UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL
Tuesday, March 13, 2012
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

PRESEN T: 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, Kinnery Shah, Dr. Berky Nelson, Laureen Lazarovici, Bob Williams, Patty Zimmerman, Katrina Dimacali

ABSENT: Dr. Deb Geller

GUESTS: Ryan Azad, Lilit Arabyan, Cathleen Carter, Sarah Baron, Lala Manoukian, Kriten Taketa, William Ruiz, Chloie Groome, Jasmin Williams, Ana Parra, Hector Lucero, Maria Penaloza, Leslie Bustos, Camila Lacques, Matthew Springs, John Joanino, Sheena Santamaria, Albert Quach, Jeffery Kho, Leo Chusan, Nadia Shamout, Alexander Detangh, Omar Elkabto, Dafne Luna, Marcus McRae, Luis Ramon, Andrea Vazquez, Ryth Mendez, Katrina Vo, Trung Nguyen, Rachel Sumekh, Anna (MECHA), Sara (MECHA), Marinessa (MECHA), Hong Nguyen, Michael, Willie, Asis (MECHA and Queer Alliance), Sasha, Andrea (MECHA), Sergio (Sigma Lambda Beta), Daniel (Latino Greek Council), Noah (Hillel and CPO), Jordan (Queer Alliance), Camila (Mixed Student Union), Archie (Mixed Student Union), Vala Vasquez, Silva Delencia, Abuela Sanchez, Selena Abriz

I. A. Call to Order

- Resnick called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Smith moved to suspend the bylaws and potentially add the resolution on public hate crimes after public comment
- Resnick said there would need to be a motion
- Smith moved to suspend the bylaws and move the resolution to after the public comment as an action item.
- Sholklapper asked if there was a specific reason
- Smith said there are members here from the public to speak on the resolution
- Sidrak said there are appointments scheduled
- Smith said he recognizes this, but there are representatives from the community here. He said he feels passionately about this.
- Bocarsly asked if they were meeting tomorrow about this
Smith said they are meeting and they can just leave this to a vote
Gamble asked if this was people commenting on the motion period
Resnick said this would be voted on next week. She said this might have caught some council members off guard
Starr seconded to add this to the agenda.
Bocarsly said in his understanding, tomorrow was when they would share their input.
Smith said they should look at how they could form better relationships with the communities
Bocarsly said he would like to do both
Smith said no
Shah said nearing the end of the quarter, there needs to be a sense of timeliness. She said she understands the meeting tomorrow is happening. She said there is a certain amount to be said and that they don’t know if they will have a meeting next week.
Resnick said they would have a meeting next week
Gamble said they would move forward from the town hall at the meeting tomorrow. She said this is how the time hall would be like. She said she knows that it was sent out today edited. She said it is fairer to at least discuss and vote on it today and if there are serious problems they should discuss this during the action item.
Resnick said on the agenda, the resolution would be postponed a week. She said they would put it to a vote to see if it will be on the agenda this week. She said if it isn’t to not take it as a sign that they are not invested on this. She said there is potential that it might not be voted on this week
Bocarsly said it’s always nice to see that people want to know what they’re doing. He said he was looking forward to a safe space to discuss more in depth what they were going to see in this resolution. He said they wanted to use what they learned today tomorrow
Starr said he’s surprised because the resolution is not on the agenda
Smith said how does it look when the chancellor sends out a message but the student leaders don’t.
Sholkklapper said they could do two different things. He said there are more details that they want to add to the resolution.
Resnick said some council members might not have put in the work yet into the resolution
Gamble said they are voting on if they would be flexible at this point and to see if they are more process oriented. She said those plans tomorrow should still happen. She said this is a question of not whether or not they could be flexible and turn that to the student body. She said she thinks it is important to have this conversation on the table since there are so many people here from diverse communities.
Sholkklapper said that it interesting and that it are important to have this discussion. He said he doesn’t know if the resolution is an appropriate thing right now
Saxe said they should just have a discussion about the hate crimes and see if it leads to a resolution. It would be an agenda item of a discussion about the hate crimes regarding the steps.
Starr said it would be fair if it were after the appointment
Shah said she’s fine with the discussion. She said to make a decision after public comment in terms of timeliness.
Saxe proposed a discussion item and anything later could be discussed.
Gamble asked to make this an action item and if people are not comfortable voting to push it to the next week
Resnick said the appointees would come before council and this could be put to a vote to be an action item.
Smith said this would be after public comments
Resnick said in respect to those scheduled, it should be put after appointees
Zimmerman said they need an amendment, not a motion
Shah moved to amend the motion to move the resolution after the appointments as an action
item. Sholklapper seconded.
-Saxe said they could ask the appointee to be pushed to later.
-Resnick said they could still add the resolution. She said they should progress and see if the
appointees are willing to move.
-Gamble asked if they could vote to have it after the appointments and if she could come later, they
could table the appointments.
-Resnick said if there are no further objections to vote to have the resolution on after the
appointments. With a vote of 9-2-1, the resolution would be added until after the appointments.
- Starr moved and Hester 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. *3/6/12
-Sholklapper said there is a repeated statement. He said he would email the changes.
- Bocarsly moved and Shah seconded to approve the minutes for March 6, 2012, as amended
-- Council voted to adjourn with a unanimous vote. 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
Cathleen Carter- CSUDH Accounting Society
-Cathleen said she is contemplating changing schools. She said she is in the middle process and
she is still wrestling with finances. She said she hopes for the best and she hopes to learn

Sarah Baron- President of Hillel
-Baron said on Feb. 1, the Olive Tree Initiative had Worlds in Conflict program. She said that the
group is for everyone. She said they had a successful program. She said all over the sign, it was
vandalized. She said OTI is not a Jewish group. She said this is a public university. She said
vandalizing doesn’t sit well with the Jewish community here. She said her representatives and she
hasn’t seen this just once. She said she knows there are debates on what is anti-Semitic. She said
this is unacceptable from the Jewish community

Chloe Groome and Lala Manoukian- Calpirg
-Chloe said they were there last week talking about the resolution about banning plastic bags. She
said she hopes they will vote on it next week. She said there are informational sheets that she
would pass out. She said they don’t have a lot of copies, but the pamphlets have valuable
information. She said this way, they would be able to vote on this at next week’s meeting
-Sholklapper asked if they could email this
-Chloe said yes

Jasmin Williams- Queer Alliance
-She said as a queer person and a member of the African community, she thought this would be a
place of diversity. She said when hate crimes happen, she is forced to question if this is a safe
place. She said she supports the resolution and the diversity requirement. She said there is not
enough education about diversity

Silva Delencia- MECHA
-She said she is here in support of the resolution. She said she is a Chicana at this university
Anna- MECHA
Anna said that from their perspective, when anything happens it gets passed by. She said it seems like their community always gets pushed aside and something needs to happen. She said they needed to address continuous actions

Sara- MECHA
She said she is supporting this resolution because she hopes that the university would take stance for this resolution. She said it is time for them to show that it wasn’t going to be tolerated

Marinessa- MECHA
She said that they need to address the apartment, t-shirt, etc.

Rachel Sumekh- Swipes for the Homeless
- Rachel said they are getting national recognition at the white house. They co-program with the CPO as well

William Ruiz- USAC FSC
He said he is here to learn and a lot of good things happen this time

Hong Nguyen
Nguyen said he has seen a lot of hate crimes happen. He said that he is in support of the resolution. He supports the communities and conflicts in the modern world

Ryan Azad- Baha’i Association
He said he would present to the council later.

Lilit Arabyan (Amnesty International)
She said she is also representing amnesty international.

Michael
He said he is in here in support of the resolution.

Willie
He said he is here in support of the resolution.

Asis- Mecha and QA
He said he would like to see change against these hate crimes

Sasha- Transfer from San Diego
She said she supports the resolution as well. She said the chancellor finally responded to the hate crimes, but USAC should also take into consideration this resolution because a lot of these communities have come together. She said these communities have come together on the resolution already

Andrea- MECHA
She said she is offended that the resolution has not passed. Some people feel unsafe. She said as council, they should represent students on campus. She said she doesn’t know why they aren’t taking the real issues into consideration

Sergio- Sigma Lambda Beta president
He said one of their pillars is cultural awareness and they promote the tolerance of all people. He
said they promote the tolerance of all people to make sure these crimes don’t occur. He said they needed to think bigger and to represent the student body

Daniel- Pres. of Latino Greek council
He said he is in support of the resolution. He said that these slow reactions are embarrassing. He said people are being attacked for their ethnic background. He said they have to wait so long just for a statement of the chancellor. He said they are doing this to reach harmony on campus

Noah- Hillel and CPO
He said he is in support in any resolution against any hate crimes

Trung Nguyen- Asian Pacific Coalition
He is here in solidarity with MECHA. He said they feel like it is their responsibility to represent what the campus needs, which is a stamen

Katrina Vo- President of the Vietnamese student union
She said she is in support of the diversity requirement. She said she would like to see them pass the resolution

Ryth Mendez- Queer Alliance
She said she identifies as transgender. She said it is unsafe on campus. She said she has heard anti-trans comments and she would like to stand in solidarity with Mecha

Jordan- Queer Alliance
She said she is here in support of the resolution

Andrea Vazquez- Queer Alliance
She said as a person of color, queer, and a woman, she has suffered a lot of hate. She said she is holding them accountable for the work that they do

Marcus McRae- Queer Alliance/Afrikan Student Union
He said he is dismayed with the process so far. He said he was surprised the resolution was not passed last week. He said he hopes they think about their positions and he thinks it should be in allyship with the community. He said some of them don’t believe in black privilege, which says they don’t understand the privileges at play here. He said he is dismayed by how political is and he doesn’t see the passion or urgency. He said if there was a hate crime against their community, he hopes they wouldn’t react this way

Dafne Luna- Queer Alliance
She said she is here in support of the diversity resolution

Luis Ramon- Queer Alliance and MECHA
He said he is here for the resolution. He said ¾ of them voted to suspend the bylaws. He said they had a week to contact organizations, and as someone who helped write the resolution he wasn’t contacted by anyone. He said this is hurtful. He said that for people that say they care about diversity, they don’t prioritize resolutions like this one. He said he hopes they don’t politicize hate crimes

Abuela Sanchez- MECHA
She said she is disappointed that there is no safe space here at UCLA. She said she came for education and a safe space. She said there is no respect for their communities and that they are
being attacked by hate crimes. She said they always needed to think about who’s coming next

Selena Abriz- MECHA
She said she supports the resolution. She said hearing all of these negative things have to end. She said she wants a safe space for all of them

Nadia Shamout- MSA
She said she came as a student and behalf of the Muslim student association. She said if people haven’t experienced a hate crime, it breaks them down. She said it really affects you and as a Muslim student she experiences hate crimes. She said two weeks ago someone threatened to kill her. She said to have this against her Latino and black brothers and sisters aren’t right and she hopes they could take this seriously. She said they are perpetuating it and saying that this is okay. She said to say that they’re behind them.

Leo Chusan- Gamma Zeta Alpha
He said this is clearly disappointing that this hasn’t passed. He said that he hopes not to confuse this with passiveness. He said some of them are on their cell phones and Facebook. He said that they should listen to these stories. He said that if lack of time is the problem, that they committed on this table and they should do this. He said they should act like the USAC they wanted to be and they should make moves or else others will.

Jeffery Kho- Asian Pacific Coalition
He said that as a people of color population, he could speak to the importance of having the voices on campus speak out against an incident like this.

Albert Quach- Asian Pacific Coalition
He said he stands in solidarity for this resolution. He said this is something that affects all communities. He said they should bring awareness to this. He said that they should understand their position as representatives of UCLA. He said hate crimes go on at UCLA. He said this is more than a statement. He said they should be proactive not reactive

John Joanino- Samahang Pilipino
He said he encourages them to pass this. They condemn hate crimes and they do not represent their community. He said they would rather them discuss these issues in front of them rather than behind closed doors

Alexander Detangh- Mixed Student Union
He said that it is easy to assume that they don’t care about these issues, but he doesn’t want to believe that they don’t care about this issue. He said he wants to know their reservations that they have. He said they want to be there for a dialogue

Camila- Chair of Mixed Student Union
She said she is tired, angry, exhausted, and upset and that this should have been passed. She said she has been wasting her time crying and rallying etc. She said this is not about politics. She said this is about safety and she needs them to be clear and take action. She said this is not what the True Bruin experience is about. She said to please take this seriously. She said to make them proud and to do their job

Archie- Mixed Student Union
He said this isn’t a Chicano issue or a people of color issue but a human issue. As students here to learn, they can’t do that if there is hate crime
Leslie Bustos- MECHA
She said she is here in support of the resolution and the diversity requirement. She said they are the only UC that doesn’t have a diversity requirement. She said it is ridiculous that they had to demand a video to get a response. She said they shouldn’t wait to vote on this. She said people are forgetting about this and it becomes not important. She is upset that they don’t feel the urgency

Maria Penaloza- Lambda Theta Alpha
She said it is 10th week and they are here. She said she feels like they should all vote for that. She said they are representing them and she hopes that they make the right decision. She said the diversity requirement is important and that they need to take action

Hector Lucero- Nu Alpha Kappa
He said that this is a pressing issue. He said he has never had this many communities come to them. He said it is embarrassing that they had to come to them. He said he used to be E-board chair. He said he feels like they care about the student body. He said it is about different communities and it is about diversity and race, diversity and class, etc. He said it would be embarrassing to these communities to let it go another day

Anna Parra- Lambda Theta Nu
She said it shouldn’t have taken this long for the resolution to pass. She said two things came from these events. The first is that they united despite their differences. She said these events have united them to stay strong. They are also tired of being passive. She said they are fed up. She said they are not being passive anymore.

Vala Vazquez- Retention Coordinator
He said this is not a standalone issue. This is a retention issue. He said they know what needs to be done.

-Resnick asked if the special presentation was willing to have it after.
-Arabyan said this moves her. She said what they were going to present is along these lines as well. She said this issue should be discussed now while all brothers and sisters are here. She said they should join them for their screening as well.
-Resnick said the appointees would wait until after the discussion
-Bocarsly moved to table the special presentation and appointees until after this discussion. Saxe seconded.

V. Special Presentations
A. “Education Under Fire” by Ryan Azad (Baha’i Association) & Lilit Arabyan (Amnesty International)
Azad said members of the Baha’i faith have been denied the right of higher education. As a response to this, 25 years ago they organized an underground university, which organized a group of informal teachers in their basements and offices for students who wanted a chance to learn and be educated. They would teach students via Skype once a week. About a decade ago, the government attacked it and people were seized. There were 6 people imprisoned and computers were seized. A lot of the smaller cities had it shut down completely. There is a 30-minute documentary made. It includes faculty and administrators. He showed a film presentation.
-Arabyan said the organization at UCLA would bring this screening on April 18, 2012 from 5-7pm. She said after the thirty minutes there would be a short panel answering questions. Rainn Wilson would moderate the event. She said that education is a human right and there is no need
for it to be limited to just certain people. She presented a list of cosponsors. She said she would just like to reach out to them. She said they really love the passion in this room and she hopes they would bring it out that day.

-Azad said they want people to attend the screening just to get this started. This screening has been shown all over the world. He said that at Harvard and Stanford, they decided to accept BIHE credits.

-Arabyan said they would eventually like to pass a resolution as well.

VI. Appointments
A. *Eena Singh for Election Board Chairperson (E-Board)

-Sidrak said she is a new student orientation counselor. She said through these positions, she has learned how to maintain neutrality amongst peers. She said she understands the impact of this on all undergraduates and understands the fair process. She said she understands the publicity of candidates. Her ARC recommendation was 1-0-2. The comments are shown below.

-Gamble said she abstained to reconcile what she said. She said she would like to hear the candidate out again.

-Kris Kaupalolo said that he wants them to keep in mind that they should choose someone who can do the job and someone who they determine can do a fair job. He said to keep in mind the students they serve as large. He said he is there to answer any questions they may have.

-Sidrak said Kaupalolo has been a wonderful source of advice. Kaupalolo said it is important that the chair is comprised of a complimentary team and to keep that in mind. He also advised to keep in mind the questions asked.

-Singh said she is an anthropology student. She said her involvements are as an RA on the hill. She has also been on orientation staff.

-Resnick asked if she had any ideas that she would bring to this position if appointed.

-Singh said she was new to student government works. She said she had to research what the offices represented and what each candidate represented. She said she looked into what parties were in place. She said she used a lot of her first year experience to understand what that was and what affect her vote has. She said last year, she was in the office of residential life. She was in OCHC. She understood the affect that student votes had on campus. She took it on herself to encourage residents to vote. She stayed away from having one party and she had a neutral stand. They were also told not to associate themselves with one party. She said that first year was getting that experience, and last year was taking what she learned to apply it to the student body. She said she understands the impact it is going to have on all students. She said if its not dealt with in a fair way, it has a huge impact. She said this process has to be done in a fair way. She said being in the process for two years lends itself to this. She said in the past year, her role was to get people to vote in general. She said she thinks that she wanted to do this is because elections is going to come up. A lot of the first year population gets intimidated and don’t really know how to navigate with the system. She said she would like to make the elections simpler for them. She said she would like to work with ORL to express what the voting process looks like. She said that RA’s are very careful when talking about elections. She said reaching out to ORL staff could be very clear that the link is important. She said ideally, there would be 100% voter turnout.

-Sidrak said E-board chair is taxing and time consuming. She asked why she is strong enough to run this process and mitigate the conflicts that will inevitably arise.

-Singh said she has been involved in a lot of different organizations. She said part of what she has done is to develop as a student. She said she is comfortable with where she is heading. She knows that what she is studying is what she’s passionate about. She said next quarter, she understands the responsibilities that she needs to take. She said all of the training she will undergo is easier to take on because she has done it for two years. She said she would only take three classes because
she understands the extensive time commitment. She said she has developed over the last two
years. Those demands helped her become organized and realize the commitments she was going
into.

-Bocarsly asked if she had specific ideas on how they could increase voter turnout,
-Singh said they should have some sort of debate. She said she realizes that if they want to
outreach to a larger available, they should make it available on the hill. They should use ResTV
or getting them on the hill. She said they should recognize that this would prepare them to vote.
She said that debates are traditionally on the hill. She said she hopes they could look into other
venues, such as Ackerman Grand Ballroom. She said she would emphasize the importance of
debates. She said debates are intense but it identifies what is around.
-Sholklapper said he doesn’t understand why she wants to do this. He asked why she wants to do
it.
-Singh said she wants to go into student affairs. She developed this passion over time. She said
she came in as biology major. She said working with orientation staff members, she found that
working with students is tough but is what she loves to do. She said at the end of the day, they are
there for them. She said residents will be disrespectful, but the job is to be there for the residents.
She said that has been her personality. She said she understands the implications, but she has been
in this type of position. She said dealing with conflicts is something she has experience with. She
said she sees the end goal of a successful election process as something that’s worth it.
-Gamble asked typically how E-board committee is structured and how she would increase
turnout
-Singh said there’s publicity, finance, external relations, etc. She said these are outlined in the
election code but she sees those changing too. She said she would like to implement a position
that would increase the voter turnout. She said they could look at getting larger audiences. She
said she sees the structure of that changing and she sees the investigation aspect important. She
said committees aren’t as cutthroat. She said if they want to create policies different from
previous years, she could talk to advisors.
-Sholklapper asked what is her proposed schedule for next quarter
-Singh said the proposed schedule is first week, which is when packets are sent out and turned in
by week 3. There would be a campaign orientation meeting and miscellaneous things are turned
in. Right before 6th week would be when the debate is. Week 6 is the main election. She said she
would probably stick with it because it’s worked in the past years.
-Shah asked how she would respond to a student asking why they should vote
-Singh said she didn’t understand the impact of USAC until now. She said now that she has
experience in USAC offices, she now understands how important it is to get your voice heard.
She said rarely do people make a lasting impact on their stay there. She said talking people
through in terms of outreach is for them. She said she looks at who makes a significant
difference. She said students should vote on what they think is better. She said as a first year, that
is a very powerful thing to have, especially coming into such a large university. She said for
people to exercise that is a great thing.
-Smith said since they are accountable to her and she’s accountable to them, he would like to
understand if she thinks they have done a good job in providing students with a safe campus
climate and everything listed under the USAC mission statement. He asked how she would hold
them accountable
-Sholklapper said she’s responsible for the election board process.
-Smith said this is relevant. He said she is a constituent.
-Singh said over the year, USAC started off with a bang. She said they were always publicized
for residents or study spaces. She said things that are crucial to not only the safety but also the
academic services and financial aid help were accomplished by USAC. She said that events try to
connect students to what UCLA is all about. She said that when people don’t connect to UCLA,
this could be something that the student can’t deal with and might end up leaving. She said that
USAC has done all it can with what it has. She said that there is always more to be done, but addressing every issue on campus is a large thing to take on. She said they are all students here. She said there is always more to be done. She said they always respond to what's happening on campus.

-Hester asked her to elaborate on how her RA skills can be applied to the election season
-Singh said a lot of conflict resolution needs to be responded to. She said each conflict is going to be different. She said in terms of the RA position, she once had a physical altercation over cleanliness. She said because of that, eventually UCPD was called and the residents met with her. She said they got advice from her supervisor. She said what one thinks is okay is not always the case. She said their job is on the line too. She said following policy is very important. She said following through with the rules is important. She said a lot of conflict lends them here too. She said conflicts here address both sides. If they violate any laws in place, they need to abide by it. If it were in line with university policy, she would look into this and take it to the advisor of E-board. She said conflicts needed to be taken care of quickly and efficiently. She said people expect you to really deal with conflicts and reflects on the E-board.

-Saxe said she was in her staff. Her committee is the largest and most productive. She said with her other obligations, she has always been one of the most reliable people in the office and someone who demands respect. She said she also noticed that she was elected with a party, but she only met Singh in an interview through an office. She said she would like to clarify that she came into this position because of her passion for the issue. Her committee doesn’t run on any political contentions. She said there were some concerns mentioned to her in her ARC interview. She asked if she did anything new since her interview.

-Singh said the manual is a long document. She said a lot of it is just statements. She said she had a lengthy meeting with Kaupalolo. She said she asked anything she was unsure about and it was made clear to her. She said after, she related it back. She said what’s on the election manual is not as simple or cutthroat as she would have hoped.

-Shah said last year, the E-board chair made some changes. She asked which events she attended, what changes she liked, and what she would change about them.

-Singh said because of her obligations and she was very neutral, she didn’t involve herself too much in the election process. She said she attended the debates her first year. She said from her first year, the debates were intense. She said she was neutral and didn’t involve herself too much. She said in that time, she wanted to take a step back.

-Shah said that is an issue with USAC. She said people that are involved are people with slates. She asked how she would target people that were neutral.

-Singh said it goes back to why voting is important. She said students have every right to pick and choose what they want to do. She said that is why she emphasized what elections are. She said she just wanted to encourage people to vote. She said making that clear is very important. She said she would like to reach out to people with influence on the student population to encourage students to vote. She said E-board is in charge of encouraging people to vote. She said part of that is to encourage people to vote. She said she would present the election process and to do what they need to in order to be informed.

-Gamble said do her best to brush up on the changes that the E-board head made last year. She said she would like her to brush up on the single transferable vote system

-Singh said she talked to Kaupalolo about it. She said it is when people are voting and the candidates rank the general representatives, there is a threshold based on the number of votes. If a candidate meets the threshold, they are given the vote. If they don’t meet the threshold, the last person is dropped and the second vote that everyone gets are redistributed. From there, the process keeps going. She said it is one of the fairest ways in getting votes because of the redistribution process.

-Sidrak said this was asked before. She asked if she has directly or indirectly participated in another campaign.
Singh said she has not. She said even first or second year, she has never gotten a shirt to endorse a candidate. She said she was asked to support people. She said sometimes, she didn’t vote for her friends because she believed in the other candidate. She said elections are important to her.

Yao said if a candidate were to commit a violation, she would take the necessary steps. She asked what she would do to prevent violations.

Singh said as E-board chair, when candidates are coming to their first meeting they are given every rule and regulation that they have to follow. She said they needed to sign a statement that acknowledges that these rules are in place. She said the people running are responsible to follow university policies. She said that everything is there for you and it is up to the candidates to understand the rules and regulations. She said it is mandatory to have office hours and she would be readily available. She said she would go to the advisor with any questions about the E-code. She said she would make herself available for these policies and regulations.

Gamble said she mentioned her involvements with USAC and if she was involved before.

Singh said she applied for IVP and CAC. She said as a second year, she was figuring out her major. She said she was not definitive of what she was going into. She said she had to back out of her obligations from both offices. She said she wanted to settle down and figure out her major. She said to establish herself and to form her career, she needed to focus on that first. She said that is why she took on her responsibilities with USAC. She said it is easier for her to take on these responsibilities.

Sholklapper asked Singh for a 30 second elevator pitch as to why he should vote

Singh said they are one of thousands of undergraduates. If you wanted to see some impact, you should make that happen and it starts here. The people who are elected will make an impact on your life here and this is one of the few chances you get to make a difference.

Sholklapper said that in the past, he got one of the flyers that said if they wanted to vote or not

Gamble asked if a committee that was impartial was important

Singh said an impartial committee was important. She said obviously, you could go to a chair or an advisor. She said it is harder to be impartial if someone is already involved with a particular slate. She said if she were picking someone, she would pick someone impartial versus someone who was affiliated with a slate.

Gamble asked if she had a plan of action in choosing a committee given that she is learning about the process herself

Singh said that once spring break hits it hits. She said that part of her plan is to do it right after finals end. She said she knows that it will be hard, but hopefully the people she chooses will understand why they need to do these things. She said over spring break, she doesn’t mind working and hopefully the committee members will work as well. She said she would get time with the committee in the beginning two weeks of spring quarter.

Shah said their different offices have different roles and responsibilities. She asked if she feels like it is her role to communicate that to voters.

Singh said in terms of E-board, it is important in terms of different offices. She said she needs clarification. She said if they’re promoting voting, they could deal with what each office entails. She said she thinks that is very important on how they can make the election process self-explanatory.

Sidrak called to question. Sholklapper seconded. With a vote of 10-1-1, Singh was appointed to E-board chair.

Singh thanked them and said she would step down from the academic affairs office.

B. *Kyley Scheier for Wooden Center Board of Governors (WCBOG)*

Bocarsly moved to approve Scheier for WCBOG. Sidrak seconded.

Sidrak said there are two alternate spots. Scheier is a 4th year but will be staying another year. She is familiar with the operations of the Wooden center. She also hopes to see the feedback to provide patrons with a positive atmosphere. Her recommendation was 3-0-0 approve.
Scheier said she is a 4th year. She transferred from Santa Monica. She works at the Wooden center.
Resnick asked why she wants to be part of the board of governors.
Scheier said as a consultant, there isn’t much she can change. She feels like she would have an important voice.
Bocarsly asked what could be approved
Scheier said she would like to see space more efficiently used. She said there is a big problem with overcrowding. She said it is often dangerous because there is a lot of equipment away. She said changing hours or moving equipment would be efficient.
Starr asked how is she at waking up at 7am.
Sholkalpper asked if she was on the board already
Scheier said it looks like she’s already on it.
Starr asked if she would do a 2nd year
Scheier said she would like to stay during her 5th year
Starr called to question
Gamble seconded. With a vote of 12-0-0, Scheier was approved for WCBOG.
Sidrak thanked her for being on call since 7pm.

VII. Fund Allocations

A. Academic Success Referendum Fund
- Saxe said there are two allocations to approve tonight. USAC facilities received $631.50 for the Ackerman study night and $2390.14 is left. They are looking at moving more into that fund from the general academic affairs budget

B. Academic Affairs Mini-Grant
- $197.11 is going for the future of the UC’s allocation to the president’s office.

C. EVP Travel Grant
Gamble said there are several allocations. First is for Mecha for their conference. Lambda Theta Nu and Hindi Urdu log also were allocated.

D. Cultural Affairs Mini-Grant
There was no business for the cultural affairs mini-grant this week.

E. *Contingency Allocations
- Bocarsly moved to approve contingency. Yao seconded.
- Arruego said he emailed the updated list Monday.
  Organizations/Commissions are requiring a total of $15,614.18 for their programs.
  A total of $3,670.36 was requested from contingency.
  A total of $945.00 is recommended for allocation for this week (at 50% reduction).
  There is a total of $55,963.52 left in the Contingency Programming Fund.
- Starr called to question. Hester seconded.
- Bocarsly asked why finance committee and budget committee don’t do the cuts.
- Arruego said he is the same one allocating it. He said he makes sure it is the bare minimum.
- Bocarsly called to question. Gamble seconded. With a vote of 12-0-0, contingency allocations for this week were approved.

VIII. Officer and Member Reports
**President- Emily Resnick**
Resnick said thank you to those who emailed her for the campus wide email. She said to email them no later to 1am. She said she wanted everyone to be included. She said she emailed out that there are more parking passes available. She said all of the appointees were emailed out. She said those emailed would be making a presentation. She said she wanted to follow up on that. She has a meeting with Zimmerman about the farmer’s market. She has a meeting with the volunteer center to see how they can work with them as USAC. She emailed out today that they would like if ASUCLA could help with Bruin Day. She said if they wanted to change it, to let her know and they could display photos of events. She passed out flyers about a panel co-sponsored by EVP and Bruin Republicans and Democrats. This would deal with the UC Master plan and what they could expect from the future.

**Internal Vice President- Kristina Sidrak**
Sidrak said the last week is Strathmore Saferides is this week. Tomorrow is the constitutional review committee. She said she found out today is that Calpirg is planning a voter registration drive in spring. She announced the Enough is Enough programming week. She said this co programs with a lot of different entities. The focus is to end domestic dating and stalking. She said the week is second week of next quarter. It would include a pledge, professional program, workshops, and a survivor speak out. They are looking for more USAC representation. She said according to the bylaws, all action items needed to be on the agenda two school days prior to the meeting. She said the agenda is sent out Friday and Sunday, but nobody can request after 7pm on Sunday. She said they might vote on something at the meeting with ⅔ approval. Resolutions should be sent to her. She said resolutions needed to be in resolution wording and needs 3 USAC sponsors. She said she was texting ARC applicants and she was paying attention. She said Gamble sent out the resolution, but it would be nice to give the council a heads up if it would be put on the agenda. She said if someone would add a statement that important to give him or her all a heads up. She said she didn’t feel comfortable about the agenda change She said she would like a heads up because it is formulated to see when things would happen.

**External Vice President- Joelle Gamble**
Gamble apologized and it was sporadic. She talked about the dialogue space and solution for students across the UC campus to talk about issues. She said the application is out and is due at the end of this month. She said to forward it to people who are interested. She said they are working on banning plastic bags. They are working to see whom they could target. She said thank you for pointing out the registration drive. She said they would work on a unified voter registration. She thanked those who supported the undocumented rally. She said it was important to have support there. She said for the May 17th rally, the regents are scared they won’t have a good rally and they are suggesting that they go on lobby visits instead. She said they are trying to figure out how they can support lobby visits and support things such as the middle class scholarship. She said in terms of the cal grant GPA changes, she went through the subcommittee on education and they voted against that unanimously that Brown proposed since they are drawing a line on cuts to education. She said if people don’t qualify, people would be in a university but couldn’t afford to pay. She said they have 10 candidates right now for the debates. She said it is important that students hone their skills and talk about why they believe what they believe. There is assembly vote 448, which hacks away at proposition 13 and looks at what constitutes what is a real ownership of property. She said Amiano sponsors it. She said there isn’t a lot of analysis on there -Arruejo asked if it overturned prop 13 or a significant part
-Gamble said it would overturn a significant part.

**Academic Affairs Commissioner-Raquel Saxe**

Saxe said they had stress free day last Friday. She said they would partner with the student alumni association. She said it is during I love UCLA week. She said this weekend they had their global leadership connection interviews. She said a member had leadership experience and she responded she didn’t want to receive a scholarship. She said she came to the conference and she didn’t realize that she was so privileged until she got there. She said that she wanted someone else to receive the scholarship. She said a lot of people didn’t know how to apply to college. She said this really made her feel like the conference was meaningful and brought a lot of different students together. She said she shared that they met with the communities and conflicts in the modern world requirement and they have a plan of action. She said a couple weeks ago she mentioned the budget for the SIAC and there were a lot of questions about the deficit that was present. She said the allocation began in fall but the funding didn’t come until later that year. She said they are not actually behind on their budget. She said there were questions that she wanted to follow up on. There was a discussion about the gas center and there were some changes made since last year. The projects were scaled down. The room rates were altered and spaces were only for people associated with the university. She said there is a greater need the conference center on campus. The board of the academic senate met. They discussed rebenching but it wasn’t passed because they wanted to look into how it would be implemented. This would remove health sciences from this equation. She said the march that was had last week was mentioned. She said the Berkeley and Davis protests were mentioned. There is a lot of discussion about what that was. She said they distinguished themselves from other universities and she would love to see all of them best involved with campus protests and how they could keep students safe.

**Patty Zimmerman- Student Government Services**

Zimmerman said to send in pictures for the displays. She said the displays would be beautiful. She said the blubs would be perfect. She said another aspect of Bruin Day is Bruin Day tours. She said they could co-tour with USAC offices. They are working with a tour guide from their offices. They would love to send representatives and for students to choose if they wanted to tour Wooden or the student government. She said Bruin Day is a great opportunity to express everything they do. 24-hour study starts this Wednesday. She said there are free vans that start at 1am. She said USAC is bringing other fun activities as well. They are keeping meeting rooms open as well. They would close unused rooms at 1am for safety. The weekend is only open Friday and Saturday until 1am. She said thank you for spreading the word. She said she gets parking passes either the end of 10th week or beginning of finals.

IX. Old Business
A. *Referendum*
   -Sholklapper tabled the referendum discussion until after the BOD programming fund allocation
   -Starr moved to approve the referendum. Bocarsly seconded.
   -Resnick said the wording could be changed. She said they would vote on whether they wanted a referendum on the spring ballot. She said they must decide whether they want to put forward a referendum. She said that since they spent a lot of time on this, votes are important. She said if the council does put a referendum, it should be 100% supported. This should not be a political issue and they should put in a lot of work in educating the student body. She said she worked with the Daily Bruin. She said that around 4pm, only 155 people voted. Later more people voted. Now, it is 52% no, 38% yes, and 10% not sure. She said that the discussion is open and she urged them not to focus too much on the wording. She said that they would tell students that their fees would be increased $3 per person.
   -Smith moved to limit the discussion to 20-25 minutes.
-Starr seconded.
-Resnick said they should be done by 11:45.
-Saxe said this should be something 100% of council should stand by.
-Resnick said 100% would support putting it on the ballot as an option. She said the education aspect is important. She said in order to put it on the ballot, it should be something that all of council can stand behind.
-Gamble asked if what was sent out is what would be on the ballot.
-Resnick said the wording is not part of the vote.
-Gamble asked if they were voting on whether or not to put it on the ballot
-Resnick said yes. She said this is an idea.
-Bocarsly said after discussion, one contention is the message they are sending. Je said they needed to be clear that they supported students having a voice not supporting a referendum.
-Sholklapper said they could always write up a statement saying what they support.
-Bocarsly asked what actions they could take to pass this to students
-Yao asked what message it would send if USAC put something on a ballot
-Dr. Nelson said it presents this to something that students can do. He said the chancellor has to approve what’s going on and the chancellor has to approve any political situation.
-Kaupalolo said the content is neutral. He said there are statements of pros or cons. He said it is supposed to be neutral language as approved by the chancellor. He said that there is also return to aid that needs to be taken into account
-Zimmerman said she thinks that being committed to educating student voters to what it means is important. She said that if USAC adds this to the referendum, it is important they take this on to inform the voters.
-Shah asked if they wrote the rhetoric used. She said this is a reflection of how this would be seen. She said the way it is written already frames it in that line. She said a lot of people would see it that way.
-Dr. Nelson asked if that was how they presented it
-Shah said yes
-Gamble talked about the language. She said that it needed to be neutral if coming from the council. She said it shapes it with the right solution. She said there was bias before. She said she thinks the points here should be included in education
-Kaupalolo said they could ask whatever they want. Here, the question needs to be content neutral.
-Starr said as long as they write clearly, it will be beneficial
-Hester said she hopes they recognize that people’s voices are heard and that a statement they send out resonates with what the community expects. She said they needed to see if they’re all in agreement for the referendum itself.
-Soto talked about the pledge referendum. He said it was multilateral and it benefitted different entities. He said reservations are because of educating students about the issues and lack of funding would be a huge undertaking. He asked if they could open up the $3 for other entities on campus and if they wanted to open that up at all in order to make it passable
-Resnick said this is a great idea.
-Sholklapper said he didn’t know if this was relevant. He said groups before approached them because they didn’t have enough funding. He said he didn’t know if they should give to specific causes if it’s already going to these groups
-Resnick said that is an idea to consider as well
-Starr said it would be a good idea to reach out to them and show them this as an option.
-Saxe said Sidrak and she sent out a survey was not in favor of a resolution. She said people didn’t have enough knowledge on this. She said there was not enough support on the referendum. She said it didn’t get a positive response
Shah said the surveys said people are not in favor of a referendum. She said the people engaging are probably involved with what they do. She said that is worrisome. She said she doesn’t know what the financial undertaking would be. She said she still thinks they are inherently taking a stance towards increasing fees. She said these are her reservations.

Sidrak said over the discussions, they’ve suggested long term and short-term discussions. She said they did a lot of background research. She said she doesn’t see a referendum going away. She said looking at other entities, GSA voted to pursue a fee increase. She said she’s worried for the next council if they don’t do all that they can. She said she thinks that putting the question to students is important. She said it was only filled out by 40 student organizations. She said the numbers were lower than she would have liked to see.

Soto said although they are helpful, at the end of the day the fundamental issue is the reliance on surplus. He said it is not the council spending a lot of money. The fact is that GSA had issues with variability on surplus funding. He said he would like to let students decide. He said if they don’t do anything, they’ve already seen the effect of cuts. He said if they don’t do anything, this would be a huge issue next year.

Bocarsly said seeing the impact on this, it is important that they do something. He said that if next year’s council is going to pursue this, they should work on next year’s council and see what they are willing to do. He said that they need the unanimous support from council. He said they should leave it up to students, but the way that they vote is hard to know if people support this. He asked if they could see who’s voting no first.

Dr. Nelson said that when council comes up with referendum, they do so with the understanding that this is something they feel that students should really have. He said that there are reasons why these are done. He said they see what the needs are. He said that they see what the responsibility entails. He said they should think in terms of why students go to UCLA. He said that students go to UCLA because of not only the academics but because of the activities that make this a vibrant and interesting place. He said that since thousands of dollars are available, it gives vitality to UCLA. He said they must think positively of what they want to do. He said if the students vote it down, they’ve done their responsibility. If they don’t, they won’t get in. He said it doesn’t matter if they’re popular, but doing what they see in the best interest of students in light of the economic situation. He said it’s not about if they fail but that they’ve done the best they could.

Sholklapper agreed. He said if it fails, they would not set up a tainted image.

Yao said she supports it and they are just making it an option for students. She said she would not vote on something not go on the ballot if they didn’t agree with it because she wanted to give students a voice.

Arruejo said a few years ago, they suspended the bylaws and did a straw vote. It would not be on the record and it wouldn’t be the final vote on the issue. They would suspend the bylaws and is nonbinding. This was done two years ago.

Bocarsly asked what they were voting on. He asked if they were committing on the $3.

Starr said they are voting on if it is going on the ballot.

Bocarsly said they are looking at if it is a specific thing.

Resnick said anything else they would add would be an additional fee.

Arruejo asked what the referendum would fund.

Bocarsly said when they were talking about it in earlier steps, they were looking at pertinent funds and before they had the option of adding more. They only looked at adding to contingency. He said looking back, they were always talking about contingency.

Gamble said they are voting on whether it would be put on the ballot.

Sholkalpper said it would be made neutral.

Bocarsly moved to suspend the bylaws and called for a straw vote. Sholklapper seconded. There were no objections. With a vote of 11-0-1, the bylaws were suspended.

Smith said he doesn’t really care about the referendum. He said they wouldn’t go out and
campaign for the referendum. He said he doesn’t think student groups care about the referendum. He said that he doesn’t understand why they are still voting on this.

- Starr called to question the referendum. Sholklapper seconded.
- Resnick said Smith addressed the issue and asked if they would campaign for this.
- Bocarsly asked if they would educate people for this
- Shah asked if there were any offices that would spearhead this. She said she couldn’t design flyers or go out and campaign
- Starr said the best they could do is educate their offices
- Bocarsly asked if this could be a funding study group initiative
- Hester said she could spearhead this. She said she could work with council, BOD, etc.
- Bocarsly said it could be a great platform to create an educational piece
- Zimmerman said this could be something to look into in funding BOD. She said either way, it could be impacted. She said they could make the percentage that goes to BOD larger.
- Starr called to question the referendum. Sholklapper seconded. With a vote of 11-1-0, there would be a referendum on the ballot.

X. New Business
- Sholklapper moved to approve the discussion on the resolution. Bocarsly seconded.
- Shah said she would like to preface this. She said what they need to address is that this is not a political issue. She said the authors are with a party but they are not on the resolution because they are from that specific party. She said this has nothing to do with elections coming up. She said not everyone’s name is on this, but there is more to be said to passing this on time. She said that they do a lot of talking outside as well. She said they could spend that extra time at the table today, but they are undermining the actual issue if they take this as a political issue. The meeting tomorrow is to take what is here and actualize it. She said these would be made actions regardless of party affiliation.
- Gamble said it says “author” but it was written by a lot of people in this room right now.
- Shah read the resolution as follows:

Resolution Condemning Hate Crimes at UCLA and in Support of the Latina/o Community’s Demands

Author: Joelle Gamble, Kinner Shah, Jason Smith
Sponsored by: El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicana y Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA) de UCLA, Latin American Student Association (LASA)

WHEREAS, the University of California, Los Angeles has openly stated that all members of its campus community should conduct themselves with integrity and “respect for the rights and dignity of others”; (1)

WHEREAS, UCLA’s Principle of Community state:

“We do not tolerate acts of discrimination, harassment, profiling or other harm to individuals on the basis of expression of race, color, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, religious beliefs, political preference, sexual orientation, gender identity, citizenship, or national origin among other personal characteristics. Such acts are in violation of UCLA’s Principles of Community and subject to sanctions according to campus policies governing the conduct of students, staff and faculty.” (2)

WHEREAS, acts of discrimination, profiling and harassment against marginalized communities have regularly occurred at UCLA’s campus and across the University of California;
WHEREAS, on February 27, 2012, a hateful act was committed against members of the Latina/o community, when a UCLA students’ apartment door was vandalized with racist and misogynistic tagging; (3)

WHEREAS, the aforementioned hate crime is just the most recent reported hate crime, students across the University of California have been protesting against a hostile campus, including (but not limited to) the responses at UC San Diego after the Compton Cookout in 2010, and at UCLA after the “Asians in the Library” in 2011;

WHEREAS, these are not isolated incidents; marginalized communities encounter a recurrence of micro-aggressions on the UCLA campus that have contributed to an extremely hostile campus climate;

WHEREAS, underrepresented students attend UCLA hoping to escape the racist, xenophobic, homophobic, misogynist discourse that plagues the country’s current political climate;

WHEREAS, it is evident that UCLA is not immune from the political rhetoric that yields a hostile campus climate for underrepresented students;

WHEREAS, the Raza community and allies at UCLA, responded to the hate crimes and hostile campus climate in solidarity on March 1, 2012 with the “Brown is Beautiful” event in Bruin Plaza; (4)

WHEREAS, the USAC Office of the President organized a Townhall scheduled for March 6, 2012, to discuss the issues of campus climate, but was ultimately postponed ensuring that affected communities are properly contacted and become part of the planning process for the Townhall;

WHEREAS; the University of California has released several statements ensuring that Diversity continues to be a focus of the University; (5)

WHEREAS, ensuring that UCLA continue to prioritize access to students from low-income, under-served communities in order to have a more inclusive and racially diverse student body would help ameliorate the current campus climate;

WHEREAS, the demographics of Latina/os in California is about 37.6% and 47.7% in Los Angeles County; (6)

WHEREAS, the number of Latina/o students applying to UCLA continues to drastically increase, but the number of admitted students has remained stagnant. While 26% of all applicants self-identified as Latina/o, Chicana/o, only 15.3% of all admitted students were Latina/o, Chicana/o for the class of 2015 and 28% of all applicants are Latino/a, Chicana/o for the class of 2016; (7)

WHEREAS, Proposition 209, which ended affirmative action, curtails the University’s ability to admit more qualified underrepresented students, the recently affected communities have developed and sponsored eight different demands from UCLA administration to ensure that administration is working towards creating a safe campus for everyone;

WHEREAS, the demands include the creation of a multicultural center, the adoption of a Diversity Requirement in the General Education requirements, support for growth in Ethnic Studies, formal apology from ASUCLA, UCPD accountability, and greater Latina/o representation in administration, the accommodation for underrepresented students who
participate in Greek life, and a formal response from Chancellor Block;

WHEREAS, sixteen different organizations, whose missions range from political, cultural, social, and Greek affiliations helped create and sponsor the demands;

WHEREAS, in Spring 2011, a student advisory vote passed in favor of Communicating Unity through Education (CUE) to integrate a component that address diversity in the General Education curriculum;

WHEREAS, the Latina/o community and allies staged a “I DEMAND DIVERSITY” rally on Thursday March 8, 2012, were students peacefully marched to the Chancellor’s Office to submit the list of demands; (8)

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council stands with undergraduate students against acts of hate and condemns the hate crime committed on February 27, 2012;

LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council will work to strongly and openly advocate for concrete measures to improve campus climate;

LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Student Association Council is committed to working with organizations representing underrepresented communities to advocate for a safe campus climate, especially the Chicana/o, Latina/o community considering there is no self-identified Latina/o council member;

LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council supports the demands created by the Latina/o community and allies that will benefit the entire UCLA community;

LET IT FINALLY BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council President will send this resolution to the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Chair of the Academic Senate and any other appropriate administrators for the purpose of addressing the hostile campus climate.

CITATION:
(1) http://www.truebruin.ucla.edu/
(2) http://www.ucla.edu/campusvalues/
(3) http://www.dailybruin.com/index.php/article/2012/02/westwood_apartment_vandalized_with_racial_sexist_slurs
(4) http://www.dailybruin.com/index.php/blog/timestamp/2012/03/mecha_of_ucla_demonstrates_against_racial_discrimination_on_campus
(6) http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06037.html
(7) http://www.ucop.edu/news/factsheets/2012/fall_2012_applications_table3.2.pdf
(8) http://www.dailybruin.com/index.php/blog/timestamp/2012/03/students_march_about_headline_here

[1]
Tlaloc Vasquez:
whereas in spring 2011, a student advisory vote passed in favor of Communicating Unity through Education (CUE) to integrate a component that address diversity in the General Education curriculum

-Resnick said if they wanted to make a change, to phrase it in a motion.
-Saxe said thank you to everyone for coming and the diversity requirement is something they have been working on. She said she wanted to say that she regrets that she wasn’t here last week. She said she has reached out to several of them. She said anything that they are doing is only stronger if they work as a theme. She said they need to condemn the hate crimes but it would only mean something if they do something about it. She said she looks forward to the opportunity to work on it. She said there is a vote this Friday. She said her office has been working with the campus retention committee. She said she wants all of their voices to be heard so they have the ability to make this change. She said the committees could make the vote. She said they could continue to get involved. She said if they have any ideas of what they could do, to please let her know. She said it is vital to understand the different communities in their education.
-Sidrak asked about page 2 whereas, if they could list the organizations that were mentioned there
-Gamble said she could yield the floor
-Resnick said this could be something they add to the top portion or one of the numbers of people coming together
-Starr said he has a friendly amendment on the whereas that states the numbers of admitted Latino/Latina students. He said he would reword it.
-Resnick said she knows the name of the requirement has changed.
-Saxe said they added a question to show the support that came from the students. She said the language there is relevant to where it has come today. She said in frustrations with some faculty, some language comes off politically contentious. She said for some reason, this is formed like how it used to be taken. She said she wouldn’t want to lose a vote because the language wasn’t accurate. She said the title is “integrated component that addresses diversity” and the requirement is the “communities and conflict in the modern world” requirement. She said it could be changed
-Smith said that is fine. He said they should have a previously known as statement so people know what they are referring to.
-Saxe said the word they want to see is diversity. She said it might hurt its ability to pass
-Gamble said it could be changed as “commonly referred to.”
-Starr said a diversity requirement was the idea about it
-Saxe said she sees what they are saying. She asked if anyone had possibly suggestions on this.
-Smith said he is confused why they react this way
-Saxe said they would want them to see it. She said it makes their argument stronger if they could show them this
-Yao said last year, there was a resolution written as intergroup education. She said they could make it clear what it is without using that specific phrase
-Shah said they could put that they are addressing the diversity requirement
-Bocarsly said it only uses diversity requirement once. He said they could educate people on what they are doing, and say that it is called “communities and conflicts in the modern world.”
-Yao read her title
-Resnick said it could be changed to something like that
-Saxe said they could be more specific, like saying the title known as the communities and conflict requirement
-Bocarsly said they could adopt it in the q line. He said looking at the 2nd page, WHEREAS, the USAC President recently wrote a press release (6), and Assistant Dean of Campus Climate Christine Mata recently wrote a Letter to the Editor in the Daily Bruin (7); and both are working
in conjunction to put on a Town Hall March 7th, 2012 from 8:30-10PM in the Plaza View Conference Room of the John Wooden Center to address the current campus climate in light of this issue;

WHEREAS, MEChA de UCLA, with other allied students, demonstrated against acts of hate and discrimination in Bruin Plaza on March 1, 2012; (6), they could add “communities and conflict in the modern world.”
-Saxe said they could add another whereas saying that USAC supports this requirement. She motioned to change the language in the 15th whereas statement. Bocarsly seconded.
-Smith said it is already kind of mentioned
-Saxe said they could say it specifically
-Starr mentioned how this would affect the vote on Friday
-Smith said he is confused on what that is going to do and how much weight it holds
-Shah said while it is in the demands, adding it right before the chancellor statement adds weight to what the academic affairs commissioner and USAC is doing toward the requirement. She said this would give more emphasis to the demands.
-Gamble said this makes the resolution more relevant and she is fine with that amendment.
-Saxe added this resolution. Bocarsly seconded. There were no objections
-Sidrak suggested adding Patrick Heely, the director of merchandise and to consider the email they got about the store’s response to the t-shirt. She said this message has not been disseminated to campus. She said they should add that chancellor Block did send out a statement. She said that is on the point of the march as well
-Resnick suggested having this as two different motions.
-Champawat said that this would be in the paper as well.
-Gamble asked if something was published last week as well
-Champawat said he sent out an email. He said this is coming from the board and the executive director.

-Sholklapper asked if this has been sent out
-Champawat said it has and it will be printed Thursday of this week.
-Sholklapper asked if he could read this out loud from the ASUCLA store. The letter apologized for those who were offended by some of the merchandise that was sold. He said the store manager rejected the design but was randomly collected. The item was found and immediately taken off stock. The ASUCLA board of directors is committed to serving the diverse student community in diverse ways. He said they are developing a process to prevent merchandise to be sold if it offends any of their constituencies.
-Resnick asked if anyone had a way this could be added to the resolution
-Gamble said after the organization statement, they could mention this statement made by ASUCLA. This would show things that would be done in support of these demands.
-Sidrak said they should mentioned when it would be published
-Arruejo asked if there was a separate motion to put it in the Daily Bruin
-Sholklapper asked if they were putting a response.
-Shah said in the 4th to last whereas, to change misogynist to misogynistic
-Starr said on the 4th whereas, he wouldn’t want that part to affect how people vote on this.
-Shah disagreed because they saw a direct affect of this. She said there is a direct correlation with that proposition. She said it is an important piece of this resolution.
-Saxe asked about the list of demands. She said she doesn’t see all of it and asked if there were changes.
-Sholklapper asked if they amended to add that or the references.
-Bocarsly said it could be put on the website
-Smith asked about the already condensed version
- Sholklapper said that could add the explanations right after at the end.
- Starr said a could of them on the resolution weren’t on the draft that was sent out. He asked if anyone had a list of his or her demands.
- Sidrak moved to add a statement about the Billabong sales
- Hester asked about what Saxe was saying. She said they should mention the community in conflict GE requirement.
- Saxe proposed a possible statement to add on to this.
- Resnick said this would make it tangible
- Saxe asked if they should cite the committee.
- Dr. Nelson said he is enthralled by the seriousness of this. He said there is a young woman who talked about anti-Semitism. He said they wanted to put anti-Semitism in there as well. He said this way, people would see that they are acting as total as they can.
- Starr said that id this is in the 7th whereas or to add “all religions” as well.
- Gamble said there is room to add the Compton cookout and the Asians in the library incident
- Bocarsly talked about the transfer student issue on the professor’s blog. He said it is great to talk about current events as well.
- Resnick asked where this would fit in
- Starr said they could add above it. He said all of these things happened in the last month
- Shah said they could say “in March 2012 alone..” and then add it here.
- Bocarsly said this would be a separate whereas
- Lazarovici said she graduated in 1989. She said they faced the hate crimes and the diversity requirement as well. She said there is a greater visibility of queer and Muslim students on campus. She said that prop 187 and 209 have changed in California. This made a situation that was already tense worst. She said this kind of thing has gone through 30-40 years. She said it is not solely the job of the council to solve that. She said she wanted to frame the larger complex of what was going on.
- Saxe said to go back to Hester’s point, to have it read as edited. Bocarsly seconded. She asked if they would be comfortable changing how it is referred to in order to address the current form. It would change on of the demands stating that they demand a diversity requirement.
- Bocarsly said there are two more clauses
- Sidrak moved to add the final whereas.
- Bocarsly seconded. He added on the beginning more information and rewording.
- Resnick said they might cite the blog post.
- Shah said to add to that clause, “several incidents at UCLA.”
- Bocarsly said he would have to change the error. He motioned to add 6 clauses in another statement
- Starr seconded. There were no objections.
- Yao asked if it would be stronger to state that the vote is happening very soon.
- Resnick said they could add it again
- Yao motioned to amend that
- Saxe said to move part of it to the “let it be resolved”
- Shah said on the second to last whereas, it should say where.
- Bocarsly asked about the citations and said they might be messed up
- Sidrak said it was the councilor Block’s whereas
- Saxe made a motion to change the second to last where as to include the diversity requirement . The second to last let it be resolved would be edited as well.
- Shah asked about the chancellor’s rally and adding that “in response of these demands, Chancellor Block came out.
- Arruejo said on the 2nd whereas it should say stays not stay
- Arruejo said it could add what the 47=47 was
- Gamble said she could look into it. She called the resolution to question.
-Bocarsly said it is inspiring that they know that they need to take action. He said he supports this
-Hester said someone wanted to see USAC to be more proactive. She said it would be wonderful to see various communities at the USAC meetings as well.
-Sholklapper said it is important that something is coming out of this. He said he would like to look at the progress on each of them. He said he would want to look at the multicultural center
-Gamble said this was a discussion with SACBOG. She said she’s not sure if they want to go through every single one of them.
-Shah said they could have that meeting tomorrow. She said tomorrow could be more action oriented
-Sholklapper asked if they were more concerned if they were passing the resolution or passing it with real action items
-Smith said the space tomorrow would give them the chance to work with leadership tomorrow
-Sholklapper said it needs to be discussed and action oriented after this is passed.
-Smith said it could be hashed out tomorrow
-Sholklapper asked how they make sure the conversation does that tomorrow
-Gamble said they could add at the second let it be resolved that they are working with community leaders. She said there is still a barrier between the students in the room and their meeting on the table.
-Shah said in terms of bringing it up, they could bring back what is discussed at tomorrow’s meeting. She said this comes back to the table.
-Smith said they would be able to add more to the discussion. He said he thinks that would be better
-Saxe said part of the reason why they wanted a separate let it be resolved is because they do have a concrete plan related to that. She said that other demands would take more initiating. She said they mentioned they would do a lot of outreach early spring. She said it would be a serious concern if it doesn’t pass. She said she would be discussing that at tomorrow’s meeting.
-Sholklapper asked if they were just going to the college of letters and sciences
-Saxe said this vote is for the letters and sciences. She said the demands asked for GE service support
-Sholklapper asked if they were pushing it for all undergraduate students and asked for clarification
-Gamble moved to amend the second let it be resolved. Sholklapper seconded. There were no objections.
-Sholklapper said in the 4th let it be resolved, if they should specify what demands what they are supporting
-Saxe asked if they just listed demands that were sited below.
-Resnick said they could remove the let it be resolved
-Sholklapper said they didn’t decide what they wanted to do yet
-Resnick suggested combining those two.
-Shah read the combined two.
-Shah moved to combine the second and fourth let it be resolved. She read the new statement of “let it be resolved.” Soto seconded.
-Sholklapper asked if they would take away one of these
-Bocarsly said yes
-Saxe talked to the students of Hillel. She said this is something they can support as a community
-Saxe moved to cede the floor to Stephanie.
-Stephanie said they were 100% in response of this resolution
-Bocarsly said the 16 groups are referring to the demands.
-Gamble said in the demands document, there are two sections. She said most of the groups are sectioned off. She said she could add a distinction to the Google docs so they could see it.
-Sholklapper asked if this was a friendly amendment
-Gamble said it should have already been.
-Sholklapper said he had a friendly amendment. For the 4th whereas, it should say when “UCLA students,” not “a.”
-Bocarsly asked about citing the sources
-Sidrak asked if the demands could be listed somewhere separately
-Sholklapper asked if they could keep that link to stay with the resolution
-Starr said they should keep it
-Sholklapper agreed. He said if someone is referencing it, they could look at it.
-Sidrak said for the Daily Bruin ad, they should consider it. She said it is a little too long for ⅓ of a page
-Saxe asked where else it would be
-Sidrak said on the website and sent out
-Saxe moved to have the Daily Bruin to move the citations and there would be a separate section for the demands
-Resnick asked if someone minded putting in the asterisk
-Sholklapper said it was made clear that the authors were the sponsoring groups. He asked if council members needed to be authors
-Zimmerman said there needs to be 3 USAC sponsors. She said some of them also assisted in the writing. She said they could be put in that category too.
-Yao said in terms of USAC council members, they are not allowed to be listed on the published version in the Daily Bruin
-Sholklapper asked if this could be removed from the document since it wouldn’t be there. He made this a friendly amendment.
-Bocarsly asked if they wanted to mention the other groups there as well.
-Zimmerman said they were listed on the bottom
-Bocarsly said okay
-Smith said he hopes it doesn’t take this long next week to pass a resolution
-Sholklapper read the groups that were listed and asked for clarification
-Gamble said it sounded like they were dealing with logistics. Smith seconded
-Arruejo said according to article 5 section a number 5 part D, they needed to put a motion. He said in the bylaws it says to include it
-Resnick said thank you to Arruejo
-Gamble called to question the passage of the resolution
-Sholklapper seconded
-Smith objected because he has finals
-Resnick said if they want to leave they have quorum
-Sholklapper read the resolution as follows:

**Resolution Condemning Hate Crimes at UCLA and in Support of the Latina/o Community’s Demands**

Sponsored by: El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicana y Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA) de UCLA, Latin American Student Association (LASA)

WHEREAS, the University of California, Los Angeles has openly stated that all members of its campus community should conduct themselves with integrity and “respect for the rights and dignity of others”; (1)

WHEREAS, UCLA’s Principles of Community states:

“We do not tolerate acts of discrimination, harassment, profiling or other harm to individuals on the basis of expression of race, color, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, religious beliefs, political
preference, sexual orientation, gender identity, citizenship, or national origin among other personal characteristics. Such acts are in violation of UCLA’s Principles of Community and subject to sanctions according to campus policies governing the conduct of students, staff and faculty.” (2)

WHEREAS, acts of discrimination, profiling and harassment against marginalized communities have regularly occurred at UCLA’s campus and across the University of California;

WHEREAS, on Monday, February 27, 2012, a hateful act was committed against members of the Latina/o community, when UCLA students’ apartment door was vandalized with racist and misogynistic tagging; (3)

WHEREAS, the aforementioned hate crime is just the most recent reported hate crime, students across the University of California have been protesting against a hostile campus, including (but not limited to) the responses at UC San Diego after the Compton Cookout in 2010, and at UCLA after the “Asians in the Library” in 2011;

WHEREAS, in March 2012 alone, we have seen several incidences of intolerance at UCLA, including anti-Semitic vandalism on a poster of a student organization and the undervaluing of the transfer community in the blog of a UCLA professor; (4)

WHEREAS, these are not isolated incidences; marginalized communities encounter a recurrence of micro-aggressions on the UCLA campus that have contributed to an extremely hostile campus climate;

WHEREAS, underrepresented students attend UCLA hoping to escape the racist, xenophobic, homophobic, and misogynistic discourse that plagues the country’s current political climate;

WHEREAS, it is evident that UCLA is not immune from the political rhetoric that yields a hostile campus climate for underrepresented students;

WHEREAS, the Raza community and allies at UCLA, responded to the hate crimes and hostile campus climate in solidarity on Thursday, March 1, 2012 with the “Brown is Beautiful” event in Bruin Plaza; (5)

WHEREAS, the USAC Office of the President organized a Town Hall scheduled for Tuesday, March 6, 2012, to discuss the issues of campus climate, but was ultimately postponed ensuring that affected communities are properly contacted and become part of the planning process for the Town Hall;

WHEREAS; the University of California has released several statements ensuring that diversity continues to be a focus of the University; (6)

WHEREAS, ensuring that UCLA continues to prioritize access to students from low-income, under-served communities in order to have a more inclusive and racially diverse student body would help ameliorate the current campus climate;

WHEREAS, the demographics of Latina/os are about 37.6% in California and 47.7% in Los Angeles County; (7)

WHEREAS, the number of Latina/o students applying to UCLA continues to drastically increase,
but the number of admitted students has remained stagnant. While 26% of all applicants for the class of 2015 and 28% for the class of 2016 self-identified as Latina/o, Chicana/o, yet only 15.3% of all admitted students were Latina/o, Chicana/o for the class of 2015; (8)

WHEREAS, Proposition 209, which ended affirmative action, curtails the University’s ability to admit more qualified underrepresented students, the recently affected communities have developed and sponsored eight different demands from UCLA administration to ensure that administration is working towards creating a safe campus for everyone;

WHEREAS, the demands include the creation of a multicultural center, the adoption of a general education requirement addressing diversity, support for growth in Ethnic Studies, formal apology from ASUCLA, UCPD accountability, and greater Latina/o representation in administration, the accommodation for underrepresented students who participate in Greek life, and a formal response from Chancellor Block;*

WHEREAS, sixteen different organizations, whose missions range from political, cultural, social, and Greek affiliations helped create and sponsor the demands;

WHEREAS, the Associated Students UCLA has issued a formal written apology for the sale of the Billabong “still filthy” shirt. ASUCLA has since removed the shirt and has requested that the apology be printed in the Daily Bruin on Thursday, March 15, 2012;

WHEREAS, in Spring 2011, a student advisory vote passed in favor of Communicating Unity through Education (CUE) to integrate a component that addresses diversity in the General Education curriculum, which has taken the form of the Communities and Conflict in the Modern World general education requirement;

WHEREAS, the Latina/o community and allies staged an “I DEMAND DIVERSITY” rally on Thursday, March 8, 2012, where students peacefully marched to the Chancellor’s Office to submit the list of demands; (9)

WHEREAS, in response to these demands, Chancellor Block issued an email to the UCLA campus community entitled “Tolerance, Civility and Respect” on Friday, March 9, 2012 stating one of his priorities as “ensuring an environment of civility and respect” and included a videotaped statement addressing the concerns raised by students about UCLA’s campus climate and condemning the recent hate crime directed towards the Latina/o community; (10)

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council stands with undergraduate students against acts of hate and condemns the hate crime committed on Monday, February 27, 2012;

LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council supports the demands created by the Latina/o community and allies that will benefit the entire UCLA community and will work to strongly and openly advocate for concrete measures to improve campus climate, starting with a scheduled meeting with student groups on March 14, 2012;

LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council is committed to working with organizations representing underrepresented communities to advocate for a safe campus climate, especially the Chicana/o, Latina/o community considering there is no self-identified Latina/o council member;
LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council supports the adoption of the Communities and Conflict in the Modern World general education requirement as related to the aforementioned demands and urges the Faculty Executive Committee to vote in favor of such a requirement when addressed in the meeting on Friday, March 16, 2012;

LET IT FINALLY BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council President will send this resolution to the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Chair of the Academic Senate and any other appropriate administrators for the purpose of addressing the hostile campus climate.

CITATION:
(1) http://www.truebruin.ucla.edu/
(2) http://www.ucla.edu/campusvalues/
(3) http://www.dailybruin.com/index.php/article/2012/02/westwood_apartment_vandalized_with_racial_sexist_slurs
(4) http://www.dailybruin.com/index.php/article/2012/03/ucla_students_administrators_condemn_professors_blog_post_criticizing_transfers
(5) http://www.dailybruin.com/index.php/blog/timestamp/2012/03/mecha_of_ucla_demonstrates_against_racial_discrimination_on_campus
(7) http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06037.html
(8) http://www.ucop.edu/news/factsheets/2012/fall_2012_applications_table3.2.pdf
(9) http://www.dailybruin.com/index.php/blog/timestamp/2012/03/students_march_about_headline_here
(10) http://newsroom.ucla.edu/portal/ucla/chancellor-block-statement-on-230225.aspx

*The detailed language regarding the demands can be found following the resolution on the USAC Website.

The following organizations support the demands entirely:
Chicanos/Latinos for Community Medicine
La Familia de UCLA
Gamma Zeta Alpha Fraternity, Inc.
Grupo Folklórico
Hermanas Unidas
Hermanos Unidos
Improving Dreams, Equality, Access and Success (IDEAS) at UCLA
Lambda Theta Alpha Latina Sorority, Inc.
Latin American Student Association
El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicana y Chicano de Aztlan (MEChA) de UCLA
Nu Alpha Kappa Fraternity, Inc.
Phi Lambda Rho Sorority, Inc.
Sigma Alpha Zeta Sorority, Inc.
Sigma Delta Sigma Sorority
Sigma Lambda Beta International Fraternity, Inc.
Sigma Lambda Gamma National Sorority, Inc.

The following organizations stand in solidarity with the affected students and communities, and wholeheartedly support these demands:
Afrikan Student Union  
American Indian Student Association  
Asian Pacific Coalition  
Hillel at UCLA  
Mixed Student Union  
Muslim Student Association  
Pacific Islands’ Student Association  
Queer Alliance  
Samahang Pilipino  
Vietnamese Student Union

Demands referenced in the resolution above, as sent to UCLA administrators:

To: UCLA Administration

From: Latina/o, Chicana/o Students, and allies

Date: Thursday March 8, 2012

Subject: Campus Climate and Response to Hate Crimes

Ensuing the hate crime that occurred on February 27, 2012 on students’ private residence in Westwood, members and allies of the communities affected met to discuss the current campus climate at the University of California, Los Angeles. It was evident, per our discussions, that students of color, queer students, and female students do not completely feel safe on this campus.

We addressed our current community conditions and experiences at this University. The University has a moral obligation to protect students, and to create a safe and nurturing environment that encourages dialogue, growth, civic engagement, and academic excellence. However, as a community, we are unable to benefit thoroughly from the University and its resources, when we constantly doubt our own safety.

Collectively, as students, we demand the following from the University:

CREATION OF A CAMPUS MULTICULTURAL CENTER managed by students.  
In order for UCLA to be a truly diverse campus welcoming of all cultures, we call for the creation of a multicultural center in which we can learn about the different cultures and lifestyles embodied by students within the UCLA community.

By creating a multicultural center on campus, students will become more conscious and sensitive to different ethnic/racial groups.

Furthermore, it would provide a space to educate students on the community conditions that different groups are subjugated to, historically and presently.

The center will strive to increase awareness to lessen the likelihood that hateful acts like these will take place in the future and will promote an inclusive campus culture.

This multicultural center would be in conjunction with SAC BOG, as we want students to fully manage this entity.
ADOPTION OF THE COMMUNITIES AND CONFLICT IN THE MODERN WORLD REQUIREMENT.

Hate crimes exist because there is a lack of understanding amongst different communities on campus.

If students are taking courses that challenge them to understand the power of diversity, we can then hope for a better and more just world--one in which we can all live and work in peace.

We invite faculty and administration to work with students in order to ensure that the Communities and Conflict in the Modern World Requirement is implemented immediately.

It is important that students learn to work and interact with people from different backgrounds, especially considering how globalized our society has become. The Communities and Conflict in the Modern World Requirement will encourage students to understand cultural differences, and how we can work in the midst of those differences.

The passage of the Communities and Conflict in the Modern World Requirement is overdue. We urge the Academic Senate to vote on behalf of the integrating diversity in the general education curriculum, so a hostile campus climate does not become the norm.

We demand that Dean/Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Judith Smith, vocalize her support for the Community and Conflict in the Modern World Requirement and do all within her power to make sure it passes and implemented swiftly.

SUPPORT FOR GROWTH IN ETHNIC STUDIES AT UCLA.

As most Ethnic Studies Research Centers at UCLA were celebrating their 40th Year Anniversary, Chancellor Block dubbed the 2009-2010 academic year The Year of Ethnic Studies.

UCLA is one of the few Universities to house four different Ethnic Studies Research Centers, as well as individualized interdisciplinary programs and majors.

Even though UCLA continues to boast all of these diverse and vital resources to preserve and educate the histories of marginalized communities, they are usually the first programs to get cut during difficult economic times.

With the attacks on Ethnic Studies, such as in Arizona, it is not only important, but also necessary, that UCLA strengthen its Ethnic Studies programs and Research Centers. We demand the University increases its support to Ethnic Studies programs and Research Centers; and suggest that the Vice Provost for the Institute of American Cultures, Belinda Tucker, contract a Development Director to research avenues so that the programs and Research Centers grow further.

FORMAL APOLOGY FROM Bob Williams to the student body in response to the “Still Filthy” shirt that was sold at ASUCLA store.

For UCLA to support and sell the Billabong t-shirt with the image of an eagle and serpent, which is a respected cultural icon, is opportunistic and socially irresponsible.

Whether ASUCLA whishes to acknowledge or not, the mere thought of selling this shirt, is a direct attack on the Mexican/Mexican-American community.
We are aware that Patrick Healy, the UCLA Store’s director of general merchandise, wrote and submitted a Letter to the Editor piece on the Daily Bruin, “‘Still Fitly’ T-Shirt not intended to be offensive.” Although, we appreciate the kind and generous sentiments, we are not fully convinced that ASUCLA really understands how offensive the image is.

We demand a formal apology from ASUCLA Executive Director, Bob Williams, to the Student Body for approving and allowing ASUCLA to sell racially offensive merchandise in the Ackerman Student Store.

UCPD ACCOUNTABILITY TO STUDENTS
As students, we expect for UCPD to be available to help and protect us. This protection should not stop once outside the official UCLA boundaries. When actions of discrimination occur, whether on or off campus, we hope that UCPD will respond immediately and assure us our safety.

Given the UCPD’s history of criminalizing students of color, we demand that racial profiling of students of color cease, so students feel welcomed to seek help from the University police department. Far too many hostile situations go unreported for fear the police might not take students seriously.

In addition, we demand that the UCPD stop using the terms “illegal” or “alien” when talking about students or communities. Those terms are inhumane and contribute to a hostile campus climate.

The University and UCPD can no longer turn a blind eye to these issues and must respond effectively to student

GREATER LATINO/A REPRESENTATION IN ADMINISTRATION
As a University that prides itself on the diversity of its student body, we demand that UCLA administration reflect the Latino/a community’s demographics.

We demand that Administration be held accountable to student needs, and be sensitive to issues of diversity, campus climate, and be familiar with our community conditions.

As a marginalized community that has, for far too long, been neglected by the University, we feel it is imperative that UCLA recruit and hire administrators with similar experiences who can voice our concerns during decision-making meetings.

We will be paying close attention to the University’s personnel decisions, considering the current vacant Director position for Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools. We demand transparency and urge that students who represent historically marginalized communities, especially underrepresented communities as considered in admissions, are included in the hiring process. We believe that Rosa Pimentel, the current Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools, is an extremely qualified candidate for the position, and we want to ensure that she is being considered.

THE ACCOMMODATION AND RECOGNITION OF UNDERREPRESENTED GREEK ORGANIZATIONS
We demand the reevaluation of the methods and approaches taken by the UCLA Greek Life office when incorporating underrepresented Greek organizations with the overall Greek
population.

The racial diversity of the Greek body should be utilized as tool to bridge gaps and more importantly introduce diverse perspectives where they may have once never existed. Due to such diversity, every voice must be addressed and respected, for what they can contribute towards the growth of a unique Greek identity.

**FORMAL RESPONSE FROM CHANCELLOR NOT CONDONING THESE ACTIONS by Friday**

As students of color, we feel unrecognized, unsupported and underrepresented within the University.

The permissance of these actions without repercussions furthers our isolation as a community on this campus by administration and members of the student body.

Although the Chancellor and several members of the UCLA administration have vocalized their disappointment with the recent hate crimes, we have yet to see any specific plans to ensure that this does not happen again.

We want a formal response from the Chancellor addressing the hate crimes, the current hostile campus climate, and his plans to ensure that we all feel safe. We expect that Chancellor Block deem such hateful and insensitive actions as intolerable on this campus and also from the larger UCLA community. We demand that response no later than Friday March 9, 2012.

We hope that ALL of the demands are acted upon and completed swiftly. It is our duty as affected students and allies to hold this Administration accountable to these demands, our safety, and our overall well-being.

-Gamble called to question the passage of this resolution
-Arruejo said they added a friendly amendment.
-Gamble called the passage of this resolution. Bocarsly seconded. With a vote of 12-0-0, the resolution has been passed.
-Resnick said they needed to vote in the size of the ad
-Gamble said she didn’t know what size to make it. She said her office can handle the funds of that
-Zimmerman said usually contingency funds it
-Gamble said she would use her funds instead of contingency funds
-Resnick asked when it should be run
-Saxe said she wants it before Friday
-Starr asked if they publish during finals week
-Arruejo said this is lengthy
-Resnick said they altered it so it would be ⅓ of a page
-Arruejo said it depends on who sends it
-Gamble said she can send it before Thursday
-Arruejo said it doesn’t need to be put to a vote since it is from her office
-Zimmerman asked her to email it to her so she could put it on the website

A. *Spring USA/BOD Programming Fund Allocation*

Nguyen passed out the allocations. He said that anything between the green is how much will be added to the base allocation. He presented African Student Union. The next column showed how
much allocation they received. The total is he next color. He said the last page is the allocations.
- Soto asked about the event in light of recent deaths.
- Arruejo said they are substituting him with another speaker.
- Nguyen said the comments and scores are there.
- Resnick asked what they were voting on
- Nguyen said he recommended not use contingent liability. She asked if there was a motion to approve spring BOD funding
- Sholklapper moved to approve spring BOD funding
- Saxe supported the recommendation
- Zimmerman said what they allocated was slightly less than what they have this year. She said there were more groups that applied and she said they never know how many groups apply going in.
- Bocarsly asked about the eligibility amount
- Nguyen said he presented the council with the eligibility amount based on what they applied to
- Arruejo said student groups are only allowed a certain amount and Nguyen works off of that
- Bocarsly asked for clarification on the numbers
- Smith said you have to look at the other sheet
- Nguyen said they look at the eligible amount and they multiply that by the score.
- Bocarsly asked about the final base allocation
- Nguyen said he times everything by the percentage and it would equal everything that he had
- Zimmerman thanked him for putting the data down so clearly. She said she hopes he passes it on.
- Bocarsly asked if they approve with no contingent liability, they would give around $230,000. Contingent liability gives $34,000.
- Sholklapper looked at the Chinese Cultural Dance Club. He asked if it is normal to subtract the amount they have from other funding sources. She said there is a total of $48,000. The need for it wasn’t there anymore since they had $12,000 then.
- Resnick said to stay away from the contingent line and it should stay contingent in case they need it
- Bocarsly said he’s in favor of not using that money
- Nguyen said if they did, it would be about $400.
- Bocarsly called to question with no contingent liability. Sholklapper seconded. With a vote of 12-0-0, the BOD allocations were passed.

XI. Announcements
- Yao said she sent out a doodle for the meeting for outreaching to student groups. This would ask offices about what they’re doing.

XII. Signing of the attendance sheet.

*The attendance sheet was passed around.*

XIII. Adjournment

- Bocarsly moved and Soto 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 11:54 p.m. by Acclamation.

XIV. Good and Welfare
Respectfully Submitted,
Katrina Dimacali
USAC Minutes Taker
2011-2012