

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday, February 5, 2013
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: David Bocarsly, Lana Habib El-Farra, Andrea Hester, Michael Starr, Carly Yoshida, Kim Davis, Anees Hasnain, Taylor Mason, Stephen Kraman, Sahil Seth, Cassarah Chu, Jan Tacinco, Yasar Mohebi, Dr. Deb Geller, Dr. Berky Nelson, Laureen Lazarovici, Bob Williams, Roy Champawat, Patty Zimmerman, Cynthia Jasso, Katrina Dimacali

ABSENT:

GUESTS:

I. A. Call to Order

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

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet was passed around.

C. Approval of the Agenda

- Seth moved to strike capital contingency
- Mason moved to strike Cultural Affairs fund
- El-Farra said to not strike the travel grant
- Hester moved to add a special presentation called we saw it
- Mohebi moved and Seth seconded to approve the agenda, as amended.
- Bocarsly called for Acclamation. Bocarsly asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the agenda was approved, as amended.

III. Approval of the Minutes

A. *1/29/13

- Mohebi moved and Hasnain seconded to approve the minutes for January 29, 2013.
- Bocarsly called for Acclamation. Bocarsly asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the minutes were approved.

IV. Public Comments

Student Health Advisory Committee- Alan, Cory, etc.

-Alan said in 2009, UCLA went under the UC-wide SHIP system. He said since then, they have accumulated \$57 million in debt and there is a major issue. He said they need to figure out what kind of cuts and raises they would need to deal with.

-Cory said this would keep going but they need to make themselves self-sufficient. He talked about a 20% rise in premiums and San Diego is the highest at 32%. He said they can either raise premiums or change the structure, removing a lot of the benefits so people don't have to pay as much.

-She said they need to see how leadership feels about the decision so they can advocate for UCLA. The debt is spread between all campuses. She said they need to figure out if they prefer more expensive copays or if they're willing to pay more for UC SHIP to protect the benefits they have now. She said it doesn't have to be as high quality of a plan as Obamacare requires. She asked if they would rather spread the burden across everywhere or require more from students who need copays

-El-Farra said they talked about this at the UCSA meeting. She said they mentioned that this is because of a lack of oversight from UCOP. She said they wanted to make sure that their committee and others make sure that this doesn't happen again because either they were paying too much or paying not enough. She said UCSA decided that UCOP should take ownership of this and students shouldn't have to take ownership of this. She said hopefully her committee can take this position. She said premiums will probably go up

-She said that the numbers looked wrong and they were suspicious of the projections. She said UCOP argued their numbers were right. She said to make sure students are not burdened, they would make sure that students would not have to pay for mismanagement. She said they should not be paying for these loans

-Seth said they proposed two different things. He said those are two ways to increase the price. He said that a lot of consulting firms have certain things that UCLA students would need that the general public wouldn't. He said that they might need to reallocate to things that UCLA students would use more often. He said that is an avenue that they should look down.

-She said they are looking at coinsurance. She said a benefit is not having a cap on pharmacy and no lifetime cap. She said they want to protect that. She said if the premium increases, at least it is covered by financial aid. She said if it decreases, some money might have to come out of pocket

-Chu asked around how much the premium would be

-She said it was around 19-20% for the medical component

-Cory said it is the lowest out of all UC's

-She said it would be around \$280 per undergraduate student

-Dr. Nelson asked if this was for the year

-She said yes. She said to email them and they have a Facebook as well. She said they need student feedback

-Jasso asked if they could do a special presentation

Lawrence

-Lawrence said he is speaking on the proposal and to the council. He said he is not targeting one person. He said he was wondering how the proposal to remove endorsements would make things fair. He said there was a mishap last year and it seemed like tracks were trying to go. He asked how the rest of the campus would know what happened on campus. He said that in regards to the proposal, he would yield to Pede because she is supposed to make decisions in a non-partisan position. He said whatever she proposes would superpose others. He talked about having proxies in the meetings.

-Pede said proposal 1 allows substitutes by the signatories

-Lawrence said he doesn't understand why the process would change and be ruined. He said he reads the Daily Bruin and some of them vote or don't vote at all. He said everyone on council should be voting because they were elected.

Co chief of staff, CAC, RA, Planning committee- Jessica Trumble

Trumble said she is deeply concerned by the proposals of getting rid of endorsements. She said that the process would be deregulated so that bold face lies would be perpetrated again. She said she trusts the people who run to follow the principles for community but she can't see that after seeing what happened last year. She said they approved Pede and it is time to let them do their job

John Joanino

Joanino said he respects the E-board and he trusts that the council will make the right decision

Eric/Musa Adams- director of Queer Alliance

Adams said he got a phone call about the proposal. He said that the person asked about endorsement hearings. He said it is important to understand the endorsement process and how it enables students to engage in the democratic process. He said a lot of students aren't always able to go to all of the events. He said as a student in the Queer Alliance, it was said that one of the members was part of the themed floor. He said this individual was not doing that work but was able to claim it. He said these proposals create more problems than it seeks to destroy. He said he would like to see stronger forms of verification such as checking Bruin Cards and proxy forms online that groups can bring.

Matt Alburche

Matt said he appreciates E-boards proposal in terms of reforming the election code. He said getting rid of the endorsement process would be a travesty because it is a space for getting a vision of the office. He said it is important to engage students with that. He said not all organizations see that it isn't worth it. He said it is important as a student org leader that they are

able to hear out what each candidate says because it is important to engage in what each candidate wants to do. He said it is important to really listen to those visions. He said it would be a travesty to get rid of endorsements and urged the council to consider how important endorsements are

Devin Murphy

Murphy said she commends Pede and Singh on the proposal because she thinks it is fair. He said they have the chance to choose non-partisan people. He said if they are serious about the work that USAC is doing, they have to go through this process. He said that most people find it tedious, but people change their mindsets afterward. He said to let the people running for elections to their work. He urged them to approve the endorsement process that E-board is proposing. He said that deregulating them isn't the solution. He said the election board is tasked with the idea that they deal with elections and to let them to the work

Taylor Bazely

Bazely said he ran as an independent. He said to consider how independents are in this process. He said independents might not have the infrastructure to reach out to all students. He said the endorsement process informs students on independents who might not have as much exposure otherwise. He lent his support to the E-board proposal

Christina Harb- Service Commission

She said their organization gets a voice through endorsements. She said she would be disappointed if she was misrepresented. She said she would like to endorse it and stress the importance of having something regulated and formal, especially for students working extremely hard

Adam Swart

Swart said he lent his support to Bocarsly's proposal to remove a lot of the red tape that makes it hard for new and independent candidates to run. He said that it is a very big hurdle in terms of endorsements. He said it is difficult because they don't know a lot of the structure and it makes it difficult to get the support you need. He said in terms of removing obstacles of getting people to run, they want to have more candidates with interesting visions rather than two big parties. He said the proposal would remove a lot of the technicalities. He said having a less formal system makes it less subjected to abuse. He said that in an informal system, everyone can endorse and it encourages turnout and more candidates.

-Hasnain asked to expand on the structural elements. She said it provided a chance for her, an independent, to interact with different groups based on different questions.

-Swart said everyone has their own opinion. He said he thinks the challenge that in her case, she wasn't opposing a slate candidate with the base of organizational support. He said if you're an

independent running against two slates, it makes it more difficult. He said that if you're the third candidate, it is unlikely that they will get a lot of support.

Marissa Hall- EVP Office, director of national affairs, board of directors of USSA

Hall said she knows what it is like to be an elected official and making decisions. She implored everyone to vote either yes or no and to not abstain. She said they were elected to voice concerns through their votes. She said to please use these votes and future votes

Raquel Saxe

Saxe said she was victim of two endorsement scandals. She said the year before last, her name was misprinted in half the endorsements on the Daily Bruin. She said without endorsing either proposal, there were a lot of problems. She said the reporting system brought other problems besides the ones last year. She said to keep that in mind when reforming the code.

V. Special Presentations

A. Enough is Enough – Consultation and Response Team, Karen Minero CRTeam@ucla.edu

Minero said she would talk about the Consultation and Response Team. Minero said these organizations were created following the Virginia Tech shootings. She said they were able to speak more freely about concerns on campus. She said they work sensitively and discreetly about issues and as mental health professionals able to share more. She said the health facilities are protected by HPPA. She said student care managers talk to students about suicide, subject to violence, and any students who might be victims of violent crimes. She said she is a psychologist in Murphy Hall in Dr. Geller's suite. She said with regards to how the campus works, for undergraduates or graduates, the consultation and response team works on those issues to try to help the student. She said as far of staff or faculty, they deal with the Violence Prevention and Response Team. She asked if anyone had heard of the Consultation and Response Team. She said they are there to assist you if you're at risk for suicide, violence, mental health issues not being addressed, etc. She talked to them as student leaders because they have a valuable role in helping peers understand what resources are available to them and potentially consult with them. She said any students can be referred if they are physically aggressive or have intimidating behavior, intimate partner violence or sexual assault, harassment or stalking, willful or intentional behavior causing damage to property, direct or implied threat of suicide or death, weapons in the UCLA community, etc. She said they have 2 24-hour options for students to call. She said UCPD changed the way they want students and staff to contact them. They said to dial 911 from their cell phone or campus line. She said they can be routed to UCPD and it is better for tracking

-Dr. Nelson asked about the other number

-Minero said that is still their line and that the dispatch line is for non-emergencies

-Dr. Nelson asked if 911 is UCPD now

-Minero said it can be routed to UCPD and that it is easier to track. She talked about the other 24-hour number for CAPS, which is 310-825-0768. She said student's talk about students they are concerned about. She said the card she passed around also has a UCPD number that is an anonymous message and tip line. She said that they talk about students that might be aggressive, etc. She said this is a good thing to have to keep in their wallet. She said she gave some to Hester and can give people more. She said they can also call a UCLA Student Care Manager. She said the True Bruins Care Initiative is what the logo is based on. It was developed almost 4 years ago. She said the idea was to follow ethical standards and to follow safety and wellness. She said UCPD also promotes community safety. She said they all need to be accountable to their community. She said they have had many ways they have reached out to the campus. She said in spring 2011, they had a faculty and staff 911 guide that was mailed out to faculty. She said this has been distributed to staff members as well. She said it helps students at distress or at risk. She said the True Bruins also have care referral cards that go out every summer to students that come to first year orientation. She said that is one way they distribute the cards. She talked about the True Bruin poster campaign. She said she would be giving posters to Chu. She said it says to make the call and that they're not alone. She said it describes when to reach out to students. She said these were put on flat screen TV's around campus. She said they do trainings for faculty and staff. She said part of their response team is CAPS. She said they provide a lot of outreach. UCPD and ORL do a lot of outreach and education as well as the Vice Provo's, etc. She said they also put on the Enough is Enough campaign. She said that USAC does part of the campaign and receive their emails. She said she has a sign up sheet if they would like to join them. She said she included on the back the flyer that they gave out that shows all of the programs they have. She said if they want to be on the planning committee or volunteer they need a lot of help. She said over the years, they focused on general violence but last year they focused on dating and domestic violence because one study by the FBI and the department of education analyzed many incidents of violence on campus and found that 1/3 were linked to an intimate relationship. She said they had a lot of participation from students and staff on their planning committee. She said this was an event they had last spring. She said they had 330 students, staff, and faculty pledge. She said last year, they focused on educational programs. She said they had 140 students attend 6 educational programs. She said these were an hour or more. She said these included self-defense trainings and a survivors panel. She said they are planning these educational programs for spring. She said they will be doing a concert in Bruin Plaza and a resource fair for student organizations. Last year in 2012, they had 6 educational programs and one panel presentation for staff and faculty. They distributed 900 resource cards and she would pass these out. She said she gave 200 to Hester. She said USAC was a cosponsor and they provided some of the funding as well. She said 330 signed the nonviolence pledge. She said they distributed 950 Enough is Enough shirts. She said they took donations, which went to the Clothesline Project. She said they work on dating and domestic violence. She said that they had a bulletin board campaign where they provided information for RA's to post on bulletin boards in each of their halls. She said they would do that this year. She said this would be their 4th annual Enough is Enough campaign. She

said they have a lot of things planned, such as the Kick-off-event concert/Student Org resource fair, CAPS workshops “if you loved me,” film screenings, self-defense trainings, stalking survivors panels, etc. She encouraged them to sign up or stay informed. She asked if anyone had any questions.

-Tancinco said she talks to people outside of UCLA and asked if someone outside of UCLA called the crisis line

-Minero said they accept anonymous calls

-Dr. Geller said they would take referrals from any interested party. She said it matters that the person they are calling about is a UCLA student

-Tancinco asked if they called someone who was not a UCLA student

-Dr. Geller said the police would be the right people to call

-Minero said they could provide information on agencies in the area

-Mohebi asked what week it is

-Minero said it is probably be week 2 of spring

-Yoshida asked what the theme was

-Minero said the theme is stalking since they weren't able to do as many programs on it last year. She said most stalking cases are after an abusive relationship. She said stalking behavior is seen as a red flag and that stalking behavior is something they want to be educated about

-Bocarsly thanked her for coming

B. We Saw it- Charles, Morgan, Tbow

-Charles asked who had iPhones. He said they wanted to raise awareness on student events and committees. He said he created a video for them and wanted them to check it out. He said the app would increase engagement. They played the video. He said it is like Yelp and they could increase and enhance campus lifestyle. He showed the council what the app looks like. He said they could see how many people are there and it is integrated with Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube and people can experience the event as if they were there. He said they could basically experience the app. He said they could choose on the app what they want to experience. He said they could look at local events and see what's going on. He said they want to team up with student committees on the UCLA campus and want to make sure they build upon communities on campus. He said it could become a hub on campus. He said they are looking for ambassadors and committees on campus. He thanked them for their time.

-Tancinco asked how they got started and said it looks really cool

-Morgan said they came up with this when they were studying at UCLA. He said not a lot of people use UCLA Happenings. He said people spend more time on their phones than their computers anyway. He said people get to see what's happening and they take feed from Instagram. He said people that don't have the app at the event will still have their media on the app.

-Tbow said it is a live stream that combines photos and videos

-Hasnain asked if people apply through the website to be an ambassador

- Morgan said they could go on their website to apply
- Tbow said they want to partner with any event organizers to raise awareness about the app and see how they can advertise. He said Dance Marathon is coming up.
- Hasnain asked what their pitch was to utilize this rather than other existing apps such as the Daily Bruin
- Morgan said they spent a lot of time developing this.
- Hasnain said Daily Bruin allows students to create apps
- Morgan said they are students and UCLA alum. He said they came up with this because they couldn't find something as useful as this.
- Tbow said Daily Bruin hires people in Eastern Europe to do apps and they go to places in Westwood to outreach
- Chu asked if it is ad revenue based
- Morgan said the app is free and no ads. He said they want to involve the UCLA community and they don't have any avenue. He said they want to provide this useful tool and aren't monopolizing on it

VI. Appointments

A. Ramin Rajaii– Student Health Advisory Committee

- Hester moved to table Rajaii until he gets there. Kraman seconded.
 - El-Farra asked if they can move new business before officer reports.
 - Hasnain said it would be respectful to move it up
 - El-Farra said they could move it up before fund allocations. She moved to move new business to before fund allocations. Mason seconded
 - Starr said that they could move it but it is already on the agenda.
 - Bocarsly said it would be nice for everyone to hear officer reports
 - Starr called to question.
 - El-Farra moved to move the election board to before fund allocations. Hasnain seconded.
 - Dr. Geller said they need a 2/3 vote.
 - With a vote of 10-2-0, the election code proposal was moved to before fund allocations.
-
- Starr moved to approve Rajaii for SHAC. Kraman seconded.
 - Hester said they voted 3-0-0. She said they were blown away by his answers and felt that he really understands the potential of the committee. She said the only recommendations were to brush up on the healthy campus initiative and the interview
 - Starr said that they talked about outreach and that he is very passionate about this
 - Hasnain said they lived on the same floor and that she reached out to him because he is a top-notch student who has leadership qualities and takes it upon himself to do his jobs well
 - Bocarsly said they have one person finishing her second term and that he would fill in the second year of a two-year appointment
 - El-Farra asked if two came in
 - Bocarsly said there is a third person they appointed last year
 - Rajaii introduced himself as a 4th year student and he would like to pursue an MD-MBA. He would like to go into health care administration. He said he has outlined a few things that can be

approved upon at Ashe and that they can better address the individualized needs. This connects with what he wants to do with administration

-Mohebi asked about the healthy campus initiative

-Rajaii said it includes stipulations on bikes, healthy living, and funding student groups that have sustainability and wellness in mind. He said they want to make the healthy way the easy way. He said that people would naturally want to go with these opportunities.

-Borcarsly said they heard about the issues with SHIP and asked if he knew what was going on

-El-Farra said they are in \$57 million dollars of debt

-Bocarsly said he challenges him to find out about it if he wasn't aware

-El-Farra said there are two options, either raise the payment or accountability on the UCOP. She asked what his role would be

-Rajaii said he did not know about the debt but from what he looked into, a couple things to address would be efficiency and productivity. He said he has waited a long time in Ashe. He said that generally, efficiency could save a lot of money. He said SHIP only covers one major package while the student population is diverse so they might need a more comprehensive package. He said they could offer different types of SHIP for more individualized care. He said they would be varied in prices. He said he would look into it more.

-Bocarsly said to look into it more

-Hasnain moved into discussion

-Chu asked to elaborate more on services Ashe needs to improve on and how they would push these improvements

-Rajaii said there is a lack of availability on weekends. He said that people have to wait several days for treatment. He said he would like to provide at least a limited service on weekends so that healthcare needs are being met. He said that urgent care walk ins are really important. He said that people are told that they need to wait several days even though they need immediate attention. He said they would put all the paperwork online so that it is electronically available to expedite the process so they could meet with the physician and get out

-Chu asked in what capacity he's explored the feasibility of these improvements

-Rajaii said he hasn't gone too far yet but in order to implement these solution he would need to know the system based on experience. He said he would definitely know the implementations better if he was familiar with the system

-Mohebi asked if the system was already online

-Rajaii said he based it on his experience. He said he had to wait for his provider to fill out additional paperwork and that this could be streamlined. He said this way that students could be met with individualized treatments and not just be pushed along. He said it could be much more productive.

-Bocarsly said they would move into discussion

-Starr called to question. Hasnain seconded. With a vote of 11-0-0 Rajaii was approved.

B. Armanoelle Ople - Office Space Allocation Committee

-Seth moved to approve Ople for OSAC

-Hester said this is the first potential appointment for OSAC. She said the doc has the complete guidelines for the committee. She said the vote was 3-0-0 approve. She said he understood the process and the importance of allocating space fairly. They suggested them to know the application process based on the guidelines and know the determinants for space misuse. She

said there are a lot of clear guidelines for how office space could be misused. She said overall they feel confident he can take on the role.

-Bocarsly said he will come back with his committee

-Zimmerman said it is only every other year OSAC does a reallocation of rooms and the other year is an audit

-Bocarsly said this year is an OSAC year. He said they will do an OSAC application

-Tancinco asked if the CEC office would always be in the CEC office

-Zimmerman said USAC offices stay the same and they don't need to go through the process but they can request to move offices. She said before, gen. reps. requested to move up to a bigger room. CSC groups need to apply

-Hasnain asked if it was for every room or just 411

-Zimmerman said 408 or 407 are always there but to look at the other ones

-Bocarsly asked if she oversees this committee

-Zimmerman said yes

-Starr said he had spreadsheets and timelines of what he expects from the committee

-Ople introduced himself. He said he is a 3rd year economics major. He is involved with PREP and he is the financial coordinator for Samahang Pilipino. He said he applied in October and as a member of organizations he has spent a lot of time in Kerckhoff. He said that there is very limited space for students to meet. He said that he has some changes that he would like to see and hopes to make and recommend them

-El-Farra said that he was brought to ARC late, how he plans to make sure the process goes smoothly

-Ople said he made a timeline. He said it is a very fast process. He said he hopes that he is chair and he would be outreaching for committee members and creating an application. He said he hopes to see them in these next few weeks. He said given the time constraint, he probably will have applications due the first week of spring quarter so it gives organizations about a month to fill out. He said that it is weekly meetings and he is planning to have town halls at the end of the quarter. He said he hopes everything goes as planned

-Chu asked what changes he would like to make

-Ople said there were things in the guidelines and there were technical bylaw concerns. He said that one of the rules in the guidelines is that they have to be 5 years old. He said given that there are student organizations that could utilize office space even though they are newly formed, they should still be taken into consideration. He said they really need to look at how it's being used now and see how they can efficiently use office spaces

-Zimmerman said OSAC chair might make changes and leave. She asked if he would stay and help with the implementation of this. She said that OSAC chairs make changes and then leave. She asked how he would implement changes

-Ople said he would be here next year and he hopes to have allocations in the middle or spring quarter and if there were any changes that need to be made he would be more than happy to help them

-Kraman asked about space misuse

-Ople said by the guidelines, it would be destruction of property, illegal activities, and not using the space at all. He said that is what he thinks as well. He said that anything that someone sees as misuse he would be more than happy to listen to

-Kraman asked about repurposing spaces for meetings

- Ople said if it came down to it, they might use one office that more than one group could have access to.
- Davis said he mentioned that a lot of organizations use offices as storage and how he would address storage issues
- Ople said there are storage spaces on campus
- Zimmerman said there is a locker room in the first floor of Kerckhoff and in the past groups that do not get an office get lockers. She said that they have been able to help more groups but it limits groups that were issued an office. She said that is how it was done in the past
- Ople said this is something to keep in mind to see what students really need. He said if student groups need storage space to keep it in consideration
- Mohebi talked about the audit process and asked how he would go about that process.
- Ople said there is a complaint procedure and he would be more than happy to listen to what students have to say and it is per situation basis. He said if it is an issue he would look into it
- Starr moved into a discussion
- El-Farra said this is an important position. She asked why this applicant is coming so late
- Bocarsly said he has been going through the process for the past 4 weeks
- Hasnain said she would abstain because he is involved in a Community Service Commission organization
- Starr called to question. Kim seconded. With a vote of 11-0-1, Ople was approved.

C. Katherine Morales – Judicial Board

- Mason moved to approve Morales for J-Board. Kraman seconded.
- Hester said this is the third person they are appointing.
- Bocarsly said they have 4 more.
- Hester said the vote was 3-0-0. She said Morales was knowledgeable about the position. She said that she knew about issues in the past and issues that have been raised
- Starr said it is great she was a freshman. He said she mentioned times where she remained unbiased
- Jasso said Morales knew about cases that she's never even heard of and she did a lot of research. She said Morales mentioned cases that happened a decade ago and she has a lot of passion and qualifications.
- Bocarsly said this would be an appointment for the entire time that they are here.
- Morales introduced herself as a freshman English major and she plans to go to law school.
- Bocarsly asked why she's applying
- Morales said she would like to do something that interprets law. She said this is a mock of what she would do in the future. She is very interested in policy making
- Mohebi asked what she could bring to the position
- Morales said she was part of student government in high school. She was vice president and secretary and had to oversee different class boards. She said she was very impartial and has experience with that. She said she did not favor certain classes.
- Mason asked what her understanding of grievances was
- Morales said they petition and once denied and the J-board gives their position on it. They have preliminary hearings and junctions and from there they go to the court of hearing. She said they have witnesses and representatives. She said the J-board has to clean out the flaws and controversies. She said the J-board has its own closed session and from there they make their

decision. The majority of the justices make the decision. The historian at the end of the year records the decision

-Seth asked if she was familiar with a case that she disagreed with

-Morales said she was researching the cases. She said she hasn't really seen any cases that she would disagree with. She was interested in the Birdie investigation. She said it was interesting how they dealt with the conflict of interest.

-Starr moved to discussion.

-Hasnian called to question. Mohebi seconded. With a vote of 12-0-0 Morales was approved.

VII. Fund Allocations

A. *Contingency Allocations

-Starr moved to approve contingency. Kraman seconded.

-Jasso said the total required is \$75,132.29. The total requested is \$9,299.53. The contingency balance is \$90,624.29. The total recommended is \$5,900.00. She said that is half of what last year got and that people are spending their money more efficiently

-Starr asked if there was a problem with Dance Marathon

-Jasso said last year Dance Marathon applied but since there is a charge to participate, they asked for them to reimburse them

-Bocarsly asked for clarification

-Starr called to question. Kraman seconded. With a vote of 11-0-1, the contingency allocations were approved.

B. #Travel and Advocacy Grant

-El-Farra said they allocated \$27 to the OTI Conference, \$150 to the Gerson Baskin Event, \$250 for the AISES Leadership Conference 2013, and \$400 for the IMPACT National Conference. So far, \$8215 has been allocated.

C. #ASRF

-Davis said this week there was one for \$1500 for hip-hop congress panel discussion

VIII. Officer and Member Reports

President – David Bocarsly

Bocarsly said he met with the college commencement and tasked them to reach out to singers and speakers for commencement. He said to tell their friends that the application is available. He said that he hopes that they saw the press release in response to the hate crimes. Cyrus approached him and he explained the hate crimes. He said it is very important they pass on instances of stories on their campuses. He said the campus wide email went out today. He said they don't have updates yet for the campus climate survey but he anticipates this year was slower

and the link should come out again tomorrow. He said next week he hopes to report higher numbers

Internal Vice President – Andrea Hester

-Hester said earlier last week Hasnain and herself talked about having an hour devoted to a presentation where they could talk outside of council meeting, such as talking about a diversity workshop.

External Vice President- Lana El-Farra

-El-Farra said she will make her update next week twice as long.

Academic Affairs Commissioner— Kim Davis

-Davis said she will email her update

IX. Old Business

There was no old business this week.

X. New Business

A. *Election Code Proposals- Dana Pede

-Mohebi moved to go into the Election Code Proposals.

-Bocarsly said the next appointment would go when he arrives

-Mohebi moved to go into Election Code Proposals

-Pede said she is E-board chair. She presented two proposals. She talked about the election board role and said they are the impartial entity that oversees election issues and goes over election code issues. She said the purpose is to ensure a fair and just process. She said their goals are to protect and promote a fair process. She said they would consider interested involved in elections and protected the election code. She thanked her board for being there. She said she would present both proposals in their entirety and provide pros and cons. She said after she would make her official recommendation. She asked for questions at the end. She talked about proposal number 1 drafted by the USAC election board. She said all of their changes happen in section V.B.5. She said that it deals with signatories registering groups in the endorsement process. All university representatives would be notified by email and university recognized representatives are responsible for communication so they represent them accurately. They are using university-recognized representative in case the term signatory changes. She said one or more preventative that applied has to be at endorsement hearings. She said the election board will provide substitution forms authorizing one or more representatives in the event that none of the

representatives can attend. She said if people need to switch out then they can. She said it is important to know who they are dealing with. She said they must provide the election board with slips to recognize endorsements. They would check with signatories to make sure there are no conflicts of interest between the signatory and substitute. She said that any groups that do not go through the process will go through endorsements. She said additional forms can happen with election board oversight and must be in addition to hearings. She said the advantage is that it closes the loophole from last year in that it holds groups accountable through the endorsement process. She said throughout the process they have access to these parties. She said if something else comes up, they are able to address that issue and they can refer to their methods. She said they stand by their document 100% and have no concerns. She said they have received feedback. She talked about cons to address concerns. She said some people feel like it does not address the implementation of endorsement hearings. She said that the implementation is something that has never been in election code to allow for flexibility on the E0board side. She said they have flexibility to see how they can improve it and it is something they want to implement on their end. She said it would change the political atmosphere at UCLA. She said the concern brings up the question of why the endorsement hearings are mandatory. She said it is important because it establishes a safe space for students to address concerns in neutral locations under regulation by the election board. She said it also promotes the idea of equal opportunity for student groups. She said it establishes solid baseline so they have that amount of communication. She said it refers to the idea that students already know what they want to do. She said students are accountable for new information and they are able to receive that. Another concern is the consolidating list. She said that they have seen the issues that have happened with it and said that it is worth the responsibility. She said it is their responsibility to make sure it is accurate. She said that every student would be able check in with these sources. She said the wording in the election code is that a list would be made and an ad would be placed in the Daily Bruin. She said they could put endorsements online. She said the Daily Bruin is an important tool to easily get out publicity but also the convenience and accessibility to students who might not have Facebook or internet. She said a concern is that endorsing members might have different opinions. She said groups have that responsibility to make that decision themselves. She said that it is important to know when groups are given that voice. She said group campaigning is still on the table. She said she doesn't think this concern is relevant to tonight's discussion. She said that a concern is that it is unlike others. She said whether this process is universal doesn't change that they see this process as valuable. She said they believe that they should have the agency to advocate for the candidates they believe in and that they should be able to check on the candidates they see. She said the process of having groups endorse is important. She said something they've heard is that it doesn't seem necessary. She said they know very well the problems with the process and they have come from mistakes due to a lack of oversight. She said it is not an inherent flaw in the system and it is their responsibility to get this right. She said these have solved a lot of problems in the past. She said in the past there were hostile environments and that it is important to consider both cases.

Pede talked about the next proposal. She said they would go in order. She said the intent as she understands is that groups are not to be recognized by, registered with, or overseen by the E-board. She said they can participate in the election process without registering with the E-board. She said the first change here is that the endorsements subcommittee is to be renamed the meet the candidates committee to make an open forum. She said it is important to note that there would be an executive committee and 4 subcommittees. She said there are some inconsistencies with the naming of the committees. She talked about the guidelines for ballot propositions. She talked about how campaigning is defined. This terminology is a little unclear of who they are registered with and who the individual is. Individuals have never been codified. She said if someone wants to support a candidate, they would never be recognized as their own entity. She said they defined an endorsement slip, which is defined as materials originating from and/or distributed by any registered or non-registered campus organization or member of the association that contains a stated endorsement or conveyance or support for any of the following. She said they were concerned with the difference between registered or non-registered campus organizations. She said that it was a little inconsistent and would be a little difficult for the E-board to interpret. She said if student groups aren't recognized it is unclear how or why the E-board would oversee their process. She talked about the signboards and regulations. She said if the E-board does not oversee the boards, how will they overlook these. She said a serious concern is a fundamental issue with signboards and stamps on campaign materials. She said this would mean that campaign materials would mean that these are from the election board process. She said candidates would then be part of the election board process and their stamps would mean nothing. She said they wouldn't be able to hold groups accountable because they wouldn't be registered with them. She said stamping and approval of material would change. She said they are already official. She said now that they are official, they would need to include the election board logo. She said it is unclear what the endorsement slip would be and it would be hard to sign off on things they could not regulate. She talked about the section suggesting that any campaign violations would be on candidates. She talked about e-mail campaigning and how they must be sent to the e-board address. She asked why the emails would be sent to them since there is nowhere they could point them back to. She said she doesn't understand why they would be part of the process. She said the changes on the endorsement hearings. These would be left up to the election board. She said inherently there is a come to terms. This event was created for the hill while endorsement hearings were for student groups. She said consolidating events marginalizes groups and creates concerns. She said it would perhaps need to be renamed since the name doesn't make sense. She said the proposal says that it would be open to members of the association but doesn't include other members so it is inconsistent with people who can go to a campaign but cannot go to endorsement hearings. She said there are inconsistencies with registered or non-registered student groups. She talked about endorsement slips being regulating. She said they have to be regulated by election board and campaigning is an official process. She said if groups aren't registered, this is no longer an official process. She said organizations and

individuals would provide endorsement slips. She said that they would be keeping track of changes they are not accountable for. She said that this issue comes up again in regulating the process. She said it is really difficult to call people out if they don't recognize where problems originate. She talked about unrecognized endorsement forums and how they would be sanctioned. She said that it is important to note the final sentence that reads that the organization holding the endorsement hearing shall also be sanctioned. She said if they cannot recognize a group, they cannot sanction them and the e-board could come under attack. She talked about section VI.B.5.a.ix-xii and how it differs. She said if groups apply with the election board, slips are not expenses for the campaign but if they print their own material, those expenses are wrapped into campaign expenses for candidates. In this system, expenses from organizations would not be considered as expenses and there is a lack of financial accountability in financing that component. She said it read that the communications board and OCHC regulations. She talked about section VI.B.5.b.v. and how they wouldn't be able to follow through with sanctions if they can't recognize them. She talked about section VII.B.4. and sanctioning and she said all of the other changes said that they couldn't. She said changes are inconsistent with what they are and are not allowed to do. She said an advantage is that it would eliminate logistical efforts and costs associated with compiling and printing the endorsement list in the Daily Bruin. She said the election board sees the benefits of having a list. She said a pro is that it opens endorsements to anyone (students and student groups, registered and non-registered). She said it also brings up the issue of not being able to hold people to what they do. She said the part that requires student groups to submit endorsement slips and changes to slips contradicts the spirit of the proposal of removing the election board oversight. She said this proposal still mandates that they do so. Another concern is that it is inconsistent and ambiguous. She said that who is and isn't allowed is something that is really important for the election board to hold onto. She said that whether sanctioning is allowed is an issue. She said another issue is organizations versus individuals as well as individuals versus members of the association. There is also ambiguity about individuals' roles to endorse. She said an individual might be representing an organization. She said in the sense, an individual's endorsement ballot is their way to express their opinions. She said that people can do this in the previous proposal. She said the a con is that it does not address issues of misrepresentation and removes the E-board's ability to fact check. She said that misrepresentation can occur in any number of levels and that groups are still publishing that they are and what they are promoting. She said that the E-board wouldn't have an official list to refer back to and it would be difficult to even acknowledge that this issue doesn't even exist. She said they wouldn't be able to recognize groups and slates. She said they wouldn't be able to investigate or make a public announcement about it because it wouldn't be happening in their eyes. She said candidates are responsible for actions of their campaigners. She said that larger organizations have more resources to campaign than individuals. She said it would be harder to have that communication of what the election rules are and how to keep everyone on board. She said their concern is that it eliminates the official compiled list that is managed and publicized by a nonpartisan source. She said having it universal is an important resource. She said if it is left up

to groups, it would be more effective. She said smaller groups would be less heard and it could be a matter of which group can shout the loudest. She said there would be no official records for fact-checking purposes. She said there would be a lack of mandatory, centralized hearing for student groups. She said there would be less access to candidates. She said it leaves candidates susceptible to potentially more hostile environments at private endorsement hearings, which lead to a lot of campus climate issues. She said the election board couldn't regulate this process. She said candidates are already nervous with the process. She said a con is that it does not allow the election board to prepare for and take action in response to campus climate issues and it relies on groups to self-regulate throughout campaigning. She said there is no other response but to keep candidates accountable. She said their decision was informed in the interest to promote and protect the fairest process, consideration of the effects of students, and deliberation about each proposal's ability to be effective and relevant to a multitude of situations in the long term. She said they need a long-term solution in mind. She said the official non-partisan entity endorses proposal #1.

-Starr said that was a biased presentation and that she tore apart the second proposal. He said he felt uncomfortable because each line was contradicted and pointed out again in the cons. He said that was not presented to him.

-Pede said the impartiality is something she takes seriously. She said it is their responsibility to present pros and cons and it is her right to provide her opinion about each proposal. She said she supported proposal number 1 and that they support it. She said she presented problems because she has serious concerns with the changes. She said that is her obligation as election board chair

-Mason said thank you for working so hard on this. She said it was not about how it was presented but how it was written and contradicted itself. She said she is so confused by the second proposal. She said it is disheartening to have an A-board sign situation and the Tumblr come up because of inconsistencies in overlooks. She said this is a time in the campus climate when things get nasty and she said that endorsement hearings need to be stricter. She said they either need to not do them or make them stricter. She said that people will become nasty week 6 of spring quarter.

-Dr. Geller said since this presentation was from E-board, she was wondering if as the author of the second proposal if they would like to propose their perspective

-Jasso asked if they could switch facilitators about the point

-Bocarsly ceded the floor to Hester to be chair of the meeting.

-El-Farra thanked Pede for presenting today. She said she was uncomfortable with questioning her presentation. She said she did not vote yesterday on CRC because she was not prepared to vote yesterday. She said after that, she thanked all of them for putting in a lot of effort. She said she supports the first proposal and she will not be voting for the second one.

-Bocarsly talked about why he was making the second proposal. He said as the process that stands, a candidate goes to orientation and attends a 5-hour endorsement. After, they submit the form or have until a couple of days later

-Pede said they have until Friday to turn in slips

-Bocarsly said they have a couple of days to submit a form. He said they register, go to orientation, go to endorsements, and submit the form. He said an issue would be accessibility by having to sit through the orientation or endorsements. He said that is why they have the proxy system. He said that when they submit forms they are published. The advantages are that they get their organization printed in the Daily Bruin. He said if they were an organization that doesn't go through the process, they could still say on their website that they support this candidate but they cannot pass out flyers.

-Pede asked if that was to reference to her point

-Bocarsly said yes

-Pede said Bruin Democrats last year submitted flyers

-Bocarsly said Bruin Democrats are a registered organization. He said that any group not on the list of organizations can show their own support for a candidate. If they break election code, there is no way the election board can hold them accountable. He said in this situation, the candidate should be sanctioned. He said that if it is an individual that supports a candidate, they are not held accountable but is the individual who has to be sanctioned. He said he is not saying they should get rid of the chance to access candidates. He said he personally learned so much about different people on campus by preparing for that process. He said he framed it as meet the candidates but there is flexibility to have both still available. He said election board would not oversee the official endorsement process. He said that every group would be the same as groups who chooses to have support in their own way. He said that he understands the current process and how they could sanction an organization and they will be removed from the endorsement process. He said at the end of the day, the accountability has on the impact of the candidates. If they are sanctioned, they are harmed in their ability to be elected. He said it would be open to all students but individuals from different groups can ask different questions. He said it would open up a forum that they can express their concerns at. The only thing that changes is that they don't have to be there the entire time and there wouldn't be an orientation session. There would be a 5hour forum and e-board will still monitor it . There would not be an official slip to say who they are endorsing. He said they could access information via the candidates themselves. He said candidates would be held responsible. He said that there were two lines that talked about sanctioning organizations. He said they could strike both lines and it would be the same if just an individual would be sanctioned. The other point about consistencies about registered and non-registered individuals is that any member can attend the forum. He said a parent for example would be able to attend. He said any individual can technically get a candidate sanctioned. He said that if groups break the rules, the candidate would be sanctioned. He said that the inconsistencies came from what was already existing in the election code. He said he chose language that was in the immediate vicinity and that is a bigger issue they should address.

-Davis asked if they could move into discussion

-Bocarsly said they are

-Davis said this is a very important conversation and that there are so many people are here to discuss them. She said neither proposal is ideal and both needs work. She said she finds value in

endorsements. She said personally, she believes that it allowed student groups to understand each candidate and her as a candidate benefitted from that. She said a member asked how she would reach out and after the endorsement hearings, they came out with a branch of her office that addressed his question. She said she has some concerns with the endorsement hearings being on one evening at one time. She said there are commuters, people who have jobs, familial obligations, etc. and that mandatory attendance cuts out a lot of opportunities. She said they might miss out on students who have to work, take the bus, etc. She said that signatories stand for their organization and by becoming a signatory they have been entrusted with the opinions and views of their organization. A signatory might have one opinion and they might have the same opinions, but sometimes opinions change. She said sometimes proxies might not have the same opinion as the group. She said podcasting them was a great help. She said those watching the podcast could not vote their opinion. She said she wants to see a solution for groups to endorse and if they're not at the event they could watch or read about it from different venues.

-El-Farra talked about the necessity of endorsements. She said student groups know who they are endorsing but they know that there will be slates and independents. She said there will be a different political climate in elections. She said it is important for candidates to be able to interact with students

-Seth said proposal number 1 provides a mandate and proposal 2 proposes something radically different. He said that as a member of council, there is a need for endorsements. He said it is important to analyze it so they are all on the same page and look at what needs to be fixed. He said they needed a breakdown of those two things

-Singh talked about what voting on this means. She said as e-board, they committed on regrouping and taking comments. She said that they will work on it separate from e-code implantation. She said there are more than 1000 groups on campus and they matter. She said their voices cannot be left out of election. She said that groups can endorse away from election board oversight. She said their voices matter and that is why they have endorsement hearings. She said that is the issue they are trying to address

-Pede said having a conversation about having it split up is not a concern associated with proposal one

-Kraman said a lot of issues are being confused together. He said group endorsements are important and that endorsements should be done. Oversight of the process is something important to the e-board. He said there is a lot of merit to opening up the endorsement process because it is restricting and it is hard to get people to sit at the entire event. He said if they have signatories responsible but not having to sit through the entire endorsement event it would be beneficial. He said they could have some process where candidates could interact with student groups in different modes. He said this would be beneficial where they might have independents and slates. He said expanding the endorsement process would allow even more student voices to be heard. He said he wants the process to be much more open than it is

-Mason ceded the floor to Charmaine

-Charmaine said one night is not really available to everyone. She said last year got crazy and it doesn't make sense to undo the rules. She said as a student who got involved by seeing the papers, she was able to take away more political awareness. She said that by not having the Daily Bruin endorsements people can't see who is endorsed

-Chu talked about what Kraman said and said she agreed that they want to increase the student voice and finding information on the candidates. She talked about not having the student signatories having to go through the orientation and said in a sense it eliminates the purpose of the endorsement hearings. She said that they should listen to the candidates and ensure that everyone who is submitting something is present and able to absorb everything the candidates are saying. She said it is not ideal that there is 1 five-hour event where people can submit questions. She said she doesn't think deregulation isn't the way to approach this issue.

-El-Farra yielded to Eric Adams

-Adams said the second proposal is predicated on the belief that all students are equally educated on the political climate. He said less than a third of the student body voted. He said that this could hinder a lot of candidates and that their campus is generally politically apathetic. This could lead to more divestment from students. He said that Chu, Gen Reps, and Kraman would not have been voted for if they had not been at the election forum since the endorsement hearings they were able to ask questions. He said that sometimes they have preformed opinions but it is important that they can engage in a political process. By deregulating it, it makes it seem that they do not trust student organizations on campus. He said he was elected to represent his community. He said they should respect that his community elected someone. He said one night of endorsements is not the solution. He said he would like to see 1-2 events per week. He said Beck has been giving the best live tweet updates ever. He said that people on the hill are asking questions to him. He said he thinks they stick with what they have. He said he went to e-board office hours. He said to keep in mind that these are important ways to endorse student groups and that they can use social media. He said that they can only do so by using their imagination

-Jasso said that they all love Davis. She said that what Singh pointed out was not about the actual event if the proposal passes. She said it would be up to e-board how endorsements would be. She said she hopes they are taking the feedback of accessibility issues. She said both proposals are looking at ideas of oversight and brings up the question of who would be overseeing the election board. She said that unless they are willing to put in an amendment, she urged them to move forward and she doesn't know if she has time to keep talking about it if they already made up their minds.

-Hasnain ceded the floor to Kimmel

-Kimmel said there has been corruption in the past. She said they vote for regulation or deregulation. She said corruption should generally be fought with regulation. She said they have to understand that deregulation is why they got into the mess they are in today. She said regulation would be a more forward solution to the problem

-Davis said e-board needs oversight in this process. She proposed an amendment but in the first proposal she would like to eliminate the proxy system and that between Wed.-Fri. that

signatories emails e-board with the other signatories could endorse whoever they want. She said that way, people have time to discuss with their constituents and make their decision.

-Pede said she can implement that on their end. She said she is interested in discussing that. She said she would like the flexibility to adapt it more fluidly. She would be open to having that night looked at.

-Singh said historically, the endorsements were carried out over a few days and they thought having it one day would be more convenient. She said they would take it back and see if they could do that. She said last year, they tried to live stream endorsements but they live streamed debates. She said because of accessibility, they could definitely work with the Daily Bruin to make sure that this does happen. She said that there are all these things they would take into consideration. She said that other schools have done that.

-Dr. Nelson commended the students on their diligence and time. He talked about the past that caused people to feel that there must be oversight. He said there was a candidate that came there from an outside entity that campaigned for the candidate and they were not UCLA affiliated. This candidate won and the entire year nothing got done because students felt the elections were hijacked. He said that however they spend their time, the back end could be horrendous because people get ticked off because they don't think things were done in the most fair way. He said that one thing they heard was that non-affiliated groups weren't able to have that much say. He said he didn't know how to regulate non-affiliated groups. He said he is concerned that things would happen that would have deleterious effects down the road. He said there were great discussions but there are checks and balances. He said that if the checks aren't there, he is concerned that it would be a heck of a year.

-Hester said Davis made an amendment proposal idea. She asked if there were any other amendments

-Bocarsly said he's glad he had the chance to voice his proposal. He said that he is by no means sold on his. He said that he wanted to provide people with a choice and there have been other great choices thrown out. He said that his issues would be solved by the proposals Davis and Kraman made. He said that way, they could have a great compromise

-Pede asked what the changes were

-Bocarsly talked about having to be at all endorsement hearings. He said they institutionalized a proxy and he is worried it could still be problematic. He said that people can follow different leads and they could have individual endorsements but the official endorsement should come from their official email address. He talked about the proxy section and said it would not be relevant

-Pede asked about signatories attending. She asked if he would propose removing the substitution forms and not having it mandatory that signatories attend the endorsement events

-Bocarsly said he would like to ask Davis and Kraman were saying

-Davis said attendance to the actual endorsement hearings is not mandatory

-Pede said the difference is whether or not it should be mandatory for them to engage in endorsements. She said she sees the accessibility issue. She said if they don't have a substitute it

could effect their participation. She said it is important that group leaders are heard. She would want endorsers to make informed decisions. She said notions change after candidates share opinions and express what they know. She said she would like to continue to have that made available. She said it is important for signatories to have access to that information because if they don't attend the meeting, the candidate might not be able to reach that group with their information

-Hasnain said just because there were Bruins that did not act with integrity, it doesn't mean that the proxy system is flawed. She said she has faith in the student body and said she believes that people can attend 5-hour hearings and report back to their groups. She said it would be great to have it podcasted in case disagreements do arise. She said that was most likely a minority of proxies

-El-Farra said she agrees with what was just said and that endorsements are the only way to make the playing field equal. She said that this would prevent accusations of endorsing groups that they don't. She asked if proxies or signatories would fill the official form

-Pede said she needs to make sure there are signatory endorsements. She said they would check their Bruincard and they would sign it off. If they don't sign it, they would call and confirm that is how their endorsement is. She said if there is no agreement, they cannot publish their endorsement until they come to an agreement

-Singh talked about an endorsement slip. She said they can make that online and have a time limit so the endorsement slip would be sent to the signatories and sent back by signatories

-Kraman said he thinks having signatories as the contact person solves the accountability. He said while substitutes might or might not have problems, they should eliminate them and that their peers elected signatories. He talked about accessibility and that if they look into podcasting it, it was in the works. If they make that available, signatories can get that information. He said they can be educated through voter guides and can bring the information back to student groups

-Mohebi said he agrees

-Seth said that signatories could have a proxy but if they turn in an endorsement they would call to verify. He said there is a fundamental discord if there was a disagreement. He said that would make the proxy irrelevant. He said they could formalize the proxy system to formalize the endorsement slip to make sure signatories stand behind what their group wants or needs. He said this way, it encourages further events beyond endorsement hearings and allows them to reach out to candidates

-Pede asked what he is advocating

-Seth said they are proposing a formalized proxy system

-Pede asked if the authorized proxy substitution system should be allowed

-Seth said there are two systems

-Pede asked if attendance at the events should be mandatory

-Seth said no

-Pede said that is their difference

-Seth said this is problematic in case a signatory and proxy disagree

-Pede said at the same time, it brings it back to choosing substitutes. She said if the substitute has differing opinions, they can discuss it and come to an agreement

-Seth said they encourage that conversation with the endorsement slip. He said that with the email they are informalizing the proxy system

-Hester said they are getting into a lot of detail but they should move forward

-Jasso said they should respect the facilitator of this meeting and if they are going to rebuttal to let the chair cede the floor. She said this should be productive. She said there should be a straw vote to move forward to see if this is something they want to vote for. She said and then they can decide where they go from there. She said this is a conversation where no ideas are coming up. She said she respects their opinions but hopes they can come to a forward thinking conversation

-Hasnain asked to explain what a signatory is and how they are liable

-Kaupololo said they sign off on signatory forms and they hold financial and legal liability for their campus organization. He said they work through the EOL system because they hold financial and legal liability for their organization

-Tancinco said she appreciates Bocarsly taking time to review the constitution. She said that he was trying to propose a solution that he felt that would help the situation. She said they should respect the checks and balances and let e-board do their job. She said that it shouldn't be done at the table right now

-Mason went off of what Jasso said. She said regardless of what they decide, they are still adding amendments onto one of the two proposals. She said she would appreciate it being brought to question

-Davis proposed tabling or moving one proposal and moving to amend if needed

-Seth said if they choose to amend one of the proposals if it should be done on the council table. She said a lot more discussion can be done

-Jasso said it should be done on the table and it should be amended on the table. She said if they table it, they could have CRC hash it out and have another amendment. She said if they vote on it today they need to amend it today. She said they could table it if needed

-Seth said it is not fair to hastily put together a new proposal. He said he would table to table both proposals and he wanted to give it the time it needs

-El-Farra said they need to understand that they appointed e-board to make the proposals. She said to understand the time constraints. She said they appointed Pede to come forward with this. Hasnain seconded

-Bocarsly objected

-Hasnain said they elected e-board. She said they should appoint them with respect. She said if they keep pushing it, they are making their jobs more difficult. She said that e-board had a lot of ideas to advertise elections through fun and engaging ways. She said by all of these ideas and pushing it forward they are hurting and disrespecting e-board and future candidates. She said people are given less opportunities to learn about USAC

-Chu said she agrees that the earlier the better, though she cautioned them to make amendments on proposals that they might not fully understand yet. She said she agrees they need to trust e-

board with the job they were given to do, however she doesn't feel like they should rush through amendments if they don't fully understand them.

-Hester said they could move to table

-Starr said when it comes to council, they approve something that they fully support. He said it clearly means they gravitated toward proposal 1 but to table it to next week

-Kraman said he has amendments

-Pede said new ideas have been brought up and that they need to respect the time constraint they are under. She said to vote on one proposal, they can make recommendations, and they can take a week to consider how they can improve it and they can have the opportunities to hear student opinions and to consult with their advisor. She said to give them time to come forward with their official recommendation

-Singh said the official wording has a lot of implications. She said to request something for them to work on. She said this is a concern of all council members and that they will notify them if they change the endorsement hearings themselves and will notify students.

-Hester said they have an ARC appointment waiting. She said e]board is listening to them

-Bocarsly said to vote on it and amend it is something they are against. He said that after the CRC hearing they voted against that. He said that he agrees with them and still does. He said they can make changes now and that they still have the ability to. He said he is okay with either one but he doesn't think they could make a decision now

-Hasnain said she was there and it seemed like these proposals were mutually exclusive. She said they want to make amendments to one of the processes by giving it further structure. She said that is what the perceived conversation would be

-Bocarsly said the changes were not mutually exclusive

-Hester said they can propose it but they needed to come to a vote soon

-Kraman said he thinks it is important that they have multiple events open for student groups so they can make sessions for signatories. He moved to strike section IV and V from their proposal regarding endorsement substitutions. He read the two sections. He said signatories should be representatives for their organizations and should make decisions based on their student groups and that other groups should be able to hold endorsement forums and that one representative should be present at all endorsement hearings so that if there are multiple events then those are not legitimate. He said they should be struck completely

-Pede said she disagrees. She said that is a valuable idea. She said that she understands what he's talking about. She said they could add that they need to be present at all endorsement hearings

-Singh said the election calendar is set in stone and they might not have a venue. She said that they would need to work on the logistics of it and that what he is suggesting is if they can even change the events or process. She said they need to finalize that and they will keep it mandatory

-Hester said they vote on something or table it

-Davis said the section Kraman suggested should be considered tonight or later and that the proxy system should be informal and the list of the organizations should have a list of who attended the event and that they have a signatory emailed. She said they could check on OrgSync

that the signatory emailed them. She said that would be less work but they still have a legitimate proxy.

-Hester said this could be something they officially propose or they can ask them to take it back

-Davis called to question proposal number 2. El-Farra seconded. With a vote of 0-10-2, the proposal was rejected.

-Bocarsly said they have one proposal on the table.

-El-Farra moved to vote on proposal 1 with no amendments. Hasnain seconded. Seth objected

-Seth said they should have a straw vote and that if there are radical changes, there are fundamental contradictions. He said it is not under their best judgment to pass it without amendments.

-Bocarsly took a straw vote. There was a vote of 5 voted to pass as is. There was a vote of 5 to pass with abstentions. There were 2 abstentions. Bocarsly said he believes there should be amendments

-Yoshida said not to confuse taking time with this as being disrespectful. She said that some people just want to take time and is something that is worth taking more time

-Davis said while they have their proposal on the table if they would be opposed to taking their recommendations and coming back next week.

-Pede said the proposal they presented is what they are most comfortable. She said they are dedicated to solving their concerns. She said she hopes they can pass it as it exists with their commitment that they respect what they've said. She said it brings accessibility issues. She said it is important to keep things mandatory. She said multiple nights aren't logistically feasible. She recommended to approve it as is.

-El-Farra said she was in the CRC meeting as well. She said there are certain things they need to keep open so that the e-board can make changes depending on the campus climate. She said not to add too many amendments because they will restrict future e-boards. She said they need to have that confidence.

-Bocarsly said the amendment is the open the process even more. He said they have the flexibility. He said that groups must be present at all endorsement hearings. He said the alternative would make it open to discretion.

-Seth said they are discussing this year. He said it is important to think about this in the future. He said the proposal they have would solidify something for the future and opens up flexibility for this year and really opens it for future years. He said if they codify something for this year it restricts future years

-Starr said they have the leeway to have multiple endorsements. He said they could have it say attend one of investing faith in them

-Mason said she doesn't feel like the table trusts this board. She said they are not there to solidify the future but for now.

-Davis said participation in endorsements is something they are hung up on. She said that participation in endorsements should be something they consider changing

-Singh said their proposal is closed to signatories. She said this is a conversation that they will have and they need to trust them that they will come out next week. She said they are a presidential appointment and they will not take this lightly. She said they have thought about every single aspect of elections. She said there is people waiting for that.

-Davis said that section Kraman sent out is what they are hung up on. By eliminating it she would be in favor of it so that they have room to make changes on it

-Jasso asked if they could have a straw vote on that.

-Kraman moved to strike section V, which says the election board, will provide substitution forms for now and he will feel completely comfortable in making endorsements. He said he would like to strike the proxy.

-Pede asked for clarification on his amendment

-Kraman said correct

-Kraman moved to strike section V. Starr seconded. There were no objections

-Davis asked him to read it again

-Kraman read section V again regarding substitution forms and endorsement hearings

-Starr seconded. There were no objections

-Zimmerman said it should be a majority to amend it.

-With a vote of 10-2-0, section V was struck.

-Davis proposed to add a section V that group participation should be at the discretion by the current e-board

-Singh said it is not part of the election code

-Davis moved to add that the participation and capacity is up to the discretion of the current e-board. Kraman seconded.

-Chu asked if the future would understand the wording

-Bocarsly read the wording

-Pede said to strike the word current.

-Singh said the statement is under endorsement hearings and usually they get context from the advisor. She said that for the future, they would have that to rely on

-Davis amended her amendment to strike the word current. She moved to add a section V that states that student group participation in the capacity of the endorsement hearings is up to the discretion of the election board. With a vote of 11-0-1, this was added.

-Bocarsly said to talk about whether groups must be present at all of the endorsement hearings.

-Starr said that if there were other things that meant endorsement hearings it could be more flexible

-Bocarsly said people think it is mandatory at all

-Hasnain said if they are considering multiple endorsements, they could strike the word "all"

-Seth said they should consider the public comments. He said the line about being mandatory should be struck all together

-Pede said that this amendment is under the discretion of the election board chair. She said to guarantee a solution, it would be a year-by-year thing. She said they wouldn't be able to satisfy it because it wouldn't keep the process fair.

-Seth asked if she meant groups or signatories

-Pede said she meant signatories.

-Kraman moved to strike the words "all of" in section IV regarding attending endorsement hearings

-Pede said they can't hold it standard and that there is a concern that they are mandatory endorsement hearings. She said that any changes would not be fairly carried out so it should be kept as is and the e-board should carry it out as is

-Bocarsly said that it is contradictory

-Pede said it could say "one or more should participate in"

-Bocarsly said the endorsement hearings would not be mandatory but there is still oversight by e-board. He said that they could choose this year that they could be present but he would like to open up the opportunity that it could change. He said that they are voting on language

-Jasso asked if there was a vote to amend the motion. She said they moved to strike the word all so that means they need to vote on that. She said they need to vote on that amendment before proposing another amendment

-Kraman so moved. There were no objections

-Starr asked if they could call to question the language

-Seth asked if there were objections

-Hasnain seconded. Seth objected.

-Bocarsly said they should have a straw vote really quickly to see if they want language that requires them to be there the entire endorsement.

-Davis asked if they already clarified it

-Bocarsly said they would still like to address the fact

-Kraman asked if she sees the change

-Pede said in section IV it could allow e-board to make the call every year of how the process would look

-Bocarsly said if the language says 1 or more representatives, if it could mean that they could say they don't have to come

-Kaupololo said that it opens it up to something that is larger than what it is today

-Kraman moved to edit section IV to read one or more representatives who have applied to endorse must participate in the endorsement hearings. Starr seconded.

-Pede said she likes the word hearings specifically

-With a vote of 8-0-4, section IV has been changed.

-Pede said the language about the form was amended

-Starr called to question proposal 1 as amended. Kraman seconded. With a vote of 11-0-0, the changes were approved.

-Pede thanked the council for this time intensive conversation and for Bocarsly

-Seth asked if they could take a break

X. Announcements

-Jasso said to fill out the security survey. There is over \$9000 left in the discretionary fund. She said to claim funds that were allocated. She said if they have proposals to send them. She said to apply to capital contingency and it closes in May and there is \$18,000 left. For commissions interested, there will be another funding study group 7th week on February 20th. She said to keep them accountable.

-Seth said he has a research opportunities fair tomorrow and there are a lot of research opportunities. Tomorrow is a workshop about pre-interviewing skills.

-Chu said thank you to those who came to the stress health fair and there will be more events for mental health week this week

-Zimmerman said the community service mini fund is due this Friday and to let her know if there are technical difficulties

-Starr said they are doing a free sneak in Fox theater for Bruins Night Out

-Kraman said to be on the lookout for TGIF

-Mason said this week they kicked off hip-hop appreciation and this Thursday they will have a screening about the LA riots

-Tancinco said they are doing screenings and they will show Skyfall at Pauley

-Hasnain talked about non-profit networking night. She said if after tomorrow they probably can't sign up anymore. She said they should register tonight to secure a spot.

XII.

The attendance sheet was passed around.

XIII. Adjournment

A. Starr moved and Mohebi seconded to adjourn the meeting.

Bocarsly called for Acclamation. Bocarsly asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 11:18 p.m. by Acclamation.

XIV. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,
Katrina Dimacali
USAC Minutes Taker
2012-2013