

FINALISED: MARCH 13, 2018



AGENDA
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL
Kerckhoff Hall 417
March 6th, 2018
7:00PM

Present: Arielle Yael Mokhtarzadeh, Chloe Pan, Nicole Corona Diaz, Kayla He, Nedda Saidian, Adriana Hardwicke, Malik D. Flournoy-Hooker, Zahra Hajee, Sayron Stoke, Christina Lee's proxy (George, James Aboagye, Dr. Debra Geller, Jessica Alexander, Rob Kadota

Absent: Vivy Li, Aaron Boudaie, Christina Lee, Divya Sharma, Justin Jackson

I. Call to Order

Mokhtarzadeh

- At 7:02 PM.

A. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- The attendance sheet is passed around.
- Given that we have some urgent and important items on the agenda tonight including items related to funding and the E-Code, I recommend we suspend the bylaws to change quorum from 10 to 9. Since there was no opposition voiced by the council, let's have a motion.
- Saidian moves to suspend the bylaws and move quorum from 10 to 9. Stokes seconds.
- 8-0-0 vote, this motion passes.

II. Approval of the Agenda*

- Pan strike Bruin Advocacy Grant Fund.
- Reports struck due to absence: IVP, FSC.
- Derek: Strikes SWPF.
- Mokhtarzadeh adds a discussion to executive session to discuss personnel matter.
- Saidian moves to approve the agenda as amended, Hajee seconds.
- 8-0-0 vote, this motion passes.

III. Approval of the Minutes from February 27th, 2018*

- Hajee moves to approve the minutes from 27th February 27 2018, Pan seconds.
- 8-0-0 vote, the minutes are approved.

IV. Public Comments

- No Audio & No Video: None
- Audio, No Video:
 - Jamie from CALPIRG:
 - This weekend we went to sacramento for our annual lobbying day.
 - We had over 100 student there and we conducted over 56 meetings.

- We did some work on net neutrality, protecting state parks, and environmental conservation.
- I also announced that I will be stepping down as State Board Chair and as Chapter Chair at UCLA. So I will no longer be Jamie from CALPIRG anymore.
- Audio & Video: None
- Mokhtarzadeh ends pibic comment at 7:11 PM.

V. Special Presentations

Commute Programs Update

Lisa Koerbling

- I am the Parking Services Director.
- This is Elena, she works with us too.
- I am here to talk about our commuter program and tell you about the fee increases. We are all about campus access and mobility.
- 78k people are on our campus every day. Our institutional priorities are safety, accessibility and mobility. We also want to reduce greenhouse gas emission.
- We want to ensure that faculty or staff who have a 40% or more appointment, have parking near their workplace.
- We also aim to provide sufficient parking for events, visitors, etc.
- We are in a really crowded place. So we are practicing a mantra called “peaceful coexistence”.
- Pedestrian safety is our top priority.
 - We train freshman to be safe pedestrians.
 - We make bike lanes prominent.
 - We want to make the campus more people centric: We have the ride hailing pick up zones to reduce automobile traffic on campus.
- We do Bruin Scooted and the Bike Share Program.
- Sustainable commute programs: discounts, Bruin Shuttle, vanpool, etc.
- Here is a summary of programs that are focused on students:
 - 4% of our students commute by bicycles. Annual subsidy is \$400K.
 - We subsidise public transport by 60%.
 - 15% student commute by public transit. Subsidy is \$1.88 million.
 - We gave free bus passes this quarter to students who wanted to try the public transport program.
- Carpool: 5% students commute. Annual subsidy is \$107k.
- Bruin Bus: working on a scheduled service. 11% students commute by Bruin Bus. Subsidy is \$4.99 million dollars. Other services are included in this number.
- Saferide program: very successful.
- We also do a lot of planning and advocacy:
 - We have traction on the Gayley bike lane.
 - We are also working on the purple line that will be coming to westwood.
 - We are working with Torrance transit and others to get them to bring transit busses to campus.
- All this costs money:
 - Total annual budget: \$15.82 million
 - Subsidy: \$7 million
 - Indirect Subsidy: \$8 million
- We have been very successful: we have had cost effective use of dollars and other impacts.
- For students who don't live on campus,
 - 40% walk
 - 20% transit
 - 11% bruin bus

- We also impacted the needed employee commute.
 - We reduced it by 2% from 52%.
- The parking system:
 - We have 23k spaces on the campus.
 - 25% devoted to daily visitors.
 - 75% permanent holders.
- Revenue:
 - 47% daily visitors
 - 41% staff and faculty permanent sales
 - 12% student permanent sales (6.5 million dollars)
- This fall: we will be launching new programs.
 - Issuing permits to people who park up there on the Hill. We will be doing enforcement by license plate.
 - We will also roll out a discounted permit for structure 5 rooftop.
- For those who haven't heard me speak before. We manage our financial picture over a 10 year horizon.
 - We have small, incremental fee increases every year.
 - This year we are using reserves so our increases are lower.
 - Our capital investments: 400 spaces parking by the end of calendar year.
 - Also looking at 3 level 3s.
 - We are doing energy improvement in ur offices.
 - Elevator upgrades.
- We will take in \$63.7 million in 2018-19.
 - Revenue will be: \$14.3 million
 - Spend on transport systems support: \$1 million
 - Reserve: \$5 million
- Proposal:
 - Current yellow rate, blue rate and all others go up.
 - Daily visitor rate: no change.
- Since we are running out of time, here are 2 more slides for you to see:
 - Shows local westwood comparison
 - Shows comparison of UCLA to other college campuses.

QnA

- Saidian: how does the transport department assign these fees? Why does every UC campus have different prices?
 - Koerbling: Each UC campus stands alone. We are luckier that we built our parking 30 yrs ago. We do a 10 year financial plan. We try to figure out how we can meet our financial benchmarks.
- Pan: how much revenue is the fee increase going to increase?
 - Koerbling: An additional 300 + 600 K.
- Hajee: Just wanted to ask if you have any knowledge of the progress on the BIRD program?
 - Koerbling: It will be decided next Friday.
- Hajee: I know there were rumors going around about re-gating of Portola Plaza?
 - Koerbling: There are plans to make a part of portola to the south of the flagpole to be primarily pedestrian.
- Hajee: Have there been discussions about this with the goal of making the area accessible to special needs students? I know many of them used Bruin Bus to reach Portola.
 - Koerbling: Anyone with the accessibility permit will be allowed to get past those gates.
- Pan: So the reason for the fee increase is to meet the 10 year financial plan?
 - Koerbling: Yes. Our labor costs continue to increase.

- Mokhtarzadeh: Can you tell us what it has been like to work with the parking advocacy task force?
 - Koerbling: I would politely request you change that name to “commute”. We have been working with them on how to spread the word on all the options available. The success of it has been seen.

Immunity Presentation

Ayesha & Suvi

- We are a health access group aiming to increase access to health for students.
- We are a peer to peer resource.
- We want to increase the likelihood of you finding someone else who is going through the same thing as you are.
- Part of the reason for starting this organization is that we noticed that there were some key issues on campus that needed changes.
 - There's a gap in knowledge: usability of ucla's health resources is very low. Students don't know how to access them, it's hard to get individualized information, there's no anonymity.
 - Specially as an international student, I found it hard to navigate US SHIP itself.
- What we offer:
 - We will utilize social media platforms.
 - Have how-go guides.
 - Notice trends in questions and answer them to the best of our capabilities.
 - We think this system will be extremely successful compared to what we have available at ucla right now.
 - Using a social media base of communication will be easy to reach students.
 - From ucla secrets, we got the idea of anonymous posting of questions.
- Planned featured:
 - Social media pages
 - Anonymous QnA
 - Infographics
 - Tip of the week
 - Discussion
 - Presentations with existing clubs to reach all the club's audience.
- Vision/Plan:
 - Info about various ucla resources.
 - Answering common queries.
 - Easy access on phone and laptop.

QnA

- Diaz: is the goal to have a fb page or a website?
 - Ayesha & Suvi: The goal is to have a facebook group, not even a page. Groups get a lot more traffic. We will start with Facebook and Instagram before going on to having a website.
- Hajee: If you started a group, how will you get people to join the group?
 - Ayesha & Suvi: We don't need several students from everywhere. We need people who genuinely want info and need help. We want to create something more private, more individualized. We are also also talking to SHACK , etc to get the publicity and outreach.
- Mokhtarzadeh: I think it is so cool when student step up to fill the voids that exist on our campus. With regard to liability, make sure that you two are protected. Have you thought about including a disclaimer.
 - Ayesha & Suvi: Yes we have a disclaimer saying that it is a “peer to peer” resource.

VI. Officer Member Reports

A. President

Mokhtarzadeh

- No written report was provided before, during or after the meeting. Please refer to the USAC Live coverage for the complete officer report.

B. External Vice President Pan

1. Campus Affairs
 - 1.1. Wednesday, March 7: Our Spark campaign to raise funds for fully-funded public service scholarships will be kicking off tomorrow. We're partnering with the UCLA Career Center to institutionalize these efforts. We also built the campaign using the data from student surveys that we collected last quarter. We're primarily focusing on external donors such as alumni in DC, New York, and Sacramento, although students certainly can donate if they have the means to do so.
 - 1.2. Wednesday, March 7: BruinsVote coalition will be meeting tomorrow to prep our plans for spring quarter voter registration. Shoutout to Jamie Kennerk from CalPirg for her work on this! We're partnering with Residential Life to kick off a month around civic engagement on Wednesday, April 11 on the Hill.
2. Local Advocacy
 - 2.1. Friday, March 2: Thank you to those of your who stopped our Housing Insecurity Campaign as part of Homelessness Awareness Week! Special thank you to our Housing Director, Sam Briante. Even though it was pouring that day, we felt it was important to acknowledge the symbolic nature of the weather: even though it was inconvenient to set up with the rain, it makes you think critically of how difficult it is for those who face housing insecurity on a daily basis.
 - 2.2. Thursday, March 8: One of our staff members will be at the Higher Education Subcommittee Meeting on census data collection at City Hall.
 - 2.3. Friday, March 9: The Mayor's Office is partnering with United Way to officially launch its "Everyone In" campaign to address homelessness in LA.
 - 2.4. Tuesday, March 13: Westwood Forward hearing with the LA Department of Neighborhood Commissioners starts at 6pm next Tuesday. You may have seen the Daily Bruin article that discusses how the Chair of the Westwood Community Council, among others, is formally suing UCLA for its attempts to build new housing on the ground that it "would disrupt the Village's backdrop of the Santa Monica mountains." Outrageous actions like this showcase are aesthetics are consistently prioritized over the need for affordable housing, and they also demonstrate why it's important to make our voices heard at events like the upcoming hearing.
3. UC Advocacy
 - 3.1. Monday-Friday, March 7-9: This entire week is a UC-wide Week of Action to write to the state legislature encouraging them to #FundTheUC.
 - 3.2. Friday, March 9: We're capping off the week with a Tuition Teach-in at noon on Friday on the Janss Steps grass. We're also providing posterboard material for a poster-making session.
 - 3.3. Friday, March 9: We have a couple in-district lobbying visits coming up (to save on costs) and the first of these is with the office of Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi, who is a member of the Budget Subcommittee on Education.
 - 3.4. Wednesday, March 14: The UC Regents meeting agenda has been officially released and the vote on tuition is confirmed to be taking place on Wednesday. A few updates: our campus organizing directors, Christine Tran, Kosi Ogbuli, and Asha Isse, have been presenting to a multitude of organizations, as well as communicating with other campuses. We have confirmed that other UCs will be bussing students in. Most exciting update is that after dozens of emails from our office staffers to various campaigns, we've received confirmations from gubernatorial candidate Delaine Eastin and liet. governor candidate Eleni Kounalakis that they will be attending the Regents meeting to support students and denounce a tuition increase.
4. State Advocacy

- 4.1. We've started lobbying training sessions for students attending the Student Lobby Conference in Sacramento at the beginning of Spring Break.

C. Facilities Commissioner Hajee

- 1. Our Know Thy Safety Week of Action is well underway this week! Each day, FAC is co-programming with a collection of diverse student organizations to host bystander intervention training workshops. Each program will be tackling the important issues of bystander intervention through a specific community lens. Special thanks to Gen Rep 1 and the Beautiful Mind project for leading very insightful discussions/workshops yesterday, and ASU for leading a workshop on Student Policing on Campus tonight. Events over the next couple days include:
 - 1.1. Wednesday, 3/7, 5 - 7 pm, Hermosa Room - "Don't stand idly by your neighbor... but wait, who's my neighbor?" - Hillel
 - 1.2. Wednesday, 3/7, 7 - 9 pm - Know Thy Safety: Solidarity with South Asians - Pakistani Student Association, Bangali Student Association, and Indus
 - 1.3. Thursday, 3/8, 7 - 9 pm - Bystander Intervention - Bruin Consent Coalition
- 2. The TGIF Committee plans to roll out the Sustainability Innovation Challenge TOMORROW. Submit your ideas to make UCLA more sustainable! Work with a team and present your proposal for a chance to receive up to \$50,000 in funding to put your idea into action! Projects can range from infrastructure change, marketing campaigns, educational programs, and more! Interest form is due April 4th at 11:59PM
- 3. BruinBus is considering a number of major service changes for spring quarter. We are working with them to host a set of focus groups week 10 to break down some of the changes for students. If you would like to fill out the survey and provide feedback you can check out the site:
<http://beagreencommuter.com/bruinbus-is-on-a-roll/>

D. Campus Events Commission Saidian

- 1. Melnitz Movies + CEC Free Sneak: Wes Anderson film Isle of Dogs.
- 2. 3/19 @James Bridges Theater.
- 3. CEC is partnered with Air + Style to give away TWO pairs of GA 2-day tickets.

E. Transfer Rep Stokes

- No written report was provided before, during or after the meeting. Please refer to the USAC Live coverage for the complete officer report.

F. Community Service Commission Hardwicke

- 1. We took 28 students that are involved in different service spaces on campus to the IMPACT national conference this weekend in Dayton, Ohio. It was a really great and informative conference as well as opportunity for us all to discuss and collaborate within the service community.
- 2. Michaels Award application is closed and the committee will be selecting recipients that will be recognized at the USAC Alumni Reunion on April 15th.
- 3. Homelessness Awareness Week wrapped up last week and was a big success. Again, a big thank you to all of the students, organizations and USAC offices who supported.

G. Administrative Representatives Aboagye, Alexander, Champawat, Geller, Kadota

- Kadota: Garcetti launched :”Resilient LA”. I forwarded the publication to the President, IVP and Facilities. It’s interesting and exciting document.

VII. Contingency Fund Allocations* Malshe

- 11 organizations.
- Requested: \$7126.87

- Recommended: \$4547.00
- Saidian moves to approve the allocation of \$4547.00 for Contingency, Pan seconds.
- 7-0-1 vote, this motion passes.

VIII. BOD Allocation* **Yaj**

- 69 organizations applied.
- 94 programs will be funded.
- Allocation total: \$232,500
- Avg: \$2277.93
- Standard deviation: \$21478.94
- Johnny wanted to thank the gerep 2 office, x and x.
- Pan moves to approve the BOD allocation of \$232,500.00, Hajee seconds.
- 6-0-2 vote, this motion passes.

IX. ARC Allocations# **Flurnoy-Hooker**

- 32 applications, all non USAC groups.
- Req: \$68873.18
- Recommended: \$30910.00
- Approved by consent.

X. New Business

1. USAC Election Code Amendments* **Price**

- Mokhtarzadeh: We all received a few different versions of this. We need to first present the first version. Any of the following version are suggestion to the original. We as a council decide what we choose to approve and what we don't. Jack, we want you to read ther language of the guidelines.

Price:

- Good to see you all again. For our original proposal, proposal A, I am reading from section 5.2, clause 1A:
- Section 9.2: Candidate Spending Limits.
- Section 9.3: state/political party spending.
- Mokhtarzadeh: so this is the language that was first proposed. This language is not compliant with either UC policy or the law. Therefore, other language was proposed. To be honest with you, I do have questions given that this was something we both spoke about. It was made clear that any discrepancy between slate vs independent candidates is not compliant with state law and the constitution of the USA. Can you explain the logic behind this to me?
 - Price: the original guidelines that we sent to all of you on Thursday were, I will admit, not simple, elegant or substantive. They are the result also of a lot of repeated and cold discussion between the executives committee and myself. And we worked really hard to find an elegant solution by Thursday of last week. We could not settle on one at that time. So we sent in what we hand which I am aware was not congruent with the things you discussed with me prior to my appointment as E-Board Director. I admit that the language that we proposed on thursday does not accomplish any of those things. So we took the weekend, consulted with our advisors and legal minds and that's when I learnt over the weekend that what we were trying to do prior to the 2nd round of amendments was to find equity of outcomes. My advisor friend told me that the law should be to find equity in terms of the law itself. We can't predict the political winds and can't quantify the benefits of running as independent vs slate. Now that's not something any election board can reasonably be called upon to quantify. So what we did first was to continue the logic of the E-Code as it stood and it was as I noted an inelegant and substantive change. The new proposal, I and my board believes is a more elegant and effective solution to the elections.

- Mokhtarzadeh: My issue was not that it was not elegant, and substantive. My issue was that it was illegal, unconstitutional and violate students' rights. Even when I spoke to you, I told you that if you have any doubts about my political feeling about this, I pointed you in the direction of Dr. Geller and Campus Council. This violates students' rights and the USAC bylaws.
 - Price: I appreciate that and you're right to ask why I did so. It's my fault and I'm really sorry. I've consulted the bylaws, my advisors and my board and we have tried to rectify the situation. I accept that the original proposal stands in violation of the bylaws and the United States Constitution and that's why we have proposed an improvement.
- Stokes: Can you just tell me in very clear and very simple way what your goal is? What was your goal going in to this change?
 - Price: something that we agreed upon is lower spending limits. The thinking that we used was that we need to change the sections on slate spending and the independent spending limit. We tried to find the best way for students to run in an equitable way. What we are trying to do is make sure that it's easy for people to run, to not spend a lot of money and to make their voices heard. And to do to in compliance with the E-Code and make it easy for the E-Board to regulate the behavior.
- Stokes: this doesn't go by the bylaws though...?
 - Price: in the first proposal, we tried to leave some of the things from 2017 as they were. When we consulted with our advisors, we decided that that was a major obstacle for candidate - both slates and independents. It was better to make the law equal and simple. We don't need complex laws. We need a law that is easy to abide by.
- Saidian: I will be very honest, I still don't logically understand this: did you consult with Chris after you submitted this to Council? logically, when you submit a paper to a class for grading, you don't retract a paper. I am trying to understand the intentionality behind this. I am not seeing where the lack in consideration played before you sent it to us on Thursday. Why didn't all the post-Thursday consulting happen earlier?
- Mokhtarzadeh: did you tell your board that the discrepancies were illegal and unconstitutional. Because it's hard for me to understand how a group of bright people didn't catch this earlier. I don't know how this was even an option because we discussed that this was not even possible.
 - Mher Mkrтчian: In terms of the logic, if the argument is that what we have proposed is illegal then what we had earlier was illegal as well. We weren't certain about how it will be received.
- Dr. Geller: I think perhaps where this might have gone wrong is because you started with the proposal that was started in fall but that was actually invalidated. So perhaps you should have started with the code that was there last winter. The issue is that by incentivising someone who will be running independent, you are disincentivizing free association and that's a violation of 1st amendment.
- Hardwicke: Was last year's E-Code unconstitutional as well?
- Dr. Geller: If you can spend more if you are not connected to other people, that disincentivizes association with other people since it will not be encouraged.
- Dr. Geller: The guidance we were given was that you can specify x dollars that someone running for a particular office can spend. You could then say that if you were running with a slate, up to a certain percent of the hypothetical \$1000 will go towards the slate. But what you can't do is have different totals for that office.
- Saidian: Jack, is that something you discussed?
 - Price: Yes, with Chris the second time. We discuss it further on Monday. In the proposal that I emailed to you all earlier today, we have tried to reach that ideal. We have tried to eliminate the discrepancy between executive and non executive positions.
- Pan: 1) to my understanding, there is higher spending limit for any of the executive positions. So personally I do think that spending limits should be higher for executives. 2) I am concerned about the slate funding being pooled because many things are purchased collectively as a slate.

- Price: to answer your 2nd question: my E-Board and this amendment is not disallowing that 2 candidate go to the store at the same time to buy their supplies. What i'm saying is that expenditure be documented individually.
- Pan: so looking at the E-Code, the idea is to set the same cap for every candidate but only up to x percent can be sent on slate vs individual. Which I know you hand in the 1st proposal. What do you mean that each candidate must be reimbursed for 100% of their expenditure.
 - Price: We decided as a board that in order to make the election process as equitable as possible, considering that money is sometimes higher in some cases than in others. I think part of that means that students need to be reimbursed.
 - Mher Mkrtchian: Our advisor told us that we felt that a publically funded collection would be the best way to fund this. We could figure something out in the next fiscal year. But the spirit of the legislation is that we want all students to be incentivized to run.
- Mokhtarzadeh: I think that's beautiful in theory, but where's that money coming from?
 - Price: SOOF could be a way. I understand that it's not easy to find this money and we don't know how many people will run every year; what we are proposing is an impartial ideal.
- Dr. Geller: if this were to pass, that would mean that USAC has to fully fund all campaigns of however many people choose to run. So since it's not in the election budget, where will the funds come from?
 - Price: another option we looked at was applying for contingency funds. Perhaps having all the offices pitch in a little bit. We are committed to finding a solution.
- Mokhtarzadeh: Jack, just for you information, you office has more fundng than 8 of the offices here. For the sake of everyone's time, maybe you have other suggestions that you have to make so we can move forward with our discussion. Do you want to present the amendments that you sent today?
 - Price: reads the new proposal.
 - Proposal A, section 5.2 section 1A
 - Proposal B: 9.2: Candidate Spending Limits. Discusses details.
 - We cut all of section 9.3 about slate and political party spending.
- Dr. Geller: Can you clarify this language about not combining funds? What is the vision for how slates would operate and how to file for things that have mroe than 1 candidate's names on it. So they can use their personal funds for the slate but they just have to submit individual receipts?
 - Price: Yes
- Mokhtarzadeh: Isn't that the current policy?
 - Price: Our new policy would get rid of the practice of submitting a slate expenditure form. If we are giving slates and independence the same amount of money, we should not be documenting them in a different way.
- Pan: my understanding of the individual thing is that I can't give the money I raised to Kayla.
 - Price: Yes any money you have raised has to be spent on your campaign.
- Pan: So if I can make 2 friendly suggestions: maybe clarify these things.
- Mokhtarzadeh: Did you have any discussion regarding referenda. UC policy on referenda states that any language change needs to be approved by Council 4 weeks in advance.
 - Price: That hinges on section 9.2. So any changes to 9.2 will affect referenda. In the amendments proposed tonight, it will be \$600.
- Mokhtarzadeh: Thank you, Jack.

Discussion:

- Mokhtarzadeh: Why don't we start with the first proposal and then discuss the amendments and suggestions that were made. What about 5.2 clause 1A.
- Dr. Geller: The 2nd is an improvement over the 1st. The substitution of syllabus over faculty note is an improvement. There is no recollection of religious observance though. Future years might have a conflict so we need to add that.

- Mokhtarzadeh: So first of all with regard to substituting syllabus for instructor's note, is there any discussion? And then with regard to addition of religious observances- any opposition to that? Sayron is suggesting we add family emergency to that? Is there an opposition to this? I also think that "any other events deemed necessary" could be used for many things that we want to arbitrate. So we could strike off that line.
- Dr. Geller: Policy can be written in a way that it can be easily interpreted by someone who is reading it.
- Mokhtarzadeh: Do we want to make these events mandatory?
- Hajee: Maybe say that if a candidate can't make it to the event, just work it out.
- Mokhtarzadeh: We should actively be encouraging students to attend events as much we can. To make that punishable by disqualification seems harsh. So I'm getting the sense that we want to remove "any other events deemed necessary." Are there other events we want to make mandatory?
- Diaz: I don't think that any event besides the orientation should be mandatory because it only hurts the person if he/she doesn't go.
- Hajee: Was there a split between 2 meet the candidates combined with endorsements?
- Mokhtarzadeh: So there is any other recommendation about not making any other events mandatory? Hearing none, that's the basic code as it currently stands. Now, the other question we need to ask is with regard to "designated campaign representative", how do we recognize those people?
 - Price: in the past it's been interpreted as representatives of a referendum.
- Mokhtarzadeh: do you want to explicitly state "candidate and representatives of referenda"? Any opposition to that?
- Dr. Geller: If you are served by Ashe, they will only be able to verify a medical emergency while the emergency was ongoing. Otherwise, what you're going to get is a note saying that student has self reported a medical condition. So those who have SHIP won't be able to get it necessarily. So this language would disadvantage those who have SHIP vs private insurance.
- Mokhtarzadeh: so do we want to remove that language? Is there an opposition?
- **Summary of Amendments:**
 - In 1st line.
 - Under "with an instructor's note" to "with a syllabus provided or health emergency"
 - Adding: "religious observances" and "family emergencies"
 - Seeing no other discussion we will
- Mo: Is there anyone who wants to argue otherwise?
- Diaz: historically, I'm assuming that commissions go unopposed. So if for example one commission chooses the next candidate from the inside, their spending limit is same as someone who has opposition.
- Mokhtarzadeh: to find a compromise, the highest amount that was spent last year was \$666. So we could increase it to \$650 for every one in recognition of what was spent last year.
- Hajee: No the figure was more for others.
- Diaz: Yeah IVP exceeded it.
- Stokes: I feel like if you got it and if you want to spend the grand, the it's cool.
- Flournoy-Hooker: if some positions are more competitive, then get more creative. You don't need more money. How's that equitable?
- Saidian: but equality in the amount that's spent from a student position would also make students view every office at the same level of importance. To place higher emphasis on one campaign than the other would not be equitable.
- Mokhtarzadeh: So I am hearing consensus on having a equal base cap.
- Dr. Geller: Given that it's not possible for USAC to fund campaigns right now. But also recognizing that we want equity, I would encourage you to pick a lower number rather than a higher number. If it's the same for all offices, then the lower the number, the more accessible running for government becomes.
- Mokhtarzadeh: the current number being proposed is \$600.

- Flournoy-Hooker: Why was that \$600?
 - Price: Based on the past couple of years, the medians are coming to high 600s and low 700s. We want to set it lower than that because we want to encourage access and equity.
 - Mher Mkrтчian: we want it to be more accessible.
- Mokhtarzadeh: So we want to change the language to “candidates for all offices are allowed to spend up to \$600 on their USAC campaigns.” and then we can include the part about the LA Consumer Price Index.
- Mokhtarzadeh: What about reimbursing candidates for their spending? We are going to strike that because we don't have funding.
- Mokhtarzadeh: As it currently stands, the language that we are proposing is that the Election Chair has the right to change that amount before the packets go out. So unless anyone feels strongly that that is something we should do, I recommend that we strike it.
- Mokhtarzadeh: We are moving to “party spending”. Does anyone want to argue that we need to keep that “addition \$200 spending”?
- Council does not oppose.
- Mokhtarzadeh: the next thing is about giving no more than 25% of their spending to the slate. The next proposal version says that the allowance of one candidate can't be combined with those of another candidate. So the question is what spending capabilities do we want to give to slates? If we are providing spending caps to everyone, why shouldn't slates get to pool their money?
- Pan: I think one concern will be that 2 student running against 1 student. So I think that some limit would be helpful.
- Dr. Geller: You could even consider something that would say that a candidate running unopposed may not contribute towards the slate pool.
- Mokhtarzadeh: the problem is that students don't know if they are running unopposed until candidate orientation.
 - Price: I just wanted to note that on our board, we had different opinion. Jayesh opposed the notion of approval limit. The more candidate that you have, the greater your pool. We want to avoid giving an advantage or disadvantage to any action. We also found credence with the idea of a pool.
 - Mher Mkrтчian: I felt that you should define a campaign only for the individuals running for that campaign. So if you have \$600, you could buy something and split the cost with someone who will benefit from what you bought.
- Mokhtarzadeh: So the proposal on the table is having a cap for all student at \$600. And a percentage of that can be used towards the slate. We are going to get rid of the 35% and talk about \$200.
- Sharma: how does this information get publicized? Does the E-Board have a flyer or something?
- Pan: It says in the bylaws that, “.....”
- Sharma: So what my question would be that if we talk about slates, we talk about the promotion of the collective word. My question is how would you look into what is the expenditure that markets the entire slate and what doesn't.
 - Price: Spending that involves the advertisement of the entire slats' name or the entire list of candidates in that slate, then we would count it.
- Mokhtarzadeh: Reads from the proposal. We cannot provide a financial incentive to someone whether they are running as a slate or as independent. So I recommend that we cut that.
- Dr. Geller: I have a question about the part that says that the maximum limit for the slate is \$2000. But what if there are more than 10 offices?
- Sharma: So in the past, the E-Code said that it's 2k per 10 candidates.
- Saidian: In have a question; so are these changes going to become the Election Code?
- Mokhtarzadeh: For the sake of consistency, we want to add the words “for referenda” to every mention of “designated campaign representative”. Our language now reads, “.....”.

- Mokhtarzadeh: moving on to section 9, I'm just going to read all of it.
- Dr. Geller: The conversation you've been having about individuals putting 200\$ into their slate, I didn't see anything about it being required that every member contributes the same amount to the slate. I'm not sure how pragmatic it is to require equal division of receipts among all slate members.
- Sharma: how would you be able to divide it all?
 - Price: The question of regulating and asking candidate to submit documents that insure that they have spent the specific function of their pool limit and then the impracticality on our part to be able to verify this is part of what influenced our decision.
- Sharma: it's a little confusing because an additional \$200 was placed on the slate. I think it would make more sense from what you are saying to not pool the personal and slate funds.
 - Price: this in and of itself would bias running on a slate.
- Mokhtarzadeh: I think requiring individual receipts in that manner goes contrary to the idea of having financial accessibility.
- Sharma: so you would mandate the people who are turning in their finances to give you their cost?
 - Price: My understanding that they will have to pay for 1/n fraction of the cost and we would look for that expenditure in their expenditure.
- Sharma: so then what is defined as pool campaign and where do we draw that line. It would be ideal to have only that.
- Dr. Geller: It counts for the slate if it has the names of more than 1 person running for office, not if it has the slate's name.
- Pan: If supplies were already purchased for this year's slates, then where would that come out of the \$600?
- Dr. Geller: If the campaign supplies have been purchased, then we can look at other solutions.
- Pan: So we are just raising the limit to \$800 for slate candidates and independent candidates running against slate candidates
 - Price: Our idea was cutting the notion of additional funding for slates.
- Dr. Geller: If slate decides that we are going to run as a slate but not spend anything on the slate, then they can do that.
- Mokhtarzadeh: so we can define slate expenditure as anything that promotes more than 1 candidate or the slate on its own with no candidates attached to it. "...Must also be divided equally among all candidates within that slate..." Any discussion regarding that language?
- Alexander: So do you want me to add this to the google drive?
- Mokhtarzadeh: reads from the proposal.
 - Price: those receipts i'm happy to strike. There is one expenditure report due at the very end. Specially since a lot of people have already started buying campaign material. There should be no reason to penalize preparedness. So we could make it that the expenses are due at the date immediately following the expenditure.
- Mokhtarzadeh: so we are cutting both A and B. Theoretically, if we choose to move forward with the changes you proposed, they were not in accordance to the rest of the election code.
- Mokhtarzadeh: in all honesty, ia am uncomfrtablnle making changes to the ecode tonight because no student hand the opportunity to see these significant changes that we have made. So I would request that these changes be sent back to the E-Code since it was their responsibility to do this in the first place.
- Sharma: what does that mean for the calendar? Having that week 5 deadline puts student leaders are the most at-risk.
- Mokhtarzadeh: we hand this conversation last week and midterms vary from week 3-8 depending on the class.
- Dr. Geller: there have been years when students picked up their packets before spring break, started collecting signatures before hand.

- Mokhtarzadeh: I think we made recommendation to the E-Code. If you all could go through everything and ensure that the changes are consistent and compliant with university policy, it would be great.
- Dr. Geller: there is one more item that I want to put back on the radar: section 13, the addition is about adding language that no amendments can be proposed if there is no E-Board Chair and in case the elected E-Board chair doesn't want to propose any changes, then UCAC can move forward with it's own changes.
- mokhtarzadeh: Jessica, I will email you the final language for this as well so that it can be included most appropriately. I will report that we pushed the voting on the calendar to next week. Thank you both, Jack and Mehr, for coming here.

2. 2018 USAC Election Calendar*

Price

- Tabled.

3. A Resolution to Dismantle Standardized Testing from the UCLA Admissions Process*

Sharma

- Sharma reads the resolution.
- Sharma: Zahra wanted to be added to the resolution but I didn't do it in time.
- Mokhtarzadeh: I have an issue with the second to last "let it be resolved". There is no surity of whether it will be removed or not.
- Saidian: on the first page, I feel like that statement is broad. It felt to me like differences in race equate to differences in intelligence.
- Sharma moves to approve the Resolution to Dismantle Standardized Testing from the UCLA Admissions Process, Pan seconds.
- 7-0-1 vote, this motion passes and the resolution has been adopted.

4. Remaining Surplus to Endowment*

Mokhtarzadeh

- Mokhtarzadeh: This item is to move the remaining \$333k surplus to endowment. I am not sure what the exact number is right now. We can entertain a motion to remove the remaining surplus money that hasn't already been allocated. Is there any discussion? Any questions?
- Hajee moves to move the remaining funds to endowment, Flournoy-Hooker seconds.
- 8-0-0 vote, this motion passes and the allocation has been approved.

5. The Council Goes to Meeting Together: Change USAC Meeting Time to 8pm on 3/13/18*

Mokhtarzadeh

- I wanted to recommend that we collectively go and show our support and also provide student who want to attend both meetings have the flexibility to attend both meetings. Is 8 PM too late? I do recognize that because of E-Code that might also be a longer meeting and its also week 10 so we can look at 7:30 instead of 8.
- Flournoy-Hooker moves to change Council meeting to 7:30 PM instead of 7 PM in recognition of the fact that the Westwood Council meeting will happen at 6pm. Hajee seconds.
- 8-0-0 vote, this motion passes.

6. Executive Session to Discuss A Personnel Matter

Mokhtarzadeh

- Mokhtarzadeh: I am going to ask our admin reps to stay but members of the public will be respectfully asked to leave. Please feel free to come back after executive session ends.
- Hajee motions to move into executive session at 10:33 PM. Sadian seconds.
- 8-0-0 vote, the executive session commences at 10:33 PM.
- Hajee moves to end executive session at 11:13 PM. Flournoy-Hooker seconds.
- 7-0-0 vote, doesn't meet $\frac{2}{3}$ majority and council is therefore unable to exit executive session.

Since council was unable to exit executive session, it was decided that in keeping with the value of transparency and accessibility, the meeting will be adjourned.

- Meeting is adjourned at 11:15 PM.

XVI. Announcements

XVII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

XVIII. Adjournment*

XIX. Good and Welfare

*Indicates Action Item
#Indicates Consent

Item

@Indicates Executive Session Item