

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

October 10, 2006  
417 Kerckhoff Hall  
7:00 p.m.

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

GUESTS: Maryanne Cabrera, Rachel Davis, Viet Tuan Bui, Jeff Dhungana, Dorothy Le, Michelle Lyon, Laura Macheski, Swati Misra, Stephanie Moore, Anthony Pesce, Zalya Sanchez-Galvan, Tiffany Smith, Lindsay Vanick

I. A. Call to Order

- Kaisey called the meeting to order at 7:12 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Cendana asked to add a Special Presentation.
- Price removed the discussion on keeping appointees accountable.
- Dehar, Caba, Saucedo, Schuster, Price, and Malik asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Kaisey removed the Old Business item and added an introduction of the new OCHC Campus Relations Chair. She also said that the applicant for the Campus Sustainability Commission would not be able to make it to the meeting.
- Cendana moved and Schuster seconded to approve the Agenda as amended by General Consent.
- Kaisey asked if there were any objections to approval by General Consent. There being none, the Agenda was approved, as amended, by General Consent.

III. Approval of the Minutes

*There were no Minutes this week.*

IV. Special Presentations

**University of California Students Association (UCSA)**

- Stephanie Moore from the University of California Students Association introduced herself to Council and passed out some background material. She said that she wanted to talk about the UC Students Vote Project and the Week of Action, and would begin with the Vote Project. She said that UCSA was the official voice of the students of California. She said that students should care about voting because their votes help to influence the UC Regents by exercising their electoral power. Moore said that UCSA was working to curb the increase in student fees, to increase the Cal Grant, to decrease the amount of loan debt that students graduate with, and to generally help students. She said she was aware of the diversity crisis taking place at UCLA, and said that was another good reason for students to vote. Moore said that the UC Vote Project had been created in 1996, and had since been institutionalized as a way to increase voter action by the students of California. She said that some schools had institutionalized it so well that they were always registering thousands of voters before each election. Moore said that UCSA was also a part of the United States Students Association, which was the official voice of all students nationwide. She said that the goal of UCSA was to register more than 26,000 voters before the

next Presidential election. Moore said that they also wanted to train more than 200 student leaders, and generally create a very non-partisan student voting workshop. She said that UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara had the most registered voters. Moore said that one of the best times to register voters was during Welcome Week, which USAC had already done, and the second best was during the official UCSA Voter Registration Week. She said that this left USAC with two weeks before they had to be ready for the Voter Registration Week.

- Lauren Macheski from the External Vice President's Office said that they were looking for lots of volunteers because manpower was what they really needed most. She said they wanted to do some work on the Hill, because the R.A.s haven't been able to sign up as many volunteers as they really needed. She said that they needed volunteers for all of next week.
- Kaisey said, with regard to the R.A.'s, that the registration cards they had turned in were being rejected, to which Macheski said that problem was being worked on.
- Price said that she would have a table set up on Wednesday of Voter Registration Week.
- Kaisey asked if they could just get voters signed up in their free time, to which Moore said that was fine, but Macheski really needed the forms back ultimately. She said that the reason for this was so they could follow-up with their registered voters and to be able to tout the number of voters they had registered to the UC Regents.
- Macheski said that the goal was to get more than 2,000 voters registered during Voter Registration Week.

#### V. Appointments

##### **LGBT Center Advisory Board**

- Kaisey said that both of the applications were included in the Agenda Packet.
- Saucedo said that Tiffany Smith was a member of the Queer Alliance last year, and she really wanted to continue this work.
- Saucedo moved and Jang seconded to approve the Appointment of Tiffany Smith to the LGBT Advisory Board.
- Zai asked what other experience Smith had, to which Saucedo said that she had done research in this area and had also worked with administrators on the board.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Tiffany Smith to the LGBT Advisory Board with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Saucedo said that Zalya Sanchez-Galvan was a woman of color and also was a member of the Queer Alliance. He said that she wanted to be on the board because the issues the Board dealt with affected her in a personal way.
- Saucedo moved and Jang seconded to approve the Appointment of Zalya Sanchez-Galvan to the LGBT Advisory Board.
- Zai said that she was concerned because Sanchez-Galvan had brushed off the importance of outreach to the community in a question that Zai had posed to her by email. Saucedo asked Zai to elaborate, to which Zai said that Sanchez-Galvan had circumvented a question about outreaching to the campus.
- Zai moved and Schuster seconded to table the Appointment of Zalya Sanchez-Galvan to the LGBT Advisory Board.
- Council voted not to table the Appointment of Zalya Sanchez-Galvan to the LGBT Advisory Board with a vote of 4 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Schuster said that Council had delayed other appointments in order to contact appointees, and said that there was no reason they couldn't do that again.
- Araabi said that Council members had two weeks to contact these appointees and, if they had chosen not to contact them, that was not the fault of the appointees.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Zalya Sanchez-Galvan to the LGBT Advisory Board with a vote of 9 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

##### **Campus Sustainability Committee**

- Kaisey said that Jeff Dhungana was very qualified for a two-year appointment to this committee.

- Cendana moved and Schuster seconded to approve the Appointment of Jeff Dhungana to the Campus Sustainability Committee for a two-year term.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Jeff Dhungana to the Campus Sustainability Committee for a two-year term with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Kaisey said that the next nominee for the Campus Sustainability Committee was Dorothy Le. She said Council members were probably familiar with Le, as well as her qualifications for this position, because of presentations she had made to Council.
- Schuster moved and Saucedo seconded to approve the Appointment of Dorothy Le to the Campus Sustainability Committee for a two-year term.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Dorothy Le to the Campus Sustainability Committee for a two-year term with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Kaisey said that the last person she was forwarding for appointment to the Campus Sustainability Committee was Rachel Davis. She said that Davis was very interested in, and knowledgeable of, sustainability issues, and said that she also knew about what was happening on a state-wide level.
- Schuster moved and Araabi seconded to approve the Appointment of Rachel Davis to the Campus Sustainability Committee for a one-year term as the Alternate.
- Schuster moved and Saucedo seconded to approve the Appointment of Rachel Davis to the Campus Sustainability Committee for a one-year term as the Alternate with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

#### **Student Conduct Committee**

- Council voted to approve the appointment of Lindsay Vanik to the Student Conduct Committee with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

#### **Committee on Disabilities**

- Kaisey told Council that Swati Misra was the only student who had applied for the Committee on Disabilities. She said that Misra was very well qualified for this committee.
- Caba moved and Zai seconded to approve the Appointment of Swati Misra to the Committee on Disabilities.
- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Swati Misra to the Committee on Disabilities with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

## VI. Fund Allocations

#### **Approval of Contingency Fund Allocations**

- Miller said that \$9,469.79 had been requested from the Contingency Fund, with \$2,861.40 recommended for allocation. He said that an additional \$2,262.95 had been requested from Contingency via discretionary, with \$875.00 recommended for allocation. Miller said that, upon Council's approval of these recommended allocations, the running total in the Contingency Fund would drop from \$50,619.50 to \$47,758.10.
- Cendana moved and Araabi seconded, to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.
- Doria said he understood that some of the applications were turned in late, and said that had been reason enough for denying funding at all in past weeks. He asked Miller why that appeared to no longer be the case. Miller answered that the only reason for the denial of funding was if there was no documentation to support the request. He said that points had been deducted from late applications, but they had still been funded.
- Price asked why the Queer Alliance was funded so much for Graphics, to which Miller said that they were putting on a week-long event that had graphics for each and every day.
- Sargent asked if Council had a desire for the Budget Review Committee to present a quarterly balance on the funding allocation recommendations. He said it was his recommendation that Council be given a running balance not just for the year, but also for the quarter. Miller said that he would try to do that, although he said it was somewhat difficult to give a clear amount.

- 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.*

VII. Appointments (continued)

**Assistant Budget Review Director**

- Kaisey said that she was forwarding Viet Tuan Bui to Council for Appointment to the position of Assistant Budget Review Director. She explained to Council that if the Budget Review Director was not available for hearings, the Assistant Budget Review Director would serve in her place and would also be eligible to vote on the allocations.
- Sargent said he understood that Bui had applied for several programs through the Budget Review Committee, and asked him to comment on that. Bui said that he had a lot of experience with the Budget Review Committee from his work with the Vietnamese Student Union. Bui said that he was in charge of budgeting during VSU's Culture Night, and was also writing the proposal to obtain funding for that event. He said he was also trying to find funding from off-campus organizations. He said he also worked with the community outreach program HOPE, and said that he had similar and funding experience with that responsibility.
- Kaisey asked Bui what kind of proposals he had written. Bui said that he had worked on proposals for the Student Organizations Operational Fund, the ASUCLA/BOD Programming Fund, the Vice Chancellor's Fund, and also the Student Initiated Access Fund.
- Kaisey asked Bui if he would recuse himself if one of the organizations he was associated with applied for funding through the Budget Review Committee. Bui said that he didn't know if that was a requirement but, if it was, he would recuse himself. He said further that he would definitely be impartial in all cases.
- Price said that it was the tradition of committee members to recuse themselves from discussions regarding any group they were part of, and asked Bui if he was willing to do that. Bui said that he was. Price also asked Bui what his other time commitments were. Bui said that he was actually quite available, with having classes only on three days each week. Price asked what his other student organization commitments were, to which Bui said that he was the Vice President of the Vietnamese Student Union. Price asked how Bui had remained impartial in working with the Student Initiated Access Mini Fund. Bui said that the SIAC Mini Fund was centered on benefiting K-12 students.
- Sargent said that, to be very clear, all he was asking was that Bui recuse himself from hearings on organizations in which he was a member. Sargent then asked Cabrera how she had found this candidate. Cabrera said that she had asked a number of students if they knew of anyone who was qualified for the ABRD position. She said that Cendana told her about Bui, and she then reached Bui and told him about the opening.
- Schuster asked Bui what the role of the Assistant Budget Review Director was for the rest of the year, to which Bui said that he would be assisting with all funding that was handled by the Budget Review Committee. Bui said he understood that he would be sitting in for Cabrera when she was not available, and mentioned that might occur during the second round of SOOF hearings. Schuster asked what made the coming round of applications different from the first round. Bui said it was his understanding that the second round was for groups whose application had been declined in the first SOOF application process. Schuster said the point he wanted to make was that USAC wanted to reach out to groups that may never have applied for funding at all, and that it was the responsibility of the Budget Review Committee to conduct this outreach. Bui said that he understood Schuster's point, and said that he would work hard to outreach to groups that had either not been allocated funding or that had never applied for funding and were unfamiliar with the application process. Schuster said he had raised this question because he didn't see any indication that Bui had experience in reaching out to student organizations. Bui said that he would certainly do his best to reach out to such student organizations, and pointed out that there was really no way for him to prove this to Schuster except by his future actions.
- Price asked Bui what concrete ideas he had for outreaching to student groups. Bui said it was his understanding that there had been very little outreach initiated by USAC in this regard in the

- past. He suggested that one idea would be for USAC to outreach by holding orientation sessions on how to apply for funding.
- Araabi moved and Caba seconded to approve the Appointment of Viet Tuan Bui to the position of Assistant Budget Review Director.
  - Schuster said that one of the things that USAC discussed during the appointments process had been the process itself, and said that he had not seen much outreach to the student body to encourage a variety of constituencies to apply for USAC appointed positions. He said he thought that Council should try to reach out to students who had no awareness of, or experience with, Budget Review Committee process.
  - Sargent pointed out that he did not think there was any requirement about outreach with regard to this appointment.
  - Kaisey said, in response to Schuster's request regarding outreach for applicants, that part of the process in finding a qualified applicant for Assistant Budget Review Director was to draw from the pool of students who had applied for the position of Budget Review Director.
  - Tuttle said that, whether it was in the Bylaws or not, he applauded the general thrust of the comments and the sensitivity, as the idea of outreach was a great one. He said it was important for everyone to keep in mind that a broad-based effort should be made to reach out to all eligible organizations because everyone needed to know about funding opportunities and deadlines and whatnot. He said that Council's successors may be called upon to conduct due-diligence, and what they did not want to do was backslide into not spreading the word and keeping the positions restricted.
  - Zai said that she really wanted to emphasize opening the funding process to the more than 800 student groups, and said that her only hesitation with Bui as a candidate was his overlap in experience with groups that have applied for BRD funding.
  - Zai Called the Question on the Motion to Approve the Appointment of Viet Tuan Bui to the position of Assistant Budget Review Director, seconded by Schuster. There was no objection to the calling of the question.
  - Council voted to Call the Question on the Motion to Approve the Appointment of Viet Tuan Bui to the position of Assistant Budget Review Director with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

*External Vice President Tina Park arrived at the meeting*

- Council voted to approve the Appointment of Viet Tuan Bui to the position of Assistant Budget Review Director with a vote of 7 in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Cendana reminded Council that Appointee applications were included in the Agenda packet so that Council could contact applicants if they had questions they wanted them to answer prior to the meeting at which they were being considered.

*Student Welfare Commissioner Tamaron Jang arrived at the meeting*

#### VIII. Fund Allocations (continued)

##### **Student Organizations Operational Fund Allocations**

- Cabrera said that, after she printed out the allocations, she made some corrections and that she then emailed the corrected document to everyone on Council via the allusa email account.
- Sargent asked why the incorrect information had been forwarded to Council in the first place. Cabrera said that changes were made based on input from Council.
- Cabrera said that the total allocations added up to \$98,973.00.
- Araabi moved and Caba seconded to approve the Student Organizations Operational Fund Allocations.
- Kaisey said that, as long as the scores were correct and the total was correct, then everything else should be fine.
- Zai asked why some groups were receiving 40 times more than other groups, to which Cabrera said that was what they applied for. Park explained that the groups had been funded based on need, and on what each group deserved, and on how much money was available for allocation.

- Council voted to approve the Student Organizations Operational Fund Allocations with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Kaisey thanked the Budget Review Committee members for their hard work and dedication.

#### IX. Officer and Member Reports

##### **Cultural Affairs Commission – Marivell Caba**

- Caba said that she had a lot going on, including that she had worked with the External Vice President on Get Out the Vote. She said that they had scheduled the first concert to be held on October 17<sup>th</sup>, and then the second to be held on November 6<sup>th</sup>. Caba also said that she had just had her first staff meeting, which had been very productive, and said that they had scheduled their staff retreat.
- Sargent asked if there was any way for students to find out what was going on in her office at any given time. Caba said that there was a preliminary website that students could visit and get that information. She also said that there would be quarterly postcards sent out.

##### **General Representative #1 – Carlos Saucedo**

- Saucedo said that there were now two gender neutral restrooms on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of Kerckhoff. He said that the USAC Open House had gone very well, and said that there would be a discussion later in the meeting about it. Saucedo said that National Coming Out Week was coming up, and there would be events in Bruin Plaza in conjunction with the LGBT center. He also said that he had planned his first all-staff meeting.
- Kaisey asked if there were signs explaining the gender-neutral bathrooms, to which Saucedo said that there was a plan to have signs, but he didn't think they were up yet. She also asked if he had found out whether they would be bringing Margaret Cho to campus for National Coming Out Week, to which Saucedo replied that they were trying to raise the funds to do that.

##### **Campus Events Commission – Ravi Dehar**

- Dehar said that this week the Campus Events Commission had kicked off a new ticket policy. He said that they now print the exact number of tickets as there are seats where the event will be held. He said the tickets would be available exactly three days before each event. Dehar said that the way it worked was that tickets would become worthless at 7:30p.m. on the night of the event to allow for walk-ins. He said that this was part of a new customer service approach, and said it was going very well so far.
- Sargent asked how the Brian Wilson Music Award was coming along, to which Dehar said that he was still waiting to hear back on that.

##### **Academic Affairs Commissioner – Nat Schuster**

- Schuster said that he'd had a lot of meetings with University Administrators of late regarding establishing a Business Major at UCLA. He said that Judi Smith (Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education) and Judy Olian (Dean, Anderson Chair in Management) were both receptive to the idea. He said they recommended that he talk with the Acting Chancellor who said he thought this would belong in the Social Sciences Department. Schuster said that he now had to talk to Letters and Science. He said that the issue had essentially come full-circle in that everyone liked the idea but nobody seemed willing to take it on. On another matter, Schuster said that AAC's first film was coming up, and that their first program, "UCLA Feud: Why Medicine?" would take place next week, on the 18<sup>th</sup>. He ended his report by saying that applications for teaching an Undergraduate Student Initiated Education class would be due on November 13.
- Tuttle asked if he understood correctly that the Chancellor had advised Schuster to talk with Social Sciences about the Business Major, saying that if this was the case, then Schuster should hammer that point and should be able to get this major established. Tuttle said that this was an idea that had been 40 years in the making and that it would be a shame to let it drop. He encouraged Schuster to make this happen.
- Sargent said, to add to Tuttle's remarks, that he recommended bringing this to Council as a resolution which could then be published in the Daily Bruin after Council approved it.

**General Representative #2 – Joline Price**

- Price invited Council to a Mental Health Resource Fair on the 18<sup>th</sup> from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm, and said that there would be a lot of students and UCLA representatives there as well as activities like punching bags and piñatas. Price also said that she had a meeting coming up with the Director of Student Psychological Services, and said that she would be bringing some student issues and concerns to her.
- Sargent asked if there was an advisory board to Student Psychological Services, to which Price said that there was not. She said, however, that she and Kaisey were working on the possibility of creating one.
- Kaisey asked Price if she would make a presentation to Council some time soon regarding the mental health information that had been sent to the UC Regents.

**Community Service Commission – Farheen Malik**

*Community Service Commissioner Farheen Malik's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes. Questions and comments followed Malik's report.*

- Tuttle asked if the Service Record was going to be attached to the transcript, to which Malik said that it was actually going to be done through MyUCLA. Tuttle said that this was pretty important, to which Malik said that it was really a done deal. Tuttle asked if the protocol had been finalized as to what was included and what was not, to which Malik said that there was a memorandum of understanding which explained all this, though there were currently seven core organizations that qualified for notation. Tuttle said that this was very important, and said that he had a question which affected the other 12 members of Council. He said that this was a pilot program, grounded in the idea that people should be recognized for their service. Tuttle said that the thing he was consistently concerned about was that the model that was established could be extended to incorporate the projects that all of Council did. He said that he did not think that it should go forward at this time, but did think that this was a great idea and process.
- Price said that she understood that not all communities on the Hill accepted the Community Service Representatives, and asked what Malik would be doing about this. Malik said that the Resident Directors would be willing to act in that capacity, but also said that she had her own director who would oversee those obligations. Price said that there was one on her floor but there was not one for the whole building for her person to answer to.
- Kaisey asked what kind of response Malik had gotten from the fraternities. Malik replied that the fraternities she had approached were those with whom her commission had connections. She said this would serve as a kind of pilot program.
- Saucedo asked about the Recruitment Fair, to which Malik replied that it would be conducted during lunchtime on Wednesday.

**Facilities Commissioner – P.C. Zai**

- Zai said that she wanted to thank McLaren for letting everyone know that Sunset Recreation Center was going to be closed. She also said that Westwood Boulevard might be closed on Wednesday for the Millennium Ball. Zai told Council that she had recently toured the on-campus power plant and said that, in an hour-and-a-half tour, she had learned that UCLA generates three types of power and could support 85% of the campus's power needs. Zai also said that the new Bruin Walkers program had already registered 1,700 students, and 900 students had picked up their pedometers from her. She also congratulated Saucedo on the gender-neutral bathrooms, and added that Wooden Center would be setting up a gender-neutral locker room.
- Kaisey asked where the UCLA Power Plant was, to which Zai said it was south of Parking Structure 8.

**Internal Vice President – Gregory Cendana**

- Cendana said that he had met with the Darfur Action Committee, and said that they were making lots of progress with the divestment campaign. He said that there would also be a free exhibit at the Hammer Museum coming up, and encouraged everyone to attend. Cendana also said that after Governance Day, he would be meeting with the Campus Retention Committee, and said that they would hopefully be building relationships on that front. He also said that he and Araabi were working on the Student Social Justice Network, and told Council that applications were

available on his and Saucedo's websites. Cendana also noted that he was not doing the Agendas anymore, and was very happy about this. Cendana said that he would be collecting dates from USAC about their events, and would then be forwarding that information to the various student organizations. Cendana also said that Parking Services might be giving a presentation to Council as he was still confused about all of it. He lastly said that he was very excited about "So You Think You Can Dance?" which was going to be on the 18<sup>th</sup>.

- Price asked Cendana if he would be sending the compiled USAC events to Council, to which he said that he would. Price also asked if he would be sending that information to the student groups. Cendana answered that he would as long as they had opted-in to receiving emails.

#### **External Vice President – Tina Park**

*External Vice President Tina Park's Officer Report is attached to the Minutes*

*Questions and comments followed Park's report.*

- Nelson said that one thing that had not been discussed was the fact that this was one of the most important mid-term elections that the country had ever faced. He pointed out that if one could not impress upon college students the need to vote, then what hope was there for the rest of the country. Nelson said that Council really needed to sell what democracy was all about, and why it was important to vote.
- Dehar asked if it was possible to register online. Park said that it was, but she didn't recommend doing so. She said the advantage to registering through her office was that they would double-check each application to make sure that it was completely filled in and, if it wasn't, they could have the student complete it correctly. She explained further that if someone registered on-line, but their application was incomplete, it would be sent back to them and they might miss the deadline. In addition, Park said that registering through her office would be a better way to keep track of how many UCLA students had said that it was an easier way to count the numbers.
- Schuster asked how Park determined who went to UCSA and USSA meetings. Park replied that she outreached to students who were interested in participating and who would be able to bring back to UCLA students what they had learned at the meetings. Sargent asked if these were open meetings which anyone could attend. Park said that was correct.
- Kaisey asked Park to email out the agendas and locations of future meetings.

#### **President – Marwa Kaisey**

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

*Questions and comments followed Kaisey's report.*

- Doria asked how strict the CSP Advisors were about the application deadlines for SOOF funding. Nelson said that this was a good question and, even though his personal opinion was that the applications should be turned in five days in advance, he did not want to see this timeline enforced to the detriment of the students. He said his main concern was that all the groups be given a full review of their proposals by their advisors so they were all treated as fairly as possible. Nelson said that he didn't have a mandate regarding the five days, but he did recommend it. He said that he personally had managed to read all of the applications that he received, but pointed out that he didn't have to review as many applications as most of the other advisors did.
- Kaisey said she thought there might not be an awareness that the proposals were to be submitted five days in advance of the deadline.
- Sargent asked why the BOD Programming applications had to have the signature of a CSP Advisor, to which Tuttle replied that it was because the BOD Programming Fund included mandatorily collected student fees. Nelson added that it was not only mandated by the funding boards, but that it also tended to result in better and more complete proposals.
- Doria said that he wanted to add this as an item on the Agenda for the following meeting as it was an issue that had concerned him for some time.
- Tuttle said that, even though he was not on the CSP staff, he had observed the increase of CSP's workload over the years. He said that one of the things Council might want to look at was how that workload might be alleviated. Nelson added by saying that there was a time when he was not the advisor for any of the groups, but that now there were just too many groups for the rest of the staff to advise without his taking on some of the work.

- Kaisey asked who would be coming to the Bienvenidos event, to which Doria said that he would be there from 11:00 to noon, Jang would be there from 11:00 to 12:30, Araabi would be there the whole time, Dehar would be there from 1:30 to 2:00, Saucedo would be present from 11:00 to 11:30, Zai would be there from noon to 12:30, and Cendana, Park and Caba were managing their own table.

X. Old Business

**USAC Action Agenda Items**

- Kaisey said that everyone had already had time to talk to their staffs, and said that it was time to decide which USAC Action Items to keep.
- Schuster moved and Price seconded to make Student Voice a USAC Action Agenda Item.
- Sargent said that his concern about this item was that it is so internally focused that it not appear that USAC was doing anything incredible. Schuster disagreed, saying he thought that this was exactly what the student body demanded.
- Araabi said that he liked the idea behind this item, but said that there didn't seem to be any single unifying theme behind it that would bring all of the students together. Price said that she disagreed, saying that this was perhaps the only item that was a unified goal for all of Council, the leaders of the student body. She said that there were things that all of the offices could contribute, and it was something that all of the offices held as a goal.
- Cendana asked if this would require a majority vote to become an Action Agenda Item, to which Kaisey said that she wanted consensus. Cendana said that he didn't think that was going to happen.
- Sargent said that if there were any items on the list that some offices couldn't do or wouldn't do, he thought they should be whittled off the list. Kaisey suggested voting on each item, with a majority vote indicating approval of the item, and then allowing people who didn't want to work on a particular item to remove themselves from any single issue.
- Doria said that Council was approving items based on the assumption that everyone would go along and would work on the items even if they voted against them. Kaisey asked Doria if he had a concrete suggestion, to which he replied that he didn't feel this item was as powerful as was being implied and didn't think it deserved as much time as Council had already spent on it.
- Price said that she didn't like the idea of individuals being able to pull themselves from items, saying that she felt it was necessary that, regardless of how many Council Members worked on an item, it was important that everyone on Council support the items. Park said that she did not think that was an issue, as nobody was going to actively work against the other Council Members' items. She said that she certainly wouldn't be working against any of the items, even though she would want to remove herself from some of the items.
- Sargent said that, to piggyback on Park's comments and to move forward with the spirit that Kaisey had implied, perhaps Council should aim for a two-thirds vote on each item rather than a majority vote. Sargent also said that, if Council ended up with no Action Agenda Items or Foci, it would give the impression that USAC couldn't agree on anything.
- Nelson said he recalled that, at the last meeting, it had been agreed that Council members would consult with their staff members to determine what each office thought they could handle. He asked what had come of that plan.
- Dehar said, with regard to Affordability and Social Justice, his office would not be willing or able to plan those events, although they would certainly offer their assistance to someone else who wanted to plan them.
- Saucedo said that he had spoken with his staff, and he was not sure exactly what was expected of his office specifically, or what was expected of the General Representatives Office in general. Kaisey said that she thought Price would appreciate any help that Saucedo's office could provide.
- Park said that she had discussed the issues with her staff, and they had attempted to determine which ones were actually feasible and could meet with success. She said that they were all good ideas, but didn't all have the potential to really accomplish anything by the end of the year.

- Price asked Park if she wanted to do Get Out the Vote or a Systemwide Vote, to which Park said that her office was doing those already. She said her point was that she thought several of these were good ideas but that they had intangible goals.
- Caba said that she had spoken with her directors, and they had been interested in the Student Voice Art Gallery.
- Kaisey took Council to a vote on the motion.
- Caba asked if by voting for an issue a Council Member was pledging their office's support, to which Kaisey said that someone could vote in favor of an Action Agenda Item but still remove themselves from working on it.
- Council voted to make Student Voice a USAC Action Item with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 abstentions.
- Price asked if these votes required a simple majority or if they needed two-thirds, to which Kaisey said that it was simple majority. Cendana said that he also thought two-thirds was better, otherwise all of the proposed Action Agenda Items were going to pass. Kaisey conceded, saying that the vote to approve would be two-thirds.
- Saucedo moved and Malik seconded to make Campus Safety a USAC Action Agenda Item.
- Price said that she had concerns about campus safety as an action item, which were that she felt it should incorporate more about emotional safety and mental health. She said that she also thought there was too much emphasis on hate crimes, and said that if there was to be a campus safety push, then it should be focused on more common crimes, such as theft.
- Schuster said that he thought Student Voice was a good item, and said that if Council was to approve another item, he thought they should "package-deal" campus safety and mental health in the way they had packaged the Student Voice item.
- Doria agreed that Campus Safety was a stretch as an Action Agenda Item, as it sensationalized problems on campus without really accomplishing much. He said that he thought appointing a single liaison to the UCPD could accomplish just as much.
- Saucedo said that the item was really more about emotional well-being, and said that there were pointed goals like the providing of information about hate crimes.
- Sargent said that in order to streamline this discussion, he recommended making specific recommendations to alter the goals.
- Caba said, in response to Price, she really liked Campus Safety, and said that she didn't think hate crime awareness was a stretch, and said that it was an aspect of student life that needed to be addressed. She said that she knew people personally who had been victims of hate crimes on campus.
- Jang moved and Dehar seconded to Call the Question on the Motion to make Campus Safety a USAC Action Agenda Item.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the Motion to make Campus Safety a USAC Action Agenda Item with a vote of 7 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Zai said that in her three meetings with Nancy Greenstein from UCPD, she had learned that there were really very few hate crimes on campus, and added that she felt that putting emphasis on this issue created fear and general panic about hate crimes. She also said that she thought this was really a facilities issue, and said she thought she should have been included in this item.
- Nelson said that it was important not to cause panic, but at the same time there were a lot of crimes that went unreported. He said he thought it was important to increase awareness on this matter.
- Schuster said that there was a lot of discussion about this item, and he said that his focus was on freshmen and transfers, so he would like those issues to be discussed together.
- Price asked if someone could make a motion while there was a motion already on the table, to which Sargent said that one could.
- Schuster moved and Zai seconded to add First Year Transfers Adjustment as a USAC Action Agenda Item in the same Motion to make Campus Safety a USAC Action Agenda Item.
- Council voted not to add First Year Transfers Adjustment as a USAC Action Agenda Item in the same Motion to make Campus Safety a USAC Action Agenda Item with a vote of 4 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention.

- Schuster moved and Dehar seconded to Call the Question on the Motion to make Campus Safety a USAC Action Agenda Item.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the Motion to make Campus Safety a USAC Action Agenda Item with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Council voted against the motion to make Campus Safety a USAC Action Agenda Item with a vote of 7 in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Doria moved and Schuster seconded to close the discussion on USAC Action Agenda Items.
- Council voted not to close the discussion on USAC Action Agenda Items with a vote of 5 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Park moved and Caba seconded to make Diversity a USAC Action Agenda Item.
- Zai asked Tuttle, Sargent, and Nelson if USAC could sponsor such a goal which was potentially in conflict with Proposition 209. Nelson said that it seemed to him that people could say what they wanted to but, when it came to admissions, that was something that was mandated by the state. He said that Council members could essentially take whatever stance they wanted.
- Park said that the UC Regents had also taken a stance on this issue, so Council would be acting under the same framework as the Regents were working under.
- Price said that Council had to represent the goals of the students at UCLA, and said that they had to think about whether or not they were representing the students at UCLA and whether or not this was what they wanted.
- Doria said that he thought Council could make a statement without violating Prop 209, but not take any action. Nelson said that this was not the case.
- Park said that nobody wanted to make a blind law that simply granted admission to minorities, but said that the goal was to reexamine the admissions process in order to provide a chance for for underprivileged students to gain access to the university.
- Schuster said that people who had been at a CUARS meeting knew that nobody can say “increasing racial diversity through admissions...” He said that this was something that USAC could not endorse.
- Caba said that this was an issue that existed at UCLA that needed addressing, whether or not one agreed with the importance and value of diversity on campus.
- Araabi said that the diversity crisis facing UCLA was the issue of this time, and Council had to do something rather than sitting on their hands.
- Schuster said that USAC was going to do what USAC was going to do, and said that they should work on this but not make it an official Action Agenda Item.
- Cendana moved to Call the Question on the Motion to make Diversity a USAC Action Agenda Item.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the Motion to make Diversity a USAC Action Agenda Item with a vote of 8 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Kaisey reminded Council that an abstention was an abstention, and that a 2/3 vote of the voting members would be required for passage.
- Council voted to make Diversity a USAC Action Agenda Item with a vote of 7 in favor, 2 opposed, and 3 abstentions.
- Price moved and Schuster seconded to reconsider.
- Council voted not to reconsider with a vote of 4 in favor, 8 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Schuster moved and Cendana seconded to make both First Year Transfer Students Adjustment and Campus Safety USAC Action Items, and to close the discussion.
- Tuttle said that there was a multiple motion on the floor, and recommended that Council consider this carefully. He said that if someone did not want to vote the package, then someone could make a motion to amend the motion to separate the votes.
- Cendana said that this was a split Council, and in the best interest of all the students, if they could cooperate on these four issues, then this was a pretty good workload which would allow

them to reach the most students possible. He said he thought that a lot of this talking was pointless, and Council should really move on with the Agenda.

- Council voted to make both First Year Transfer Students Adjustment and Campus Safety USAC Action Items, and to close the discussion, with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

## XI. New Business

### **USAC Open House**

- Saucedo said that he wanted to open up a discussion for any comments on how the USAC Open House had gone.
- Park said that she had gotten 15 people signed up for her office, so she was very happy. She said that she had gotten a lot of requests for having the option of a guided tour. Saucedo said that had been the intent, but there had not been enough volunteers to lead the tours.
- Kaisey asked what people thought about combining the USAC and Student Activities Center Open Houses, to which Cendana said that he had heard people expressing interest in that already.
- Dehar suggested that, in future years, they print a map so people could find their way to the Open House .
- Cendana said that he liked that there was so much good food available.
- Kaisey said that she thought it had been a cool event, but would like to have even more students participate next year.
- Cendana suggested maybe having all of the student organizations in Kerckhoff have their Open House at the same time as USAC's.

### **\*Application for USAC Faculty, Staff, & Administrator Recognition Award**

- Schuster moved and Jang seconded to approve the guidelines for the USAC Faculty, Staff, & Administrator Recognition Award.
- Sargent said that, technically speaking, the word administrator was a little loaded. He said that there was Staff and there was Faculty. Sargent suggested making this a staff award. Schuster directed Sargent to Section 2.e. which outlined who was qualified. Sargent countered that he didn't think Faculty members would want to be referred to as Administrators.
- Kaisey suggested changing 2.e. to "faculty / administrator." Sargent said that might be a good idea.
- Zai suggested using the words "administrators and student support..." or something like that. Sargent said his main point was that Faculty members might not want to be referred to as Administrators.
- Kaisey suggested cutting out "undergraduate" in 2.e.
- Nelson suggested that Schuster use, "Faculty/Staff/Administration." He agreed with Sargent that Faculty members do not like to be called Administrators. He said, in addition, that if an award entitled "Administrator Award" was given to a junior member of the Faculty, an award with the name might actually work to their disadvantage.
- Schuster suggested they consider calling it "Professional Leadership Award".
- Sargent suggested making several separate awards. He said that might even be more valuable.
- Tuttle said he would recommend going with "Faculty/Staff/Administration Award."
- Schuster accepted Tuttle's amendment to his motion.
- Kaisey said that she would want to see a score-sheet of some sort that would be used to determine the recipient of this award. Schuster said that was exactly what he wanted to avoid. Kaisey said that she just wanted him to outline what his vision was for the future.
- Sargent said that he thought it was good to have a very general framework.
- Zai said that one question Council should ask is if award winners could apply and win more than once. Kaisey asked Schuster if there were any such stipulations, to which Schuster said that there were not. Kaisey asked him if there should be, to which he said that he didn't think so.
- McLaren said she had a couple of revisions to recommend. She said that the term "Officially Recognized Student Organizations" should be changed to "Campus Registered Student Organizations" because of the recent changes to the registration process. In addition, she

suggested that Schuster might want to clarify the language in Section 3.a. Schuster said what he was trying to convey was his hope that the awards plaque would be put on display in Murphy Hall.

- Council voted to approve the Guidelines for the USAC Faculty, Staff, Administration Recognition Award with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

#### **Building Relationships with the Administration**

- Schuster asked Tuttle if Council had ever had representatives from the Academic Senate. Tuttle replied that there was a seat on the Council for a member of the Academic Senate but that seat had not been filled for some years.
- Sargent said that when he was on USAC, from 1992-1995, the Vice-Chair of the Academic Senate came to the USAC meetings once a quarter.
- Kaisey said that she had spoken to Judi Smith about this after Governance Day, and said that Smith had expressed interest in having someone from the Academic Senate begin coming to the USAC meetings again.
- Tuttle said that he thought it had been a little strange back in the day when the faculty actually had a vote on USAC, but said he thought it would be great to have a representative again. He said this could even go hand-in-hand with the Faculty/Staff/Administration Recognition Award that Schuster is establishing.
- Tuttle said that back in the 1960s, when the Black students were having sit-ins, the Vietnam War was almost over, and that students who were the age of the present Council members were active in the Civil Rights movement, the Administration had taken an interest in all of these activities. Tuttle said that if someone from the Administration could relate to students in the way that former Chancellor Charles E. Young could, that would be the ideal. He said that Young was not selected as Chancellor because of his fundraising ability, but rather because he could relate to students, and it was great to have robust discussions with the Faculty back in his time.
- Schuster said that he loved the subject under discussion, but said it had been a long night and that he would like to continue this discussion with all interested parties at another time.

#### XII. Announcements

- Dehar said that there was a concert coming up.
- Caba said that the Jazz Series was starting up again and would be held on Mondays from 7:00 to 9:00p.m. in the Kerckhoff Coffee House.
- Malik said that the CSC Fair would be on Wednesday, and that there would be food and activities.
- Zai said that the Transportation Fair would be held on Thursday.
- Jang said that SWC was having a Blood for Books Drive on Wednesday and Thursday.

#### XIII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

#### XIV. Adjournment

- Cendana moved and Park seconded to adjourn.
- Council voted to adjourn the meeting at 11:20 p.m. with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

#### XV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,  
Michael Keesler  
USAC Minutes Taker