

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

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

PRESENT: Jasmine Hill, Stephanie Lucas, Cris Santos, Emily Resnick, Gatsby Miller, Suza Khy, Charles Ma, Jamie Yao, Kinnery Shah, JC De Vera, Rustom Birdie, Linda Phi, Bob Williams, Dr. Deb Geller, Dr. Berky Nelson, Katrina Dimacali, Willard Tressel, Patty Zimmerman, Isaac Rose

ABSENT: Stephanie Lucas, Gatsby Miller

GUESTS:

I. A. Call to Order

- Hill called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

II. Approval of the Agenda

-Santos moved to strike Ramera from the election board.

-Birdie moved to strike the internal vice president report

-Khy moved to strike the ASRF funding report.

- Resnick moved to approve the agenda, as amended.

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

III. Approval of the Minutes

-Spring moved to approve the minutes. Shah seconded.

Hill called for Acclamation. Hill asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the minutes from 11/30/10 were approved, as amended.

IV. Public Comments

*There were no public comments this week.*

V. Special Presentations

*There were no Special Presentations this week.*

VI. Appointments

Patrick Ahrens– Elections Board

-Ahrens was here to approve 4 people to the elections board. He said that he felt like they would be impartial to these positions. He said that they are actively interested in student government and are able to objectively look at student government elections.

-Hill asked for the age demographic

Ahrens said one is an exchange student from England and is competent in USAC. She was involved in leadership in her other college. Justin Reyes is a transfer student. He was president of his college campus there. Ashley Lobe is also a transfer student. He has had extensive one-on-ones with these people and represent a diverse number of opinions. They represent different groups on campus.

-Santos said that in terms of the roles they are going to fulfill will be decided now.

-Ahrens said that Lobe is determined to be the vice chair. They all have marketing experience in one capacity or another. He said that they will be placed in positions according to their skills.

- Spring asked if these people have background of UCLA.
- Ahrens said that before asking them to make a final decision of being on E-board, the E-board code was sent out as well as his interpretation of how things were run as well as how they could make a smoother elections process. He said that they understand the gravity of these responsibilities.
- Birdie asked if there was a reason for the change.
- Ahrens said that the other appointment would be graduating early.
- Birdie asked if there was a rough guideline of what the board would do between now and spring
- Ahrens said that they have conference calls set up and a guideline of how they want the council to be run. He said that he didn't want to push these all on the council before getting the advice from the board.
- Santos commended him on getting all of these people with extra time.
- Ahrens said that this is a good study group that they have.
- Hill said that this is a consent items and the names will be read after. She suggested a motion to approve these individuals.
- Santos moved to approve the appointments of Ashley Loeb, Andrae Vigil-Romero, Libby Edgar, and Lizzie Odendahl. Shah seconded. With no objectives, Loeb, Vigil-Romero, Edgar, and Odendahl were approved for E-board.

## VII. Fund Allocations

### **A. Academic Success Referendum Fund**

*There was no business for the Academic Success Referendum Fund.*

### **B. Academic Affairs Mini-Grant**

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

### **C. EVP Travel Grant**

*There was no business for the EVP Travel grant this week.*

### **D. Cultural Affairs Mini-Grant**

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

### **E. \*Contingency Allocations**

- Rose said that the contingency allocations should be looked at holistically due to the urgency of the funds. Rose said they asked for bookcases. They were docked because of the nature of the bookcases. Rose said that they found cheaper ones online and allocated a smaller amount. He said he will create a point system when they have time.
- Hill asked about deadlines and if they would still discuss the funds on Monday night
- Rose said that they would review it when they get it and would send it to the council
- Zimmerman said that they need to add this to the agenda if they will approve this as an action item. Zimmerman said that it is up to the council with what to do.
- Hill said that they should delineate that they pull from two different funds. She said that the recommendation is to approve capital contingency as a line item
- Birdie moved to add capital contingency allocations as a line item. Santos seconded.
- Phi called to question adding an action item of capital contingency to fund allocations. Shah seconded. With a vote of 10-0-0, capital contingency was added as an action item.
- Khy asked if the bookcases that Rose found were open or closed.
- Rose said that they were opened
- Khy said that they looked for closed bookcases to prevent stealing.
- Hill said that the bookcases were for the textbook loan program in the SAC. She said that there is a request for locked items to prevent stealing.
- Birdie said that the interns handling the books won't be in the room the entire day. He said that this is why the bookcases need to be closed.
- Rose said that from the application he thought that there would be people constantly watching the books
- Khy said that with renovations in the SAC, they will have people being at the textbooks because they are in meeting places. She said that the reason for the locked bookcases was to protect the books and the program.

- Hill suggested that they amend the allocation to the original request because they are serving so many individuals in an open space.
- Dr. Geller asked if they were allowing the bookcases to be attached to the wall.
- Hill said 5 feet
- Dr. Geller asked what the guidelines are for securing a bookcase
- Zimmerman said that they should talk to the SAC.
- Hill asked if there were traditionally height limits.
- Zimmerman said that the bookcase would be close to the height limit.
- Birdie said that these would be nominal costs. He said that sometimes they provide the necessary brackets with the bookcases.
- Spring moved to amend the fund recommendation to the full amount of \$1896.23 De Vera seconded.
- Shah called to question capital contingency allocations. Spring seconded. With a vote of 10-0-0, capital contingency was approved for \$1896.23.

Hill said that she sent out an email about contingency allocations. She said that the organization she highlighted was allocated on October 12. There was a discrepancy with what their allocation letter. Hill said that this event involved a speaker, where Chi Alpha Christian Fellowship found out that they were given \$300. There was an area of concern about the difference because they still need \$150. Hill suggested that they fund them the remaining amount since it was a mistake on their part. Hill asked if it was true if they allocated contingency toward facilities, that they couldn't redirect it toward honorarium.

- Zimmerman said that it goes along with the mission of that line item.
- Hill asked if they could rearrange the funds.
- Zimmerman said that as long as they use the funds for something that could be funded for through contingency.
- Rose said that the SGA doesn't audit them by line items.
- Zimmerman said that this would need to be approved by the Finance Committee Chair since this is a budget reallocation.
- Hill said that her recommendation is that they allocation Chi Alpha Christian Fellowship with \$150 to make up the difference.
- Khy moved to approve the allocation of \$150 for Chi Alpha Christian Fellowship to contingency funding. Shah seconded.
- Spring said that online, the categories are not delineated.
- Hill said that when they went to SGA they had a separate allocation. She said that this was a separate issue.
- Spring called to question allocating Chi Alpha Christian Fellowship with \$150. Santos seconded. With a vote of 10-0-0, the allocation was approved.
- Zimmerman said that she would follow up with SGA.

#### VIII. Officer and Member Reports

##### **President – Jasmine Hill**

Hill said Resnick and herself met with the administrative vice chancellor to discuss the farmer's market and getting a blue light on Hilgard to improve safety for students that live off campus.

##### **Academic Affairs Commissioner--Suza Khy**

Khy said that she met with vice provos Smith to talk about GE requirements and were discussion how to conceptualize diversity. She said that she was moving this along and there will be an executive board meeting next week. They will talk about the proposed faculty center. She said that there were questions about who would use that space and who would have priority.

#### IX. Old Business

*There was no Old Business this week.*

## X. New Business

## BOD Allocations

Hill said that one group requested a line item that was ineligible. She said that there was a difference between what was allocated and what was in the budget. Hill said that she made a couple of changes. She said that the BRD and Assistant BRD said that they should allocate \$114,000, which is different from the \$125,000 that is available. Hill said that she created an additional process that would bump up what the council really values in terms of the BRD allocations. She said that they value giving a group as much funding as possible based on high scores. She said that the BRD noted the average score. Groups that had scores higher than the average (which was a total of 26) would be allocated more from what wasn't used. Hill presented the equation for allocations. She said that there was a difference and there was \$10,000 left over. Hill said she divided the \$10,000 by 26 (groups that had higher than average scores). Each group got \$412.98. The adjusted amount was listed and the average amount rewarded was adjusted from 24.7% to 26.87%.

-Birdie asked if the groups that were allocated got more money

-Hill said yes. She said that 6 groups requested less than \$800, which means they got more than they asked for. She allocated them the amount requested times their score. An example of this was the first group. She said that she readjusted the allocations accordingly.

-Zimmerman said that she liked the idea of giving higher scoring groups more finding. She said that her only concern was that even the lower scoring groups received high amounts of funding.

-Hill said that she was trying to give a significant amount to everyone rather than a smaller amount to everyone. She said that even after her formula, \$607 is still remaining. She asked if anyone had perspectives.

-Phi said that some groups requested more money and received only half of what the other group requested

-Love said that anyway you normalize it, that a group can only receive 27% of the total amount available. He said that there are outliers, which will skew the distribution if one tries to normalize it. He said they could possibly put a cap on the limits they request. The variance that they request will be skewed no matter how it is normalized.

-Hill asked if the incarcerated youth group was the only instance where there are funding problems. She asked if this was the problem with every group she sees.

-Phi also pointed out the Muslim Student group. She said that if a group didn't receive the threshold of the average, they were allocated less money. She said that she agreed with Zimmerman on how to allocate the funds.

-Hill said that they could either award the groups that scored above average or equally allocate the funds. She said that they could alleviate the discrepancies with the two groups that didn't receive enough with the former equation.

-Ma said that with a competition of limited resources, they should be able to award higher scoring groups more.

-Spring said that they should award groups that scored higher scoring groups more to go along with UCLA values.

-Phi said that other than those two, all the other groups requested a lot of funding.

-Hill asked if anyone had other feedback.

-Birdie asked how the funding was left over in the first place.

-Hill said that some people didn't ask for enough funds and therefore there were funds left over.

-De Vera said that he liked the idea of rewarding higher scoring groups with more funding. They have the perceived needs as well as programming that they need to carry out.

-Birdie said that he liked the idea of allocating higher scoring groups more funds as well. He said that if a group didn't receive enough funds, they could apply for contingency

-Yao said that she felt like there wasn't much difference between receiving certain scores and she feels like the average amount for each group is better.

-Santos asked Love about the points that were given to groups.

-Love said that every point counts and is based on hearings, applications, etc. Love said that saying that every point doesn't matter would disqualify groups that earned every point.

-Resnick said that from BRC, she felt that there were some items on the score sheet were based on opinion. She said that they should split up the money evenly because some of the applications were based on opinion.

-Shah said that these are averages of averages. She said that the opinion factor wouldn't be a full point difference.

-Ma said that it was based on opinion but he was consistent when he was allocating his points to groups.

-Hill suggested that someone makes a motion. She said that they could approve the formula as is, which would reward above average groups. She said that they would allocate \$125,710.35. If they approve the entire budget, they would approve rewarding the higher scoring groups. Hill said that if people wanted to average the scores, they would take a recess and reassess the scores.

-Santos said that allocating more funds to higher scoring groups would serve as an initiative for groups that didn't meet the higher end. He compared allocating these funds to grades.

-Khy said that she supported groups that were above average because they took the time to fully articulate their needs. She suggested taking the remaining amount of \$607 be split between the 14 other groups. This way, there wouldn't be a remainder.

-Love said that this was a good idea.

-Phi said she agrees with Khy's proposal.

-Yao said that the idea was good but \$43 is not a substantial amount

-Resnick said that she felt like every dollar counts

-Birdie said that it makes a difference to give the remaining groups these amounts.

-Yao said that she was still in favor in allocating the funds evenly throughout.

-De Vera moved to approve the amount of \$125, 710.35 for BOD for winter quarter. Santos seconded.

-Spring called to question the BOD allocations. Shah seconded. With a vote of 10-0-0, the BOD funding for winter quarter was approved.

#### XI. Announcements

-Santos said that the DREAM act will be voted on in the House tomorrow for sure. He told them to keep calling senators.

-Rose said that he will be out of the country on the first meeting of fall quarter.

-Zimmerman said that the final day to turn in recs before winter break is on the 17<sup>th</sup>. Zimmerman said that recs should be turned in as soon as possible.

-Zimmerman said that if they want a parking permit, they could email herself or Hill.

#### XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

#### XIII. Adjournment

- Spring moved and Phi seconded to adjourn the meeting.

- Hill called for Acclamation. Hill asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m. by Acclamation.

#### XIV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,

Katrina Dimacali  
USAC Minutes Taker  
2010-2011