

Finalized

Approved November 18, 2014

FINALIZED MINUTES  
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

Kerckhoff Hall 417

November 12, 2014

7:35 PM

PRESENT: Devin Murphy, Avinoam Baral, Conrad Contreras, Manjot Singh, Sofia Moreno Haq, Negeen Sadeghi-Movahed, Fabienne Roth, Allyson Bach, Greg Kalfayan, Cynthia Wong, Irmay Garcia, Carlos Quintanilla, Heather Rosen, Savannah Badalich, Cindy Wang

ABSENT:

GUESTS:

I. Call to Order

-Murphy calls the meeting to order at 7:35pm

II. A. Approval of the Agenda

-Singh moves to add Artsakh Awareness Week to the Special Presentations

-Quintanilla moves to strike Facilities Commission Report

-Garcia moves to strike CAC Mini Fund

-Badalich moves to strike SWC Fund

-Contreras moves to strike EVP Travel and Advocacy

-Bach moves to strike ASRF

-Contreras moves to create a New Business for discretionary for combating tuition increase as an action item

-Baral asks if the tuition increase discussion will be replaced by discretionary or is the discussion item remaining the same

-Murphy states the discussion item will remain and a separate item will

-Baral asks if you want to move it after tuition increase discussion

-Contreras moves it to as an action item after tuition increase discussion

-Badalich moves to approve the agenda

13-0-0 the agenda is approved

III. Approval of the Minutes from November 4, 2014

-Kalfayan stated that Fab, Heather, Manjot and Savannah were listed as absent and present and will be listed as absent.

-Badalich moves to approve the minutes. Contreras seconds.

13-0-0 the minutes are approved.

III. Public Comments

-Basically he truly believes the reason we're facing a tuition increase is because nobody is demanding a decrease. There wasn't even a demand for tuition freeze and its not surprising that Napolitano demands to increase. The whole country looks up to UC as a beacon light of hope for public education and you all are the hope of the UC. UC is the

only place that competes with ivy league for research and you will see the death of public education right here. Napolitano is the antichrist of public education and is bad news. We need to get rid of her and think about what its going to be in the next 20-30 years. Think about all the poor kids in bad neighborhoods, they wont get a chance at education. I also support divestment.

-Kateyana Hemsted transfer student just wanted to say that UCLA and the UC's transition will turn away a lot of transfer students because we cant afford it. A lot of us transfer students come from low socioeconomic backgrounds and my brother doesn't want to come because of the potential increase. It will affect diversity which we don't have and UCLA isn't that diverse anyways.

-Rick Montsumoto president of transfer student alliance and how the tuition increase will disproportionality affect transfer students, the most diverse student population. Please notice that transfer student population includes traditional, non traditional, military veterans, commuters, and parenting will find the increase in tuition far more detrimental. Theyre still important members of the community.

-Jeffrey Patters is a transfer student a year ago and saw the loans taking out and you don't feel the money burden until you leave. There were probably thousands of students before us fighting for the same thing and think about what youre going to do for the futures.

-Albert is a transfer and at his community college he used to pay \$46 for a class size of 50 students because students would be on the floor taking notes. He's sitting 150 students with around \$400 a unit and its insane. To say that we have to pay \$3,000 more plus whatever living expenses is completely insane. Of the four billion dollars it spends about 100 million for undergraduates. Whens the last time they've actually fixed the bathrooms or changed the permits in elevators, if you look at it it expired in July. Look at the centennial campaign and coming back we don't have enough money, are you kidding me?! Four billion goes to show that they'll get 500 million and tell you I'm sorry because I invested in all these companies and I have no money to give it to you and youll have to take out more loans. Those loans don't even go away because that's federal loans and whether you go bankrupt or not youll go screwed. As a representative body of 28,000 students you should be pissed. In Irvine theyre going to go nuts and we are going to go nuts. It's insane we should go nuts and we stormed Berkeley once and we can storm Berkeley again.

## V. Special Presentations

### A. Israel-Palestine Conflict Mediation Group -- Saeed Marandi and Aurelia Friedman

-Marandi is part of the olive tree initiative and a conflict resolution. They have a branch that focuses on Armenia and a branch that focuses on Israel Palestine. Aurelia and him wanted to speak to him about something extremelty important from an academic perspective and foster dialogue with student communities and Israelis and Palestinians. They lead simulations and faculty to come talk to students. As you know divestment coming before council and are suggesting that students have firm beliefs and concerned about intellectual honesty and using terms correctly that would marginalize students. Without further ado they came up with some buzzwords concocted that they've heard and continue to hear. He thanks them for letting them talk.

-Friedman will hand everyone each word and use in context on the campus. This will be a mini OTI meeting with randomly sorted words.

-Contreras has dialogue and when he thinks of dialogue he thinks about an educated discussion about what students. Dialogue is a talking point for many people in power and power structures as a way to delay social justice actions and to talk and not act on it.

-Haq had terrorist state and unfortunately anything affiliated with Islam as a religion

-Sadeghi-Mvahed had the term colonialism as something media doesn't like to portray as widely spread. Colonialism promotes cultural erasure and affects indigenous people as much as it affects that land. The way she heard colonialism last year was the impact of Western influences on that land.

-Rosen has imperialism she thinks about the manifest destiny basically the idea of America extending borders and force indigenous people out of America.

-Quintanilla has the word settlers and the way he heard was a group of people coming up to a place with low occupation and not occupied.

-Bach has Islamic terrorist and when Americans hear it they probably think 9/11 and they think extremists and any notion of reasons why we are at war.

-Wong had jihad it says it has two meanings. One to be the interspiritual struggle of the jihad and the outer struggle against Islam.

-Badalich has ISIS/ISIL/ISOL which wasn't brought up last year because it wasn't on media. It's the Islamic state of Iraq and Syria. Badalich states she doesn't have enough knowledge and hopes the first two aren't brought up because it has nothing to do with the situation.

-Kalfayan had ethnic cleansing and he thinks of religious mass murder to systematically eliminate an certain ethnic group and thinks of the Armenian genocide and a lot of different groups throughout history.

-Garcia had extremists and when she thinks extremists she thinks of a spectrum and further than a normal level of action.

-Singh got genocide and thinks of genocide denial for Armenian Genocide and Sikh genocide as well as intellectual genocide that is related to cultural genocide.

-Roth had Zionism/Zion and the idea that Zionism the belief of self determination and the word Nazi be conflated with WWII can't be taking anything out of the context. Zion is a legitimate view and shouldn't be used either especially as prerogative.

-Murphy has barbaric of less civilized less sophisticated

-Baral has Zionism is racism and how he heard it on campus. Zionism is the belief that Jewish has the right to self determination in homeland and doesn't think its controversial but some people do. How certain power structures are corrupted by some people how they cast dispersions on the state. For example the United Nations that met in the 1980s passed a resolution called Zionism is Racism and was overturned because it was pretty messed up to say the least.

-Marandi states that they will elaborate on these terms.

-Friedman states we should be aware of these terms and put them on public comment and these words affect a lot of communities and be cognizant.

-Marandi states the first one is Islamic terrorist and heard this a number of times as the pro-Israel or pro-Palestine. This phrase was the pro-Israel community as Palestinians. Although its true that Palestinians are those who engage in violence, this term was used to generalize Palestinian students and hurt a lot of Palestinian and Muslim and gives into

the conflation of islam and terrorism that has continued since 2001 as an event we'll never forget but we should forget the negative habits since then.

-The second term is jihad and this term is used so much and misunderstood and misused. It literally means a struggle. In Islam it means struggle and maybe its eating or snacking but maybe that's your personal jihad. He heard this used a lot and isn't just used as divestment its used on campus and stop misusing it. Its simple.

-Friedman stated ISIS says its been used by both pro-israel and pro-palestine about operation of protective edge and making a lude comparison and used ISIS to generalize Israel. Ethnic cleansing is used by pro-palestinian while talking about ethnic cleansing is incorrect.

-Marandi states the next word is extremists and is used a lot at divestment and is used by both communities and this is such a vague term and like to encourage that if you use it and use it with some sort of intellectual sustenance rather than being thrown out there without substance. The next term is genocide and used a lot and the past couple terms is misused by both Pro Israel and Pro Palestine and Gaza as a humanitarian crisis but using genocide as a term its not accurate. Hes not saying that you don't have freedom of speech but even with freedom of speech comes a responsibility. You cant shout fire in a crowded theater. Genocide is the systematic killing and raises the question of genocides that have happened throughout history with historical basis and has detrimental affects.

-Friedman states Zionazi,zios,zinosim is racism because her grandparents survived the holocaust and to equate the same thing that the Nazis put on is in inaccurate and extremely offensive.

-Friedman states barbaric is used to describe Palestinians and that's completely inaccurate and imperialism and colonialism shouldn't be used.

-Marandi heard barbaric a lot and used it mostly by the ProIsrael to describe the palestinians and calling them barbaric or civilizes is extremely disrespectful. People use settlers to talk about the conflict and thrown around as an insult and three teenagers in the west bank and lived in a settlement community and people refuse to acknowledge it and dehumanize them during a political party.

-Friedman stated the campus will appreciate if they send cognizant of social media. You can post anything after the fact and why you have the opinion but portray the campus community that youre open to everyones ideas.

-Murphy encourages them to work to the IVP and have these around the room and talk about language.

-Sadeghi-Movahed has a few comments and doesn't know if theyre going to do this presentation and would appreciate a trigger warning because talking about ISIS/terrorism and used against her really raised her stress levels and would appreciate a trigger warning. Secondly the explanation of the word extremism and often times as we stay extremism as it relates to islam it puts the burden on muslim individual to denounce them. Therefore conflating the two calling them islam extremists and a sect of a peaceful religion that is extreme and goes under that guise and going forward could be added into the presentation because herself from the past and having to constantly enounce ISIS has taken a toll on her and members of her community.

-Marandi thanks her for explaining it and it was succinct and its specifically why and the association of extremism and islam and palestines and people are completely forgetting that Palestinians are Christians.

-Badalich states as a council member who sat through the 9 hours and felt so helpless has at least of 6 pages worth of public comments and how do you stop pushing Israel into the ocean and make them out of fish food and anti-islamic comments? How do you manage that when you see a person actively insulting and seeing 3 people crying. How do you think we failed last year?

-Marandi says it might not be the most practical but his personal solution is calling them out and tell them what theyre saying is wrong. The issue with this is that people have such strong emotions and its unrealistic to expect those emotions and there needs to be an objective understanding and an educational element to knowing the history and knowing the conflict. When people understand whats going on theyre less likely to let their ego take over and throw out the words so seamlessly. Hes not interested in doing a plug but it comes down to a group as an educational as far as council. He doesn't know the powers and imagines that if he was a council member he'd get in there.

-Friedman stated this list being posted is a good compromise and say we are UCLA students and these are values whether it be true bruin or UCLA's core values that sound awesome. Friedman thanks everyone.

-Murphy states he loved the presentation and wants them to touch base with Baral.

#### B. Artsakh Awareness Week – UCLA Armenians Students Association

-Today they are presenting about artsakh, an independent de facto between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

-Artsakh is north of Iran and a state of ancient kingdom in Armenia from 189 BCE and 1261 CE. Ever since then the Armenian was under foreign domination for much of its history. The Russian empire took the region with Treaties of Gulistan in 1813 and Turkmenchay in 1828 following two Russo-Persian wars setting stage for Soviety crisis. Under pressure from Stalin, handed over Azerbaijan in 1924 with 94% Armenian population which lead to eventual war and liberation struggle in the waning years of the Soviet Union.

-In 1988 the people of Nagorno-Karabakh vote to unify with Armenia but were not able to do this and led to a struggle for self-determination. Instead of becoming a part of the stae of Armenia they wanted to become their own stte. Nagorno-Karbackh was backed by Armenian forces and the Republic of Azerbaijan backed by Turkey armed by Israel lasted about 6 years from 1988-1994. The result was Armenian military factory and establishedment of defacto independent Nagorno-Karabagh Republic. There was an ongoing blockade of Armenia by Turkey. In reality they were trying to have self determination.

-In 1994 there was a ceasefire facilitated by Russia and Nagorno-Karabakh Republic gained full control of its land, and is now a de facto independent state with its own governmet, military, and airport. The ceasefire violations continue to this day. Because of lack of leagal binding truth, theres been continuous violations.

-After the soviet union fell there was a fight fr self determination including Georgia and Moldova unrecognized by UN states. All three recognize NKR as independent and call it a "frozen conflct."

-Artsakh today has about 150,000 with 99.7% Armenian with own functioning government and president. It is not recognized by a lot of states but multiple US stated and cities have recognized it.

- They show a flag of Artsakh and shows the separation of Armenia.
- They show pictures of Artsakh today of a wedding and the world cup with 674 couples getting married the same day and each couple got a cow as a present.
- The current military and political situation and because the region hasn't been given sovereignty and self determination and during NATO training session in 2004 an Armenian tenant was axed to death was given a presidential pardon and festival. The ceasefire has been constantly violated since 1994 and Armenia villages are constantly kicked up and tortured. "Just as we have beaten the Armenians on the political and economic fronts, we are able to defeat them on the battlefield." Hes quoted saying that Zeri President on twitter that today unarmed Karaback defense army helicopter show down by Azerbaijan near the Karabakh-Azerbaijan Line of Contact and there are three deaths.
- For moving forward they've been given a lot of history and political dynamics. That being said, the Azeri president was quoted saying they've beaten Armenians economic and political fronts. Their entire campaign has been funded by selling oil to nations in region and United States. Its creating to destroy her people and the political front that certain neighboring countries have supported the regime to quote how democratic they were even though the same family has been in power for 30 years. This isn't an isolated incident. Rhetoric and systems of oppression seen all over the world. He finishes saying "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere" and huma nbeings have the moral imperative as the consequences.
- The first ever Artsakh Awareness Week (AAW) 2014 take place November 18- November 20. The first day is "What is Artsakh?" displayed in bruin plaza. The second day is "The Artsakh Liberation" and the third day on November 20 is "Artsakh today."
- The most popular monument in Artsakh translates to Grandma and Grandpa meaning we are mountains and symbolizes this is land and part of the land.
- Rosen asks if theres other universities that have put on a week
- She stated that this is her brain child
  
- Baral stated Jonas did email him and if you want to add a new special presentation for Israel-Palestine and can go with his IVP report.

## VI. Appointments

### A. Shawn Trabanino—Judicial Board

- Murphy states they have two appointments and first he'll have Baral read ARC recommendations.
- Baral stated that Trabanino had a 3-0-0 vote for ARC. The recommendation they had was to spend more time by the bylaws and refer the cases by name and have his definition of conflict of interest.
- Trabanino stated its great to see diversity and worked in superior court in DTLA and helped 750 litigants to obtain legal justice through the system of United States. He states he really thinks that his skills can travel over to what they want to accomplish and take conflicts of interest seriously and in the superior courts you cant be too involved with litigants and can break the law. Its abotbeing unbiased and impartial.
- Roth asks why do you think its important that theres a judicial board?

-Trabanino states we can look to the United States government with the supreme court. If there's a problem in the USAC bylaws and approve of people are able to do something about it.

-Trabanino states he's a fifth year and a mentor to minority students in Los Angeles and actively involved and would be a great opportunity to serve the USAC community.

-Badalich moves to approve Shawn Trabanino to judicial board. Baral seconds.

13-0-0 Shawn Trabanino is approved to judicial board.

#### B. Jason Schechter—Judicial Board

-Baral stated ARC had 3-0-0 vote and accurately express bylaws of USAC and further investigate relevant jboard case and review conflict of interest.

-Schechter thanks council to be on judicial board as a justice. He believes that his qualifications speak for himself. He is currently a law clerk on the judicial board for the last 6 months. His capacities and duties with this position is to compile evidence and witness lists, write minutes for all of hearing and meetings, and edit the opinions written by justices. He's attended two different hearings. He's a member of UCLA's only pre-law fraternity and educated him on trial format, Roberts rules, and objections that are all relevant to being a justice on judicial board. His desire to be a justice stems a lot from the fact that he's on a judicial board as a law clerk and was able to witness the responsibilities justices have the way they help the council. He wants to assure the judicial process of this student government and makes sure the constitution and by laws are strictly adhered to.

-Wong asks what can he approve about judicial board

-Schechter states he'll start about accountability. Everyone on the judicial board should be accountable and some of the justices who are no longer on the board did not have as much accountability in terms of going to meetings in making sure they were active participants in decisions and hearings. It's imperative that every justice is an active participant and hold other justices accountable and meet more regularly to best serve the student body.

-Schechter reiterates that he's very experienced after being a law clerk and he's so excited to be on this board to hopefully hear some important cases and make sure that every student interest is being represented fairly and justly through the judicial branch which is an imperative branch and he's so happy he might be able to be part of this branch of government and be an active participant in the school and student body.

-Wong moves to approve Jason Schechter for Judicial Board. Badalich seconds.

13-0-0 Jason Schechter is approved for judicial board.

### VII. Officer and Member Report

#### A. President – Devin Murphy

-Murphy stated that he had a meeting with Napolitano and talk about the tuition increase and how the lack of funding specifically the next year and the questions will be answered in discussion. The GSAC president and him needed to have a vocal advocate for the undergraduate and graduate student body. The proposal that 5% increases for graduate and undergraduate and some of the PTSD programs up to 20%. He was honored on Saturday to be honored by the Black Alumni Association as a role as a proud queer African American president. He met with the director of the UCLA career center and

don't often go to the career center and encourages everyone to go. He has a lot of great ideas to some general representatives of post graduate success. He wanted to remind everyone that November 21<sup>st</sup> on Friday at 8AM they're having breakfast with the chancellor and invites everyone about the disappointment to hold them accountable. Today he met with Wong and Tiana to talk about the facing project presented last week to talk about access and higher education and break down the stories as Bruins. He met with Vice Chancellor Janina Montero and Freedom Riders Council did a memorialization of UCLA Freedom Riders of students across the nation to making statements. This plaque is so beautiful in the council room but doesn't do justice to commemorate individuals. He was working with chancellors and vice chancellors Freedom Riders commemoration on February 6<sup>th</sup> at 9AM.

#### B. Internal President – Avinoam Baral

-Baral yields to Jonas

-Jonas wanted to talk about how we as a campus have been handling divestment because of the polarizing affect of the student body. This doesn't say he doesn't support some form of divestment. The problem he thinks that the divestment should be pursuing that Palestinian students have to be complicit in efforts of own people or engaging in higher education and that is a compromise someone shouldn't have to take. This shouldn't polarize any Jewish people. He wants to talk about what's wrong with the current divestment bill and possible solutions. Two things that strike him with the current resolution is that it condemns Israel and what it does to council members and you all will be making a judgement against Israel and he doesn't think it's appropriate for a council to make a judgement against Israel. However the Palestinians are in an unacceptable position. He's a member of the Jewish community and their primary concern is that divestment is not the end of condemnation of Israel on campus. Whether or not there is intent from some of these people to continue BDS this issue needs to be seriously addressed. There needs to be a iteration of divestment that prohibits the use of University as a tool against Israel and not denounce Israel but make it as neutral on the conflict possible. There is a crucial point of arguing and there has to be a concrete definition. People in the communities affected do not understand the other and he's pretty unhappy with it. We have not fostered a space where people feel comfortable discussing their opinions or controversial opinions. He went to the SJP townhall and felt comfortable, but there were some people from the Jewish community there wasn't an effective effort even if it was genuine. His solution is that the divestment resolution should be tabled for definite time and implement student led workshops with leaders and if you get everyone in a room it will turn into a giant yelling match. There should be workshops as cross engagement and safe place to promote the concepts of multiple valid and conflicting perspectives. It's not the case that either the Israeli or Palestinian cause is right and not the other, both sides have good reasons and bad reasons. Right now they have a lot of hating of the person rather than opinion or perspective. We want it to be over, and we owe it to ourselves and the students behind us to handle it appropriately. Only after mutual understanding should we concern and be sit on the table. He would love to hear comments, questions, and concerns.



-Garcia agrees that townhall did a good job bringing people together and how many people showed up from certain communities is on the communities itself to put in their opinions. What part of the resolution of bare bones did you feel ostracized?

-Jonas states that most Jews on campus didn't feel comfortable going and some SJP don't feel comfortable going to BFI. It was a sincere effort, but at the end of the day it wasn't effective. This is clearly about human rights and doesn't condone Israel's actions against human rights, but in the sake of resolution not condemning Israel it shouldn't say Israel isn't doing bad things. The bill can stand even on the bold assumption that Israel was in the right but doesn't think there's a point to exasperate the situation by condemning Israel. The Jewish community is sensitive to criticism to Israel and is the most criticized country. For example if you've heard about the rising tensions in Jerusalem, or Gazans of displaced the Egypt. The point being that if one Palestinian is killed by an Israeli it is covered but if an Egyptian kills a Palestinian it's not aired. A lot of Jews are extremely critical of Israel too.

-Sadeghi-Movahed thanks him for coming and appreciates his efforts to going to the townhall. Her only concern is that her interpretation of the resolution is that the resolution doesn't condemn Israel but rather the corporations. This is the distinction of companies that are profiting versus the Israel state. From the current resolution, where's the distinction and that piece that could be changed. As council members we have the ability to amend and pick it out and analyze it.

-Jonas stated that considering those companies are hired by Israel and he doesn't have a concrete answer but the purpose of listening to the others perspective is that is the only way we can appropriately handle Palestinian concerns and Jewish concerns. He can't give a solution on how the resolution ought to work because no one has done adequate listening to other perspective. It's a good question.

-Baral states he'll present on week 8 all the cool things his office has been working on because they all don't know enough about each other.

### C. External Vice President Report – Conrad Contreras

-Contreras stated he met with Chancellor Block to talk about the joint statement about the tuition increase and talked about how students and public reception don't agree with tuition increase. It was very straight forward and he didn't answer and asked him a second time. He asked if he would be willing to rescind his report on the tuition joint statement and his answer was no. They want to think of other ways to combat tuition increase and look at targets in terms of combatting it. From November 7-9 the EVP office brought 90 delegates and had a press conference on Saturday lunch time to rally everyone on tuition policy and the lack of transparency on how it uses students as political pawns. They had workshops led by UCLA students such as Badalich and Murphy. UCLA always represents at the conferences talking about the campaigns. At the board meeting they decided they were against the tuition increase and made plans on how to mobilize as a statewide action to amplify collective voices. He will respond to public comment and are changing the messaging and will be talking about how this tuition policy should not be voted on. They have 5,000 signatures and hopefully it increases next week. In regards to IGNITE they talked about access in retention and diversity and SCA5 was pulled out and their reasoning was there wasn't a lot of support. He stated that a lot of organizations will be working on it and organize around the issue. That meeting was an organizing

space as students. Thirdly has been meeting with a few organizations such as TransUp, Queer Alliance, and Samahang Pilipino to talk about Jennifer Laude murder as an issue for the next coming weeks. They've worked with IVP and bring those community based organizations at Spring Activities fair.

#### D. General Representative 1

-Singh states on November 6 they had a photoshop workshop and will have some on November 13 and November 20 on the third floor in Powell. They also have a linkedin workshop during week 8 and social justice community mixer on November 26 in the Global Viewpoint Lounge to bring together various communities to set the stage of solidarity. They are working with AAP to talk about cap and gown and are now at 35. He wanted to give a shout out to Syracuse University and on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of sit-in on lack of diversity policies.

#### E. Academic Affairs Commissioner

-Bach states they're working with GenRep1 with research opportunities and preprofessional organizations as well as the career center. It's a great opportunity for students and a collaboration. Her diversity requirement is drafting a report for the council in 8<sup>th</sup> week as a resolution to support the diversity requirement. Its moving to the legislative assembly have proposed a debate and discuss ways to approach the opposition in the bureaucratic process.

#### F. Student Wellness Commission

-Badalich thanks Baral for talking about Circle of 6. This upcoming week there is an end the stigma week about toxic masculinity about the dangers of masculinity with 6 different speakers they were told by men and women on all spectrum to man-up and saw some of her staff members be vulnerable. Tomorrow in Southbay room they are putting on Frozen and a whole analogy with mental illness. The directors made it to represent mental illness and shame and stigma. Next week they have an event on Wednesday called Don't Ask Don't Tell in Ackerman Grandballroom operation MEND talking about sexual violence in the military and mental ramifications in one setting such as PTSD from a veterans perspective. She invites everyone to be reached out the photo campaign. When she went to SOCC she presented a UConsent toolkit and has everything you could ever want for helping sexual assault survivors. Actually UCSD started their UConsent campaign and had the itsonus event. Tomorrow she'll be going to the task force through some recommendations and advocates office. Lastly, she states theres a new typeface that helps dyslexic students read.

#### G. Transfer Student Representative

-Saedghi-Movahed said shes in interviews and every applicant that comes in is so humbling. In terms of platforms shes working on an initiative with UC Berkeley to meet with her for this project that involves commuter students over 40 miles from campus through a charter system. She also went to SOCC this weekend and taught a workshop on iran sanction for the southwest Asian and north African middle eastern space. They talked about access rates of SWANA community and rates admitted to university. Although they're considered model minority its exemplified through the executive board

of transfer students and shows there's a direct problem and resources provided to other communities. They will obtain information about admission rates and work around these numbers and help with access rates.

#### H. Administrative Report

-Sheryl states if there interested in being RAs applications are available and due at orientation to see the dates.

-Murphy asks about programming coordinator position

-Sheryl states they will be coming out soon

#### VIII. Funding Allocations

##### A. Contingency Programming

-Wang stated \$12,5,06.06 required and \$2,7040 recommended. \$53,036.75 left in contingency.

-Bach moves to approve contingency. Wong seconds.

13-0-0 contingency is approved.

#### IX. Old Business

-Badalich moves to have a 5 minute recess at 9:39pm. Wong seconds.

#### X. New Business

##### A. Tuition Increase Discussion

-Contreras stated that there's a lot of students that talked about tuition increase and we should all be angry.

-Murphy stated that there was an idea that tuition was constantly increasing and out of the USAC Office of the President was to ask how to have a funding mechanism in the state of California really advocate for affordability. In the council of president space and as a UCLA USAC president we are the most vocal. One of the first thing he mentioned was that if she were to interest tuition or come in November we would want to be consulted prior to her proposing it. He got an email last week that in the next 48 hours he has to go to Oakland to meet with the UC President. He headed to Oakland to meet with her with UCSA executive and President Napolitano. Napolitano said she would notify us that they would be increasing a 5% increase over the next 5 years. We already knew what the conversation is going to be about and it wasn't a surprise. The surprise was that the tuition policy plan is something she's proposing in November. It's not a tuition increase, it's a tuition plan. To every year for the next 5 years they'll have a 5% increase which with inflation is 25.7%. Typically when tuition increased in the past they would do it for a year but this year President Napolitano stated she wanted to do something sustainable in her eyes in efforts to not surprise folks on what's going to happen in next couple years. Murphy states he gives her credit for being strategic for long term vision but step back and say that this decision was lack of consultation with students and is affecting only students. There's two issues, we should never support an increase in tuition that based on the California master plan they should not be spending any money. The second issue is the shared governance system that we pride ourselves on. Our system is adamant on shared governance of different stakeholders participating such as having a student regent

and faculty and alumni involved. To develop a plan and then have no options or alternatives is essentially a disrespect to students and power they have historically and the understanding of this to students. She clearly stated in the meeting that student wouldn't be supportive of tuition increase and lacked the ability of understanding on why its wrong to propose the plan in such a short time frame. Theyre seeing a tuition increase and lack of shared governance that started with student regents collection.

-Contreras stated that student designate regent Avi Oved about a talk of potential tuition increase. As UCSA board of directors they want to be proactive and launched an online tuition campaign as a fee rollback because studnets don't just want a tutition increase but also a rollback. Hes been meeting with regents and figure out if tuition increase will happen. Every month they told them they don't know and its really up to Napolitano. It wasn't until last week they found out. They met with UCSA board of directors and talked about action. They are going to talk about specific targets and don't want to take away from each of the targets and is welcome to talk to council members and DailyBruin but doesn't want to give too much details. As UCSA board they decided that they are not siding with legislators but aren't siding with UC Office of President. The root of the issue is state funding. In order to get the funding UCOP should use student as political pawns for increasing funding. He has some connections with legislators and knows students are struggling and any sort of lack of funding they give to UC there will be a tuition increase. If you look at the California budget the UC has received gradual increase in funding in addition to surplus. Theyre not seeing a deficit, its actually a surplus. Its making sure that surplus is invested in higher education and cant think that its just going to receive funding from the governor, for the UC from the state. Our long term goal as students is to increase state funding for the UC. We have a lot of planning in 2015 and wanted to focus on something short term right now like the UC tuition and are really angry at UCOP because that's ugent. They all decided to have a statewide day of action with every UC doing something on November 18, and depend on EVP of campus and coalition. He knows that there are several and are clear in terms of the target and next meetings to prepare for the urgency.

-Murphy asks if everyone is on the same page, and both of these issues for logistics and set up are incredibly important.

-Roth states that we're being vague about the November 18<sup>th</sup> its super important to show up and some of us have the privilege of our parents helping us or minimal loans and truth is majority of students here are on financial aid or loans or scholarships. IT doesn't matter if you can afford to attend because you represent the students. It would be really disappointing to see not all council members because \$4,000 is a ridiculous amount of money.

-Murphy asks if theres any relevant questions on tuition increases

-Bach asks what were the reasons given from Napolitano or regents for tuition increase

-Contreras stated essentially theyre not receiving enough funding from the state and raise tuition.

-Bach asks why is it 5% how did they determine those numbers

-Murphy stated during her meeting she decided she was going to state it without papers so they waited. While the state has been increasing it slowly and those small incements aren't effective enough to keep up with costs they took from 10 years ago. The 5% tuition increase isn't met to give you more service, and its meeting what we haven't met in the

past couple years and a set precedence as net cost going up. There's specific numbers they can send. We can't be narrow minded in addressing the target, it's not just the UC Presidents faults, not just the regents, not just the students. We have to figure out these targets to effectively challenge the notion it's one individual's fault. With shared governance, it becomes everyone's fault.

-Rosen asks about transparency and the timeline of tuition increase.

-Murphy says in the past there's no set procedure for tuition increase. However UCSA stated in a bill there has to be formal process for tuition increase. The UC OP stated there may be a tuition increase but there was no confirmation or no specific percentage and have been meeting with students about tuition increase. To her, she sees that as transparency because she talked about it with UCOP. There's a loophole there because she's identifying normal conversations and talking about tuition increase and how it will go about the process.

-Contreras stated the way it was proposed was disrespectful. Four months ago they talk about raising chancellor salary and then proposing tuition increase. They're using student as political pawns and he's not okay with the disrespect.

-Sadeghi-Movahed stated the percent of increase how for undergraduates there's a 181% increase in 2001 until 2014 for resident students. It nearly doubled for nonresident and international students with 88%. Graduate students face a 146% and 47% increase international. She feels that UC was founded on affordability, diversity and quality and are obliterating it with tuition increase. We have to think about students who won't access higher education and won't get to see what being a UC is like. Her brother wants to go to a UC and she wants to go to grad school. This is not only an issue but humanizing it and every student at this campus from now until people who come after us will have to deal with and look at what Contreras said.

-Contreras said a talking point is that it's okay they'll raise tuition because it stabilizes anyways. To him that's problematic because a comment says that tuition increases for next 5 years so my family can plan for it. This is a problematic statement because not everyone has the privilege to plan for it. The fact they'll be effective and help students because it's stabilized and it shouldn't be appropriate to increase UC spending.

-Contreras yields to Todd from Student Coalition Against Labor Exploitation

-Todd states the main issue they have to look beyond is tuition because he personally believes it's about the university privatization that causes changing of reconstruction of university and instead of public university becomes a business model and actively sees the university as a business and students as consumers rather than an area in which students come together for education. It allows faculty to produce knowledge without being restricted. You see that between 1993 and 2014 tenured faculty increased only 13% but senior administration grew by 300% and non tenured by 114%. They are hiring adjunct faculty and instead of having expenditures to go to productive means for students for faculty, it's going to paychecks bloated administration. If you look at tuition cuts and raise tuition in 2009 and 2011 you'll see the administration at the school grew with more senior administration. He sees that the tuition increases and then stabilizes, increases and then stabilizes. Students have organized against the UC regents and caused the regents to have a tuition freeze. In the net gain, the student activists won. We might get a tuition freeze but a couple years later they're just going to increase tuition again. If we don't think with the actual issue, university privatization, we have lost the

students. We have to collaborate with faculty and unions, ASFME, UAW and everyone at stake with workers and faculty is a major problem. They see university as a means to an end. It's a nationwide problem and realizes the problems are the expenditure and our tuition is paying for construction and interest rates on how university is paying back. It's a bigger issue that must be addressed and take a stand on one large issue. He truly believes in a public education and really wants to work with everyone. His group SCALE is having a teach in next Wednesday about university privatization.

-Singh asks if any board of UC Regents have any background in education

-Contreras stated they're usually hired by governor and it's whoever donates the most. So, no.

-Murphy stated ironically they are regents who are supposed to ensure fiscal responsibilities are on point.

-Badalich states that she wants to go to grad school and her brother is going to the UC. She's going to support anything council wants to do and knowing the regents from task force and even though they implemented it they've been holding off on giving the exact number. It is very shady. They are using students as pawns in a game of chess.

-Baral states he doesn't know about organizing for these kinds of things and is excited to be out there for a great proposal and what he can do from his standpoint to encourage friends and offices and networks to sign the petition and attend the rally on the 18<sup>th</sup> and try to sign up the regents.

-Contreras wants this discussion what do you think your office or councilmembers can do. Next week on Monday they want to have a teach in to inform students on what's going to happen. On Wednesday they're sending a delegate of students to UCSF.

-Baral stated quite frankly we've been really lucky and came in as freshmen and last year of tuition increase and have had tuition freedom. We've been lucky our tuition has remained stable and absolutely unacceptable to be raised more and used as pawns and is looking forward to supporting it.

-Roth states if you have listserves or student groups and the easiest way to get information out. As an international student and told her mom today and doesn't think she could afford to come here in 5 times. There are some international students it might not affect them but generally a lot that reached to her office that don't know how to do. International and out of state pay over double and if we stop coming tuition is going to go up even more, and it's an issue for everyone.

-Saedghi-Movahed stated that everyone who came to speak on public comment was a transfer and attests the fact that transfer students will roll out. If the tuition is increasing and money for financial aid is increasing that's counter intuitive.

-Murphy stated our university works on high fee and high problem. As we increase in fees 30-33% go back to financial aid for students. As we increase in tuition we increase more financial aid. It's odd because you're doing the same thing in opposite ways. When we pass a referendum whether we vote on it or imposed on it, 30% go back to financial aid and dispersed on a UC wide level.

-Rosen stated as FSC increasing tuition is everything against her office would do and want to help students. By increasing tuition by 5% it's unacceptable and will love to help anyway they can. She was looking at the letter the chancellors put together and one of the reasons they proposed the increase because California's economy is back on track.

Which is not. The unemployment level is still higher and affects a lot of homes and how can you expect students to pay for these.

-Bach thanks Badalich, Contreras, and Murphy for putting the rally. They have academic inequity awareness week in spring but clearly academic inequity is happening right now and will want to help.

-Contreras stated they need a venue for the teach-in and says Rosen and Bach can help with coprogramming this. They have the materials and presentation and need help in terms of outreach.

#### B. Discretionary Funding for Action

-Contreras stated to put on an action and go to UCSF is really expensive. He can promise that the money spent will be going towards effective delegation, teach in, and action. He's asking for \$1,5000 just to ensure transportation and materials for the action. He can't give details and line by line breakdown because its an urgent matter.

-Badalich asks how much has been allocated out of discretionary.

-Wang states the computer was \$400 so we have about \$4,200.

-Badalich states its totally reasonable

-Murphy asks is there an approximate number of people youd like to see go there

-Contreras stted they essentially want to bring a bus of 45-55 students. Tomorrow theyre launching a facebook event and singing up to be a delegate to go to regents about vans or buses. A lot of students are reaching out to him and go. The action will be really cool and needs to know demand and a bus can cost up to \$800-\$1000.

-Murphy states theres a large base of movement of alumni who are adamant about going through tuition increase. Alumni donate so much to UC system and see alumni in opposition is actually a hit to the plan. Theres a lot of alumni who will actually travel to UCSF meeting, its huge. This could be as big as 32% in tuition increase.

-Contreras stated any money left would be used for Fund the UC its for any initiatives.

-Baral asks what is the current Fund the UC budget.

-Contreras stated his budgets dividied in terms of conferences and there are programming and supplies funds that hes allocated. He doesn't have a specific line item just for fund the UC it comes from different budgets.

-Wong asks if the trip could be covered by the Travel and Advocacy grant in his office

-Contreras stated yes it can but students do apply to the grant but doesn't want to take it which is low relative to student demand.

-Rosen asks how many students

-Contreras states that about 20-30 students, and the bus would probably cost around \$900-\$1000. This is for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. The rest would be used for materials

-Bach asks what materials does he want to purpose

-Contreras stated like sign and tape and may want to get more megaphones and are reaching out to organizations. The most important thing is shirts not enough FundtheUC to be used for this action and the future.

-Bach asked if the teach in would use the funds. Also, is it in terms of paying for the venue?

-Contreras stated he wouldn't want to pay but hes talked to OCHC

-Singh asks when will students leave

-Contreras stated he wants students there at 6AM and students will have to leave midnight Tuesday going into Wednesday. Students will come back at UCLA around Wednesday night time.

-Badalich moves to approve \$1,500 from the discretionary for organizing against tuition increase. Singh seconds.

13-0-0 \$1,500 from discretionary is allocated to External Vice Presidents office

-Contreras thanks council and promises to be transparent and give a break down

### C.Logistics Meeting for Divestment Meeting

-Murphy stated there will only be undergraduate members speaking, those undergraduate members will be filling out a sign up sheet, there will be 30 pro speakers and 30 con speakers distributed through his office, the time limit will be 2 hours and AGB should be open and security and crowd control with only people with bruincards will be allowed in. Lastly in terms it will only be UCLA student media outlets and there will be no audio or video on public commenters.

-Sadeghi-Movahed wanted to express a concern of 30 for and 30 against. It erases the narratives of those who are not completely for or against and in order to not erase those narratives and instead of making a cut off time for those who enter the room and stop sign ups and allow for those students to make a comment. Shes open to a different take or different ways to go about it. She doesn't feel necessarily comfortable with tow lists because it allows for students and take a spot.

-Murphy states its 10:45pm if you have a constructive criticism make sure you have a recommendation in your comment.

-Sadeghi-Movahed stated rather than having two lists its better to have a cut off time at 8:30pm.

-Roth agrees and states that's enough people to be able to speak. On one side there is one community that wants to speak against and on the other side theres a coalition. The ability to just sign up on lists might impair students for those who choose their own and enable others to sign up and so thinks there should be a cutoff time with people having to stand in line and maybe distribute wristbands and if you don't have it by 7:30/8. As much possible representation without it going to 9 or 10 hours it would be good.

-Murphy states only people with enter with bruincard and those in line by x amount of time.

-Roth states 8 oclock.

-Zimmerman states because we want to have bruincard only to be able to enter, we'll be wristbandning people and you can choose how you want to have it. She had an idea of public comment check in table and receive wristband number 2 and we can choose how many wristbands total or as many as can grab a wristband. We can get a lot of people in the venue within an hours time. She plans to do 2 wristbanding to clarify.

-Badalich states in theory she wants to hear from as many students as possible and once you go thorough hour nine you don't want to be at the table with the secret ballot haphazardly and straw votes haphazardly. In theory we want to hear a smany students bu in practice it ruins the voice. She firmly believes limited wristbands in limits with 2 hours. After hearing the editorials point of view, since we are a government body and the public come in with tension in the room, technically every tax payer deserves to be in that



room. She agrees with editorial, allow anyone in, eliminate 60 public commenters, distribution of wristbands, and limit it 2 hours.

-Murphy wanted to clarify that one of the ideas is that the tax payers are undergraduate students, we are not the regents. While people are paying taxes, we aren't accountable to the state of California we're accountable to tax payers of the undergraduate student body.

-Badalich stated she knows that a lot parents pay one way or another about the specific resolution and will think about it.

-Wong states firstly shes completely for limiting the public comment to 2 hours because that's a long enough time beyond 2 hours doesn't know how productive it would be. She states the reason we proposed the two groups to allow two groups on somewhat equal level. She thinks that wristbanding can get chaotic day of. She doesn't know what will happen with open public comment completely because she wants students to feel safe and not pressured. She advocates for some sort of sign up and some sort of balance in the conversation. She thiks she can limit who can attend this council meeting. Her primary concern is that she doesn't want students to feel not safe. If external entities make students feel unsafe and not voice their opinion then its not okay.

-Murphy states that bruincard is a safety concern and the perception why bruincard holders were the ones being able to go into the room because they wanted to maintain safety.

-Wongs recommendation is cutting off public comment in 2 hours.

-Murphy states this is an important resolution and its not different from any typical council meeting. Public comment is a space not just for this resolution,

-Contreras stated that they wanted to hold the same standards to what if the UC regents would limited. He agrees it has to be shorter than 9 hours. We have to find a solution to have access to be able to talk and even cutting up time will let anyone off at 7:30pm. Last year people were calling folks at 1Am or 2AM. If we say if you aren't here by a specific time you cannot speak for public comment. His recommendation is if we want to make it shorter we should cut off time to allow people to come until 7:30 they wont speak for public comment. When you do a quota system and in terms of sing up theres a lot of accessibility on how to do sign up and how are they going to do with the internet. Hes thinking and seeing at someone who is angry at UC Regents how would they feel.

-Murphy stated Sadeghi-Movahed wanted to cut up at 8:30pm. Is anyone opposed strongly opposed to the plan as is.

-Individuals raised their hand.

-Baral suggests that the 2 hour public comment is good and have one hour of selective public comment and ask SJP for 15 undergraduates and BFI give us 15 undergraduates. For the second hour we can do some sort of wristband situation and have 30 people. Lastly we can distribute that resolution common feature to our network they can do so and read peoples comments.

-Murphy stated theres a one hour of selected public comment with 2 groups of 15 pro speakers and 15 con speakers and then an open one hour that would essentially be wristbanding. Is there anyone as opposition?

-Roth states that stop thinking about this as time but as people. She stands by that she doesn't think they'll be able to organize who would be allowed to and be like your story is a little more valuable and these are people wanting to share their stories and its our job and sorry if its not what we want to be doing but it is our duty. Theres a huge discrepancy

between 9 hours to 2 hours. There's a good middle ground and she had to leave personally but she wants a council member, she stands by the cut off and stands by wristbands, she stands by having BruinCard because people were painted in bad light by people that aren't in the same school. Maybe we can open to being a press pass

-Murphy states those in opposition of closing public comment at 7:30pm

-Individuals are against opposition

-Singh thanks the middle ground would be limiting it at 7:30 or 8pm because we are limited the time but it's not limiting in the sense on who people because limiting to 2 hours limits the stories.

-Garcia states we forgot to reiterate having the 2 presentations in beginning. When it comes to lines there may be people still in line. It needs to be online because of commuters can't make it. They will have a ton of issues having in person cutting off because there will be a ton of people waiting in line to be cut off. She prefers online and doesn't know the compromise about people who don't feel passionate. She sees how lines work out and it's going to cause more chaos than it will add to the discussion. She recommends online and open to adding but still believes to stick to current plan is is.

-Kalfayan states when you have the line day of it turns into a logistical nightmare. People line up early and saying cut offs then lines at 5:30 will form with hundreds of students. He sees this as black and white either you let an unlimited line people do public comment or draw the lines. He agrees the bylaws 30 minutes but believes the cut off is 2 hours and let people.

-Badalich states she agrees with Roth and we were ready but we were disappointment during that. There are so many things to do differently and this is her chance and the students didn't like the fact that didn't say anything. It wasn't a conversation it wasn't a discussion. She understands the theory but the practice ended up hurting students. There were so many students that were angry. There will never be a perfect solution and agrees it should be 2 hours or even 3 hours but it will end up having a line beforehand to get into that conversation around Kerkhoff. If something comes up at 7:30 or 8 as a cut off she will vote against it.

-Rosen stated it's an issue of safety as with Hilary Clinton. She thinks online reservation is a good idea. She's willing to listen and send an email and reach out in student groups so students could have better preparations. Perhaps we can even do a flux list of people with yes or no. Rosen is open to have a middle ground for something who doesn't.

-Sadeghi-Movahed said she wants everyone to have an ample chance to speak. She stated the solution in the flux list and people who didn't. She really thinks public comment is important to use who speaks on behalf of what and to expedite that process and to integrate it would be extremely impactful. She would be okay with 2 hours upon the stipulation that everyone's diverse public comments. She's struggling with balance and open Pandora's box of other issues. Concretely she's willing to compromise on 2 hours of public comment and wants diversity of opinions.

-Murphy states they will not do selective public comment and doesn't want it.

-Moreno-Haq asks what's the reason why is it only 2 hours? She has had so much backlash on both sides so even if I want to comment why can't I make the list. We sit here because we are elected to be here, we are paid to be here and if all these students want to do is listen. She doesn't care if you ran against someone we represent students at this university we need to listen to them and we should acknowledge them.

-Baral states he simply doesn't agree. Its supposed to be 30 minutes and its not productive. Its our council they get to decide how they want to run their council. He thinks this idea of having 2 hours of public comment and sending out 15 and 15 preselected public comment and that's not a public comment, but even in the senate they have selected public comments. As the internal vice president and hes here to represent undergraduate students and if youre that invested you can watch it on USAC live. We are not a governmental body, we are a large electoral board to a nonprofit organization. At the end of the day we get a chance to frame how we want this meeting. We saw what happened last year and to say we don't want to change anything it seems ridiculous. Last week it seemed like we were on a good point. He proposes an hour of pre selected comments of 15/15 and hour of anyone who wants public comments and 30 minutes of it not surrounding agenda items. He thinks bruincards should be requires.

-Murphy asks if theres questions.

-Garcia asks if we can do the 30 minutes public comment not regarding the resolution, 1 hour of pre selected 15 pro/15 con and 1 hour of anyone who wants to speak of anyone who wants to speak.

-Wong states the second hour of public comment and is really concerned about wristbanding. If anything you know about lines is that it gets super chaotic. She advocates for doing things online. Theyre trying to learn from what happened from last year and theres no way to make everyone happy. They want to put some sort of structure to be productive. Shes still in full of support of the 2.5 hour public comment and is opposed to wristbanding.

-Rosen asks about the one hour proposed pre-selected do we ofer it to determine student groups

-Baral stated they would email SJP and email BFI you both have 15 people please send us this list on any time.

-Murphy doesn't agree with this plan and the perception is that theyre silencing and quieting people. He appreciates the solution based plan and hear selective public comment is so counter intuitive. He understands what big lines are and all have specific events and this plan is not going to fly. This honestly has to be something as people who are sharing their stories. Often times we talk about divestment and its controversial and forget people are sharing their stories. He'd be damned if someone says he couldn't make a comment. We have to find a new solution.

-Zimmerman stated instead of creating a timeline for public comment is having an end time of the meeting. The meeting will not go back x time and if that time means we have to table it and give us a fresh view and not being exhausted to have an important discussion. If the student body x amount of hours and we cant get to that point at that end time we haven't gotten a chance to look and come back the next week as another way of looking at it and confine the public comment but much rather confine the deadline of the meeting.

-Baral states he doesn't agree and in an era of such technological ability and work on an online system and doesn't want to limit student voices. He's still in support of having a 2 hour limit and regarding a three week long divestment talk, we've already spent 3 weeks talking about divestment. We're talking about talking about talking about talking about divestment over tuition and we need to get this over with and is still in support of the problem.

-Roth states shes disappointed keen for 2 hours and technically sat on the end of that and sat through it but thinks that everyones so set of 2 hours. We literally have meetings for regular stuff gone on until 12. She believes in compromise, but if we're going to talk about people voicing and no ones posting about USAC live and no one comes to meeting, we're terrible at advertising. She thinks people could have coalitions and strongly publicize where they can put own suggestion.

-Garcia stated we need to maintain solution oriented and want to make sure we make the right decisions and think we need to balance it.

-Kalfayan stated you either let everyone speak or draw the line somewhere. We all agree that we don't want 9 hours again and as long as it takes itll be another 9 hours. We should place a limit on it. We have a bylaw for that reason and its not productive for anyone. Any arbitrary number youre still limiting student voices. How many more arguments can you make out of that?

-Murphy states the medium ground is that we're figuring out a time to cut off public comment and the wristband will be difficult.

-Rosen states we're assuming that public comment will be cut off, we shouldn't select individuals, we have a sign up list beforehand and you can put vote yes, no, or I don't know. It's whoever signs up first. Its not preselected its just that you sign up.

-Murphy states shes adding the I don't know part is added. Is anyone in opposition

-Council members are in opposition

-Murphy states theres opposition time

-Roth asks if it would be one hour straight of yes, no, or intermingled

-Murphy states it could be three lines

-Singh states he doesn't understand why it doesn't have to be separated. He doesn't think there should be a distinction about yes, no, or maybe.

-Murphy states pre-signed up for 90 individuals plus 30 minutes of open public comment

-Baral states that he liked the idea of the line because it prevents students from playing games or strategic battle and the second part and see extremely computer science from one side or another side to sign up in advanced to be earlier rather than later.

-Garcia asks are we still going to online set up

-Singh just thinks people will sign up and do first come and first serve

-Murphy stated it could be one sided but its not an experiment, its an opportunity of first come and first serve. The goal of having a set number of folk or flux would be so its represented of the student body and equal voice.

-Singh asks what if there aren't the set number but has no solution.

-Murphy states that its not an action items, it's a discussion item.

-Kalfayan states maybe we should discuss the press issue and then move on.

-Badalich agrees with you that people can watch public comment and certain stake holders. Last year she had a huge issue of someone coming as an intimidation tactic and doesn't feel comfortable limiting press. She thinks they should still have press passes. She sees it going really bad. She wants all press.

-Murphy states theres no consensus, what if his office just does it

-Baral asks would it be okay to take a vote on this as an issue of what our stance is on council and we can have a second.

-Roth states he trusts the power of president but more agree on a more solid plan

-Murphy states at this point we can do it in a vote

- Badalich states we can do it in chunks.
- Baral moves to recommend to the USAC president that we hold a 30 minute public comment on non-agenda items, three hours of total public comment, one hour to those who support, one hour who reject, and one hour who consider those in flux all by online sign in sheet well in advanced. Rosen seconds.
- Murphy reiterates 3.5 hour public comment.
- 8-5-0 so that recommendation is approved.
- Garcia stated last week she was against press, but we will have to have a briefing meeting we have to make sure its important to incorporate press on the same page on what they can and cannot do on how they approach situations to calm the students and her recommendation is open press and security briefing.
- Sadeghi-Movahed asks who determines and how does it go through getting a press pass
- Zimmerman stated they have to show a press pass issued by the city pass police lines.
- Sadeghi-Movahed stated in terms of safety and not being stressed shes hesitant to allow outside media even with press pass and definitely has to do her research.
- Zimmerman suggested pencil press with just cameras no video
- Murphy asks if anyone is opposed to pencil press and security briefing and we have USAC live
- Rosen asks about who pays for security
- Zimmerman stated it happens anyway and will send the budget to see what they can assist with the cost.
- Murphy states all access, pencil press, and briefing.
- No opposing sides.
- Garcia asks what does all encompass
- Zimmerman says the ballroom
- Baral states the live stream will be video and audio at all times but the video and audio will be pointed at the USAC council at all times.
- Baral moves to recommend to the USAC president that the divestment weekend will be only open to those who carry a bruincard. Wong seconds.
- 11-2-0 the motion is approved and there will only be bruincard holders in the room
- Rosen asks if theyre all recommendations
- Murphy states yes
- Sadeghi-Movahed asks if theyre still on board with the two presentations
- Murphy says yes

## XI. Announcements

- Roth states breaking the bubble at LACMA and November 19 the Bruin Research Fair and it will be really good at research. Look out for unwind UCLA in December and coupons since admin shut down food on the hill.
- Kalfayan states a film screening and speaking engagement TBA.
- Badalich states tomorrow Frozen and look out for the photo campaign. Don't ask don't tell by operation mend talking about PTSD. The speak your mind panel suicide from Thursday.
- Wong says day of service was this past Saturday. Next week is national hunger and homelessness. On Monday and Wednesday they'll be doing hygiene kit assemblies and

they would be visiting the LA Kitchen. They have the keynote speaker as the person who created hunger kitchen

-Baral states ASUCLA will have posters and everyone should come

XII. Signing of the attendance sheet

XIII. Adjournment

-Singh moves to adjourn the meeting. Wong seconds.

Meeting adjourned at 12:06 PM.

XIV. Good and Welfare