

Finalized

Approved November 24, 2015

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

Kerckhoff Hall 417

November 17, 2015

7:00 PM

PRESENT: Heather Rosen, Heather Hourdequin, Zach Helder, Anais Leontine, Danny Siegel, Aaliya Khan, Trent Kajikawa, Lexi Mossler, Zack Dameron, Amy Shao, Ian Cocroft, Ruhi Patil, Marvin Chen, Ariel Rafalian, Stephanie Wong, Patricia Zimmerman, Christina Mata

ABSENCE: Deborah Geller

I. Call to Order

-Rosen calls the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

A. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet is passed around

II. Approval of the Agenda

-Shao moves to strike ARC

-Hourdequin moves to switch the order of the appointments because Zeigler is driving

-Chen moves to strike Student Wellness Commissioner Report

-Dameron moves to strike Community Service Commissioner Report

-Kajikawa moves to strike Academic Affairs Report

-Helder moves to strike EVP travel and advocacy grant

-Helder moves to approve the agenda as amended. Kajikawa seconds.

13-0-0 the agenda has been approved as amended.

B. Approval of the Minutes from November 10, 2015

-Helder moves to the minutes. Hourdequin seconds.

13-0-0 the minutes are approved.

-Mossler is asking if we're going to keep 30 minutes according to the by laws.

-Rosen chooses to enact public comment for 30 minutes.

III. Public Comments

-Kristoff is a third year political science and a volunteer with CalPirg. I just wanted to give you a few updates and we are student led and student funded and fight for public interest like the environment and making college more affordable. We have been on campus for 30 years and have grass roots power with a ton of power. It was a few years ago we were able to ban plastic bags in California in December. We passed SB315. Also a few weeks ago we had a first victory and convinced Subway to stop. We have 30,000 students who give us \$10 per quarter around California. Also advocates for us who works full time in DC for Sacramento and we'll speak later for other campaigns then you can always come to me.

-Brian from CalPirg is an intern for the solar campaign. Normally people can generate solar panels but they're trying to cut back the price drastically and what we're doing is that there's a hearing and trying to get as much support as we can. We have 103,000 petitions and ask for handwritten letters to the commission board to the letters to the editor and try to get as much support as we can to make as much money. We will be sending emails to all of you guys and thanks for this opportunity.

-Calbreath as a human rights activist and worked in student development. I have to ask y'all to vote down this resolution. The language undermines one of the major avenues for average students to get their issues heard by putting students instantly on the defensive in needing to justify their efforts according to the interpretation of a fluctuating council body year to year. As someone who is actually registered through the Office of Disabilities for my mental health struggles with anxiety and depression, I find this both insulting and dangerous in potentially silencing voices that may not be as prepared to share their personal struggles and the scope things that influence to the extent that I am. Also, given the nature in which this resolution was brought forward, it feels like a cheap shortcut that undermines political processes and the value of differing voices on council. Where was the outreach to people who actually work in areas of student development on the subjects you seek to define here? Where was the outreach to the communities you sit here to represent? When was the outreach to your fellow council members? ...and if this is such a critical clarification of bylaw language, why is there only one council member among you willing to put his name on the resolution? If it is still a subject that council members feel passionately about, I suggest you try again with some concrete outreach efforts to make your endeavor more effective. And if you really think we need to limit the scope of issues we approach as students, I must ask you to more intensely evaluate the reach of UCLA as an academic, social, and economic force internationally. We cannot claim to be a part world-class institution that produces world leaders only when it's convenient then choose to stick our heads in the sand when things get difficult. If you choose to do so as an individual, fine—but do not pull your public office down with you."

-Singh is a member of the Sikh Student association and against the by law and I don't see a Sikh sitting at the table. Even if you have the best of intentions you have no idea what contributes to my welfare. There are countless communities not represented and why should this group of 14 students constitute student welfare in the past and the future. The Sikh student association got resolution that took a significant amount of time and effort and having our organization to campaign every year will significantly hinder it every year.

-Arnie is the vice president for Students for Justice in Palestine and an Armenian student on campus. I am here to call you all out on petty bullshit as a clear attempt to undue the resolution from last year. First you all want to do resolutions that have to do with wellness. For some students that has to do with wellness, who are you to tell them what is their wellness. Its emotionally taxing for them to have their tuition dollars for destruction of family members. I know some students don't care about Palestine students and don't care about it. As an Armenian student its ridiculous that every year we are going to have bring up every year to divest form Turkey who continues to deny and rewrite. You know what's emotionally taxing? Its to reaffirm our history and fight for who are killed.

-Annie is Arnie's sister is here on behalf of Armenian Student Association and JSP and behalf for humans in general. I've spent 3 years on campus and advocate for what's right and I have to come back here every year to know what I'm doing every year is ridiculous. We aren't here for you to pick and choose to be morally consistent to put extra effort to get your affirmation when you're supposed to be an avenue for us to get heard. You are in a place of privilege and we don't have the power and this resolution is just really frustrating that we have to constantly reaffirm and what student wellness affects us. If we tell you something is our student wellness you have to believe us you can't pick and choose. I strongly urge all of you to think about the 28,000 students you represent and think of a different understanding of student wellness.

-Rick fourth year business economic major and transfer advocate I notice that some of my friends are talking about a certain by law change about capacity of certain resolutions. I like to say that we can do with better transparency with regards to how we make up proposed items that council votes on available to the public. We should make the text of proposed resolutions online such as by law changes until they're actually enacted aren't easily made public but we can certainly do better by making the text of those proposed by law changes available so we can be better formed. I would also like to discuss someone Silena and first had the opportunity to meet her on combined USAC retreats that she made a joke about Asians.

-The 1984 Sikh genocide resolution was passed in the last school year by the Sikh Student Association and I understand the resolution may be in good intentions but in reality our organization cannot afford to come here every year to prove that it still matters. When the resolution passed when we were presenting it I wanted to feel like the Sikhs have a home. When we celebrate Sikh Awareness week you all had our book and we appreciate it that. In four years from now no one will be here to thank you. This is the first time since 1994 that Sikh student association has had ANY time of presence on campus and have been a club since then. By making us come out here every single year clubs are cyclical of passionate and not passionate. If our passion fades and our resolution passes again and another passionate Singh says I want to pass this is halting us. I've met with a lot of you and making it a permanent activist community that will work. From the Sikh community there's only 3 of us out of 74, what do you think will happen next year

-Zoya is the president of INDUS and is my job to make sure south Asian students are represented. A few months ago when we condemned the 1984 Sikh Genocide Awareness and I had the opportunity to work with SSA to talk about Sikh Awareness. Resolutions only happen because they have the power and censoring their ability is directly limiting the scope of student organization. The fact that you feel the need to limit is a testament on who powerful they are. As an international student issues back home directly affect my existence but although they don't affect every single student it shouldn't diminish their validity. Only 29% of our student body showed up to vote so it's a folly to believe that 14 people represent UCLA for us to bring issues that matter to them.

-Franklokk is a senior year of UCLA and some resolutions I've opposed and rejected and the reason I care and campaign and elect my student body representatives is to not promote any political agenda. It's here to take care of students and focus student government back on the issues and that's the people I elected into office because I trust them to focus on student issues. To the point of a resolution is only good for one year and is nothing like last year. More to the point the student body changes every year.

Resolutions are only valid one year because the council would have no passed resolutions last year and this year. It only makes sense to have resolutions for one year because it only represents that council. This by law change makes our student government and the amount of time that has been spent on divisive and not towards proposing political agenda. It should promote for being an activist but its not the way to be doing it.

-Minh Tran is the co chair of Fossil Free and we stand in solidarity with SJP, and Armenians and as students and politicized groups that this resolution that will pass and resolution is a slap in the face to student democracy. I respectfully disagree with the previous comment, not withstanding how this would erase that would not mean in concert. This is very patronizing to just claim that we students should not try to use our own student government as a voice to speak up. I really want to see what your priorities are because I think you already betrayed them.

-Todd Liu is the co chair of fossil fuel and in solidarity. I'm speaking in regards to the constitutional amendment and speaking for myself. As someone who spent the past 2 years in activism through student labor solidarity and student tuition hikes who have been heavily involved in these student issues. I don't think its effective at all to marginalize a big portion of the student activist because its not effective for student issues. For student tuition hikes it was these activist groups pushing for these student issues as part of as you profess here. Its not effective to do that and throw them under the bus is not going to do well with student issues. As someone who has been deeply involved and many hours doing research and being involved in protests. I respectfully ask all of you to vote against this constitutional amendment.

-Alex is a grad student in sociology and as a sociologist you might know that I have to think what issues are considered relevant and got discussed in table and what's considered is student welfare. There's nothing objective and that has to do with power. I'm here to say in solidarity with student organizations and elected to student council and use that power in different kinds of ways and use that power that is engaging with a broad and diverse campus. I'm the chair for the unions that represent teaching assistants so basically we have interpreted broadly a lot of different issues are relevant to teaching assistant like tuition hikes. We really found through experience bringing in all these different issues such as having a safe bathroom might be the number one priority and why its important to get feedback about what are their issues instead of assuming.

-Hourdequin states point of order only undergraduate students are able to speak.

-Noah is a second year and urge council to adopt this bylaw change and at its core USAC is not the united nations and you weren't elected to take stances on geopolitical issues that experts cant solve. Many of you are many disconnected and have too bias of a stance or not enough information. These resolutions poisoned this campus climate and if you want to stay relevant make decisions that collectively benefit students rather than isolate students.

-Cassasola is a third year advocacy director for AllofUs and External Vice President for Samahang Pilipino. As an advocacy director student wellness issues is personal to each person and community. For 14 students to constitute what is a student wellness issue. For example they just passed a resolution to the history of California and we have to justify our issues everyday and this is a blatant censorship of student voice at the mercy of 14 student's Ifs something is damaging as my welfare then I should be able to decide what's good for my welfare and not the 14 of you. This is America my community should be

able to what say and define and constitute our own welfare. You should think about more tangible ways of student programming rather than petty student bylaws.

-Everyone knows this bylaw is not student welfare its about undermining progressive issues and the work they've done and really everyone knows that's its about undoing divestment about Turkey and Palestine and on top of that you don't get to define what is student welfare and student health. We do because its our communities and its condescending that people who aren't facing the issues to tell us what's relevant. You don't get to define what that is we do.

-Angut is a freshman year part of the Student Activist Project. As far as I understand this proposed by law change is the attempt to take geopolitical issues and take their voice away. Here's a very simple notion, this campus tries so hard to promote diversity and these people are intrinsically tied to the issues of their homeland. You will never take away the way the 1984 will affect me. If you want to promote diversity you have to allow diverse people from these backgrounds to come for the issue otherwise what's the point of diversity.

-Alisha is here to represent Afrikan Student Union. There is no student representation who look like me and this sake for our opportunity for our voice to rip away and our option on social matters is disrespectful and the fact that our population size is undermined its already enough that we should still have a voice on this matter.

-Kaiy there's no way that a small group of people to represent everyone on campus on council and student groups. Based on what you think its right there's no way you can express every communities needs.

-I'm here representing IDEAS and we want equality and access and this would hinder our equality and access. We already face a big problem and this proposition will further limit our ability to limit on campus and our mental health is a student wellness issue. Without advocating to divest from prisons and invest in mental centers is affecting our academic engagement. Not every undocumented student is eligible for privilege therefore by isolating groups like iDEAS this resolution takes away our tools of advocacy to protect ourselves outside of our school community.

-Amin asked for us to extend the public comment

-Rosen states that it was a point of order and we cant because it was in our bylaws.

-Helder states there's no way to suspend our bylaws

IV. Special Presentations

A. Diwali Event

-Zoya is a third year and president of Indus and is a South Asian student organization founded in 2013. We aim to unite UCLAs South Asian student and our biggest event is Diwali. Its this Friday in Ackerman Grand Ballroom and free Indian food which means everyone is going and hoping to come back and teach you about our culture. It will be really cool if you can tell all of our offices and come to support. As any org we are hella broke so if you feel the need to donate or contribute ill be around here for a while. I hope you all can come out and here are some fliers. Its an Ackerman Grand Ballroom Friday November 20 at 6:30pm

-Khan asks the best way to outreach and fund

-Zoya stated if you want to make last minute contributions but there's a Facebook event feel free to post that and help us market.

-Kajikawa asks for the other events INDUS puts on
-Zoya states the 0 week mixer and we have Diwali, and week 6 we did a hashtag for Indian and Pakistan students coming together but despite that our governments our fighting the citizens don't. We have a political discussion coming up at the end of the quarter. Winter quarter week 5 we have another event and in spring quarter we have more fun events on the agenda.

B. UCSA

-The largest turn out of a campus student and his name is Kevin Sabo and is fourth year at UC Berkeley studying Peace and Conflict and Anais runs communication which means the money you all pay helps support my job in getting our issues to the wider public and plan all of our conferences and congresses and imp the staff person running all of those.
-Patty is the undergrad organizing director for southern California working for running campaigns for reform against mental health and you'll probably see me around
-I wanted to chat with UCSA concerning out funding and proposal with 19 campus visits in 7 weeks. UCSA is the UC Student Association and represent 250,000 students from every campus and your EVP is the board of representative. Right now students want advocacy to access and we have to figure out how each student pays \$1.30 each students. SAGE stands for the student advocacy governance and engagement are important for Washington DC and Sacramento and our own campus to make sure we are relaying information that is up to date and accurate. Rather than mandatory fees we would move to a voluntary opt out free of \$4-6 to see if they want to opt out. Some current problems are poor representation and fallout form controversial decisions. Only 92% of students are represented in the UCSA Board. Graduate students from here and UCSD aren't included. For controversial issues we can withdraw from the organization and only you EVP can make that choice and only one organization can make that vote. We cannot become inherently conservative and risk averse. Associations have inherent inequities with some campuses paying more than others. Some campuses don't pay anything at all that are still benefited from the two year commission and the federal advocacy grant and the benefits from shared governance. Budget unpredictability if thousands of students can leave USAC it would be like your budget disappeared. There's restraints on staff retention such as UCSA lobbyists, executive director, and we want to make sure we have the funds available to make sure staff has the ability to access professional development and fair standard of living and we need resources. A little economic wonkiness, our budget is fixated and aren't many UC students and getting 10,000 more. Our expenses stay flat but this is some of the current problems that make it difficult. Some of the main principles is that UCSA has a half century of proven advocacy and activism for students. This is an administrative change and now a new fee. Students, not student governments, choose to fund UCSA through opt-out system. SAGE fund would be maintained by student representatives from every campus. SAGE would create a stable source of funds to sustain the student movement in California. It wont go to UCOP and cant exert undue influence and control decisions, we already pay our fees and hand it to us through associations through complicated system of middle men and women and we would centralize it. It creates stability for a solid number of people we represent. The potential revenue uses of what students want such as improving student representation in statewide and federal affairs. For expanding the conference schedule, recognizing student

accomplishments and increasing access to UCSA. There could be improvements to staffing and bringing tech presence into the 21st century. For example I cannot represent women of color in STEM when imp a white male in the humanities. In terms of state and federal affairs, its really important we step up our game especially since Perkins loan expired and we have to be in DC and its far and expensive but we have to be there because decisions are made on the table and if we aren't there we'll be on the menu. We have to eliminate our funding support for women of color. We want to make sure we can live stream and naturally good and beneficial. Some future actions leading up to the January Regents meeting and you can join other associations in weighting in on the SAGE proposal. You can educate students on your campus or invite us to have a SAGE townhall and take the student input survey. Learn more at ucsa.org/sage. We aren't asking for a fee but we are asking for democracy for each lavvy and make sure we voice our considerations.

-Rafalian states you mentioned that some campuses pay a larger fee, what constitutes what a campus pays?

-Sabo states some campuses felt that the UCSA was a priority but for Cal \$32,000 go to UCSA as come out of our budget. It would free up several thousands of dollars. Some people thought it was worth it and imp glad that they do.

-Cocroft asks how this proposal would be implemented.

-Sabo states we are working with UCOP and the legality of opt out and mandarin fees and working with UCOP legal for new policy and working with the tech folks. The community college currently uses this but since we're the UC we have to do something different and its controlled by our charter. Really its up to you that at the end of the day even if SAGE was implemented so we are able to amend through a resolution. Some campuses think we should refer this to students and simply revise but our charter says otherwise.

C. Bruin Shelter

-Shaw is a third year graduate mechanical student. We live in the homelessness capital in the country. There are 9,000 youth in LA who don't have a place to sleep tonight. There are three reasons: home isn't safe, home isn't supportive, home doesn't exist. They think its safer to be on their own and out on the street. Although homelessness among youths exist on the spectrum from crashing on a friends couch to physically sleeping on the ground on the street. There's a lot that we can do to move youth through more sustainable forms of housing. There are three sad questions: "do I have to steal? What will I have to do to pretext myself? Is this even worth it at all should I give up?"

Why now, and why us? LA has the highest population of homeless youths. We have more homeless youth than the bottom 25 states and only have 4 homeless shelters and none are on the Westside. As you are all aware of that this has been recently decreed a \$100M state of emergency. Our decades old formulas re not working. We've had the opportunity to be the 2nd student run shelter in the entire US. Harvard's been running for 31 years. We aim to do it the same and tailor our shelter for homeless youths from age 17-23. The preliminary costs are pretty basic but we can house 20 students for \$25,000 a year. That is dirt cheap. When we remove labor and use a volunteer taskforce we can take a bite out of this problem. I don't claim to be a caseworker but I plan to partner with the experts and established ties with a number of organizations such as SP and Path and

Westside coalition and come out to our shelter and be caseworkers for our constituents. Why this idea at UCLA? This is the perfect place for a project from a peer to peer network is that its unique. Its worked in Harvard and ucla is a vast ecosystem and already received support from the student run homelessness clinic who are prepared to offer us pro bono legal work. We plan to open up nest Winter for three months. Although that's a short amount of time but any housing at all is infinitely better than none. Even if we can get them off the street for just a week the experts for partner agencies are better and we can put them on the path to transitioning out of homelessness. Why students? There is so much work that needs to happen and its totally doable. We highly encourage students to get involved and put together the governing principles for our shelter and make sure that this project can be successful. If we want to put it under UCLA you cant spell funding without fund. We need your help in raising money from outside funding agencies. We need to look internally but money does make the world go round. The next steps for bruin shelter and come quite a ways and first and foremost that we are in final negotiations for locations. The shelter is close to campus, at the basement of a church and ultimately demonstrate its effective so it can be roped to UCLA. We've had a lot of support from Mick DeLuca and possibility of eventually bringing this to campus. We want to form a non-profit organization for a 501c3 organization and we will be able to solicit tax-free donations and grants. I will be registering under SOLE and star t student movement. We aim to build a campus organization that shares the ideals of a Bruin Shelter. The history is ours to make in Harvard 1984. First and foremost I want to generate buzz for this project and the shelter is run entirely by student leaders, both undergraduate and graduate. We are seeking students interested in the cause. The email is lukeshaw@ucla.edu, bruinshelter.wordpress.com, and facebook.com/bruinshelter

- Kajikawa states you're a PhD student what other ways to get them more active?
- Shaw states he's working to set it up as a register campus organization and shelter itself and governance and policy and aim to create a student movement that champions homelessness, advocacy, and awareness. There's a club that came about from USAC meeting in 2010 called BruinTent where they did all kind of great work.
- Khan states I have a special projects and we're working on having a bruin voice project and there's a lot of homeless students and we haven't had heard and you can definitely pair this with the centennial campaign. If any wants to talk in a more intimate setting I'll hang around.
- Shao asks when this gets launched and get going are you planning to have any particular activities to keep them stimulated?
- Shaw states we aim to use the same shelter and opening up 6pm and serving hot meal and have some evening programming and build a community. We are essentially trying to establish Dance LA to serve underserved youth.
- Wong states once a new organizations gets registered with SOLE I would love to talk to you to apply to different funding sources you are eligible for.
- Rosen states Dameron and Chen sit with Louis in food group and we would love to work with you.

V. Appointments

A.

The vote was 2-1-0.

Kajikawa states he wants to discuss a teaching fellowship.

-Cocroft asks if its referring to letters and sciences.

-Hourdequin states reach out to MO's and retention projects and can work well with others.

- Palozzola is a second year biochemistry student and I'm really excited because I love ucla and I'm so thankful for the resources I've received since before stepping foot. I want to make sure the decisions made by faculty reflect the undergraduate student voice.

-Cocroft asks how her background can represent students on this campus

- Palozzola states as a brioche student that's an underrepresented major for students especially south campus and this is a passion for me to get involved. My extra curricular as the chief of staff for the Internal Vice President and learn about the organizations and how we can help them. As CFO of a funding organization from a 501c3 and that's a difficult step to take offers me a large financial background. I understand where there coming from and I know how to represent the student voice and see.

-Shao states given your last interview were you able to reach out to mother orgs and what retention programs did you learn about.

- Palozzola states I didn't reach out because I didn't have the seat yet so I didn't think it was my place. However, I did my research. There are 5 in CPO and the Campus Retention Committee apply them.

-Patil asks for one initiative or goal program

- Palozzola states imp really interested in the 3 year and the direct path to get out of here in 3 years for a different financial demographic and its really important to get the education

-Shao asks what recommendations for those who don't identify but want to use their counselors

- Palozzola states they have specific academic counseling and group tutoring and what actual resources they can connect with you and that's really near and incredible that the overarching program. I look forward to learning more and those individuals who may or may not identify with these communities are being represented.

-Mata asks how would you manage the time and academics.

- Palozzola states academics are important and we work hard and have incredible stories and important to put school work first. School comes first and make sure it comes first. Academics first and extracurricular activities and get a social aspect. I would put the academics and the seat first to forgo a party or dinner I would.

-Khan asks what's a main issue you would want to change

- Palozzola says underrepresentation is important for a safe place to voice concerns and demonstrate that to be approached if you want to talk imp open to hearing what you all have to say. Thank you all so much for your time and came out here for the academic appointment. I'm a second year biochemistry student and unique perspective and understanding large organizations.

-Helder moves

-Helder states he knows Palozzola personally and one of the most hard working people and without revealing too much about her personal life and background you should all be conscious of the fact that very few people have worked hard and her academic performance and extracurricular excellence and presence here are all exceptional given all of that and the council should take note.

-Kajikawa states the one thing that was surprising was the 3 year plan and a ton of different things that FSC covered that they didn't receive and realizes her passion for the position. This position states I had two candidates that were going to move forward but they stepped down for various reasons but its nice to see her take initiative.

-Shao states after having sat in on the interview I was impressed by the biochemistry major but the thing I did advise the idea of going back to the mother orgs because regardless of the position there should be reaching out to mother organizations and reaching out for retention. I was disappointed but I did reach out to the mother organizations and I

There were apparently some comments made in the mother orgs where they were offended by and that personally hurt me. I believe she has potential to grow and they were waiting for her to come speak to her about the rendition programs.

-Kajikawa states that's surprising and I'm shocked and given that its been on the week and I do know she met with Khan and came away learning what it means to interact with different students. The other point that faculty executive sees all students and sees the person of faculty and mother orgs are important but that's not her job, that's my other appointments job. I look forward to see her but shouldn't be limiting that type of scope. In terms of comments please bring forward.

-Cocroft stated on a different note during the CRC vote I was impressed that the ideas she'll bring with the plan and knowledge for the job.

-Khan stated she had a productive meeting personally and from that conversation and I feel like that she has a lot of potential and learning. Being south campus as a women of color and I commend her for a great job but I think its important to the necessary outreach, at the end of the day the people that we appoint are student leaders who represent everyone. I know they have this opportunity, personally with certain concerns I feel comfortable for learning about these individuals before stepping up to represent them. There's no space for mistakes especially when it is with mistakes and faculty. I really hope she can take the opportunity and I know she definitely will, but until then I want to physically see that growth.

-9-3-1 Palozola has been approved for the Faculty Executive Committee.

B. Faculty Executive Committee: Sabrina Zeigler

3-0-0 vote of approval by ARC

-Zeigler is a third year from UCLA and imp applying to faculty executive committee because I think I can be the voice for students to have. I'm a political science major and society and genetics minor.

-Kajikawa asks how she would bring your unique combination to the faculty

-Ziegler's states she has a humanities major and biology minor and I think its important to bring to the campus.

-Mata asks how will she manage her time

-Zeigler states she states there's time for everyone to do everything as long as there willing to give up the free time and me being able to hang out and spending time free time will benefit me and I will love to manage my time well and I don't see it's as a conflict.

-Amin asks what Impact UCLA is

-Zeigler states they go to George Washington Carver middle school and go to under represented communities and spend an hour with them and having fun and being one on one mentors and talk about what's important to life and guide the group and kind of putting a college and higher education idea.

-Zeigler would really love to be part of this committee and I bring an open mind and interesting perspective of student issues and a whole range. I'm part of the Pediatric Aids Coalition and working with kids and I know the inner and outer workings of USAC so I think I would be a great choice. Thank you for letting me spend your time.

-Hourdequin moves to approve Zeigler for Faculty Executive Committee.

-Dameron states she sits with SREC and for someone who wasn't familiar with CPO and CSC she did a great job to learn how to do that and the different resources SREC has able to provide. She demonstrated a strong knowledge which has been really impressive this past quarter.

-Starr states for Zeigler she's one of the only people that went to my high school that is from my rural hometown and has always shown great leadership and initiative and put her heart into everything and I would just like to say that in her behalf.

-Rafalian states she shows impressive leadership qualities and have no doubt able to balance this and showed me to Google calendar. We have a qualified candidate.

-Khan states I've seen her involved in many organizations and to see her at inter faith and ask open and honest questions and really appreciate her to take time to listen to different narratives.

12-0-1 Zeigler is approved for Faculty Executive Committee.

VI. Office and Member Reports

A. President – Rosen

-Rosen states we lobbied against Safe Campus Act and we met with 12 congressional and we are both members of Greek life and very much opposed to it. It would force survivors to work with police instead of campus entities and it would go against title ix and resources. I worked a lot with Badalich and Chrissie Keenan to work with bruin consent coalition. This is a conversation I've had with my own chapter and my chapter will not be supporting this. Everyone seemed pretty much on the same page and a lot of members are support of CASA for universities to have the right resources and conversations having to go on with here. I also talked about expanding mental health resources especially increase representation considering we are talking to increase violence and many people who go to CAPS. Yesterday I had a meeting with Denise Pacheco to talk about different ways to work with administration on campus climate. One thing they want to implement is the golden chair and it's a yellow chair to tell your narrative and listen to yours and anyone can use them and it would be a great way to bring chairs to bring these conversations and going in the same direction and will be having more meetings with Denise Pacheco for more administrative support.

B. Internal Vice President – Hourdequin

-Hourdequin states the 20 finalists have been released for t-shirt design and are all awesome for voting online and this Friday. This morning I've had a conference call with Larry Growth who is a founder of coalition for economic survival and tenants rights and

what codes there are for rent control versus non rent control to bring the lack of adhering to codes especially in Westwood to light to rectify those discrepancies. I wanted to let you all know we'll have Campus Safety Alliance meeting at 4pm.

C. External Vice President- Helder

-Helder states from Wednesday-Saturday and obviously during the school year its harder to stay there for a few days and went over for safe campus. There's good campus that procedurally speaking, Senators Alexander and Murray has total control on what goes through and what doesn't for education issues. It looks certain that the Safe Campus Act isn't going anywhere and the concerns for victims rights and mandatory police reporting isn't going anywhere. We're glad to be part of the big coalition that thought against that. We worked with higher education act that student loan debt legislation is getting closer to getting co sponsor for what council passed and an update on Perkins Loans that are first meeting felt hopeless because Lamar Alexander has a lot of power what passes and does not. We have been the squeaky wheels in politics and constantly knocking on the door for Perkins issue and looks like the house of representative will attach it to the highway bill which means Lamar Alexander will have to vote down the highway bill to vote down Perkins. It seem stat Perkins is alive. HR2426 is a comprehensive mental health bill and my staff on the ground do policy walks as a 350 page bill. It looks really good on the outside and has alto of bipartisan support and wants to possibly work on amendments for student welfare. The other sexual assault is Campus Accountability and Safety Act CASA and we have a strong relationship with senator McCaskey office and is willing to work with us on how students have a direct connection with federal power. We have an important impact for how federal bill works out. Please utilize bruin defenders and Kevin alluded to it during his presentation and its awesome we have direct advocacy for students.

D. Administrative Representatives

VII. Fund Allocations

A. Contingency Programming

-Wong states the non-USAC 9 groups applied. Required was \$12,738.16. Requested was \$4,304.42 Recommended was \$1,384.

-Helder moves to approve \$1,384. Khan seconds.

12-0-0 the contingency programming for non-sac

-Wong states GenRep3 USAC required \$336.10 and requested \$336.10 and \$80 was recommended. If approved there would be \$43,354 left in budget for regular contingency.

-Helder moves to approve. Khan seconds.

12-0-1 contingency is approved.

B. ASRF

-Kajikawa states INDUS requested and did not adhere to 2 week funding and given the urgency and allocated \$827.14 to cover the room reservation for Ackerman Grand Ballroom.

C. Student Wellness Programming Fund

-Chen states \$401.94 has been approved for GenRep3

VIII. Old Business

IX. New Business

-Helder states point of order and we should recognize Roberts rules and each be sure to 2 floor speeches on the topic of the resolution and the campus on the past has to go in circles and this is in the best interest of the council to follow Roberts Rules

-Rosen states according to Roberts Rules each person is allotted two comments and once everyone has spoken it'll go in the second round.

-Khan asks for point of interest just because we did only have 30 minutes is there any way for us to use one of our two turns to yield the floor that are still enthusiastic to share the opinion because we barely touched half the room.

-Rosen states that is the concern and you aren't allowed to yield floor especially not one in the room.

-Rosen states our office doors are always open and you can email us and this is what our bylaw changes and no real way to break our bylaws so we aren't allowed to yield the floor.

Bylaw Change:

Article VI., Section A.

5. Resolutions

a. Resolutions will be handled in the manner described in Article V[I] Section

A.2.b.

b. Resolutions shall express the opinion of the Undergraduate Students

Association Council on matters directly and substantially pertaining to

student welfare issues.

I. Student welfare issues shall be defined as those issues pertaining to

student [health], resources, education, safety and

c. A Resolution shall represent only the opinion of the current USA Council.

d. Resolutions must have at least three (3) sponsors.

e. Resolutions must receive a majority vote of the entire voting membership of

the Council to be approved.

f. If the resolution is to be published, the motion must include the size and cost of the advertisement, and the date(s) that it is to run, and may be amended as to any of these factors.

g. Approval of publication shall constitute approval by the Council of appropriate Contingency Funding.

h. No author or sponsor's name shall be included in any published resolution.

Article VI., Section A.

8. Any provision of these bylaws may be suspended upon a three fourths [two thirds] vote of the entire voting membership of the Council.

-Cocroft stated the bylaw change imp proposing would amend Article 6 section A clause 5 for resolutions and insert a new clause under Article 6 section A clause 8. I move to adopt the amendments by the bylaws to association.

-Helder states to clarify a little bit of confusion and will be begin about what it does not do and what it does do. It doesn't give council any additional powers. It doesn't expand powers we already have and under Roberts Rules if there's 2/3 that council disagrees with we can reject it. If the chair of the council believes an emotion is out of order and doesn't for our bylaws or motion we can overturn. Under this bylaw change if someone were to bring a resolution forward that did not follow the student welfare issues the President can make that determination but still subject to bylaws. Of course judicial board can come and say sorry we violated the bylaws. We can talk about that with judicial board and we can talk about resolution in the pass. Five or six years it was a different student body ND different student council still represents student body and council is a misstatement of the facts. Its not that the resolution has to dome up again and again and recognize the point of view then that's what you can do. If you don't think its addressed you can always bring it back if you want us to take action on it. Furthermore people were talking about how 14 people an we were represented by the student body on how to represent the issues. You can recall this and enact an initiative to amend bylaws and call a recourse. It ensures that its directly relevant to student body and four pages for anti Semitism and resolutions that didn't have a direct impact on student welfare and that's made a lot of people see USAC not relevant. Its to snore that people must make a deliberate effort to ensure it connects directly. The third point that allows us to suspend bylaws give the flexibility to extend public comment or bring out issues that might not agree.

-Rosen asks about the exact procure on CRC

-Cocroft states there have been concerns for transparency. The bylaws announce there needs to be a week and it was announced two weeks ago and it went through constitutional review committee that was reviewed unanimously. I announced it once again and sent out the language. Khan and Siegel reached out to me. No one lese at the campus community expressed no concerns.

-Amin states I have a few points on why imp completely against. We are elected because people liked our platforms to effectively carry our the work and we do not have the right and act entitled and assume that we know the rights and health benefits of this campus. We don't have that privilege or right. I don't personally think that someone has the right to tell me how I feel how vie been sexually assaulted. As an Armenian I don't think anyone has the right to tell me how to feel. That is completely undermining the activism my community has gone through for hundreds of years. If you are not able to make these tough decisions we shouldn't be on this council. There's no reason to make it easier. In regards to making it more united, you're ever going to make everyone happy. Divest Turkey directly affects Turkish club and through proper research and data it passed unanimously last year. The fact that I have to sit here and say this resolution was passed I have to leave it up to my council if Divest Turkey is an issue. We have to humbly sit and here every community struggle. We cant determine if that's student welfare. Resolutions are based on opinions and vote no against it but don't silence communities beforehand before you bring it to the council..

-Helder states an issue that has been cited is the issue of Divestment Resolutions. There's been an argument made from Divest Israel and the companies there that resolution that the editorial board and several people in public comment and I want to maybe say that this is one of the greatest merits that prevents toxic divisive resolutions to come o the table. I want to read something about this amendment that on behalf of the weary campus I would remind everyone that while we should have opinions its both wrong and irresponsible of the urging of one community and the expense of another. Its not USAC's place and that one community deserves prioritization. Last time the council made this gross mistake and eclipsed by debate and it isolated the Jewish community and coincided with violence and discrimination and it ripped our campus apart. It is our job as officers to foster mutual understandings and I feel the council is strongly obligated to spend more time just dong that.

-Khan states I completely agree that we don't have the power to prioritize one community of another. This bylaw says it will decide what entitled student welfare and that directly states that it says what's important for what community of another. You have to look at the things ripped our campus apart. Anti Semitism, islamaphobia, anti blackness, racism, and investment in these countries is what is ripping us apart. We pass resolutions to divest form companies that directly invested and not recognizing a genocide or prison industrial complex and taking away students of color so rapidly. We have a direct responsibility to recognize all of these issues. We have to recognize what rips campus apart. All of the groups in the pass have identified anti-Semitism and identified several different divestment resolutions and to recognize the apartheid are still relevant. Its what the historical foundation is based on. Its important to us know our history before yourself. So many mother orgs are based on our history and talk about our histories. We don't have a voice on this campus historically and having this bylaw change we are continuing to silence student voices. From what Cocroft states this is important about not side stepping

and involves things that are important. The students are the ones to tell us what important. In order to pass a resolution 3 council members have to support a resolution. If there aren't enough council members it can't come to the table. Knowing there are three council members to craft to reach out and don't that on the pass. It's a huge slap in the face that these resolutions are passed and aren't going to recognize that and we don't really care about the prison industrial, Armenian genocide, or Sikh genocide. It's exhausting for students to work so hard and have teach ins and to have teach ins for students and have huge media launching campaigns and own money and own energies to pass these resolutions extremely pertinent and by saying you can pass it every year is not allowing student groups to move forward in progression. It's moving forward based on the student organizations and allow it to move forward. We're telling students to wait you out and by the time new student organizers graduate we won't care about it.

-Hourdequin states the process now of having the 3 sponsors to have resolutions come to council table and I think with that student welfare is already being brought and you know like, having a resolution for good for one year is not invalidating what isn't passed. Resolutions are an opinion of what's the council how are we supposed to pass what was relevant 20-30 years that won't be valid. I think that resolutions are taking into account everything that we have going on and reflect the current opinion. That's not to say that resolutions aren't invalid. I was part of the divestment Turkey and condemnation of the Sikh genocide and I recognize that these issues are important and are part of our campus community and affecting people in our community. It's not to say that resolutions in the past are invalid but that was a reflection of the opinion of that council. Also if someone were to bring another resolution of divest Turkey that's just bringing more awareness to these issues that are happening and amplifying voices because it's a conversation that's being had again and different councils can way in that are impacting of students. There's a new council and new turn over and have the same opinions. This year's council is not the same as last years. I was on both for most of it and the resolutions are not going to be the same. Resolutions are opinions of the current council.

-Rosen states she won't be participating we are the Undergraduate Students and are all current members of the students.

-Shao states speaking as Cultural Affairs and urges you all to reach out to communities of color because once you sit down with them you will realize how silenced they have been. For us to sit here and say there are 14 of us and say we can speak on behalf that is honestly one of the most disrespectful statements have to sit here and hear. The idea of validation and invalidation and know history and know self if you continuously to bring out the resolution to once again do what they always have told o which is validate themselves. History has told them they are not relevant, and every time you bring up a resolution that has already been passed you've been saying "please validate myself." I'm speaking so adamantly against this resolution and bylaws because the idea as my responsibility I will never co-op anyone's narratives and wouldn't tell them what they experience under student welfare and revalidate themselves to this council because they do that to their daily life and daily struggle. Even though we do sit on this table and you represent a lot of communities and identities that we would never go through. At the end of the day you have to sit back and can't judge other people's identities or narratives because you sit on the table. You cannot judge what is relevant on the table. You can't have that power or entitlement to judge what is valid and what is not valid.

-Siegel states there's a serious change when I think about USAC and what brought me to this institution was how the educational experience of students and we're at a university and we come here our top priority is going to class and one compartment and it could be the defining one but what imp saying is that when I go to school educational value and what school does goes back to education. Some doing some research and bylaw change and I was looking at the University California of President and public policy oriented activities and that's what a resolution does and I proposed some language I think we could discuss. I took this from Under 64: Levying an doter Public Policy and I would like to add and supposed to abide "educational benefit provided to student by such activities must outweigh any purpose of furthering a particular ideological or political report." Sow eke an make a difference in the world is that our student government is helping students in this pursuit and furthering a particular ideological body and that's vague. One can say we aren't a political body but I still recognize that I am political and political that we want our campus to be like. This is a codified USAC policy its not something I made up but I think its important that in proposing this bylaw change we are standing up in education. I feel like I'm in a classroom right now. There is an obvious rift and taking a stance and that's not prioritizing education and that's what we should do. I wanted to amend to add

-Siegel moves to amend this bylaw change to include the sentence "the educational benefit provided to students by such activities such as revolutions must outweigh any purpose of furthering a particular ideological or political viewpoint.

-Cocroft asks where to inset it

-Siegel states C

-Chen asks if there's two motions on the table

-Rosen says yes

-Kajikawa states I disagree we are bestowing that what's ideological or political is problematic and have specific identities that are represented by our ideologies. I look at this as giving it more power than it should and representing 29,000 and who are we to determine what's ideological or political stances and I think its extremely problematic.

-Khan states I agree with Kajikawa and some of our identities are inherently political. For furthering education such as mental health and finances and for constantly telling someone they don't matter and have to look at narrative and identities. As a student our priority is education but most of us doesn't have that privilege because we are invested in taking care of our families. We come as international students and there are so many things we cant decide for them

-Helder states if a resolution is too ideologically dogmatic it can be defeated by virtue of contradicting and defeated by council by council not wanting to vote on it and I'm concerned it's a little redundant and move to call to question and resume discussion

-Rosen states we have to vote to call to question and if you want to continue the discussion you can vote it down.

4-9-0 the call to question was rejected and discuss this new amendment.

-Shao states specifically the focus on education itself it invalidates the political and ideological that got us here on this campus. I speak on this as a personal level it goes all the way back as undocumented to my dad being homeless to working 365 days and 15 hours a day. That is the political ideological and systems of oppression in order to send his 2 daughters to school. At the end of the day education is a light of beacon and

identities and narratives isn't commonly tell, when you narrow it down to what is educational you tend to eliminate how everyone got here. There's a lot of students that are suffering and can't stay here because of the political and ideological.

-Siegel thanks her for sharing her narrative and check the circumstances that brought us. We were elected to lead and use our own judgment that our peers invested us to make decisions that we think are important. Everything there's something we don't like it's not appropriate that these are students that we're silencing it. These students are conduit to us and we are representing to us. If we aren't allowed to make decisions for leading and moving us into the future so all students can have more harmonious experience that's very unfortunate. I understand that your ideology and political experience is so invested. Why is it USAC's role to judge that and make that call and there's so many avenues to be involved and create these politics and when we are representing a student body to further the students experience and taking these positions it's unfortunate to say we are speaking for the whole student body. This resolution gives power back to students so they don't rely on USAC. We aren't the defining emblem of this campus and be critical of themselves and one another and as past history has dictated to say we are creating this viewpoints and making education take a backseat is problematic. There are so many ways to get involved but I think USAC makes it an unconvincing point.

-Amin states my direct response is that I want to reiterate the public commenters. This is diverse and there are different identities. You have to make a hard choice about talking about the issues and somehow the campus is united. There's no reason for this is going to happen but you have to be respectful to different students and face all the diverse narratives. I don't know what was wrong with the old resolution because it says any opinion is expressed. I don't know what I means to be Jewish or be black or be Palestinian or Chinese and so on and so forth. I have to sit here and humbly listen to all the narratives and meet with these students and community organizers and that's my job. It's not my job to make the minified I have to learn about you and educate and educate about these narratives and that's my two cents.

-Cocroft says there's an article that a resolution is a formal opinion or stance on an issue that represents the holistic view of the resolutions and I think I furthers that goal of being a holistic rather than an ideological or political tool of certain people on campus.

-Shao states my simple and direct response, there's a difference between representing students and overpowering students. There's a fine line between that and we are stepping very close to and that's making me very scared.

-Khan states what Siegel states we as USAC represent all of students. Less than 30% of student body voted. We technically don't represent. It would be hypocritical but USAC is not the only avenue for students to do it anymore. We are going to accept other students and if we genuinely want to represent all students it shouldn't be a call to question. We need to make sure we aren't overstepping our bounds. For students to talk there should've been more outreach, here were several communities that came in but if something that we genuinely feel the student body knees not just 30 minutes but taking our time to outreach. They should not be responsible for researching it when we should be

-Helder interrupts and asks are we on the educational component

-Cocroft states low voter turnout is a slippery slope because we're making our body illegitimate.

-Siegel thanks him for sharing the feedback and understand the position you're coming from but I want to go about why I bring this here and personal experience why I'm proposing this. The term that has been used a lot is identity. Identity is inherently political as Jewish student. The reason I bring this forward that I do think till improve and my own frustration for USAC and my school. As a student on this campus I felt like my identity is under attack and maybe it still is. The way USAC has behaved has wanted me to bring forward favor ideological or political viewpoint over education and unfortunate for my experience on campus. I want you to understand why I'm doing this and in terms of resolution its important to be critical of issues but when we are favoring polarizing issues and yet we are taking a stance on one community I think that's inherently ideological or political and is it outweighing USAC's purpose. I cant speak anymore and that's it.

-Hourdequin thinks the language is restrictive and we walking this fine line of what direction of what resolutions are supposed to do and the language that you presented is too restrictive.

-Hourdequin calls to question. Patil seconds.

12-1-0 it is not called to question.

-Rosen asks all those in favor of the amendment.

2-11-0 we will not be adding that amendment to the bylaw change.

-Patil states student government is funded by the student body and we should focus our time directly pertaining to students. Although any issue could be student welfare and cannot simply rely on inferences. We really need to define exactly what that is.

-Kajikawa stated we touched on a lot of issues and look around the table. There's 14 of us and we all come from different parts of campus and each and every one of our possibilities falls on a unique aspect. I sit on Academic Affairs or Campus Rendition and falls under my specialization. It doesn't mean that I take over student wellness issues or community service issues. As we look at representatives of the 29+ students we were elected for that reason. When we look at issues of student welfare but when we have student representatives that come form this aspect we are limited in scope of what we specialize in. We want to be cognizant of the body. It says we are silencing communities as a result, and I strongly disagree with that. Students will have to talk to particular councilmembers and student welfare is broadly defined and when we look at issues of divestment and know history but when we look at the South Africa vote of apartheid in 1997 it was passed unanimously. Ironically who brought it forward is John Capara is a close family friend, there is an opportunity for students to come forward and you all can message me and you all can text me. It is our responsibilities to have our door open and if its an issue that doesn't fall under broad definition and its our issue to step up to the plate that its important to bring up like something that would get unanimously passed like 1997.

-Dameron states my loyalty is the commission I serve but my responsibility is the students of UCLA. I do not represent the students I serve the students. There's no way I can say I represent the students when I don't. I serve them and that's the role I take as community service commissioner and everything that is going in and the addition is B in adding an entirely new layer is making us more inaccessible to students. We are not a senate system and its already hard to get justified in how student voices are heard or for even to get access to students heard. Adding this layer and attempting to student welfare

in these terms of student body we “represent” I cannot do. I don’t think adding B is me doing my job that I was elected. C a resolution shall represent only the opinion of the current USA Council. That’s implied with a resolution that indicating with us is a job for students who worked on resolutions these past years and students graduated. Its implied that it passing under it is doing more harm than good and may not adequately serve. I’m all for 8 but I’m just saying that’s my viewpoint if it were to call to vote and I would call no.

-Chen states my commission was student welfare and I agree with Dameron and I think it adds another layer on how it goes about student issues and currently right now it has $\frac{3}{4}$ of resolution and it has worked so far. Adding on another layer will limit the access to students and getting the message across. Even playing more specifically and talking more students, and I am the student wellness commissioner. I know a little bit what student welfare is but I cannot define it. I may have a better idea but I don’t want to slight anyone in the council table and there’s an issue of what “student welfare” would be defined us and I don’t think its necessary to add a layer to another issue. We all acknowledge this and I thin kits our job to not only keep it among the people but the fact that its being brought up is really a job. We already understand it so there’s no reason to understand it up to 50 years ago. Going back to B, if we are to add another layer even as USAC and cant define what student welfare is there is a certain level of discretion at this table. This discretion cannot be on selecting what issues on what matters but I think we should focus on if we have that level of discretion we should make sure it doesn’t harm student welfare. If you bring something up but if you are to exercise we have to make sure that it isn’t divisive. I’m not proposing any amendments but we should all keep that in mind an provide that different perspective and coming from Dameron. We are representing a lot of people that don’t necessarily stand for and a lot of our programming doesn’t affect a lot of the people that usually voice and don’t silence it.

-Rafalian says his role as a council member is two parts is to serve the student body on our platforms but our other job is to represent the student body on the council table. That falls in line of direct democracy and representative democracy and that falls into the own voter turn out of 29.6% and the election of 2014 had 26.3% is an issue. Its not silencing student voices but redirecting our dedication and too many issues come that are polarizing that at the end of the day that we either pass it or don’t pass it and makes everyone angry. What I also appreciate is that I like how things have to come up again. I would not have the knowledge to stand with the Armenian community or what Sikhs have gone through and it would be a disservice for students to come and get this knowledge that this resolution is to provide. We’re seeing this as a positive and have been here to make tough decisions and I’m a firm believer in expression “pressure creates diamonds” and that’s why I like this.

-Messler states we have a unique perspective on council and see multiple sides of a discussion and represented by students independently form slates. I’m also to see both sides of the discussion and got to hear so many people speak and why there in support or nor support and there both valid and I’m taking the time. I do understand that as someone who represents a lot of students but do know the consequences of the divisive and polarizing ones and people don’t want to involved in USAC when we do a lot of valuable work. People get threats and fights and its important in the grand schemes and harming students is not what erred intending to do. At the same time its not my position to define

“welfare.” Just because I cannot define welfare it doesn’t mean we should bring forth things that can’t harm it, but instead of seeing it from one perspective and step back and consider the perspectives and coming to a compromise rather than a combative one. We want to make sure welfare and what we choose to see it. As a whole I don’t think it has bad intentions but I recommend everyone take a step back and we all have our own opinions and maybe find a way to make it representative of our table but we can do our best.

-Amin states she appreciates Rafalian to be engaged but since we’re on this topic of student welfare. Don’t you think it’s inefficient to talk about student welfare to talk about student issues for it or against it. It’s inefficient to bring up the past because all those years and I was part of ASA and members up until 4AM about resolution and educating and takes time and the strain on persons mental health for that and I don’t want to revisit that. I had to do that my entire life and I had to be mindful of that aspect and that’s all I wanted to give.

-Helder would like to speak through the theme of reaffirmation of resolution and it’s not bad practice if a council is concerned with an issue to each year reaffirm its dedication to that issue. In a sense this bylaw change represents another reaffirmation of this council and this council and entire university needs to have a reckoning with itself and change our attitude and tactics and share us down is just as guilty as anti-Semitism and racism of others. Some of USAC’s resolutions has made USAC a bully. None of us can claim innocence and we fool ourselves that resolutions are the platform for a problem of this magnitude. Can’t we understand that it’s our role for students to come together? Can’t we understand that we share the same short life and similar goals. I think this bylaw change affects our ability to tear each other down.

-Shao states when there’s this perspective that the reaffirmation comes from the bylaw for the only means to come with solidarity this where it becomes problematic. At the end of the day we don’t need Sikh students to always push a resolution, but if you really want to stand in solidarity you would go to their events and reach out. That is a perspective in which I was able to grow in and sit here at 7pm but that is the most incremental duty. At the end of the day I make sure that in between classes I’m going to events and meeting students and having conversations as opposed to just using 7pm on Tuesday. When there’s this idea of bringing about resolution and using it as an excuse to stand in solidarity is the worst excuse. As a USAC member elected by your peers not because the position but that’s because you want to as a student yourself.

-Khan wants to echo a lot of what Shao says and concrete examples. I don’t think it’s the responsibility for students to teach us but it’s our responsibility to learn and outreach to us. It is our responsibility to go to their events and Sikh Student Association has to watch a movie every year and why should they do the same presentations. The Incarceration Youth Tutorial Project does movies and Afrikan Student Union holds incredible programming and if you are invested you would co program and reach out and attend their events and learn how to hold narratives. I feel like the word divisive has been thrown around and we need to take a moment to outreach to students and think it’s divisive. Who are we to say that Palestinian students don’t matter? We divested a lot of things, but we are only talking about divesting on companies who are violating human rights we didn’t divest from a country. We have notes and issues and we have histories and we have other people and student organizations who document their history so well.

It's our responsibility to use these resources; it's not our responsibility for them to make the same arguments.

-Patil states ¼ of the campus is new every year and one of them as an Indian woman is about to educate another community on issues students face on a day to day basis.

-Cocroft wants to address the provision that resolution only represents the current council. Dameron said it's introduced to most everyone. People seem to believe that resolution is opinion of all future UCLA students and the opinion of this student body and it has to be the opinion of others and that clarifies what the council felt at the same time. That is a perfectly valid and I don't necessarily agree that it represents UCLA students 20 years from now. The other divisive issues are silencing the issues that are invalidating people's narratives. If we focus on people's issues and focus on issues that impact day to day life and we are in a position not individually but to decide what issues promote the wellbeing. When people disagree they have democratic means to do so and elect new representatives or seek to overturn the decision and that's the best thing about democracy. One of the public commenters said we're in America. We have privilege and think if 2/3 decide that it's a broad consensus and I think each of these provisions will go and have positive impact on making it more relevant to student body and more united and better protecting.

-Rosen states there's no way of signing a waiver and if you're taking snap chats please refrain from doing so.

-Chen moves to make an amendment on the resolution by law change. In point b I would like to eliminate "directly and substantially pertaining to student welfare issues" and "that do not subject welfare of the association to harm" Chen amends to delete "Student welfare issues shall be defined as those issues"

-Cocroft asks if you can consider each change individually

-Rosen says yes

-Chen states point of order would it be able for me to clarify.

-Chen states not harming anyone in the association is the best way to focus our power to have discretion on what we listen to. In USAC we have the discretion to talk about issues we are inclined to talk about. If we want to add another layer and make a solution for everyone to agree on and if we are going to add anything it should "not subject the welfare of anyone in the association to harm" the other layer that it should be focused on not harming anyone. My second point that notice I didn't take out welfare, because welfare as we talked about earlier is loosely defined and fluid, I bring this about because I think that fluidity and discussion in talking about issues and having a sense of issues is very beneficial and useful and making sure it doesn't harm anyone. We have to know the fluidity and some form of not change the bylaw we have to come up with a solution. When we discuss what won't harm it's worth our time to discuss. If we don't know it will harm the student community to not hinder anyone from the current process in terms of their concerns. It's just that their concerns are primarily that no one is harmed in the student community.

-Khan appreciates the amendment but since we struck out so much and would it be possible to the already existing such as "resolutions must have at least three sponsors the subject of welfare to harm" and we can clearly define what harm is. For the council members who choose to endorse them and it's a building process. I'm asking if you feel like it's something you can be comfortable for.

-Chen asks if I can do a point of order and question

-Helder states point of order is doing the right thing

-Chen asks if I were to clarify and talk about addressing my point would that cost one of my comments? Can I ask for clarification

-Rosen says yes

-Cocroft says the end goal of all these changes that the wellbeing of the student body is protected and promoted and making sure they don't harm anyone strives for the same goal and I am completely on board with that. If you have to define student welfare we have to define the terms

-Siegel said this is a learning process and challenge my own ideas and that my understanding can improve on the day to day basis will work on in a lecture so I can be a good person and good citizen. That being said I am really reconsidering why I proposed that amendment before and I have a lot of different feelings and seeing the vote of course where my priorities are and moving forward. That being said I need to stay on this and I feel that when you're talking about harm and things that harmed me and USAC an this identity on campus an consider getting behind and don't feel harm. I think harm is more pressing and if someone feels harm that can arm them physically or mentally who are we to say what that harm is. Overall I am really intrigued by the language Chen proposed and could possibly see myself as supporting it.

-Mossler asks point of order are we doing different talking points or is it all 2 points.

-Rosen states two talking points of amendment B

-Mossler states touching on what Chen is fluid definitions allow for change and we do and because we aren't defining welfare doesn't mean we cannot protect it. It wont remain stagnant on our opinion because it wont remain because it allows us to adapt as we do and grow as we do.

-Starr said anyone in association so that just is more constrictive than inclusive. If one person says this "if you pass this it can harm my welfare" and it could be restricting.

-Chen states thank you for the suggestion and being brought up. The intention of this in regarding to the association before I even thought about specific semantics and in terms of leaving the welfare not defined necessarily is essentially bring up Mossler and Siegel brought up. Fluidity and necessary for debate is the most suitable and best way to use it that currently there is a system of 3 weeks. In terms of 3 weeks and bring it up and people and talk about whatever resolution and the current process of allowing people to go by is effective and encourage discussion to ensure no harm is being done. Defining harm is not a slippery slope but its difficult and its hard to define what harm is and inherent that we don't do anything that does harm people. I think that going through the process outside this table because most of us can agree what harm is and if there's harm brought up by a different stent I don't doubt that other council members wont be reached out to. Second point, anyone in harm, I'm not sure what word we should use but I'm open to suggestions

-Rafalian states maybe "members of the association to harm"

-Cocroft says if any student came up the council if they said "this resolution harms me" we will not be able to take it up and therefore its invalid and restrictive. Now every single student can veto by saying they are harmed. We don't want resolutions to harm anyone in the campus and its good there's a fluid definition but it opens up for a lot of problems.

-Kajikawa states it's a lot of problems and national movement of what microaggressions constitute in the classroom and attempt to address sensitivity and more things to point out

and looking forward and any provision of the bylaws may be suspended among a 2/3 vote. If the student can approach the council than we do need to take into consideration and we are elected to determine is this substantial harm? That do not subject to substantial harm and kind of higher level

-Helder stated it's a flaw word but there's precedent given the flexibility by saying that the resolution do not reasonably subject the welfare of members of association and its flawed because it leaves open the discussion of the reasonability of a student and it leads to hurt feelings and provides flexibility of the language and allows the council to pass a member of judgment on flexible measure of judgment.

-Hourdequin doesn't think we should have a threshold of harm because if someone is harmed than who are we to say. "you're not being harmed" I don't think we should be having a certain level of harm inflicted or certain threshold. I really like this amendment and I also want to remind everyone that bylaws can be suspended by a 2/3 vote of council. Lets say resolution can come to council, it would have to be sponsored by 3 members. We can over rule the president with a majority decide if we agree with the decision for this year and future years, the council can override it. If council wants to over ride the decision we can 2/3 vote that we can have these resolutions come.

-Rosen states we are on letter B

-Starr wonders if "I" is struck than if it remains a controversial and what is happening abroad affects my welfare and what happens home it does affect and under that interpretation it makes sense for the resolution to come. I don't know what's restricting but I worry the negation content.

-Chen states the clarification being people can challenge the resolutions saying it did cause harm in general this would give them a better way to express that whereas if we didn't answer before than people can still do the same thing. People can do that now but it's a better avenue for the concern whether we want to bring it to the table or not so that's just a clarification.

-Rosen calls to question on letter B "resolutions shall express the opinion of the Undergraduate Students Association Council on matters that do not subject the welfare of members of the association to a substantial harm."

9-2-2

-Chen states a lot of points were brought up and wants to strike "student welfare issues shall be defined as those issues pertaining to student [health], resources, education, safety, and rights" and want to eliminate a sense of definition and by no means is that inclusive.

-Cocroft states it makes complete sense now that we struck B

-Kajikawa calls to question

12-1-0 there is a call to question.

-Rosen asks those in favor to strike this.

13-0-0 they will be striking I.

-Rosen states they'll go be cu to conversation regarding the discussion of the bylaw entirely.

-Chen says point of order. I believe I motioned on the table can I ask for a clarification.

-Zimmerman stated we voted them separately.

-Chen moves to strike "c. a resolution shall represent only the opinion of the current USA Council." Shao seconds.

-Chen states a lot of the points brought up have been discussed and one, I believe that the idea of this is inherent and in no way there is no way to expect my voice for last 100,000 years if UCLA still exists. With that being said, the purpose of this entire change is to focus on talking about the issues that affect student climate and we all want to talk about things that matter and reflected upon the previous changes. The strikethrough for C is something that is inherent and causing significant division and eliminating things that are already there and eliminating it will restore a connection that is already a division.

-Kajikawa disagrees and come across a lot of different students who take previous resolutions for matter of fact. One of my platforms was Covelo Peer Learning and that was passed. Those actually perpetuated academic inequity and students who would go were B+/A- and passing and most likely going to graduate. Those aren't the students we are focusing on. This really specifies that this was the previous thought that this is the new council and come in with new experiences and may be more educated about the decisions. One of the things I want to mention and removal of the current UCLA council. It doesn't limit us for the current council in keeping the fluidity. It doesn't limit us to clean slate but allows us for flexibility for doing our job year over year when essentially ¼ is new and doing our best to represent them. I disagree with striking the entire thing and continue striking "only"

-Cocroft wants to reiterate a point that a resolution can either only be our opinion or the opinion of the student body or future students. Student government and things that promote need to be flexible. I think that people that enact resolutions of the pass are used in that resolution in that point o time but I don't think resolutions adopted in the past represent mine or represent those in the past. Even though its implicitly understood, I don think a let of students understand that is what implied an more detailed and larger portion of student body doesn't take the time and having it more clearly stated is a benefit.

-Khan wants to go back and agree with Dameron when its implicitly applied. From the students we did hear that it's a slap in the face that we delegitimize it and have to keep in mind to go to public comment and personally I am in favor of striking them out. It's a huge deal. Its not only we are choosing but for next council the efforts you are putting on this year wont matter. What would motivate them to pass resolutions or speak up? It does silence student voices because this is one of their one mode of expressing themselves to teach council but to put tight constraints but their momentum and social justice is going to stop because of this presence of this bylaw, it's a huge slap to the face.

-Hourdequin states resolutions are expressing the opinion who voted on them. I believe its 1963 the president of the USAC council spoke out against having a student reagent. Is that to say that we don't support having a student reagent? We just passed a resolution in support of adding more student representation. Things change over time. What was voted on back there is not true because that was the opinion of the council at that time. I also want to say that resolutions aren't the only form of activism. It is one avenue but it is not by any means the only means of activism. It really is open to interpretation and in which there was nothing in there that they were nothing that videos were supposed to be archive and actually when I removed the video with board appointment I was able to do that within my guidelines. If I was going to do that we archive it. This is not redundant because its what actually is happening and council is voting on resolution and council change every single year. These resolutions are a way for students to voice their opinions to the council.

-Shao states this idea that we have to consistently reaffirm makes the resolution a paper tiger. We as USAC have money, connections, and resources in order to get what we need to do. In order for student organizations and communities of color we have to mobilize with less resources and not even half. It's a paper tiger, you are asking them to basically revalidate themselves every single year utilizing resources to move themselves back forward to do grassroots campaigning, actions, public comment, to sit down and write op-eds. You are asking them to go through over and over when they are trying to move forward and try to succeed. How resolutions are not the only avenue of activism which is agree with, but it is the end goal. When they are creating actions and protesting and sending emails and the end goal is to have resolutions passed. Yes its no the only avenue and it is the end goal. I'm going back to ask these students to revalidate themselves every single year and is triggering their own identity to reevaluate themselves every day to tell students we feel relevant when history and society have consistently told them we aren't relevant. If we try to pass it, one paper tiger, two asking to validate, and three draining resources.

-Siegel states specific language and certain interpretations and delegitimizes groups. This says it represents only the opinion and everyone knows what it occurs and the publicity and awareness of the situation and issue. We're not taking a strike in the history books, this is an opinion on what happened. Its not an institution that never occurred or go back in time, its just recognizing that this is a new constituency and new first years come and come with a blank slate and want to experience this campus that can help mold this experience about what is good and what is beneficial can make it better. By including it in here it gives an avenue to new students on campus an idealism n how they can make an impact and shows I can make this different and the crux of my opinion. The work is respected but this is simply an opinion its not deleting from the history books and we want to represent this new student body and value these issues with the school year.

-Helder wants to say I hope its not the end goal to achieve the great variety because in fact a resolution is symbolic and symbolic victories are merely symbolic. That aside I think that its worth noting codifying something already in practice and recognize change of student body year to year. We shouldn't take away the right. A resolution is a nice way to publicize issues but if you choose not to then you can choose not to there's no restrictions with this by law change than to codify an exiting practice.

-Mossler states when looking at part c do they see it implicitly stated as year and invalidating the work or do they see it as an ongoing thing to reflect my opinions currently. Its more of a clarification and don't want to subject my opinions on next year but I don't want someone to feel bound by my opinions and I don't want someone to feel like their work isn't validated. My opinions are not someone else's, this is a proposed question if implicitly or explicitly is causing more harm than good.

-Wong states that this clause was supposed to be a clarification and may not be a leader of USAC and come to Kajikawa for clarifications. Its great that we are working to clarify the bylaws and I don't think it has to be expressly stated. Expressed contacts are just as valid as implied. I think clarification is important it may do more harm than good. Based on the discussions and students that showed up, I cant quantify it. Every year the student body changes and council who serves students not necessarily as elected but as a volunteer capacity where we get stipends and that implies that we have assumed a voluntary position and take a financial compensation. Every year student body changes,

council that serves students changes, and this is already implied that the resolution represents the opinion. The identities are represented each year differently because campus climate. Resolutions regardless of our bylaws will resurface and that is why we do not need c to be expressed in this manner.

-Dameron stated it does more harm than good on how students feel and you have the opportunity to say you don't agree. In addition you can also pass resolutions and overturn resolution if you're really that passionate about it. Adding this causes more harm than good.

-Khan states you can overturn a specific resolution. Its counter productive to say we cant bind future USAC to these resolutions then don't bind them to this bylaw. As a direct response, every student every year has access to know who votes. Its not a representation of every one on council and if students speak up it does more harm than good. Its not the only way its one step in engaging in a farther plan of action. Its really one form as formal means and may have hot privilege. If each council has its own opinion than its counter productive that past councils like not using illegal immigrant, divestment from fossil fuels, divestment from school to prison pipeline

-Helder states there are names attached and resolutions act as a recommendation. And recognizing from the non binding detracts from the power.

-Cocroft says there are two arguments and its already implied why do we need to change things and its already implied than why do groups feel the need to bring it up again. We adopted the ban the I word and its my opinion but if you want to gather that issue it should be publicized again. This just is that we're not speaking for future councils but if its already implied than it wont do any harm.

-Kajikawa has different opinions and stated that its councils responsibility to address mental health but as a council we ever voted on it and yes than its explicitly stated and going back to the 2011 of peer learning labs, that's alarming. We have to explicitly say it has own opinions unique of before or after us.

-Rafalian stated if C is implied what's the problem with codifying it to further progress a ND making progress and continuing momentum.

-Rosen moves to strike this amendment for C.

6-7-0 vote this amendment will be kept in the by laws.

-Zimmerman states "only" is the one struck

-Rosen calls the vote for the entire bylaw change in its entirety.

9-4-0 the bylaw change has been approved.

X. Announcements

-Siegel states this Saturday is the viewing UCLA party in sunset rec and it will be awesome with my office corporate sponsor Target and the den and performances by different student talent group. There's a lot of cool aspects and we'll have blankets to rally around

-Chen states tomorrow is a big day for SWC Body Task Force that will include 5 different committees and be tabling for resource fair and different aspects regarding body image in 6-8pm with CAPS and HGI in De Neve Plaza Room. Tomorrow at 8pm SWC SEARCH will be partnering with student committee in arts for silent disco in Powell with free food and coffee in Powell at 8pm. I was at a meeting on wellness on committee and Sarah Potter updated us on gift giving in a budget efficient way on Thursday 4-6 in SAC

conference room number 4. I wanted to share those 3 events with you all. SWC body image is also patterning with CAC and cohost the Word on Wednesday featuring poet Jessica Salgado.

-Cocroft states texting 7177 and it's a free text to save 1000 gallons of water. We beat USC and saved over a million and second year of #thirstisreal.

-Kajikawa states tomorrow is that tomorrow is the academic townhall. Again I am serving on the online educational steering committee coordinated by executive vice chancellor office across the UC's and expand on education to make more mandatory class.

-Rafalian states we have a transfer coalition meeting and transfer pride meeting. The transfer coalition meeting is what we want the transfer resource center to look like about the space tomorrow at 11pm.

-Khan states the night market is Monday 6-8 in bruin plaza. We had an international student town hall and heard a lot of students who feel like USAC doesn't represent them to institute a lot of changes like a hotline to international countries, a bigger voice for them and establishing a position.

-Wong states they want to create a more comprehensive audit position with 2 audit coordinators to keep track and detailed records for different records. We just made this position because I felt like there was need for more student group accountability and transparency. This is end of the quarter and want to update you.

-Hourdequin wants to remind everyone that next week we will have a shortened council meeting with no officer reports or new business unless something comes up between now and Thursday at 5pm that very urgent and approving funding.

-Rosen states 6 clock.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet has been passed around.

XII. Adjournment

-Cocroft moves to adjourn the meeting. Rafalian seconds.

Rosen adjourns the meeting at 11:19pm.

XII. Good and Welfare