

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday, February 7, 2012

417 Kerckhoff Hall

7:00 p.m.

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

ABSENT: Kinnery Shah

GUESTS: Jilliam Beck, Kristen Taketa, John Joanino

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

-Starr moved to strike the cultural affairs mini-grant.

- Gamble moved and Smith 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. *1/24/12

-Gamble said Lee is spelled Le

-Arruejo said it should read 13 offices, not 15

-Dr. Geller said she wasn't here

- Starr moved and Saxe seconded to approve the minutes for February 7, 2012, 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

There were no public comments this week.

V. Special Presentations

Sarah and Brandon- Special Olympics

-Brandon said he would like to go over what the Special Olympics is and how they could get involved. They are a nonprofit organization. He talked about the use the power of sports training and competition. They are one of the 15 chapters around North America. This is a worldwide movement. One of the biggest chapters is in southern California. The World Games will be hosted at UCLA. The mission is to provide training and competition for children and adults with intellectual disabilities. Their vision is to improve their lives and the lives they touch. They have about 2.5 athletes around the world. Everything is free for the athletes. The impact is that 52% of athletes are employed and gain skills from the sports. The goal is to change lives through sports. People could get involved through competitions. People could also become a coach or volunteer. The competitions would be a way to get involved. This could be running an event or operating one of the venues. People could keep time, keep score, or be a delegation escort. People could connect and help make their experience memorable. During down time, people are able to hang out. People could hang out in Olympic Village. This is a fun experience that enhances the overall competition.

-Sarah said they sustain their organization through different fundraising events. She said they have polar plunge. Lambda Chi Alpha is taking part this year. They would love to see UCLA get involved in any way. People sign up as a team on Polar Plunge. People can use the website to raise money. They have incentive prizes as well. They have a safety demonstration. They have an opportunity for people to join a team. People could become a chicken instead and they have incentives for the chickens as well. Everyone has something they could do. The next large fundraising event is in August. This is called plane pull in Long Beach airport. This requires teams of 24. Each team must raise a minimum of \$2000, or \$40 each. They come out to LB Airport and play tug of war with an airbus to the next plane. They did not have UCLA the past year but they would love to have them. Their founder is alum of UCLA. They could also get involved with the end the R-word campaign. This is an initiative to create awareness for individuals with disabilities. Part of this is to have a pledge drive. People can sign pledges online. To go along with that, a group could

do fundraisers or a sports day. This is a way to increase awareness on the campus. This is a way to reach solidarity.

-Sarah said all of the other opportunities involve them going out to do something, but this way people could participate on their own. She said this is something where a million different things could be done.

-Brandon said people could be a coach. He said this is one of the greatest experiences they could have. They could work with athletes on a weekly basis. The coaches are amazing and they are able to see the transformation from the beginning to the end of training. They are blessed with having great volunteers. They all play a part in this movement.

-Sarah said thank you for their time.

-Brandon said thank you and their contact is there

-Starr asked what would be at UCLA

-Brandon said World Games would be at UCLA in 2015.

-Smith said he appreciates the spreading of awareness of the R-word. He said he is working on a campaign that deals with non-inclusive language. He asked if there is an education piece

-Sarah said if he wants to do a campaign, he could work with herself and Brandon and they could do something for a day or a week

-Brandon said it could make it easier on his end.

-Sarah said they put their cards in the folder

-Resnick thanked them for coming.

-Sarah said thank you and they would be back soon.

“Effect of ASUCLA contingent liability funds on BOD Programming Fund” by Roman Nguyen

Nguyen said they calculated all the scores from last year and this year. He showed the allocations last year and everything to the right of that was based on the numbers this year.

He said he has the estimated base allocation. They are going to have around \$135,000

-Sidrak asked if there was supposed to be numbers in the column that says UCLA BOX

-Nguyen said no. He said they could see what it looks like compared to last year

-Saxe asked why last year's number was so much lower

-Nguyen said they have to look at everything

-Bocarsly said the groups that would've gotten \$9000 last year would only get \$5000 this year

-Nguyen said in the last page, they had to do a 55% reduction from the base amount. He said the next box over is when they accept half. This is about \$17,000. They would have

\$152,000. This would only be a 50% cut. The next box over shows a 44% cut. If they accept the ASUCLA fund, they reduce the reduction rate from 10%. He said many factors could apply. He said groups could change and these are only projections of what it might look like.

-Champawat said it seems like they changed something about the formula. He asked what percentage in spring quarter of the requests was filled last year. He said now, they are cutting about cuts. He asked what the amount of cut last year. He asked what was the percentage of what was given to what was asked for.

-Nguyen said the total requested asked for and eligible was \$800,000. They only have a total of \$178,000 last year. They have \$50,000 short this year.

-Champawat said \$178,765 was granted on a request of how much

-Nguyen said approximately \$800,000

-Champawat said last year it was 25%

-Nguyen said his formula changes the numbers a lot. He said the total requested number is a different number.

-Champawat asked if it flushes itself out

-Bocarsly asked where they were getting the cuts. He said they should have a total of \$280,000

-Nguyen said the eligible amount is there. The eligible calculated total is \$300,000.

-Starr asked what the reduction was. He asked what the 55.9% was

-Nguyen said the eligible calculated was what student groups were supposed to get. He said if they fully allocated to everyone, which is what they would get.

-Saxe asked if they knew how many more groups would apply

-Nguyen said about 20

-Saxe said how that would impact things

-Nguyen said it would make a dramatic difference. He said the 10% figure would probably decrease.

-Resnick said he mentioned closing accounts. She asked if it was factored in

-Nguyen said yes

-Gamble asked what the estimated amount is

-Nguyen said \$135,000.

-Gamble asked what the additional amount added was. She asked what closing of accounts mean

-Nguyen said less than \$2000. He said student groups are using their funds

-Saxe said thank you for a detailed account

-Dr. Geller said as she looks at these numbers, the first thing she notices is that the formula makes an increase where smaller groups are getting more funding. She said

whether they use the extra funds or not, the smaller groups are getting more money than last year. She said by giving them these extra dollars, they are taking it away from next year. She said they need to decide if it's worth giving the larger groups, who the formula change has reduced their allocations, to give the larger groups 10% more and having less to giving out last year. She asked if that was an accurate description.

- Nguyen said yes. He said he tried to make it as clear as possible
- Resnick asked what he sees the impact of the BOD funding
- Nguyen said any funding would help students
- Resnick asked what would be most beneficial
- Nguyen suggested accepting and not using it until they have more data in March. He said he would show them 3 options with how it would look like with the numbers.
- Resnick said that is very wise. She said thank you for all of their different options
- Sholklapper asked if multiple groups could apply for the same event
- Nguyen said no
- Sholklapper said more than one group applied for the African Student Graduation
- Resnick said this was last year
- Nguyen said he wouldn't know because that was from a different BRD
- Resnick said to give the council a little longer to see if they have questions
- Saxe asked if that was a change in guidelines that they couldn't apply for the same event twice
- Nguyen said it could have been a mistake from last year
- Saxe said if this was in the guidelines
- Nguyen said he believes it was
- Arruejo asked if there is questioning of Nguyen. He said this discussion item has ended.
- Resnick said thank you to Nguyen. She said they would like to move to old business of the amendment to winter SOOF allocations

VI. Appointments

There were no appointments this week.

VII. Fund Allocations

A. Academic Success Referendum Fund

- Saxe said they got a request from NSU. They were allocated \$2000.
- Jewish Student Union was allocated \$131.24
- Cultural Affairs were allocated \$900
- Dr. Geller asked how much was left in the fund
- Saxe said she could bring it next week.

B. Academic Affairs Mini-Grant

There was no business for the academic affairs mini-grant this week.

C. EVP Travel Grant

-Gamble said she could read the allocations. There were three groups. Bruin Democrats got \$430 for the CA Democratic Convention. They did a good job cutting the costs. Bruins for Taiwan is going to a conference exploring Taiwanese Identity. Their allocation was \$490. Chi Alpha Christian fellowship got \$320 for their conference. The grant is approaching \$7000.

D. Cultural Affairs Mini-Grant

There was no business for the cultural affairs mini-grant this week.

E. *Contingency Allocations

Bocarsly moved to approve this week's contingency. Sidrak seconded.

-Arruejo said he sent out the allocations this weekend.

Organizations/Commissions are requiring a total of **\$16,414.96** for their programs. A total of **\$5,934.64 was requested from contingency** of that, a total of **\$902.50 is recommended for allocation** for this week (at 50% reduction).

There is a total of **\$4,676.07** left in the Contingency Programming Fund.

-Arruejo said this doesn't include the closing of accounts

-Bocarsly said he knows that Shah and Resnick wanted to not accept their allocations. He moved to amend the USAC cultural affairs and USAC Office of the President allocations. Sholklapper seconded.

-Sidrak called to question. Gamble seconded. With a vote of 9-0-0, contingency this week was approved.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports**President- Emily Resnick**

Resnick said thank you to everyone who met the student regents last week. They felt very welcome and said there was a larger turn out. This week she will be meeting the president of Berkeley. They had a council of presidents call this week as well. She said tomorrow is Kids Empowerment Day with SWC, AAC, and Gen. Rep 2. This is in Bruin Plaza from 11-1. They are bringing Teach for America, One Heart Source, Camp Laurel, Pediatric Aids

Coalition, etc. She said this is about outreach, awareness, internship opportunities, and jobs. She said all of these groups have games as well. This also commends what these groups are doing. She said this week on Thursday from 7-9 is the prop 209 debate. She said she would email out all of these dates. This Saturday would be the rolling rally. This is a project by one of the presidential interns from 10:30-11:30 by Drake where the busses load. There will be face painting and prizes. She said they have their all USAC dinner on the 23rd. As a part of sustainability week, March 3 from late morning to early afternoon, the office will have an all-office beach clean up. She said they are excited about that. She said the president's office has been looking at the USAC website and see how they could revamp it. She said they should all look at it. If they see anything that they want changed they could let her know. She said they could update the calendar via their own calendars in their USAC emails. She said they are also looking into having a section of office accomplishments to increase transparency.

-Sidrak said the TGIF mini fund application has an error message.

-Resnick said to keep looking at the website and see how they could make it better

Internal Vice President- Kristina Sidrak

Sidrak said student-networking night is 8th week on Tuesday. OrgSync invites would be sent out soon. Campus Safety week is also coming up. The Enough is Enough project is looking to expand and get more students involved. It is an anti-violence campaign. This year is about dating abuse and stalking. She said this is scheduled for week 2 of spring. She said the student group advocacy initiative aims to ensure that all student groups at UCLA are supported by UCLA. Last quarter, they took all the student groups on OrgSync and broke them down into categories. This quarter they followed up on emails. They are starting student group visits and are there to answer questions that students groups may have. She said questions are rolling in constantly

External Vice President- Joelle Gamble

Gamble said the UCSA board meeting was over the weekend. She said they endorsed the millionaire's tax but not in absence of endorsing Brown's initiative as well. She said they passed a resolution that would take UCSA funds from their bank to a credit union or a community bank as a sign of solidarity with the occupy movement. She said they would like to make the associate degree an automatic acceptance. They would be meeting with Holly Mitchell soon. She said there is something important coming from the speaker's office this week. She said in addition, they got about 200 applicants for the student lobby conference. They are trying to get funds from outside sources. She believes the prop 209 debate was cancelled but students will be going up to San Francisco on Monday. She said they got sponsorship from the NAACP and other groups.

Academic Affairs Commissioner-Raquel Saxe

Saxe said it is mental health week. Their contribution is Thursday 11-1 with SWC and Gen Rep 2 as well as random acts of kindness. They have a lot of materials with CAPS and are working with the Bruin Resource Center as well. She said they are working on establishing a one-on-one peer mentorship program. They will most likely do a pilot program. They are working with FLAG, future leaders of America's generation. She said they could pursue major blast for spring quarter on April 10th in Ackerman. This is geared toward all students and would provide information on what all majors have to offer. She said some programs are impacted and under-utilized, such as the poli-sci minor. She said this would hopefully allow students to take advantage of different things on campus. She said she met with an SWC representative who works with Fitted. They are working to do collaboration. She met with the SIAC representative. She worked with Khy on the Princeton Review scholarships as well. She said she was helpful in giving advice. Tonight, some of their staffers are at the entrepreneurship course and are seeing if they can improve it. There are 8 high schools for the global leadership conference. She has been meeting with ASUCLA for cheaper textbooks and to have more options available online. She said the campus on planning and budget would like to clarify the sale of the Japanese garden. When it was acquired, it was used at the chancellor's residence. The funds are supposed to go to management, medicine, and art history departments. There is a projection that it could go to potential student scholarships if there are additional funds.

-Dr. Nelson asked what the sale price would be

-Saxe said in 1982 it was about \$4 million. She said that is the last figure they have. The report she got didn't have the exact financial information but she could try to get that and pass it along

Administrative Representative- Dr. Geller

Dr. Geller said they are invited to breakfast with the chancellor on Feb. 22 in De Neve dining hall at 7:50 and they would be out by 9. She said this is a chance to share with him some of their initiatives, concerns, and ask questions. There will be some student affairs present to provide follow up. She said she needs to know by next Tuesday evening if they are available to go. She said to email her if she could go. This invitation is not transferrable. She said this is only for the elected plus FiCom chair. Dr. Geller said they would meet in the lobby. She said there is an organization called Autism Speaks. They do a lot of work promoting issues related to Autism and providing services. They named April 2 as World Autism Awareness Day. They are running an initiative called light it up blue. They are looking for organizations that would put up blue lights on that day. She said she has their literature. She asked if any of them are interested in potentially finding a way to

participate.

Student Government Services- Patty Zimmerman

-Zimmerman said they had their green initiative funds. She said they had about 17 groups apply for projects and they had a lot of new groups. They got 6 mini-fund applications. The mini-fund is new. She said if they have any other problems to send the web master an email. She said they are getting lots of applications in and are adding compost to UCLA. Jazz Reggae is adding things to projects. They have a water tank at Sunset Garden. They are also helping Dance Marathon. She said she would like to share this with them soon.

-Resnick said thank you and thank you to the council members that participated in hearings

Alumni Representative- Lauren Lazarovici

Lazarovici said the R-word campaign is intriguing. She said there are a lot of words that have the same sting as the R-word campaign. She said with the issue of free speech and how speech has been used, it is an interesting thing that has come up.

IX. Old Business

A. Amendment to Winter SOOF Allocations

-Nguyen said he made an error on his part. There were 3 organizations ineligible for SOOF. This averages on \$18 more for each group

-Arruejo asked if they could make members aware that only one person is allowed to speak at a time

-Resnick said if they had side comments to please keep it to a whisper

-Nguyen said there were some groups who applied twice.

-Dr. Nelson asked if those groups got no money

-Nguyen said yes

-Sholklapper called to question the amendment winter SOOF allocations. Saxe seconded.

-Smith asked why they were ineligible.

-Nguyen said they applied fall quarter.

-Sholklapper called to question the amendment winter SOOF allocations. Saxe seconded.

-With a vote of 9-0-0, the SOOF allocations were approved.

B. * ASUCLA Contingent Liability Funds

-Bocarsly moved to approve the ASUCLA contingent liability funds language. Starr seconded.

-Resnick said she thinks that from taking from Nguyen's presentation, the last line is the only one that needs clarification. She said they would present numbers with and without

funding from ASUCLA when he has numbers. She said they should say, "We recommend the budget review director to use minimal or the least amount of funding."

-Sidrak asked if they could add something to the end that had to do with the BRD and then evaluate then

-Bocarsly said there is nothing to allocate until then. He said they could say, "from then they could review what to spend." He said he is leaning toward they shouldn't spend any money on it. He said if they look at the last line, they could assume they have the exact same applications this year as last year. He said last year, they gave 22% of the total allocations. He said out of his numbers, it adds up to 17% and 19%. He said they would see minimal increase. He said the increase using all the money to none would be a 4% increase. He said they are looking at a minimal effect

-Saxe said they are used to a 50% reduction. She said if they stay on the same numbers they could say on the same page. She said if more groups apply the numbers would be reduced. She said she thinks the difference would be minimal and she suggests they don't use it. She said they don't have to approve or do anything with the amount they were given. She said she thinks that is totally fine.

-Bocarsly said the process for contingency is different from BOD. He said the 55% is from the eligible amount. He said they are not using the same numbers and the same variables.

-Saxe said it is closer to the amount requested. She said it is closer in concept. She said either way it is minimal

-Sholklapper said he agrees that they probably won't end up using it and they should decide later. He said while the amount is minimal, to the groups that need a lot of funding, it could be significant. He said for Lotus Steps, they were given \$9000 last year and based on this year they would be given half. He said if they were given the money, they would get almost \$1300 more. He said that was a big difference for a big event. He said they couldn't do anything until they see those numbers

-Zimmerman said herself and Champawat would work with Nguyen to go over the formula and add clarity. She said she would work with Nguyen with the numbers for when they present

-Bocarsly said they haven't even talked about the contingency. He wrote new language

-Saxe said if it could include liability

-Gamble said her issue was more with contingency programming. She said she feels like in terms of the contingency allocations, they should take an approach and wait until they see how many funds should be added. She said if FiCom is already closing accounts, they should continue with that process and continue until they are at the point that they need to add ASUCLA liability funds.

-Bocarsly said the difference between BRD and FiCom is that FiCom is budgeting for the

whole year. He said Arruejo would not run out of money. He said when dollars will be spent is not relevant

-Gamble said it should be kept at 50% and she understands his point of they it doesn't matter when they spend it, but she said she would be more comfortable voting on it sooner.

-Bocarsly mentioned the wording

-Starr said they are not spending it now.

-Gamble said they are implying the money is already spent by spring quarter

-Bocarsly mentioned possible wording for the capital contingency statement wording.

-Saxe said they are not voting on whether or not they would use it, but that they would deal with BOD later and continue to keep contingency allocated at that rate. She said that is the only way that is coming to play.

-Gamble said before the statement was ambiguous. She said this new statement is clearer

-Bocarsly asked if that was correct grammar.

-Sidrak asked if he needed the date of that meeting

-Starr mentioned possible wording for the statement

-Saxe said if this would make the other sentence void

-Resnick said they are saying that they would not be spending more than allocated

-Saxe said they are saying they cannot spend more than what is in contingency

-Bocarsly said he agrees. He said last week they added it to their statement

-Arruejo asked what the original motion is and he's not sure what the different amendments were.

-Bocarsly said the motion was to approve the statement that they now changed

-Arruejo said it's in the minutes.

-Zimmerman said they could say that they move to amend the statement and then amend it as adjusted.

-Bocarsly moved the amendment to read as follows: *USAC recommends to the Finance Committee to allocate contingency programming at the rate of 50% for the rest of winter quarter and the first two weeks of Spring quarter. We will reevaluate the spending of the contingent liability funds second week of spring quarter unless the contingency fund is depleted prior to second week of spring quarter. Furthermore, USAC will address whether to use the contingent liability funds allocated to BOD when spring allocations are submitted to council for approval. We recommend to the Budget Review Director to present to council figures with and without the contingent liability funds.*

-Sidrak seconded.

-Resnick welcomed Yao and Chikanov. She said they are making changes to the wording of the USAC recommendation. She said that Nguyen would present the numbers later in the most visible way. She said the revision is to reflect what she said.

-Sholklapper asked if it should state the "undergraduate student association council"

instead of “we.”

-Bocarsly suggested that they change this to say that they would not tap into the fund until they run out of funding. He said that they could make this clearer.

-Resnick said that if there is a sentence, they could “move to add” before they made an amendment to the statement

-Sholklapper made a friendly amendment to change USAC to “the undergraduate student association council” and to use “USAC” instead of “we.”

-Gamble said before they move to amend it, she likes that it says second week of spring quarter because it sets a hard deadline. She said if there were a motion, she would like to keep that in there.

-Resnick agreed that this language is powerful

-Smith asked if they should cut out “council” and put USAC. He made a friendly amendment to change “council” and “council figures” to “USAC.”

-Bocarsly moved to change the second sentence to say, “*USAC will reevaluate the proposed usage of Contingent liability funds.*”

-Resnick said they should look over the wording

-Saxe asked when he anticipates depleting contingency

-Arruejo said probably in the last two weeks. He said the finance committee would like the recommendations from USAC for reductions because they won’t know until the last few weeks

-Bocarsly asked if it would be the last weeks of spring

-Arruejo said it would be the last two weeks of May

-Bocarsly said the spring allocations would be good language

-Resnick recommended the change to the last sentence to read: “*USAC recommends to the Budget Review Director to present the allocations to USAC with and without the contingent liability funds*”

-Soto said that there needs more clarification on the sentence mentioning spring quarter

-Bocarsly made a friendly amendment to change the wording to: “*f the fund is depleted prior to second week of spring quarter, USAC will reevaluate the proposed usage at that time.*”

-Sholklapper made a friendly amendment to lowercase “spring.”

-Saxe moved to approve the statement. She read the statement as follows: “*The Undergraduate Students Association Council, from here forth referred to as USAC, recommends to the Finance Committee to allocate contingency programming at the rate of 50% for the rest of winter quarter and the first two weeks of spring quarter. USAC will reevaluate the proposed usage of the contingent liability funds second week of spring quarter unless the contingency fund is depleted prior to second week of spring quarter. If the fund is depleted prior to second week of spring quarter, USAC will reevaluate the proposed usage at that time. Furthermore, USAC will address whether to use the contingent liability funds allocated to BOD when spring allocations are submitted to USAC for approval. USAC recommends to the Budget Review Director to present the allocations to USAC*”

with and without the contingent liability funds.”

-Soto said they could delete parts that may be redundant.

-Saxe read the statement as follows: *“The Undergraduate Students Association Council, from here forth referred to as USAC, recommends to the Finance Committee to allocate contingency programming at the rate of 50% for the rest of winter quarter and the first two weeks of spring quarter. USAC will reevaluate the proposed usage of the contingent liability funds second week of spring quarter. If the fund is depleted prior to second week of spring quarter, USAC will reevaluate the proposed usage at that time. Furthermore, USAC will address whether to use the contingent liability funds allocated to BOD when spring allocations are submitted to USAC for approval. USAC recommends to the Budget Review Director to present the allocations to USAC with and without the contingent liability funds.”*

-Sholklapper called to question. Gamble seconded. With a vote of 11-0-0, the language of the statement of the capital contingency money transfer has been approved.

X. New Business

A. Code of Ethics Discussion

-Resnick said she would like to mention the code of ethics discussion. She they wanted to draft a document that illustrated this. She said directors in her office brought this up. She said she wanted to bring this to the table to see what council thought about the idea of having a code of ethics in place. She said in her opinion, it could be something that council could possibly sign. She said she would like to hear their thoughts.

-Arruejo asked how the code of ethics is approved on other campuses and how they use it in student government lives.

-Resnick said she would find out before council approves it. She said this would be something that was acknowledged by USAC.

-Arruejo asked if they were voting on anything

-Resnick said no. She said this is a discussion to get input

-Saxe asked if they had a way that this would be issued to council members every year

-Zimmerman said they could set that up to be institutionalized in some way. She said they could have this added to installation or stipend paperwork.

-Saxe asked if she had a recommendation of where it would be most appropriate

-Champawat said every year they sign an ethical understanding. He said by signing it, it is a type of affirmative action. He said they sign it when they sign evaluations. He said installation could be an affirming time to see what they stand for. He said that might be a powerful time to do it

-Gamble said in the document section 2, what the change was between this and article e.

-Resnick said she wasn't sure but she would check and get back to them. She said she doesn't know if all council has read to all of the bylaws. She said she would go back and check on that

-Lazarovici said she works in health care, which is highly regulated. She said in her work

organization, everyone has to take compliance training every year. She said this is a common thing. She asked if they take an oath of office.

-The council said yes.

-Lazarovici said this is part of it

-Sholklapper said it reads "no USA member" and it should be changed to "USAC"

-Dr. Geller said that in section 3, UCLA has 5 values: respect, accountability, integrity, service, and excellence.

-Smith said they could possibly add a section toward USAC retreat that addresses the code of ethics like during installation

-Sidrak asked for clarification in "appointed" and if it reflects people they appoint

-Resnick said she would make sure to clarify that.

-Sidrak said since they do appoint individuals, it might be worthwhile for people they appoint to sign the pledge and follow the values they list. She said for article 2, it is similar to what is stated in conflict of interest. She asked if they would like to include a sentence about council members and their technological privileges. She said that they need to hold their staff members accountable as well.

-Gamble said she is still trying to figure out what the document is designed to do. She said she is looking through the additional guidelines. She said these sections are in the bylaws, student conduct code, etc. She asked if this was a code of ethics cheat sheet or if it was meant to add something.

-Resnick said by taking their oath, they are expected to follow it. She said this is a way to take these guidelines and put them in front of council to let them know what the rules and guidelines are. She said this is the overarching goal.

-Gamble recommended this be presented in the binders but not codified.

-Champawat said this is good in reinforcing the bylaws. He said nobody wants someone that is elected to trip over something that they didn't do. He said everyone wants the rules of engagement to be clear. He said that the defense that someone didn't know is a defense to take off the table. He said it helps a person not to trip over something

-Lazarovici said they should call this a compilation rather than a "cheat sheet."

-Bocarsly said this highlights something they all care about. He said he likes what Sidrak said about using it for appointments. He said he likes changing USA to "USAC." He said in terms of article 2 versus what's in the bylaws, it is specific to elected officials.

-Saxe proposed it saying, "I vow not to...I will not" to have it as more of a personal pledge. She said this would take care of the rest of the language.

-Resnick said this is a great change. She said next week, members of her office would be able to present. She said this is an open document open for discussions. She said she hopes this is in place for future councils as well. She said they are not voting on anything

tonight and she appreciates their input

-Bocarsly asked if they would have potential copies

-Resnick said next week is when language would be voted upon. She guessed that in two weeks, it would be something that they sign. She said this would be something they endorse hopefully within the next two weeks.

B. Referendum Discussion

-Saxe said she thinks that if they are looking to pursue this, it would have to be something that all of council supported. She said if they do not all stand together, this is not something they would support either. She said in light of increased fees, they should look to other alternatives. She said that they've all talked about internal structural changes but she hasn't heard any formal changes to the finance committee guidelines. She said she would love to hear more details about the internal funding guidelines. She said she is not sure of what those changes are but she would love to hear ideas.

-Gamble said in terms of ideas, they should discuss something specifically. She asked if this would be during USAC elections or during special elections

-Resnick said it could be fall

-Gamble asked if the future council would vote on it

-Resnick said yes

-Zimmerman said if they vote in fall, it wouldn't come into effect until the year after.

-Dr. Geller said if an election were held in fall depending on when, it could potential take effect in winter and maybe by spring

-Dr. Nelson said it would be with council's vote

-Zimmerman said disregard her comment

-Yao asked if they had it before the upcoming spring election if people were in favor of a referendum

-Gamble said there should be a time frame for making a special election happen.

-Resnick said Sidrak is looking up the bylaws now

-Dr. Geller said if they wanted to hold a special election, they should have their election board in place. They would need the language of the referendum early enough to get the chancellor's approval early enough to get the ballot set up. She said as long as these things are in place, it could be done at any point in time. She said if they look realistically, they probably don't have time to take all the technical steps and do enough campaigning to get enough people to vote on it. She said they would need to make a presentation to SFAC. She said if they don't support you, it could be a challenge

-Saxe said the 15 days refers to if a council member is removed from office. She said special elections can't be have first or tenth week and should last one or two days.

-Dr. Nelson asked what the advantages and disadvantages were to having a special election

-Saxe said if this is brought up in a general election, it could bring up political tension. If everyone was behind it, it could generate more support

-Dr. Nelson asked if everyone could agree. He said more groups are applying and fewer funds are available. She said large groups are getting less money and small groups are getting more money. He said it seems that they need a certain percentage of students to vote to have a viable result.

-Dr. Geller said the pledge referendum brought together support from some USAC functions with support of different students who vote. She said it brought funding for access and retention. This was at a time when fees were increasing. She encouraged them to consult with other parts of campus that receive referendum funds that would be interested in partnering with them to add small amounts. This way, they would get a larger voting base. She said they need to get people to vote. She said if they don't get a 20% voter turnout, it is nullified. She said if they run a special election, they need 20% of the undergraduate body. She said this is a more challenging type of election.

-Saxe said pledge included the Daily Bruin as one of the beneficiaries. She said she is nervous if they open that because she doesn't know how large this fee would be

-Champawat said another variation could be to build upon the council. He said they could build something on the case of the council's diversity

-Dr. Nelson said on the national level, they are all Americans. He said it would be wonderful to have members of different parts of the campus to come up with information and have a referendum. He said everything goes up in cost and the amount of resources goes down. He said this is a challenge he would challenge them to think about. He said they are all UCLA students.

-Saxe said in terms of bringing people together, it is something that could be brought up with groups. He said that is who would be most affected by it. She said if those groups don't support a referendum, nobody will.

-Sidrak said they could survey them. She said that is a good idea

-Resnick asked about council members on this table

-Bocarsly said he was vocal about it in the past. He said they are short a lot of money in their programming funds. He said a referendum is a long-term solution. He said with the ASUCLA giving them liability money, they have at least dealt with their problem. He said he supports a long-term solution. He said it is hard to say they are going to lower fees when they are protesting to lower fees. He said this is something next year should decide.

-Starr said the hole wouldn't be filled for next year

-Bocarsly said they have the 33% and they are aware that they would have fewer

surpluses.

-Starr said they're not making the decision but making the decision open to students.

-Resnick said they are just seeing surplus for this winter. She said the results of the special election would affect next year's winter council. She said this is what would happen when special election was run next year.

-Saxe said they wanted to do more research and background. She said they haven't looked into that much. She asked if they could send a more inclusive survey and start getting an idea of what funding sources could be better advertised. She said she would want to know about those who apply to ASRF. She said that is to her specifically. She said she would like to know if these people know about off-campus grants. She asked if they could survey about all the different grants before they look at internal changes.

-Sidrak said they have a CSP programming lunch this week. She said they could talk about the survey.

-Dr. Nelson asked how much money they think they would need to have. He said it is important to get that understanding to see what programming they might need for next year. He said they should find out how much is available and how much students might get. He said they need to ballpark some ideas. He said this would allow them to know how much they would tie every student. He said it might not sound like much initially. He said they need to think of a goal and how to get there

-Bocarsly said numbers that were thrown out was at maximum \$3 per students per quarter. This would give them a little cushion per quarter.

Champawat said this is close to doubling the initial fund.

-Bocarsly said students already spend \$4-\$5 per quarter. He said this is a number to consider.

-Dr. Nelson asked how this would change the percentages regarding giving money out to organizations

-Champawat said this would get 100%. He said some of the unemployment rate is when people give up looking for work. He wondered if there was a suppressed demand. He asked when informing groups of their funding level, to what degree do they understand the why. He asked if they understand the numbers. He asked if they come out of the experience understanding that. He said that they are trying to get them back the money that they ask for. He asked if they come out of the funding request process understanding that dimension

-Arruejo said their allocations are based on the amount of funding they have. He said they look at the most fair and equitable way.

-Champawat asked if the community understands what the process is. He said that one of the most important factors is their funding level. He said they try to explain the money story

so that non-money people can understand what they are talking about. He said that they look at whether this is a clear understanding of the circumstances.

-Gamble said thank you to Champawat. She said she would like to hear more from her council members. She said she would like to figure out the base number. She said she would like to figure out different ways to reach that number.

-Hester said in her experience, a student group asking why they didn't get their funding confronted her. She said it took a while to describe what was happening. She said there are student groups that see discrepancies in the numbers. She said a lot of student groups feel like they are getting short changed. She said regardless of what they end up doing, they need to educate students in general. She said the email she sent out earlier was saying that they were trying to be smart about their money usage. She said with whatever they end up choosing, they need to put a big emphasis on why they are doing it. She said they should say why they think it is best. She said it doesn't really make sense on how it would help the overall community

-Dr. Geller said it was interesting that the withdrawal for the two office requests wasn't mentioned. She said they should look at whether it is more important in times of limited funding or to be there as a voice to make sure concerns of students are heard. She said they should look at educating the campus community without so much programming. She said they might have benefits if they reach consensus and then a message to be said. They could say that as a group, they would seek external funding besides what they already have. She said they could indicate some programs that hold priority. She said this would send a powerful message. She said it wouldn't be an easy conversation, but they have been tackling tough subjects lately. She said they might silence some who are challenging where the funding is going.

-Resnick said they could add this to the agenda

-Soto said there isn't much of a space to assess and compare groups between different funding requests. He said that among these missions is if it is culturally relevant or educational. He said a lot of programs could be argued that they support these things. He said that at some point they need to make a decision. He said that in regards to having a referendum, postponing it until fall is a bit of a cop out. He said that he is not advocating for a referendum, but the groups now are who will be affected. He said it would make a much stronger statement for council. He said it should go on for spring versus later. He said it is evident that there are so many more groups applying to funding. He said regardless of surplus, budget review director has to cut some allocations because they don't have the funds for every single group. He said in terms of fewer surpluses and allocating effectively, there is still the problem of not enough funding

-Yao said in regards to the referendum, they should see how other much other revenues

would get. She said she is hesitant that other groups would get \$100,000 or more. She said in terms of student groups, students in terms of whether they would be happier giving \$3 per quarter versus being in a student group, the \$3 is what they would prefer. She said she can't speak for every student group but the groups are struggling and this money is going towards them

-Saxe said it would be nice to send out a survey. She said she sent out a Google doc. She said if they go into the lunch with a survey, it might be helpful. She said they could add to the survey.

-Sidrak said in terms of the referendum, there is still qualitative and quantitative analysis. She said if they took tasks and got updates, they could push that idea at the CSP luncheon. She said they could get a better understanding of the numbers. She said she doesn't know what her response would be. She said they are all making sacrifices. She said they should set out action items and work on them.

-Resnick said they must make changes if they want to see changes

-Bocarsly said these changes should go back to the funding study group. He said when talking about a referendum, they should consider the future of Bruin Bash as well. He said that money comes out of programming funds. He said they might not have money for Bruin Bash next year. He said that they should institutionalize something. He said he has spoken to Simmons and Zimmerman about increasing student fees. He said he's not sure where he stands on this. They could look at the underutilized resources. They could also look at reevaluating the caps on contingency in the future years. He said they could look at exact numbers. He said at this exact moment, it's hard to say what they should and shouldn't do with the referendum

-Champawat said what Bocarsly said has a lot of merit. He said it should be their judgment. He said this is partly because of the great work done by the council. He said they should look at the consequences of information level. He said they were talking about readjusting funds in a sense. He said it might be more sensible to go to the electorate. He said they should say what fees they would eliminate or have for a different purpose. He said there is a problem having something a previous electorate had and changing its purpose. He said this is important

-Dr. Nelson said it is important they think expansively and grandiose. He said one of the things they should be aware of is that they would be revisiting this issue. He said they should also understand that their contingency has allowed for flexibility. He said that is the reason why students have not had to go back to referendum. He said they shouldn't think of the minimum they need. He said this is their PR task. He said they don't need to spend all their money, but certain things do arise. He said councils in the past have been successful. He said they should try to think about having some kind of cushion.

-Gamble said this is what they meant earlier. She said they should think about what the ideal budget is. She said she thinks that would be the best way to visualize this as well.

-Resnick said this is something that could come out of the funding study group as well. She said she would like to go back to Sidrak's point. She said they should divide up tasks in terms of what they would like to know. She said they would like to call a funding study group meeting and what money they would need and how much they would need per student. She said one of the great ways to work with CSP is by attending the lunch on Friday

-Saxe said she agrees with the points being brought up. She said they need to figure out why sources aren't being used and why student groups aren't using them. She said she would be interested in seeing where all of the excess funds are coming from. She said she would like to see a breakdown of where students are getting that money from and where surplus is coming from.

-Bocarsly said it's on the sheet with the surplus comes from

-Champawat said there are details that make up the surplus that isn't the surplus. He said that surplus couldn't go away. He said that doesn't speak to the size.

-Hester said drawing from her experience from ORL, after a program they do a summary of what went well and what didn't. She said this would be interesting. They see groups week to week and it might be interesting to see if different groups could do more research. She said they could see what they changed from last year. She said this would be a way for groups to be held accountable to using money efficiently and wisely.

-Gamble said she would like to know more about enrollment and she would like to see how they did funding before. She said they should look at what were good practices and what didn't work

-Resnick asked if she was willing to do some of that research

-Gamble said yes

-Dr. Nelson said they should consider the new incoming freshmen

-Champawat said they are looking at 400-500 more. He said with more students comes more need

-Saxe said those projected numbers should remain stable

-Bocarsly asked if Gamble would support this

-Gamble said that she would like to get student input. She said she might support it after doing student research. She said there are student fees increasing in ORL and at the state level. She said it depends on what the students say

-Yao said in terms of survey of Saxe would do that

-Saxe said she could continue to do that and talk about that at the CSP lunch. She asked if student group advocacy could follow up with groups. She said there is a lot of potential in

getting the word out

-Sidrak said she would like to look at new student group registration policies with CSP

-Yao asked when the next time the funding study group would meet up.

-Resnick said it depends on their schedules. She said she hopes they could meet before next week.

-Yao asked if Champawat could look at other pots of funding

-Champawat asked what funds

-Bocarsly said they don't have control over what was passed in the referendum

-Champawat said Zimmerman has a notion

-Saxe said they could look at their own funding sources. She said they should look at what is being used

-Champawat asked if they were wondering about how utilized those funds are. He said he doesn't have that information

-Dr. Geller said they should go to CAC and CPC and see if funds are being underutilized. She said she could give them information about the funds she administers, such as the student diversity and student management fund. CSP can give them CAC and CPC

-Yao asked if Smith could go to corporate sponsors.

-Smith said he wasn't in full support. He hasn't heard any update from Emily. He said he feels like this conversation doesn't really involve him. He said the conversation is going too long

-Resnick said that she has not heard back. She said Yao was suggesting some of the previous ideas he brought up.

-Smith said he suggested asking Chancellor Block in terms of what to do. He said he doesn't know why they are talking about this and he would like to work on the referendum.

-Saxe said one of the questions is if the groups have applied to off campus groups. She said they would ask about their accessibility and writing grants. She encouraged him to follow up with Ken Heller.

-Smith said in that regard, it should be something that Ken Heller should come in and make a presentation about. He said he believes that is how they can develop themselves as students. He said that some people don't think the same way. He said that he doesn't know why he's still sitting there

-Resnick asked if he was willing to initiate that conversation with Ken Heller

-Smith said yes. He said he thought they were going to go to the chancellor

-Resnick said she did go to the chancellor. She said his ties are tied up

-Champawat said that Resnick was pointed to someone in development. He said there is a lot of potential there. He said that in a sense, a lot of their elements are with a different organization. He said that they should get a working group. He said that they need to make

sure that nothing conflicts with the interests with ASUCLA. He said they should sit down and discuss that at meetings.

-Resnick said she would include him on that

-Soto said himself and Shah met with Heller discussing how to fund Bruin Bash. He said he could be a liaison between Heller and council.

-Champawat said they shouldn't get ahead of the relationships that they don't need to have

-Resnick said that Soto could keep them posted

-Soto said they were going to have a meeting with those who hold welcome week a lot sooner this year. He said Champawat could be at that table as well

-Saxe said she would follow up with Heller.

-Starr he would like to table this discussion until further notice.

-Resnick encouraged them to be proactive and seek out those sources as well.

-Sholklapper asked if they lay it on the table or postpone it.

-Resnick said it was not an action item. She said this is something that they could just add to the agenda

-Zimmerman said this could be added as a different kind of item.

-Resnick said thank you for their input.

XI. Announcements

-Sidrak said the CSP lunch is Friday at 12pm in Ackerman Viewpoint Conference Room.

-Dr. Geller said if they want to go to breakfast with the chancellor to email her by Tuesday night.

-Starr said they are trying to get 500 responses to the flyaway survey. They got 550.

-Yao has non-profitting networking night and have two alternative spring break sites open in California

-Resnick said if they are in Bruin Plaza, they are having kids empowerment day from 11-2

XII. Signing of the attendance sheet.

The attendance sheet was passed around.

XIII. Adjournment

- Bocarsly moved and Yao seconded to adjourn the meeting.

- Bocarsly called for Acclamation. Sholklapper asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 9:54 p.m. by Acclamation.

FINAL

Approved: February 14, 2012

XIV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,
Katrina Dimacali
USAC Minutes Taker
2011-2012