in the Residence Halls such as reminders on doorknobs and distributing informational pieces such as a voter guide.
- Zai asked Park if she had reached out to other campus organizations about voter registration, saying she was particularly asking about the Greeks. Park said they had already done this and that the members of the Greek community were very easy to work with. She said that she was hoping to have some competitions among the fraternity and sorority houses. She said that she would also be working with student organizations and others who were focusing on the ballot propositions.

Internal Vice President – Gregory Cendana

- Cendana said that he was working with ORL on a transgender housing project in the Residence Halls. He said that UCLA is the only campus in the UC system that doesn't have themed housing. He said he was also working with Ronni Sanlo, Director of the LGBT Center, and that he plans to meet with Nancy Greenstein, UCPD's Director of Community Services and with other members of the campus community who would be interested in establishing themed housing at UCLA. On another matter, Cendana said that he was working on the USAC T-Shirt design, and was really excited about it. He said the shirts would hopefully be out soon. He said that he and Saucedo had been tabling in Bruin Plaza, directing students to Open House events in the Student Activities Center and in the Ackerman Grand Ballroom. He said they would also be tabling in Wilson Plaza, and invited other Council members to come out and help them. He said that he would be helping with the guided tours for Open House and said there would be food at all of the stops along the way on the tour. Cendana said that he was also working on the Forum on Democracy, which would be held on October 12th. He said it was designed primarily for first-time voters and would give them lots of information about the election.
- Kaisey asked if people coming to the USAC tours could just go to certain points on the tour. Cendana explained that people would get a sticker for each office they went to, which would then translate into raffle tickets for ASUCLA gift cards.
- Saucedo said that the Open House would be on Wednesday from 12:00 to 3:00p.m., but asked Council to come in at 11:00a.m. He said that it would start at the Student Activities Center, where there would be food. He said there would also be food in various USAC offices. Saucedo said that the central station would be in front of the LGBT Center.

President – Marwa Kaisey

President Marwa Kaisey's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes.

Questions and Comments followed Kaisey's Report.

- Kaisey introduced Vice Chancellor Montero, and Montero introduced herself to Council.
- Sargent asked how long Kaisey would be accepting applications for the USAC Fellowship program, to which she said that she would be accepting informal applications into the second week of Fall Quarter.
- Schuster said that he had spoken with Judy Smith, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and said that he would be working with her office to get academic credit for students who participate in the USAC Fellowship.
- Price asked Kaisey how the recruiting for the Fellowship was going, to which Kaisey said that she had gotten a lot of interest at the fair and during orientations over the summer.
- Sargent asked how offices were doing at filling their staffs, as there were always some offices that got a lot of interest and some who struggled. Kaisey asked if any offices were struggling or

- if any had too many. Zai said that her office was struggling. Doria said that he had filled all his Director positions. Dehar said that he had an overflow and could refer some of them to any offices that didn't get enough. Kaisey said that she knew a lot of people wanted to do programming which might explain the high level of interest in Campus Events. She suggested that offices that didn't have enough interest might promote their programming aspects more.
- Price asked Kaisey if she had a sign-up sheet for the ASUCLA event, to which Kaisey said that she would be emailing it out.

VIII. Old Business

Discussion on Action Agenda and Focus Submissions

- Cendana said that all of the Action Agenda and Focus Submissions were in the Agenda packets. He said that Council would be going through them one at a time. Cendana said that the way this would proceed would be to have each point person present their item, and then have anyone interested add to it.
- Kaisey suggested that it might be more efficient if only changes be noted since Council had already looked at the various items. She said that the first one up was "Strengthening the Student Voice", and said that there was an increased emphasis on Get Out the Vote and other leadership endeavors.
- Cendana said that the second item was "Campus Safety". Saucedo interjected that the name had changed to "USAC Bringing Safety Back". He also said that Malik had been added to the team. Saucedo said that they had added campaigns such as the Crime Awareness Campaign, the STOP Program, and some others. He told Council that more officers had also been added. Zai said that more sexual violence issues had been added, including advocacy in addition to training.
- Sargent said that he remembered talking about the Student Health Advocate Program at UCLA, and said he thought it could fit into this item. Saucedo said that Malik was going to work on that.
- Cendana said that the next Action Agenda item was "First Year/Transfer Advisory." Schuster said that the item had not changed much, that ten offices were still participating, that they had fleshed out the responsibilities of the Office of General Representative #2, had expanded some of his own responsibilities, and also had added some more tasks for the Facilities Commission. Sargent asked if this included transfer student issues, to which Schuster replied that he would be addressing that as well. Saucedo asked if this would be an Action Agenda Item, to which Schuster said that it would, as there were nine members of Council on it. Dehar said that he was working with Jerry Mann towards having the \$2 movies be free and also on improving the parking situation.
- Sargent said that a Transfer Hub had been spoken about a lot, but that he didn't really understand how that would work. Kaisey said that the Transfer Hub would be a sequence of five workshops held during the first quarter. She said that they were very concise, as that she didn't want to waste any of their time. Kaisey said that she could email her outline to Sargent if he was interested in seeing it.
- Cendana said that the next issue to discuss was "Diversity in Admissions". Caba said that since Park had been working a lot with admissions, she and Park had changed this to "Increasing Racial Diversity at UCLA Through Admissions." She said that they had all talked about the low number of Black students coming to UCLA, and said that a comment to that effect had been added to the language of the item. Park said that another change made to the item was that it was somewhat more concrete, outlining actions that Council could actually take with the administration. She said that she wanted to make sure that USAC was a contributing member to the issue through their feedback to the administration. Park also said that she intended to hold Town Hall Meetings for the students so that they could be kept apprised of USAC's progress with the administration, as it was important for new students to be able to ask questions and to be educated about current issues facing them. Kaisey asked what the difference was between the Education Aspect and the Panel, to which Park said that general education was just that while the panel was a chance to ask pointed questions. Park also said that this was a good opportunity for the three General Representatives to work together, though what they really needed was a sweeping change at UCLA to change their admissions criteria to improve racial diversity.

- Sargent asked if there had been any discussion with the admissions office to make sure that USAC was complementing their work rather than clashing with them. Park said it was her understanding that they had the opportunity to do this at the Town Hall Meetings. Sargent said that was his point, as the admissions office might be more interested in cooperating if they felt there was collaboration instead of competition. He said he thought there might be a lot of administrators who agreed with the item, and would probably like to be kept apprised of USAC's activities and progress.
- Price asked why the officers hadn't been contacted about these changes, to which Park said that she had been contacted at the last minute about feedback. She said that she had wanted to get even more feedback than this before discussing the item, but there had been no feedback to provide. Price said that she also wanted there to be some recognition of the fact that some students do not support a change in the admissions criteria. Park said that this need would be met by having the Town Halls for students. She said that there would be a diverse panel at the Town Halls to respond to questions posed by the students.
- Doria said that, according to Prop 209, and as an official organization, he didn't think that USAC could name an Action Agenda Item "Increasing Racial Diversity..." Park said she thought that, as the student voice, they did have the option to call it what it was, as the present situation was detrimental to the student body.
- Sargent said there was no reference to improving yield for students of color, saying that he thought that was a much easier way to improve diversity on campus, as altering admissions processes was very challenging.
- Nelson said that he wanted to comment for perspective that when the Regents made these decisions in 1995, all of the UCLA Administrators, all of the members of the Academic Senate, and all of the student councils had said that they opposed the change, but it was still done. He said he brought this up because he wasn't sure how much power they might need to effect change. Nelson said it didn't make sense to him that, when it came to education, everyone seemed to think they knew more about education than the educators, so he applauded Council's efforts.
- Cendana said that the next issue to discuss was affordability. Doria said that the issue had been changed, and said that he wanted the focus to shift now to academic fees. He said that he had added Kaisey to the team, as she had contacts that the rest of Council did not. Doria said that he also wanted to work on the cost of textbooks and course readers, as he thought that was the single issue that Council could potentially have the greatest effect on. He said that, for Campus Events, since the fund raisers have such a high rate of success, he thought that Dehar would be the best suited to making those events successful.
- Dehar said that the Campus Events Commission was happy to help with the planning portion of any events, but said that they would not be getting into the business of producing new events that went outside the scope of their usual events.
- Park asked why the Cultural Affairs Commission had not been tapped for this issue. Doria said that the series was intended to be speakers, and said that he knew Campus Events had more experience with speakers than the Cultural Affairs Commission did.
- Sargent said that he fully supported ways to raise scholarship funds, and said that there were a lot of other groups on campus which were already doing this that Doria might work with. Doria said that he wanted to have a scholarship that was specific to USAC that could help students who did not get financial aid. Sargent said that what USAC had seen historically was that non-programming offices did not continue programming due to the political nature of those offices, and suggested partnering with a programming office.
- Araabi said that his item had been completely changed around to now be "USAC for Social Justice." He said that it was a more vague idea than all of the other items, and had taken him some time to figure out how to approach it. Araabi said that they had created a database of all the social justice groups on campus, and said that they had collected information on those groups and how they could be best served by USAC. He said that some of the organizations were already working on specific issues and had talked with him about how USAC could help. He then told Council that they were planning to have a social justice event at the end of the year which would be put together by all of the groups. Araabi also said that there was a major movement going on presently against hunger and homelessness, and said that it was centered

- around the USC neighborhood. H said that there were seven organizations on campus which all worked on this issue, 'though none of them had worked together. He said he planned to bring them together. Araabi ended by saying that CalPirg was working on campus climate issues.
- Kaisey said that USAC now needed to set specific goals to determine how all these projects could be accomplished.
 - Price said that she had been thinking about it, and said that she wanted to challenge Council to decide what they really wanted to do and what they were really needed on. She said that, rather than eliminate issues, she thought they should start with none and then build the list from that point.
 - Schuster said that all of the ideas that came out around the table were really good ones which all deserved USAC's full attention. He said that they could and would work on all of the issues, and suggested that they should work towards making these more meaningful. Schuster said that, by reducing the number, the remaining projects would actually resonate more.
 - Sargent said that he disagreed, as people had intended to work on all of the issues, but there had been little or no accountability for progress. Sargent said he thought they should do them all, and have regular status reports at each meeting.
 - Park said that it was not about which issues were the best, but was rather about what was feasible. She said she thought that Council needed to be realistic about the fact that they had limited time, resources, and money.
 - Zai said that Park had addressed many of her concerns. She said she thought that, if they select only two or three, they could focus more attention on each of them. She said that last year's Council had six concentrations, and they were swamped by them. Zai said it had been hard to get people to help on just six concentrations last year, which is why she thought it would be better to have a manageable number this year.
 - Saucedo said that he liked the idea of two Foci and two Action Agenda items.
 - Tuttle recommended a "stop loss", with the understanding that there could be two or three cycles, with a review of the Action Agenda items coming up every couple of weeks. Tuttle pointed out that everyone was equally affected by all this.
 - Nelson said he thought this was a great opportunity for everyone to demonstrate leadership by delegating. He said that, with 20,000 undergrads at UCLA, it seemed to him that there were enough people to find to do the work. He commended Council for the great job they had done in putting together what they wanted to be accomplished for and by the students.
 - Park said that she would like a little time to go back to her staff to find out what they wanted to take on as well, but said that she was also be in favor of focusing on fewer concentrations.
 - Kaisey said that she thought it would be good to allow one more week in which everyone could take these back to their staffs to determine which should be selected.
 - Price said that she disagreed because Council already had a week to look at these, and said she thought they should at least begin the discussion tonight.
 - Schuster said that he really wanted USAC to move on past appointments and Action Agenda Items.
 - Price said she thought the Student Voice proposal was the most important issue and actually required all of Council to work on it and to get behind it. She said her suggestion was to just do one.
 - Sargent asked if this discussion was structured, to which Kaisey replied that this was a way to find out what people were interested in.
 - Doria asked if Council could go around the table and have each member give their opinions on what should stay and what should go.
 - Schuster said that Council members should not feel insulted if their proposals were spoken against. Zai agreed with Schuster's remark..
 - Dehar said that he thought the three he could take on were Student Voice, Campus Safety, and the Transfer Student or First Year Experience.
 - Doria agreed on Student Voice. He also said he didn't think that admissions was a good issue, because he didn't feel there was any more he could do on it. Kaisey interjected that she wanted to keep comments in favor of issues, rather than against them.

- Araabi said he thought six was too many, but thought that Council could do three or four. He said Student Voice, Campus Safety, and Diversity in Admissions seemed appropriate since those were the most pressing issues at present.
- Schuster said that he agreed with Doria and Dehar that Student Voice was important, and said that he agreed with Dehar that the Action Agenda Items should be kept and the foci should be dropped.
- Sargent said that if all of these issues were vital, and that Council would be working on them anyway, he didn't understand why Council didn't think they could do all of them. He said he thought it was a misconception for Council to think that they had to limit themselves in order to achieve. Kaisey said she agreed that all of the areas would be worked on, and said that there were issues that certain offices would elect not to work on if they were not made a priority for those offices.
- Park said that picking a number was arbitrary, and said she thought she should have time to take this to her staff to make sure that she could commit to as much as possible.
- Kaisey said that Council seemed to be pretty divided, and that she could not move forward until Council was in full agreement on what they wanted to do. She said that Student Voice seemed to be pretty important to everyone, and Campus Safety seemed similarly important to most.
- Park said she thought that Council should come back to the next meeting with a list of rankings for the various items.
- Schuster said that Council really needed to take a vote now to add Action Agenda Items and then move on.
- Kaisey suggested voting to adopt Student Voice at this meeting and to then discuss with their staffs on how many more could be adopted.
- Price said that there had already been time to talk to their staffs, to which Park countered that a lot of these had changed all of a sudden. Kaisey added that Council couldn't force individuals to work on items they were not committed to.
- Tuttle said he thought it was a good idea to take a week and talk with their staffs about how many of these items could be taken on. He suggested that, when making their decision, Council think about the fresh troops they had recruited recently.
- Kaisey said that, logistically, this was the only way that it could be done.
- Zai reiterated that this was the Council's agenda for the year, and said that it was important for Council to figure out what they wanted to do.
- Price and Schuster said that they wanted a vote to postpone the decision on these.
- Doria moved and Zai seconded that a decision on the number of Action Agenda Items be postponed until the next Council meeting, with the understanding that the next meeting could not be adjourned until the issue was settled.
- Council voted to approve the motion that a decision on the number of Action Agenda Items be postponed until the next Council meeting, with the understanding that the next meeting could not be adjourned until the issue was settled with a vote of 8 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

IX. New Business

Discussion on the Visibility of USAC

- Doria said that he had a concern about USAC's visibility. He said he thought it would be a good idea to create a USAC banner that would help to increase awareness of USAC's role and purpose on campus and to let students know that there was a place they could go if they had issues to present. He said the estimates on what such a banner would cost ranged from \$50 - \$200, depending on the quality and the design. He also said that he thought the USAC logo was much too small on most of the commissions' ads. He suggested that the design of the office and commission logos be modified to make it clear that they are a part of USAC.
- Zai said that she agreed with Doria, and suggested making the USAC logo easier to incorporate into various documents. She also agreed that the logos of each office and commission should refer in some way to USAC because people don't realize that USAC is the organization that puts on such programs as the \$2 film series.

- Dehar said he thought that a lot of Campus Events Commission supporters did not realize that the CEC was a part of USAC. He said that he understood the advantage of USAC affiliation but, at the same time, he liked the fact that his commission was somewhat apolitical. He said that he worried about the possible politicization of Campus Events by making people aware that CEC is a part of USAC.
- Kaisey said that she was not asking anyone to change their logo, but was suggesting that each office and commission acknowledge in some way that they are part of USAC.
- Tuttle pointed out that, if the Campus Events Commission was not part of USAC, it would have to be a branch of the University administration. He said that, in 1960, former Chancellor Franklin Murphy disconnected programming from the administration and gave it over to the undergraduate student government. He said that the students were the ones organizing the events, and said that it was the students' right to do so. He asked that Dehar take pride in the fact that Campus Events is a part of USAC.
- Zai said that she completely understood Dehar's pride in his commission, but simply asked that he identify the commission as part of USAC. She said that she hoped he would acknowledge that USAC not only advocated for the students but also entertained them.
- Schuster said that, in future years, the Campus Events Commission might become political, and suggested that Dehar own up to the accomplishments of his commission in its era of "apoliticism".
- Dehar said that, when he first joined Campus Events, he didn't know about USAC or campus politics, and he liked it that way. He said he thought that his successor would probably have opinions similar to his.
- Price asked if there was anyone that was not willing to get on board with increasing USAC visibility. Nobody identified themselves as unwilling.
- McLaren raised a point of information regarding the banner that Doria spoke about, saying that she thought the banner was a great idea, but was concerned that USAC might not be able to display it as often as they would like because of the limited amount of banner space available on campus.

Discussion on the Composition of the Budget Review Committee (BRC)

- Park said that, based on her experience with the funding hearings for the student organizations, she thought that the current system placed a terrible burden on all members of the Budget Review Committee. She said she was bringing this up now because there will be another round of funding hearings for the student organizations in January. She said it had been a struggle just to make quorum, and they had to cut out whole days of hearings because of their inability to meet quorum. Park said that she had been burned out by the hearings because of the time required to read all the proposals, sit in on all the hearings, and to then determine how much to allocate to each organization. She said she thought that Council should evaluate whether or not this was the best way to determine how much to allocate to each student group for their operational expenses.
- Price said she thought that the Winter Quarter hearings would be easier to manage because RA training would be over, and also because the FiCom Chair would not be taking LSAT prep classes and would be more available to participate in the hearings. She said that perhaps Council should set the dates much earlier so that committee members could put them on their calendars and not get double-booked.
- Kaisey said that, with 110 groups applying in Fall Quarter, she thought there would probably be a lot less that would apply for the next round of hearings.
- Park said that she understood how difficult it was to change dates on students at the last minute, and said she thought there needed to be better collaboration and collective accountability among the members of the Budget Review Committee. She said that the last round had been incredibly difficult for everyone involved.
- Kaisey said she thought that a discussion of the breakdown in the hearing process was one that should probably take place away from the table, and should be considered by her and the members of the Budget Review Committee.

Bruin Bash Review

- Dehar said that the Bruin Bash Concert had been a big success, as they had been forced to close the gates while there were still many people trying to get in. He said that there had been about 8,000 people in attendance, which was the highest ever. Dehar said that about 3,000 people came to the dance, which was far and above last year's attendance. He said that they had to close the floor as people had been repeatedly trying to rush it. Dehar said that the Sunday/Monday model worked very well, and said he thought this model was likely to be repeated at next year's Bruin Bash. He also said that he would try to include academic groups into the events more. Dehar lastly noted that if he could do it over again, he would have made T-Shirts so that volunteers and staff could be recognized.
- Caba agreed that everything had been a big success, and said that things often got done at the last minute like they had this year. She said that there were also some things she would change, like having a better system of radio communication between the people working the event.
- Kaisey said that the fair had encountered a little trouble with registration and the emails from CSP. She also said that there had been some complaints about the music being too loud, and said that there would be more emphasis on the interaction between the staff and the guests at future Bruin Bashes. Kaisey said that some of the academic offices had been a no-show, but said that was something that required a change in attitude which took more than just one year.
- Schuster said that it seemed like counselors from the smaller departments came primarily to recruit for their majors and that lots of other counselors didn't show up. He said his goal had been to get many counselors out of their offices and outreaching to their current and potential students and talking to the students.
- Kaisey said that something long-term that needed to be looked at was planning more in advance.
- Dehar said that there had been about \$10,000 raised in sponsorship, which was about what he expected, and said it was a lot more than the \$4,000 last year. He said he hoped the sponsorship funding would increase to help cover the costs of the event. Dehar also said that it might be in the best interest of the Campus Events Commission to institutionalize the groups that worked under it.
- Caba said that the fair had gone very well. In terms of the sound, she thought it was okay at the same volume, but that the speakers should just be rearranged. She also said that, because of the timing of the fair, it might be nice to have water or refreshments available at the event. She said that the water stations had run out well before the end of the event.
- Kaisey said she thought that ASUCLA had done a very good job with the water and the ice cream bars, but said she did not realize they had run out of water as early as they had.
- Saucedo asked if there had been an overlapping problem with the dance, the movie, and the concert. Dehar answered that the dance and the concert had been staggered well, but there had been more people attending the movie than anticipated. He said that the fire marshal had also been unwilling to allow more people into the event even though people who were in had begun to filter out.
- Doria said he thought that something similar had happened last year. He said further that he thought there just weren't that many rap fans on campus. Caba said she thought it was just a really long event, with the doors opening at 6:30p.m., and the event not ending until 10:00p.m.
- Araabi said there seemed to be a lot of communication problems within the activities fair, as many groups had contacted him about not knowing where or how to register. Kaisey said that she thought there had been a website glitch which she thought could be taken care of in the future.
- Price said she didn't think it was fair that the groups who had registered first then had to be put on the waiting list. Kaisey said the groups had to wait because they hadn't shown up at 8:00 as instructed, so their tables had been given away. She said it all worked out, however, and that everyone who wanted a table eventually got one. Price asked why the glitch hadn't been figured out earlier, to which Kaisey replied that she didn't know.
- Schuster said he would like to have the Academic Affairs Commission more involved in the planning process for next year's event.

X. Announcements

- Araabi said that the Lebanon Relief Dinner was coming up, and said that it was being put on by 15 different campus organizations. He said that it was a purely humanitarian-based event.
- McLaren said that AAA Resort Rentals had sent a check for \$1,000 which is a refund of the deposit USAC was required to make on the house they rented for their annual retreat. She said would give the check to Student Government Accounting so the funds will be put back into USAC's Retreat account.
- Zai said that she had gotten an email about the chilled water cooler in parking structure 8, which would be turned off on October 1st.
- Schuster asked the Resident Advisors on Council to send any maintenance concerns they had to the Facilities Commissioner.
- Malik said that the Community Service Commission was having their recruitment fair next week.
- Saucedo said that Welcome Week was not over, and reminded everyone that they needed volunteers and staff members to help out.
- Jang said that SWC was having a blood drive next week.
- McLaren clarified that the blood drive Jang announced would be for just three days rather than for the full week.
- Dehar said that there were going to be free sneaks coming up if anyone was interested.
- Tuttle said that he wanted Council to learn the Alma Mater.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet was passed around.

XII. Adjournment

- Schuster moved and Park seconded to adjourn.
- Council voted to adjourn at 10:31 with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

XIII. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker