

Finalized

Approved January 6, 2015

MINUTES
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL
Kerckhoff Hall 417
December 2, 2014
7:00 PM

PRESENT: 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

-Baral calls the meeting to order at 7:03pm.

II. A. Approval of the Agenda

-Baral strikes USA Bylaw Changes and approval of Minutes from November 18

-Bach strikes ASRF

-Sadeghi-Movahed strikes transfer rep report

-Garcia moves to strike mini fund

-Badalich moves to strike SWC Programming

-Contreras strikes EVP Fund Allocations and EVP Report

-Quintanilla strikes Facilities Commissioners Report

-Rosen moves to approve the agenda as amended. Roth seconds.

III. Approval of the Minutes from October 7, 2014

-Rosen moves to approve the minutes.

III. Public Comments

-Denea Joseph, state affairs director of EVP, led the delegation to San Francisco UCSF to stop the reagents from making the vote for tuition increase. There's been plenty of other efforts and petition by UCLA and clear disregard in students' interest and it's important for no confidence because they don't prioritize students' interests. We asked to work together and they had a clear time and we just had midterm elections and it would've been a key point to work together to make a difference. They strategically waited when students have no flexibility. We have to do something, we have to have votes of no confidence and 2 other UCs. Why is it that UCLA is behind when it comes to changes. As one of the best institutions of the nation we continue to use the title and put in action and lead in example. It's important to make a stance and if UCLA says no confidence insure the other UCs will follow behind because people look to us to make a difference and don't want to prioritize us or our beliefs. Why must we show them any regard when they don't show it for us and this isn't about vengeance. Education should be the norm.

-Clinton Ogrady, as the undergraduate student association it's to support the students and not uphold the image of Napolitano or waiver in the face of the board of regents. Your

job is to represent me and my needs. My question for council is, how much longer would the regents need to fuck us over before this council speaks us over? How many students need to push out in this undemocratic, unresponsive board of regents. Why are you so much more concerned with upsetting the board of regents than the students. Stop trying to pad resumes by trying to befriend Napolitano and make sure to continue to put students first.

-Subce ciybcuk us trying to loosen conflict of interests. He wants to read an email from our current student body president why we need to think ethical standards are necessary "hello Mr. Milstein I have recently decided to run for student government for the position of general representative largely so pro Israel will be represented I would like to take this opportunity to take over who is also running for internal president, we are both running for Bruins United party and continuously trying to be unfortunately I fear we are fighting a much harder strong pro Israel and anti-diversity are needed more than ever. Specifically the Palestinian cause has been taken over and if the Bruins United don't win the divestment will pass/ to be blunt, running at UCLA is a complex and expensive campaign and I hope you be of assistance. Additionally me and Avi are free of any day this week if you'd like to speak any day and hope to speak to you soon.

-Erineo Garcia is part of MeChA and EVP and USSA. One of the things about this resolution is a quote from the council members from Roth "if you have something to say that can damage to Napolitano and regents. I say, what relationship? They don't listen to student concerns or student needs." He's a retention counselor and having actions against the tuition increase has disallowed him to put in time and this resolution is going to put in a lot of work so us as students don't have to put at the forefront so students don't have to fight these politics. Napolitano is not an educator, she's a deporter and secretary of homeland security. I hope you vote yes on the resolution

-Shayla is state affairs director and we organized a rally 2 weeks ago and had a sit in and sent around 50 students to San Francisco to talk about the regents meeting. That is like some of the efforts to fight this increase and the resolution on the table is important because we've done all we can do because we're against this tuition. I definitely do think that you all should take this resolution and look through it and recognize these things. There are a lot of cultural orgs that allow us to put together and a lot of students are against this.

-Matthew Holland comments on the conflict of interest and we should be restricting further conflicts of interest and be bought off with free trips and etc. We need to pass the resolution because the state blames the school even though the state's too busy to pay prisons and the schools too busy playing Napolitano. If anything it needs to be more extreme and we have no confidence because it talks about diversity even if she deported more than anyone in US history.

-Todd Lu is a member of SCALE, an organization participated in tuition hike actions and occupation of bonfire and show worker solidarity. In the campus for the bus to UCSF, American Federation of Teachers and adjunct faculty saved \$1,000 to bus students in light of these tuition hikes. A lot of students perceive these tuition hikes not just tuition hikes, but a larger scale that's been going on since 1960's. They've been increasing our tuition and handing them to corporate interests. Since 2003, \$2 billion has been invested in private deals and public entities that have deep connections to UC Regents. There's

definitely conflict of interest and use the public money to profit themselves. This issue has been going on nationwide and adopting high tuition high A model.

-Morris and is hear to speak on behalf of Armenian students association and finds it incredibly shameful that some mevers of council are worried about regents and regents perception of us even though they made it more inaccessible. He finds it incredibly shameful that some council are more worried about the hand that slaps you across the face than the hand that feeds you. The hand that feeds you is us. Your vote her shows who you prioritize. Your vote here will be prioritizing concerns of us or the regents. With the new conflict of interest by law and its completely horrific instead of fixing the problem and actually stiupulating what we're talking about so j-board doesn't have opportunity to sway them and give the mmore power and relax regulations. Never is striking the clause the answer, specify, stipulate, and add, don't reduce.

-Kate Tungsgova in support of no confidence. She signed her SIR in Spring and offered a calgrant to extend her an offer at UCLA at no cost and then her calgrant will be taken away. She just declined and now has to work. She worked 40 hours a week and developed mental health and close to the finish line. As you all know, debt is psychologically and emotionally draining. She knows she can eat dinner and join other clubs and be a student.

Studnets like her and students like me to just get by have just lost an education. We've given the regents, we've marched, rallied, called and did everything she could possibly. She wants children to have a future and the time is to express no confidence and raised their pay 20%. Theres no reason that those without a background in educatin should dominate.

-Siquan states the conflict of interest bylaws need to be amended but this would not be the correct way to do it. To narrow it would make it worse and allow outside influences on council members is threatening. As far as the resolution, he supports te resolution to support no confidence because the regents are doing everything in the power to maintain their power and income at the cost of their students. If we are supposed to be the future, then this state of fellow students are going to be doomed. Supporting this resolution is in the best interest of students and councilmembers.

-Omar wants to talk about conflicts of interest and it's a bad idea to try to narrow the definition or even strike parts of this caluse. If anything we should be writing more about it and opening the doors. It's for a reason that so many ways someone can be influenced. Its necessary that outside orgs aren't influenced students decisions and should be by the students and for the students. In regards to no confidence, I also support it. They've shown that they don't care what they think or what they want. Its important to show that they don't want to listen.

-Alla is a fourth year communications major and wants to reiterate the conflict of interest bylaw amendment and narrowing it wont be helpful. Its only going to weaken it and expanding and including benefits before and after a vote and including financial benefits but also any kind of benefits. An example of a great conflict of interest is UCI's: "all ASUCI officers shall support the receipt of gifts, receipts, or hands out" atotalling a sum greater than \$300 at any time during office. At an event they should refrain from otting on any issue. She also supports the no confidence resolution.

-Alex Torpy wanted to stress three issues about the no confidence vote and definitely wants to say that this is a public institution created to serve and benefit a diverse group of

California. Also, think about the young people in your family who want to have a quality education and we are students today and leaders of tomorrow. We have to stand up and say something. He thinks that third, you all as student leaders have the voices that are powerful to say something as students we are powerful when we speak up. When we follow yesterday that's when we lose it.

-Jennifer is a fourth year working student and student leader and came today because it's so important to her. She strongly urges to pass this resolution of no confidence. She was part of the group of students who drove to UCSF to protest tuition. It was very discouraging and we are ignored and treated like animals. It was very clear we are unwanted. She's proud to attend a public education but she fears it's going to be a private luxury. She fears that Napolitano wants to privatize the UC with corporations and does not want to support that. They prioritize their salary over their education but a council full of students shouldn't vote against this. She strongly encourages council not to vote no on this resolution.

V. Special Presentations

VI. Appointments

VII. Officer and Member Reports

A. President – Avinoam Baral

B. Internal President – Heather Hourdequin

-Hourdequin sent out whenisgood to people who sit on campus safety alliance and wants to meet up 10th week.

C. Academic Affairs Commissioner

-Bach thanks everyone for their collaboration with the diversity requirement resolution and talked to academic senate and thanked everyone and know that they made a difference. Next Monday December 8 AAC is hosting stressfree day from 10am-2pm and collaborating with CSC, AllofUs, Mortar Board Senior Honor Society and writing little giftbaskets as well as usual supplies. Please come out and support and promote students signing those pledge cards.

D. Student Wellness Commissioner

-Badalich stated that the conference for AllofUs will be February 8th Saturday from 9am-4pm. They will have 2 keynote speakers and there will be 3 workshop slots. One will relate to stigma and awareness, second is community, and third is advocacy and self-care and tips. If you or a student group are interested in holding there will be applications and second report on Preventing Sexual Assault will be coming up January at UC regents meeting and talk about 3 of the recommendations that are due by January 2015 including the advocacy office.

C. Administrative Representative

-Zimmermna thanks everyone for signing and it would be locknetics as well.

VIII. Funding Allocations

A. Contingency Programming

-Wang stated 5,732.27 required, \$2,300.07 requested, \$1100 asked.

-Wong moves to approve the contingency programming allocation. Badalich seconds

IX. Old Business

X. New Business

A. USA Bylaw Change Article 1, section D, number 1

5. Council Consent Approval

e. Presidential Appointments

i. Campus Sustainability Committee: two (2) appointments for one (1) year terms

ii. Chancellor's Enrollment Advisory Committee: one (1) appointment for a one (1) year term

iii. Committee on Instructional Improvement Programs: one (1) appointment for a one (1) year term

iv. Committee on LGBTQ Affairs: three (3) appointments for one (1) year terms

v. Communications Director: one (1) appointment for a one (1) year term v.

vi. Eating and Activities Task Force: one (1) appointment for a one (1) year term

-Quintanilla states it's a bylaw change and wants to add a communications director for one appointment for one year term. The communications director will work with all the offices and brand them with one thing and compete with space and students attention and wanted to create a position of things that is for USAC and will be useful for AlLOfUs and elections. It can help facilitate communication between different offices.

-Rosen states it says one appointment but they can still have a committee if they choose to have one?

-Quintanilla stated that its up to them and the first person that gets the position will be a guinea pig and evaluate towards the end of the year.

-Bach asks if theres a place that clearly outlines the job description because right now on the bylaws it just ha a title. What would be the procedure?

-Baral stated that as you can see these are council consent approval because these are non-stipended but as something its what the president keeps on hand. When you look at

application there's a link and asked Quintanilla to resend it when he has a chance and update it when they have a chance to put in their appointment.

-Quintanilla states it exists.

-Sadeghi-Movahed asks if they'll be branding USAC, what would their qualifications entail? Like graphic design?

-Quintanilla stated the way he imagined it would be picking a staff and appoint own graphic designer and facilitate conversation on how to promote transparency and market USAC.

-Garcia asks how would they stay in communications with us? How would they be in contact with the offices?

-Quintanilla states it's a good question but maybe it would be a subcommittee and decided how they would do that outside of council and how they would decide if they want to go to all meetings.

-Rosen states it's up to the director how they choose and who has the position what their management style would be such as marketing and graphic designer. It would be up to the director.

-Singh states they should make a USAC wide calendar instead of attending each others events.

-Baral states this person would be cool to keeping the USAC website up to date and can be really powerful and all of us are responsible that it's not up to date.

-Roth asks if that's the IVP job for website.

-Zimmerman states that on the website there's a calendar feature but if you send me your events you can send it. You should all have access to the calendar and have webmaster email it to them all and it should all be there.

-Quintanilla stated it would be helpful for resolutions and we could do a lot more to educate the student body and stick around people with USAC who know.

-Kalfayan states it could be helpful for publicizing presidential appointment and if a communications director to push these out to various clubs and stuff. If we do appoint someone it could be earlier so all the other appointments following it can be earlier.

-Bach states that it's a great idea and department emails are all the time. A communications director could be useful to sift through.

-Haq states people aren't that educated with issues in USAC and it would be a liaison on who to go to and create a stronger presence and think it's 1 or 2 offices and do such different things.

-Roth states it's a good idea and important and be holistic and we aren't holistic and don't see offices advertising each others events and hopefully it will enable us to come out for a more united front.

-Quintanilla stated that it would be a person as a direct line to daily Bruin.

-Badalich moves to approve the bylaw change. Sadeghi-Movahed seconded.

13-0-0 the bylaw change is approved.

B. A Resolution Expressing No Confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California

A Resolution Expressing No Confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California

Sponsors: Conrad Contreras, External Vice President

Fabienne Roth, General Representative 3

Negeen Sadeghi-Movahed, Transfer Student Representative

Manjot Singh, General Representative 1

WHEREAS, on November 5, 2014, University of California President Janet Napolitano announced to the leadership of the University of California Student Association and the Council of Student Body Presidents her intent to submit a “long-term stability plan” to the Regents for adoption at their November meeting scheduled just two weeks later ; and,

WHEREAS, President Napolitano’s plan increases tuition and fees up to five percent annually over the next five years, depending on the level of support provided by the Governor and Legislature, potentially raising mandatory system tuition and fees nearly 28%, or up to \$15,560 by 2019 ; and,

WHEREAS, tuition and fee levels for any given academic year beginning in the fall would not be determined until the state budget is adopted in June, undermining the claim that the plan provides stability for families and putting student leadership in a perpetual crisis mode of seeking increasing funding from the state to avoid increases; and,

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill (AB) 970 was passed in 2012, creating Section 66028.3, subsection (b) of the California Education Code requiring that the University of California consult the University of California Student Association at least forty days prior to the adoption of any increase to mandatory system tuition and fees and provide at minimum:

1. A justification for the fee increase proposal, setting forth the facts supporting the fee increase;
2. A statement specifying the purposes for which revenue derived from a fee increase will be used;
3. A description of the efforts to mitigate the impact of the fee increase on needy students;
4. The potential impact to students, including, but not limited to, the changes to the minimum workload burden for all students, if applicable, institutional financial aid awards, and the average student loan debt for undergraduates; and
5. Alternative proposals that can be considered in lieu of the proposed net student fee revenue proposal; and,

WHEREAS, the University of California is only required to comply with AB 970 to the extent to which the University enacts the provisions of the law, failing to do so in the two years since its passage ; and,

WHEREAS, students recognize the strain placed on the University of California as a result of drastically diminished funding from the State of California despite the university's daunting challenges of addressing the wall of pension debt for university employees, maintenance for aging infrastructure and growth of new campuses, and commitment under the Master Plan for Higher Education to accept the top one-eighth of graduating high school seniors and transfers from the California Community Colleges ; and,

WHEREAS, students recognize the need for the Governor of California to more aggressively invest in the University of California by increasing the annual apportionment provided by the state, including allocating far above the paltry 4.5% of total revenues generated from the provisions of Proposition 30 ; and,

WHEREAS, the plan relegated students to the status of political pawns to be used in a power play between the university and the state in what the Los Angeles Times referred to as a hostage situation, despite our status as the largest contributor of revenue to the budget of the University of California ; and,

WHEREAS, on November 18th, 2014, members of the UCLA campus community including undergraduates, graduates, faculty and workers rallied and protested against the tuition hike policy stated above; and

WHEREAS, on November 19th, 2014, members of the UCLA campus community traveled to the University of California - San Francisco before sunrise to protest with other UC students to protest against the tuition hike policy stated above; and,

WHEREAS, the Regents, ignoring the concerns of over ten-thousand signatories of a petition circulated by the University of California Student Association, overwhelmingly voted to adopt the plan 14-7, with the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Regents Pérez, Oakley, and Saifuddin voting against adoption ; and,

WHEREAS, The UC Regents should listen and be accountable to the concerns and demands of students who are directly affected by their decisions; and,

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council expresses no confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California and their ability to effectively govern the University of California; and

THEREFORE, LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council condemns the Regents and the President of the University of

California for adopting a tuition plan that seeks to increase tuition by five percent annually over the next five years beginning in the 2015-2016 academic year; and

THEREFORE, LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council condemns the Regents and the President of the University of California for dismissing the protests of students and statements from the University of California Student Association in their decisions including but not limited to appointments and policy changes ; and

THEREFORE, LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council rebukes the Regents and President of the University of California for failing to implement the provisions of AB 970 passed in 2012 that called for consultation of students prior to the increase of any system tuition or fees; and

THEREFORE, LET IT BE FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students Association Council maintain no confidence in the Regents and President of the University of California until such time that the following demands are satisfied:

1. The repeal of the “long-term stability plan” adopted by the Regents at their November meeting;
2. Full implementation of the statutory provisions of AB 970;
3. The creation of a task force with representation of student, faculty, represented staff, administration, alumni system leadership and the California Department of Finance charged with investigating the budget of the University of California and submitting a report of its findings, including opportunities for realizing savings and resolving inefficiencies.

THEREFORE, LET IT BE FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Student Association Council direct the External Vice President to introduce a resolution to the University of California Student Association Board of Directors expressing the same at its January meeting at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

1

2

3

1 <http://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article3938256.html>

2 http://www.mercurynews.com/education/ci_26978468/uc-regents-approve-tuition-hike-plan

3 http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201120120AB970

4 http://ucfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/ca_masterplan_summary.pdf

5 <http://ucscfa.org/2014/11/cucfa-statement-on-ucs-planned-tuition-increases/>

6 <http://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-cap-brown-napolitano-20141124-column.html>

7 <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/regents-approve-long-term-stability-plan-tuition-and-financial-aid>

8 <http://www.sfgate.com/education/article/UC-regents-appoint-Napolitano-amid-protest-4673527.php>

9 <http://www.latimes.com/local/education/la-me-uc-regents-20140717-story.html>

-Baral states you can make friendly amendments with which the sponsors agree to and nonfriendly amendments that require majority vote.

-Badalich has two friendly amendments there's a redundancy of protests in second whereas there should just be to protest tuition hike and asks for quotations around "hostage situation"

-Quintanilla has a friendly amendment to change the footnote in 9 to be more holistic in addressing the regents. Instead of just focusing on one regent we are adding an article about multiple regents.

-Kalfayan states that our student regent and student regent designate worked with you, what was changed at the meeting

-Contreras stated he talked to both Sadhi and Avi and didn't specifically support the resolution but support advocacy. What came out of that conversation was that we are targeting the regents in this resolution because they want to start a conversation about regential reform because there's so many issues and decisions that really shows they didn't listen to students. What came out of that conversation is that after this resolution you cannot forget about the state. They recommended to add things about the state. While he agrees that it's important to talk about the state and governor brown, it would really stray away from what the resolution is doing. We have to listen to recommendations and great to pass a resolution more than willing to write it and increase more funding in the UC so we can target them in both angles.

-Hourdequin asks what are the main goals of expressing no confidence

-Contreras stated the intent of the resolution is to reflect what students are actually really feeling. It doesn't anyway change what UCLA views of tuition hike. Personally he could say he has never had confidence in UC President Napolitano and would love her to get removed. The intent to this resolution is to reflect what students are feeling and asking for and really expressing that as a campus student government. After the tuition hike policy has passed, all the conversation about the tuition hike died down and felt like it defeated and this is a way as a student government that we have a chance to speak up against this and to ignite the fire to say we can fight against this.

-Bach states the last cause is so solution oriented and in her personal opinion why is it that it has to be about demands and why is the language so strong in the regents and Napolitano and regents. Our issues with Napolitano and regents vary in the sense that not all the regents voted and its encompassing for us to say that no confidence in regents as a whole and Napolitano is a separate issue. Her question is why cant it just be demands and really showing the solution oriented factions.

-Roth states in her perspective personally strongly supports it there are some regents on students side. This resolution is aims towards those who haven't put students interest first and saying no confidence in the regents is one of the way to express and empower us how we feel. Last year the reasons to say they wouldn't vote no confidence because there hasn't been enough time to assess how Napolitano and here we are a year onwards and the regents proven beyond a doubt that they don't respond to us in demands, protests, or conversations. Its not as radical as you might see it, its taking a stance of saying no and should encompass all regents.

-Sadghi-Movahed asks what Bach had in mind for the demands and what would you suggest to make it more holistic. She still thinks that its important to be important tat even though some regents did not support the tuition increase they still sit on a board that approves it. It's coming off as no confidence in that board that approves the tuition increase. What demands will that entail?

-Quintanilla appreciates the public comments and completely against the tuition increase and understands the concerns and does working class and works 20 hours a week and understands what its like to be working and be a student and be worried about money and stress all the time. Hes also coming from a facilities commissioner where his job is wholly administrative and based off relationship with these administraros and so vital for campaigns. As a resolution of no confidence counters how he leads his office and try to complete his agenda office. For him, the demands if he were suggesting them instead of no confidence his thing we should hit the root of the cause like regential reform such as adding a new student regent or a clause that specifies that it isn't a specific increase still such as a 40 day rule.

-Bach appreciates the demands expressed in the last clause and are solutions oriented. The main points of the resolution in regards to tuition hikes do express the concerns. However, its still a resolution expressing no confidence and shes not confident in doing. Its about the strength of the language and entitling it a no language rather than expressing demands for Napolitano and the regents.

-Badalich respectfully disagrees with Bach. We've heard a lot of public comment and is pissed about the tuition increase because he has to deal with it. This severe language is reflected about the severe distaste with the regents. In terms of not ruining the relationship of administrators, and would be sitting next to Napolitano and still will vote yes and if she happens to find that out she doesn't think it will change the relationship. IF it does so then that's on them. They had to yell over students to doing the vote. Shes totally fine with voting yes and will keep the strong language because that's the strong feelings students are expressing. After watering it down from last years resolution, this is a severe case of students disregard. If you would ask a student if they would trust a student about doing a protest. No confidence is even benign compared to how they really feel.

-Contreras stated that before he was even External Vice President he has been organizing students and having specific asks and demands to regents and Napolitano over the last four years. After having better access in this position he thought it would be so much easier to create change with one on one meetings. It's frustrating as an organizer and someone with privilege of access, it's really frustrating talking about demands. Students protesting are demands. This resolution will reflect what they're feeling. His rationale for the no confidence vote is that we've exhausted every option. We've lobbied, made statements, did petitions, and those were all demands. There was no address or consideration of student input and in terms of working in administration, his philosophy in his office and working with people is always a great thing to do. At least in an advocacy and organizer position, once that relationship isn't working, and a relationship is a 2 way street and he's not getting anything back. That relationship needs to be challenged and to create stances like this to transform power dynamics and pressuring them. This is essentially pressuring them and the strength of this language is intentional and it's very strong for every UC to pass this to say UC Regents you haven't listened to us, there is a problem. And so many other issues. He's still going to have meetings and their job is to listen to him, but it's still their job to listen to me as a student. They are really unfit to work with students if they feel some type of way.

-Roth states the people who consider are voting no, given that students came out that if you voted no you wouldn't be supporting their needs, how would you feel if you vote no if you don't prioritize student needs? If they aren't going to keep working with us because we vote no confidence, what are they being paid for? There's not that much of a relationship to be severed, if anything it's going to make a statement and will pressure them and make them look bad and do something about it.

-Wong wanted to say that it's beautifully written and the purpose of the resolution was not a tone down diplomatic statement about the regents. The language inherently fully supports the student, and in terms of drafting the resolution, were students involved in the language and developing.

-Contreras stated this resolution was written by a collaboration of his staff members and staff of different external offices and other schools. In terms of collaborating, most of the staff members was a live document and specifically Cal and UCR they were in the know of drafting. The timing of this resolution and having it is essential because they need to have budget talks and plans moving forwards in addressing the budget, tuition hike, and next steps in keeping them more accountable. Unfortunately for his position they run on an external calendar and depends on legislation and how regents vote on certain things.

-Sadeghi-Movahed wants to address that there are a lot of transfer students feel the same that if we don't vote on this we're compliant. We've been manipulated constantly and not taking any effort to say we're angry means we're in compliance. Recently, Janet Napolitano has been getting positive press such as streamlining the transfer process to UC system. One thing that has been noted that Jerry Brown created a proposal states want to increase number of transfers admitted because there's more pushback because the more transfers you admit the quality of education will decline and that's her huge problem with the situation. They're looking to her to make sure it's communicated because often times transfer students don't have time to understand the UC system to get here in the first place. It's making the system more difficult than it already is, and will probably have to deal with relationship severing. It's not about relationships with administration it's about

challenging them and asking if they care what they deal with. She represents students and also work within the parameters of the consequences of doing so, and if I severed that relationship and work in the parameters of severing the relationships and is willing to do it if student voices are heard.

-Hourdequin states if we do express no confidence to Janet and the regents what is that going to look like to state when we have questions to adjusting funding. Is our vote to confidence going to delegitimize the regents?

-Contreras said several senators and our state senator Ben Allen expressed the disappointment in UC Regents. In a way its delegitimized and reflects what people are feeling.

-Quintanilla stated a lot of people are talking about something I brought, if we are going to vote no confidence its regent reform, something that UCSA tried. He knows it's a long term thing and people need to vote and amend and fix problems with communication if we plan the rules and engagements. Public commenters were talking about the conflict of interest and the problem is that we're deleting language and the way to approve is to amend it and expand it, why aren't we doing that with regent reform in our communications with our regents.

-Rosen states as financial supports commissioner and this resolution what will it do with the tuition hike and how would it help? We can use tools on our own benefit as opposed to own benefit and might not be as willing to work with them. She has issues with seeing the resolutions benefit in regards to tuition hike.

-Sadeghi-Movahed wont speak on behalf of EVP office, and the EVP office has been lobbying since the inception. To answer the question how it affects the tuition increase, tomorrow if a group of students sent a petition of 20,000 students and got a resolution of saying no confidence among students and other entities and came to her and youre not doing it and we're pretty angry and you still don't work and broke a glass window, youre still not listening and yelling at us,. This resolution is saying that we recognize that youre not doing your job, we recognize youre not doing your job, start doing your job. We've been lobbying and petitioning and as an activist you try multiple different approaches and the first step is to work with the system to get what you want. The next step is try to get something new and work with parameters of what you have to get what you have. When people get that frustrated that publically something comes out of it, what she sees this as is not only an amplification of students voices, but also recognizing that as students ourselves that the regents have not been caring at all about us. If they cared about us in the whole tuition increase, they would've been more transparent and sorry about it. They would've been there's nothing else we can do, they can increase the number of transform, reform prop 13, or reform how funding is allocated, but we've tried that and advocated that we've done all these things leading up to this point. This resolution is just acknowledging that they aren't doing their job.

-Garcia states shes slightly disappointed and we aren't here on this council to salvage relationships and students want us to give a vote of no confidence. Malcolm X never cared about let me salvage the relationship, im going to question the authority and push it to ensure my community is fully represented. At the end of the day, Napolitano wont help me and the regents wont help us. We must be accountable to students not Napolitano or the regents.

-Contreras stated that the future of this tuition hike relies on this state. Napolitano is clever for this because she knew once the tuition passed and she can completely get the number and after this tuition hike passed she's expecting students to shame the regents and make the state now a target. As a student, someone whose dedicated time to plan protests and be in solidarity to amplify students voice, to be a part of it you can't just turn away and say alright you're good let me go back to the state. That's not right for him, the tuition hike his office will be focusing on it. They start in January until June and have main lobby day. He sits in the room in a regent and legislator and the regents do not know how to lobby. The fact that you're scared to work with us to lobby, they don't know how to. We can't let Napolitano use us as political pawns and we're not going to turn away and not shame her. Again like Quintanilla said, when you think of campaign you must think of tactics. This is a great tactic for people outside of UCLA that there is an internal problem within the UC and needs a reform and revolution. We need to start that conversation because the demands have been there and have no confidence in you and demand a full revolution.

-Badalich agrees with what Contreras said about political pawns. Like many resolutions it doesn't make USAC create change immediately, but we have leverage in one specific area to demonstrate student voice to show bad PR. It's worked in many other cases and us passing this will not turn the tuition increase we still need to regential reform and target the state. That's next. When students are angry enough to have multiple opinion articles, talks, singing letters, and trying to communicate and still not heard then we're sort of worried about burning a bridge that hasn't been utilized by one side at all. This is a powerful way to give a pretty impactful. The only thing we have to leverage is PR. It might seem like we're burning a bridge like they're bad people, she's a huge fan of sexual violence prevention and activism but that's different. She's not going to let her one positive thing dissuade her of no confidence. No student likes this tuition increase. The only way is no confidence. We've already established that regential reform and state targets will be on the way. What relationship do we have? We only have our voices, and if we're worried about our voices then we don't know the power of our voices.

-Bach would like to respond to Badalich and respects the tactics that have been proposed in the demands and has different communication and leadership tactics that we can respectfully disagree. The way that this resolution is expressed is a stronger language than you're voting upon than she's comfortable. You can call her apprehensive and her opinion hasn't changed and hopes they can respect that.

-Rosen states the title itself doesn't address tuition hikes so people truly know that we are discontent with that board in that tuition hike and the title is not focusing on the issue she would like to see it focused on.

-Haq states it is solution oriented and in terms of the language, they didn't care when we silenced students up there and didn't have sympathy. They have no sympathy towards them especially because you just got a 20% pay increase and 25% tuition increase. We are not business men and women we're representative. She acknowledges all the students who have essays to write and tests to study for because maybe some of them have to get a second job. She now lives in a single parent household and if this increase happens her relatives can't afford it where a few thousand dollars will be a burden. She certainly doesn't want to water it down and make it sound mushy gushy this is the way it is and this is what you did and you have to deal with the consequences.

-Singh states that he has no relationship with Napolitano and never talked to Governor Brown and is obviously in support of this resolution. There are other schools who are ringing up similar resolutions and if UCLA could spearhead it would be. He doesn't know them and it's fine, his second point is that our job is to not suck up. Their job is to represent students on this campus and the protest occupying Murphy and protests in San Francisco, these are all humongous flags. The third is that none of the regents have any background in education, they're all politicians, businessmen, and have none of our interests. Is there any amendments to anyone wants to change?

-Kalfayan is a little apprehensive but it's a good tool to bring media attention. He agrees that he's on board, well written, and makes sense.

-Wong says state democrats proposed a 17% of out of state tuition increase. She states even though it's not immediate legislative change, it's important for us to take definitive stances. To not take a stance is doing a disservice to the students we are supposed to be representing. She very much thinks it's important we move forward and doesn't want to take the opportunity and move forward.

-Wong moves to approve the Resolution Expressing No Confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California

9-4-0 the Resolution Expressing No Confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California is passed.

XI. Announcements

-Garcia states intern applications for CAC due Friday to understand offices and work with all series and filtered into the series the following years. It's really fun and all the interns from last year are all in the interns and tell all your friends.

-Kalfayan states he's meeting a delegation from Amsterdam and their equivalent of CEC and are coming to UCLA and meeting the Block and administrators and want to meet with USAC. He's hosting the meeting in Kerckhoff 9AM on Friday and will be a cool experience. The 2 CEC events 10th week they will be screening The Interview in Melnitz and will be advanced screening and will be a cocktail reception. If you have free time Thursday 10th week come to Bruin Theatre in Westwood.

-Badalich is treat yo self self care and discovery with active minds committee from 6-8pm in Rieber Fireside Lounge. This upcoming weekend is the last 3 CPR/first aid classes of the quarter. This Thursday is love yourself yoga. The speak out for 7000 in solidarity to this Wednesday CAPS conference room survivor speak out for a safe space.

-Roth states that December 5 there's ice skating in Santa Monica for breaking the bubble and if you Instagram a cute picture and breakingthebubble there's a prize. It'll probably be a Lyft or Uber promotional code.

-Zimmerman stated starting finals week there is 24 hours studying in Ackerman and Kerckhoff and all the study lounges available and after 1 AM there's free van rides and a great resource.

-Singh stated the teach me how to LinkedIn is tomorrow in MS4000 at 7pm.

-Garcia stated she mentioned a townhall to discuss mobilizing such as Ferguson and police brutality. If you all have ideas it's open.

-Badalich stated silent disco tomorrow from 8:00-9:30 in Powell Library Rotunda and only the other people with headphones can hear. It's really confusing and it's so much fun, there's lots of food.

XII. Signing of the attendance sheet

XIII. Adjournment

-Haq moves to adjourn the meeting. Bach seconds.

-Baral adjourns the meeting at 8:51pm.

XIV. Good and Welfare