

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday May 11, 2010
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Flores, Bawa, Li, Banani, Wu, Nguyen, Lin, Farmer, Faelnar, Mullins, Tengco, Huddy, Tep, Tan, Geller, Nelson, Casillas, Tressel, Zimmerman.

ABSENT: Williams

GUESTS: Jeremiah Garcia, Ramie Milo, Jan Victor Andason, Jesus Ceballos, Coreen Weintraub, Parisa Mahdad, Sarah Ravani, Kelly Zhou, Andra Lim, Shoshee Jau, Aylin Kuzuean, Sheena Santamaria, Kristine Isidla, Luz Maria Kumpel.

I. A. Call to Order

- Flores called the meeting to order at 7:08 pm.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet was passed around.

II. Approval of the Agenda

-Bawa asked to add the approval of stipend eligibility as an action item. She also added the approval of the election results, and the ballot randomization proposal.

-Banani added an officer report.

-Lu added an officer report.

-Nguyen asked to add ballot randomization as a special presentation.

-Tep asked to strike her report for the Academic Affairs Mini Grant.

-Faelnar asked to strike the report for the Cultural Affairs mini grant.

-Nguyen moved and Mullins seconded to approve the agenda, as amended.

- Flores called for Acclamation. Flores asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the agenda was approved, as amended.

III. Approval of the Minutes

A. *5/4/2010

- Nguyen moved and Li seconded to approve the minutes for May 4, 2010, as presented

- Flores called for Acclamation. Flores asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the minutes were approved, as amended.

IV. Public Comments

A. Coreen Weintraub--CALPIRG

Weintraub came to the meeting to thank members for the partnership formed between USAC and CALPIRG. She also introduced the organization to the incoming council. She discussed some of the main campaigns of the organization.

V. Special Presentations

A. Ballot Randomization –Tak Nguyen and Hector Lucero

-Nguyen and Lucero waited to make this proposal until the past elections concluded. The intention is to randomize the way in which names appear on the online ballot for USAC elections. The candidate ballot positions are currently randomly drawn at candidate orientation. Currently the British Single Transferable voting system is in effect, and was piloted in 2007 by Gabe Rose. The program implemented the concept of ranking candidates into the ballot. Nguyen presented a report of the winners, and demonstrated what he feels is a correlation between victory and place on the ballot. The proposal is to randomize ballot positions for each candidate. The names will appear in each position 20% of the time.

-Li said that she is having trouble with the perceived correlation to the winners and their position on the ballot.

-Nguyen said that candidates have been shown to win because of their position on the ballot.

-Flores said that the report in the presentation is incorrect.

-Farmer said that he does not see any correlation between the variables presented. He said that individual slates might possibly position their candidates in the order in which they feel they will win. He says that the correlation presented might be due to an improper conclusion.

-Nguyen said that he feels the position on the ballot affects victories in elections. He said that he does not feel that the randomization would make the vote unfair for any candidates.

-Huddy said that randomization is implemented in governmental elections. He echoed Nguyen's opinion by arguing that position on the ballot can effect election results.

-Tengco asked if all governmental election ballots are randomized.

-Huddy said that every ballot is randomized.

-Tep said that she does not see the correlation between ballot order and winners of elections.

-Nguyen said that he does not have an issue with the system, he has a problem with the order on the ballot.

-Bawa asked if this proposal would only affect the General Representative section of the ballot, adding that she would not be against the idea of implementing the new proposal for one particular section.

-Mullins said that with the new system, there would be no way for a bias or partisan situation. He asked Lucero to express his opinion on the proposal and his reasoning for supporting the idea.

-Lucero said that there are many uniformed voters on campus, and feels that candidates in the primary slots on the ballot might benefit from their position.

-Nguyen assured council that this proposal is coming as an unbiased idea.

-Lucero said that it is important to empathize with candidates who are affected by ballot position.

-Farmer asked if MyUCLA services have even verified the possibility of implementing the new system.

-Nguyen said that MyUCLA would first need to have council support before examining the feasibility of the idea.

-Tressel felt that the issue was being brought up backwards. He stated that it would be preferable to know whether or not the idea was even feasible before implementing the new voting system.

-Flores said that some of the errors presented at the beginning raise doubts in her mind of the perceived correlative effect. She said that there should be a conversation of feasibility and whether or not the evidence presented suggests an idea that the council should consider. She also said that the argument made in favor of randomization does not indicate a need for this program to be implemented.

-Flores thanked Nguyen for the presentation.

VI. Appointments

There were no appointments to be approved at this meeting.

VII. Fund Allocations

A. Academic Success Referendum Fund

-Tep said that a total of \$1160.43 was requested from ASRF; of that, a total of \$810.43 was allocated to the Incarcerated Youth Tutorial Project and the Vietnamese Student Union.

B. Academic Affairs Mini-Grant

There was no business for the Academic Affairs Mini-Grant this week.

C. External Vice President Travel Grant

-Li said that a total of \$1,500.00 for the External Vice President Travel Grant was requested; of that, a total of \$930.00 was allocated.

-There were a total of three funding requests made by MEChA de UCLA.

D. Cultural Affairs Mini-Grant

There was no business for the Cultural Affairs Mini-Grant this week.

E. *Contingency Allocations

-Tan said that a total of \$31,236.20 was requested from Contingency; of that, a total of \$8,707.05 is recommended for allocation for this week.

-The groups requesting funding were Queer Alliance, Pilipino Transfer Student Partnership, Pilipino Recruitment and Enrichment Program, Hunger Project, Effective Activism Collective (ESAC), Grupo Folklorico de UCLA, HOOLIGAN, Iranian Student Group, Campus Events Commission, and the Nigerian Students Association (NSA).

-Tengco asked how much funding is remaining in the account.

-Tan said that a substantial amount is still in the fund.

-Lin said that the deadline to submit funding applications for Capital Contingency was on Monday. However, contingency has a deadline of May 28th.

-Flores asked council members to discuss deadlines with Tan after the meeting.

-Banani yielded the floor to Mullins.

-Banani moved and Lin seconded to approve the Contingency Allocations as presented by Tan.

-Flores called for Acclamation. Flores asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation.

There being none, the Contingency Allocations recommending \$8707.05 were approved, as amended.

F. *Capital Contingency

-Tan said that a total of \$9640.50 was requested from Capital Contingency; of that, a total of \$3118.85 is recommended for allocation for this week.

-The groups requesting funding this week were the Office of the General Representative 2, Academic Affairs Commission, The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), and the Office of the External Vice President.

-Banani moved and Mullins seconded to approve the Contingency Allocations as presented by Tan.

-Flores called for Acclamation. Flores asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation.

There being none, the Contingency Allocations recommending \$3118.85 were approved, as amended.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

President – Cinthia Flores

Flores said that she will be attending the final board meeting of the Alumni Association, and will be bringing Jasmine Hill. Today, Flores met with Geller to discuss a housing proposal. Her office also worked to make the hill a more student friendly environment (she mentioned the new food closet in De Neve Residential Hall). Flores will be attending the downtown LA Cal Grant rally tomorrow, and will be hosting a second installment of the Latina Symposium. Her office has also been working on critical pieces of legislation, and will be hosting the Sustainability Summit on May 25.

Internal Vice President – Shahida Bawa

Bawa said that the BruINTENT director application has been released and she will be working on the program outside of USAC next year. She announced the commencement student speaker for this year, Flavia de la Fuente. The process will be continued in years to come, and Bawa is looking to increase the

number of students on the committee. The SREC will be compiling a request to allow student groups to use the UCLA name on affiliated documents. She will also be attending the UC wide Policy Conference in June, as a rep from SREC to discuss what UCLA has done to implement student risk programs on campus.

External Vice President- Susan Li

Li said that she went to UC Berkeley to conduct interviews for the incoming student regent, and the UC Regents will be announcing the name of the selected candidate at a later date. UCSA passed a resolution to mobilize for the DREAM act, and she hopes that the incoming External Vice President will continue the proposal. Chris Santos will be proposing the UCSA budget to the new council at the next meeting. The goal is to get approval from each of the UC Campuses. The rally scheduled for tomorrow will be centered on March fee raises, but is also about preserving the CAL grant program. The EVP office will have a lobby instruction day hosted by the advocacy office. Li will be white lining at the UC Regents meeting next week. Within the next month, the regents will be making many decisions in regards to differential fees. This Thursday, Li will be at the University of Wisconsin, Madison for the USSA board meeting.

Academic Affairs Commissioner—Layhannara Tep

-Tep said that she spoke with administrators about training for the PEER counseling program. She will develop specific ways for PEER counselors to address enrollment questions, and will be implementing a system of counselors with a specific focus. She is planning on meeting with individual academic departments to discuss implementing a policy of teaching courses on more days, for less time. Follow up conversations will be handled by Suza Khy. She has decided to have the next council review topics presented by Judith Smith and the first recommendation for the Institutional Aid proposal has been issued. The first round of the process will be followed by recommendations by other campuses.

Community Service Commissioner—Farhan Banani

-Banani said that the first accomplishment of his office this year was to pioneer the use of Microsoft Power Point for officer reports. Some events hosted by his office this year were Community Service day, Mini Community Service days, and Promoting Individuality through the Arts (PITA). The Community Service Days had an emphasis on restoring buildings and parks, working with the elderly, and helping the homeless. The smaller events were focused on specific issues and were held during the winter. PITA brought youth from neighborhoods in Los Angeles to hold enrichment workshops. There were over 200 kids in attendance this year that had the opportunity to take lessons in Tae Kwan Do, arts and crafts, and dance. Banani discussed the transfer of keys to the Ackerman A Level, which increased efficiency. He said that work by his office has also increased the fleet size to 12 vans, which lowered the cost of vans for projects. The Ackerman Union replaced an old van as well, which decreased management costs and improved safety. Banani said that work with SREC has introduced Livescans, youth safety training, and DMV pulls from driver records which provided quicker updates on driving records. A declaration of non-sponsorship of RCOs has been made, and now there is a movement via risk management initiatives to find liability coverage. Banani said that his commission has also worked to establish a space for a Community Service Commission representative within the Volunteer Center Fellow. The purpose of having a representative is to provide student voice in the volunteer center.

Student Welfare Commissioner—Lucy Wu

Wu said that her Commission held a Super CPR program and certified 140 people. She thanked Roll AIDS participants for their help. She said that Sexual Health Day was held on Thursday, and she shared results from a survey conducted in regards to sexual health. Wu felt that the responses were interesting, and said that Bruin health week was a success.

IX. Old Business

There was no Old Business this week.

X. New Business

A. Approval of the USA Budget—Roy Champawat

-The total amount of income in the budget for the 2010-2011 fiscal year is \$3,800,729, and the total amount of expenses is \$3,631,067.

-Farmer moved and Faelnar seconded to approve the USA Preliminary budget for the 2010-2011 school year.

-Farmer said that he expected to see a decrease in the numbers presented.

-Champawat said that membership fees might have been increased as a result of PLEDGE.

-Geller questioned why some PLEDGE referendum fees are not listed in the preliminary budget.

-Champawat said that the fees are collected by the Registrar and are then handled through the administration. He said that the band fee was bundled with the fee collection but is not a part of the expenses presented.

-Tengco moved and Li seconded to call the motion on the table to question. There were no objections.

-The council voted to unanimously approve the USA Preliminary Budget for 2010-2011 with a vote of 12 in favor, 0 in opposition, and 0 abstentions.

B. Stipend Eligibility, Proposed bylaw addition—Shahida Bawa

Proposed bylaw addition: Article I. Section C. 5:

“If an elected official is ineligible to receive a stipend, at the individual’s discretion, a staff member may receive the allocated stipend in lieu of the elected council member.”

-Bawa moved and Li seconded to include the following bylaw proposal.

-Banani said that the language presented leaves room for misinterpretation, and proposed the following friendly amendment:

“If an elected official chooses not to take his or her stipend, a staff member from that elected official's office may be eligible to receive the allocated stipend in lieu of the elected official.”

-Farmer said that the way the language is framed still leaves room for misinterpretation. He proposed the following friendly amendment:

“If an elected official is unable to take his or her stipend, a staff member from that elected official's office may be eligible to receive the allocated stipend in lieu of the elected official.”

-Mullins questioned the rationale for the proposal, and said that the proposed bylaw addition could create a lack of transparency.

-Flores said that the person who would be held accountable for audits of funds would be the elected officer.

-Farmer said that this type of situation should occur only as a consent item at USAC meeting, in order to be included on the record.

-Mullins said that the proposal leaves room for any individual to receive funding. He cited stipend limits determined by the SGA, and mentioned that the officer stipend could overthrow the guidelines established by SGA.

-Flores said that council members have been entrusted by the student body to make responsible fiduciary decisions, and said that officers will act responsibly.

-Huddy questioned whether or not the council was addressing the central issue at hand. He asked if there is a way to work with ASUCLA to determine eligibility issues.

-Bawa said that she prefers the inclusion of the friendly amendment proposed by Banani.

-Flores said that these stipends have affected students’ tax statuses and financial aid status, as well.

-Geller said that her understanding is that the proposed friendly amendment should be clarified, as the issue at hand does not appear to be semantically linked to the original intention.

- Farmer said that his rationale was to address personal concerns, and said that he understands the opinion of Geller.
- Li asked if the council is focusing on the inability to accept stipends, or on the choice to allocate funding.
- Banani asked if Farmer can remove his amendment. Flores said that the amendment is now a property of the body as a whole, and cannot be withdrawn.
- Champawat asked what the mechanism would be to determine the process of how the funds will be allocated.
- Nelson raised concerns with the possibility of socialization determining how these funds are allocated.
- Wu said that it might be beneficial to be specific in terms of office names.
- Lin said that issues could be raised considering the various ways that offices are constructed. She suggested proposing a bylaw devising a system that would allow officers to set aside funds to a specific pot for personal allocation.
- Champawat raised concerns with the way in which the bylaws are being proposed at the current time. He mentioned specific situations in the past which led to problems.
- Zimmerman said that bylaw additions are traditionally guided through a specific process, including the verification of constitutionality.
- Flores said that SGA was consulted about the situation and said that the Constitutionality of the bylaw was analyzed.
- Champawat said that he finds the current process to be troubling because of the failure to follow set guidelines.
- Faelnar offered to draft a friendly amendment which would take Lin's idea into consideration.
- Huddy said that he understands the concerns voiced by Champawat, and said that he would feel comfortable with having the CRC analyze the bylaw proposal before voting at the current meeting. He said that he would feel most comfortable with having the next council vote on the proposal, as the issue is not time sensitive.
- Tengco feels that the council should vote on the question of stipends, as the stipend will affect future councils. He expressed support for the friendly amendment being drafted by Lin.
- Nguyen said that he respects the judgment of Champawat and Zimmerman, and feels that it would be beneficial to table the idea.
- Mullins said he does not disagree with the idea, but said that the bylaw addition should follow the set out guidelines.
- Li echoed the sentiments of Tengco, and apologized for not following established procedure.
- Tressel said that it would not be wise to hand down a contentious issue to the next council, and said that approving the amendment could create problems.
- Flores said that the issue is not regarding choice, but inability to accept stipends. She said the intention is to address the issue of inability to accept stipends.
- Geller said that she is unclear about the intentions. She said that stipend amounts were set at specific levels according to the level of work performed by office staff. She could support a quick action which would simply set aside funds to a commission budget, expecting the officer to distribute funding according to university policy and guidelines. She said that the possibility of abuse is not being addressed comprehensively.
- Farmer said that the current process is unfair, and yielded the floor to Faelnar to issue her friendly amendment. Faelnar proposed the following friendly amendment:

"If an elected official is unable to or chooses not to take his or her stipend, the official has an option to yield their allocated stipend into the budget of that elected official's office."

- Huddy asked where the funding would be allocated.
- Tan said that the proposed language would just be a reaffirmation of the guidelines in place. He said that the pool of money is for all offices.
- Lin said that the Campus Events Commission assistant stipends are distributed through a specific funding source within the office, and asked where USAC funding is usually derived from.
- Champawat said that generalized fees fund the overhead budgetary expenses.
- Nguyen said that he feels that there is not a consensus in regards to the issue on the table. He said that it would be responsible for the council to follow guidelines. While there might be a conflict of interest, he still feels that the next council should be trusted.

- Lin said that she questions whether or not the incoming council would understand parliamentary procedure and guidelines, which is her rationale to push the vote through.
- Flores called for a ten minute recess at 9:02PM.
- Flores called the meeting back in session at 9:13PM, and the conversation resumed.
- Lin said that the current proposed language allows offices flexibility and still abides by SGA regulations.
- Bawa clarified issues through a discussion with Champawat and Zimmerman, and proposed the following friendly amendment:

“If an elected official is unable to take his or her stipend, the official has an option to yield their allocated stipend into the budget of that elected official's office.”

- Mullins said that the amendment still leaves room for the possibility of a SGA guideline violation.
- Bawa said that because SGOF is independent of these funds, it would not be implicated in this process at all.
- Champawat said that he is more comfortable with the ideas conveyed through the language presented by Bawa. He said that this would revert to a more stable system.
- Lin said that transferring funds to general office funds would leave room for a transparent system of allocation.
- Bawa moved and Li seconded to call the friendly amendment to question. There were no objections.
- The final proposed friendly amendment, proposed by Bawa, was approved by the council, with a total of 9 in favor, 0 in opposition, and 3 abstentions.

C. Approval of the 2010 USAC Election Results—Hector Lucero, Elections Board Chair

- Lucero commended the work of the victorious candidates, and also applauded present council members for a year of success. He announced the following victorious candidates: Jasmine Hill, Stephanie Lucas, Chris Santos, Suza Khy, Rustom Z. Birdie, Jamie Yao, Linda Phi, Kinnery Shah, JC De Vera, Matt Spring, Emily Resnick, and Gatsby Miller.
- Tengco moved and Mullins seconded to approve the 2010 USAC Election Results. There were no objections.
- The 2010 USAC Election results were approved unanimously with a total of 12 in favor, 0 in opposition, and 0 abstentions.

D. Randomization of the Ballot Order—Tak Nguyen

- Nguyen spoke to Elections Board officials, and decided to remove the issue from the table to allow the new council to make a more educated decision regarding the idea.
- Nguyen moved and Bawa seconded to withdraw the proposed randomization from the agenda.

XI. Announcements

- Tengco said that a trip to the Griffith Observatory is taking place on May 27th.
- Aziz Ansari will be offering a free comedy show and Q & A on Monday at 9PM. Far East Movement will be on campus Wednesday night in Ackerman Grand Ballroom. The Campus Events Commission is presenting the UCLA Jack Benny award to Judd Apatow in June.
- Nguyen said that Meal Swipes for the Homeless will be taking place near the end of the quarter, and all food will be going to the food closet in the Student Activities Center.
- SWC is co-hosting an “I love UCLA” blood drive with the Student Alumni Association. On May 23rd, the 5K Bruin Run/Walk is being held.
- Li said that the downtown rally is taking place tomorrow, and all buses have been paid for by UC San Diego.
- The last round of student Jazz/Reggae tickets will be distributed on May 25th. Faelnar said that CAC has volunteer forms available on the office website.
- Zimmerman made an announcement about the USAC Installation, scheduled for June 1st. She also passed around invitations.

XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet was passed around.

XIII. Adjournment

-Banani yielded the floor to Wu.

-Wu moved and Lin seconded to adjourn the meeting.

- Flores called for Acclamation. Flores asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation.

There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30p.m. by Acclamation.

XIV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,

Joseph Casillas
USAC Minutes Taker
2009-2010