

Finalized

Approved March 29, 2016

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

Kerckhoff Hall 417

March 8, 2016

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, Marvin Chen, Ariel Rafalian, Stephanie Wong, Patricia Zimmerman, Deborah Geller, Christina Mata

ABSENCE: Ruhi Patil

I. Call to Order

- Rosen calls the meeting to order at 7:04pm
- Rosen explains they aren't at maximum capacity and for fire regulations

A. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet is passed around

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Rosen moves to approve minutes from March 1st
- Hourdequin moves to change the order to the New Business to have Election Calendar Changes to A and B and move Meeting During Finals Week as F
- Khan asks if we could move the meeting
- Zimmerman said all the other rooms are booked
- Kajikawa moves to strike Academic Affairs Commissioner Report and ASRF
- Chen moves to strike Student Wellness Programming Fund
- Helder moves to approve the agenda as amended. Rafalian seconds.
11-0-0 the agenda has been approved as amended.

B. Approval of the Minutes from March 1, 2015

- Helder moves to approve the minutes. Rafalian seconds.
11-0-0 the minutes have been approved.

III. Public Comments

- Kevin Hale the SIOC Vice Chair and the American Indian Student Association outreach coordinator and I'm here in favor of the referendum and I can just speak on our success in our program and the American Indian Recruitment and reached out to four sites that they attend on a weekly basis. Each AiSa coordinator has reached out to Flagstaff border town of Navajo and Apache and also have 30 students from the Hoopa Valley Reservation Community College and I just want to support that most of this work on a voluntary basis because we're short on funds. I'm in favor of the referendum to reach out further to other states and other reservations on behalf of the native American community.
- Justin Lei is representing SEACLEAR as the mentorship coordinator and I'm here to push for the referendum. A little bit of history 4 years ago over 3 million south east

Asians were uprooted from their country to come to lands. The struggle does not stop here such as PTSD imagine seeing your family blown up and poverty Even though its been 40 years these problems are evident in south east Asian students. They are really one of a kind and come to the great university and the problem of retention does exist. We serve 100 students and without these referendums we wouldn't be able to serve these students. They can contribute so much to the world and to UCLA and bring so much from what they fund.

-Jennifer Lee is a member of SEACLEAR one of the five retention projects. I wanted to talk about the services in support of the referendum. CPO we also have other services including test bank and study hall and late night vans and computer lab. On top of these services, we have 11 counselors who serve 330 students. That's at least 300 students to make sure they graduate from UCLA, a great university. Without this referendum, a lot of these student initiative and student projects will have to cut staff and imagine how many students we would fail to retain if this referendum is not passed. I want to bring up this reality and I hope you all vote yes for the referendum.

-Iliana Flores MeCha's retention coordinator and my involvement in student initiated and student run and my involvement has made my ucla experience fulfilling for social justice. As a bruin who embraces concepts of community I'm developing in these spaces. As a unicamp counselor I witnessed the positive impacts on la youth but as a student leader having to self sustain projects becomes a retention issue for myself and impacts my academic trajectory. WE need to amplify the student voice and give back to future leaders.

-Good evening Iran Hernandez is MeCha's secretary and treasurer and Amigos de UCLA Community Outreach and go to the greater los Angeles area and mentor and tutor kids that come from low economic social status and under represented and work towards molding their minds and hopefully they get to go to a great institution at UCLA. We have a great ideal that ucla comes to their school and comes to work with them and wants them here. We need to push for them to really be here, not just because its our duty but we must push for it.

-Stephanie Garcia is the site coordinator under MEChA and goes twice a week to east LA and provide holistic support and helping them academically and expose them to social justice efforts and deconstruct preconceived notions that they cant attend ucla. I recall multiple students who want to come to UCLA and give back. As one of our students at site, " I'm really thankful for all and giving me support. Its cool that you come down and help out. It's a big reason I want to come out and continue giving back to the community to help students of color achieve their goals/"

-Julius Sanders is from the African education project is that we teach them about black history and African history going beyond what students are taught, beyond civil rights movement. We basically teach things that we want to learn when they were younger. There's a social justice referendum will continue to let us lobby in the community and transportation and additionally our site takes back outside the park and the passing will help us get a space.

-Project Director under a project of CPO and goes to under represented communities such as CPA in Inglewood and tutor 3-5th graders and offer a quarterly

field trip. We double as mentors and retain the same kids. These past 2 quarters we didn't get funded enough money by community activities and we had to explain to 8 year olds that we couldn't take them because we don't have enough money. About \$4.44 will go to community activities. I support the referendum because many other projects that are trying to give back aren't allowed to based off money.

-Monia Aguilar is one of the interns to bring back consciousness and holistic health led by registered dieticians and we often neglect our health. We need to provide healthy resources to share the skills and I'm here in favor of the referendum because it will help to reach out to under represented communities and keep retention.

-Alexis Martinez is the MEChA assistant director for the retention project. I wanted to talk about my narrative. As a first year coming into UCLA I was struggling with mental health issues not knowing how to go about campus and it wasn't until exposed to these retention projects and academic peer counselor who helped me learn policies like ECP or my major and having these guidelines here through my peer counselor really helped me and exposed me to the personal peer counseling which specifically work on mental health students. I then became involved with the mentorship and femtor who guided me to what to do and became part of the internship run by students. This program has been here since 80s and the roots are extensive into the 60s. These projects really do have an impact and develop student leadership and empowering them. We are targeting students for personal development and true bruin values of leadership that UCLA embodies and emphasized, my narrative isn't the only one. We need these services still and meet with all students and really try to outreach when we can only meet for 8 weeks and only twice a quarter so we need to focus on the issue of retention so they can graduate.

-Olympia Naranjo is the assistant director of MEChA and urge you all to put social justice referendum on the ballot because we go on a weekly basis in the greater LA area and drive over an LA to east la and boyle heights to give students services that might not be accessible and culturally relevant services. We need to ensure outreach efforts exist. We also need to advocate project directing positions as low funding is putting that at risk for being cut. We don't want out projects to do that we need to continue to service under resource youth in the great LA area.

-David Streamer is a project director for Fitted and on board for American student association. Being a first generation college student from a reservation and I was very unprepared coming in as a first year and finding them gave me a family away from home and they allowed me to excel even though they struggled they allowed me to stayed. Furthermore I just got accepted into a masters program these projects have been able to make my way through UCLA and without these projects I wouldn't be able to have. My little sister here is a second year and my brother is a first year. This is bringing more native students and we're less than 1%. If we're going to cut these funds we are going to have 0%. This is American Indian land. These projects are all essential.

-Michael Parreli is a transfer coordinator as ASU and I'm in charge in making sure that I'm in touch with transfer students and support transfer students here and all students that fall under ASU banner that align themselves as Afrikan on this campus.

As a transfer from community college that a majority are coming from community colleges that we allow our access and retention programs. I work with SHAPE and go out into the community and work with students. Additionally, for all the students that do that, especially the black community where there's only 4% of students and we are trying to bring other students in and they really need to be retained.

-Janay Williams is the chair person of Afrikan Student Union and urge council to put the referendum and students of color come together and rallied around. I think that this referendum is very important because its ultimately what's fulfilling our agenda. We always focus on access and retention. Through our access and retention projects that's a way that we have a community and retain students. If our referendum doesn't pass or change that would be detrimental to the black community. This is a decision the students ultimately should be making whether they want to tax themselves.

-Len Vuong is SEACLEARs retention coordinator. The reality of the project is that our staff is getting paid 9 hours and working 25 hours. Our staffs own retention is at risk and not focusing on yourself. The reality is that these students are at risk. The students who have been dismissed and projects are working with them to have them come back. We are telling them UCLA cares about you and people of color issues and I really want to push for the council to vote for this referendum.

-Veronica is the president of Pacific Island Student Association and supports the referendum. As one of the sponsors and our projects means the world to us. We were founded in 1996 and plan on being here for decades to come and this referendum will help ensure that.

-Joanna is from Pacific Island Student Association and a first year in academic advancement program and I really enjoyed being part of FSP to get familiarity of campus and get benefits of AAP. I was able to meet with counselors and connect with students of color who I wouldn't have met. Another huge benefit is PLF which is basically free tutoring and I've taken it for a few other classes. The tutor breaks down the material in simple ways to answer and the TA won't stop classes but PLF will go over it. With more funding for AAP these services will continue to grow especially students of color with low income backgrounds.

-Kelsee Foster is a first year from Pacific Island Student Association and I'm the academic success coordinator. PEERS is a retention project that caters to Carson and Long Beach and an advisor 6 hours a week which means one site and one meeting. Three years ago it has supported 9 hours a week. This reduction in hours affects not only myself but also the high school students that PEER provides.

-Tania is a board member of Pacific Island member and I attended Carson which is one of the sites that we service. Interacting with them from PEER helped me join UCLA. I worked for PEER which allowed me to give back from my alma mater and although I don't work for PEER its nice to know that PEER is still thriving and I would like to see it thrive for the years to come on. This referendum can make it happen.

-I'm the director of Asian Pacific Island Coalition comprised of 24 orgs. I'm in support of the social justice referendum. It funds many different campus sources and it gives back to financial aid, various funding pools that other student groups. All the students do great work and vastly under paid. We do this job because we

love our community and love our students, I don't understand why VSU has to sell bread to fund their programs. We are already under paid and over worked and this social justice referendum will sustain funding and keep this programs going on. OGabby is president of American Indian student association. Without RAIN our retention project, I wouldn't be where I am. I wouldn't be president and last year I got the opportunity to be a peer counselor and like many hats. I was a treasurer and peer counselor and we wear so many hats, and work way more than we get paid for. Everything means so much to us and we'll do anything to see it grow. We have four retention rates and being on tribal land is unacceptable.

-Danny is the president of the Vietnamese student union and urge the council to vote yes for referendum. Its our collective voices of people of color and ucla community. There's so many different communities in this room who are taking time out of the 10th week when we should be retaining yourself. We support this referendum and want this to be student teach. It warms my heart to see communities in the past we fought tooth and nail against ideologies. We need money for ourselves and for our students and make sure high school students go to college and college students. I'll be honest I'm on probation, but we want to make sure they can be amazing individuals. I ask you all to really put this on the ballot. Hear our voices and make sure our voices are heard so we can be one community. We are here unified let us be unified at UCLA.

-First year transfer student I was very nervous what would be on campus and I didn't have 2 years to build a community an di only have 2 years to get involved. Fortunately I found a place to get involved and engage in different communities like AAP and working at CPO I have seen a positive impact because I've seen people from every background and ethnicity use the services. No service is more important. One that is really important is the food closet who provides food for students who are hungry. The culture and student spiritual service fund which a lot of UCLA lacks. The SIOC reaches out to people who are invested. I like going back and telling people that they can make it here. I am in support of the social justice referendum. These resources are for everyone.

-I'm a first generation non traditional student. Her name is Jade and I'm here to support the social justice referendum because a student like me first generation not knowing what to respect I struggle din my fall quarter and the peer counselor saved me to tell you the truth. I'm here for my daughter and I feel like I cant tell her what to do if I didn't do it and I gave up a great job just to be broke and how my daughter that education is the way. This program that the referendum has to offer, they are amazing.

IV. Special Presentations

A. Teach for America

-Hailey is a fourth year from TFA and I want to remind you that everyone of us at a low income area and 1 out of 3 wouldn't be here. How are we preventing this in changing these odds? We are taking driven hard working students and placing them in one of 52 low income. You can get your masters and credential. Its not volunteering, it's a viable job straight out of graduation. Its important I'm a first

generation student and my dad didn't graduate high school. Within student government and we are leaders and we care about education or we wouldn't be here today. What we can all do is that the senior deadline passed but if you are a junior you are able to apply. As well as a job you care about that is doing something for education and kids. I encourage juniors and its April 20th and the first part of the application is 3 questions and your resume so its very simple and easily. I have contact cards to pass around and I'll be in this corner if you're interested. We also have internship sand can become a campus campaign coordinator and spread the word about this organization.

-Kajikawa states I'm graduating, how does that work for recent graduates

-Hailey states you can still apply you just wont be able to go straight out of college. If you're a junior and you don't get it you can apply again. It's a yearly basis and you can reapply until you get it.

B. Parking Services

-Lisa states that transportation services have some campus goals such as UC carbon neutrality, UC climate action plan, reduce employee drive alone rate to 50%, a campus trip cap of no more than 139,500 trips on/off campus each day, and SQAMD. Our mission is about access and mobility. Its not about parking. We are trying to make sure that those who need to get on campus that students, staff, faculty, patients, medical center, any coming for a conference, and general public can access the campus. Its challenging because we have a daily population of 75,000 and have about 22,000 parking spaces. You might not realize that we are surrounded by the busiest streets not only in the state but in the country. Wilshire boulevard has the highest traffic volume of any place in LA and exceeds it in many parts of the country. One of the many things we do is cap daily trips. In 1990 there was 123,000 and a daily population of 53,000. We now have student/staff population of 73,610 and daily trips of 100,000. This is the drive alone versus sustainable modes. It looks like the students are doing really good, except students 3 years ago was 29.1% rather than the current 46.1%. Its heading in the wrong directions. This is our mode split compared to the greater LA area an the national average. Our drive alone rate is much better than the national average. Our carpool lane is okay. Walking we are do really well, bicycling we're doing really well. Some of the things is that we are emphasizing bicycling. We have significant growth in bicycling. There's a lot of green bicycle lanes. We are trying to get the bike lane in Westwood in the city. Everyday we have about 3,000 bicyclists coming to campus, 10 years ago it was closer to 1000. We have a lot of people who walk. Of the non-resident hall students about 1/3 walk to campus and 12% of employees walk to campus. There are al to of employees who live in a walkable distance who still drive their car. One problem is safety. How do we co-exist safely? It's a lot of stuff on small footprint. We do a lot of activities. We do traffic calming to narrow roads to drive slower. The speed limit on campus is 25mph. We also subsidize public transit but one of the things we find out is that the message has gotten lost. We subsidize public transit for 6 agencies. Santa Monica, culver city, LA DOT, Santa Clarita transit, antelope valley transit. We subsidize and allow you to do multiple things. When the expo line opens in May you can buy a subsidized expo line pass and get subsidized flash pass to get it straight to

campus. Anywhere that live on expo line or live all the way out to Monrovia and Azusa, you can have a predictable and modestly priced transportation to campus using multi bus lines. Our most popular bus line is the 12 and 13% who commute and a quarter of students who commute and do not live on campus commute to campus on bus. We have more than 400 buses on to campus every single day. Carpoolers and vanpoolers have about 1000 parking permits that we issue. Carpooling is stale and vanpooling is stale and we are trying to reharvest both. 85% of students walk, 3% bicycle, and 7% use bruin bus for some portion of their commute including graduate students. Notable changes in growth! The student population is going to grow and have a commitment to 750 students and everything is growing. We have a parking crunch and peak LA area traffic has returned. It can take me 40-45 minutes to just get on 405 freeway. Solo driving is also up. This is sort of a look at the numbers of student commuters. It went from 27,000 to 30,000. The student parking prioritization is something we brought to usac and GSA 5 years ago and now there's a student waitlist. We have specially allocated students not assigned by parking's services. We have students with unique needs like child care issues and students with dependent or sick parents or unique situations. We come along with graduate students and then seniors and then lower. We are offering Free BruinGo! Flash pass. Everyone who didn't get a spring quarter permit get a flash pass. We're going to do the same thing. We have a bruin commuter club for students. We have realized from conversations that our website was not answering the questions that people didn't even know they had. We are completely rewriting the student website and we are going to break it down so we can improve the information and asking everyone else to help us with that information. The fee was supposed to go up January 1 but we deferred it to July 1. Parking is an auxiliary unit and we have to make money to pay for operating costs, debt services to make them, major maintenance and seismic retrofitting, and improvement in lighting and embark on charging project. In addition after we pay parking services we subsidize all van pool and transit. All that comes out of parking services fund. This is run over a 10 year plan. Instead of a big giant fee increase, we try to do gradual fee increases. One of the things we don't do is that we construct parking. We would have to subsidize the parking sales \$200 per month. Parking services last year we generated \$49.7M and this budget is estimated at \$58M. We are budgeting \$53M and operating expense at \$26M and then have to pay debt service of \$11M and maintenance of \$6M and alternative transportation subsidy is going to make \$12 and infrastructure and investment of \$7.2M. We plan on using \$8M of reserve and The parking reserve balance is \$18M.

- Rafalian states in the junior and senior category how is the need determined
- Lisa states there's no need, it's a lottery draw. Anyone who has a unique need deals with it separately.
- Rosen asks about off campus students
- Lisa states our expectations if you live on campus you don't bring your car. You can get a zip car or bus pass
- Cocroft asks about the parking cap
- Lisa states it not an official part but part of town relations and report it every year to the city of Los Angeles

-Siegel states talking about the waitlist and got a lot of attention, but going forward and showing us your financials and had to have the wait list and get it down to 3.8%.
-Lisa states our way of doing is to reduce demand and thereby freeing up space for the students.

C. #UCLAwellness Referendum
#UCLAwellness Initiative

Shall the Undergraduate Students Association support the wellness of the student body, student organizations and surrounding community through increasing student fees by \$6 per undergraduate student per quarter, for three consecutive years, to fund wellness-related programs and services, beginning Fall 2016? (Allocation of the fees would be as described below).*

Beginning Fall 2016, the approval of this referendum would provide the following:

A. \$1.50/quarter to UCLA Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)

B. \$1.00/quarter to USAC Contingency Programming Fund

C. \$0.50/quarter to USAC Student Wellness Commission (SWC)

D. \$0.50/quarter to USAC Campus Events Commission (CEC)

E. \$1.00/quarter to USAC Community Service Commission (CSC)

F. In accordance with University policy, 25% of the amount collected from the referendum

(\$1.50/quarter) will be returned to UCLA students in the form of undergraduate financial aid.

G. The fee will increase to \$12 per undergraduate student per quarter in Fall 2017.

H. The fee will increase to \$18 per undergraduate student per quarter in Fall 2018.

I. This fee will be subject to a Los Angeles County Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment factor

(as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor) beginning Fall

2019 for every year thereafter in order to address changes due to inflation and any rise in the cost

of living.

_YES

_NO

*This fee will be assessed each academic quarter including each Summer Session term.

#UCLAwellness Initiative Supplemental Ballot Language

-Chen explains the UCLA Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)

History:

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) is a multidisciplinary student mental health center for the UCLA campus. CAPS supports the academic and student development missions of the University and the Division of Student Affairs.

The mission of UCLA Student Affairs is to contribute to the teaching, research, and public service functions of the University by providing programs, services and educational experiences which promote the academic success of UCLA students and enhance the quality of campus life. The goal of Student

Affairs programs and services is to promote “the mental, social, and physical growth and development of the students in a healthy, safe, and intellectually challenging environment.”

In the broadest terms, the mission of CAPS is to promote academic achievement and reduce attrition and impediments to academic success. In carrying out this charge, the mission is threefold and reflects the needs of a diverse campus community: (1) to promote positive personal growth and self-management by UCLA students; (2) to assist students in coping with increasingly complex and stressful emotional crises, trauma and mental health issues which may interfere with academic and personal functioning; and (3) to enhance the psychological well being and safety of the campus community.

Problem:

CAPS has experienced an all-time high of services usage, amounting to around 20% of the entire population of UCLA. This figure is well above the national average for utilization among college campuses across the nation, and this figure is more significant at a campus as large as UCLA. Compounded with this significant utilization is the diversity of the student body at UCLA with diverse needs. CAPS is currently overwhelmed with the burden of serving such a large and diverse population, resulting in long wait times, session limits, and thus a general lack of accessibility for students. Most recently, UCSA gave UCLA a C+ for their mental

health resource evaluation. CAPS is one of the most important services provided to the UCLA community. A particular service supported by these funds may include the Campus Assault Resources and Education (CARE) office, which is a safe place for survivors of sexual assault, dating and domestic violence, and stalking to get support, consultation, and to have a confidential place to talk. Other services that would be able to benefit include expanding the current wellness workshops, introducing digital media podcasts and content for a broad and accessible outreach, introducing undergraduate internship opportunities, helping peer support groups on campus, and more.

Conclusion:

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) supports an increase of \$1.50/quarter to be able to provide support to CAPS services that improve the mental health and wellness of the undergraduate population and entire UCLA community.

-Wong explains the USAC Contingency Programming Fund

History:

The USAC Contingency Programming Fund supports over 1,000 officially registered undergraduate student organizations at UCLA by providing them programming funds throughout the school year. The fund is the most applied to and most efficient fund in that it has been consistently utilized in its entirety by the end of the fiscal year. Student groups receive allocations from the fund on a weekly basis. The USAC Contingency Programming Fund aims to increase students' campus involvement through supporting retreats, conferences, culture nights, workshops, banquets, and programs related to the arts, activism, career planning, education, recreation, retention, service, sustainability, and wellness.

Problem:

Based on recent figures from fall 2015, the average number of applications for the Contingency Programming fund has increased a drastic 39% from last year. While need has risen, average Contingency allocations have decreased 13% from fall 2014 to fall 2015, and almost 25% from winter 2015 to winter 2016. This is widely due to the increasing number of registered student groups requesting more funds to cover the rising costs of programming. In addition, as funding literacy has improved since 2011, student groups are seeking financial resources more than ever, while funding bodies have remained fixed.

The Contingency Programming Fund also depends on USAC surplus funds that are not determined until January of each fiscal year. Thus, the amount of available funds in the budget for Contingency Programming is unstable, unpredictable, and limited until winter quarter, considering the

growing number of student groups. Through this referendum, Contingency allocations would nearly double in the first year alone, will become a more reliable source for student groups, and can benefit an additional 16,000+ undergraduates each quarter to create an inclusive, well-rounded student body.

Conclusion:

The \$1.00/quarter will be used to stabilize the USAC Contingency Programming Fund, thereby creating a more sustainable funding source that student groups can rely on throughout the entire school year. It will allow UCLA to promote and maintain programs essential to the wellness of both students and student organizations.

-Chen explains the USAC Student Wellness Commission (SWC)

History:

The Student Wellness Commission (SWC) was added to the Undergraduate Students Association Council in 1965 to meet the needs of addressing student health and general well-being.

Since then, SWC has advocated for student health on campus through services such as evening vans, student health facilities (like the modern day Ashe Center), anti-smoking campaigns, and health fairs.

Currently, SWC continues to promote student well-being by its weekly programs, small and large-scale, as put on by the twelve committees of SWC. It also offers some philanthropic and community service events such as Run/Walk at UCLA, because a well-rounded education cannot be obtained solely in the classroom. The commission has grown from a 40-member commission to a commission of 12 individual student organizations and over 550 members (staff and volunteers), and from having 7-8 programs a year to over 150 events a year, focusing on maximizing the health and wellness of the students of UCLA.

The Student Wellness Commission affirms that student well-being goes hand-in-hand with both physical and psychological health as well as academic success, and well-roundedness. Therefore, SWC tends to the needs of undergraduate students in these areas. In this way, SWC promotes the holistic well-being of the student body. Through our diverse programs and projects, we address issues concerning the students' physical and mental health, campus safety, sexual assault prevention education, academic success, retention, and awareness about issues and philanthropy as we give the students the opportunity to take part in programs that benefit certain non-profit organizations related to UCLA or other non-UCLA organizations related to improving health and well-being of others

Problem:

As costs for programming and the UCLA student body population have increased, the buying power of SWC has decreased. The Student Wellness Commission is one of the lowest funded student government organizations in terms of budget, in proportion to the amount of programming and impact on the UCLA student body.

Topics of health and wellness have evolved since the inception of the Student Wellness Commission, where many topics that were not discussed from before are now at the forefront of student health and wellness. Through SWC's efforts in reducing stigma, raising awareness, and advocating for mental health, sexual assault prevention, these topics are at the forefront of student wellness discussions.

Student groups that are nationally recognized and leading organizations for these topics such as SWC Active Minds, the All of Us Campaign, and SWC Bruin Consent Coalition, would directly benefit in addition to the other committees of SWC to impact all aspects of health and wellness.

With additional funding, SWC would be able to innovate upon its tradition of student-run, student-initiated efforts by undertaking new efforts, particularly in providing free feminine hygiene products to the campus. In addition, more funding would be available to other student groups that impact health and wellness to access through the Student Wellness Programming Fund.

Conclusion:

The Student Wellness Commission is asking for an increase of \$0.50/quarter to enhance programming and services in support of maximizing the health and wellness of the UCLA student body and community.

USAC Campus Events Commission (CEC)

History:

The Campus Events Commission (CEC) was established in 1965, and since then has risen to be the largest purveyor of campus entertainment. CEC works to establish the holistic wellness of campus from a student perspective through its many programming activities including film sneaks, free films, film festivals, speakers, and concerts. CEC is also widely regarded for producing the Jack Benny Award and Spencer Tracy Award, where actors such as Robin Williams, Betty White, Morgan Freeman, and Tom Hanks have been honored for their achievement in comedy and film, respectively. Short Takes Film Festival, created by CEC and now in its 22nd year, gives collegiate filmmakers an opportunity to showcase their work and receive feedback from the top industry professionals. CEC provides programming that is accessible and welcoming to every undergraduate on campus. Through our events, CEC supports thousands of students of year, and creates memories that

will positively mark a student's college experience, whether it is participating in Bruin Bash, standing on the red carpet at the 22 Jump Street World Premiere, or attending a Macklemore and Ryan Lewis concert. Through CEC's efforts, undergraduates are able to diversify their college student experience to include more than academic involvements, thus promoting personal and campus-wide wellness.

Problem:

CEC continues to expand in outreach to the student body, and as our ability to reach more students increases, so does the demand on the programming we initiate. Considering those factors as well as the projected rise in enrollment for the coming years, it is exceptionally important to find means to accommodate the growing interest in CEC programming. Furthermore, funding has the potential to open up more co-programming opportunities with other student organizations that may not have the means or infrastructure to plan and execute an entertainment-related event.

In addition, while the costs of facilitating a CEC program have risen over the years, funding has remained stagnant. However, with this additional funding, CEC will be able to improve upon both the quantity and quality of events. CEC would be able to undertake additional programming, such as a concert in the spring, more student group collaborations, and opportunities to accommodate more undergraduates.

Conclusion:

The Campus Events Commission is asking for an increase of \$0.50/ quarter to cover an increase in cost for programming events and, in result, improve the overall health and wellness of the UCLA campus.

USAC Community Service Commission (CSC)

History:

The Community Service Commission (CSC) was established in 1965 during the Civil Rights Movement as a result of the Freedom Rides that took place in the South during this time period. CSC focuses its efforts towards improving the wellness of our local community by creating social change, understanding the greater Los Angeles community, and promoting campus-wide service programming.

Over the past 50 years, CSC has developed into an umbrella organization with 33 student-run community service projects and over 2,000 student volunteers, making CSC the largest completely student-run, student-initiated community service organization in the nation. Students work together to tutor youths and adults, address the health needs of ethnic communities, combat poverty and

homelessness, and reach out to incarcerated youth and neglected children. CSC projects strive to improve the wellbeing of communities by providing them with the tools to empower themselves and challenge the structures and barriers that keep them from achieving their goals. Additionally, the commission engages the service efforts of the UCLA campus-wide community through large-scale service programming, Alternative Break immersion programs, collaborations, and issue awareness campaigns.

Problem:

As CSC continues to grow and new service organizations get integrated each year, some issues have developed that prevent the ongoing operations of this entity to function at its full capacity. One of the main areas in need of more support is transportation; this is crucial to the success of CSC because transportation provides students with the necessary means to go out in any part of the local community and provide service. With the increase in service organizations at UCLA and expansion of CSC projects, transportation must receive more support in order to continue serving the wellbeing of the Los Angeles area.

Additionally, the increased involvement of the UCLA student body in community service programs has created a strain on the current resources provided and must be increased in order to sustain the current level of service-based programming available. With the implementation and growth of CSC's campus-wide programs such as Alternative Breaks, Day of Service, Nonprofit Networking Night and Serve Fest, the cost to program increases annually with the continued growth of each program. Through the additional support from this referendum, CSC will be able to continue the ongoing success of such large programs across campus.

Conclusion:

The Community Service Commission is asking for an increase of \$1.00/quarter to be able to provide operational support to different projects that improve the wellbeing of the local community as well as the holistic well being of students by providing them with the opportunity to participate in service-based programming across campus.

-Kajikawa is curious on why they didn't team out with other entities like the community activities committee because there is a lot of overlap.

-Dameron states there's a lot of overlap and there's going to be a daily bruin article on why we won't collaborate. The needs of our respective faces were different and at the end of the day we are looking at the need of the student body and able to justify. We decided to do 2 separate initiatives because it addresses two different issues. We have wellness on one side and social justice on another side and bring that in to that form.

-Helder asks if Chen is familiar AB2017 to amend mental health services and amends the California constitution. It says you're raising money to affect CAPS in creative ways. Has there been thought to organize money around students.

- Chen starts we'll talk to Dr. Nicole Green
- Hourdequin asks why the fee is increasing every year and what factors
- Dameron states we have an increase of nearly 1000 students. One of the purposes of this particularly referendum not to only justify the needs, but expand the increase in enrollment. A lot of students attend the events we put on but we didn't want to put this fee increase immediately on next years students but do it incrementally and spread out and see what students are able to do each year and progress that way.
- Kajikawa states in response wouldn't it be counterintuitive would nonetheless be paying so fee and I'm confused about the logic unclear because nonetheless we are getting more money. The 953 new students are going to pay a fee why not have a straight forward \$18.
- Dameron states 950 are coming in but at the end of the day for contingency its an auxiliary source of funding. Bringing in \$3 is a large surplus and its auxiliary meaning that student groups apply to it to supplement it. We want to take contingency in the next 3 years and if it becomes main source its just an auxiliary source. Its an expansion and end up in surplus. The 3 years is a developmental phase to initiate the process we laid out here with that 6 year increase.

D. Social Justice Referendum Social Justice Referendum of 2016

- Kiang stated they were disappointed and wanted to have one collective referendum so we wouldn't have competing issues so we wouldn't have to have student orgs fight and oppose each other. We are still moving forward to social justice referendum because there are real time needs.
- Kiang states before we go into details we wanted to present the amount of student fees the amount that each UC pays. We pay the least student fees compared to all Student fees. This \$24.99 this is a large amount but we haven't walked the walk for student fees. In comparison, Santa Barbara has \$1200.

-

Shall the Undergraduate Students Association support the promotion of social justice efforts, including programs and services that further community service involvement, college preparation, student health and retention efforts, and cultural, spiritual, and LGBT events by increasing the Undergraduate Students Association membership fees by \$24.99 per undergraduate student per quarter, including summer. (Allocation of the fees would be as described below.)*

-----YES

----- NO

The approval of the referendum would provide:

A. \$4.50/quarter to the Community Activities Committee

B. \$4.00/quarter to the Campus Retention Committee

- C. \$4.00/quarter to the Student Initiated Outreach Committee
- D. \$2.00/quarter to the Academic Advancement Program
- E. \$1.75/quarter to the Access to John Wooden Center 24 Hours/Day
- F. \$0.79/quarter to the Students with Dependents Child Care Services Fund
- G. \$0.50/quarter to UCLA UniCamp
- H. \$0.50/quarter to the UCLA Food Closet
- I. \$0.25/quarter to the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Student Programming Fund
- J. \$0.25/quarter to the Cultural and Spiritual Student Programming Fund
- K. \$0.25/quarter to the USAC Academic Affairs Commission Travel Mini Fund
- L. \$6.20/quarter will be returned to UCLA students in the form of Undergraduate Financial Aid.

Specifically, funding would be used as follows:

A. \$4.50/quarter to the Community Activities Committee (CAC) to support the efforts of social justice related community service organizations that provide direct equity related services. Organizations that apply to the CAC identify disparities in labor, education, and health that exist in low-income communities. Student-initiated registered campus organizations that provide an ongoing service to a target population throughout the academic year are eligible to apply to the CAC for annual funding. The CAC currently funds 90 community service organizations that work in the Greater Los Angeles area, providing students an opportunity to participate in volunteer service.

B. \$4.00/quarter to the Campus Retention Committee (CRC) to support the Student Retention Center's services, including: student-run peer counseling projects, test bank operation, free printing at the computer lab, the Writing Success Program, evening van services for commuter students, student jobs, and many other services. The Student Retention Center aims to increase graduation rates at UCLA, with an emphasis on graduating students from historically marginalized communities with the lowest retention rates. CRC funds are open to all undergraduate UCLA registered student organizations and all undergraduate students qualify to utilize these services.

C. \$4.00/quarter to the Student Initiated Outreach Committee (SIOC) to support social justice efforts by providing funds for student-initiated, student-run projects that promote community development by increasing access to higher education for students attending under-resourced K-14 institutions. Approximately 200 UCLA students work to provide academic services such as peer counseling, tutoring, educational workshops, and college tours for over 1,500 high school and community college students at over 20 different sites, on a weekly basis, throughout the Greater Los Angeles area. The ultimate goal of these projects is to increase the number of high school and community college students from historically underserved communities with the lowest matriculation rates into higher education. SIOC funds are open to all UCLA registered student organizations and SIOC job opportunities are open to all UCLA undergraduate students.

D. \$2.00/quarter to the Academic Advancement Program (AAP) to support the academic success of UCLA students with an emphasis on students from underrepresented and under resourced communities who enter UCLA unprepared for its competitive and rigorous coursework. The resources offered by AAP, which include professional and peer counseling, graduate mentoring of undergraduate students, and student-run outreach groups, aim to increase both access and retention of marginalized communities in higher education. AAP provides free tutoring for students, by students through peer learning facilitation that allows students to discuss course material with their peers in small, personalized sessions. AAP staff members –peer learning facilitators (tutors), peer counselors, graduate mentors, computer lab monitors, professional counselors, clerks, and administrators – inspire and challenge students to expand their personal and academic boundaries by building upon the great wealth of resources and talent they bring to the university. As a student enrichment program, AAP serves UCLA students of all races, ethnicities, and socioeconomic backgrounds who would benefit most from these services.

E. \$1.75/quarter to the Access to John Wooden Center 24 Hours/Day in of the expansion of the operational hours of the John Wooden Center to provide 24-hour gym access. This will create equity among students and give them the opportunity to prioritize their health. UCLA has a diverse student population that has varying interests, priorities, and schedules which make it difficult for them to all utilize the gym with the current operating hours. Those disadvantaged by the operational hours of the John Wooden Center due to the irregularity of their schedules will find a more inclusive, equitable and affordable gym with 24-hour Wooden.

F. \$0.79/quarter to the Students with Dependents Childcare Services Fund to support the childcare costs of students with dependents. Parenting students often overcome adversity to get to UCLA and their choice to have children should not bar them from getting involved on campus. Currently, there is no evening childcare service available. This prevents parenting students from getting involved in campus clubs and organizations, from staying late to study, and from getting the full UCLA experience. The availability of evening childcare services will greatly support the

retention of parenting students by alleviating the added stress of locating affordable childcare. This childcare service is available to all students with dependents and will be accessible through the Office of the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Campus Life.

G. \$0.50/quarter to UCLA UniCamp, the official charity of the students of UCLA, which challenges UCLA student volunteers to deliver unique outdoor experiences for children from urban communities that foster personal growth, build relationships, and teach leadership. This allows both; student volunteers and campers, to learn that they can reach their full potential, often beyond what they thought possible, and make a positive impact in their community. Each week of camp addresses different social issues faced by urban communities and allows UCLA student volunteers to give back to their community.

H. \$0.50/quarter to the UCLA Food Closet to support food security on campus. Food is a human right and students should not go without eating because they cannot afford to eat at UCLA. In recognizing student hunger and the stigma that may arise from food insecurity, the UCLA Food Closet located in the Student Activities Center (SAC) provides free food for any hungry student on a daily basis without requirements for identification. Since its inception, the utilization of the Food Closet has increased significantly. The UCLA Food Closet, in an attempt to meet these increasing needs, has expanded to include healthier food alternatives and more options for students. Despite this proactive approach, without sustained funding the UCLA Food Closet cannot meet the demands of students. Students should not have to decide between paying for their books and having a meal. Food security helps students meet their most basic needs so they can focus on their academics. The Food Closet was founded by the Community Programs Office (CPO) and is managed by the CPO on a daily basis.

I. \$0.25/quarter to the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) Student Programming Fund, which serves as an integral part of the UCLA LGBT community. This fund would advocate for the equity and safe spaces of all UCLA students by supporting programs that highlight LGBT student issues and campus inclusion. The LGBT Student Programming Fund, which will be administered by the Assistant Vice Chancellor's Office of Campus Life, will be allocated on a weekly basis and will fund all aspects of student programming including, but not limited to, honoraria, facilities, cultural food, parking, advertising, and graphics. These funds will be open to all UCLA registered student organizations.

J. \$0.25/quarter to the Cultural and Spiritual Student Programming Fund to support the efforts of registered campus organizations by providing financial resources to programs that strengthen social ties within communities and provide avenues for cultural and spiritual expression. These cultural and spiritual programs promote mutual respect between students, cross-cultural collaboration, and the sharing of each student's cultural and spiritual identity and traditions. The Cultural and Spiritual Student Programming Fund, which will be administered by the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Campus Life, will be allocated on a weekly basis and will fund all

aspects of student programming including, but not limited to, honoraria, facilities, cultural food, parking, advertising, and graphics. These funds will be open to all UCLA registered student organizations.

K. \$0.25/quarter to the USAC Academic Affairs Commission's Academic Travel Mini Fund, which will support UCLA's student body by assisting students in furthering their collegiate, social justice advocacy, and professional aspirations by funding attendance to academic and

leadership-based conferences. These funds will help offset the cost of academic-based conference travel, including but not limited to, registration, flight, and room and board. The Academic Affairs Commissioner (AAC) will appoint a committee to administer the funds.

L. In accordance with University policy, 25% of the amount collected from this referendum (\$6.20/quarter) will be returned to UCLA students in the form of undergraduate financial aid.

M. This fee will be subject to a Los Angeles County Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment factor (as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor) every year in order to address changes due to inflation and any rise in the cost of living.

N. This fee will be assessed each academic quarter including each Summer Session term, beginning in Summer 2016.

Social Justice Referendum of 2016

Supplemental Ballot Language

Community Activities Committee (CAC)

-John explains the Community Activities Committee (CAC) resides under the Program Activities Board as a funding body for programs and activities that focus on

the elimination of poverty and poverty-related issues. Groups that apply for CAC funding identify environmental, educational and health concerns that exist in economically and socially disadvantaged communities. With this knowledge, groups provide unique ongoing off-campus services based on unmet needs of communities throughout the greater Los Angeles area and abroad. As the primary funding source for community service, groups generally rely on the CAC for items including health screening equipment, healthy foods, educational materials and transportation in the form of sedans, buses

The number of groups that apply to the Community Activities Committee (CAC) has increased from 43 (in 2007) and 59 (in 2009) to 88 groups this past year. Each year, new and continuing groups rely on CAC for a significant portion of their annual operating budget, but suffer from reductions in the amounts they receive due to budget constraints. This past year, 36 of the 88 groups that applied received allocations that were less than half of the amount that was requested and not a single group received a full allocation. CAC groups heavily depend on allocations for transportation costs; however, surplus decreases and the addition of several applying groups have caused further difficulty for funding transportation. In 2015, the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) provided a supplement of \$100,000 to the CAC, recognizing that the committee had difficulties funding groups. The CAC was notified that this was a one-time occurrence to help shortfalls and projections anticipate that this supplement will be extinguished within the next two years.

Conclusion

The Community Activities Committee is requesting for an increase of \$4.50/quarter. This will allow for the committee to fund groups closer to their requested amounts and accommodate for future growth in the number of organizations that apply for funding.

Campus Retention Committee (CRC)

The Campus Retention Committee (CRC) was established in 1988 to augment university run retention programs. Since its creation, the CRC has addressed the low retention rates of underrepresented and underserved students through a unique approach to academic empowerment. Through the “Each one, Teach one” motto, students benefit in their UCLA career through a three-pronged approach: individual peer counseling, collective mentorship, and leadership through internship. Currently, six projects actively serve students through this approach: the Academic Supports Program (ASP), MEChA Calmecac, Retention of American Indians Now! (RAIN!), Samahang Pilipino Education and Retention (SPEAR), Southeast Asian Campus Learning Education and Retention (SEA CLEAR), and the Writing Success Program

Over the past 27 years, various services have been developed by students through the CRC to meet the needs of students not met elsewhere: peer counseling,

mentorship programs, wellness programs, gender & sexuality counseling, transfer services, internships with course credit, the

CPO Computer Lab with free printing services, Study Hall with van services, commuter van services, a student-initiated seminar with course credit in four Ethnic Studies departments, and liaison office hours with representatives from campus-wide student support departments such as the UCLA Career Center and the Financial Aid Office. With increased visibility, ads in the Daily Bruin, and tours for incoming students, our Student Retention Center continues to grow with students demanding additional services.

The historic population of communities that have been damaged by low graduation and retention rates, in conjunction with the growing population of the undergraduate student body that use the services, has increased the need for CRC funding. As many of these services are at capacity, it has become increasingly difficult to meet the needs of students. Through peer counseling components, for example, the inability to fund additional hours for student counselors has caused students who benefit from such services to have fewer sessions per quarter. This is primarily due to rising costs for job benefits and salary increases, as regulated by the state of California and Los Angeles County laws, as well as minimum wage increases mandated by the University of California beginning in 2015-2016 for years to come. While projects have been innovative in creating new components and programs to address rising student needs, such as programs focused on Wellness, Fitness, and Transfer retention, the current CRC budget does not allow for these programs to be successfully carried out and maintained in the future, as there has been no increase in funding base while there have been concurrent rises in costs to the projects. Paying for these project staff expenses has taken away from the CRC's ability to strengthen the projects.

One key area of focus is the Writing Success Program (WSP), which has seen huge increases in the number of students requesting their services. With new components forming in WSP to address the diverse needs of the UCLA population, such as services specifically targeting English as a Second Language (ESL) students coming from international backgrounds, WSP is becoming one of the most widely used services on campus. The WSP staff has worked hard to address the writing needs of undergraduate students from across the campus, meeting and exceeding their objectives in the previous two consecutive years. With the growing need for WSP, the CRC is expected to support the project and contribute to its potential growth, however this is difficult due to outside factors that are forcing CRC to cut back services.

Conclusion

We are asking for an increase of \$4.00/quarter for CRC to be able to provide every student with the necessary support in order to increase the retention rates on the UCLA campus.

The Student Initiated Outreach Committee (SIOC)

The Student Initiated Outreach Committee (SIOC) was created in the spring of 1998 as a means of funding student-initiated and student-run K-14 outreach programs. The impetus for the SIOC's creation came in the wake of the dramatic drop of underrepresented students in the UC system, due to the passage of Proposition 209 and the UC Regent's 1995 ban on affirmative action. For students at UCLA with a history of low admissions, there had been a historic lack of adequate outreach services and relevant educational support in institutions of higher education and in K-14 education. Hence, students have continuously addressed these needs by providing tutoring, peer advising, college preparation resources, and culturally relevant workshops to empower students to apply to institutions of higher education.

SIOC is the latest in a long line of collaborative student-initiated programs that offers leadership development to all economically disadvantaged communities in need. The program works at different levels to encourage students to take their academic and life goals into their own hands.

SIOC also promotes student and individual growth. SIOC projects are open to all UCLA students who are willing to become positive role models in the lives of underserved youth. In addition, the SIOC Mini-Fund provides support to student groups that carry out youth-oriented programming.

In recent years, the number of applicants to the SIOC Mini-Fund has increased as other funding bodies have cut back on allocations for these impactful youth-related programs.

The current California fiscal situation has had a negative impact on the SIOC budget. The state funding that SIOC receives has been reduced over the last few years; shrinking the overall SIOC budget. Additionally, SIOC faces UC mandates that further drained our resources away from student services. When the University increased wages for paid staff, SIOC did not receive an allocation to cover the additional cost. Thus, SIOC has to cover the wage increases through their budget, diverting resources that could be otherwise spent on servicing students. SIOC is forced to comply with these requirements, but has received no funding to cover the cost increases directly associated with these mandates.

At the same time, the current state of our economy has led to the university to hold each department accountable for covering the benefits of their full-time staff. The SIOC has to account for the benefits for seven (7) project directors. This cost has drained resources away from student services, since the SIOC has not received funding to cover the additional cost. Full time project directors are hired to support the development of undergraduate student staff members while managing the complexities of running a SIOC project.

The project directors have been a pivotal aspect of each project since they interface with community organizations and schools and are responsible for raising funds to support the services provided.

Conclusion

The Student Initiated Outreach Committee is requesting \$4.00/quarter from the student body to continue supporting projects and programming that address the inequity in youth access to higher education and related endeavors. Academic Advancement Program UCLA's Academic Advancement Program (AAP) is a premier student academic enrichment program open to students of all races, ethnicities, and social backgrounds whose entering academic profiles indicate that they would most benefit from AAP's innovative services. The AAP was created in 1971 by consolidating UCLA's Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and High Potential Program (HPP), two early efforts by Student Affairs to widen university access for students who had historically been underrepresented. In 1986, AAP was transferred from Students Affairs to a new unit of honors and undergraduate programs in the College of Letters and Science in recognition of its major academic mission. Today AAP is a major unit in UCLA's Division of Undergraduate Education, and the Associate Vice Provost for Student Diversity reports to the Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and serves as the

Director of AAP.

Built on principles of social justice, AAP has a threefold mission: 1) to ensure the academic success and graduation of students who have been historically underrepresented in higher education; 2) to increase the numbers of AAP students entering graduate and professional schools; and 3) to develop the academic, scientific, political, economic, and community leadership necessary to transform society. A significant number of AAP students come from low-income families, are the first in their family to go to college, are immigrants, and are from underrepresented minority communities. All AAP students enter UCLA as high achievers who have demonstrated their potential to excel at, and graduate from, UCLA. The successful integration of our three-fold mission strengthens our commitment to access, equity and excellence.

Over the past years, AAP has faces major challenges in maintaining the quality and effectiveness of its services due to major budget cuts. The Peer Counseling division has lost two full-time counseling positions and numerous student peer counselors in the last four years. Changes in University rules and policies and stricter guidelines within the majors have increased not only the need for students to meet with Counselors but also the amount of time Counselors must devote to processing student petitions, reviewing appeals, and filing other paperwork. As such, the gap between availability of counselors and students needs is one of the program's primary areas of The Peer Learning division has had to reduce the number of peer learning facilitators, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences Labs, due to

unfunded wage increases and operating cost. In 2009, the Humanities and Social Sciences Labs were merged, resulting in the loss of one full-time coordinator position. In addition, between 2005-2006 and 2011-2012, the number of student facilitators in humanities and social science courses was drastically reduced from 99 PLFs to 30, a 70% reduction. Subsequently, the number of courses for which Peer Learning is offered has dropped from 137 courses to 36, a 74% reduction. As a result, the number of students enrolled in Peer Learning sessions has decreased from 3941 students to 1801, a 55% reduction. To keep up with growing demands for workshops in Math and Science, AAP reallocated funds from Humanities/Social Sciences to meet the growing need. But as workshop costs increase, the number of workshops offered have decreased, and many math/science courses can no longer be supported by the division. To compensate for reductions in the total hours each PLF can work, the number of students in each section has been increased. Nonetheless, demand for Peer Learning sessions in Math and Science still significantly exceeds capacity. Larger group sizes make it difficult to practice AAP's preferred collaborative-learning pedagogy and provide the kind of individualized attention that students require.

Over the past three years, the Graduate Mentoring and Research Programs unit has also had to reduce the number of Graduate Mentors due to budgetary constraints. As a consequence, staff can no longer specialize in specific fields. Instead, General Graduate Mentors work with students across disciplines, including those with which they are not familiar, which reduces their effectiveness. To compensate for the reduction in staff, Graduate Mentoring and Research Programs has partnered with various departments and groups, but campus-wide cuts make such collaborations difficult to establish.

Conclusion

The Academic Advancement Program (AAP) is asking for \$2.00/quarter to continue providing free tutoring to students that face retention challenges.

Access to John Wooden Center 24 Hours/Day

The John Wooden Center is a 95,000 square foot multi-faceted recreation facility, named after the UCLA basketball coach John Wooden. The building serves UCLA students, faculty, and staff in addition to serving as the primary training facility for UCLA gymnastics. The facility includes

10 racquetball courts, two squash courts, a coed weight room, a basketball gymnasium with three regulation courts with seating for 2,000 people, a volleyball and badminton gymnasium, a dance studio, a gymnastics training center, a matted room for Judo and Karate classes and numerous meeting rooms. The John Wooden Center Board of Governors, a student majority committee, governs and provides recommendations regarding the design, use, policy, and operational issues

of the John Wooden Center. The John Wooden Center operates Monday – Friday: 5:30 a.m. – 12:45 a.m., Friday: 5:30 a.m. – 9:45 p.m., Saturday: 9:00 a.m. – 7:45 p.m., Sunday: 9:00 a.m. – Health disparities among low-income and non-traditional students are one of the most prevalent issues that are facing students today. Issues of access to fitness facilities are one of the main contributing factors to poor student health. Non-traditional students and students with irregular schedules are not able to access the gym on a consistent basis. Creating a 24-hour gym will create a more equitable and inclusive environment in which students will have access to a fitness facility and be able to address their health. The increase in operating hours will also be able to provide students with an increase in meeting room and dance space options for their student

Conclusion

We are asking for an increase of \$1.75/quarter for the John Wooden Center to be able to provide 24-hour gym access to every student in order to better support campus health.

-Cocroft moves to extend presentation by 5 minutes. Rafalian seconds.
11-0-0 there is a 5 minutes extension.

Students with Dependents Childcare Services Fund

There is currently no evening childcare service available on the UCLA campus for student-parents of disadvantaged backgrounds. The absence of on-campus evening child care services for low-income students cause conflicts with students' class schedules, their academic performance, and thus negatively impacts student retention and the social integration of students with dependents into the UCLA community.

UCLA Early Child Care and Education services are offered to students with dependents in the daytime through centers such as the Krieger Center located on the northwest part of campus.

While education and child development resources are offered to children of full-time students, the daytime service ends at 5:30 p.m. Students who pick up their children later than 5:30 p.m. receive a fine of \$1.00 per minute. Repeated lateness can result in the suspension of the service. Students who enroll in classes scheduled in-between the 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. block must either leave class early to pick up their children or arrive late to class. Students often choose to take their children with them to class or work, if alternative childcare options are not available. This can cause a disruption for the class or work environment, and can create additional stress for students with dependents to balance their focus on their work with caring for their child.

Considering the wait list for enrollment into the Krieger Center at UCLA spans from one to three years, students with dependents must find alternative childcare

services off-campus which can be costly, especially for non-traditional, low-income students. For students that rely on family members for childcare, this can add additional stress, as it adds to the students' daily commute.

The current Early Child Care and Education program at UCLA is not considerate of the financial strain of student parents, single parents, and non-traditional student families seeking higher education. A service which is designed to tailor to the circumstances of the diverse student population at UCLA is necessary to ensure that all students have the opportunity to succeed.

Conclusion:

There is a high need for accessible, free student-initiated evening childcare services at UCLA. The availability of childcare services will greatly support student retention, and support the overall wellness of students with dependents by alleviating the added stress of locating affordable childcare. We are asking for \$0.79/quarter to better support these needs.

UCLA Unicamp

Founded in 1934 by 11 UCLA students, UniCamp has given over 10,000 UCLA Student Volunteers the opportunity to serve urban Los Angeles youth by utilizing their leadership abilities to provide a resident camp experience for campers who could not otherwise afford it. UCLA UniCamp creates an opportunity for UCLA Students to provide a space for empowerment for youth. UniCamp was named "The Official Charity of the Students of UCLA" in 1948 and continues to motivate underserved youth to attend college, specifically UCLA, to this day.

Although it has been a long-standing institution within the history and traditions of UCLA, and was deemed the "Official Charity of the Students of UCLA", UCLA UniCamp receives no annual support from the university or the students. In the past, iterations of Spring Sing, Jazz Fest, Ackerman Movies, and Mardi Gras have participated as campus-wide fundraisers for UniCamp. Currently, UCLA UniCamp volunteers each fundraise at least \$500 to participate in the program and despite constant efforts from UCLA students, alumni, and staff members, fundraising continues to be an issue for UCLA UniCamp every year. Funds are needed to help support the UCLA student volunteers and keep the program operating annually. Though plenty has been accomplished over the past 81 years, much more is possible.

Conclusion

We are asking for \$0.50/quarter to ensure long term funding for UCLA UniCamp, the 450+ student volunteers, and the 1,200 urban youth it serves annually, while also providing an opportunity for UCLA students to tangibly support their own official charity.

UCLA Food Closet

In the Fall of 2008, following the massive economic downturn, the campus first began receiving anecdotal reports about students moving out of residence halls or apartments and couch surfing or sleeping in their cars, skipping meals in order to buy books, using their financial aid to help their families, and other such scenarios.

An unused utility closet near the CPO offices was identified, and used catering from student events became one of the first significant sources of contributions to the Food Closet. The need for the Food Closet soon became clearer, and outreach efforts in several areas developed, including awareness within the campus community, outreach to local markets for donations of non-perishable items that were near expiration, and networking with various off-campus. The small closet in the UCLA's Student Activities Center soon became the source of a nationwide "wake-up call" on the issue of economic distress among college students and on the many invisible victims of the economic downturn. The Food Closet was featured in an article in the Los Angeles Times and another in The Atlantic magazine; received coverage by Diana Sawyer on ABC's World News Tonight; was the subject of two programs on National Public Radio; and was even featured in a broadcast by Germany's National Public Radio. Institutions throughout the state and across the nation have contacted CPO and Abdallah for information about steps that may be needed to start similar services on their own campuses. Campuses that have started or are working to start their own programs include UC Davis, UC Santa Barbara, the University of Southern California, Pasadena Community College, Southwestern Community College, Fresno State University, the University of Texas, and the University of Oklahoma.

According to a 2012 study from the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 3.8 million low-income adults in California could not afford sufficient food – an increase of 1.4 million people since 2001. In the same period of time since 2001, food insecurity has disproportionately increased among communities of color and low-income communities in California.

The UCLA Food Security Work Group was originally convened in May 2015 to develop a plan for investing \$75,000 from the University of California Office of the President (UCOP)'s Global Food Initiative grant and to create a centralized food security operation. Including 11 undergraduate students, 6 graduate students, 16 staff members, 1 faculty advisor, and 6 external community members, the work group has moved forward with implementing the Food Closet Healthy Food Program, hiring of student logistics coordinators, establishing a graduate student researcher (GSR) position to ensure UCLA representation in the Global Food Initiative, seeking additional funding for the food voucher program, and more.

In order to continue the work of implementing sustainable food security projects, a permanent source of funding for the GSR position and Food Logistics Coordinator

must be found. Additionally, piloting of the student-initiated grocery co-op will require funds to support

volunteer efforts of student leaders. As the \$75,000 from UCOP was a one-time grant to explore such efforts, food insecurity remains to be an issue on campus without proper resourcing to sustain services. From the same 2012 UCLA Center for Health Policy Research study, the primary recommendation was to increase participation in nutrition assistance programs –including CalFresh – therefore evidence of an ongoing need for implementation resources.

Conclusion

We are asking for an increase of \$0.50/quarter for the UCLA Food Closet to be able to provide basic food items for UCLA students facing severe financial difficulty. LGBT Student Programming Fund Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender student leaders on the UCLA campus continuously strive for equity, safe spaces, and inclusion. Through activism, programming, and the LGBT Resource Center, many programs and spaces have been created to serve the LGBT community and help them maintain wellness, retention, and academic success. LGBT students on campus participate and show solidarity with other historically oppressed groups on campus, and continue to show their support for other communities as well.

While the fight for equity, safe spaces, and inclusion has not ended, there is an urgent need for funding to provide services for the LGBT community that is unmet. Gender inclusive restrooms, non-binary, gender-queer, and inclusive dormitories, STD/HIV testing education and opportunities, medical, wellness, and mental services, and the list goes on. LGBT students on the UCLA campus are under-resourced and there must be an effort to maintain an inclusive environment for all students at UCLA.

Conclusion

We are asking for \$0.25/quarter to be able to fund LGBT students' need for voicing and implementing mental, wellness, and educational programming efforts on the UCLA campus for all students. Cultural and Spiritual Student Programming Fund Cultural and spiritual programming and developmental opportunities challenges students to recognize the presence of and validity of other communities and their practices. This type of programming encourages the campus to respect various cultures and identities, creating more open-minded students who are knowledgeable and embracing of other heritages. These cultural and spiritual programs promote a vision of the UCLA student body that values mutual respect between students, cross-cultural collaboration, and each student's spiritual identity and The rising cost of facilities and operations has made it more difficult for student organizations to maintain the quantity and quality of cultural and spiritually based student programs on campus.

As the number of student organizations increases each year, student funds are continuously stretched thin. Events that promote the history, culture, and traditions of spiritual groups are important to students' identities as well as to understanding of such identities. Spiritual groups provide UCLA with a unique opportunity to celebrate beliefs and find commonalities and differences between other communities. These programs are valuable ways by which campus dialogue and improvement takes place between those of difference cultural, religious, or spiritual backgrounds. However, such programs are inhibited in their ability to promote cultural and spiritual diversity and awareness within the student body because of waning funding sources that can cover all elements of a program. In efforts to create a more equitable campus for all backgrounds, more avenues of funding should be provided to encourage such programming.

Conclusion

On a campus that prides itself on diversity, it is important that programs that highlight and celebrate different cultures and spiritual traditions are prioritized. The Cultural and Spiritual Student Programming Fund will support programs that provide students with the adequate resources to understand the historical, cultural, spiritual, and political contexts of various communities and heritages. This fund would help to bring about a safer campus climate that is more inclusive of the diverse student population that is unique to this campus. Upon the passing of this referendum, \$0.25/quarter will go towards the creation of this fund. USAC Academic Affairs Commission Academic Travel Mini Fund The Academic Affairs Commission has been a part of the Undergraduate Student Association Council since 1982 and has been an avenue for the student voice regarding academic affairs at UCLA ever since. The commission has worked on countless array of issues affecting student academics, including the access of students from underrepresented backgrounds, curricular reform, the improvement of UCLA graduation rates and the diversity requirement.

Every year, there are numerous events and forums for students to attend that complement their academic, leadership, professional development. These events provide students with the ability to grow while securing valuable connections and knowledge of opportunities that will help students expand their post-graduation options.

The cost of academic, leadership and professional development conferences, which include registration, air/ground transportation, and room and board, can be expensive depending on the location and length of the conference. Because of these costs, students from low income and nontraditional backgrounds have not been able to participate in these important opportunities.

While there is an EVP travel grant, the grant only funds travel to events that are for student advocacy. There is no source of funding for academic travel administered through the AAC and this is an issue of equal opportunity that must be addressed.

Students from all backgrounds who attend UCLA should be able to participate in opportunities that might help identify connections and future resources. Currently, only students who can afford these opportunities take advantage of them. This funding will help to support all students in their participation in these opportunities.

Conclusion

Upon the passing of this referendum, \$0.25/quarter will go towards a travel fund accessible by all students for academic travel purposes.

- Geller states for childcare, are you proposing a fund so that students can pay for child care or a student initiated childcare
- Kiang states the goal is to a pilot program or alternative plans that might happen.
- Cocroft says for the money that would go towards keeping John Wooden Center 24 hours how would that affect the operation of John Wooden Center
- Kiang states we are looking for weekdays
- Shao asks would you be outreaching in parking lots
- Kiang states that's a huge goal
- Shao states has that outreach begin?
- Kiang states we would want to see it passed before we get hopes up.

V. Appointments

A. Communications Director: Gilma Bernal

- Rosen states this person has the responsibilities of developing USAC wide branding and advocating for USAC wide initiatives and advertising and website and Facebook page. I am pushing forward Gilma and demonstrated enthusiasm and works with Transfer and ORL and does publicity for Rieber.
- Hourdequin states that this appointment is a consent item and ARC voted via email with a 3-0-0 vote of approval.
- Gilma Bernal has been approved by consent.

VI. Officer and Member Reports

A. President – Rosen

- Rosen had meeting with chief financial officer of California and talked a lot about residential living on the hill as well as apartments and university housing. I brought up a lot of concerns about affordability and privacy. WE are paying a lot for apartments without locks and the costs on the hill like for meal plans and the cost for university housing. President Napolitano has pushed the option of having more beds available. UC Santa Cruz has a big problem too. We are in Los Angeles surrounded by very expensive areas and see how the university can purchase more private housing for Westwood areas. On Friday we had our meeting with the Council of Study Body Presidents and the rest were able to Skype in via Google because UCSA was this weekend. Some agenda items we talked about were pertinent to

graduate students like campus climate and issues graduate students are facing switching advisors and how to figure out student advocacy. We talked about the global food initiative and secure funding. We talked a lot about the reagent vacancies and the council of student body presidents as a point to be present in reagent discussions. It is past of the California state constitution and legally make sure we abide by our constitution to make sure that the reagent is involved. We talked a lot about the enrollment and UCLA is projected to get 953 students and UCSD expected to get 1100 and talked a lot about student services that are going to be affected by this and have two referendums to work to address this. We talked a little about AB1711 to cap the number of percentage out of state students. UCSA hasn't taken a stance and council of presidents is still up in the air to figure out our lobbying efforts. We talked a lot about time degree issues and brought up efforts made at UCLA about expected unit completion. San Diego is facing the same issue and looking for more information in efforts we made to make sure we can partner together and make sure they're graduating and have other concerns be prioritized. This past Sunday I got to present to council of presidents at UCSA Board Meeting and a lot of them were graduate oriented since we haven't had as many active graduate students. I had a phone call with Steve Sand from Westwood neighborhood council about elections and great connecting with him and Eugene one of the board members and Cocroft. Next Tuesday I will be meeting with president Napolitano and council of student body presidents. The undergraduate is on Tuesday and the graduate is Thursday. I will be attending the graduate meeting please let me know as soon as possible. I posted form my office page and if you have anything you specifically want I need to know by tomorrow. Additionally, this Saturday I will be present at southern nominate committee. We will be reviewing northern school applicant and then the north will be reviewing our reagents nominee committee.

-

B. Internal Vice President – Hourdequin

-Hourdequin states this Sunday, Monday, Tuesday well be having food truck for finals by humanities. We have sushirito, los globos, and grilled cheese. The IVP and AAC will coprogram in Ackerman Grand Ballroom from 5pm-midnight with free snacks and blue books and coffee and tea and a nice place to study. This past week I had the campus safety alliance which different entities from across campus that focus on safety and security come together to talk about the lets get lit lighting campaign. Some concerns lighting campaign was the increased use of hover boards, and the lithium ion battery has been causing a lot of fires by self imploding and it's a fire hazard especially on the hill. The UC OP office is drafting a ban on hover boards. Bike theft has been on the rise like we saw from the transportation services bikes have been an increase mode and due to people not registering bikes in national bike registry and bikes who have been stolen are unable to get them back. There was an incident where 100 bikes were stolen and only 1 person was able to get theirs back. Register your bike on national bike registry. I met with Pam Schizer of the SOLE office to have workshops to rethink workshops and ensure we are targeting student needs and doing outreach at the beginning of next quarter via a survey and focus groups.

C. External Vice President - Helder

-Helder states we hosted UCSA here this past weekend and it was very productive and exciting and stuff that we have been working on has concrete payoff. Two highlights are automatic student voter registration is something we have been working on spearheaded by Berkeley law students. We have forefront mode of attack before the end of this year. When you enroll you would be automatically register to vote unless you opt out. So students don't have to spend time registering so much as we can spend time getting out the vote. I had a brief exchange with President Napolitano and some of her staff and see where they are and are down to analyze their systems to see if there's a smooth way. There's also bill language and place holder bill ready to take that I. We passed a resolution and bringing that to council in the near future and that's something that may happen. That's incredible given that's what is been talked about and how students have to spend on lifting one another up. When we can automate that to reduce that is a good thing. I have a team on the ground in Sacramento to work on putting together mental health working group and it has been very successful and organizing the governor office and key legislators and stakeholders. A very exciting bill that I briefly referenced was AB2017 which is bill that would give grants up to 5 million dollars like ours and its contingent on university hiring more diverse counselors so students feel comfortable seeking help from LGBT issues to representing several communities with respect to ethnicity and nationality so that way CAPS not a higher capacity but also reflecting the diversity of UCLA. This looks like it will probably make it to ballot and is contingent on UCLA students working to get out the vote. This is all to say that its been a productive year for students.

D. Administrative Representatives

-Starr states UNICAMP meetings are starting and its our 81st summer and we have about 450 students who are volunteering with us.

VII. Fund Allocations

A. Contingency Programming

-Wong states 8 groups applied. The IVP required \$2,900 for Spring Activities fair, requested \$500 and recommended \$80.

-Dameron moves to approve the contingency allocation of \$80. Kajikawa seconds 11-0-0 contingency programming for IVP has been approved.

-Wong states 7 student groups. \$20,104.69 required, \$7,078.41 requested, and \$1,620 recommended. If approved there will be \$39,738 left in contingency.

-Siegel moves to approve \$1,620. Dameron seconds.

11-0-1 the allocation has been approved

B. EVP Bruin Defenders

-Helder states National Society of Black Engineers to attend their national conference for \$500. The Tara Indian dance group is traveling to participate in a charity competition.

-Shao asks are we allowed to ask about funding request that didn't get approved. There's an application but no response.

-Shao states I was cc'd on an email that CAC was trying to co-program to bring Bobby Seal to campus and she's still waiting for you to respond back to second email and why funding wasn't granted seeing that its pertinent to our r program and mission statement.

-Helder states we had a full conversation about this and I told her that it seems like an incredible opportunity bringing a figure like that to campus and have an advocacy component. The speaking fee alone if \$4,500 and that's not including the airfare and lodging and it seemed like an incredible opportunity. Any allocation that large and unethical and not in the guidelines of EVP and I would be interested in funding what the guidelines allowed which includes some of the cost like airfare, room, or catering but for many reasons we of course cant fund the full \$4,500. We event consulted with Stephanie who wouldn't approve an allocation that large.

-Mossler states if you want to reach out to CEC we are more than happy to speak with you and I know EVP is unique but you can feel inclined to reach out to CEC.

-Kajikawa asks if your fund covers honorarium. Its for students travel to elsewhere not for people to come.

-Helder states that's one component, if we were to fund that it couldn't come form bruin defenders we would have to transfer money into programming from other places to make room for it and that's a sketchy exercise There were a lot of issues associated with it and in the conversation I didn't promise but I promised to look into it thoroughly to see what we could do and I think we could allocate some money.

-Rosen states there are other funding bodies like ASRF or contingency. There are other funding bodies that are more programming based

-Shao states the only reason I asked for clarification I wasn't present and the proposal originally and there was discussion to fund as much as you could but then after the second time there was no funding so I just wanted clarification at this time. I think we were looking for partial funding but you clarified that you had that conversation.

-Helder stated after the last email you saw there was conversation.

-Rosen states its approved by consent.

C. ASRF

-Shao states 22 organizations applied. ASU applied late and right now their allocation isn't confirmed but we wanted to support the admit weekend. The Hawaii club requested \$5000 we allocated \$2000.

United Khumer requested \$3,096 and allocated—Shao says she'll get back to that.

Electronic Dance Music club requested \$5000 and \$1200 allocated

Paper mix tape requested \$3350 and allocated \$1000

Thai culture night requested \$ 5000 and allocated \$1978

Pi delta theta for APWC benefit concert requested \$1000 and allocated \$1000

Malaysian students association culture night 1755. 64 and allocated \$1755.64

Night of cultura requested \$3183 and allocated \$1200

Jrf requested \$ 5000 and allocated \$823

Bruins for Israel requested \$ 2000 and allocated \$ 1000

Association of Chinese Americans culture night requested \$ 5000 and allocated \$ 3000

Hooligan theatre requested \$ 5000 and allocated \$5000

Chinese scholars association requested \$ 4933 and allocated \$2000

Nigerian student association requested \$ 4971.41 and allocated \$3500

Icarus requested \$2000 and allocated \$1000

Tyko requested \$ 5000 and allocated \$1300

Mecha de ucla raza grad requested \$5000 and allocated \$1500

Cultural affairs commission n the broad requested \$5000 and allocated \$ 2700

Word series requested \$2316 and allocated \$575

United Arab society culture night requested \$5000 and allocated \$4000 allocated

-Rosen states that the money has been allocated has the money been given already

-Shao states no

-Rosen states there was an allocation of 3,096 but your cap is 3000

-Shao states there was a discussion of 3000 or 5000. Everyone's cap is 5000 after having the meeting in your office

-Rosen states is this part of your bylaws now so you still have 3000 funding cap

-Shao states we had a meeting with and we are operating under the new budget

-Geller states make a motion to table to see if the guidelines are passed at 5000 and there won't be any conflict

-Rosen says we can table it for ARC guidelines and later in agenda and that guideline is changed then it could be approved.

-Hourdequin states these applications were reviewed are already under current in place

-Rosen states no amount of money has been allocated but they are operating under the guidelines that they will be changed.

-Kajikawa asks if there's a 2 limit ask why did JRF get allocated 3 times

--Shao states for the rest of the year JRF cannot apply. If council approves at \$5,000 then they cant apply for all spring. Whereas most organizations and all organizations can apply to all funding so we capped them at 5000

-Helder moves to table. Dameron seconds.

12-0-0 arts restoring fund is tabled.

VIII. Old Business

A. Jazz Reggae Festival

-Shao states this was brought to my attention and this is a free forum to ask me the questions that you would all like to ask me regarding last weeks special presentation.

-Kajikawa states this is not an attack on your commission, but for me it's a concern that Jazz Reggae it lost \$152,000 and lost \$113,000 and that could've gone to surplus or student groups. You brought up the \$85,000 and \$90,000 in reserve it eh max and sponsorship should go to honorarium. In BOD hearings and the numbers presented, Jazz Reggae is going to come out to \$178,000 and \$148,000 for field and \$30,000 for honorarium and huge discrepancy between those numbers. Have there

been any updated numbers? What is your plan if Jazz Reggae does have a loss? Are you going to pull it out of the year and hurt next years funding sources.

-Shao states we are still on this premises that we will be pulling out of surplus. I will cut the festival if I see it touching surplus a little. I made it clear we are not depending on tickets sales. What we are able to allocate through CAC, garner through funding sources, and able to receive through sponsorships. Once that baseline is set I would personally cut the festival and it wont come to this table. That being said, there have been new developments. Recently we got a generous donation from combined acrobatics of student affairs of \$1,500 and project SHREC to allocate \$1,000 and ASUCLA BOD funding we projected a lower allocation and last year we were allocated 7,000 this year we project 5000. This brings our total confirmed budget to 98,000 and last time it was presented it was 96,000. from now on our secure can only go up and confirm Kirin and we are allowed to use a third party source to secrete fiulicogy and have been approved and ready to reach out and have big name companies that are willing to fund jazz reggae. Now third party sponsorship are approved. Last week Kirin has now approved different package deals. One of the package deals that if outside groups want to advertise they can pay a 1,500 fee if you want to advertise at jazz reggae. If you want to advertise at jazz reggae and 1919 then 3,000 will go to jrf and 1000 will go to 1919 and that's a 4000. The third package deal is jrf and bruin bash. 3,000 would go to jrf and bruin bash would be 2000. We are foreseeing that will bring out to. We are not looking at external grants and living culture grant program, breaker international, sony pictures so those are the most recent development where the money is going. We also found that soundblanket may be limited and cut 8000 from our budget if we don't have the sound blanket. If you can see that in a weeks time how much the team has been hustling that it stays within the means that the red isn't even an option. I will ensure to cut the festival if it goes towards the red. March 14 is the administrations budget deadline, by march 14 if we don't have our numbers to cut it then they themselves will ask us to cut it

-Cocroft asks what date do you have to enter any contracts or any facilities to pay money

-Shao stats we are not relying on profits, ucla rec's numbers are still going through the process and see what can be cut and what cant and what venders and the idea of transitioning from vendors to food trucks, once those are all solidified by march 14 deadline, the that's when call to action. No money has been spent yet.

-Kajikawa asks if you can send an update march 14.

-Shao states of course. Because march 14 is finals week, if she sees that JRF is consistently having progress she's going to extend deadline by a week and shouldn't go over. At the end of the quarter might happen and oh its too late and we don't want that to happen.

-Cocroft states that the presentation that the potential to get funding from campus services to get the amount of funding from 110,000 and if there's 14,000

-Shao states there's other funding sources and we all submitted our applications

-Cocroft states if the budget is 180,000 do you expect that 70,000 to be covered by sponsorships

- Shao states it wouldn't go to 180,000. The highball is 140,000 and the lowball is 120,000. Our main fee right now is facilities cost. As a matter of looking at talent and facilities is significantly higher. Whatever is left over from facilities will go over to talent. Student performers are the main focus and honorarium was very high but if we cut down to student performers. Student performers don't get paid because that's how ucla policy goes. We are depending on the company and we are referring to new package deals that Kirin has implemented and foresee none of it going to surplus. We have wells fargo with us and at&t
- Cocroft asks is there an estimate of sponsorships
- Shao states as of current I'm not comfortable saying a definite number

IX. New Business

- Amin moves to change the campaign and candidate expenditure from an action item to a discussion item.

11-0-0 it has been changed to a discussion item.

A. Election Calendar Changes

- Allen states the original date was Friday April 22, 2016. It was brought to my attention that there's a major Jewish holiday and be more inclusive and move it to the day before same process and same timing. The new date is Thursday, April 21, 2016. The due date of candidate package is this week. The election code says it has to be available for 10 school days it technically counts as 10 but it doesn't specify hours but later it says hours. Internally we want to keep consistency and so we would like to 10 school days on an hourly basis via 24 hour system so we would like to move the due date to Friday at noon. We understand it's a long process getting the signatures and move the candidate packages from Thursday at noon to Friday at noon.

- Rosen states right now we have candidate debates on Friday April 29 and signboards go on Sunday. Typically in the past the signboards go up the same night which goes up and incentive to go to debate. Would it be possible to do 12:01 Saturday.

- Allen states we need security the night goes up the signboards

- Rosen states maybe you can talk to committee and talk to us

- Chen asks is there any documentation for change

- Allen states our plan for moving forward was that I would contact all signatories of the slate, it will go on facebook the ucla USAC election board, change as well on our calendar and then work with daily bruin to change online advertisement

- Cocroft asks if you already have security booked for Sunday

- Allen said not yet

- Rosen states regarding the changes for the endorsement hearings to be on Thursday as opposed to Friday and the candidate packets due Friday instead of Thursday. Its an added benefit. Those two items have been proposed. Quickly to follow up for the sign boards, whens the last date we are available to make that change happen

- Allen says we can vote on it at any point before the actual date so there's no strict deadline. Obviously sooner better than later.

-Rosen entertains a motion for the change in endorsements and meet the candidates and change in packets.

-Helder moves to approve the changes recommended by election board. Kajikawa seconds.

11-0-0 the election calendar changes have been approved.

B. Campaign and Candidate Expenditure Limitations

-Allen states the Executive position limits range is \$850-950 and we are going with \$900. The non executive is \$600-\$800 and we are going with \$750. Allen states the range was voted on and in the election code it is set by election board

-Rosen asks what the range means

-Allen states election board gave itself and gave elections to be evaluated every three years. The chair person picks a number in that range that candidates cant spend that amount.

-Rosen states there's no range, there's just a maximum

-Allen states no the max you can spend as an executive position is \$900 and the non executive position is \$750.

-Hourdequin states will you notify the slates

-Allen states we will be talking about it with the candidate and slate orientation

-Hourdequin asks what would the limit be for referendum

-Allen states in election code referendum is treated as non executive candidates and under the spending jurisdiction

-Cocroft states if the referendum aren't affiliated with slate would they get the extra \$200

-Allen states it would be treated like an independent candidate

C. ARC Funding Guidelines

-Shao moves to suspend the rules to allow Melody Chen to speak on ARC. Kajikawa seconds.

12-0-0 the rules are suspended.

-Chen states the background is pretty much the same and goes into detail in how the cultural affairs commission is affiliated with student funding's.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

The purpose of the Cultural Programming Mini-Fund is to help alleviate some of the fiscal responsibilities student organizations face when putting on culturally orientated programs. The fund is an auxiliary financial resource and can only be used supplementary to other monetary sources. Student organizations may apply each quarter for a maximum amount of \$5000.00 per funding period. The USAC Cultural Affairs Commission has the right to partially or fully grant the applied amount dependent on the application's thoroughness, applicant's necessity, and program's benefit for the general undergraduate student body.

ü GUIDELINES:

Please read through the entire guidelines section to ensure your organization qualifies for the fund. Additional information about the fund may also be found on the “ARC Referendum Funding Guide” found on the CAC website.

- o Eligibility- Must be an undergraduate student group/ organization registered with the Center for Student

- o Each student organization may apply once per funding period

- o All applications must include estimates/quotes/ documentation outlining what the allocated funds

- o Allocated funds may only be used for the program for which it was applied for.

- o The program(s) must have cultural relevance, either by promoting cultural diversity, various cultures,

- o Funds may only be used to offset honoraria and/or facilities expenses and/or supplies.

- o Applications must be submitted electronically with proper documentation attached to

- o Proper documentation: quotes, receipts, invoices, venue layouts, program budget report, event

- o Please ensure that the signatory listed is the current signatory of the organization.

- o If selected to receive funding:

Programming (CSP).would be used for. and/or cultural awareness.funding@culturalaffairscla.com with the student organization name in the subject line. Publicity/flyer

1. You are required to publicize the Cultural Affairs Commission through written and verbal publicity.

2. You must submit your completed requisition form in person to the fund manager no later than 3 weeks past your event date, or by Week 9 of the quarter during which it occurred, whichever is earlier. Proper documentation is required. Failure to comply with any of the deadlines will result in the rescindment of your fund.

UCLA CULTURAL AFFAIRS COMMISSION

311 Kerckhoff Hall – 308 Westwood Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90024

funding@culturalaffairsla.com

DEADLINES:

- ü Fall 1st Funding Period – Due 11:59 PM Saturday before 0 Week
- ü Fall 2nd Funding Period – Due 11:59 PM Saturday of FALL 3rd Week
- ü Winter 1st Funding Period – Due 11:59 PM Saturday of FALL 8th Week
- ü Winter 2nd Funding Period – Due 11:59 PM Saturday of WINTER 3rd Week
- ü Spring 1st Funding Period – Due 11:59 PM Saturday of WINTER 8th Week
- ü Spring 2nd Funding Period – Due 11:59 PM Saturday of SPRING 3rd Week

-Chen states there's 2 funding cycles so there's 6 total. We changed our cap to \$5,000 to provide as much money as we can to each student org and we noticed we had a lot of money for spring so we wanted to raise the cap to \$5000 to allocate that out. What is funded is the same. I think the clarification that there are 2 funding periods per quarter but groups can only apply once per funding period. The previous one was rolling was once per quarter, but now you can only apply once per funding period.

-Brian stated that there used to be 2 caps and a high cap for collective. The collective is no longer needed since we are funding events based on arts and culture it really was a double reassurance but now we aren't doing that.

-Shao states there's no longer two caps and so the reason is that there's 1 cap for all orgs instead of 2. There's no longer this idea if you're part of collective or no longer. As she explained, looking at the trends from past years and as funding director last year, winter quarter students don't apply that much because culture nights just beginning. There's a high influx for graduations and admit weekends. That's why the 5000 cap is initiated and its 100,000 and it's a funding source to turn to when they really need funding.

-Rosen asks about discretionary funding

-Melody states its now struck through.

-Rosen states we're glad you're updating because you are not allowed to do discretionary and reimbursements. No where does it say its under CAC but I'm glad you're striking that because that's big time no-no because its supposed to be specified.

-Cocroft states what are we changing it from. On the website it says \$1,500

-Shao states this is the old guidelines and we cant change anything until we change the bylaws. The guidelines in place of discretionary and retroactive and that was approved by last years council. It was last years council that approved it.

-Cocroft said if the past guidelines been \$1,500 has any money been updated in excess.

-Our current cap is \$3,000

-Cocroft states on the website it says \$1,500 but its currently \$3,000. Has any money been allocated excess of that \$3,000

-Melody says no

-Shao states a new things we implemented were hearings. Student orgs can have discrepancies and boards have made a point to reach out to student organizations

-Hourdequin states by my understanding it was 1500 and now its 3000

-Shao states that brought up with Rosen and that's why I had a meeting. Shao states that Garcia never told me it had to go to

-Hourdequin states as a council member its your bylaws especially if you have a funding body

-Shao states that's why we're here and we halted all allocations and brought it to this council. The beginning of the year and we didn't allocate at all during fall quarter. So during winter quarter why bylaw had to go to council that's why we are going to

-Hourdequin states the funds for 3000 has been approved without updated guidelines

-Shao states that its not been approved and listed allocations and council has approved those funding. At that point those allocations have already been set but if we have to slash it but council has approved al the funding and you all voted yes on the funding allocations when I listed all of them

-Rosen states the concern those allocation were brought week 3 or week 4 and the guidelines have never been voted on

-Rosen states I'm glad now that we confirmed. We all take an oath to uphold the constitution. I just encourage in the future that if you have a funding guideline just be accountable to the oath you took. Additionally form my recollection I would like to look at amendments and ARC was never brought and this is a perceptual issue within ARC and I'm glad you're bringing this and I hope any future changes are brought immediately and it was a consent item but council didn't know there was a change in guidelines so there was no way when issue that consent item that there has been changed by 1500 to 300

-Shao states last year as funding director I wasn't notified that Garcia didn't bring it to council. The fund was really successful and all \$100,000 were allocated and multiple cultural nights were fully funded.

-Rosen states for clarification when did the 1500 change to the 2000-3000

-Chen states we changed it during the second funding period

-Rosen states it was under your term

-Shao states yes and there was a clarification that it hasn't been bylaw and there was an agreement to vote on it and send all the numbers to SGA and get the account

-Rosen sets that change in language was never approved by council

-Shao states yes that's why we're here

-Rosen asks if people were notified about changes-

-Chen states that we emailed everyone we are holding mandatory hearings and let them reapply again and currently everyone should know at this point.

-Rosen states do you mean all 1100 student groups.

-Chen states we don't have a complete org but currently we just have a list of all arts and culture groups that we compiled

-Kajikawa says in terms of this new \$5000 cap, potentially could be unfair for those groups who applied earlier this quarter under the \$3000 and receive less than possible and essentially making another allocation. Is it possible for those students who applied under \$3000 to next quarter have greater than \$5000 to compensate for loss of opportunity

-Chen states we don't view it as a loss of opportunity most people who applied for CAP on \$3,000 typically got the CAP because we didn't have that many apply during winter quarter and the ones that did we did so according to their application. I don't know if we can reassess and give them more money there events have passed and would be confusing.

-Helder states I was thinking about Bruin Defenders and later my discretionary budget and considering altering the travel and advocacy grant and raise the cap and had an office discussion that it would be unethical and those who applied later would receive less item and you are benefiting based on the timing of your conference and you all should consider tabling it next year and have CAC next year do this as a point of fairness and equitable funding

-Khan states since a majority of funding does go towards spring quarter for culture night and also for the admit weekends a huge part of cultural groups and it makes sense why it raises the caps, it would be more unfair to wait until next year because based on Shao said and the funding caps and the majority of funding that makes sure it was distributed to make sure they have more of an opportunity during spring. Since a majority of funds go towards spring it makes sense to increase the cap towards spring that are especially more limited in the scope of funding body.

-Shao states the \$5,000 cap and looking at bylaws. ARC is seen as a saving grace where they can't commit to a lot of fees. The fact that they are allowed to apply twice a quarter and apply is a saving grace for culture nights, graduations, and admit weekends. That's why we are pushing for \$5,000 because students need money. Our biggest goal is to make sure \$100,000 is completely used up for student orgs and not being wasted.

-Kajikawa I completely agree, and last year you said all the funds were used under the previous guidelines of \$1,500 so I don't think that increasing it would affect it

-Shao states last year cultural orgs said the cap was too low. There shouldn't be a collective cap and non collective cap because it was exclusionary. That's why we created a one line so students weren't limited or excluded.

-Cocroft states if we are debating we should make a motion.

-Khan moves to change the ARC Fund Guidelines. Shao seconds.

-Helder states that I think of course there is a cap, are you projecting that under the current cap are they not going to be spent because of significant differences between this year and last year

-Shao states our biggest fear right now is that we wanted to start fall quarter but because there was this whole revamp in winter quarter and pushing back the deadlines because more changes Now our fear is that we aren't going to allocate all of \$100,000. The structure of ARC is completely different and I can explain it

-Helder states quick follow up, this time last year had more groups applied funding at this point then this year. Is the trajectory different such that there's fear?

-Edmond states in regards in spending trajectory was exponential and want to move towards a more constant rate.

-Helder states at a constant rate we will not fully use the funds at ARC?

-Edmond states

-Helder states if the guidelines aren't changed than the money wont be spent?

-Edmond says yes

-Rosen asks has discretionary money been used has the past discretionary fund of \$500 used

-Shao states last year was retroactive funding. We slashed that and don't use discretionary funding.

-Wong says its hard to make judgments and ARC was last year and now. They weren't open in the fall and by nature

-Cocroft asks about fair funding and not allowing equal opportunity

-Shao states the reason e are creating this cap is long term in mind not short term. So student groups can feel that its viable. Most student orgs don't apply up to 5000, they apply up to 1000 or 2000 on what's necessary. That's my third point that there's this mathematical matrix Edmond created so that funding would be equal so no organization would get exorbitant amount of money.

-Chen states just because the cap is \$5,000 it just gives room. It doesn't mean less groups are able to get funded. We tried a trial and error process and found out what works. Its 5000 that would most likely stay for next year and we found new way to review the application and everything is from experience through winter quarter. Since there weren't that many student groups and they didn't even apply for the full cap it was just a way

-Geller says ideally it would be changed in a new fiscal year. Whether they're getting more restrictive or generous is not unprecedented. For example contingency was changing almost monthly. The ideal is that the situation is an option. What we have is the opportunity. Many of the large scale cultural events do happen in Spring and if there are funds that would other wise go unused and go to surplus or some other purpose rather than going to the thing that the referendum voted for, sometimes it's the lesser of the evils rather than the ideal. What I'm hearing and saying is that they have heard what's appropriate the way and to approve the funds and also seen what the campus organizations put on cultural programming as need. I encourage you as you move forward in making a decision to not necessarily think adjust about what would be the perfect timing, but what is ultimately in the best interest of student groups and USAC as a whole. Is it better to wait and make changes at the start of the new year or is it better to bring the guidelines to a place that is more consistent with what your expectations have been all along. Like the removal of discretionary paragraph not consistent with referendum of the bylaws. There's good and bad I encourage you think holistically in making decisions, not just the perspective of would this happen last summer.

-Rosen states the concern I have as chair as fund that previously it has been allocated without council consent and changed without council consent and it's a referendum that comes out of every students pocket. I want to make it clear for any changes that would make it clear and another allocation period week 3, I want to

make it very clear and clear and in order to retain fiscal responsibility that any allocation must be presented for consent and any guideline be presented.

-Shao states that's what we've been doing since these discussions. We are still a moving body, and specifically what two weeks I specifically brought tit melody. This is everyone's concerns and need to fix it and try to figure out the best way to allocate to ensure we are being transparent. We have all these matrixes and Google docs and I will freely share with you. There's nothing we have to hide. To be cognizant of the fact that this fund has been alive for 2 years and adhere to culture orgs and different realms of understanding what they need and what we need. There is a motion and are there last points.

-Wong states fair funding in a sense should be given a student group equal opportunity based on quality and I don't think it should be precedence to drastically change guidelines but with that said its better to having all the money spent and if raising that cap means it will be spent at the end of the fiscal year then I think its better for student orgs in general. Im wondering if you could change CSP to SOLE just to make it parallel to other funding sources and recently updated.

-Khan states the fact that we are changing it half way in and making it more expansive is for the betterment of the student body and its not being restrictive. If it was restrictive it would've been a bigger issue but right now we're providing more access to necessary resources.

-Kajikawa asks if you have done projections if the cap remains at 1500

-Brian says we changed it to 1500 at the beginning of the year and that wasn't approved and after we changed it 1000-1500 cap. Technically the cap and everything we haven't allocated

-Edmond states the cap is at 3000 currently.

-Kajikawa asks for the Cap at 3 what the surplus would be?

-Edmond we want to focus on groups that deserve it and do it relatively to do it with their funds and use the money better. We use the hearings to assess them on a logistical basis on math and culture.

-Kajikawa states that through a wrench in everything, because now I realize that last years were different than this year starting off. Now I understand that's why its hard to look at last years and this years. Let me think about that and how that would affect numbers.

-Mossler states that CAC was given this fund and discretion to allocate as seen fit to groups that apply to that fund. She understands what funding they need, long story short we need to respect CAC and the guidelines they've been given and acted on because its up to their discretion. I personally wouldn't want someone to come and say that I don't understand my commission or weekend needs and respect her decision's Its best to have the money spent and go to good use and having it sent back and attacking Shao and ARC is not right. Don't spend time attacking what she sees is best for commission. She's not doing it for bad judgment of malice so either respect it or shoot it own and its getting really circular.

10-2-0 the ARC guidelines have been approved.

B. #UCLAWellness Referendum

- Dameron moves to approve #UCLAWellnessReferndum language be placed on ballot upon approval by UCOP
- Dameron states based on everything we presented during the special presentation that's the main question and breakdown right there and I open it to discussion.
- Kajikawa asks for \$1.50 to CAPS and that's under student affairs, does it go to CommBoard and then to CAPS or directly to CAPS
- Chens states directly to CAPS
- Dameron states this particular knowledge has been approved by Nicole Green of CAPS and enforced by assistant vice chancellor. This has been endorsed.
- Rosen asks about the \$12 and \$18 and correlates to 950 students
- Dameron states there's a variety of reasons why we want to stagger it. The main reason is that the programs we want to establish with this money, particularly within the commission on behalf of contingency, we don't want to get this excess amount of money and cant guarantee it will be carried out and the last thing we want is for students to charge all this money and not be implemented for the programs its set up right now. For the office it's a big expansion in collaboration. We want it staggered so it would be rolled out and by the time we get it so we can get money and spend it as institutionalized office to create programs to utilize money most efficiently.
- Wong states the implement is not arbitrary. We want an increase in funds but we want to increase parallel to growth of need. Coming from someone who manages contingency, having a drastic increase in first year and the funds would be managed, budgeted, advertised, and allocated a lot differently so that whole process would have to be re-evaluated. As far as commissions they would be expanding services and a scale that parallels increase in funds. I can give concrete examples because the program directors that has \$273,000 and does one funding cycle a year and does hearings. We have to do due diligence and expand and then say it to my successor and have to figure it out and change the entire reevaluation. That's from an objective perspective who sat in on BOD hearings and manages funds and commissions.
- Cocroft asks if contingency programming were to increase by \$3 then \$1, wouldn't that allow the committee to allocate sufficient funds to meet the needs to not change the way funding is dispersed. This would meet \$120 out of \$720 would it sustain that much of a change. On the presentation, is that for the entire event for average requested?
- Wong states that's what's called required.
- Cocroft asks would it be allowed to just fulfill it
- Wong states by increasingly implemental then allocations would double for nearly every single group, and the finance committee would have to change. Its good as it is and in 3 years from now but having an incremental change, if you do that in the first year alone then I do not know how much it would do that times 10. In that case you need more committee members do more hearings and revamp everything.
- Kajikawa asks what premise are we working under that it will change dramatically. In previous years has there been an increase of \$18 that you are all justifying. We project that if it were to be \$18 and it would be a ton of work for everyone. Has previous experience shown that?

-Wong states not in one specific, take bruin bash and EAF referendum and Arts restoring community fund, all of those are amounts that are higher we are proposing for the third year implemental increase. Regarding that one specific funding body that's not I'm aware of. I think that its based on the growing of our student groups.

-Dameron states we followed a model of incremental referendums of TGIF and SAFE because these 2 referendums got adjusted. For example, SAFE increased by \$48 over 5 years. They were projecting these funds to come in to carry out multi year projects. To project it to the 3 years out because we don't want excess to cash and want to follow the same model on where we got hat idea from.

-Siegel states given that this referendum passed, it would substantially increase would you readjust or would it prompt you to want to change contingency

-Wong states if this referendum did pass then contingency would receive a lot more funds and regardless of that we are looking to changes for other funding pools that aren't as efficient such as SOOF or what not. Yes we are open to changes, and yes contingency would change

-Dameron says if this were approved then it would have a stable fund of contingency and reallocate to SOOF and that would be more of a bylaw change once we see the results of the referendum once we see it and other ways we can accommodate by percentages of that membership fee.

-Rosen thanks them for the line by line and clarify where the discrepancy are lying.

-Kajikawa says one quick question, did you know that last year if you had surplus?

-Dameron said the amount of surplus for the office I serve and looking to expand that surplus I would not be allowed to do it. That's \$10,000 to maintain over the course.

-Chen states form my understating there was a surplus but not in a technical understanding. Our surplus is always taken into account and fund by more student run and student initiatives like gender inclusive bathrooms.

-Kajikawa says so you don't usually have a surplus

-Chen says yes

-Mossler says we had surplus but its because one event ran through. Our events are high budget and the events that we do are high budget but to my knowledge we are not going to have a surplus this year.

-Rosen says 2 out of 3 are running on a surplus, do you know what the surplus is

-Dameron says we are unaware

-Chen says we didn't have a surplus because we used it for student initiative.

-Rosen states in past years have you run in surplus

-Chen says not to my knowledge

-Rosen asks Dameron if he has surplus

-Dameron says he's not sure

-Mossler says we did run a surplus because it fell through, but the events that we are looking to throw are going to incur with higher fees. Its difficult to manage that. The expectation of programming and the standards of achieving programming of prestigious. This is what I need in the future to run the events and we need to make that case very clear and it should be up to the students. Council can ask the need and the fact is up to the students to have programs in place that students enjoy. We have

thousands of students and the impact of CAPS and SWC and CSC and Contingency demonstrates that these programs and institutions are being used and a higher and higher rate. CEC is going to increase in popularity and enrollment an outreach. Its should be up to students.

-Rosen states you mentioned that you're looking at your term for CEC but next year you don't know who CEC is going to be how do you know that they will need the fees

-Mossler states we have certain programs that years passed and the Jack Benny award has happened and these are institutionalized programs and we want to grow and we are not complacent and we will ensure that we will have an impact on the community

-Chen says I'm not going to be here next year but the students should be able to decide. I don't know who the next SWC is so there is a reason on what we do to institutionalize this effort to make sure this is something that moves forward so most people can agree on this is an impact to UCLA community.

-Khan asks about the CAPS portion how are you able to decide this amount

-Chen says we talked down and they are very sympathetic to student efforts and want to ask from students and mores that they have given us the approval and we do support something like this and recognize students want to make an impact an this is a student run and student initiated motive. In terms of where the ideas go to create new innovative interfaces for the student body and creating one more would just open up another lane and it would just get fulfilled. I want to have online symposiums and if you have the funds ready and help the facilitate that and get facilitated it, you can impact it on a more broad level and get more impact.

-Kajikawa states base don the projections of your presentation that were extremely insightful and the program you proposed in three years and I move to amend the language so that the #uclawellness to mix the fee increases and have it starting next year. Essentially I'm tripling everything after the third year we will triple it. I'm proposing a one time fee instead of going up 3, 6, 18. I'm just tripling and its more transparent that its just going to be \$18 right off the bat. Cocroft seconds.

-Dameron says what's the approval, is it a majority? As a commissioner in an office for the past couple years, the way its written is not lacking transparency. It says \$6 and then G and then H. I don't want to see this huge surplus and then surplus be used but we want to plan a long term and I don't see that its fiscally responsible to charge our students immediately and I would obviously ask everyone to vote no on that as written and approved by departments at UCLA who have projected it as well by their increase.

-Kajikawa says that's completely fair and that previous discussion

-Cocroft thinks it's a good amendment. Its more up front and the commissions next year can use it to the best of their ability.

-Amin says we are not the judges to add the amount we haven't done adequate research its irresponsible of us. We have to trust and let the students vote and make sure students have the vote to see which one. The students should be the ultimate deciders and see if they want to vote for approval.

-Wong says she was going to echo and its not fiscally responsible to throw \$18 for contingency and all of these commissions because these growth of funds have to parallel the growth in funding. As we saw there was a surplus of \$300,000 and if we

do a change then it would exponentially increase. A high surplus year there's a lot of problems. Surplus isn't necessarily a good thing.

Rosen calls to a vote.

1-11-0 the amendment has failed.

-Kajikawa says I want to amend it of not \$6 and then not have a \$12 and \$18 and in my opinion if its fiscally irresponsible to do it to the student body so lets go ahead and have just the \$6 so if we see this used effectively then we can come back and run this again. Kajikawa motions to remove G and H.

-Dameron says the reason it doesn't apply to this because last time we aren't talking about \$18 all at once and infusing it and allow it a surplus and its not a responsible. We want to project a 3 year plan to carry out these new activities and relative to my office and main hubs that use transportation for service orientations and more vehicles to provide more transportation services back in July and we didn't get those until February. To coordinate the logistical paperwork and timelines like those and addition to other implementation as to why we need time ad cant do it all at once. Getting \$6 now compared to \$18 over three years presents us. I get an email at least twice a month of a service organization to come to CSC umbrella to utilize our transportation. We cannot bring anywhere because our resources thin. A \$1 increase and this is long term sustainable funding and be fiscally responsible.

-Shao states as a commission and the legacy is so long and we cant project what we cant happen in the future, yeah there's some truth, but these commissions have set events and what they've been doing for so many years and the only way we see our commissions in general is that we approve on these agendas every single year. The comment earlier on what you don't know is a bit offensive to commissioners. Once we walk into our office we are taught our history and the idea that we can all grow. We have to acknowledge that commission perspective and you can even attest that for AAC you know what you do that all and you institutionally know what has been set in place. You know that what has been set is even to do new things. For me personally I wouldn't feel right if I hadn't said that tonight or addressed that comment.

-Rosen calls to question the amendment.

2-10-0 the amendment has failed.

-Amin calls to question.

-Rosen says all those in favor of #uclawellness initiative to be placed on ballot

12-0-0 the #UCLAwellness initiative has been approved to go to UCOP to be place on ballot.

D. Social Justice Referendum

-Kajikawa moves to expend the rules. Hourdequin seconds.

-Cocroft states that's a little broad.

-Amin says direct questions

-Cocroft amends to allow the authors of the referendum to answer questions when recognized by the chair. Amin seconds.

Rosen calls in question the amended motion.

12-0-0 the amended motion has been approved.

-Rosen goes onto conversations to social justice referendum.

- Kajikawa moved to approve Social Justice Referendum of 2016 to be discussed by UCOP for this USAC 2016 election. Rafalian seconds.
 - Kajikawa asks Kiang what changes have been made by what's sent to us
 - Kiang says we got feedback from Dr. Geller if the fund is being created and whether to say create. We had to clarify regarding unicamp being housed under cultural and recreational affairs. A lot of them had to be changed for when UCOP used it. We calculated the return incorrectly, the only copy we thought it was \$6.25 instead of \$6.20 and the biggest change is that CAC was \$4.50 and \$4.45
 - Khan asks what funds were created
 - Rosen states Child Services, Academic Affairs Commissioner Mini Fund, and LGT Fund
 - Helder states largely it's the same and we needed to clarify for UCOP
 - Rosen says access for 24/7 its okay to say support because we aren't created a separate fund
 - Rosen asks if there's any questions or points.
 - Rosen opens the table and open up to any amendments they would like to make.
 - Rosen thanks everyone for providing detailed information and it was a request for lineup breakdowns and straight and al students who presented and able to demonstrate that people from each entities and demonstrated the need and thank you to all the students and here at 11:15 during 10th week. This is admirable and shows the need for a referendum.
 - Helder states I don't think I've ever seen anything like this as a terms of positive coming together of campus in respect o campus climate and this is a point of unity and it made me very proud to be a UCLA bruin.
 - Rafalian wants to go on to what Helder and everything that's been stated and its :beautiful." Especially line item F about students with dependents for child care and I work with a lot of transfers and non traditional students and I really appreciate that line.
 - Rosen calls to question of having Social Justice Referendum go before UCOP.
- 12-0-0 the motion has been approved.

-Rosen states now that we approve the new guidelines and the allocations that exceeded \$3,000 and under the cap of \$5,000 and this is a consent item. Are there any points?

-Shao wants to clarify that for Selma requested \$1,460.61 and they were allocated \$1,460.61.

-Rosen states its approved by consensus

F. Meeting During Finals Week

- Rosen states as chair I don't think we need a meeting during finals week so before we get any motion and want to ask if you need to be brought up by next Tuesday
- Wong asks if online voting is an option for contingency programming fund.
- Zimmerman said we did it before winter break and reaffirm it
- Wong states I want to let student groups know
- Rosen asks council t o be uphold that accountability. Is there anyone that needs to have it reapproved of next week

-Shao states ARC would need approval to allocate funds and it is a consent item. We can reaffirm week 1 during spring quarter.

-Helder moves to cancel next weeks council meeting. Cocroft seconds.

12-0-0 there will be no meeting next week . Please be on call

X. Announcements

-Amin states we're passing out the goodie bags and pick up your free hand sanitizers.

XI. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The attendance sheet has been passed around.

XII. Adjournment

-Helder moves to adjourn the meeting. Amin seconds.

12-0-0 the meeting has been adjourned at 11:22pm.

XII. Good and Welfare