

FINALIZED

Approved October 29, 2013

AGENDA
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL
Kerckhoff Hall 417
October 22, 2013
7:00 PM

PRESENT: John Joanino, Avi Oved, Maryssa Hall, Sam Haws, Sunny Singh, Lizzy Naameh, Darren Ramalho, Jessica Kim, Omar Arce, Jessica Trumble, Armen Hadjimanoukian, Lauren Rogers, Savannah D. Badalich Laureen Lazarovici, Cynthia Jasso, Patricia Zimmerman, Dr. Berky Nelson, Dr. Debra Geller, Danielle Dimacali

ABSENT:

GUESTS:

I. Call to Order

-Joanino calls to order at 7:00 pm.

II. A. Approval of the Agenda

- Joanino states they are going to look for a larger space, but we do need to get all the council members into the seats so they can vote on certain items that need to be done.
- Zimmerman stated there needs to be a 15 minute recess.
- Ramalho moves to recesses. Hall seconds.
- Zimmerman stated that they are moving into the grand ballroom.
- Joanino reconvened the meeting at 7:26pm.
- Joanino requests to minimize side conversations.
- Ramalho moves to Ramanever to before public comments. Singh seconds.
- Joanino asks for any other changes.
- Hall moves to move new business to after appointments but before office and member reports. Badalich seconds.
- Oved moves to strike EVP travel and advocacy grant and cultural affairs mini fund, and ASRF fund. Hall seconds.
- Trumble calls to question. Haws seconds.
- 12-0-0 the agenda is approved as amended.

III. Approval of the Minutes from October 15, 2013

Trumble calls to question. Ramalho seconds.
12-0-0 the minutes are approved.

IV. Public Comments

-

V. Special Presentations

A. Audit Process

-Cynthia Jasso talks about the USA Contingency Audit Process. In the USAC Bylaws Article VII Section B4c claims that each member of the finance committee shall also be responsible for performing any auditing functions of council funds of at least five percent of all programs, excluding retreats as required by council financial policies. Jasso states they care about audits because its their job, evaluate funding allocated, access our allocation method, and track progress over the years. Her last term she really cared about research, especially when it comes to funding. Her investments are from FiComm, and it will be accomplished through a two pronged approach: on an online audit form and a random sample audit. The two types of information given to the committee is general and event-specific. They are really trying to evaluate and see cultural programs and other social enrichment and assess the real needs. It is no way to condemn organizations, but an opportunity to understand what funding goes into. The online audit form is where all student organization must submit a 10-15 survey, which will ask to explain attendance, goals, line items, and adequate funding. The deadline is Friday of Finals Week. Student government facilitates student programming to enrich lives and properly allocate. Also, there is a random sample audit where they randomly selected events, physically attended by committee members, and submit an evaluation form that includes copy of original receipts and flow of attendance. This is to view how the events are actually playing out. They want to inform student organizations of the outcome, they must let their evaluation known. In no way is it a method to say it's a method to spend in such a form, they are here to evaluate them for a long term proposal to be systematic. They want to learn by retaining data over the years, improve existing systems, and formalize a process. This is a good step to move forward and collect information that we have. There needs to be more accountability on USAC council and finance committee. There should be a holistic audit process to look to the future to see what we can provide them and the resources available.

-Ramalho asks for an email out.

-Jasso states she sent it out and will send it out again.

-Singh stated that the clause says excluding retreats, and asks if retreats are being audited.

-Jasso states she doesn't want committee members to infringe on retreat spaces.

-Singh asks if their office was to submit an online audit form, would it be subject.

-Jasso states that the retreat is still on the online audit form but it will not be subject to the random audit form.

-Rogers asks if every organization must fill out the audit form.

-Jasso says yes.

-Singh asks about the data collection and if the data collection last year impacted it and saw any trends.

-Jasso states it was more significant in allocating thresholds, and she knows she shouldn't allocate more than 30-40% of fall quarter because of fall budget, it helped me calculate where to keep a threshold salary. We need to allocate with the assumption of the initial budget and we also used it for SOOF to implement guidelines for efficient spending.

-Zimmerman states that it's a great addition and two comments. This would be a great addition for USA BOD for applicants with large programs and have a feeling it will be adding to that. She was wondering if the online question had an online audit about student organizations not knowing how to access their funds. She states it would be a great addition such as "Do you need any help with your accounting?" and move them forward to funding helpers.

-Jasso states she will add that.

-Avinoam asks what the process of the random selection and are you going to tell the student organizations in advanced?

-Jasso states its randomized by a computer and randomly assign it but they do inform the student organization a week in advance to prepare original receipts or get them retroactively. The random sample audit will be more tricky, and by the end of this week she hopes to put in the finalized protocol online.

-Singh asks if they go to randomly audited events and the expectations for the event does not live up to its reality, does that affect future funding for that student group?

-Jasso states no, but only in the case if a student organization has an event and the event is not going then its her responsibility to freeze their account and applied for funding application and still used the money, then that's problematic. For the most part she wants to have feedback for an open channel of communication such as what went wrong and why their event didn't meet their expectations. Jasso states she is understanding and expectations and goals will not always meet.

-Nelson states that one of the things that was problematic that if she is able to convey that this is supposed to be a helpful technique rather than punitive will be effective.

-Jasso states she will have info sessions throughout the quarter for student organizations that have angst for it and doesn't want to make student orgs nervous.

-Zimmerman states that maybe changing the name from audit.

-Jasso agrees and thanks everyone.

Public Comments:

-My name is Elyssa Schlossberg, I'm a 3rd year psychobiology major. This resolution was written tactfully and with the peaceful rhetoric that properly conveys the peaceful sentiment and promotion of productive, positive dialogue that it seeks to address. I fully support this resolution, and quite frankly, if this resolution were to not pass tonight then USAC council should simply refrain from delving into the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, because a resolution addressing the conflict doesn't get more non marginalizing and non partisan than this. This resolution has the opportunity to really improve campus climate, and it is the type of resolution I would expect my student government to support.

-I'm Naomi Esserman, a second year. I'm under the impression that the divestment campaign (which I oppose) seeks to divest from companies that support what some call the illegal occupation, but what I refer to as an area of land that was acquired by Israel in a defensive war. Semantics. This resolution seeks to invest in companies that support collaboration between both Palestinians and Israelis. The two concepts don't effect each other. This resolution promotes a positive step towards peace. It does not stop others from seeking divestment from whatever they feel should be divested from. Consider the actual words of the resolution.

-Hi my name is Joseph Hassine. I'm a 4th year transfer student studying Sociology and Public Policy, and this is my public comment: I first want to address the letter read earlier from Berkeley's ASUC President, stating that divestment did not make students feel unsafe. One opinion does not equal fact. Berkeley's current EVP disagrees and stated that divestment on campus makes not just Jewish students, but all students feel unsafe

because of the divisive campus climate that stems from it. As a student on this campus and a member of one of the communities directly involved in this discussion, I honestly believe that this is the most positive stance USAC can take regarding this issue. None of the other solutions that have come forward here or at other campuses have supported both sides, and most have made communities feel unsafe on campus. This is not an ideal resolution for Israel's supporters, and it is not ideal for Palestine's supporters. This resolution is a positive step toward peace and gives students the ability to at least feel safe on this campus, and I hope that all of you vote based on the actual resolution in front of you as opposed to some of the irrelevant and extravagant conjecture that has come forward tonight.

-Hi. My name is Miriam Eshaghian and I am a fourth year Psychobiology student here at UCLA. And among other things I am the President of Bruins For Israel. I am here in reference to the Resolution in Support of Positive Steps Towards an Israeli-Palestinian Peace. We, as BFI, work to empower the network of pro-Israel supporters at UCLA to promote a healthy and safe pro-Israel climate on campus. As a representative of the Pro-Israel community at UCLA, I unreservedly support this resolution in its attempts to foster respectful dialogue and a positive campus climate through supporting the current peace talks. I ultimately believe this resolution facilitates the opportunity for students to promote peace. I support that this resolution is transparent in its attempts to recognize the struggles that both sides involved in the conflict have endured and aims to advocate for peace. I support that this resolution confirms that the demonization and stigmatization of ANY one party in the conflict are detrimental to the causes of peace and justice. I support that this resolution recognizes that both the democratic State of Israel and Palestinian Authority must take responsible measures to end the suffering on either side. I want to emphasize that this resolution does not demonstrate Israel's CONTINUOUS EFFORTS TOWARDS PEACE. It should include that Palestinian representatives have REJECTED peace offerings at least 8 times since bilateral negotiations have started 20 years ago. I criticize this resolution in the fact that it does not include the condemning of both the Islamic Jihad and Hamas rulings in Gaza. Both the Islamic Jihad and Hamas do not support freedom of speech, have caused much suffering to both Israelis and Palestinians, and do not acknowledge my right to self-determination and the right of Israel to exist. Nevertheless, I am asking YOU as my representatives to support this resolution and focus on the current peace talks and not to dwell on the past. Moreover, I further encourage the Undergraduate Students Association Council to consider the following: not only support investments within the region but to also CALL TO ACTION that ASUCLA and UCLA Fund invests in companies and ventures that promote the economic and commercial growth for both groups. Investing in the funds mentioned that requires cooperation and cross-cultural understanding between both Israelis and Palestinians is investing in coexistence. It is investing in the coexistence that many Israelis and Palestinians in the region are currently trying to facilitate. Let us focus on the present. Let us be proactive and take positive steps toward an Israeli-Palestinian Peace without demonizing either side involved in the peace process. I am here to not focus on the past, but As seen in the recent peace talks both the elected Israeli Parliament and elected Palestinian leadership are willing to compromise for peace. If you are here in support of democratic and western values, you will support the collaborative efforts of

the Israeli democracy and Palestinian leadership that is in the process of a peaceful solution. The goal of this resolution is to end the conflict and therefore end the loss on both sides in a diplomatic way. My question is how can you not support a peaceful solution? If you don't support this peaceful solution, what are you in support of?

-Naameh moves to approve recess. Badalich seconded.

There will be a recess until 10:05.

-Joanino calls meeting back to order 10:07.

-Joanino requests some respect to move forward on the agenda.

VI. Appointments

A. Ramanveer Virk – Undergraduate Council

-Ramalho states that the undergraduate council proposes basic general education policies regarding minors and policies, Ramaveer sat on the committee before and sat on it last year and thought shed be a good appointment.

-Trumble asks why the undergraduate council and why a second time?

-Ramaveer stated that she did it last year and she has gotten a lot of positive feedback and it meant a lot to see that she was making a difference from the staff. A lot of people forget to realize that we do have a say whats happening with the majors and minors. You need to be sitting on the committee to be very active, and a lot of departments don't serve students well, policy regarding online education, AAP, and test banks its important to be in those spaces to bring those matters up. This school is 30,000 undergrad and its important for someone vocal to me.

-Naameh asks what her vision for the position next year is.

-Ramaveer stated that her biggest vision is to really get the other members to be really proactive. That's what matters. To have a committee person with majority faculty to say "one of a few" is not okay. You need to vocalize whats important, and she wants to see change and more active appointments. Even though theres only 4 all together, you still can implement change you see is necessary within our campus and academic resources. It really has to be shaped to more active student participation.

-Singh asks what was the biggest personal challenge she faces on council and how does she seek to address that.

-Ramaveer stated there was al lack of knowledge, and not having that prior knowledge was hard but they gave me the means to fill in the blank. You choose to be there for one year and you can choose to add on that second year. Yes shes there to represent students, and there what she wants to represent students for. She wants to ask for information and necessary questions.

-Joanino asks for final words.

-Ramaveer just stated that it's a great committee and shes been blessed to have it for one year and she wants to keep it a second room.

-Joanino asks her to step aside.

-Trumble states that Ramaveer is one of her directors and one of those people that gets it done and in a way that's effective.

-Hall stated shes excited to see her on the committee and itll compliment the experience of the first years.

-Badalich says she agrees.
Trumble calls to question. Hall seconds.
12-0-0 Ramaveer is approved.

B. Leanna Huynh – Campus Sustainability

-Joanino thanks Huynh and asks her to introduce herself.

-Hyunh introduces herself as a fourth year as an environmental science major and political science minor. She comes here to sit on the campus sustainability and already started the work and met with those to get connected to the space. With or without the title she will still continue the work and it breaks her heart to see so many plastic containers and not be complacent. She really encourages everyone to go above and beyond in the daily lives and invest in a water bottle. It's a small investment and a great investment for saving the planet for future generations.

-Hadjimanoukian asks what she sees as one of the most tangible and direct campaigns to push UCLA for a most sustainable institution.

-Hyunh states that we can provide access and resources for students to be sustainable. We have the TGIF fund and Green initiative fund since we have the monetary resource and implement projects. For example implementing filters in Kerkhoff to provide that for students then students will have the incentive to bring a reusable water bottle. She asks why is there plastic cups and providing students a way to be complacent. Not only changing the campus climate, but its also about us to provide resources to want to incentivize them.

-Haws asks one thing she is looking to accomplish.

-Hyunh really likes the idea of a south campus to have a roof top garden. She really wants to take that idea and build gardens on top of an actual building. How cool would it be for UCLA to increase urban spaces.

-Zimmerman states that one exciting component is that she gets to sit in the TGIF committee, and she asks if shes aware she'd be sitting on TGIF.

-Hyunh states that yes and we have the resources and we must utilize them. She's looked through past funding and only saw that funding for water bottles. We need to reevaluate but being able to implement water filters to bring that to here on campus.

-Hadjimanoukian stated that in Kerkhoff and Ackerman they have two motion sensor water bottle fountain and all over campus.

-Hyunh states great, and lets do more.

-Badalich stated that SWC has an EARTH committee and encourages her to reach out.

-Hyunh encourages council to see that everything we do has an unintended consequence, but at the end of the day there is a pacific pool of water bottles. It's not just about the environment, its about the communities.

Hyunh walks out.

-Joanino opens discussion.

-Kim was wondering why there was no ARC recommendations for any of the appointments.

-Joanino states there is no quorum, and according to by laws by a certain number of weeks he's allowed to bring them in.

-Zimmerman stated its great that she reached out and she received a call and already planned to sit it on the first meeting and has continued interest.

-Trumble states she has shown a lot of dedication and passion.

-Badalich agrees.

-Trumble calls to question. Hadjimanoukian seconds.

12-0-0 Hyunh is approved.

C. Jazz Kiang – Student Fee Advisory Committee

-Kiang introduces himself as a second year Asian American studies major and the current external director of the Asian Pacific Coalition.

-Badalich asks what experience personal or professional that makes him qualified.

-Kiang stated that one thing about SFAC it's important of having student leaders that understand campus initiatives. Last year he was involved in a very large amount of organizations such as the Community Programs Office that gave him a real realization of how important student initiatives and student services are. Linking that with SFAC, SFAC is a committee that serves as an official advisory board to the chancellor to serve as advocates for the entire student body because SFAC consists of both undergraduates and graduates. Linking that to his experience, he recognizes how important those student services were and utilizes themselves. UCLA is so rich when it comes to so many diverse projects and many of these things were fought for by students and get funded for by students. He sees that role for himself and he was a student that utilized it and realized there was a need for that to continue that tradition of student initiatives.

-Naameh asks what issues in SFAC are.

-Kiang states the issue of transparency because a lot of times when they talk about budgets and allocations of money, a lot of students don't know where their student fees go or where its allocated. The website SFAC is very out dated and even right now it doesn't list current members. There is a section on the website about current projects and that is only as recent as 2011-2012 and its missing last year and this year. He wants to be able to update public information to be able to have knowledge and to have students more involved. Once they see their money is going to things on a daily basis, then they will get involved and that should be the end goal.

-Ramalho asked if he has reached out to anyone and what he learned.

-Kiang stated he shadowed the SFAC meeting last week and wanted to become familiar what they did. He has a working relationship of one of the staffmembers, and he has learned how SFAC is dependent on student input and having accessibility from the student body to voice what they want and need. A lot of our money goes to student services, but when it comes to budget cuts we have to be cognizant.

-Rogers states that Education 150 was being taken away by SFAC last year and asks if he has any plans.

-Kiang states he can't speak on behalf of any committee members, and there are a lot of hard decisions that happen. Really what it comes down to is the lack of student input and one of his goals this year is to not just have office hours, but whenever he introduces himself he is not just a SFAC committee member one day, but everyday. He wants to be the ears for student input to provide better and smarter decisions when it comes to pressing issues such as budget cuts.

-Joanino stated that Education 150 was defunded because it violated policy since it funded academic credit.

-Ramalho asks if he can discuss a path and how to address a funding issue that they don't agree with.

-Kiang states that from communication of SFAC members, they are having major budget cuts to retention and access projects predominantly those that affect under represented students. He truly feels that if they are pushing for diversity, there must be active strides to have access to higher education. He was hoping that there would be more funding this year for those things. Secondly, being a committee on SFAC has so many different lenses and has different people who know different people. There are always different ideas on how funding should be allocated. Part of that is to be able to see yourself to have your own ideas of what to write and being able to handle the fact that other people on the committee see what they embody. Having everyone come to the table and making smart decisions is important.

-Kiang states that the special presentation inspired him and how there should be smart funding so they can be held accountable. That is aligned with one of his goals when it comes to transparency because that money comes out of our pockets and should go to the things they want.

Kiang steps out.

-Trumble states that he was very well spoken and is impressed with his membership relations.

-Singh asks why there was no quorum meeting.

-Oved states that people's schedules were not cooperating and they need a quorum of three original members and if not there will be an alternate. There were personal issues but there was no opportunity for them to meet to review all these appointments. Oved states he is sad that they are moving forward the process with out moving forward for the bylaws. Oved wishes we could respect the checks and balances in place with the Arc.

-Jasso states there is a problem, and unless we're forgetting that we have bylaws then we are forgetting the fact that in our own bylaws we only have one alternate. If we are adding a second alternate, we must suspend that bylaw. Jasso recommends to adding a lot of alternates. We need to respect Joanino's timeline and the timeline of CS Mini. It's a very unfortunate situation.

-Trumble wishes that ARC was meeting, and Hyunh was submitted six weeks ago. These meetings are already happening, but they aren't appointed. They should be voting members of these members.

-Joanino states this conversation could happen outside the table. He apologizes but he sent them out weeks ago.

-Singh states Kiang is incredibly qualified, especially shadowing SFAC and has an excellent understanding of what the committee does and the significance. He likes the working and tangible ideas to make SFAC transparent and make him more accessible to student body.

-Ramalho asks if it's a one year appointment.

-Joanino confirms.

-Naameh states she likes that he is an advocate.

-Geller states its unfortunate that he wasn't appointed before orientation and is hopeful that someone may be able to pull him aside and give him some of that training the committee itself. That same situation would apply to anyone appointed at this point and shouldn't be held against him and an alternative mechanism.

-Singh states that he is a great candidate for SFAC and calls to question. Rogers second.
12-0-0 Kiang is appointed to SFAC.

D. Mary Onglatco – Student Health Advisory Committee

-Onglatco introduces herself as a third year physiological science major and biomedical research minor and here to apply for a position in the student health advisory committee.

-Trumble asks why this committee.

-Onglatco states she was really unfamiliar with it and it wasn't until she came across it and she is premed and pre-health, and health is something she is really interested in. What caught her eye was the advocacy and she is part of SPEAR and SPACE and PCH. She really cares about what students have to say and she really enjoys the one on one sessions and SHAC seems like the perfect place to get the students input and representing them.

-Badalich asks to elaborate on personal and professional experience.

-Onglatco states she is a SPEAR counselor and has a lot of one on one conversations and listens to them. They work with administration and project directors and some college academic counselors. She feels that her constant interaction will keep her accountable.

-Singh asks what issues SHAC is facing and will face in the future, and how will she actively contribute to the student's perspective.

-Onglatco states that SHAC is in transition because there is only two returning members and one of her priorities is to really learn the ropes and get involved such as staying in UCSHIP. She has talked to returning members and understands things they struggled with and understanding policies on how school insurance works to know how much in terms of learning ahead of time to educate herself and educate others. She also met with the Ashe center liaison with SHAC to learn about the working relationships with students and wanted more input for advertising immunizations. Constant communication and more effort on their part of SHAC is important and to outreach more such as having town hall more often. She wants public comment to happen like in SHAC.

-Joanino asks for closing statements.

-Onglatco states there is a whole bunch of resources, please utilize it because health is usually put on the back burner. She wants everyone to understand to take care of their health.

-Hall states she likes that she wants to be proactive to outreach students and expand open house. She likes how she is trying to improve the role she is stepping into.

-Badalich states she obviously has a personal tie with health and a lot of experience to back it up specifically with different communities and service recipients.

-Trumble calls to question. Hall seconds.

12-0-0 Onglatco is appointed for SHAC.

E. Matthew Murray – Student Health Advisory Committee

-Murray introduces himself as a second year MIMG major and a candidate for the SHAC.

-Badalich asks what experience he has personal or professional that makes him qualified.

-Murray states he was part of the student activist project and learned a lot about advocating for students for their needs. He is able to listen to other students as far as their health needs and represent that to the administration. Personal experience, he knows many students that are unaware of all the services. It is one thing to have access but it's

also a retention issue such as mental health. He wants students to get help when they need it.

-Ramalho asks what he hopes to accomplish.

-Murray states that SHIP has a huge deficit, and a law suit has started with the financial consulting firm that helped create the program. That financial consulting company created a \$57 million deficit because of misallocations and that should not happen. If we pay for our health insurance, our money should be going there. Additionally, SHAC presence in the campus is not as strong as it could be. It's job is listening to student needs and cater to them. He feels he is the perfect candidate and he is part of the Gen Rep 3 office where SHAC's presence can be more visible.

-Singh asks what role did he want to play for advocating against the deficit.

-Murray states the current members don't know all the policies because it's a very intricate system. He wants to learn the process as best as he can to educate themselves to check the systems being in place.

-Murray thanks everyone for considering him, and health is something dear to him and he is premed, prehealth, and interested in student government. It combines everything he likes.

Murray walks in.

-Naameh states he loves Murray.

-Badalich wishes he talked about his role in SexSquad and safety. In addition to that and his personal love of health and career wise in combination with interest in student government, then this is perfect and it will be a good complement to Mary.

-Trumble testifies his commitment to health and definitely what he wants for the future and is the best appointment possible.

-Hall states Murray will do an amazing job and likes the fact that he is a second year with a fresh perspective with passion and energy to really push forward knowledge about student health issues and be open to Badalich and other folks.

-Singh calls to question. Arce seconds.

11-0-1 Murray is appointed to SHAC.

F. Chika Chuku – CS Mini Fund

-Chuku introduces herself as a fourth year biochem major to be approved for the CS Mini Fund.

-Badalich asks to describe her community service.

-Chuku states she was financial director for BLADES.

-Arce asks if she applied before.

-Chuku states not.

-Arce asks what the most important need for community service projects.

-Chuku states it depends on the type of project. For example for BLADES they need transportation and it varies within project.

-Ramalho what she hopes to accomplish.

-Chuku states that she is really trying to experience everything UCLA has to offer and is interested on seeing the other side of the table.

-Arce asks what other sources she's applied to.

-Chuku states CAC Mini fund and BOD.

-Badalich asks what her definition of fair funding is.

- Chuku stated giving orgs what they need, but allow orgs to fundraise on their own.
- Jasso asks for an experience or situation where she has to remain neutral if any bias was present.
- Chuku states that when there was a CAC meeting and if she knows someone personally she wouldn't speak. To remain neutral, she will ask objective and general questions to the person applying to the fund.
- Arce asks what the time commitment is.
- Chuku states she volunteers but her schedule is flexible.
- Chuku thanks everyone for being here and for their time.
- Chuku steps out.*
- Arce states that catching up is important because its really important and she understands the basics of it.
- Badalich states that she needs a better definition of fair funding, but that goes with catching up. She has the experience and has applied to other funds and understands the key terms.
- Arce states that CAC Regular is really intense and she has good experience.
- Trumble calls to question. Badalich seconds.
- 12-0-0 Chuku is appointed for CS Mini Fund.

G. Diana Lazo – CS Mini Fund

- Lazo introduces herself as a third year geography and environmental studies and is the current director for CHC and a CPO volunteer director.
- Singh asks about her past experience to be on the CS Mini Fund.
- Lazo states that she applied to CAC, and her entire summer they applied to the funding applications and most of the questions are pretty similar.
- Ramalho asks what her vision is.
- Lazo states she wants to help out the community because a lot of organizations don't know about the committee.
- Arce asks how will she promote awareness.
- Lazo states providing workshops before week 4, and have them happen quarterly.
- Oved asks him to describe the application process.
- Lazo states it includes statement of need, target population, budget narrative, why theyre requesting certain types of funding and must be approved by an advisor before it goes on. There also needs to be a project description and the events they are planning for.
- Singh asks what she would change to make it more accessible to students.
- Lazo states that right now the online application is fine but awareness must be addressed.
- Arce asks if shes aware there are hearings.
- Lazo states yes.
- Badalich asks what fair funding means.
- Lazo states that a lot of organizations tries to apply for this funding and everyone that applies for this funding should get some sort of funding to run their services.
- Lazo states that her experience with CS Mini Fund isn't that great, but she spoke to the chair person from last year and knows all of her responsibilities.
- Lazo walks out.*
- Badalich states she has the community service but lacks fair funding.

- Singh states it shows great initiative to talk to the old chair.
 - Oved states the reason he asks and raised concerns with her specifically.
 - Joanino states that CS Mini Fund is composed of CS Mini Fund and CPOSA and Lazo was very passionate about community service. He thinks those things are learnable and she was a personal recommendation.
 - Arce states he spoke to Elliott and was a bit weary, but it's obvious she did her research and at the end of the day its really unfortunate to have these appointments soon. It's not the appointments fault it's the recommendation. He has trust in Elliot and Zimmerman.
 - Jasso states that it's a logical outcome to approach Jonathan Martinez because they are both part of CCM. Lazo also applies to contingency and her applications have also been impeccable and the type of grant writing. It's a very specific skill set and how to help people navigate that difficult process of writing a grant. She also wants to add that in regards to fair funding, but one of the reasons she stopped asking was because she didn't have a good definition of fair funding until she started evaluating. That vision happens when you're in the hearings and meeting the organizations and seeing what their needs are.
 - Trumble calls to question. Hall seconds.
- 12-0-0 Lazo is approved for CS Mini Fund.

H. Appellate Review Board

- Joanino states that are contesting their allocations because there are more community service projects with a smaller fund. This is the first time this committee is convening, Cynthia and Cindy of FiComm chair and vice chair to provide a more objective review.
- Jasso states that she is excited to be part of the appellate review board and a good time to understand community activities because a lot of people spend months applying for that fund.
- Arce states that less funding and more projects. He suggests having a conversation with Melissa to see her thoughts.
- Jasso states that they haven't been given the grievance and cannot comment on it, but definitely have considered meeting with her. It's also the current dynamic of SOOF. She will keep everyone updated because any time there is an allegation of an unequal distribution of funds is a very serious manner. She will bring this information back.
- Arce states that for next year that it wont be as much as a hassle bcause there are talks to move CAC supplemental to go back to CAC regular pod. They will work on that this year to move money around.
- Joanino states that as soon as those allocations are decided to let council know.

I. Alternate for ARC

- Joanino stated they want to appoint another alternate. He has taken a look into the previous USA Standing Committees, and Arce has expressed interests to be an alternate. He hopes to fix this situation, but there must be a motion to suspend the bylaws.
 - Badalich moves to suspend the bylaw where there is only one alternate on ARC. Hall seconds.
- 12-0-0 the bylaw is suspended.
- Joanino asks if Arce accepts his nomination.
 - Arce says yes.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

A. President – John Joanino

- Joanino stated he had an extensive retreat with Napolitano and was able to discuss title IX rights and happy to bring this issue up that UCI will be audited for sexual assault policy. It's looking as though that Napolitano is a lot more informed and support changes to proposition 13. They are looking for the statewide to have presidential and 7000 in solidarity campaign is still collecting cards. This weekend has set a state wide agenda separate from UCSA. Week four they are looking at marketing for scholarship.

B. Internal Vice President – Avi Oved

- Oved stated that the quarterly budget group is moving forward. IVP is still going to have a hand in it.

C. External Vice President – Maryssa Hall

-Hall states the EVP office is planning on hosting biannual GROW training, Grass Roots Organizing Workshop from November 8-9th and there will be a link coming out Thursday and send it out to all the offices for a campus wide push and learning these grassroots organization tools is extremely beneficial and really serve the purpose of the USSA to utilize resources they provide.

D. Academic Affairs Commissioners -- Daren Ramalho

-Ramalho states that Friday is the first stress-free day called "Scare away the stress" and is happy that random acts of kindness and SWC is co-programming. He highly recommends coming out with post it notes and blue books and pens. Lastly, they want to increase accessibility and the first meeting with administrators is called "Meet the Deans" with appetizers supplied by contingency and is really excited and it's a quarterly thing for everyone to stop by.

E. Student Wellness Commissioner – Savannah Badalich

-Badalich states that 7000 in solidarity is doing a lot of things, and will email an update.

F. Administrative Representative

Patricia Zimmerman

-Zimmerman states that she will lock up the building.

VII. Fund Allocations

A. Contingency Programming

-Badalich moves to approve. Arce seconds.

Hall moves to approve. Rogers seconds.

10-0-2 contingency programming is approved.

B. SOOF

-Hadjimanoukian moves to approve. Singh seconds.
-In general you can ask him questions and come to the office and ask specifics.
-Jasso asks him to elaborate why organizations got a lower allocations.
-Jacob ? states that the SOOF fund is smaller and its definitely a lot lower and that makes him sad but theres only so much money in the world.
-Jasso doesn't want student organizations to feel that its unfair and a stipend increase was a reason why the negligible bund decreased and that \$200 disapirty as a result of multiple factors. Even last years endowment took that into consideration.
-Zimmerman noticed trends past few years of groups not utilizingthose funds and they are working this year with groups to have more liability to spend on what they want to spend. Removing the 30% cap of their allocations and all the work they are putting into it will actually help student orgs.
-Jasso states that because last year USAC council used their retreat fund on room and board, it has been decided that they want to blanket it tthat to everyone else where people can use SOOF and SGOF to spend for food on their retreat. As of now.
-Zimmerman states the only thing is they must read assumptions and is under incidentals.
-Hall calls to question. Badalich seconds.
12-0-0 SOOF is approved.

-Singh makes a motion to add BOD as an action item.
12-0-0 BOD as an item.

C. BOD

-Ramalho moves to approve. Singh seconds.
-Jacob stated that \$50,000 allocated which is 17.5% between USA and BOD because in Fall the smallest number of groups apply and by Spring itll be more. Last year 15% used and this year is 17%.
-Jasso asks why Financial Supports Commission got \$66.
-Jacob stated because that's all they ask.
-Singh asks if its available to everyone.
-Jacob stated that itll be on the website this Friday. If anyone wants to talk about the formula he invites everyone to his office hours.
-Hall calls to question. Badalich seconds.
10-0-3 BOD is approved.

IX. Old Business

No old business

X. New Business

A. A Resolution in Support of Positive Steps Towards an Israeli-Palestinian Peace

-Hall asks for Singh's clarification on conflicts of interest because of his trip to Israel.
-Jasso is reading Article 1 and Section D, the conflict of interest states and no association member appointed can directly or indirectly as pimproper benefits and should avoid even the perception of such a conflict of interest. No association member can accept anything that will have divided loyalty. The member should disclose and should refrain from any

vote of any association should be involved. The USA constitution should be followed the by the constitution and bylaws.

-Singh states that he never hid it from anyone that he went to Israel and wrote it's mission. He doesn't believe it's a conflict of interest and determined he was going to ADEL Winter Quarter before he even knew he was running for GenRep. He is not acting on behalf of the ADEL and using his position as a student leader to do what is right and sponsor this resolution and bring a discussion to this council member. The claims that he has a conflict of interest are unfounded, but he understands why it seems like that. He hopes that it handles his concerns.

-Hall stated she read the Daily Bruin OpEd and questioning why. It says here that the perception of such a conflict of interest should be avoided. Perception is agree but if she was confused and many other people during public comment, and has garnered enough a perception of conflict of interest.

-Joanino asks what he thinks is most appropriate.

-Hall states that as a council they should discuss sponsorship if its within the bylaws.

-Oved is confused because she brought forth an IGNITE resolution and she brought a UCSA IGNITE resolution. Like Singh said, its not a personal conflict of interest and what does it mean for other resolutions.

-Hall states that UCLA members pay into UCSA and she was not at all sponsored to go to UCSA because it's a coalition of students that fight for rights, access, and affordability and doesn't understand why it would be a parallel. Six council members are part of UCSA and she didn't financially give anything.

-Singh states he is looking at the language and understands there are some concerns and he has no unauthorized financial interest and no divided loyalty. He can disclose and show everyone where they stayed. Hes not sure what more he can show and what more he wants. He does not have a conflict of interest.

-Naameh asks about Dr. Gellers perception.

-Geller states that a conflict of interest is about whether there is some sort of personal gain and perceived conflict of interest. The fact that someone in a campus community of ten thousands of people and may perceive there is a conflict of interest that was just played out doesn't make it so. She suggests setting aside that a few of the public comments suggested there might be, and rather focus what is in it for Singh to vote in a particular way. Is there some benefit for him or some organization hes connected to? That's a fair conversation. If he is disclosing that his trip was funded by ADL, the conversation should be about if ADL benefits on the resolution based on the particular outcome. It is subjective and there isn't necessarily a black and white answer. Geller asks if he gets paid, is an intern, or any future support for his office. In the absence of something personal, then look at the connection of the language in the resolution to the specific organization. If you look back over past years, then someone who cares about a particular topic has a conflict because they care deeply. People bring resolutions because they care deeply and have seen that from all different perspectives. One revision or ethnic or national origin should not be interpreted as conflict of interest, but someone who actually has an emotional bond to care about the topic or some history. A conflict of interest is really about benefit and the most important piece is to be entirely transparent, and look at it really in that context and to make decisions as a group moving forward for the financial gain either for the council member or the organization.

- Singh drives the point home and emphasizes modern middle east political economy and state formation and what he wants to dedicate his life to, as far as getting a PhD. He cares about something, and it's not a conflict of interest. It is before he became a genrep.
- Jasso states she likes solutions, and she doesn't think there is a conflict of interest. With that said, if the public really believes there is a conflict of interest there are many avenues where student members can voice their opinion such as a judicial proceeding. In her opinion, she doesn't believe there is a conflict of interest but there is always an option available to students.
- Ramalho stated to increase transparency, he went on the same trip last summer but is no longer affiliated.
- Naameh stated talking about the language and how it relates to ADL, and ADL is anti-divestment and wants to challenge the notion that Singh before being a genrep. Oved states that he was notified of being a candidate before winter quarter.
- Joanino stated that these technicalities are clouding the conversation. Let's talk about Singh's eligibility and conflict of interest.
- Naameh asks during her candidacy if he would bring up a divestment bill.
- Singh disagrees with the notion.
- Joanino dismisses the argument.
- Hall brought this up and just asked a question about legitimacy for candidacy.
- Oved states that Singh doesn't find it to be a conflict of interest.
- Jasso clarifies that the question is if council thinks it is a conflict of interest, not Singh.
- Joanino asks what makes the council feel comfortable.
- Naameh states that Singh should be able to sponsor the resolution.
- Hall states raises her concern, if other members are concerned then they should exercise looking at someone else sponsoring the issue. She doesn't feel comfortable moving forward this way.
- Kim moves to take a vote if Singh is eligible cosponsor. Hall seconds.
- Joanino clarifies it's a super majority.
- Joanino asks all those in favor moving Singh's name as a cosponsor.
- 2-7-2. Singh's name is staying on as a cosponsor.
- Joanino asks if there are any issues moving forward for the resolution.
- Oved reads the resolution.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED TO THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT
ASSOCIATION

COUNCIL

FALL 2013

A Resolution In Support of Positive Steps Towards an Israeli-Palestinian Peace

Authored by Avi Oved

Sponsored by Sunny Singh and Sam Haws

WHEREAS, all UCLA students have an inalienable right to free speech and to express their

views and narratives [1]; and,

WHEREAS, the UCLA “Principles of Community” are intended to ensure “freedom of expression and dialogue, in a respectful and civil manner, on the spectrum of views held by

our varied and diverse campus communities” [2]; and,

WHEREAS, the University of California, Los Angeles actively supports promoting an inclusive climate on campus, in which “all individuals and groups generally feel welcomed,

respected, and valued by the university” [2] with the understanding that “healthy climate is

grounded in respect for others, nurtured by dialogue between those of differing perspectives,

and is evidenced by a pattern of civil interactions among community members” [3]; and,

WHEREAS, UCLA students have a longstanding tradition of examining critical issues of our

time thoroughly and honestly, appreciating the complexity and nuances of world affairs, along with a responsibility to place our discussions in a clear and accurate contextual and historical framework; and,

WHEREAS, the Undergraduate Students Association Council has previously resolved not to

tolerate or accept the behaviors of students, staff, faculty, or administration that infringe upon

the safety of another person and/or develop a hostile and unsafe environment” [4]; and,

WHEREAS, “campus climate has become hostile for some students as a result of a lack of

understanding amongst communities and identities” [4], specifically in regards to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and,

WHEREAS, both the Jewish people and the Palestinian people have historical and cultural

ties to the land; and,

WHEREAS, both the Jewish and Palestinian narratives regarding the land are substantial parts of each group’s self-identity; and,

WHEREAS, both Israelis and Palestinians have considerably suffered as a result of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and, WHEREAS, even as recently as July 29th, US Secretary of State John Kerry announced that

direct peace negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians have resumed out of necessity, noting that “despite tough decisions that have to be made and despite pressure that

exists on both sides...both the Palestinians and Israelis have remained steadfast in their commitment to continuing the talks” and that there is a consensus that “a final status agreement is important in enhancing regional security and stability throughout the Middle East” [5]; and,

WHEREAS any efforts leading to or contributing to demonization and stigmatization of any

one party in the conflict are detrimental to the causes of peace and justice and therefore only

perpetuate the conflict; and,

WHEREAS, it is harmful to campus life and the welfare of the UCLA student body to exacerbate tensions related to foreign conflicts between student groups on campus; and,

WHEREAS, the UC Regents affirmed in 2010 that it would not bring forward any discussion about divesting from companies that deal with the State of Israel until such actions

were similarly adopted by the United States government [6]; and,

WHEREAS, divestment resolutions at other UC campuses have had negative effects on campus climate [7][8]; investment has the potential to foster positive discussion and promote

cross-community collaboration; and,

WHEREAS, firms like Sadara Ventures and Al-Bawader invest constructively in economic

development for Palestinians and Arab-Israelis in Israel, the West Bank and Gaza; and

companies such as Intel, Google, Cisco Systems and others have invested more than \$15

million into promoting Israeli-Palestinian cooperation and created a 35-company coalition

(“Ma-antech”) with the stated goal of increasing cross-cultural understanding and jobs for Arab tech workers [9].

THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council acknowledges the work of students and student groups who have continually advocated for positive campus climate through peaceful and respectful dialogue.

LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

acknowledges that civilian death and suffering on either side is unacceptable, and that the

State of Israel and the Palestinian Authority must take reasonable measures together to end

that suffering.

LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

supports a diplomatic and peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and only

considers legislation that reflects its complex, multi-faceted nature and explicitly recognizes

the inalienable rights of both Palestinians and Israelis to self-determination in their respective homelands.

LET IT BE FINALLY RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

would support ASUCLA and UCLA Fund investments in companies and ventures such as

Sadara Ventures, Al-Bawadar, Cisco Systems, Inc., Microsoft Corp., Intel Corp., and Google

that have spent time and resources on efforts to facilitate cooperative interaction between

Israelis and Palestinians by promoting economic and commercial growth for both groups, if

such investments are financially sound.

LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

urges Student Affairs and the UCLA Administration to specifically address intergroup dynamic

awareness, acceptance of other people's identities, and fostering of a culture that positively

and proactively deals with conflict.

1. http://www.usconstitution.net/xconst_Am1.html

2. https://diversity.ucla.edu/strategic-plan/20092010_CAGD_Strategic_Plan.pdf

3. http://diversity.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/07-campus_report.pdf

4. Resolution to Improve Intergroup Understanding and Dynamics on UCLA's Campus

http://www.usac.ucla.edu/documents/resolutions/resolution_dynamics.pdf

5. <http://www.newsdaily.com/world/bcf51122d0c07fd193dd2762487ab875/israel-palestinians-steadfast-on-peace-talks-kerry>

6. <http://www.ucop.edu/newsroom/newswire/img/15/15382853384e7a6d1bcce55.pdf>

7. Open letter sent from the President of the Associated Students of UC Riverside Liam Dow to the members of the Associated Students of UC San Diego

8. Open letter sent from the President of the Associated Students of UC San Diego Meggie

Le to the members of the Associated Students of UC Santa Barbara

9. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/richardbehar/2013/07/24/peace-through-profits-a-private-sector-detente-is-drawing-israelis-palestinians-closer/1/>

-Joanino opens discussion.

-Trumble states that one thing they heard really specifically and wants to ask about was the idea that the resolution speaks both of the Israeli and Palestinian students, but the Palestinian students weren't approached. CAC dedicated so much time to supporting and \$15,000 of a mini fund to support cultural programming. She wants to hear directly from the authors and co-sponsors and why they didn't ask Palestinian students.

-Oved states he did not mean for it to speak behalf on Israel or Palestinian community. He did not approach SJP, BFI, Hillel, or MSA and within his capacity for IVP he wanted to talk issues that is important to him and to shape campus climate in terms of him. He wants it to be a constructive and productive conversation. He didn't reach out and this was the way to go out to bring it to council. It's not intended to speak on behalf of any community but rather to bring it light for council.

-Singh echoes Oved's sentiments and it's a great way for USAC to speak behalf on itself and frame a conversation that happens all the time in a manner that is respectful to all parties. We heard about the diversity of opinion regarding conflict, and this resolution does not speak on behalf of the Israeli, Jewish, Muslim, or Palestinian. It speaks on behalf of USAC.

-Ramalho states he personally wishes Oved reached out to both. He liked Oved's perspective and intentions, and he is open to editing so we can all work it to acknowledge that it wasn't perfect.

-Oved states that he is part of BFI and he is not hiding that fact. This is not a resolution sponsored by BFI or Hillel. The resolution would look different if either of them were part of the process. Regardless of the fact that he is bringing it to council, but this is not a Pro-Israel or Pro-Palestine resolution its trying to define the approach and tried to the best to his capacity to not be biased in this manner and really tried with every fiber in his being.

-Naameh states that whether the intent was to represent one community or not, but it is shown that during public comment the room was polarized. A lot of students from Hillel and BFI felt supported while students from SJP felt marginalized.

-Hall wants to yield her time to Lana El-Farra.

-El-Farra states this conversation sounds familiar and it was brought up a couple of months ago because it's similar. Council decided to have a forum and students from all sides and if this issue was to ever be brought up in any form and the students decided that if this issue is brought up all communities would be asked. El-Farra doesn't understand why all communities weren't asked since it was clear.

-Oved states that the Ethical Investment issues and the difference from this resolution is because it's not taking a stance on the issue or problem but he's taking a stance on the approach about campus climate and the approach. He sees a huge distinction of Ethical Investment and wants to stray away from the parallel. He is trying to highlight it and is proud of it, and the language is the way we need to shape the issue.

-Badalich thinks that Oved had good intentions, and wants to look at what's being brought not who. This resolution does not exist in a vacuum, and since he is technically a member of Hillel and BFI, he is still a representative. They feel they already had that in the back of his mind. It's being perceived that is coming from one side, and he is a political figure not in a vacuum.

-Singh amends that instead of saying "Finally Resolved" to "further resolved" and let the last part say "finally resolved."

-Hadjimanoukian stated that the biggest issue is that it's stifling divestment and any form of BDS, and the question is what is the goal? Can divestment ever come to the table? Is it general to the Israel-Palestine conflict? What are the actual rules if it's enacted the way it was?

-Oved stated that he wants to go line by line to answer his question. In terms of divestment where it's speaking directly about the Israel Palestine conflict, not any other issue. He wants to go in order, and regardless of that it doesn't mean that someone can't bring a divestment bill. If you do bring an issue like that to council, he hopes council acknowledges there are so many sides and perspectives to that issue. In terms of divestment people feel like it demonizes one side and puts blame on one side. Instead of blaming one side they want to take the entire context. To answer your question, he hopes that it reflects the complexity and people can still bring divestment issues.

-Dr. Nelson states that communication is learned as a child. Everyone feels they are an expert in communicating because he or she can give his or her idea and it will be received the same way it was delivered. What happens is that the receiver doesn't hear the intentions, and there have been occasions where one side and another go to an adjacent room and try to hammer out whatever the dialogue can be and come back and come to a general consensus. Unfortunately, students haven't been face to face and he knows how difficult it is with families and relatives elsewhere. You try to do things here and what impact it would have elsewhere, but when you realize that communication is the essence of what it's about, he is just wondering if there is a possibility that groups can get together to get some kind of language. He applauds Oved for presenting it and applauds everyone who is here pro and con. Council must consider the language.

-Haws states Oved keeps talking about that divestment should represent both sides and complexity, and he is confused about the subjectiveness, and what are the rules that are going to be applied to decide how complex an issue is.

-Joanino asks if they want to go line by line.

-Naameh asks if there is going to be a discussion after every clause.

-Oved reads “WHEREAS, all UCLA students have an inalienable right to free speech and to express their

views and narratives [1]; and,

WHEREAS, the UCLA “Principles of Community” are intended to ensure “freedom of expression and dialogue, in a respectful and civil manner, on the spectrum of views held by

our varied and diverse campus communities” [2]; and,

WHEREAS, the University of California, Los Angeles actively supports promoting an inclusive climate on campus, in which “all individuals and groups generally feel welcomed,

respected, and valued by the university” [2] with the understanding that “healthy climate is

grounded in respect for others, nurtured by dialogue between those of differing perspectives,

and is evidenced by a pattern of civil interactions among community members”

-Naameh states she has a problem with this and it goes back to what Kim said and it was mentioned during public comment. While its okay that it’s a political bill and trying to frame the issue and not take a stance, people feel that it does so. Naameh states that this bill is set up in hypocritical way specifically at dialogue between those different perspectives because its insulting to suggest that Palestinians were represented when they clearly weren’t.

-Oved stated that the principles of community were cited, and its not talking about the resolution but tis talking about UCLA. This is not saying that it speaks on behalf of Palestinians and Israelis, it states that UCLA nurtured inclusive climate.

-Naameh states putting that in this bill is shady because there is a language about diestment and there seems to be clouding an attack on the use of divestment in the future through the language of dialogue and inclusivity and it makes it seem dishonest. She states its unnecessary and pair it down to the real goals of the resolution to make it more helpful and less clouded.

-Singh stated that the purpose of the resolution is to define the approach to the situation in a way that all parties are respected and all people are heard. This speaks directly to that end goal to ensure that we understand that whatever your point of view may be that this

discussion comes up then you have the right to advocate and express that opinion whether it's a majority opinion or a minority opinion. Maybe we can move the location so its more clear to whoever is reading it and include it in the resolve clause for the idea of everyone being involved in the conversation because that's definitely what they want to keep and they want everyone to be involved because everyone has a place in the conversation. If that's unclear there, they are open to amending language and changing the location to rectify any fears.

-Joanino states now they are discussing positioning.

-Naameh states that they can come back to us and if it appears later on that the resolution is pro any side then they can strike it later.

-Rogers states that what Oved said that the resolution on the table is because of campus climate issues and this is what they are talking about and this is the dialogue what its facilitating and it is appropriate there.

-Singh states they'll come back to it.

-Naameh asks if they talk about campus climate.

-Oved states a "healthy climate is grounded in respect for others." He continues WHEREAS, UCLA students have a longstanding tradition of examining critical issues of our

time thoroughly and honestly, appreciating the complexity and nuances of world affairs,

along with a responsibility to place our discussions in a clear and accurate contextual and

historical framework; and, WHEREAS, the Undergraduate Students Association Council has previously resolved not to

tolerate or accept the behaviors of students, staff, faculty, or administration that infringe upon

the safety of another person and/or develop a hostile and unsafe environment" [4]; and WHEREAS, "campus climate has become hostile for some students as a result of a lack of

understanding amongst communities and identities" [4], specifically in regards to the

Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and,

-Hall states that she needs more clarification and the source for this particular clause.

-Oved states that it was a resolution to improve intergroup dynamic and understanding on UCLA's campus.

-Naameh stated that hes saying that campus climate is hostile specifically in regards to Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and if he has any backing.

-Oved states its evident that there are issues and wants to put the resolution into context.

-Naameh asks where "campus climate has become hostile for some students as a result of a lack of

understanding amongst communities and identities" is from.

-Singh states its from the fourth in the cited resolution.

-Naameh states that the issue of campus climate cannot be thrown around for anything. Calling the tensions between Israeli-Palestinian a campus climate issue because of a different understanding trivializes campus climate. If political debate is an issue, then Bruin Democrats and Bruin Republicans shouldn't be allowed. It trivializes the experiences and campus climate issues are on black students and undocumented. She is asking how this is a campus climate issue.

-Hall stated in the cited resolution there is nothing noted about Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and its very misleading. The "let it be further resolved" was talking about a general education for diversity requirement, a townhall about diversity, desegregating the Asian identity, and the language its written and its misleading that this resolution already takes a stance. That is not what is actually happening. She is asking for some clarification why the two issues were parallel even if they aren't the same.

-Singh answers Naameh's first question as to why this specific resolution was cited was because the title was "Resolution to Improve Intergroup Understanding and Dynamics on UCLA's Campus" because it's a powerful testament that they respect the power of the resolution and they respect public comments.

-Naameh asks for clarification.

-Singh states that the resolution initially passed is important, each resolution is important. By citing a previous resolution, it states we care about whats happening in the past and continued to give importance to it.

-Oved finds it problematic to belittle people's definition of campus climate and its not fair to say that a problem on campus cannot be regard as campus climate.

-Joanino wants to go back to Hall's point about how the resolution using in context in the new resolution and the way that its framed implies that we already have taken a stance. However the stance that was previously passed was not addressing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. People feel that this resolution was used as a cite that was thrown in.

-Hadjimanoukian stated that this could be a ground rule.

-Singh states he offers a friendly amendment to change the language and read instead of "specifically" they describe that it can be applied to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Singh amends "WHEREAS, "campus climate has become hostile for some students as a result of a lack of

understanding amongst communities and identities" [4], and this can be applicable to the

Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and,"

-Singh asks if that does enough to distinguish the two.

-Naameh really wants to go back to what idea is a campus climate issue. If theres a disagreement that's not a campus climate issue, but documented attacks would be helpful. Why is this a campus climate issue, and not anything else that students agreed on? Why is Bruin Democrats and Bruin Republicans or affirmative action not a campus climate issue?

-Hall states she would like a citation that campus climate has become hostile, because hostile is a strong word. When she thinks of hostile she thinks of violence and harassment, and that original resolution was in response to harassment and incidents of essentially discriminatory hate crime. He is not trying to delegitimize but does not want

to cloud feeling strongly and deeply to be confused with feeling unsafe or personal attack when really it's a geopolitical issue where its not as tangible as we like it to be.

-Ramalho states that Bruin Democrats and Bruin Republicans had really respectful disagreements and every year there has been a physical or verbal attack on each community. He loves Palestinian awareness week, students are upset, physical exchanges, and making that comparison to BR and BD isn't necessarily the best.

-Oved wants to reiterate that tonight's public comment that it's a testament to the campus climate issue because each group feels stereotyped or demonized and really thinks it's a campus climate issue.

-Naameh wants to propose that whereas clauses are really gray, and has real issues to the end.

-Oved states its important to go line by line because its what they did in the past.

-Hall has a clarifying question, and Ramalho represented he mentioned Palestine Awareness Week as a campus climate issue. She sees it as their inalienable right for free speech and to express their views and narratives" where students exercise their right to protest a document. It's saying that is creating an unsafe environment but to her understanding its just shedding a light on things students feel passionate about. Hall states that its not a good reference.

-Ramalho states that he shouldn't have given that example, but Israeli Soldiers Speak Out where students felt unsafe and had a walk out. Hes not saying that one week is unallowed, but through these events that hes personally seen ahs been on both sides. He learned a lot about Palestanian Awanress Week.

-Geller states that citation number four is from Spring 2011 and its problematic that states "campus climate is hostile" makes it sound like its recent or current. She encourages that if its staying in there should be some sort of amendment that this citation is from a campus climate issue is from a situation in the 2010-2011 year because there is confusion and citing something old and tacking on the Israeli-Palestinian issue when that wasn't the basis of the issue.

-Trumble states in the interest of moving forward, are we having a motion?

-Joanino states no.

-Singh states that he amends that "WHEREAS, in Spring of 2011 "campus climate has become hostile for some students as a result of a lack of

understanding amongst communities and identities" [4], and this persists to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

-Naameh friendly amends adding [had] and to add this persists to the campus debate to read "Whereas in spring of 2011 "campus climate" [had] become hostile for some students as a result of a lack of understanding amongst communities and identities" [4] and this persists to the campus debate on the Israeli Palestinian conflict currently.

-Oved reads "WHEREAS, both the Jewish people and the Palestinian people have historical and cultural

ties to the land; and,

WHEREAS, both the Jewish and Palestinian narratives regarding the land are substantial

parts of each group's self-identity; and,"

-Hall states that it's problematic to compare Jewish and Israeli because it's not equivalent and the generalizations aren't worded correctly.

-Oved states that being Jewish is part of his religion, it's part of his identity. In that sense and ties to the land, it's parallel to Palestinian.

-Singh defers to Oved.

-Oved WHEREAS, both the Jewish people and the Palestinian people have historical and cultural

ties to the land; and,

WHEREAS, both the Jewish and Palestinian narratives regarding the land are substantial

parts of each group's self-identity; and,

WHEREAS, both Israelis and Palestinians have considerably suffered as a result of the

ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and,"

-Naameh states that earlier Oved talked about contextualizing within historical frameworks like UCLA students in the fourth whereas, and if we want to talk about the suffering as a result of ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict and if they say they have historical framework, then historical framework should be included. That whole history is not debated and an international consensus.

-Oved states that Naameh is talking about the conflict itself, but there's another side and doesn't want to talk about the conflict but talk about the approach.

-Hall states that the two clauses Jewish to Palestinian and then it switches to Israelis and Palestinians. She is confused as to why it switches.

-Oved states that the Israelis are those in the state of Israel where Jewish people are dispersed across the world. Jewish is all encompassing and can be an identity, and nationhood.

-Joanino asks if there is a friendly amendment.

-Hall states that the confusion is that we're referencing the Jewish people and then switch to Israeli. She is confused because Israel is a Jewish state and they are connected overall. This lacks clarification in this portion and the switch is too abrupt without giving any sort of background as to that switch and to distinguish between the two because of the complex issues and the intersectionalities of Israel, Jewish, Christians, and Muslims and all the other ethnic groups that do have ties, and she personally wants more clarification about this particular clause.

-Singh states that he can speak of the history and when Oved states Jewish, regardless of to where they live they have a tie to the land. However, in regards to the Israeli and Palestinian conflict, the Israelis are more affected. Israel is a Jewish democratic state and the term Israelis is more appropriate and more specific because it states that the Jewish people in India are affected by the ongoing Palestinian conflict directly is an overstatement, but to say the Israelis are being affected is more specific.

-Hall amends to add those that don't identify as others such as refugees such as Africans and wants to recognize other communities because its not just Israelis and Palestinians.

-Singh asks what would the language reads.

-Hall states that it doesn't exist in a vacuum because other folks are directly affected and should be recognized.

-Naameh agrees there are other communities impacted and want to offer an example of her Lebanese community being affected and the establishment of Israel there was a huge exodus of Palestinian and some were accepted others were not. In regards to the Lebanese community, with the big influx of Palestinian refugees shifted the focus and caused a civil war in Lebanon because of Israel's establishment and kicking out of the Palestinian people. Before her there are 5 UN Security Council Resolutions specifically about Israel illegally bombing the Lebanese state and has consistently affected since 1975 to today. In 2006, Israel bombed the international airport in Beirut, and Lebanese community is affected.

-Oved states that both "WHEREAS, both Israelis and Palestinians and those who identify with the complications of have considerably suffered as a result of the

ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and,"

-Hall states "WHEREAS, both Israelis and Palestinians such as refugees from Sudan and Ethiopia of have considerably suffered as a result of the

ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and,"

-Singh states that there is some sort of impact but its not entirely about that specific community.

-Ramalho stated that the fear is that theres a longer list of those who have been suffered and would have to be included to.

-Oved doesn't want to state any specific communities.

-Trumble suggests "WHEREAS, both Israelis and Palestinians and other affected groups have considerably suffered as a result of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict; and,"

-Oved reads "WHEREAS, even as recently as July 29th, US Secretary of State John Kerry announced that

direct peace negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians have resumed out of

necessity, noting that "despite tough decisions that have to be made and despite pressure that

exists on both sides...both the Palestinians and Israelis have remained steadfast in their

commitment to continuing the talks" and that there is a consensus that "a final status

agreement is important in enhancing regional security and stability throughout the Middle

East" [5]; and,"

-Oved friendly amends to add July 29, 2013.

-Oved moves on “WHEREAS any efforts leading to or contributing to demonization and stigmatization of any

one party in the conflict are detrimental to the causes of peace and justice and therefore only

perpetuate the conflict; and,

WHEREAS, it is harmful to campus life and the welfare of the UCLA student body to

exacerbate tensions related to foreign conflicts between student groups on campus; and,”WHEREAS, the UC Regents affirmed in 2010 that it would not bring forward any

discussion about divesting from companies that deal with the State of Israel until such actions

were similarly adopted by the United States government [6]; and,

”

-Hall states she would like to strike the clause because as EVP they constantly protest against regents. For example, the regents stated they wouldn't take a stance against South Africa Apartheid, but students took a stance and actively opposed the decisions despite regents. She doesn't feel comfortable that it states they agree with regents.

-Oved states as a whereas clause that the UC Regents have a letter of confirmation, not an opinion.

-Arce states that the purpose of this whereas the UC Regents is a moral campus.

-Badalich stated that this specifically Palestinian Sstudents that they view divestment as a way of peaceful dialogue and putting this and felt that they weren't included in that creating this resolution specifically this resolution thata talks about two sides of the conflict where one side feels like they've been represented without being contacted in addition to this way diagloug. If they were contacted this wouldn't have been in it. Whereas sets up the context of a resolution, and its not in adherence for the goal of the resolution. The goal of the resolution form what I understand is open and constructive and respectful dialogue. Unfortunately, that isn't represented by how this one came about and not talking with them and in combination with the wording itself. The wording is benign but these specific issues are not benign to these students and this isn't a representation of their voice to include this whereas. This is where the meat of the contention is.

-Kim states that the title is “A Resolution in Support of Positive Steps Towards an Israeli-Palestinian Peace” and stated that this comes out of nowhere. This is very positive wording and we look at both sides of the issue and promote dialogue and then this whereas the whole divestmeng and divesting comes out of no where and people are angry. It's really nice language and all of a sudden you throw in some information that is divisiv.e She agrees to strike it from the resolution.

-Singh defends Oved for getting a bad rap writing this resolution and there is so many different opinions nad having something written and then discussing it, really gives us

way for concrete steps to be taken. He is asking to keep these whereas clause, but it's apparent that keeping it is unacceptable. He defers to Oved.

-Kim states that they're not talking Oved, he praised him for his neutral and positive language especially being open to all of these amendments, if anything they're trying to support Oved and improving this resolution.

-Singh withdraws his conference.

-Hall amends to strike "WHEREAS, the UC Regents affirmed in 2010 that it would not bring forward any

discussion about divesting from companies that deal with the State of Israel until such actions

were similarly adopted by the United States government [6]; and,

WHEREAS, divestment resolutions at other UC campuses have had negative effects on

campus climate [7][8]; investment has the potential to foster positive discussion and promote

cross-community collaboration; and"

-Hadjimanoukian suggests that to keep that wording WHEREAS, the UC Regents affirmed in 2010 that it would not bring forward any

discussion about divesting, we support freedom of expression"

-Oved states he rejects the strike. Badalich seconds the motion.

-Hall rescinds her motion and moves to strike WHEREAS, the UC Regents affirmed in 2010 that it would not bring forward any

discussion about divesting from companies that deal with the State of Israel until such actions

were similarly adopted by the United States government [6]; and" She wants to take it off the table because Hadjimanoukian doesn't mitigate it. Badalich seconds.

8-4-0 that clause is struck.

-Oved continues "WHEREAS, divestment resolutions at other UC campuses have had negative effects on

campus climate [7][8]; investment has the potential to foster positive discussion and promote

cross-community collaboration; and,

"

-Arce states the 7 and 8 citations, and asks if those were cited.

-Badalich states that in the actual title it talks about Israeli-Palestinian so there needs to be Palestinian. It not comprobably to Napolitano. These are two specific communities

that are being represented, both feel marginalized. Both feel oppressed. The conflicts affects them both, but one community feels especially ignored.

-Arce states the biggest issue that this quote "dialogue cannot exist without humility" He is concerned that the Palestinian and Israeli community and he feels like there was a lack of humility in coming to this and didn't approach those folks. For example, when we passed the drop the i-word resolution IDEAS was talking to.

-Joanino states that everyone is bringing up valid points but not use resolutions as a preface.

-Kim wants to straw away of the conversation of Oved with BFI and move on going clause by clause instead of attacking Oved. When it comes from her perspective, stop targeting people on council, target their resolution.

-Oved just forwarded the letter from ASUCSD.

-Rogers stated she read both the letters attached and wants to quote one of the letters. "Two of our senators resigned that night and a vote of no confidence from doing so, according to our student director this is the first time that a no confidence vote was for the council and they are willing to state they have no faith and its forever barred.

-Hall states its vague although they are citing seven and eight. She is aware that the intent is solely to talk about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, its really counter intuitive to the work shes doing and UC students as a whole. It says divestment as a whole, and that's why she wants to strike that clause because its not addressing it.

-Oved states he wants to make an amendment in terms of "WHEREAS, divestment resolutions at other UC campuses in regards to the Israeli-Palestinian have had negative effects on

campus climate [7][8]; investment has the potential to foster positive discussion and promote

cross-community collaboration; and,"

-Badalich stated that this other whereas and Oved has these other citations and this is a "fact" and this is context and its talking about a tool in which Palestinian vocally said that divestment is a nonviolent dialogue tool. To put this in a resolution when talking about Israeli-Palestinian dialogue is counter intuitive of the purpose of this resolution.

-Oved states in terms of divestment it does strike close to home of Jewish students in this campus and feels like they are taking a stance against them and its very personal and have negative campus climates. The student government is a neutral entity and a safe space and is taking a stance against the Jewish community and Pro-Israel community.

-Badalich stated that hes talking about the Jewish community, but the Palestinian students here stated that divestment is the tool to communicate. If we are talking about the divestment resolution it should come as an actual conversation, not as a way to talk about it in a dialogue resolution when this is their way of dialoging. They very vocally said that during their public comment. When one community uses this as part of the dialogue, its unfair and should be stricken.

-Singh states what Rogers quoted was how it impacts an entire college community Pro-Israel or not. He advocates that this language stay in and sets a precedent for this resolution. When talking about positive steps, we want civil interactions and they aren't saying that divestment is uncivil, but if some communities see it that way we have to

respect them. We as a council are going to resolve ourselves so there should be universally accepted civil interactions. When we fail then it's absolutely justified for those communities to bring divestment anyways. It aligns with our positive step for conducive dialogue.

-Badalich stated again they are talking about sides, and divestment ends up making sides and bringing up sides. People who are bringing up this divestment as an issue of other campuses is one side, and others who think it's a good dialogue is sides. The purpose is being undermined although the intentions are good. This whereas is not a dialogue piece for the community.

-Joanino stated the concerns for the citations because student leaders who are biased and their experiences are bringing them forward where someone can use that letter to legitimize their side. It's assuming that ASUCSD should be an objective viewpoint. He is asking where the legitimacy of student leaders like themselves.

-Jasso is trying to understand people's logic and finds that it doesn't make sense to have two sides where the issue is far outside the UCLA campus and is more than what the resolution would produce. How do you get these two sides that are completely on different levels to cause that divisiveness? That clause is more pro-Israel and more pro one specific side as opposed to including the Palestinian. If your platform is to create a dialogue and systematically excluding Palestinian she doesn't understand that logic. She wants to learn what the logic behind that.

-Oved states the resolution calls for positive campus climate because it alludes to the fact that it has led to negative campus climate and did cause negative affects and it's really important to include it.

-Jasso asks if this clause is included in the resolution and it passes, is it also going to have negative affects because it will silence someone? Either way, this clause silences someone whether it's kept. If we're trying to give voice, how are we silencing it with keeping or not keeping a clause.

-Trumble feels that including language about divestment and saying that Palestinian students and their allies cannot bring divestment issues. To talk about another side, we are talking about student leaders and looking at a letter from the current student of ASUCSD that writes a letter to UCLA about corporate accountability of Israeli-Palestinian and use divestment to make social change such as apartheid and fossil fuels this year. These actions will always be met with resistance, but as an institution of higher learning it's important to engage in these global dialogues to react on these principles to uphold in support of data associated and actively calls into the institutions role in proliferating violence. The resolution presented tonight does not give its attention it deserves. They want to ensure a safe environment, to suggest that it has been negatively affected the opposite has been true. This past week a director of socially responsible investments was appointed. He encourages council to foster a similarly open environment. Trumble states we can't make these citations because they are in flux. The opposite may be true now. That's why she is in support of striking the clause.

-Joanino states that ASUCSD president is not pardoned from having biases.

-Hadjimanoukian stated that he agrees negative and divestment have issues, and suggests instead of striking the clause "very."

-Naameh states she thinks that's absolutely pointless and calls to question to strike it.

-Joanino states they are discussing the investment portion of this clause.

-Badalich stated that either divestment or investment shouldn't be there and economic language shouldn't be there because either way that's still retracting from the purpose for communication and dialogue. She sees the point but if divestment is there investment shouldn't be there, and shouldn't be there regardless.

-Hall cedes her time, and continuing investment will also have a negative affect on campus climate and just because we don't want an uprising. Pro-Palestinian students have constantly been attacked under campus climate.

-Haws stated they already challenged the two citations, and now there are any citations. He doesn't see how any connection of investment and divestment.

-Oved states that divestment stifles a voice and investment, depending on what you're investing in such as bringing communities together, doesn't personally see it as a conflict when it's benefiting both sides.

-Badalich states that divestment stifles a point. We just heard investment stifles a voice. In this resolution, both voices are stifled and the point of this is to dialogue. She moves to strike this clause.

-Oved wants to state that investment is positive depending on what you invest in.

-Hadjimanoukian stated that if you get rid of the investment point then the next point has no context either.

-Ramalho stated that when talking about investment in specific companies, these are companies that benefit both sides and both perspectives they aren't saying they are investing to positively affect both.

-Naameh moves to address to strike the first half.

-Oved requests to move forward and past it.

-Jasso states that doesn't follow his logic and we should follow his blueprint.

-Joanino states that this motion should be separated into two different motions.

-Badalich stated she definitely doesn't want divestment in there, and if we strike it now then the further ones won't be needed. He sees why Oved wants to skip ahead, and she's fine with striking divestment and then coming back to investment.

-Hall states that the term investment is in a lot of ways making it seem like we're taking an action but the fact of the matter is that we are already invested in the conflict with the investments we already have. By saying that it stated investment has the potential to foster positive discussion and promote

cross-community collaboration; and,

“yet we are already invested. This is counter intuitive since cross community collaboration hasn't been addressed. This should stay together. She agrees it will move along since the resolution would not move along.

-Oved states he would appreciate Hall's respect in the resolution, and he takes offense to it.

-Singh states that splitting the investment portion to another where as and striking divestment and then inverting it so it would solve all the issues.

-Badalich stating that continued investment was a negative thing for one community, and doesn't want continued in there. If we are taking the investment thing, but if we got rid of the investment then the next whereas must have to go and in addition to that then the second to last therefore would have to go. She's not saying it's useless, if anything it will allow for a better representation of the Palestinian view. If there's no talk of divestment

and investment, and if it only stresses dialogue and different views, then that is still a huge statement. There doesn't have to be economic ties to push for dialogue.

-Hall stated she never wanted to disrespect him and wants to reiterate what Badalich stated about discussion and dialogue and positivity, but this particular clause is counter intuitive to positivity. We already discussed that students of Palestine were not addressed and this will bind this council and all other future councils. She wants to strike this whereas, and she doesn't think the resolution will hold weight because these two are counter intuitive.

-Joanino asked if they are dividing the whereas clause.

-Badalich stated that although those companies had those intentions, one of those communities feel that this investment doesn't accurately represent their voice.

-Oved addresses the points that have been raised and sees how divestment may stifle the voices of one side and investment can stifle another side. Oved will strike this whereas because he's listened to every single person speak at public comment and the discussion on council and wants everyone to rally behind the resolution and be proud of it and be excited for it. He wants to apologize for attacking anyone. He feels that divesting and investing is not as productive as he thought it would be. He was naïve through the issue because he truly thought it was the middle ground for the issue. He wants to strike the whereas and wants to say we shouldn't reconsider investment or divestment because their side is stifled. He doesn't want anyone to feel like their council is going against them. He is willing to strike that and not give a stance.

-Hall asks for clarification purposes and getting back to the point that positive discussion and dialogue was absent in the form of this resolution, and in the future if we were to have dialogue and communication then in the future anything in the future divestment and investment can be revisited but cannot be communicated that us as council shouldn't take stances on issues.

-Oved states it has been said time and time again that divestment and investment stifles voices and doesn't want to stifle any voice and wants to be representative of everybody. By saying we will neither divest or invest will be more reflective of a consensus of people.

-Jasso has a clarifying question, you would like to remove those clauses and USAC as council is bounded to not take a stance on this particular issue.

-Naameh states from what Oved just said validates the removal of the whereas and elaborated that we should neither invest or divest, and that's not the goal of this resolution. In future resolutions might want to address investments and divestments because it's a free speech issue and BDS has been a peaceful tool for occupation and that is a peaceful measure to resist the unilateral and asymmetrical warfare and replacing words of not divesting or investing is hurtful to Palestinians.

-Badalich stated from what she understands he wants to strike the whereas that talk about divestment and investment.

-Oved wants to state that investment and divestment stifles voice

-Badalich clarifies that adding divestment and investment both stifle voices would be problematic because certain communities use this as a dialogue tool.

-Hadjimanoukian states that the one thing to say from the Palestinian perspective that we are currently invested and not taking a stance perpetuates the issue.

-Hall states currently we are invested in the occupation and we should take out the clause. However, for this resolution and it was well intended but it had negative impacts. As a council they shouldn't say we shouldn't discuss investments and divestments in the future.

-Joanino stated that this resolution is conflating and makes him wonder what the real intent is.

-Oved states that USAC was proactive in bringing those communities together and reiterates the fact that if we are an ally of every student in this way then we can keep this line of communication and doesn't feel like that's stifling voices.

-Naameh wants to challenge the idea that this is being proactive by saying that we're not doing anything.

-Oved states that this saying it's not going to do anything to marginalize it but your student government wants to talk to you and instead of judging the actual language it's being judged by him and that's how it's being interpreted.

-Naameh stated that it's not the person, but divestment and investment. However, USA has been rejecting UN delegations and challenge status quo and if you are silent in the face of inequality then you take the side of oppressor. If the purpose is just to foster dialogue and the actual intention was to stop divestment in future.

-Singh states that the purpose of this resolution is to frame the approach to the conversation and frames the approach of the conversation and undertaking either investment or divestment and marginalizing certain communities on campus and sympathizes with his attempt to be proactive and making sure they don't do that. Obviously it looks like there should be more discussion. In the sake of time and strike.

-Oved wants to respond and that it isn't reiterating the status quo because in fact it is trying to break the status quo.

-Naameh directly responds then talking about divestment and investment is a global issue. Oved is trying to limit it to the campus but talking about investments and divestments is bringing about human rights.

-Oved states it directly relates to council and makes students feel uncomfortable on campus does not directly relate to campus.

-Haws states the issue that he keeps coming back to is that they are trying to change the frame of the conversation and want to work with them. However in this resolution they didn't make everyone feel like they are involved.

-Badalich stated she totally understands that he is trying his hardest that people will dialogue that there will be a comfortable and respectful setting because that's the intentions. Unfortunately when a resolution is trying to frame an approach and didn't approach both communities, it's not framing anything. Your resolution is talking about dialogue and she understands that, but he didn't dialogue prior. She thinks that as well intentioned as it is, a lot of students don't feel comfortable with this being a resolution that comes up unless those specific stakeholders in this conflict have specific ties in the resolution and helping author it. If we were to strike out the whereas in terms of divestment, some students will feel that this isn't a representation of their voices. The purpose of this resolution was meant to bring a dialogue but unfortunately there was no dialogue. She understands it feels like they are attacking him, but again we don't live in a vacuum it is a political sphere this is a college campus and this is college politics. Both stakeholders need to be involved in the creation of something that involves both

stakeholders. She is hung up on the fact that he failed to talk to both sides. She understands how personal it is to him, but you must talk to both sides if it involves both sides.

-Oved just wants to frame this in a positive way and move forward and still have the effective.

-Rogers stated we have gone this clause by clause and Oved has offered to take out divestment and investment and we deleted any phrases people felt uncomfortable with, and maybe there should be conversation but facts of the matter we have gone through this and figured out what was controversial and non controversial and this was set as a foundation to facilitate the dialogue as a starting point. Let it be known that everyone in this council room, Jewish students fear divestment. She is neutral. She thinks its important to acknowledge that even though they are taking it out and she feels that council should acknowledge that too. They have done the best and they are trying to try as hard as they can to facilitate the dialogue.

-Trumble wants to echo what Badalich said but its clear that this resolution is coming from the best intentions but the manner which is been carried out has not been productive and has been very upsetting. She doesn't want to speak for this community so she cedes to Denna.

-Denna states that Jewish students are afraid of divestment and included those that were called a traitor and blanket statements should be avoided, but also recognize fact that Jewish students feel alienated because they support the occupation and do support divestment. They keep talking about this dialogue but what does this dialogue look like? Is this taking into account power dynamics? Are we wakening the bruin resources of the privileged side and the oppressed side are we taking into account resources center? We cant just throw this term dialogue around because like in slavery you cant expect a white slave owner to have a dialogue of a slave.

-Oved yields his time and she wants to look at this as doing something productive and not water down the resolution so it means something

-Badalich stated that she comes from a place that is not personally affected by this conflict and she acknowledges her privilege. Something talks about white privilege and as someone who is privileged and a European mutt and her ancestors were the oppressors. She is not going to talk about their specific communities and by talking with both Oved and Pro-Israel roommate and chief of logistics of Pro-Israel and talked with SJP and talked with Olive Tree Initiative. She tried to get a wide range, and the ultimate thing she realized and this resolution that this had great intention but this resolution that is meant to be a way of creating dialogue and to bring together everyone has created a divisive issue. Both sides are coming out and either opposing or being for the resolution. This is the product of the resolution, unfortunately not everyone is on board and those aren't on board are direct stakeholdres in tehr esolution. Unforunately she sees all these faces that are much more involved than she is and she doesn't feel comfortable voting on a resolution that doesn't have intimate input by both stakeholdres in this conflict.

-Singh states that Badalich brought up great points and wants to bring this back to what he believed and that's w ay to define the approach to the conflict to the challenges that exist. He thinks that the council can do that and make a statement and wants to acknowledge something Oved stated. Singh states Oved acknowledges the fact that Oved states hes wrong and appreciates the fact that they striked the clause. He friendly amends

to strike all clauses talking about divestment and investment to define the frame. He moves to strike “WHEREAS, firms like Sadara Ventures and Al-Bawader invest constructively in economic

development for Palestinians and Arab-Israelis in Israel, the West Bank and Gaza; and companies such as Intel, Google, Cisco Systems and others have invested more than \$15 million into promoting Israeli-Palestinian cooperation and created a 35-company coalition

(“Ma-antech”) with the stated goal of increasing cross-cultural understanding and jobs for Arab tech workers [9] LET IT BE FINALLY RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

would support ASUCLA and UCLA Fund investments in companies and ventures such as

Sadara Ventures, Al-Bawadar, Cisco Systems, Inc., Microsoft Corp., Intel Corp., and Google

that have spent time and resources on efforts to facilitate cooperative interaction between Israelis and Palestinians by promoting economic and commercial growth for both groups, if

such investments are financially sound.”

-Naameh seconds.

12-0-0 the clause is stricken.

-Rogers state that she was supportive of getting rid of the clauses and divestment being a tool then also acknowledging the fact that divestment does scare some Jewish students, and wants to yield to Miriam.

-Miriam requests that council doesn't use politically charged terms because some of the offensive.

-Miriam stated that this point of the resolution isn't to look at history but the point is to be proactive. She would love to have a conversation because it's a more in-depth conversation.

-Hall wants to second the point that divisive language shouldn't be used. When we refer to the Palestinian people we don't refer to them as terrorists because we heard that several times during public comment. She hopes that these conversations don't stop, and we have to have positive conversations.

-Oved continues “THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association

Council acknowledges the work of students and student groups who have continually

advocated for positive campus climate through peaceful and respectful dialogue.

LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

acknowledges that civilian death and suffering on either side is unacceptable, and that the State of Israel and the Palestinian Authority must take reasonable measures together to end

that suffering”

-Naameh asks if Naamaas is a nonstate government official and shouldn't it be included if it leaves out one half of the governing bodies.

-Singh states they are putting this in context and why they have such great whereas clauses and when we think about the talks of Kerry then its important to tie that together.

-Oved stated that Palenstarian authority is the only body that is in state of peace talks.

-Naameh stated that we must be critical who are we terming extremists and terrorists because it was feely elected. That is the reason why Israel started bombing Gaza and came to the point in 2008 and the Gaza terrorist attack from Israel to Gaza as a punishment of USA considering a Paenstine authority.

-Oved stated that Hamas wasn't coming together in terms of peace talks.

-Hall gives a point of order and cedes to El-Farra

-El-Farra states that Hamas was democratically elected and doesn't need to be discussed on the table. The problem is that she doesn't appreciate just having Palenstine authority or striking that.

-Oved yields his time to Avinoam. They elected to Hamas and responsded to thousand of rocket attacks. He continues that it's the only recognized legal body.

-Haws stated the intent was to be positive and it's the exact opposite.

-Badalich stated that this issue shouldn't be talked about this council and having this decision to pick the right is side is exactly what the resolution doesn't want to do.

-Naameh friendly amends stating that “LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

acknowledges that civilian death and suffering on either side is unacceptable, and that the Israelis and Palestanians and their respective governments must take reasonable measures together to end

that suffering.”

-Oved accepts.

-Oved reads “LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

supports a diplomatic and peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and only

considers legislation that reflects its complex, multi-faceted nature and explicitly recognizes

the inalienable rights of both Palestinians and Israelis to self-determination in their respective homelands”

-Naameh likes the idea of peaceful resolution, but the last part seems like it could be interpreted in different ways. She wants to ask which homelands because the borders are a contentious issue.

-Singh states that they don't want to define the borders and they want to discuss this in a positive constructive manner and leaving it like this allows us to this.

-Hall has an issue of it because its vague and the fact that it says “supports a diplomatic and peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and only

considers legislation that reflects its complex, multi-faceted nature and explicitly recognizes

the inalienable rights of both Palestinians and Israelis to self-determination in their respective homelands.

“ is really vague in itself is taking a stance.

-Oved states its not taking a stance.

-Hall states yes that its complex and multifaceted, but as a council we cant take a stance on something that didn't really exist right now. The fact that this is restricting from a council moving forward thinking of this as a tactful standpoint and there are different tactics tht can be used and its very confusing.

-Kim stated that the issue Hall and Naameh have to it when they tried to make an amendment to strike the UC Regents and divestment and add another clause saying we wont make a stance and that's the problem Naameh and Hall sees. She understands that councils considers legislation, but we cant take a stance on something prematurely.

-Hall amends to keep “LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

supports a diplomatic and peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.” And then strike the rest of it because of the lack of clarity and not wanting to bind it. She hopes we all agree that we support a diplomatic. The rest of the clause goes that's where the confusion comes in.

-Oved states that the point of conetnion is “considers” and rather than “considers” change it.

-Ramalho suggests to strike the word “considers” and “supports” instead.

-Naameh states that that's an issue because if we support a legislation, and the reason to say we support that addresses the multifaceted issue because we cant support resolution that hasn't happen. It puts USAC in the position to be bound.

-Hall reiterates that the motion is to keep “LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

supports a diplomatic and peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict” and strike “only

considers legislation that reflects its complex, multi-faceted nature and explicitly recognizes

the inalienable rights of both Palestinians and Israelis to self-determination in their respective”

-Oved rejects that motion.

-Oved stated it will be “LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

supports a diplomatic and peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict reflects its complex, multi-faceted nature and explicitly recognizes

the inalienable rights of both Palestinians and Israelis to self-determination in their respective homelands.

“

-Oved continues “LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Students Association Council

urges Student Affairs and the UCLA Administration to specifically address intergroup dynamic

awareness, acceptance of other people’s identities, and fostering of a culture that positively

and proactively deals with conflict”

-Naameh has a point of clarification that we are not taking a stance, but it supports a solution.

-Oved states that it recognizes both people right to self determination and narratives to both exist and wants to keep continuity of resolution.

-Trumble states shes still caught up on the fact that in public comment palenstaianian felt not only not represented, but misrepresented. The spirit of the resolution is not kept and positioned the well of the resolution and that’s what shes caught up on as the entire hole.

-Badalich stated she talked with amny different sudents from both sides because there is so much she doesn’t know and she wont pretend she does. What is the purpose of this resolution? The purpose is to create dialogue and frame the conversation and try to promote it. What are the problems that we see from the students? This has to do with a specific two sided conflict and one side specifically doesn’t feel their voice is being presented and unfortunately but both sides weren’t brought in for the creation of this resolution and the purpose of this dialogue and there is no dialogue of this creation and if anything this has already divided this entire room, it’s the creation and the lack of communication between both sides in representing both sides in a resolution that deals with both sides in a conflict that is convoluted undermines the entire resolution. She doesn’t feel comfortable voting on ar esolution that doesn’t represent both sides epcifically when both sides weren’t part of the creation and one side specifically where

students remain until 2:21 AM still feel that even with the changes still don't feel comfortable.

-Oved stated they acknowledged it and went line by line and the language was not stifling or attacking anyone and would hate that this 7.5 hour conversation is powerful and can really shape the conversation. Just because the dialogue hasn't happened this is the stepping stone and can initiate so much.

-Badalich stated that the drop the I word that community was directly involved in this creation, she sees what she's trying to do. As a representative of the students this isn't representing all the students. She states that maybe hold off and talk with them and patch out and how to make it to work because she really wants it to work and doesn't feel comfortable representative not representing. She is saying it on both sides but she sees these faces they were marginalized in an already marginalizing issue on both sides.

-Ramalho doesn't want to sound disrespectful and it's frustrating that we have been working so long and as a council willing to make edits.

-Badalich stated that we went through the framework that Oved set up and went line by line because there's many more people that feel involved. We went through Napolitano line by line where Ramalho decided that amendments weren't stricken. At the end you still did not support the resolution. However, what she has to say that we will go line by line and during the entire thing she talked about the lack of communication and that stills hold through. Seven hours is a long meeting but people spend their entire lifetimes on this. She has to say that this is an issue well we spent seven hours I just want to vote on it because I'm tired, and I'm not saying seven hours were worthless. This was a constructive meeting but it didn't honestly include all the dialogue it should have. She doesn't think it's wasted effort or long enough.

-Oved stated it was support to spark conversation and it hurts.

-Joanino states it's important to learn multiple perspectives.

-Hall wants to second everything Badalich stated because she doesn't think that it was invaluable to have the seven hour long conversation because we really delved into the impacts that a resolution has on campus climate and community. The fact that this resolution as a whole by the real passion feel on either side has in itself detrimental to campus climate. She expressed a long time ago that she was uncomfortable. Despite going through this resolution and going through these amendments she still very much feels that the process is problematic and the fact these different sides were not addressed is wrong. It wasn't discussed with the communities and it's not fair to say that we had a dialogue because students have been limited to a 2 limit public comment. This is evident that this conversation needs to happen on a bigger scale because the fact that communities weren't brought in and still wary of language brought in of the resolution and it's to the point where voting no is better than changing it and bringing it forth later.

-Geller states that they've been striving for compromise into reach consensus. You must accept that votes aren't always going to be unanimous and there is nothing wrong with dissent. There is nothing wrong and no matter how hard you worked hard towards consensus and compromise but there is still value in that exercise in an effort and willingness to consider multiple perspectives and desire to be uniting and not divisive. It's the reality that if this council all yearlong only had unanimous votes she would be concerned that some members weren't actually speaking up and owning perspectives because there is a wide diversity in backgrounds, experiences, and beliefs as do the

students on campus. This campus is a diversity of experiences, opinions, and knowledge. To reflect that by having votes that aren't unanimous is just a reflection of the reality it's going to be a myriad of opinions.

-Oved wants to take a straw vote and wants to say that they've worked incredibly hard and made amazing compromises and proud of the work that contributed to. Voting no on this resolution is voting against bringing people together and voting no is against the dialogue and voting no is against the cooperation. Oved wants to take a straw vote.

-Joanino stated he wants more perspective.

-Trumble states that she is not comfortable with dichotomy and they have all worked incredibly hard with constructive dialogue and primarily she doesn't like where it came from being the conception did not recognize the spirit of the resolution. By no means does that mean she is against dialogue, and dialogue should not come from a resolution but should come from a space where everyone is represented where all students feel supported and engaged. She is really uncomfortable.

-Hall agrees with Trumble. As council, they have a responsibility that this does not begin and end tonight. This conversation and these town halls and forums but as a council we should focus on transparency, visibility, and reaching out student groups. They must reach out to student groups before making a resolution and being proactive before we even come to this point. The fact that we spent the last seven hours and the fact that we didn't go forward, things should have stopped when we didn't address both communities involved. By voting no the resolution challenges the fact that its voting no towards dialogue, it is including dialogue and moving forward to dialogue. If we want to move forward to bring more for investment and investment after we have dialogue and not after an isolated group of council members have this discussion.

-Badalich stated that when she talked with olive tree initiative they wanted these conversations to be done by students in specific groups and should come together naturally and shouldn't be mandated by resolution to come to talk but should be doing something anyways. One thing she wants to say is that its not personal, but their talks on the phone that is something she wants to see with both sides and then come back to the table. Maybe we don't vote on the resolution and approach certain groups and see it happens. Her voting no is not voting dialogue, its opposite and really wants him to dialogue with specific communities that are stakeholders. If he could do that, then she will support it. She personally doesn't have that tie with everyones faces exhausted and tired and feeling not represented she doesn't feel comfortable. If he can somehow hold off and talk, and its not him it's the creation of it that isn't including specific groups represented of these voices. The dichotomy created was uncomfortable because she does like the resolution but she doesn't like how it came up.

-Kim stated that after reading it over and personally agrees with all of the language but the problem is because there are a lot of bodies that don't agree because they weren't included, and it wants to promote an inclusive climate to feel welcome then she has an issue that they weren't included in constructing any language. She might personally think its fair but it does make her feel uncomfortable there is contention because no one is consulted. This goes for both sides, since SJP, Hillel, or BFI.

-Haws stated that voting no is not a no to dialogue and everything apart of the text sounds so great on paper, but he sees the heads shaking in those invested in the issue because he

ist trying to represent every side and he doesn't have particular stake. He can't ignore the voices that have a part of the resolution.

-Arce echoed what Badalich stated and it wasn't brought to any of the two groups and it's just not the best way to go and have students that are extremely unheard and brother literally grinding. He feels that it's his duty to listen to these folks. His whole life he was underrepresented and people that listened and supported him ended up at this table.

-Ramalho stated that in the future where resolution has brought forward and he is going to be critical that if a resolution is impacting any group or community they must be contacted. He is going to ensure and be critical because if that's the logic that will be used he expects that to be maintained.

-Singh states when he sponsors this resolution was so as a council to define a new approach and came together and presented a resolution and went through what approach we are defining. It came down to an issue where it wasn't as biased nor was it as neutral. They worked incredibly hard and this resolution is not perfect and no resolution ever will be because it simply doesn't exist, however this is a tremendous result of compromise and cooperation and something they can be proud of as a council. He wants everyone to keep in mind and the language should be proud of and the conversations are meaningful and impactful.

-Hadjimankoukian agrees that the words are impartiality and says "look we want to have a dialogue!" and everyone should be in support of it. So it raises his question what is the concern that they weren't included therefore they will not pass the resolution? The whole point was that this is a stepping stone and there is no dialogue to encourage dialogue and get rid of any type of polarization and now we aren't at an even playing field. Either way if we say no and the idea out there is that we should be having dialogue and up to the communities themselves and asks what the appropriate action whether it should be voted on or tabled or anything productive.

-Rogers echoes Hadjimankoukian because it's a collaborative effort to put a foundation and form this conversation to quote this is what they're going to do and support it in their entire form.

-Naameh wants to say something about the goals of the resolution and that everyone is here and hear everyone's public comment is awesome. What they got out of discussing resolution has been accomplished and heard what the other side has to say to every person and she doesn't think it's a waste of time but learned a lot.

-Badalich stated that huge portions of the resolution were taken out to try to bring compromise and from what Hadjimanoukian stated that even if there is tie on either community they do not embody the entire voice. Even though the language was impartial and to say that it represents the voices then it's not true. The last key to make her vote yes and knowing how specific community feels. She suggests tabling it and talking with these specific communities and bringing it back next week. The big issues not having that dialogue.

-Jasso hopes that public comments states that this is a dialogue that is happening within this public conversation that is existing and even in this community forum that happened last year, the dialogue is existing. What's frustrating that this conversation there is no considerable action taken by either. There are possibilities but no one has the backbone to let's move into a vote or table which is what they are putting everything in this room. We

cannot say lets move forward and the conversation has been the me nad is unexcusable. She suggests take a stance by either tabling it or vote on it simply. People deserve it.

- Hall suggests call it to question and commits to dialogue and bring another eoslution that confronts both sides.
- Oved yields time to Fabienne Roth. This issue in particular its important people are consulted but the campus wide has not been consulted in the past few reoslutions then for the future every oice has been heard and she is tired of hearing about resolutions that have been passed that affected her. USAC Resolutions and outreach must be increased.
- Joanino states its time to really start moving forward and call the resolution to question and read to its final forum.
- Hadjimanoukian calls the resolution to question. Naameh seconds.
- Oved reads the resolution “INSERTHERE”
- Joanino asks as amended.
- Oved wants to take a straw bote of the people in the room who are in favor of this resolution to please raise their hand.
- Joanino asks if there are any other final resolutions.
- Kim has a quick comment to make a move to vote and because there is so much time and Oved and his sponsos made them make so many changes and would they be willing to make outreach.
- Hall stated that everyone can abstain and the motion can be made.
- Hadjimanoukian makes a motion. Naameh seconds.
- Joanino asks of those to approve the resolution.

5-7-0 the resolution fails.

XI. Announcements

- Arce invites everyone to his community service events and emails have been sent.
- Trumble invites everyone to go to to the Word on Wednesday.
- Hall brings to light the “Affirmative Action Bake Sale” where it reduces the issue of affirmative action to solely moneatrry value so much to the point that the baked goods would be sold at varying prices depending on ethnicity. As a council they should really discuss something in response to this in order for there to be productive campus climate moving forward that doesn’t alienate or marginalize or disrespect communities or their place on the campus. This bakesale is happening this Friday at 11, and Bruin Republicans is not one of the sponsors. Hall is all for freedom of speech but it shouldn’t be exersised at the expense of studnets at this campus and their existence is being hchalenged.
- Badalich stated look out for SWC events.
- Singh stated he will wear the t-shirt every Tuesday and the submission is open on the 17th and as of 5 oclock they’ve had 12 submissions. Some of them were really good and some of them were great effort and the committee will decided that.
- Ramalho states that Bruin Republicans is at it again and as a council they should do something to do proactive and they had “cocoa and conflict” where they talked about Israel and Palestine conflict last year.
- Hall states she is down for it and as a council they should work on co sponsoring as USAC and hoping to have dialogue.
- Rogers states that on campus job fair is happening on Thursday from 11:30-3:00.
- Joanino asks for bios.

XII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet was passed around.

XIII. Adjournment

-Trumble moves to adjourn. Hall seconds.

Meeting adjourned at 3:24 AM.

XIV. Good and Welfare