



AGENDA  
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL  
Kerckhoff Hall 417  
May 15th, 2018  
7:00PM

Present: ~~Arielle Yael Mokhtarzadeh, Vivy Li, Chloe Pan, Nicole Corona Diaz, Kayla He, Justin Jackson, Divya Sharma, Nedda Saidian, Adriana Hardwicke, Malik D. Flournoy-Hooker, Zahra Hajee, Aaron Boudaie, Christina Lee, Sayron Stokes~~

~~nidirah~~

Absent: ~~Roy Champawat, James Aboagye, Dr. Debra Geller, Jessica Alexander, Rob Kadota~~

I. Call to Order

Mokhtarzadeh

- Mokhtarzadeh: calls the meeting to order at 7:14 PM.
- Mokhtarzadeh: Just for transparency, I want to inform that the meeting was delayed because we had issues setting up USAC Live.

A. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- The attendance sheet is passed around.

II. Approval of the Agenda\*

- Officer Member Reports that have been struck: FSC (Boudaie), CEC (Hardwicke), TSR (Stokes), FAC (Hajee), AAC (Sharma)
- Jackson tables CALPIRG special presentation until next week.
- Flournoy-Hooker strikes ARC funding allocation.
- Pan strikes BAG funding allocation.
- Hardwicke: can we add a discussion item to ask e-board what is going on?
- Mokhtarzadeh: they have to explain the results to us so we can do it then.
- Stokes moves to approve the agenda as amended, Jackson seconds.
- 12-0-0 vote, the agenda is approved as amended.

III. Approval of the Minutes from

May 8th, 2018\*

- Saidian moves to approve the minutes from 5/8/18, Boudaie seconds.
- 12-0-0 vote, the minutes are approved.

IV. Public Comments

- Mokhtarzadeh: we have 30 minutes allotted for public comment, there will be 3 rounds. Each public commenter is allocated 2 mins and when you have 10 seconds left, I will hit the gavel.
- Public comment is reserved only for the members of the undergraduate association.
- Mokhtarzadeh begins public comment at 7:19 PM.

No Audio & No Video

- None

Audio, No Video

- None

Audio & Video

- Member of the Public, Matthew William Richard: You all know what has occurred: voter coercion. It has been occurring for many years. I took it to the e-board after their hasty decision. The j-board report said they must re-examine. Today they released a statement saying that they didn't find anything. We had numerous people who were coerced who came forward. The e-board said there was a mistake. They have failed this year and must be held accountable. Tonight I ask you not to certify the results and to preserve the legitimacy of USAC.
- Mokhtarzadeh ends public comment at 7:22 PM.

## V. Special Presentations

### 1. The New USAC Website!

Han

- I've been working on this for the past year with Vivy.
- This is the beta version.
- I still need some pictures and some of the pages need to be polished.
- We are working on a back end so that the website is easier to develop for the future webmasters.
- That's all I have for updates.
- Dr. Geller: is this site accessible to those who have vision impairments and require assistance?
  - Han: I am not sure.
- Dr. Geller: whoever is taking this forwards should look into this. It will include aspects such accurate captioning. Talk to Julie Ratrie.
- Li: one thing I want to add is in the calendar part, you can share and put up your events. If you are planning events. You can put up your events there for all the students to access and it can also help you set up events.
- Mokhtarzadeh: maybe less branding to look like UCLA and more to looking like ASUCLA would be better and maybe if there's a design template that goes across all 4 units of ASUCLA so that it looks coherent.

### 2. USAC History Presentation

Li

- This is a doc written by Steven Halpern who was 1970 USAC President.
- It is a 1200 page book
- It has been passed down from council to council and it only records the history of USAC and UCLA, USA etc.
- However the author passed away in 2011 with her mother in a car accident so unfortunately the book stopped and nobody continued it.
- All our councilmembers have this document and all future councilmembers can pass it down too.
- Li reads quotes by Charles E Young and Steven Halpern.
- Li reads the facts from the preface
  - In 1970 the dean of students said, ...“
- My office started to continue the project and I hope that all future members will continue this. We got all the alumni information from Jessica and the alumni association through James' help and we emailed everyone.
- Dana Trapnell submitted a 2 page write up. She was the AAC in 1979-1980.
  - she changed the pass no pass deadline from week 4 to 6. Something that had been attempted by many commissioners before her.
  - So just to encourage the future councilmembers, things may not be done in 1 year and they can be passed on to future councilmember sa as well.
- From last year FAC and the 1991-1992 FSC also sent us very thoughtful memories.
- For this year's council, I encourage you to write a memoir, record what you did this year and we can put it on the website.

QnA

- Jackson: how many alumni were you able to find?
- Li: I reached out to 300 but only 20 responded.

~~3. Campus Presentation~~

—Gist

VI. Officer Reports

~~A. President~~

Mokhtarzadeh

~~B. Internal Vice President~~

Li

~~C. External Vice President~~

Pan

~~D. Academic Affairs Commissioner~~

Sharma

E. Facilities Commissioner

Hajee

1. -Sustainability Innovation Challenge: Demo Day
2. Join The Green Initiative Fund as we celebrate innovation in sustainability this Thursday from 6:30-9PM!
- 3.
4. This quarter, student teams have been developing proposals covering a range of on-campus sustainability project. At our Demo Day, they will present their proposals for a panel of judges who will choose one team to receive up to \$50,000 to implement their project!
- 5.
6. The event will begin with dinner and a showcase of sustainability organizations on campus (room 2343), followed by the pitches and announcement of the winning team (room 2214).
- 7.
8. \*Engage with on-campus sustainability organizations \*
9. Activities and raffle prizes
10. Food will be served!
- 11.
12. -Zero Waste Meal Kits: DIY Beeswax Wraps
13. Join us at the #MyLastTrash Zero Waste Meal Kits Event at the Hitchen on Friday 5/18 in the Hitchen from 2-4pm! Sign the #MyLastTrash and Zero Waste By 2020 pledges, learn how to make beeswax food wrappings, how to repurpose t-shirts into lunch or produce bags (we will provide the t-shirts), and receive a reusable To-Go cutlery kit (knife, fork, spoon, chopsticks) to complete your Zero Waste Meal Kit. All you need to do is bring a reusable item (straw, bottle, mug, etc.) along with you to show how you try to achieve zero waste; if you don't have anything yet, please still come by, and we'll start you on your way to living zero waste! Come enjoy some free pizza as well; we hope to see you there!
- 14.
15. -Westwood Forward
16. -Voting is from 2-8pm at the John Wooden Center. ANY student can vote--international students, undocumented students, students not registered to vote in LA, commuter students as long as they put down a UCLA address

~~F. Financial Supports Commissioner~~

~~Boudaie~~

G. General Rep 2

He

H. Campus Events Commission

Saidian

~~I. Transfer Rep~~

—Stokes

J. Student Wellness Commissioner

Lee

~~K. Community Service Commissioner~~

—Hardwicke

L. Administrative Representatives  
Kadota  
Roy

Aboagye, Alexander, Champawat, Geller,

1. I will make an exciting announcement about how we opened Veggie Grill!

Dr. geller:

1. I will reinforce the encouragement to go vote in the westwood forward vote.

VII. Contingency Programming\*

Malshe

- 35 applications
- 33 were student organizations, 2 were USAC offices (BRC and Marshe's offices)
- Total Requested: \$ 29,376.33
- The Recommended: \$ 20,808.00
- Boudaie moves to allocate \$ 20,808.00 to Contingency, Jackson seconds.
- 12-0-0 vote, the contingency allocation passes.

VIII. Student Wellness Programming Fund#

Lee

- 1 application.
- Annual Fashion Show
  - Total Requested: \$ 750
  - The Recommended: \$ 750
- Mokhtarzadeh: is there any question?
- Mokhtarzadeh: Any opposition?
- Mokhtarzadeh: Seeing none, the allocation is approved by consent.

~~IX. Bruin Advocacy Grant Fund#~~

~~Pan~~

~~X. Travel Grant Mini Fund#~~

~~Sharma~~

~~XI. Academic Success Referendum#~~

~~Sharma~~

~~XII. ARC Allocations#~~

~~Flournoy-Hooker~~

XIII. Supplemental Fund for Service#

Hardwicke

- 6 groups applied
- Total Recommended: \$ 3355.60
- Mokhtarzadeh: any questions?
- Mokhtarzadeh: Any oppsition?
- Mokhtarzadeh: Seeing none, this allocation passes.

~~XIV. Old Business~~

XV. New Business

I. Election Code Bylaw Amendment\* Li

- Li: Jack, we wanted to get your perspective on this.
  - Price: It looked to me like it was just a codification of the process that we discussed so it looks good
- Mokhtarzadeh: we are talking about the members of the executive board right?
- Jackson moves the approve the Election Code Bylaw Amendment, Flournoy-Hooker seconds.
- 12-0-0 vote, this motion passes.

## 2. USAC International Representative Bylaw Amendment\*

Li

- Li: before this amendment can be passed, can Jessica present the survey? After reaching out during last week and this weekend and Monday, I reached out to all student groups and we got 127 responses and 93.7% of them are international students and 6% are not. The distribution is mainly 3rd and 2nd year students. Not a lot of 1st and 4th year students responded.
- Presenting the survey:
  - What issues concerned you the most: communication with Dashew Center, housing, jobs, mental health issues, food security.
  - Someone said better academic counselling and 4 yrs of housing.
- I also asked for additional suggestions and people left a lot of comments.
  - According to the survey, the top things that the ISR should be responsible for is communication with Dashew, jobs and internships, housing and financial support.
- He: it is important for us to reach out to all the undocumented and out of state student groups and to make sure that the organization is reading the document such that Dashew and OCHC is okay with it. A lot of us don't feel comfortable doing this. We have the whole year to write the bylaw so we don't need to rush.
- Li: I don't mean to rush it but this council brought up the idea and so the least we can do is lay the foundation.
- He: it would be nice but we can't finish it in such a rushed way.
- Dr. Geller: there is no time pressure to have these bylaws implemented until the start of the next election season. Whether something is adopted tonight or not, the next council can edit it in any way they see fit. If the election season is coming, it needs to be in effect before applications are submitted. The pressure to move tonight is for it to be this council's legacy as opposed to the next. From a pragmatic perspective, there's no need to act right now. It could even wait until fall.  
Jackson: If we approve this tonight, it sets it on the next council's radar and they'll have to address it soon.
- He: the town hall is happening next monday and I feel like we don't even know if Dashew is open to work with this representative. There are so many things we haven't done yet. People want to leave a legacy but I don't think...
- Jackson: in the outreach, do you anticipate there being someone who says that we don't need a ISR.
- He: Dashew supports this but I don't know how committed they are to working together.
- Hajee: the only difference is having an official or unofficial skeleton for the council to work off of. But if it is passed today, maybe the coverage of it will help bring in more students who want to give inputs.
- Mokhtarzadeh: so we have one sense that we can approve the section or to leave it.
- Hardwicke: I agree with Kayla's point about talking to the bodies who are referenced in the document before ratifying it.
- Li: Supply comes before demand.
- Boudie: the referendum has already passed.
- Pan: I don't see immigration advocacy over there at all. It is a big piece that is missing from there. I will not feel comfortable without getting student ideas to come in.
- Li: we've already collected enough responses.
- Pan: but immigration was not a pre-determined option in the document.
- Jackson: so you are waiting till the monday town hall to add things?
- He: yes, and we need to talk to OCHC and Dashew to see how best we can collaborate.
  - Ayesha: there was a talk about an advisory board being forced and the student liaison was through that. So for us to say that the IRS would be a Dashew liaison is not warranted right now. My last conversation with the Dashew director is that the only thing on their radar was the international student advisory board.

- Mokhtarzadeh: I want to recognize the work that Vivy has put into this.
- Li: I did a lot of outreach before putting this on and Kayla's team also worked for the town hall but I don't see these things conflicting with each other. I see them as complimentary.
- He: what's the problem if this gets done in week 8 or 9?
- Li: I am worried that council pushes things way too late into the year.
- Mokhtarzadeh: vivy, the urgency is not there. Even if council doesn't get to it by the the end of the year, that would be ok.
- Saidan: I see Vivy's point in terms of the fact that this council had the intention of voting on this this season and see it come to reality. We owe the next council that we give them a skeleton. It would place this responsibility on the next council. Who are we to say that to should be your responsibility whether you want it or not. If Vivy feels like she's compelled to put this into act. If Ayesha feels there's a problem with it later, she can redo it.
- Li: a lot of 4th years voted too and their opinion should count.
- Hardwicke: I guess our bylaws are not a place for rough drafts. This is a document we have to abide by and guides everything we do so why would we ratify something we can edit.
- Li: I put this up for 2 weeks and I didn't get any personal info or questions about the bylaws. I posted this on various media and nobody reached out to me.
- He: I have talked to Ayesha and she is committed not to let this slide. A lot of people who have worked on this don't feel comfortable passing this without doing more outreach.
- Saidian: Vivy have you talked to the people who have been integral to making this a reality and gotten their perspective. Because we have 2 perspectives here.
- Li: I did the survey and Kayla added options other survey.
- Saidian: but it did not cover some of the perspectives like undocumented students.
- Li: I don't want to waste people's time but I want to put this skeleton into action and if everyone is okay with the language we can approve it.
- Li moves to approve the International Representative Bylaw Amendment, Jackson seconds.
- 2-10-0 vote, this motion fails and the bylaw amendment is rejected.

## 2. Install Security Cameras in Kerckhoff\*

Hajee

- Champawat: I want to clarify that from ASUCLA building management perspective, this is something we have done in partnership with council. These are your spaces. If you want cameras to address the concern and make the space more safe, the best would be a partnership where you indicate what you want. But we are more hesitant to put cameras into your spaces out of respect. The history these 2 floors is that there had been an incident and there was a discussion on the table. At that time we signed the halls. After 8 PM we would ask anyone hws not part of ASUCLA to leave. I just want to ensure that you shouldn't frame your discussion thinking about money. It is also important to take into consideration that incidents have. It is also important what the incoming council thinks.
- Hajee: we reached out to student organizations on 3rd and 4th floors to ask how they felt about the installation of cameras and if they had any suggestions. On the initial survey we didn't get that many responses so we scheduled physical meetings. As of now, I am not completely comfortable making a decision based on how much data we have collected. The general theme was that a lot of organizations are comfortable but students are uncomfortable because that the cameras will be there all the time watching their movement. So they asked for a policy such that there be restrictions on who and when can access the feed.
- Hardwicke: in term sof positioning, where will the cameras be? Couldn't it be that the cameras were on the stairs so you could see whos entering and exiting.

- Champawat: it depends what we want to accomplish. We don't want a tool that leaves as many questions as it answers. We need to know enough to associate an individual with the action. It's worth discussing. And I think I need to think and discuss it more to understand the ramifications.
- Diaz: it also needs to take into account the elevator access.
- Hardwicke: people might not be as comfortable taking condoms and tampons.
- Hajee: having exits covered would assist an investigation.
  - Member of SWC, Serena: what if we move the tampon and condom resources to a less visible area.
- Lee: complying with fire marshal policy is complicated but we will look into this.
- Champawat: I wasn't able to follow the location that was being specifically proposed. But one concern that was raised was an example of the type of thing that might be of concern is privacy of accessing sensitive resources. We can come up with something that allows privacy and respect both. We don't want to set off an incident which one has to interview and investigate multiple people. We don't want to have unintended consequences. There may be other solutions to privacy and entrance.
- Mokhtarzadeh: recognizing that we are in our way out and there is consensus around student groups wants this. Maybe we can recommend that ASUCLA implements cameras and let it be incumbent upon each incoming council to decide if they want the cameras to be rolling or not.
- Hardwicke: while I get that it's a USAC decision, there are a lot of non-USAC groups on the 4th floor who will not have a say in this. The second thing is the idea of security cameras that already exist are being constantly monitored in the A-level office.
- Champawat: they are constantly recording and are to be seen at all times. But monitoring is not something we do actively.
- Hardwicke: people will be comfortable with the cameras recording but only be accessed in the case of an investigation.
- Champawat: certain things are protocols that are informed by best practices that I don't want to casually move past. What if someone calls saying there's a scary activity in the corridor and then the body is able to access the cameras and confirm that and call UCPD. We need to also include the new council in the conversation. But I will need to go back and check on some of these things to ensure I am not missing anything.
- Hardwicke: I think the point was that people were not just watching to watch it. If someone is calling with information, someone can turn on the feed.
- Champawat: I have never witnessed anyone on our staff having voyeuristic instincts to watch what's happening in these spaces. I don't mean that as a dismissive comment, I mean it to be clear. For example, we don't have cameras in a lot of our public spaces.
- Nidirah (AAC proxy): what sort of outreach has been done?
- Hajee: Surveys and personal interviews will be done in offices on these floors.
- Nidirah (AAC proxy): I think Arielle's idea is a great one. For different offices, this is something worth considering. Beyond the survey, did you ask them specifically if they were comfortable with the installation of cameras. And then asked them more specific details about where they want them installed?
- Nidirah (AAC proxy): if there are condoms and tampons and you took them, you wouldn't be part of an investigation if something happened.
- Pan: in the past when there have been rumors and allegations regarding things like using USAC offices for campaign material, would e-board be able to have access to this footage. Or would that be restricted to campus administrators?
- Champawat: I don't believe that we would make this kind of recording public but I also would need to make sure I am aware of whatever regulations and laws would govern this. Our protocol would normally not be able to make this accessible to students for investigation. So I will need to go back and check in order to make further comment.

- Lee: I wanted to ask about the possibility of having restricted access and access only in case of investigation? Only recorded but not viewable in real time?
- Champawat: I'm open to looking into that. Normally, I know that when something may have happened in the space, it involves someone sitting for hours and something happening. It may be that pure recording without the ability to view in real time may be a viable solution. One thing is that you know the camera is working and not going in the wrong direction.
- Lee: and then can we also put up a sign that informs students of the same in those monitored areas.
- Champawat: a camera that is present can also have a deterrent effect. It can get students to not make bad choices.
- Mokhtarzadeh: there is a suggestion that cameras only be turned on during off hours and weekends.
- Hardwicke: we've had people steal during the day time.
- Mokhtarzadeh: there are other ways to go around it.
- Jackson: I think Arielle's idea about each council deciding for itself is great.
- Hajee: for the council right now, I have a question: is it a yes or no to installing the cameras in the first place? or is it a yes contingent on us continuing to figure out the details with the new council. And then for the new council, I like the idea of revising the idea each year but we can't have it happened one year and then not on another year. So maybe we can change the OSAC bylaws such that this is revisited each year and outreach is done each year.
- Champawat: it seems to me that the best part is that this council is in its 11th 3/4th hour. This council should be conveying its intent that then can be worked with the next council. To be getting into the fine details seems something like we will be talking to the next council about this and that is immediately around the corner.
- Mokhtarzadeh: most of us on this table agree that this is a more thoughtful conversation to have and the new council continues the follow
  - The safety and security of undergraduate student spaces
  - The input of student groups that inhabit these spaces
  - Recommended that the onus be on each individual council each year.
  - Go through OSAC.
- Champawat: we don't need to take an action on this tonight, a straw poll should suffice. Some kind of non-action item vote would be appropriate.
- Mokhtarzadeh: maybe we do a straw poll vote.
- Straw poll: majority votes in favor.
- Mokhtarzadeh: we are making a recommendation to the incoming council to continue this discussion.

#### Certification of USAC Election Results

- Dr. Geller: I want to speak from a policy perspective. ~~Should get the write up from Dr. Geller.~~ It would not be appropriate to aggregate new information related to new complaints. The j-board judgement put e-board in a untenable position and delegated them to respond with a decision to consider if the case involved coercion even if the original complaint, this is not only contrary to the basic tenets of ethics. Based on e-board's practices, they have no jurisdiction to investigate. I've read the decision that was posted a little bit earlier and it seems that they made an effort. They considered coercion as they were directed by j-board.
- Dr. Geller: I want to frame it around the basics of fairness when it comes to any deliberative process. The focus is on complying with actual policies.
  - Price: I have never presented a result before. I emailed the results to you all 10 days ago. We did our best to comply with J-Board's order and finished our investigation in keeping with the practices that we established prior to the ad hoc committee. We established a rule of simple majority of vote. The established findings are posted on our website. The board came to a decision

based on the things that Dr. Geller referenced during our deliberations on how to issue a sanction. We found that we had differences that we couldn't overcome.

- Price reads the USAC 2018-19 election results.
- Price: The constitutional amendment passes by a healthy margin of 81% vote.
- Price: Those are the results, and I submit them to you. The council has to certify the votes now.
- Boudaie: could you explain why the results of all these new sanctions was put online at 6:37 PM.
  - Price: we cast votes and that meeting adjourned at 2:23am last night and had a vote this afternoon. We were strapped for time. The j-board put a slim time frame on our investigation. We had 2 business days.
- Jackson: if you weren't strapped for time, would you have a different decision? What was a difference that you couldn't get past?
  - Price: the options, secondly, the rubric established by the election board which means we consider both the validity and the impact of those violations on the elections.
- Jackson: so you feel confident with us approving this ballot?
  - Price: Yes.
- Saidian: you would be confident despite saying that your board did not reach a final decision.
  - Price: there were disagreements about whether a sanction can be put after the results have been announced.
- Saidian: to be transparent, can you outline what the disagreements were?
- Mokhtarzadeh: Hasn't that been published in the sanction you disclosed at 6:37PM?
- Hajee: they were published right before council.
- Saidian: if you can articulate that to the rest of the room that doesn't have laptops.
  - Price: we discussed at length the testimony that we had connected during the time frame established by the j-board and the interviews we had done to establish context. We deliberated on what sort of sanctions should be put given the validity and effectiveness of the violation on the election and the also the cooperation of the defendant. Our processes delineated the code and you know where to find the code and our findings are also on our website.
- Jacksons: was there ever any hesitate to take action because of what the consequences could be.
  - Price: there were a number of debates about what the option could be. We looked at validity and impact of the violation more than anything else. That was the main focus.
- Pan: at any point, were there any students or student organizations that threatened you in a professional and personal capacity?
- Saidian: you have to think about it?
  - Price: people throw words at the election board all the time but we stick to our code
- Pan: do you say that beyond a reasonable doubt?
  - Price: in our minutes from our meeting, we established beyond doubt that... one has to assume that more likely than not, an offense occurred.
- Pan: invasion of voter privacy was found to have taken place. Why wasn't a sanction issued for that?
  - Price: the board couldn't come to a decision about what a reasonable sanction would be at that time.
- Pan: so you're not sure as to what to do?
  - Price: We couldn't come to a decision.
- Dr. Geller: the appropriate thing is not to open closed cases that came in but to thoroughly investigate any new complaints that were received after they opened the complaint site.
- Saidina: if we feel like the cases that were closed, and e-board did not handle them appropriately, then what?
- Dr. Geller: if you feel that e-board didn't follow their own practice, then J-board is the place that determines if that is true or not. It is not for council to second-guess their decisions. You appointed and empowered

them. If there's concern from any member of the association, that's what j-board is there for. It's not about do you like the decision. It is if the decisions are consistent with their policies and practices.

- Hajee: in the very initial sanction that was filed that the j-board case was about regarding there was violation of voter privacy and the sanction was 2 hrs of no campaigning. After that was a j-board case where they had e-board reopen the investigation and then these 5 sanctions were filed. And the last section says that there was violation of voter privacy but no voter coercion. This is sanction 71.
  - Price: the issue that the ad-hoc investigations team came upon is that one cannot issue a ban on campaigning. The voting has ended.
- Hajee: so you're saying that invasion of voter privacy occurred but you will let it go because election season is over.
  - Price: the board couldn't decide on appropriate sanction.
- Pan: the problem with e-board being responsible for upholding the elections code is that we don't know what to do when we find people violate sanctions filed on thursday night and friday. And because we have that precedent, we need to have some sort of a sanction. You just couldn't decide what the sanction should be.
- Mokhtarzadeh: an allegation was being thrown around. It's false, unsubstantiated and offensive. We are on this table and don't have the power to decide who we want to and don't want to sit on the table next year.
- He: regardless of the intention, there needs to be sent a message that there will be big consequences.
- Mokhtarzadeh: that is something future e-board should look to rectify
- Saidian: it's not about being offensive, its about having a discussion about whether someone feels that someone overstepped or coerced someone. And reprimanding someone for bringing that to the table is offensive. Someone who has vested interest and won't have power next year, that's out of line.
- Mokhtarzadeh: that allegation was used against me and my slate for a past few years. It was used to disqualify me an Aaron last year. It is an unsubstantiated claim.
- Saidian: this is a part of history.
- Mokhtarzadeh: the allegation that BU violated rules is unsubstantiated.
- Saidian: before we reprimand people for voicing their opinions.
- Mokhtarzadeh: I didn't reprimand, I said she should think about whether this is substantiated. There is no evidence because it doesn't happen.
- Flournoy-Hooker: I agree and it's weird to say that you should feel comfortable approving this. It's really weird saying this is okay. I have seen videos on facebook. It's really weird that you would advise us to approve this. I also think that we do have some responsibility to ensure that this election goes honestly. I am definitely voting no and would encourage us to wrap this discussion because it's obvious that shit happened.
- Hardwicke: I have personally experienced this happening to me at a frat parties. So I've experienced this specifically with BU candidates. Saying that there is no history of this is incorrect. However, if we vote no on this, what happens?
- Dr. Geller: If you vote not to certify, you all stay in office and there would be some sort of legal steps to figure out what's next. As written the only body with ability to judge this is j-board.
- Jackson: in the past, j-board has made remedies that council had to take action on.
- Champawat: the supreme court is for looking at whether you're violating your constitutional. If you don't certify your election, we would need to then identify what that path looks like.
- He: is it possible of us to certify those who won fairly?
- Dr. Geller: It is all or nothing.
- Flournoy-Hooker: I think if you coerced voters to vote for you, you should be disqualified. There's no alternative to that. You unfairly gained those votes.
- Nidirah : seems like a sanction was not enough. Does disqualification fall under same ground as the sanction.

- Price: there are structural issues with the e-code and the sanctions process. One of the main issues we encountered was that despite doing our best, Matthew dunham is expected to be judge jury and executor. That creates problems. Secondly, Matt only has a set number of sanction possibilities and that creates a structural issues at the end of election. We ran the election as well as we could. We don't term out until the end of spring and we are going to draft a recommendation for the next council
- Pan: what would be enough violation to disqualify a candidate?
  - Price: it would be something that has severe effect on the results of the election. We would consult the e-code and determine that
- Nidirah: are you guys even able under the code to disqualify candidates?
  - Price: Yes that is provided for.
- Hajee: this is a violation voter privacy and it calls for disqualification. I can't certify this on moral grounds.
- Champawat: I wonder if we are understanding whether these are your roles. Your certification or non certification can be taken an action on and when we get to the point in courts, there are judgement that have to be made. A penalty relative to a crime. There are people who believe that more severe penalties should be put into position. Did e-board follow its rules and make judgements that had some valid basis?
- Flournoy-Hooker: I am ready to vote.
- Jackson: I second that. I agree with Roy that it's not our place but we vote yes or not. Back to j-board, I know that they can recommend to disqualify because it happened in freshman year when spending for SJR went 10x over their spending limits.
- He: it's not us who are empowered. We are in positions we are able to speak. It's our responsibility to ensure that future council who are going to serve students are people who are going to speak for themselves
  - Member of the Public, Ramneek hazrah: the sanction #59 said that, "...” so if you came the conclusion that there was voter coercion and they won seats unfairly, why was there no action taken? You determined that there was voter coercion but what is e-board doing to uphold the ecode.
- Mokhtarzadeh: I personally don't believe that it's our jurisdiction.
- Flournoy-Hooker I think we need to let Jack answer the question first.
  - Price: we used the practices that we set forth as an ad-hoc investigation committee. In deliberating what would be a reasonable sanction, we referred to the section 11 that gives directions on how to give sanctions.
- Mokhtarzadeh: upon reopening section #59 there was no new evidence submitted. You found there is evidence of conversion based on what?
  - Price: there was testimony in the j-board investigation as per clause 84.
- Mokhtarzadeh: can you explain how you came up with the definition of coercion. Looking at any other legal document in this country, your definition is much less strict. "Putting voter in a position to do something they don't want to do." can you answer how you came up with your definition.
- Hajee: I want to yield my time.
- Saidian: Arielle, you are using your position unfairly right now.
  - Mehr: you looked at the definition for 5 seconds and question it. We've worked on it for hours. We produced definition first and the considered the evidence. Per j-board case, we opened the investigation. We looked at ecode, USAC bylaws, dictionaries. We spent a lot of time researching the definition of voter coercion.
- Stokes: what are the solutions?
  - Price: we have seen structural issues with the way that the ecode and elections are set up. One of the main issues that allegations of voter coercion go back for years and are so rampant is that there are 31K polling places on campus and you can't put a poll worker on staff to monitor those polling

places. If we are going to address voter privacy, we are going to have to make a transition back to physical polling places.

- Stokes: so you're saying you can't determine whether it happened or not. So you reopen the election again. If we said no to the results would you reopen the elections. I didn't get an answer yet. What will happen?
- Dr. Geller: if at the end of tonight, you don't certify the results, you will continue for another week and we will get some guidance by consulting legal counsel.
- Pan: Jack, I have a lot of respect for you. At the end of the day, I am frustrated. I am looking at the daily Bruin editorial piece that you submitted two years ago. It's not as if you stepped into this position not aware of these institutional problems. Earlier you talked about how you stayed up till 2:32 PM. I don't see the minutes from those meetings online. So I'm curious if those minutes can be made available. Can you clarify how the ultimate decision was made.
  - Price: one of our board members has requested anonymity for personal reasons in their deliberations so we will see if we can find a way to give out the general position of what happened last night. The decision to not issue sanction- we made motions to vote and we couldn't achieve a consensus as a board at that time.
- Boudaie: something you said, I'm looking at the minutes from May 12th. You asked j-board for extra time and they said no.
  - J-board, Nick: in our roles, we can only prevent the swearing in for 5 business days.
- Hajee: your decision was that you couldn't make a decision.
- Boudaie: would an extra week benefit you? When we asked for more time, we were still trying to field interviews. We were able to gain one interview within the period that j-board did allow us. We considered the evidence and what we had.
- Nidirah: I personally think that a lot of us are unsatisfied with the solutions and the answers to our questions. And I hope you would offer us specific solutions. Can we articulate some solution that we can offer to the j-board.
- Jackson: it almost sounds like this body then would construct what e-board should do. We can balance it between us j-board and other institutions but it will fall on Jack Price at the end of the day. Our hands are tied.
- Lee: I thought that earlier in the year we had talked about going to legal counsel which is a resource not available to students. That would set a dangerous precedent. I want to understand if this is the same legal counsel.
- Dr. Geller: UCLA legal counsel doesn't serve students but it does serve administration so we can take questions to them.
- Champawat: you have the j-board. Anytime you're going to get legal guidance, you have to frame a question. You're going to have to look at your constitution, bylaws and e-code.
- Jackson: that would bring us right back to e-board!
- Lee: this is the same legal counsel we talked about earlier in the year?
- Saidian: what is the difference between you going to them vs us going to them?
- Champawat: this issue is such that the answers exist within your constitution, bylaws, j-board code and e-code. I am not sure we are clear on what we can get their interpretation on.
- Jackson: our question would be if they gave appropriate sanction or not.
- Champawat: one question could be what does it mean if you don't certify a decision that was brought to you.
- Jackson: if we don't certify, does it stop right there?
  - J-board, Nick: it would only come to j-board if this non-certification violated an existing code in the bylaws.
  - Member of the Public, Matthew William Richard: I was asked to write a testimony and I said I was available and election board never got back to me on that. Given that the decision just came

out today, doesn't that strip students the right to petition results uptill 2 days after the results are declared.

- Price: I don't think that's a question for me.
- Saidian: given that context, I think you've made it clear that you didn't make a decision which means you haven't decided based on the description of e-board what you're going to do in terms of the repercussion of the results you found. That power lies in your hands right now Jack. So maybe more time will be substantial. You should think more about these things, right? I've said it multiple times. Council is often being placed in positions to vote on time sensitive issues but I don't give a shit if its convenient or not. We need to uphold the standards that we are expected to hold. We as a council can ask you to go back and come to a conclusion instead of saying we don't know. I don't get it!
- Pan: I am looking at article 12 of the e-code where it talks about ballot tabulation. It doesn't say we have to certify the entire ballot. Couldn't we go position by position.
- Mokhtarzadeh: I would argue an alternate interpretation.
- Pan: we can do them one by one.
  - J-board, Nick: I would have to go to my entire eboard to come to a conclusion on that.
- Kadota: there is a decision that there was no sanction.
  - Price: its not on me to decide whether or not sanction could be issued. Isabelle Bock felt...
  - Isabelle: a majority of our board feel that we need to disqualify. This is unacceptable. That I get my vote constantly stifled just because the chair has a veto per the e-code. I can't handle this. How is this going down.
  - Price: the decision that I made are the ones I put down.
  - Mehr: per the election code, the chair has the final say.
  - Isabelle: and I will be fired for this tonight.
  - Mehr: he has the right to do so. If you don't like that code, you could change it but that's the code and that's how we implemented it.
- Mokhtarzadeh: we can either certify the results, take a vote not to certify or table. In the even that we take a vote and we don't certify, we can discuss our next course of action that we can put into motion for next week.
- Champawat: your codes don't specify what happens in the absence of certification. There was something that said that referenda are certified separate from ballot. The language of section 9 says that you "certification of the candidates elected". All we can do is look at the language of the text.

USAC LIVE WAS FOUND TO HAVE STOPPED WORKING AT 9:43 PM

- Hardwicke motions for a 5 minute recess, Boudaie seconds.
- 11-0-1 vote, recess commences
- Mokhtarzadeh: we just took a 5 minute recess which ended up being longer.
- Mokhtarzadeh: our first option is to table the vote, if we are going vote, we have the opportunity to separate the referendum from the certification of the candidates. If we do choose to move forward, we can vote to abstain, certify or not. We don't know what will happen if we don't certify. Is everyone comfortable moving forward with one of those actions tonight.
- Jackson: can we look at focusing on the positions that aren't in question.
- Mokhtarzadeh: that sets a dangerous precedent which leds to council getting to decide whether or not to certify certain positions.
- Diaz: the way I conduct myself at these meeting is that I listen to everyone and then decide what I want to say. With the initial conversation of USAC overstepping with this decision, I do agree however in this circumstance, this level of intervention is needed. It is our duty on a moral basis. Also with the statement that Mehr made about Jack having the sole authority as per e-code, that creates an issues because you have

a divided room. I have a very strong opposition to that. These bylaws are very unaccessible and written in ways that restrict council. I would urge Jack, given the statement you brought up in the daily bruin article, to really think critically about your position moving forward. You should think critically of the role you have here. Thank you Isabelle for coming and giving your testimony. I think that provided a lot of insight into how the committee was deliberating. Lastly, honestly, I think the e-board can do better and if it is time that you need, we should give it to you. This room is so divided that everyone needs more time. I am nervous saying all this but I am choosing to vote no because this issue needs a lot more time that it has been given. I am ready to vote now. Even if it means separating the referendum from the ballot.

- Boudaie: the only thing possible is to take the case back to j-board. I am reluctant to allow administrators or anyone in Murphy to help make the decision. In 2016, someone did that about SJR and j-board ruled yes but they could have made alternative recommendations as well.
  - J-board, Nick: we can accept a petition on concerns of sanctions being unreasonable. We did issue an order to election board to issue a sanction but that was not fulfilled by e-board.
- Mokhtarzadeh: is there a reason why you stayed inconclusive?
  - Price: specifically trying to address whether a reasonable sanction for voter coercion, there is nothing in the code.
  - Isabelle Bock: doesn't matter if you fail to coerce, it is still coercion.
  - Price: there are disagreements on the board.
- Pan: Jack, since j-board did say that there needs to be a reasonable sanction and majority of your board voted for a disqualification and can you explain why your decision was different from that. You said the minutes are unavailable. I want to ask if there were any threats made against you that led you to overrule your board's decision.
  - Price: I based my decision on sanction 59 and that Dr. Geller expressed that the j-board order creates order of an investigation that in my opinion falls out of our jurisdiction.
- Pan: so you felt that the decision your board had come to was out of your jurisdiction?
  - Price: we have the power to disqualify but I looked to section 11 that stipulates how we decide sanction and how we come to a point that we need to decide.
- Nidirah: I think e-board should mandate in terms of decision how to disqualify candidates. A lot of the decisions and questions and misbehaviors that have been allowed are due to the lack of specificity in the code.
- Stokes: I motion that we certify the ISR referendum and we table this discussion to next Tuesday. Boudaie seconds.
  - Member of the Public, Ramneek hazrah: you said you can't disqualify, but wasn't Justin Jackson disqualified for not submitting something?
  - Member of the Public: did individuals with special interest to the case reach out to you?
  - Price: Yes. people reach out to us all the time. We reached out to the defenders also.
  - Member of the Public: did that influence your decision?
  - Price: no.
- Saidian: do you think it would've been important to let the council know that you overruled your board's decision. It seems fishy and there's something going on here that isn't clear. You aren't answering question to your fullest ability. That's your job Jack. We don't have minutes to reference that.
  - Price: yes I thin accountability is important.
- Hardwicke: can we split the current motion into 2.
- Stokes and Boudaie withdraw the motion
- Stokes moves to certify the ISR position, Boudaie seconds.
- 10-2-0 vote, this motion passes.

- Flournoy-Hooker moves to table the vote for the USAC 2018-19 candidates certification (not ISR) contingent upon a reevaluation and figuring out what we can and can't do.
- Stokes seconds.

#### Discussion

- Saidian : we are going to take time to see what avenues we can pursue.
- Hardwicke: if we vote no, can a j-board investigation be reopened?
- 12-0-0 vote, this motion passes.

#### XVI. Announcements

- Flournoy-Hooker: JRF tickets are available. There's a student lottery so you can get a free ticket. There is the event of food from shithole countries next week
- He: do you have questions about election process of the ISR.
- Flournoy-Hooker: we didn't have enough discussion
- Stokes: we can talk outside.
- Pan: you've heard THAT we've been trying to fight LEGISLATURE so that UC doesn't have to raise tuition. Tomorrow morning at 10am, there's a huge rally and hopefully tuition doesn't have to go up.
- TGIF is having sustainability demo day this friday for on campus sustainability. One team will be chosen to win 50k to implement their proposal. Pub affairs 2214.
- Mokhtarzadeh: this is the first time in Spring Sing history that tickets are \$5. If anyone in the room is unable to pay that price, I will be offering some of my office funds. If the ticket don't sell out, there's a possibility that spring sing won't happen in Pauley anymore.
- Stokes moves to adjourn at 10:25 PM, Flournoy-Hooker seconds.
- 12-0-0 vote, the meeting is adjourned.

#### XVII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- The attendance sheet is passed around

#### XVIII. Adjournment\*

#### XIX. Good and Welfare

\* Indicates Action Item

# Indicates Consent Item

@Indicates Executive Session Item