

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL

Tuesday, November 22, 2011  
417 Kerckhoff Hall  
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Emily Resnick, Kristina Sidrak, Joelle Gamble, Daniel Soto, Jamie Yao, David Bocarsly, Andrea Hester, Ronald Arruejo, Raquel Saxe, Dan Chikanov, Jason Smith, Tamir Sholklapper, Michael Starr, Dr. Berky Nelson, Lauren Lazarovici, Patty Zimmerman, Bob Williams, Katrina Dimacali, Donnaly Natividad

ABSENT: Kinnery Shah, Dr. Deb Geller,

GUESTS:

I. A. Call to Order

- Resnick called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

II. Approval of the Agenda

-Gamble moved to strike the cultural affairs mini grant

-Saxe moved to strike both Academic affairs grants

-Gamble moved to move the appointment immediately after public comment because they have to leave at 7:30

- Bocarsly moved and Chikanov seconded to approve the agenda, as amended.

-- Resnick called for Acclamation. Resnick 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. \*11/15/11

-Hester asked if her changes were made.

-Dimacali said yes

- Saxe moved and Sidrak seconded to approve the minutes for November 15, 2011, as amended

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

IV. Public Comments

Matt Abularach-Macias

-He there is a movement around the world. He said that we are in a critical point in time. He said we are in a struggle to maintain and defend our education. He asked where they were. He asked where the rest of the council has been. He said they talked about how they care about the issue, yet their actions don't reflect what they said. He said this is a time to advocate voice. He said this is an issue of responsibility. He urged the council to be the change.

Mallory Valenzuela

-Valenzuela said as a concerned student, the way that the council is spending money would be highly scrutinized by her community. She talked about Samahang cultural night, where they welcome members to the UCLA campus. She said they try to engage students in relevant education. She talked about financial literacy. She challenged all of them to see if they were financial literate with their current funding. She said that the members of her community and

other communities would be watching closely.

#### Devante

A member of ASU said that they fear by not properly spending money, their Admit Weekend would not be able to attend that event. He said that they fear that spending the money the wrong way wouldn't be enough to have their event.

#### Julia- Roosevelt Institute

She talked about funding once again. She said they got lucky with how much money they got. One event was a policy-writing seminar. She said that another event was an Occupy Movement discussion. She said a lot of their events are to help students find a space to talk about current issues. She talked about how the organization is worried about the future of their events, which are beneficial to students

#### Marcus- Queer Alliance

He said one of his responsibilities is to provide a safe space for the queer community on campus. He said that it is important for self-expression and LGBT empowerment. They put on large programs. He said that they feel like the events they put on benefit the students who put the event on and those who attend. He said the existence of these programs benefit campus climate and visibility. He said he hopes that they work tirelessly to make sure funding is available for the holistic development of the student body

#### Amy- Chief of Staff of Amnesty International

She said that USAC should make careful decisions about where the money goes. They advocate for human rights and raise awareness to things on campus that are happening internationally. She urged them to be aware of where money is going. She said they could usually only apply to the EXP Advocacy grant.

#### Justin- education co-coordinator

He said he would also like to voice his concern about funding. He said they should take into consideration the events in spring. He said they're important because they need people who can provide perspective students with the appropriate resources. He said he attended these events in the past, which made him into who he is today

#### Jeffrey- APC

He talked about the Asian Pacific Coalition. He said they would like to address the cuts to the budget. He said that given recent attacks on the API community, they should challenge stereotypes and improve campus climate risk. He said that it's important to protect these funding sources. He said they are concerned that culture nights will heavily impacted in the community.

-Resnick said they would be followed up with.

## V. Special Presentations

### A. Funding Study Group- Roman Nguyen, Kim Deenas, Sheena Santamaria, and Cynthia Jasso

-Jasso said one of the biggest things they find is a sense that contingency is their sole funding source. She said that this is one of the core problems they will try to address. She talked about how they could mitigate this perception and work towards a sustainable model and work towards to make sure this does not happen again. She said the moment when they force to make student groups to pay out of pocket is the moment they fail as a student government. She said these programs effect everyone. She said everyone here plans events. She said this is why the funding study group is really here. She talked about how they are trying to make sure that their student groups gets their needs met. She said that one of their goals is to define fair funding. She said she would like to let them know about this. She said although they focused their meeting on contingency, during summer there were concerns voiced by what is fair. She said they would have a universal funding application. She said the first recommendation is that a student organization may apply for honorarium for the same person a maximum of two times per quarter. She said that they should push student groups to be innovative. She said that a non-UCLA person could be considered honorarium a maximum of two times.

-Saxe asked what would happen if a different organization wanted to bring the same person in

-Jasso said that's acceptable for another organization to bring in the same person in another two times if they would like to. She said they want to develop new programs for students.

- They said that the next recommendation is that student organizations may apply to contingency a maximum of 5 times per quarter. She said the cap applies to both retreats and events. IT is up to the student organization's discretion to determine which events they want to apply for
- Sidrak asked what would happen if a student group co-programs
- Jasso said they haven't spoken about, but as of now co-programming would not count toward their 5 times.
- Deenas said their third recommendation is that the maximum amount any student organization may apply to contingency for is not to exceed \$1000 or 50% of the total event cost. She said an example of this is if a total event cost is \$1,500. They may not request more than \$750
- Hester asked if this applied to food and certain line items
- Jasso said this applied to the total amount.
- Starr said his concern is that student groups could inflate their costs
- Sheena said that all the people who regulate funding could tell if a group is inflating their funding. She said it is obvious if a group is inflating their costs. She hopes they have faith in them that the allocations they make are fair.
- Jasso said they typically stay away of funding \$1000. She said they typically don't even go over the \$1000.
- Nguyen went over all of the recommendations again. He asked if there were questions
- Sidrak said they discussed whether or not they capped events. She asked if there were discussions about cutting allocations
- Jasso said they wiped that out from their discussion
- Resnick asked if there would be percentage cuts from their allocations
- Arruejo said they would still be making reductions
- Sidrak asked for clarification
- Arruejo said if they accept and implement these, he would still reduce them by a certain amount.
- Bocarsly said he realizes amounts would be less. He asked what they think an appropriate amount to be cutting would be
- Arruejo said including the new surplus and the recommendations, he sees a 30-40% reduction. He said he would cut at least 40% when considering the thread from the last three years.
- Resnick said they should direct questions to the funding study group
- Williams asked how much money would be shifted to somewhere else if they enforce these allocations
- Arruejo said if they adopt these, he would lessen the reduction for about 5% or the first one, 5-10% for the second, and 5-15% for the third.
- Williams asked if these would be significant in the future
- Arruejo asked for clarification
- Williams said it seems like some groups are getting more than others
- Jasso said he's right and that some groups have used the system. She said they want to ensure that the perception of contingency would be changed and that people would realize that they are an auxiliary resource. She said the perception would be the significant change.
- Resnick said the cuts and reductions would be coupled with a push for applying for spring BOD and better advertising their other funds
- Gamble said they want to change contingency. She asked if the third recommendation would be permanent
- Jasso said yes. This would be a way to sustain funding over the years
- Sheena said the idea is to make others realize that this is an auxiliary fund and that there is other under utilized funding sources
- Bocarsly pointed out the third recommendation. He asked about retreats and how this is the sole funding source retreats have. He asked if they would make exceptions for that.
- Arruejo said they already have specific guidelines for retreats. He said retreats usually cost around \$1000. He said it would still be reduced, but they would still need to list all expenses. He said there would be that and the additional cut for retreats.
- Resnick asked if the 50% cut would still apply to retreat
- Arruejo said yes. He said they would cap at \$450 if the retreat were at \$900
- Bocarsly asked if this has happened in the past
- Arruejo said retreats could range from less than \$100 to more than \$2000.
- Bocarsly asked if they would be changing the policy
- Arruejo said it would barely affect retreats because they already barely get funding
- Jasso said they take into consideration how many people they would be taking. She said it wouldn't affect retreats that much
- Champawat said they are trying to address the honorarium problem. He asked if they would get a handle on

problems with groups splitting into multiple groups for more funding. He asked if they would like to change the recommendation to having only honorarium twice for one person

-Jasso said she likes that idea

-Champawat said these guidelines would be set until someone changes them

-Sheena said not all of the recommendations have to be taken

-Smith said thank you so much. He said they have been doing a great job. He said they are doing a better job than the super committee. He said this is a last resort funding. He said the only thing he would like to change about the climate of the campus would be that they weren't so money hungry. He said groups could co-program with businesses in LA or ASUCLA to offset issues. He said some student organizations are echoing that. He pushed for financial literacy, such as writing grants. He said they should move toward being in a hustling mindset

-Jasso encouraged them to help that perception. She said if anyone would like to participate in these meetings, they could push for a professional development

-Sidrak said her question was asked already

-Yao said for smaller events, would they still stick to the 50% rule with the expectation that a student group would be applying for another fund

-Arruejo said yes, this would still be the assumption with this reduction

-Sheena said the campus programs committee has a mini fund. She said that they would direct people to that fund.

-Deenas said some type of change is necessary.

-Saxe asked about the mini fund

-Sheena said that it would be the only fund a group would typically fund for.

-Saxe asked if they could apply for food from contingency and the rest from another fund

-Sheena said that from her understanding, no

-Resnick thanked them for their work.

## VI. Appointments

-Bocarsly moved to approve Mikaela for ASUCLA BOD

-Saxe told the groups to apply for the academic affairs mini grant

-Mikaela introduced herself. She said she was involved with USAC her first three years of college. She said people have heard about her situation last year.

-Arruejo asked if there was a motion to approve her

-Resnick said yes

-Sidrak asked why she would continue to serve on the board and be reappointed. She asked what initiatives she had

-Mikaela said the first year is a lot of learning. She said she doesn't think it would be effective if they appoint another person. She said if she were reappointed, she would be a part of new committees that dealt with media, etc. These look at how they could address student needs. She said they are behind in some advancement with media. She said they would like to use sites like Twitter to get a new message out through the technology of today

-Hester asked what experiences she's gained as BOD and how she could utilize these experiences

-Mikaela said there are a lot of new things happening with ASUCLA. She said she would be continuing with what's involved. She said in terms of Ackerman and the redesign, a lot of things are happening. She said they need someone who's been on the board for the past year.

-Gamble talked about the renovations. She said \$300,000 is a lot of money. She asked about fiscal responsibility

-Mikaela said this is fiscally responsible. She said they've been discussing concerns in the meetings. She said there's a lot of space in Ackerman that could be utilized. She said the bookstore could be turned into a lounge where students could buy their books and use for studying. She said the building is outdated. She said they're being fiscally responsible and are aware of how much money they should be spending. She said they need to do something immediate to address these needs.

-Starr said they know she's been on board. He asked why she would like to be back on the board.

-Mikaela said she would like to continue and finish her term, because if a new person is reappointed it wouldn't be beneficial. She said this would help financially for herself and she has experience

-Saxe asked what she thought her responsibility was as a board member. She asked how involved the board should be with students. She asked what is involved in being a board member and how she plans to fulfill those requirements.

-Mikaela said they should be responsible for any major decisions made. She said the services they offer to students are the most influential decisions. She said a lot of people use Ackerman for food. She talked about already existing services and the importance of addressing concerns with these services.

-Saxe asked what relationship students should have with the student on the board

-Mikaela said USAC and the board of directors should work together. She said they are all representing undergraduate students. She said herself and Maggie has been talking about setting up a presentation after every meeting to give their feedback with what's happening on board. She said USAC could go to their meetings as well. She said it makes sense for them to work together.

-Resnick asked what qualities she possesses to make her a valuable board member

-Mikaela said she is a part of a lot of spaces. She said that she goes to spaces and listens to what students are stressed or concerned about. She said she has been involved for 4 years and she is aware of bureaucracy, structure, etc. She said she is a great person. She said she is fun and she represents undergraduates well. She said she's worked with a lot of them. She said she has connections to a lot of them

-Hester asked about hurdles she's faced and how she could get back from that

-Mikaela talked about the learning process she went through. She said they work as a collective and as a board. She said it's different than when she gets there. She said the biggest difficulty for her was how to effect change.

-Williams said there are all kinds of conflict of interest with talking about board members. He said they have a good relationship. He said she plays an important role on the board. He said she represents a certain area of the campus and brings a lot of great information to the board

-Starr called to question the appointment of Mikaela to the board of directors. Smith seconded. With a vote of 10-0-1 Mikaela was reappointed.

## 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

-Gamble said she just sent out the travel grant. She said there is one student group. The Queer Pinoy Conference took 18 students. They had 84 points. She said if there are questions about this to let her know.

### D. Cultural Affairs Mini-Grant

### E. \*Contingency Allocations

-Starr moved to approve contingency allocations. Chikanov seconded.

A total of **\$4529.83 was requested from contingency** of that, a total of **\$579.00 is recommended for allocation** for this week (at 70% reduction).

There is a total of **\$16,179.55** left in the Contingency Programming Fund.

-Arruejo talked about the 50% reduction. He said his recommendation is seen in the last column

-Saxe moved to table this until after the funding discussion

-Resnick asked if they could move the discussion

-Zimmerman said they could add it

-Starr asked for clarification on one of the calculations

-Arruejo said this is a mistake. He said it would be \$150 instead of \$67.50.

-Resnick said they should table contingency until after they vote on guidelines.

-Zimmerman said they should table and then add. Bocarsly seconded

-Zimmerman asked if this was an action item

-Resnick said yes

-Bocarsly moved a discussion of the funding guidelines as an action item. Sholklapper seconded. There were no objections. With a vote of 10-0-0, this would be added in old business after BOD programming.

## VIII. Officer and Member Reports

### President - Emily Resnick

Resnick said if USAC offices would like a parking permit to email her. She said she would email them if offices could have more than one. She thanked the funding study group for all of their work and advised council to take into account what they've brought up. Resnick said surplus is around \$113,000 plus \$4000 from Homecoming. She said the guidelines would help sustain the future. She said they are excited to discuss those. She said today, they had a USAC visibility and outreach meeting. She said gen rep 3 is already planning a lot of things concerning USAC visibility. She talked about the USAC roll out around 4th week. She said this would allow students to engage with them in Bruin Plaza. She said they discussed how they would reach out to student groups to let them know what services are available to them. She said they would put out a survey soon. She said they have a lot of visibility and outreach components to her office. She said a lot of offices have weekly newsletters. She said these are some ideas that came out of the meeting. She said last Wednesday, she talked to all UC presidents and some regents. She said this year they don't plan tuition increases. They plan to increase financial aid. She said the venues that would be available would be announced. She talked about investment rather than spending. She reiterated that they are lucky that the regents meeting would be November 28. She said she would be making a public comment. She said if anyone else would like to make a public comment to let her know. She said the public comment would be from 9-10am on Monday morning. She said the president's office is planning a necessities drive. She told people to forward these to their offices. She said these things would go to homeless students at UCLA. She said they would be meeting on Tuesday of finals week to make allocations from contingency. She said this meeting would be kept short. She said she had a great time at the game. She passed out thank you notes to everyone. She told all of them how much they appreciate all of them

-Gamble asked about the UCLA chancellor and the letter about police brutality

-Resnick said she is working with Montero. She said she has not received a response and that the chancellor is not in Los Angeles at this time.

#### **Internal Vice President - Kristina Sidrak**

-Sidrak said this past week, they had their first ally week meeting. Participants included members of QG, Smith, etc. They critically reviewed the pros and cons of last year's events. She said they discussed respecting cooperation and community building. She said they talked about how to be allies to specific communities. They said that their focus should be education. She said they would have extensive discussion of what ally week should entail. She said they are excited to make this a successful and appropriate event. She said they would go over current crime trends with UCPD. They would be discussion campus safety week and reviewing UCPD's policy for non-violent protests. She said she would distribute the minutes for that meeting. Next week is their last meeting for Strathmore saferides

#### **External Vice President- Joelle Gamble**

Gamble said they had the most postcards out of all UC campuses. They were able to make 250 calls last week. She said the rally was good for visibility. She said they couldn't update people last week. She talked about the resolution from the UCSA council about non-violent protests. They are circulating a resolution about police brutality. She said it is important that they are all aware of this. SOCC went well. She said there was a ribbon that said "this should be used as a noose." She said this negatively affected a lot of UC campus's, especially UCSC and UCSD. She talked about the practice that was written into each fee increase. She said Yudof would look more into this. She talked about financial aid reform. She said they are writing a proposal. She said the regents meeting next week would be here. She said that the meeting is not transparent. She said that she doesn't think that having the meeting early in the morning isn't the solution. She said they would like to let people know about this. She said they would be meeting with regent Keefer soon. She said that it's good to know that some regents are willing to meet. She said they are talking about getting other campus's here. UCI, UCSD, and UCR are still up in the air. Public comments would be limited for this regents meeting. She said in terms of Occupy UCLA, they were talking to the chancellor. The chancellor said the student leaders should communicate with administrators. She said she was up at 5 in the morning to talk to administrators. She urged everyone to go out there. She said it is important that they are visible with anything major is happening on campus.

#### **Academic Affairs Commissioner--Raquel Saxe**

Saxe talked about the undergraduate academic affairs meeting. She said that the requirement talked about in past weeks lacked the proper funding and lecturer. She said Judy Smith, the vice Provo, is retiring. She has given a significant amount of notice. She said likely discussions of who will replace her would happen. There are 4 undergraduate student representatives on this council. She said they could talk about important qualities in a vice Provo. Course evaluations have been moved online. She said they are looking at changing the questions asked on evaluations, since professors don't evaluate their recommendations. She said they have been working with people to

see if it's possible to get evaluations published. She said they hope to hold professors accountable. She said members of her office met with the math department. They are looking at bringing a pilot program to the math department. They would be working closely with the math department to make sure this happens spring quarter. She said they would be circulating a survey to students. She said she met with Zimmerman and Starr about study lounges. They are aware that ASUCLA does phenomenal services. She said these could be better utilized. She said to take advantage of their resources, they would be working with ASUCLA to work with what they have such as including a van service. She said this would make sure students could take advantage of this. They met with social sciences and programming to see how they have been successful in their own department. She said they hope to present these to the faculty committee in winter. She talked about the global leadership committee and schools were contacted and sent information packets. she said they were planning on the major blast for spring quarter. ORL would participate in their stress free day. They would be co-programming with other groups. This will be a highly interactive day. They are letting students know about the social entrepreneur course. They would like students to know about this course since this is a way to educate students in a new field of business. She said they hope to get an update from SFAC about the writing center.

-Gamble asked about the political science minor

-Saxe said the deadline is December 9. She said they hope to educate students about this change. They also had a Daily Bruin article on it.

-Gamble asked if she could send this information to council

-Saxe said yes

### **Robert Williams- ASUCLA Executive Director**

Williams said he would like to clarify some things. He said only the board can decide if they want to spend \$300,000. He said service enterprises are a \$75 million business. This is a student business that operates student buildings and facilities. They keep the student fees low. He said in comparison to other campuses, they have fewer fees. He said they have a student fees events fund, which comes from the net that services met. He said the first things they are required to cut are the program and event funds. ASUCLA has primarily a bookstore. He said this business is changing and will continue to change. The business part of the larger ASUCLA is very important. The design study looks at Ackerman and student needs as well as a business strategy to look at what they sell and where. They spend a million dollars on utilities. He said it's a question of what they return. This is a design study. He said that some spaces need to be renovated. They would like to have a design template to be used in the future. The \$300,000 would also look at what they sell in the store and how it's used. He said when visitors buy a sweatshirt, that's how they fund everything else. The plans could cost more than \$300,000, but the return could be greater over time. He said he thinks there's a misunderstanding. They are looking at specific spaces and see how they can increase sales and make spaces work. Williams said most student associations are gone because they did not reinvest in good business decisions. The board is there and spends the money carefully. People could be more involved and listen to board meetings. They will have a student union master plan to be used for projects 10 or 15 years in the future. He said they know that now's not a time to spend a lot of money, but they could look at how the money could be returned. He said they have more students applying for funding. He said USAC could go to the board and ask for more funding for student groups. This would only be possible if they make investments now. He said ASUCLA has been here for years and all of it comes back to students. He said the board makes sound business decisions

-Sidrak asked when the last time there's been a unified revamp

-Williams said the design now is 15 years old. They have to spend almost 1 million a year to run these facilities. There has never been a student union design. He said they hope to put together a design template. They would have a plan so over time, they want to make sure the association is financially strong. The biggest challenge is that they don't keep up with the campus. They got a letter before from the chancellor that the food is not up to par. He said they have since then put a significant amount of money into food facilities. He said they don't have money to waste.

-Sidrak said this extended explanation should have been put into the article

-Gamble said she was in a focus group. She asked if this was used to inform students about the renovations

-Williams said this is different. He said that group looks at how spaces are underutilized, such as the bookstore. He said they've added store elements because they could fund projects by selling stuff. He said they look at the overall needs to all students in general. He said they would do a presentation in the future. He said that they looked at the student needs that aren't being met. He said that student projects always want to be funded by referendum. He said they are all interconnected. He said they would like to do more work on this. They have a need for more student and fitness spaces. He said this is a bigger thought process.

-Saxe asked if they find it appropriate to ask for funding how they would and what figure would be appropriate

-Williams said their budget is \$139,000. He said that they lost money because of the renovation of Pauley. He said book sales are declining. He said the more they could say how need has changed, the better. He said this is what services and enterprises are there for. They are there to provide programming needs for the student government. He said it is important that they spend it this way

#### **Laureen Lazarovici- Alumni Representative**

-Lazarovici said she wishes the student groups were there last week. She said they have a feeling there would be more meetings like this. She said what struck her was that they are sometimes the one asking other governments for funding. She said she was thinking about the name of the contingency fund. She said they might want to think about naming it something else.

#### **Patty Zimmerman- Student Government Services**

-Zimmerman said now everyone has access to the Google calendar. She said people could type in their programs and the Webmaster would add them to the USAC website. She said this would help increase visibility.

-Saxe asked when this was sent out

-Zimmerman she thinks last week. She said she would double check

-Resnick said Zimmerman dropped off their new copy of what would be on the bottom of Kerckhoff. She said this would also be in the communal office space. They are looking to designing ceiling hangings for USAC.

-Hester asked if they could use this to make others aware that other funds are available

-Dr. Nelson said the regents are coming to town. He talked about what happened at UC Davis. He said he wants them to think about working with the student affairs office. He said they should keep in mind that this is their campus. He said his concern is that other people would come to their campus. He said his concern that interlopers would try to cause things. He said student affairs are responsible for making sure that the police aren't over-exercised. He commended chancellor Young for his work with the issues. He said he appreciated the protests. He said before, it was easier to pay for debts and loans. He said things aren't the way they should be. He said nobody is happy with the fees and budget cuts. He told them to work closely. Dr. Geller is sick

-Saxe said she was at the Occupy movement and administrators were there as well. She said working with them is a great idea.

#### **IX. Old Business**

Bocarsly moved to approve winter BOD allocations. Sholklapper seconded.

-Nguyen said they used the same formula as last time. They added \$10,000 since it would come from Dance Marathon.

-Bocarsly asked what actions were followed up

-Nguyen said DM wanted to appeal

-Bocarsly asked what they would do with the money

-Nguyen said the money is expected to be returned. The rate would be determined by the total allocated divided by the total cost

-Starr asked if this was in the bylaws

-Nguyen said this is what Simmons told him

-Starr asked for clarification

-Zimmerman said they give a portion of the total cost. She said they would expect a certain amount of what they make from their event.

-Champawat asked if they made \$400,000

-Zimmerman said they would have to give the money back

-Starr asked about what they would pay back

-Champawat said this is a fundraiser

-Starr asked if they could offer them \$10,000 and asks for it all back.

-Zimmerman said they wouldn't force them to pay more than what is allocated

-Champawat said they need to look at if they could pay it back

-Bocarsly asked if they need to make the decision for them

-Champawat said it is important to recognize what kind of event this is. He said the effect is to give the money to their charity. He said it is clearer for them to ask directly for money

- Bocarsly asked if this money would go to the facility and they would pay it back if they could pay it back. He asked said they would have to pay everything back
- Champawat said this is like jazz reggae. He said they have a cash flow issue where some costs need to be dealt with in revenue writing. He said with DM, a lot of money comes in. He said it is clear that they will make enough to pay the event back. He said they may not need to go through this whole exercise since they are part of SWC. He said they could use this, if they would like, to give money directly to their charity.
- Starr suggested that they go through the allocation assuming they will pay it back. He said seed money is very important. He said knowing they will raise the money, the \$10,000 will come back
- Champawat said it may not be necessary to go through USA. He said that they will assume modest revenue.
- Starr said he has no problem paying the \$10,000 back as a part of DM
- Sidrak said she sees his point, but Waiverpool could only do so much. She said if they need money for operational purposes. She said the amounts from fundraising aren't revealed until almost the end of the event
- Champawat said they could work through the issues. HE said since they would need the money, the conservative thing would be to fund that and develop a stipulation. They will meet with the finance person of DM and solidify plans better. He said this should be aligned with SWC finances are
- Resnick said this is what BOD allocations are set for.
- Gamble told campus members to take back their bias and not on organizational affiliation
- Starr said that he understands that. He said that this is money that will go back to BOD for spring allocations.
- Zimmerman said she knows that the group is interested in appealing the decision for the allocation. She said if someone from council wants to talk to them, they can since the appeal process will tie up their money for a few weeks.
- Starr said they've given them allocations in the past and was able to pay it back. He said in the past, they allocated the money without paying it back and this year they would pay it back
- Bocarsly said it seems like they're all on the same page. He said if DM wants to spend the money it is up to DM. He called to question
- Gamble asked for clarification.
- Resnick said if they use the allocation, they have to pay it back
- Starr said it has to be by before Feb. 24 (spring allocations)
- Sholklapper said he is more than happy to talk to them. He said that they are affiliated with SWC and USAC. He said that they are in agreement with what's going on. He said he's not really worried about this.
- Bocarsly called to question. Yao seconded
- Starr asked if the \$10,000 went to the other groups
- Nguyen said yes
- Bocarsly called to question. Yao seconded. With a vote of 9-0-2, the allocations were approved.

Sidrak moved to approve the ongoing contingency guideline discussion. Yao seconded.

- Resnick said they could go through each line item the funding study group had. She read the first suggestion from the funding study group. She said there was also discussion about 2 allocations per honorarium
- Bocarsly asked for clarification about the rule.
- Saxe asked if they should be concerned if there may be a group not aware that a different student group had used a person for honorarium already
- Starr said they could announce this
- Saxe asked how student groups would know
- Champawat said he's signed every honorarium. He said it almost never plays out like that. He said it hasn't come up that way, but it isn't something that has come up over the last few years
- Resnick said they could make this public on the USAC website. She said if they make this a bylaw or guideline change, they could make it public
- Champawat asked what would be published
- Resnick said it would be what honorarium would be approved
- Champawat said they would look at privacy issues
- Zimmerman said that they could look at special cases more carefully
- Resnick said she likes the change of two times per quarter for one person
- Sholklapper asked how many times has a person been paid multiple times in a quarter
- Arruejo said there are certain groups that use the same performers in the sense of honorarium more than 5 for other funding sources. He said they would get it from multiple choices multiple times. They are attempting to eliminate

this extreme outlier for future groups.

-Champawat said if groups did this, it wouldn't limit groups from using other income. He said this is a limiter on student fee usage to compensate these individuals

-Yao asked if these guidelines were only for contingency

-Resnick said yes

-Bocarsly asked if they were looking at these for bylaws or guidelines

-Zimmerman said this would be under contingency and guidelines and they would see where to place them

-Bocarsly asked if they were looking at wording

-Zimmerman said they could look at the meaning first

-Gamble asked if more than one group could bring the same speaker more than twice

-Resnick said not through contingency

-Gamble asked about the previous discussions

-Resnick said it applies for the same person

-Arruejo said they changed it to apply to the performer and not the group

-Natividad said that since they could fund the performer from another fund, it doesn't really fix anything

-Arruejo said it fixes the problem with contingency. He said if they want to bring up discussions with BOD or other funding sources, they could and he is open to that.

-Resnick said tonight's focus is on contingency and other concerns could be brought to the funding study group. She said this is something they should and could bring up

-Bocarsly said their goal is not to limit groups to do what they want. He said contingency does not fund someone's salary. He said this one source of funding is for all student groups

-Gamble asked if they are saving money from contingency. She said that USAC paying for people's salaries is still an issue.

-Resnick said this is something they should be held accountable for and this could go back to the funding study group

-Yao said she is weary that they create a situation where student groups would feel like they're competing with each other. She asked what if they could change it to one group could apply for one person per quarter

-Champawat said that some groups used a loophole and funded the same performer under different names

-Yao said with that said, if it just so happened that there was a speaker that a lot of people wanted, they could look at a contingent decision.

-Arruejo said this could alleviate her concern for competition

-Resnick said they are aware that other groups could apply to more than one source

-Williams asked what would happen if Obama wanted to come twice

-Resnick said this could be looked at

-Natividad asked if they were voting on one of them or all of them

-Resnick said they would look at them one by one. She said they would be voting on them next week's meeting and this week would just look at the meat of them

-Bocarsly moved to move to the next recommendation

-Resnick read the second recommendation

-Bocarsly said with the numbers from Zimmerman, 80 groups applied, only 4 groups applied more than 5 times. By setting a maximum, this would save them 45 applications. This would restrict only these 4 groups from applying a multiple amount of times

-Resnick said they talked about co-programming and that it could be used as a way to avoid this 5-cap restriction. She said their main goal is that groups receive a usable and fair allocation. She said the co-programming idea is an idea that could be discussed. This would foster a better campus climate. She said everyone in the funding study group was excited about this

-Arruejo asked USAC really felt this would be the last resort/ he felt like contingency should not be capped. He said he would yield the floor to Jasso.

-Jasso said she is against this recommendation. She said there is a reason they are able to allocate money. She said this is not about limiting groups but to change the perception of contingency. She said they are not there to cut applications but here to provide a space for students to apply and provide possible funding. She said she's glad they found extra money, because they want to make sure that groups have the opportunity to go out in the community and find relevant education. She said the council trusted the chairs and the funding study group do not feel like this is a measure that they follow through with. She said she hopes that they take that into consideration because there are other funding sources that are under utilized

-Resnick said it seems like a recommendation of the funding study group. She said if they don't cap it, they will

continue to see percentage cuts. She said they are working towards a common goal. She said there were very few groups that would be limited from this kind of funding

-Smith said co-programming could be an option. He asked how this would look like. He said there is no guidance to student groups and asked what does that really mean for scoring for the application. He asked if they were really pushing for more co-programming because groups would think that they would get more money

-Bocarsly asked about the 4 groups and what was the nature of the event

-Zimmerman said the 4 groups that applied more than 5 times had a lot of subgroups. She said instead of having just one representative, it might be their subgroups underneath their hub. She said they are different CSP groups under one category. She said those are the groups that have the most applications. She said this is like CSC. She said parts of CSC would then apply for their own funding.

-Sidrak said in response to Jasso, she hears where she's coming from. She said the vision she is trying to hold onto is incredible. She said the only thing they wanted to take in was that student groups need the funding to reach out to their communities. She said they have to work this out now. She said they need to work some compromise out for student groups

-Gamble said since they are looking at sustainable change, she sees 2 and 3 as conflicting. She said if the goal is to change the perception of contingency, they should go with 3. She said students should get less because they should apply for other sources of funding. She said they can't implement both 2 and 3 because they would cap events and money. She said they should choose 3 over 2

-Bocarsly said he is a proponent of 2. He talked about the necessity that every group gets the fair amount of every program. He said for that reason, it would be a burden on a small population. He said they could go hand in hand. He said that 3 set the tone of an auxiliary fund. He said by not cutting the events, they would have to take a percentage of the final recommendation. He said that a group that doesn't get their full amount and finds out late would have difficulties getting funding. Two allows them to get more recommendation and 3 would let them know in advance how much they get

-Starr said he understands where they're coming from. He said it's hard to take both.

-Yao said that since the groups that apply a lot are subgroups, there is no purpose to number 2

-Sholklapper said they're not trying to do anything bad. He said realistically, if groups are going to try to find loopholes then why put it in place anyway

-Bocarsly said a lot of groups came in to talk about their funding. He said that this is a great way of doing it. He said they need to find a way that the recommendation is upheld. He said that a majority of the applications were from a few groups. He said they need to find a way to solve this

-Arruejo said if groups put on this hard work, they should get their allocations. He said he is against the second recommendation, because spring is program heavy. He said this is supposed to help what funding they're supposed to have. He said that contingency should be something where they get a little something out of it. He said that if they do a lot of programs, they should be getting some type of allocation related to the impact on campus. He is for number 3. He is open for negotiating less or more. He said that the committee agrees that 2 shouldn't even be put into consideration

-Bocarsly said he thinks that a group finds out less than 2 weeks from their event that someone would get less than they expected. He said he is against finding out the final allocation and cutting it. He said 1 and 3 would not cut the percentage very much.

-Sidrak asked how they arrived at 50% and if it was taken into consideration when they found out surplus was higher

-Arruejo said this would encourage student groups to look for other sources of funding. He said groups can't get a main source of their funding from contingency. He said there are certain considerations that they came up with when allocating money. He said they get groups to think about certain things.

-Sidrak asked if their recommendation was 50%. She asked if something lower could sustain contingency

-Arruejo said if they lower it, the cut would make would be less than the proposed 70%.

-Sidrak said if a group applies for \$250 for food, their amount would be half

-Arruejo said yes, because they are encouraging them to look for other sources of funding

-Resnick said they would need to put careful wording in

-Bocarsly said if they get facilities covered, where they would get money for food

-Zimmerman said to get their fees waived from the student union event fee, they would still have costs. She said that students think that everything is waived. She said that this is not the case. She said they really use ASUCLA funding. She said there is still event staff fee, etc.

-Bocarsly said there are places that would be free

-Zimmerman said there are other funds, such as Dr. Geller's fund

- Bocarsly asked if they could cut more than 50%
- Yao said she likes 3 because it stresses that contingency is not the only fund. She said for retreats, you could use SOOF and SGOF. She said if a student group starts after the SOOF deadline, where they would find funding. She talked about food and how ABC couldn't fund off campus groups for food
- Resnick asked if these could be exceptions
- Arruejo said he's not sure of the answer to that question. He said they have to keep it consistent with the 50% reduction. He said he wouldn't be opposed to creating an exception for retreats because of that unique situation. He said he would still be weary of that
- Zimmerman said there is second SOOF due January 16. She said that groups could use that funding as well
- Starr asked what they were planning to get from surplus before summer
- Arruejo said they assumed that they would get \$80,000.
- Starr asked if the numbers were based on \$80,000
- Arruejo said it was based on \$80,000-\$100,000.
- Starr asked if there is a reason to give more to contingency
- Arruejo said they were expecting \$49,000 with the new numbers. He said student groups are applying more than in previous years as well.
- Resnick asked about closing out accounts for fall quarter
- Arruejo said he is assuming that they would be closing out accounts with their reductions
- Bocarsly said it's fair that 2 are off. He said they still need to look at other solutions
- Resnick asked if everyone was comfortable with number 3.
- Yao said no, because with retreats it's about \$400-\$500 and a retreat is about \$1000. She talked about food. She said ABC wouldn't work for groups like community service groups.
- Resnick said for that specific case if this is something to take into consideration
- Jasso said yes. She said that 50% of a \$1000 retreat, that group would get a majority of what the retreat would cost. \$450 would be lower than what they would be eligible for. She said their cap for contingency is \$450. She said if they did the third guideline, it would be 50% of the total cost. This would be \$500. She said that this amount is above \$450.
- Starr said he would prefer that student groups would apply for their normal costs. He said that if a group only applied for half, they would get even less funding.
- Resnick said this could be worked into the wording
- Arruejo said student groups should never assume how much money they should be getting from any funding source. He said that if a student group turns in the application early, they would get their allocations early. He said he gives unofficial allocations online and on the board in Kerckhoff
- Starr said a majority of their allocations had been filled. He said he is concerned about the wording
- Resnick said this needs to be clear
- Jasso said this could be taken back to the funding study group. She said that they could change "apply" to "eligible." She said this is something they could work on throughout the week.
- Starr said that makes him more comfortable
- Resnick said this is something that student groups could overlook
- Bocarsly said he doesn't agree that this is enough. He said that they are saying that they are going to cut their allocation in half. He said they are saying to apply for more so they still have a lot
- Arruejo said the 50% is backed up by documentation. If there is inflation, the funding study group sees it and will adjust accordingly. Arruejo said Nguyen cuts for non-eligible amounts.
- Gamble said if they make these recommendations, they are worried because there is not enough money. She said these cuts might not be enough. She said that a lot of the groups applying are from them. She said they shouldn't do so much programming if they are taking away from student groups. She said for her office, they should focus on internal funding
- Sholklapper said he would like to think that programs on council is for UCLA as a whole and not a small community rather than one group
- Gamble said sometimes it is and sometimes it isn't. She said sometimes groups fulfill what they said they should fulfill. She said they could support a student group instead of having their own program. She said last year in the gen rep fund, there is an expectation that they should they go out to help out the campus community. She said people are supposed to advocate student groups. She said there are still student groups that should be looked at to accomplish their purposes.
- Sholklapper said he agrees. He said 90% of their programs are co-programs. He said that USAC does that for the most part. He said that he has an expectation for directors to work with other groups. He said that they hope that the

student welfare commission helps other student groups on campus

-Dr. Nelson said there are more organizations that exist that they could properly fund. He said that he hasn't heard the term "priority" or anything about latitude. He said they could be fair, but at the same time they could come up with a distorted result. He said that he appreciates the time toward equity, but the hard and fast issue is that there should be some priority made. He said if they already have priority in their mind, they would spend time diluting what should be going out there. He said they should prioritize what they are going to do. He said this is something that he would like them to think about.

-Resnick said they have agreed on 3 contingent on retreats and food. She asked if they would like to revisit these based on themselves

-Bocarsly asked if it would cut applications if they did 2

-Zimmerman said the impact would be smaller and it may affect one of the groups. She said with the public comment, this action might not affect them as much as they feel it will. She said it might not affect the numbers that much

-Resnick said Gamble brings up a good point. She said since they are aware of these funding sources, this is a huge push for them to apply for BOD and other funds. She said if they can look for sources where they could receive their funding elsewhere.

-Bocarsly said co-programming would not be in those 5 mentioned in recommendation 2. He said this is a good challenge to co-program for each of their options

-Smith said that as a council, they shouldn't be as programmatic. He said they should create more sustainable resources on campus so that groups could have a better experience at UCLA. He said that council shouldn't be programming when student groups could use these funds. He said he has his own programs and he's willing to cut back. He said that they should look for ways they could create sustainable change.

-Resnick said this could be discovered through the surveys they put out. She asked if anyone would want to write these down

-Starr said programs are an integral part of some of these offices. He said they got elected for a reason. He said he feels like this is a catch 22 and they are just a part of it.

-Smith said they haven't come together as a council in terms of tackling a big issue in terms of advocacy. He said they are all programming but they are not doing anything together. He said they aren't working on one project or two.

-Hester said they have been focusing on programming this quarter, but programming and advocacy goes hand in hand. She said that sometimes it helps students to bring home the message with tangible programming. She said community service day advocates greater issues at the greater Los Angeles area that puts together students at the greater Los Angeles area.

-Resnick asked if this was something they wanted to see on the guidelines

-Gamble said they should at least look into it. She said that the funding study group should look into it as well

-Resnick asked if they needed to vote

-Zimmerman said they didn't have anything to vote on

-Bocarsly said last week, they upped their allocations. He asked said the two new implementations would help.

-Arruejo said his recommendation is still the reduced amount by 70%.

-Bocarsly said they lacked consistency and there are still things to discuss. He asked if they should depend on the funding study group

-Zimmerman said the allocation was prior to Resnick's email. She asked if this would effect their percentages

-Arruejo said it would still be cut with 70% and he would be uncomfortable with a 60% reduction. He said looking at last year, they allocated under \$170,000. He said with the new allocation, they have \$49,000. He said since the money is starting earlier and there are more groups applying, he would keep the cuts at 70%. This would put contingency closest to 70%.

-Zimmerman said she understands that there was a higher budget last year. She said when there is a larger budget, there are less cuts to individual allocations. She said that they should keep that in mind. She said they are now looking at allocations with more detail because they are aware that there are less funds. She said there was a different perspective from last year.

-Resnick said they would not be able to allocate that much in winter and spring. She said it is hard to look at a group getting \$16. She said they know that they would not allocate that much.

-Arruejo said they shouldn't use 4 as an example because they didn't have enough documentation.

-Resnick said looking at other groups there were also small allocations. She said some groups still receive a 70% cut.

-Jasso said as of now, they are not saying they are eligible for 50%. As a committee, they are grading thinking they

had money. She said last year, they saw a group applying and thought of contingency applying with enough money. She said the cuts were done afterwards. She said they allocate as if there were no cuts and everyone at the end is cut to ensure that it was fair

-Bocarsly asked if they should move into the contingency allocation

-Resnick said they go hand in hand.

-Sidrak said for SGA, they have asked for them to be in by the end of this week or early next week. She said it may be a pressing issue to wait

-Resnick said there are upcoming events.

-Bocarsly gave an example of why it is a big issue to cut 50%. He brought up the IBP retreat. The retreat applied for \$600 and needed \$1100. In this case, they would receive \$67

-Arruejo said it would be \$135.

-Bocarsly said with this stipulation, they should get \$450

-Arruejo said he needed to cut everything equally. He said they are capping it and it's going to affect everyone in that way. He said he thinks this is the fairest way because otherwise there would be no cap for retreat. He said this is still something upon the members if they want to fund this.

-Zimmerman said she understands where Arruejo is coming from and ensuring that they have enough for the whole year. She said she knows that in the past, FiCom divided how much they should allocate each week. She said the number is useful gauge-wise. This way they could see if they were giving out a lot or a little. This would make it clear what the average was. She said this might be a helpful tool to make sure that we're not over-cutting but not under-cutting.

-Dr. Nelson said all other funding boards are not doing the same thing. He suggested a round table discussion to see what they could reach as far as funding can concern. He said he didn't know what the other funding entities would be thinking and what they would be able to go. He said that groups going to different groups wouldn't get enough funding. He said they're doing everything right but they're still functioning in isolation. He said they're hearing about 50% but they don't know what 100% is.

-Resnick asked about the allocations currently

-Bocarsly asked if they would be cut 70%. He said Zimmerman had a good point about using a reference. He said he doesn't feel comfortable giving less than 50%

-Sholklapper asked if the reason why they are sticking with the 70% reduction

-Arruejo said looking at past trends, 70% reductions to all groups would sustain contingency and put it close to 0 at the end of the year

-Sholklapper asked if the reduced amounts and if as many groups would continue to apply if the allocations are so small

-Arruejo said yes and they would use more of the money that they used than in previous years. He said there would be a lesser chance that they would use more of the money.

-Resnick said the 70% cut makes her nervous as well

-Sidrak said she doesn't think it's fair it was 50% last week and 70% this week considering it could change

-Starr said there asked if there was around \$75,000 at the beginning of the quarter

-Arruejo said probably around \$80,000

-Starr asked about accounts closing

-Arruejo said he's already assuming that accounts close. Even with closing accounts, they would still be reducing.

-Starr said based on numbers, a 50% cut seems reasonable

-Arruejo said spring has more programming. He said there are so many big events happening in spring. He said if they go with 50%, there will be a time where cuts are up to 80-90%. He said that if 50% would be done, they would make more cuts later.

-Resnick asked if BOD could cover the larger funds

-Bocarsly said that right now, they are proposing to cut 70%. He said this doesn't take into account other alternatives from the funding study group may have. He said that for consistency's sake, they could hopefully solve the problem before they get to later

-Resnick asked if those groups would get funding from other sources

-Arruejo said this is an added thing to make groups realize that groups would not get more than 50%. He said they could state that they should clearly say to get other sources of funding. He said he could reduce it by 5%. He said they allocated by previous guidelines and he still stands behind his allocations

-Bocarsly said with the cut, they would be getting less money

-Arruejo said groups would ask for less. He said that groups that ask for a lot aren't budgeting wisely and they are not keeping contingency as an auxiliary fund. He pointed to groups 5 and 8. The total requested was much less than

required and they were given more consideration when giving allocations.

-Bocarsly asked if they were rewarding groups for asking for less and then with the precedent all groups would do that

-Jasso said this cut is pushing for a sense of urgency. She said there is no way that if they maintain the way they allocating that groups will even get \$14 because there was a time where they graded 41 applications. She said if one week they get that many applications, they will need to cut more. She said this is urgent because student groups need to get their money allocated. She said there is a trend that is indisputable that they will get more applications. She asked what their priorities are now. She asked if the priority is getting to 0 or to give student groups funding. She said they are groups waiting for their allocations tomorrow. She said it is sad. She said she has applied to these funding sources. She asked if this was sustainable. She said she hopes they trust in the chairs knowing they've worked with the applications and knowing that they would get a lot more applications. She said they should consider that the contingencies they have now are what they're working on now. She said she promises that the funding study group will come up with more solutions. She said they have done everything they've done possible. She said they might not have the \$10,000 threshold in the bylaws to uphold their accounts. She asked about the long-term picture. She said everything they program is priority but she hopes that they prioritize spring quarter now.

-Resnick said thank you for her passion and they are still trying to come to terms to giving groups something they could use. She said they don't know the answer and they appreciate all of the work that the finance committee has done.

-Bocarsly said they are doing a great job. He said he still doesn't understand a 70% cut and the amount of money has changed

-Arruejo said the difference is \$20,000. He said previously, finance committee would have gotten more than \$120,000. He said 70% was the next line they would draw. He said given these are not there, he feels comfortable about the 70%. He said he is sure 50% is not sustainable throughout the year He is open to 60-65% reductions.

-Gamble said she is thinking back when they found out surplus was reduced. She said student groups are spending more and will continue to do the same thing. She said that at UCSB, student fees are higher so they have more funds. She said given the money they have, they need to be fiscally responsible. She said considering Arruejo and Jasso work with applications, they should trust in their decision. She said given spring quarter, they are making sure that groups get money at the end of the year. She said personally she is trusting what the FiCom is saying.

-Dr. Nelson asked how they figure out how much they would get later

-Arruejo said he looks at trends and what they've been giving has been a little less than last year's fall quarter.

-Dr. Nelson asked if he was going to project less money given out in winter than in spring. He asked if he could think in terms of quarters rather than weeks

-Arruejo said he could, but groups could apply really early which could skew the quarters. He said with contingency, there is a lot of educated guesswork. He said that looking at past quarters, given an increase, his best guess would be that a 70% reduction would sustain it. He said this is the nature of the programming fund. He said he is making educated guesses given past guesses

-Dr. Nelson said it is up to council to have some trust in the people who have their finger on this. He said to trust the people who are doing projections on this. He said he is concerned about priorities. He said they can't do everything for everybody. He said that they should trust the people who were put in these positions

-Bocarsly said he thinks that it's more important that events that get done get done earlier rather than spread themselves too thin. He said that they risk ending early.

-Hester said it makes sense that small allocations don't make sense. She said this biases earlier programs.

-Bocarsly said he agrees there is a bias. He said that he trusts the recommendations, but they're budgeting to making the money last but he's saying let's make the events happen rather than not

-Arruejo said he disagrees. He said his job is to make sure contingency is available the entire year. He said he still recommends a 70% reduction. He said they are being more transparent. He said they are giving USAC additional information. He said they are giving more information and showing that they have thought about all the consequences.

-Sidrak said with all due respect, the appropriate forum is the funding study group. She said the three options are to vote for contingency with their recommendations, to keep the allocation from last week, or to table it.

-Starr said he feels like they are comparing emotional attachment to what's fair. He said Arruejo is presenting what's most fair. He said if they are to do what's fair, he believes in the allocation Arruejo brought up.

-Yao said it is important to be consistent. She said based on next week, if there would be more information. She said she would want to make her decision based on if there is new information

-Resnick said she believes that the recommendation is the way to go contingent if they are still going to explore other options. She said this goes hand in hand with advertising for other events as well to ensure student groups get

## funding

- Bocarsly said they are forgetting that they are getting more money from ASUCLA. He said there are a lot of things they could discuss that could potentially increase their money. He said they could make the 50% cut now and once they have finalized things they could make a consistent cut. He said they are assuming some things but not other things. He said there are still ways around this and they are taking a risk of being inconsistent.
- Yao said since this is the end of the quarter, they can stay with the 50% and over winter break they could highly publicize to student groups to watch out that contingency is being lessened so that groups are ready by the time they apply
- Resnick said these guidelines and a 70% cut would start next quarter
- Zimmerman said after these next few weeks, 50% might be a good number to keep it consistent. She said they could decide on a final number after they have concrete details.
- Starr said it would only raise a little and there weren't many applications this week. He said 50% for this week wouldn't have a detrimental impact on the allocations.
- Resnick said the guidelines aren't set in stone. She asked if anyone is opposed to the 50% cut for this week's contingency.
- Arruejo asked if she was only asking voting members. He objected
- Yao amended the finance committee allocation to a 50% cut.
- Sholklapper moved to approve contingency
- Arruejo said it is now 30%. They should approve his and amend it
- Sholklapper moved to approve contingency this week. Bocarsly seconded
- Yao moved to amend it to 50%. Soto seconded
- Starr called to question contingency for this week. Chikanov seconded. With a vote of 8-2-0, contingency for this week was approved with the amended 50% cut.

## X. New Business

## A. \*Police Brutality Resolution

- Starr moved to approve the police brutality resolution
- Resnick asked if someone could make amendments to the resolution
- Zimmerman asked the amender to send her the amended resolution
- Gamble said that instances of severe police brutality are happening across UC campuses. UCPD are also used to dealing with violent protestors. At UCLA, those arrested went peacefully. She read the amendment as follows:

## Resolution Condemning Police Brutality in the University of California

WHEREAS, the skyrocketing costs to attend UCLA and declining quality of the academic and student services provided have caused added stress and increased frustration amongst the student body; and

WHEREAS, Regents meetings are no longer held at campuses with undergraduate student populations and the November 2011 meeting was rescheduled to a teleconference meeting to be held early Monday morning immediately after Thanksgiving break (1); and

WHEREAS, there is a trend towards decreased transparency for Regents meetings and the University of California Office of the President; and

WHEREAS, this lack of transparency was seen at President Yudof's visit to UC San Diego during which he denied a request to meet with student leaders there; and

WHEREAS, University students have fewer and fewer avenues through which to express their concerns, as Chancellors hold office hours once or twice a quarter and most students do not have the ability to access their administrators; and

WHEREAS, due to the lack of accessibility to University decision-makers, students across the UC are using direct actions to make their voices heard on issues of University quality and affordability; and

WHEREAS, direct actions have taken place in the last week at UCLA and each of the other undergraduate campuses

(2); and

WHEREAS, peaceful student protestors at UC Berkeley and UC Davis were met with excessive police force and, in the case of UC Davis, pepper spray (3); and

WHEREAS, cases of police brutality on one UC campus has implication on all other campuses; and

WHEREAS, the UCLA Undergraduate Students Association Council has the duty to serve as an advocate and voice for the students it represents; and

WHEREAS, the Undergraduate Students Association Council has the responsibility to put student needs first even over that of individual council member projects; and

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council condemns any acts of police brutality and excessive force used against peaceful student protestors.

LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council stands in solidarity with students at the Berkeley and Davis campuses of the University of California.

LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council strongly urges Chancellor Block to issue a public statement in support of peaceful student protestors across the UC and against excessive police force.

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council will advocate for preventative measures within the UCLA University of California Police Department to prevent incidents of police brutality from occurring at this campus.

LET IT FINALLY BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council President will send this resolution to all appropriate administrators, including the Chancellor of the University and the Directory of the UCLA Police Community Service Bureau.

Sponsor:

Joelle Gamble, USAC External Vice President  
Kinnery Shah, USAC Cultural Affairs Commissioner

Citation:

- (1) <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/nov28.html>
- (2) <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/18/us/berkeley-crackdown-raises-fear-of-move-backward.html>
- (3) <http://abcnews.go.com/US/uc-davis-pepper-spraying-occupy-protesters-call-chancellors/story?id=14992787>

-Gamble said it puts into context why students are using direct actions to get their actions heard. She said that coupled with frustrations are causing students to use alternative means, which are being met with excessive force.  
-Resnick said the title is not indicative of everything it talks about. She said it could mention exercising free speech or resolution condemning police brutality and exercising free speech  
-Gamble said that could be added as a friendly amendment  
-Resnick said it could be the Resolution condemning police brutality and in support of free speech  
-Starr said he doesn't understand the context of one part of the wheras's about presence  
-Gamble said it could be amended  
-Smith said UCLA did not have a presence with some events and movements  
-Starr said it is kind of redundant when looking at the line before it  
-Smith said it echo's what he said earlier about different programming and making sure that they are on the same bandwagon  
-Resnick said they could amend it so both opinions are heard  
-Sholklapper said the last whereas should be taken out because it attacks USAC.

- Starr asked if they should have the events
- Gamble said it's saying that they step outside what their existing agendas are and recognize that these are things that are happening immediately. She said at some point, something will happen and they would need to prioritize this
- Resnick said they could phrase it in a different way. She said she would hope that if something like this happens then that would be priority
- Gamble said the point is off rather than the intention or message
- Bocarsly said they could change the resolution to "whereas the top priority of the undergraduate student council is to service as an advocate.." which combines the two resolutions
- Resnick said she emailed something to council that was circulating amongst presidents. She said one part of the letter is something they as student government should follow. It says that they could peacefully protest within university regulations.
- Smith said he read it and understands it. He said speaking to the different movements, they as council need to make a bigger stance on these needs. He said he wasn't sure of the policies in tact, but he feels like they should evaluate what they are doing. One part of the resolution calls on the chancellor for taking a stance on this. He said he is interested in figuring out what they are going to do on behalf of student needs. He said they are stagnant.
- Resnick said she agrees and this is a point to consider
- Starr said a reason they haven't taken much stance is because nothing has happened here. He said they have to assume a silent majority that's with this. He said as a council, making a statement is not something they need to do because it's not affecting their campus
- Lazarovici said that pepper spray was used against UCLA students at a regents meeting
- Resnick asked if there were any amendments to the resolution as is
- Smith said he didn't understand being reactionary. He asked why something needed to happen for them to get involved. He said asking the chancellor to step in is not a huge thing for him to do and they should pressure him and themselves to take more of a stance.
- Sidrak said she understands Starr's point and they don't need to wait around until something happens. She said it is an important message the resolution is addressing. She said she should reference her Daily Bruin article
- Gamble said it could talk about the UCLA's student civic responsibility to engage in political dialogue.
- Sidrak said they are in conjunction with their sister campuses with that
- Gamble said the resolution could become a stronger statement and they could put it out next week
- Bocarsly said things may change after the regents meeting. He said there was a contradiction in the second point.
- Gamble said that should be clarified
- Resnick said this should be made obvious that the meeting is at a campus
- Bocarsly said that could be a statement at the end
- Resnick said they could ensure that student voices could be heard
- Gamble said that she would start a thread
- Resnick said if this has the power to have a lot of purpose and action, it would be a lot more effective.
- Bocarsly asked if they were suppose to have three sponsors
- Zimmerman said they need three council members
- Bocarsly moved to table this to next week. Starr seconded.
- Resnick said they should mark up the resolution and have friendly amendments and comments.

#### XI. Announcements

- Chikanov talked about bikes to campus week. They had bike tune ups and thanked everyone who helped publicize the event
- Zimmerman said December 2 is the ASUCLA event fund deadline. This is the deadline for January. She reminded them to read the website. She said it's easy to apply. She talked about UCOP about a survey and said they didn't have to do that. She said she talked to HR and they don't have to worry about filling out the survey.
- Resnick asked if they could look at making Waiverpool more accessible.
- Zimmerman said it is posted on the same website where they apply. She said they could always talk to their event manager. She said they could try to think of another location. She said they never post the amount. She said to mention it to Laury or she could do that.

#### XII. Signing of the attendance sheet.

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

XIII. Adjournment

- Starr moved and Bocarsly seconded to adjourn the meeting.
- Resnick called for Acclamation. Resnick asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 11:17 p.m. by Acclamation.

XIV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,  
Katrina Dimacali  
USAC Minutes Taker  
2011-2012