AGENDA
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL
May 4 2021
 7 PM PST
Zoom: https://ucla.zoom.us/s/97123303841

I. Call to Order

Riley

- Naomi calls the meeting to order at 7:06pm

A.   Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Signed via Google Docs

II. Approval of Agenda*

Luong

- Strike TSR bylaw change
- FSC verbal report
- Strike TGMF
- Strike ASRF
- Strike BAG
- Strike TGIF
- TSR written report
- Strike SFS
- CSC written report
- Strike Capital Contingency
- Move discussion item for CAE up in New Business
- Strike Seat at the Table Initiative

- Emily motions to approve the agenda as amended, Breeze seconds
- By motion of 12-0-0 the motion passes, agenda is approved as amended

III. Approval of the minutes*

Luong

4/27/2021; 4/30/2021

- Promise motions to approve minutes from 4/27/2021 and 4/30/2021, Emily seconds
- By motion of 11-0-1 the motion passes, minutes from 4/27/2021 and 4/30/2021 are approved

IV. Public Comment

Riley

Alfred: Hello Council members. I hope you're doing well. This is the second to last council meeting and we're almost there so hang on in there, y'all have done a great job this year. I came to talk to all of you today to speak on behalf of the Elections Board because we are worried. We are seriously worried about voter turnout this year. We're seriously worried because the Elections Board has done everything imaginable in our power to encourage students to vote in the elections throughout this year and the campaign season. We are working together with all Student Affairs entities, ASUCLA, TSR, Recreation, Housing, DASHEW center to publicize election information, to do live events and takeovers. We're reaching out to student organizations to share information and endorsements and voting and drop-ins. We're blasting ads on Facebook and Instagram about voting, we're sending school wide emails to students and student organizations. We're also having a my.UCLA notice and flyer. We're also working with student media groups to do ads and we're also doing giveaways. Despite all of our hard efforts to increase voter turnout and engagement we are still seeing alarmingly low numbers. This is honestly very shocking for me because the Elections Board has seriously spent so much hours, labor, and effort trying to get students to vote, and the numbers are really lagging behind but at the same time it's also not that much of a surprise because of the disconnect that we all have with campus after doing remote learning for nearly a year, everyone is burned out and everyone is tired and I get that. It's because of this alarming red that we're seeing in voter turnout that we are collectively imploring each and every single USAC office and officer to help us push the students to vote. If possible, we want to ask for each USAC officer to ask their office to consistently blask our voting graphics that we sent throughout the week and reach out to all other connections to do the same until voting is over. If USAC offices want to collaborate together on the event that the Elections Board and the CSR is working on together, we would really appreciate that as well. We will deeply appreciate anything that you can do to boost turnout. We really need your help to make sure that voting turnout does not shape out to be below 20% this year. We have done literally everything that we can and we

really need more hands on deck to get this chance to vote, and it is critical that as many students vote this year. If we don't do anything about this together the turnout might not reach 20% so please give us your active help, we have to go through and make sure that the voter turnout is quite alright this year. Thank you all.

Janine Dilla: Hi everyone, my name is Janine Dilla and I'm here in my capacity as the director of Internal Affairs for the TSR office. Zuleika will be putting forth a resolution and I am just here to urge council members to vote in support. As an entity that aims to serve the student body, the Basic Needs Committee unfortunately lacks transparency. Up until sometime between last Friday, which is the last time the Basic Needs Committee met, and today they only had one meeting agenda available on their website for this whole entire academic year. That document was a one page spending plan for three years and it has yet to be broken down into a yearly budget plan with detailed expenditures. Additionally, it's really hard to access their quarterly meetings, only people who are on the Basic Needs email list have the link to register for this meeting, and when I asked why this meeting wasn't available to the public, they responded that it's a sensitive issue and while I acknowledge that material insecurities can be sensitive, CPO administration who also serve as the Basic Needs leadership need to reevaluate their position and acknowledge that they need to actively work towards destigmatizing asking for help, especially the communities who are most vulnerable to these situations. Lastly, I hope that you consider my concerns and vote in support of this resolution to restructure the Basic Needs Committee and also create a Basic Needs Student Advisory Board. Thank you and I yield my time.

Joaquin: Hi everyone, my name is Joaquin Escalante, I'm a research assistant within the Internal Affairs Committee within the TSR office as well. I also just wanted to boost Janine's message on the Basic Needs Committee's creation. Having looked at the data on UCLA students needs which aren't met, there's not enough accountability and input within these communities that are facing unequal and inequitable access to resources that are vitally needed just to get though these classes and through this course work especially after this pandemic. I imagine the numbers are going to look even worse as we recover. I yield my time.

Brandon: Hi everyone, my name is Brandon Lee and I'm also a research analyst for the Internal Affairs Committee for the TSR office alongside Janine and Joaquin, and I'm also urging this council to really pass this resolution in regards to basic needs. I also had a hard time trying to find the Basic Needs Committee agendas and I really do think that there needs to be a restructure implemented in place and there's a lot of students that are being disproportionately impacted by the lack of transparency and I think that without transparency we won't be able to see whether or not change can really be implemented for the years to come. I yield my time.

Yondon: I just want to say I really urge the council to pass this resolution as well, because this is not only a UCLA issue but this a a UC wide systemic issue. As someone who is from the Internal Affairs and who does research alongside Brandon and Joaquin, I really want to say that I've looked at the data in detail and I have analyzed it and I realized that this is a really big issue, and as students, student need to worry about their academics and other issues regarding housing security, basic needs should always be met and it should always be a responsibility of the school. Thank you so much I yield my time.

Quinn: Hi all, my name is Quinn O'Connor and I'm honestly very disappointed that I am here yet again attempting to hold UCLA administration accountable to the disabled community. I know this counts as council's last meeting as elections are happening, but I am glad that there's finally an agenda item addressing this repeating issues. The first public comment I made back in November detailed an event in which Dr.Blandizzi the Dean of Students did not communicate with student leaders that she was hiring the candidate for the Center for Accessible Education Director that we as disabled students strongly advised against, citing numerous testimonies from students who have had negative experiences with this person. In this process she also ignored our emails for about three weeks following up with her. We only ended up finding out about the hiring of this position through the university committee on disability, which I am a USAC appointment of under the Facilities Commission. A month after these public comments were made, we finally were able to get a meeting with Monroe Gordon, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs to address our concerns. AFter this initial meeting as well as another meeting with various other Student Affairs professionals, we came to the conclusion that the CAE would have continued communication with us as disabled student leaders as well as with the Facilities Commission to better address these issues and keep us included in their decision making. And now the events that you are all aware of, and will hear more about at the agenda item later. Apparently, placating disabled students into bi weekly and monthly meetings with CAE representatives is not a good way to continue the communication and remedy the past patterns of inaction. As I expressed in the last meeting I had with Dr. Monroe Gordon, setting up these meetings did not count as tangible action items that we had asked for in support of our community as disabled students. Just a week after a resolution was presented commemorating Lily Shaw's past advocacy work on council, the underlying systemic ableism that she

strove to address that is ever present within this university is blatantly obvious yet again. Despite all the work that her and other disabled student leaders that have followed have done in the past few years, Student Affairs and by extension UCLA as a whole, in my opinion, does not live up to the title of number one public university in the nation that we all love to hold dearly. In situations where administration is not transparent with the disabled community after many chances for accountability and action, the clear disregard for advocates who dedicate their free time and labor in most cases is sorely obvious at this point. Since November, when we first went to public comment, no tangible action items have been presented by Student Affairs, or any action items have clearly not been effective in getting this relationship with the disabled student body. I hope that through this agenda item as well as whatever pressures the administrators feel from the outside, this is the time where we can create some meaningful change. Thank you for your consideration and attention to this matter as the agenda item comes up later tonight. And again, I'm incredibly disappointed and I apologize to all of you who have to sit through this.

Kyle (read by Emily): Good evening. I'm writing about Maria Blandizzi's gross mishandling of funds originally allocated to help students with disabilities on campus. A short while ago, before she decided to leave the university admin she deliberately voided a check that would've allocated funds for the Center for Accessible Education. Why does this matter? After ten months of work, students with disabilities have tried to engage with Student Affairs in talks of remodeling the CAE, making it more accessible to students. Blandizzi delayed this process at every juncture until the final days of her tenure where she could deliberately void the check without facing any accountability for her actions. This is the definition of [indiscernible]. The CAE can only afford to hire a counselor for three out of the four weeks of the month. The Dean of Students is not for students. The relegation of this money to the general fund shows Blandizzi and the office of the students is not deserving of this money or any money from anyone. We as a community are not welcomed on campus as a unique community and we are only accepted in public society when we erase the most defining parts of our identity, our disability. I am tired of the institutionalized contempt.

- Public comment adjourned at 7:25pm

V. Funding

Capital Contingency*   Minasyan

Contingency Programming*   Minasyan
Total Requested: $9,621.71
Total Recommended: $5,575.77
16 non-USAC entities
- Justin moves to allocate $5,575.77 to 16 non-USAC entities, Jonathan seconds
- By vote of 13-0-0 the motion passes, Contingency Programming allocations are approved

SFS Allocations#   Wisner

SWC Programming Fund Allocations#   Read
$600.00 allocated
- No opposition, SWC Programming Fund allocation passes by consent

Bruin Advocacy Grant Allocations#   Arasasingham

ASRF Allocations#   Velazquez

AAC Travel Mini-Grant Allocations#   Velazquez

ARCF Allocations#   Ogunleye
9 student orgs
Total Requested: $21,012.31
Total Recommended: $21,012.31
- No opposition, ARCF allocations pass by consent

TGIF   Cooper

VI. Special Presentations

USAC Seat at the Table Initiative   Riley

VII. Appointments

- None

VIII. Officer Reports

A. President   Riley
- Had meeting with Vice Chancellor Gordon last week, discussed communications between transfers and Office of Student Affairs, received some updates about advocacy going on around commencement, mentioned that they would be responding to our letter about the Gold Book
- Wanted to thank everyone for attending Honorary Naming Listening session
- Monday there was a work stoppage for abolition May
- Office has been busy running BERF trying to get it passed, trying to engage students in voting
- Sending out campus wide email by this Friday reminding students to vote

B. Internal Vice President   Luong
- On Friday our office held an Abolition Panel as a final part of our abolition series
- Campus Safety Alliance - working on secondary follow up post regarding UC data breach
- Drive Down Rent Committee - released another resource guide to help folks access housing resources in Westwood and LA
- Finished a preliminary campus job review portal
- Posting clips from workshop for Transformative Justice Now

C. External Vice President   Arasasingham
- Had our quarterly meeting with President Drake, we discussed campus safety, inclusivity and support for disabled students at UC. Some things we got back is that the Gold Book was a separate set of policies from a prior planning process that has to be updated every 3 years, and does not reflect the future of campus safety. EVP will be submitting an opposition letter about proposed changes in that document
- Working to start educating and mobilizing students for public comment about tuition discussion that will be discussed in May
- Elections - sent out a campus wide email about different registration deadlines
- Wrapping up for transition
- Preparing for two events this week - two town halls for different elections

D. General Representative 1 Written   Laubach
E. General Representative 2 Written   Rodriguez
F. General Representative 3 Written   Wade
G. Academic Affairs Commissioner   Velazquez
- Finalizing readings for Books for Bruin
- Student Advocate Board taking on first couple of cases, starting an Instagram for them

H. Campus Events Commission Written   Naland
I. Community Service Commissioner Written   Wisner
J. Cultural Affairs Commissioner Written   Ogunleye
K. Facilities Commissioner Written   Cooper
L. Financial Supports Commissioner Spoken   Garcia
- Relief Fund - opened up applications for a week, 390 new applicants; $532,500 allocated
- Working on Requisition Forms for Round 2
- Learned that we can start distributing funds through PayPal, waiting on final confirmation for that
- Last week we met with HERF Student Grant Committee - decided what students to focus on

M. Student Wellness Commissioner Written   Read
N. Transfer Representative Written   Bravo
O. International Student Representative Written   Madini
Q. Administrative Representatives   Alexander, Chacon, Geller, O'Connor, Perez, Solomon

Jessica: ASUCLA has an Employee Engagement Committee and they are hosting a Speaker Series on May 13th with the UCLA Career Center. It's open to anyone. If you need any additional support during final transitions, please let me or Fernando know. Were open to having one on one meetings. Just a reminder to wrap up internal transition documents.

Fernando: No new updates I just want to echo what Jessica said.

IX. Old Business

Alfred: I reached out to Roy, Vuong, and Jessica after the last council meeting and we had a meeting to discuss about the stipend increase. The summary of the meeting was the fact tat yes, in terms of the budget and the actual money for the stipends that is up for the next council to decide. But what we can still do on our end is we can still increase the ceiling for the stipend guidelines in a way so that leaves flexibility for the future chairs to adjust the stipend as they find appropriate. So what happens is that even if the stipend ceiling is raised, it doesn't mean that that amount has to be paid, it just means that the amount can be raised to that amount when there is availability and the budget to pay for those.

o The Chairperson of the Election Board shall receive a stipend amount not to exceed the weekly rate of $240 (as of 01/01/2022, rate increases to $__).
The Vice Chairperson of the Elections Board shall receive a stipend amount not to exceed the weekly rate of $160 (as of 01/01/2022, rate increases to $___)
o Members of the Election Board Executive Committee (Election Board Directors) shall receive a stipend amount not to exceed the weekly rate of $115 (as of 01/01/2022, rate increases to __)

- Promise motions to approve the USA Financial Guideline Changes, Bakur seconds
- By motion of 13-0-0 the motion passes, USA Financial Guideline Changes are approved

X. New Business

CAE and Student Affairs Funding Misuse

Sachi: Hello everyone. I just wanted to bring this item as a discussion to council, you all should have received an email or been copied on an email sent from myself and the leaders of DSU regarding the situation in terms of the Center for Accessible Education redesign and specifically the $30,000 that last year's council allocated to the CAE redesign. So I'll kind of give a brief overview of events and then I'll ask a few questions and definitely open it up to everyone else. So I met totally tangentially with Jessica and Vuong from ASUCLA just to discuss like general finances and specifically Disability Center finances. I mentioned that something that the Facilities Commission was interested in doing was transferring $30,000 that had been put towards the CAE redesign into the Disability Cultural Center project fund which has yet to be created, but that was kind of the purpose of our meeting. I can give a little more background on that if anyone has questions but essentially what happened is that I was informed at that meeting that the $30,000 that had been transferred to the CAE or to Student Affairs for the purpose of the CAE redesign, that check had been voided. That was a surprise to me, I had no idea that a check had been voided. We had no notification of any changes in terms of what the funding was going to be or what was being done with the funding from the last conversation with members of the facilities commission who were point people on the project. There was a discussion of transferring the funding over, but you know transferring is very different than voiding a check. There was no official confirmation via email during these meetings and the word void was never used. So I wanted to bring this to council. In the email I wrote about the way in which this, I believe, violates a Memorandum of Understanding that the Facilities Commission and Student Affairs had agreed upon we we transferred over the funding, and then just a larger issue of the fact that there's a history of bad communication between our office and between the CAE, and I think it's a relationship that I have worked and I think other student leaders have worked tirelessly with Student Affairs to improve with the goal of ensuring that disabled students get the representation and the communication that they deserve. I think that this was just really actively worsening that situation in addition to bringing about a larger issue of why the money hasn't been spent, why there has been stagnation on the project. I see that Dr. Blandizzi is here and I appreciate you coming tonight. I guess I wanted to ask you and also maybe Dr. Geller about why there was a decision made to void the signs and if there was knowledge of that decision, resulting in the funding being placed into next year surplus and actually before you answer that question I will give context. Voiding the funds means that the money, that $30,000 is no longer my money or this council's money, it goes into next year's council surplus money.

Naomi: I know you said that it doesn't go into this year's surplus anymore it would go into next year's surplus, but is there a possibility right now for us to reserve that money?

Sachi: I'll explain that briefly now as well just so that we all understand the context of the conversation. So, thanks to Naomi and thanks to Roy and others at ASUCLA we've figured out a way to reserve the $30,000. It's still going to go into next year's

surplus but it'll be restricted surplus so it can't be used for anything other than something like a Disability Cultural Center or CAE redesign project. It's still going to be in the hands of next year's Facilities Commissioner but they can't use it for anything other than this project. So this is kind of worked out but I did still want to bring the issue to council in terms of the lack of communication and just given that it is $30,000 worth of student fees and I think it's really concerning that decisions were made without student input.

Maria Blandizzi: I understand the frustration and I see that this is what you see as a pattern of behavior about lack of communication, and the intention here was not to misuse student funding at all. The intention here was to give the funding back, not void, not make it more complicated, but as I see it now that did result so I accept responsibility for the complications that resulted from the process and I appreciate your question. To clarify, while the funds are in the general surplus they are now reserved for FAC use, and as I understand it, Roy was really instrumental in making sure and along with many of you all, making sure that occurred. So, in terms of the word void I do want to offer up a different perspective, not to dismiss but to offer a different perspective because there was no intention of voiding a check, but the way it turns out is, as UCLA mailed a check to CAE for its use as agreed upon in the MOU that we had talked about in summer. That check was never cashed, so there was no money to transfer back and forth because the check was never cashed. So the way that ASUCLA issued the funding was through a check of $30,000 and we didn't cash the check. What we do is just cancel the check so that we don't utilize the funds, and not utilizing the funds, it's not that we're not committed to redesigning the CAE. We have started on the project but not yet broke ground. I can understand the frustration about the stagnation of the project so we can talk about that separate but obviously connected to this conversation. There was no intention to void the check or not go through with the project, as we had described that intention remains, we plan to redesign and renovate the CAE, we have identified $100,000 of saved resources within the CAE budget to do that project, I've shared that with you previously and we don't want to use student fees to do that we want to use university fees to do that. Our intention was to give it back so that DSU and the Disability Cultural Center could have resources to start so bad communication, poor communication, Dr. Geller wrote but wrote to the wrong commissioner to give notice and it was my understanding that the director of the CAE had also spoken with you all about this. It is our intention to continue with the project and include a student voice in that project.

Sachi: Got it. Yeah, I think that you're, I feel like you're bringing up two separate things which I also kind of brought up. One is a pattern of miscommunication or lack of communication kind of culminating in this and then also a separate conversation about the progress of the CAE redesign. I think that we were all clear on the level of student engagement in the CAE redesign regardless of whether or not we had student fees as part of that and I'm glad that we're trying to move away from relying on student fees for necessary improvements. I think the larger issue that I want to go back on is, and something that was mentioned in public comment as well, is that there is a clear pattern of a lack of communication and not even just a simple lack of communication, like so egregiously so that $30,000 worth of student fees had just disappeared essentially and if I hadn't met with UCLA I would have never known and I think the explanation that you just gave me about explaining that you weren't going to use student fees anymore, you never cashed the check, that would have been a great explanation for me to hear, or for the people that were representing me at meetings, it would have been a great explanation for them to hear, but no one heard anything close to that and no would would have ever heard anything close to that had I not tangentially met with ASUCLA to talk about something else. Dr. Geller, I'm obviously presuming that you did not mean to send this to the Student Wellness Commissioner instead of me, that wouldn't make any sense. But I'm a little confused as to how as the admin you or anyone else in Student Affairs wasn't aware that voiding a check would mean that the money would go into next year's surplus.

Dr.Geller: So, as far as sending it to the wrong email address, I apologize. The letter was addressed to you, and the original email addresses that I had when you did the updates across USAC email addresses, some of the things in my directory got messed up. That's no excuse it shouldn't have happened. I own that, I apologize for having the wrong email address attached to your name. I put in Sachi and it sent it to the wrong person and that should've never happened. But as far as knowing that the money would go towards next year's surplus. Yes, I did. I was not aware of the details of the MOU. It was my understanding the money was intended all for the CAE remodel, and I was aware that we had committed to use university funds, not student fee funds for the remodel that they were still committed to doing, and therefore I saw it as money coming back to USAC that would be able to support students next year without taking away from that original project, since there was now a commitment of a different funding source for that project. I was aware that particularly in this year we've had, where students have been so impacted in so many ways, and USAC has been trying so arduously to put money into the hands of students and to support the different challenges students have been facing broadly, as well as within the disabled student population that having an additional $30,000 returned would be available. I was not aware that if it came back in now, it couldn't be used until next year. I actually thought that it would be available to you this year because it was back in your account, and only if you didn't do other things with it would it

come forward to next year. Once that question was raised that was when the engagement with Roy began about finding ways to make it a restricted surplus, so that it would definitely be available for facilities and for support of the Disabled Student Cultural Center and Programming and the things that you've been wanting to do. But our intent was never to take away money from your impact or your service to the students broadly in this population. More specifically, it was always to give you additional resources so you could actually have more of an impact and not have to rely on students to pay for the remodel.

Justin: I think what I want to raise is that there's a reason why we student leaders like moving towards using student fees. It's because time and time again admin hasn't shown any commitment to using university fees and if anything in this last year has cut several programs including a program dear to my heart. I guess I respect the intentions, Dr. Blandizz, as far as wanting to use university fees. My concern is definitely with like, and I guess that underscores and underlines the importance of communication with it and maybe some of the blame lies on Dr. Geller as well. With that, given that it sounds like that decision wasn't going to be communicated in any way, shape, or form, that's my concern. That brings me to my clarifying question and further concern. It's my understanding, I've been referring a little bit to an MOU that was maybe created for the purpose of this project and I want to ask what would be the status of that MOU, given that it referenced the use of student fees if university fees are now being used. What is the commitment to student voices now that, in theory, there's less of a basis for listening to students.

Dr. Blandizzi: I want to make sure I understand, Justin, the perspective and then I want to also be very transparent about my responses. The concerns that I'm understanding are that the university has not moved on utilizing institutional resources to benefit students as a primary concern, and you're seeing that also happen in other areas and programs that you care about, which I'm going to tell you I don't know all of the programs that you're referring to. I want to make sure that you understand that I understand the concern, that you see this as another example of the university not committed to using resources to improve student services. So I hear that and I, on that point would just offer that I took over supervision of the CAE in the past year and I think we have had some ups and downs in our communication with FAC, and when we discussed this MOU last summer we were meeting every other week, Sachi and a few of the FAC and DSU students. When I recall our conversations about this MOU, I was actually uncomfortable with some of the language, and I know that Sachi edited some of the language that was described in the MOU because an MOU is a Memorandum of Understanding that two parties sign to agree. If you'll note, I did not sign this MOU, not because I was not committed to improving the center and not that I was not committed to engaging with student voices for how the space needed to be utilized, but there was a time pressure that we were trying to get this MOU signed, and we had to go back and forth a number of times about how the space, how FAC was envisioning the use of CAE space and how we actually have to use this space. There was some concern about programming space so we came to some back and forth conversations about how we could use the CAE office space that is administrative services to meet one on one with students to also do programming in the after hours should the campus reopen. We had thought about the LGBTQ campus resource center as a similar model, where the LGBTQ Campus Resource Center can be open after hours depending on making sure that there is the right infrastructure in place so that the space is managed well and can also be used for student programming, but the CAE doesn't have a history of doing student programming and that's a concern. I understand that concern and I think what we're trying to do is change the space so that it can be multipurpose. We're also short on space so I'm trying to identify more space for the CAE. So part of the concern here is how do we manage the space and do the things that we administratively are committed to doing and required to do by law, and how do we incorporate Sachi's vision and other's visions, the DSU's vision in building community within the disability student community, and we're trying to do multiple things with that. So what I would offer is there is no intention to cut those conversations off or to not continue those conversations. You don't have to have an MOU to say I want to meet, and there is a bi weekly or maybe monthly meeting. If it's not regular enough then we need to increase those numbers of communications and meetings, but there is an intention to continue to engage in conversation about this space and how we utilize it, and how we open it up to after hours and how we can get more space for the community to do what it needs to do.

Sachi: I just wanted to pop in and clarify from that response. Over the summer, I was under the impression that the MOU was signed by both parties because what would the point of editing an MOU be from both sides if you weren't going to sign it.

Dr. Blandizzi: I recall that we were under time pressure, and you were trying to make this happen quickly and so you wanted to move the money and we wanted to receive it, but we also wanted to receive it, understanding that we didn't know exactly how we were going to deploy these resources because of Covid, because of changes, because of requirements that we have to use the space. So we had a number of conversations as I recall that we were trying to get it right. So, I had no intention of not living up to the MOU, there is no intention to not live up to the MOU. We are going to redesign the space. We have committed to redesigning the space, we have identified more space, we are trying to move administrative offices out so that it can create more space for

FAC and others to do programming. We have every intention to redo the flooring, to purchase lobby furniture so that it's moveable so that more peop;e can join to support the community, we have every intention to do what's bulleted in the MOU.

Sachi: So then why wasn't it signed? Because this MOU is deeply watered down from not just our original vision but Lily's original vision, I think that's important to bring in that it's her vision and her money that she accomplished and that she got also $5,000 in matching funding from Student Affairs. So, what is the point of saying that you're going to pull the MOU but then we're hearing now that you never signed it, even though this entire year I was under the impression that you all had signed it.

Dr.Blandizzi: So I'm not trying to suggest that I'm not engaged in this process. It's a timing question. What I recall, we were trying to complete this quickly, and I didn't see the edits you had made by the time you got it to ASUCLA, and if you recall, we went back and forth, I offered my own typed edits, I was engaged in the process with you. I gave you my verbal feedback about concerns. Some of the things that were included in there were concerns about the carpet and you made statements about mold on the carpet and I didn't agree with some of those statements and I verbally communicated to you that I can't go on record signing something that isn't factually accurate in an MOU.

Sachi: Right, but that's not in the MOU. We took all of your edits. I disagreed initially because I wanted to uphold what Lily had achieved the money for but then in our conversations with you, I agreed with you that some of these things can't necessarily be stipulated in the MOU. So the MOU is very broad, it literally says purchase furniture to open up the lobby space, which you had noted, redo the flooring, which you had noted, and pay for programming to aid in creating community for students with disabilities, which you noted is something that the CAE wants to continue to do. The CAE has engaged in programming, and it's something that the DSU said that they would do in conjunction with the CAE in order to ensure that CAE students were included within the DSU community. So I don't really understand how we could have gone a whole year under the impression that we were on the same page and then now we're getting to this point where there was an additional miscommunication with the fact that we didn't even know where the money was going, and now we're being told that we don't even know what was going on with the money when we originally sent it over. I'm just really shocked that all of this information, despite the fact that we had bi weekly meetings as you said, all of this information is just coming up today.

Dr. Blandizzi: Sachi, the first MOU you offered had a spot for me to sign. When I saw this there was no spot for me to sign so I didn't sign it. I think I might be triggering how I communicate and you receive my communication and so I am not attempting to negate the responsibilities of what we had agreed to, which are in the MOU. We are on a path to continue to do everything that is outlined in the MOU.

Naomi: I wanted to bring the conversation back around and see now that we've kind of talked about this and we've kind of opened up where there were gaps in communication and misunderstandings that were taking place. I also just want to ask if there are any other questions of clarification that folks want to ask or even solid asks that we want to make and think about how we can orient towards solutions.

Sachi: I think I will frame this in terms of the solution that I'm asking for which honestly at this point is accountability, and frankly this conversation made me even less confident in the status of the communication between my office and between disabled student leaders and between CAE and Student Affairs. New information was shared today that would have never been shared had we not called upon you to come to this meeting to explain the information that I would not have known had I not had a random meeting with ASUCLA. So, I think that is a broader statement, outside of this project to the student body that our fees are frankly being disrespected by administration and that's how I feel. It's not even just student fees, it's also the time and labor of myself, of diabled student leaders, and of all the work that we have put into advocating for student space with student fees. I'm honestly less concerned with the continuation of the CAE redesign than I am with the issues that have arisen in the past year with respect to the relationship between Student Affairs and the disabled student community. In December we had a meeting in which we asked for a clear commitment to support the disabled student community through a variety of things such as the CAE redesign but also through continued tangible commitment to improvement for a student population that has lower retention rates and lower graduation rates. So, overall the solution in terms of the money for council members is what has been negotiated with Roy, and thank you Roy for ensuring that our money will be reserved for next year, but I want to make it very clear to the public, to Student Affairs, and to anyone else listening, that the misuse and the disregard for our student fees and for our labor is not okay. It's an issue beyond just this council, it's an issue of the student body at the point that it comes to $30,000of our money being sent to an office that didn't sign an MOU even though they had indicated to us that they agreed with the contents of the MOU, and then later voiding a check without us knowing anything. That's really an issue of grave concern that will carry on beyond any one

single administrator, but really signals a deeper issue with Student Affairs at large. My term is ending but for future council members let it be on record that this is not okay and it's not something that we should accept.

OSAC & FINANCE COMMITTEE

To: Undergraduate Students Association Council
From: Hannah Regan, OSAC Chair
          David Minasyan, USA Finance Committee Chair
Re: 2020-2021 Capital Contingency Guidelines
Contacts: osac1919@gmail.com & usacficom@gmail.com

The Contingency Capital Fund is an auxiliary source of funding for Capital Items only. The Finance Committee and OSAC Office work closely to determine the appropriate allocations for Capital Items. ***You must contact us regarding any Capital Items you wish to purchase before filling out an application.***

Eligibility

To qualify for USA Contingency Capital Item Funds, you must be a USA Office, Commission or undergraduate student organization currently registered with the Student Organizations, Leadership & Engagement (SOLE) department **with an office in Kerckhoff Hall.** Please contact your SOLE Advisor for more information.

Categories of Capital Items

1. **Computer and Peripherals**

   This line item includes but is not limited to desktop computers, a monitor, lockdown equipment and any applicable hardware upgrades. We will not consider software products for this line item. We will examine all requests on a case by case basis to best understand the technological needs of each office. Allocations for computers and peripherals **shall not exceed $2000 per office.**

2. **Furniture [Non-Computer] Equipment**

   Requests submitted for furniture equipment may include items such as file cabinets, desk(s), chair(s), storage units, etc. We will examine furniture items on a case to case basis to determine the best options for the office.

Application and Fund Details

- **Submitting a Proposal:** Once you have contacted us regarding the items you wish to purchase, please submit an application here.
  i. Proposals must be turned in at **least 21 days in advance** of when you wish to make purchases.
  ii. For full consideration, you must include all necessary estimates of the items you wish to purchase.

- **The following items may NOT be purchased with this fund**:
  i. Laptops, refrigerators, microwaves, copy machines, televisions, DVD/CD players, digital cameras, camcorders, projectors, and other sound equipment.
  ii. Final discretion is up to SGA, the Finance Committee and OSAC.

- **12 Month Rule:**
  i. Records from the Student Government Accounting office shall be used to review prior requests for capital

items funding (ex. If a computer was purchased less than 12 months ago with USA funding, purchase of another computer will not be allowed).

- **All requested items must be documented & housed within the UCLA campus with proper supervision and lockdown**:
    i. Items must be locked and secured in a student government office in Kerckhoff or in a University office/department/lounge with a written acknowledgement by a university official.
    ii. Your group will not be eligible to receive funding without the proper supervision and lockdown of the requested equipment.

- **Quotes MUST be provided for every item that you would like to purchase**:
    i. Requests that do not include all invoices, quotes or documentation will **not** be considered.

- **Audits:**
    i. Organizations may be subject to at least one **audit** of capital items by the Student Government Accounting (SGA), OSAC, and Finance Committee Office.

DISCLAIMER: Upon release of the funds, allocations for Capital Items will be made on a first come-first served basis. Once the capital funds for the year are depleted, applications for Capital Items will no longer be considered. Capital requests for a particular item may not be made within 12 months of purchase of the same item purchased with Capital Items funding.

- No opposition, Capital Contingency Guidelines pass by consent

TGIF Guidelines#_____   Cooper
() - deletion

GUIDELINES OF THE GREEN INITIATIVE FUND

MISSION STATEMENT

The goal of The Green Initiative Fund (TGIF) is to enable and empower students to take an active role in making UCLA a leader in sustainability. TGIF supports and provides much-needed funding for projects that promote the mission of UCLA sustainability, which is to create a culture in which the entire UCLA community is aware of, engaged in, and committed to advancing sustainability.

We define sustainability as "the integration of environmental health, social equity, and economic vitality in order to create thriving, healthy, diverse, and resilient communities for this generation and generations to come. The practice of sustainability recognizes how these issues are interconnected and require(s) a systems approach and an acknowledg(e)ment of complexity."

ARTICLE 1 – GRANT-MAKING COMMITTEE

SECTION 1.1 – POWERS AND VOTING

The Grant-making Committee has authority over TGIF. A simple student majority of the committee's present members is required to make funding and any other official decisions, except as provided for elsewhere in these guidelines. Apart from their normal function as a part of this committee, a member has no individual authority.

A majority of committee members (one more than half) must be present to vote on official

matters. **SECTION 1.2 – DUTIES OF GRANT-MAKING COMMITTEE**

It shall be the duty of the Committee members to:

- Review project applications and determine the allocation of funds.
- Supervise and prescribe the duties of all staff and interns of The Green Initiative Fund.

SECTION 1.3 – MEMBER NUMBER & REPRESENTATION

The Grant-making Committee shall consist of six student and three non-student voting members as follows:

- ~~One~~ Four undergraduate students appointed by the Undergraduate Students Association Council (USAC) Facilities Commissioner for one-year terms:
    - The USAC Facilities Commissioner will be an ex-officio voting member and will serve as the Committee Chair unless they choose to relegate the position to another student member (Note: This student will be the USAC representative and will report back to USAC the grant-making committee's decisions).
    - Two at-large undergraduate students (Note: The student selected must have knowledge of sustainability or experience with environmental advocacy or research).
- ~~One student appointed by the UCLA Office of Sustainability (Note: The student selected must have knowledge of sustainability or experience with environmental advocacy or research).~~
- Two undergraduate students ~~elected by~~ from groups registered as "Environmental" undergraduate student organizations under SOLE
    - The Office of Sustainability and the Student Sustainability Leadership Council may submit recommendations for appointments
    - ~~Each student organization will have the opportunity to nominate one student with a proven record of environmental advocacy or research.~~
    - ~~After the nomination period, each participating student organization will receive two votes to elect candidates for the Committee~~
        - ~~The two candidates who receive the highest number of votes will be forwarded to the USAC Facilities Commissioner for appointment~~

- One graduate student appointed by the Graduate Students Association (GSA) President (Note: The student selected must have knowledge of sustainability or experience with environmental advocacy or research).
- Two Staff or Faculty members from UCLA Student Affairs selected by the Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs.

The grant coordinator will also attend meetings as a non-voting member. The Committee shall invite experts/guests to provide information and experience as needed.

Student committee members shall receive a stipend in accordance with the USA Financial Guidelines.

In addition to the grant-making committee, three student positions will support the committee in their outreach and publicity efforts. These members are non-voting members and will not participate in funding allocation decisions. They will receive a stipend in accordance with the USA Financial Guidelines.

SECTION 1.4 – OFFICERS

The Grant-making Committee shall have two officers: a Chair and a Vice-Chair.

The USAC Facilities Commissioner will serve as ex-officio Chair unless they chose to participate as a regular member of the Committee. The Chair shall serve as ~~the~~ a signatory of TGIF and is responsible for approving ~~all~~ funding requisition forms submit to Student Government Accounting. The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Grant-making Committee, acting as facilitator and holding meetings to the agenda in a timely fashion. The Chair shall also coordinate and approve meeting agendas with the Grant Coordinator (described in Article 2). The Chair must be a student member of the Grant-making Committee. The Chair will arrange a method for ~~quarterly~~ evaluations and conduct them in the absence of the Grant Coordinator. The Chair will discuss these evaluations with both the Grant Coordinator and its hiring body.

The Vice-Chair will assist the Chair with ~~his or her~~ their duties. In the absence and support of the Chair, the Vice-Chair shall assume or support all duties of the Chair, including approving funding requisition forms submit to Student Government Accounting. The Vice-Chair must be a student member of the Grant-making Committee. The Vice-Chair or a delegate shall preside over the three non-voting student outreach members. The Vice-Chair shall assume additional duties as assigned by the Chair and may preside over non-voting week meetings.

At the beginning of each term of office, the Grant-making Committee will take nominations and volunteers for Chair (if the USAC Facilities Commissioner chooses to relegate the position) and Vice-Chair. Candidates for Chair will be selected first by the majority vote of the Committee. After the Chair has been selected, the Committee shall select the Vice-Chair by majority vote. Defeated candidates for Chair are eligible to run for Vice-Chair, and candidates for both positions are eligible to vote in these elections.

SECTION 1.5 – TERMS OF OFFICE

Each member of the Grant-making Committee shall be appointed for one year. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall hold office for one year. Committee members may serve more than one consecutive term as long as they are re-appointed each year according to these guidelines. The total number of terms they may serve is not limited.

SECTION 1.6 – MEMBER QUALIFICATIONS

All Student members of the Grant-making Committee must be registered (full or part-time) UCLA students during their term of office. Students must have at least a 2.0 GPA to serve on the committee and must remain above a 2.0 GPA during their term in office.

Staff and Faculty members of the Grant-making Committee must be currently employed by

UCLA.

SECTION 1.7 – MEMBER REPLACEMENT

A Committee member may be removed by unanimous vote of the other Committee members for unjustifiable absence, conflict of interest, or other appropriate reasons.

In the event that a Committee member is removed or resigns, the original appointing body will select a replacement. The new Committee member will serve the remainder of the original member's term.

SECTION 1.8 – CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Grant-making Committee shall conduct itself in such a way that conflicts of interest are minimized and all potential conflicts of interest are made public.

For example, each Committee member must make public all campus groups of which he or she is a member and their level of involvement in each group. Where appropriate, the Committee member should recuse themselves from voting on grant allocations for projects proposed by such groups. For such votes, the "full Committee membership" as defined for voting majority purposes shall be decreased to account for the Committee member's recusal.

ARTICLE 2 – TGIF GRANT COORDINATOR

SECTION 2.1 – DUTIES OF THE GRANT COORDINATOR

There will be one part-time staff position referred to as the TGIF Grant Coordinator. The Grant Coordinator works at the direction of the Grant-making Committee and exists to meet the needs of the Committee.

The function of the Grant Coordinator is to:

- Publicize and promote the grant program to students, faculty, and administration with the assistance of the Grant Making Committee.
- Help guide students through TGIF application (i.e., proper signatures, grant requirements etc…).
- Monitor the progress of projects that have received funding via reports submitted by grant recipients (Section 5.2).
- Prepare an annual report of the previous year's budget and funded projects by two weeks before the start of fall quarter classes, and make it available to the public via the USAC website and present it to USAC at an official meeting.
- Maintain the archives of the Grant-making Committee as outlined in Section 5.3

● Train new Grant-making Committee members as necessary.
● Keep the minutes of the meeting and make them available to the public upon request and in compliance with Article VII.C.5. of the USA Bylaws.
● Work with the Committee Chair and the Vice-chair to schedule regular meetings.
● Monitor and provide counsel for active projects.
● Set quarterly deadlines for funding applications.

SECTION 2.2 – HIRING THE GRANT COORDINATOR

The Grant Coordinator will be hired via open recruitment. Candidates must understand and agree to comply with all of TGIF's guidelines and supporting documents. The Grant Coordinator will be hired by ASUCLA in conjunction with the Grant-making Committee. The Grant-making Committee must approve the selected Grant Coordinator candidate and participate in quarterly performance evaluations. The Grant-making Committee, through a supermajority (5 of 7 members) may recommend that ASUCLA dismiss the Grant Coordinator in response to poor performance. At the recommendation of the committee, only ASUCLA has the authority to dismiss the Grant Coordinator.

SECTION 2.3 – SALARY OF THE GRANT COORDINATOR

Funds for the Grant Coordinator's compensation (salary and benefits) are allocated annually from TGIF before the amount available to be allocated for projects is calculated. The amount of the Grant Coordinator's compensation should be commensurate with the level appropriate to 50% FTE of the ASUCLA Service Area Manager II position.

The Committee, by majority vote, can recommend to USAC a change in the percent employment of the Grant Coordinator.

SECTION 2.4 – OPERATIONAL BUDGET FOR THE GRANT COORDINATOR

The Grant Coordinator may submit an annual budget request to the Grant-making Committee for funds to be used for operational expenses, including but not limited to permanent or flexible office space, supplies, student support stipends, etc. incurred by the Grant Coordinator in the performance of ~~his or her~~ their duties.

ARTICLE 3 – ALLOCATION OF FUNDS & PROJECT SELECTION

SECTION 3.1 – ALLOCATION OF FUNDS BY THE GRANT-MAKING COMMITTEE

As noted in Section 1.1, the Grant-making Committee shall decide to allocate funds on a viewpoint-neutral basis to submitted projects by a simple student majority vote of the Committee. The Committee may elect to fund only a portion of a proposal.

SECTION 3.2 – GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSED PROJECTS

All projects to be considered for TGIF funding must meet the following criteria:

● Projects must promote environmental sustainability on UCLA's campus, including off-campus activities which influence sustainability on campus.
● Projects must have a clearly defined, measurable outcome.
● Project proposals may be submitted by UCLA students, staff, and faculty. Individuals and organizations outside of UCLA may not submit proposals.
● Projects shall have received all necessary written approval by appropriate campus officials prior to consideration.
● TGIF funding will not support projects already mandated by law or UCLA policy directive (e.g., standards for new building construction) since UCLA is already obliged to allocate funds for such projects. TGIF will fund projects which go above and beyond minimum requirements.
● All projects shall have a mechanism for evaluation and follow-up after funding has been dispersed. At a minimum, a project plan must include a report made to the Grant-making Committee after successful (or unsuccessful) implementation. If a project is expected to have ongoing benefits such as annual cost savings, the project plan must include a mechanism for tracking, recording, and reporting these benefits back to the Grant-making Committee on an (at least) annual basis.
● Projects must have undergraduate student involvement and/or undergraduate student benefit.
● Funds will not be appropriated between the final Committee meeting of the Spring Quarter and the first meeting of the

Fall Quarter.
- All groups which have requested funds over $1,000 (i.e., Main Fund) and up to $10,000 shall sign up for a hearing date and time if advised by the Grant-Making Committee after submitting a funding proposal. If a group is not asked for a hearing but would like to request one, they may do so. This will ensure that all groups have the opportunity for equal representation before the Committee to elaborate on the goals and objectives of their proposal beyond what is articulated in the application.
- Funding proposals requesting $1,000 or less (i.e., Mini Fund) do not need to attend a hearing.
- Funding proposals requesting over $10,000 (i.e., capital and infrastructure projects) will be accepted on a rolling basis from the beginning of Fall Quarter to the end of Spring Quarter, are required to submit necessary documentation demonstrating approval of the project from partnering entities, and must meet with the TGIF Grant Coordinator for project updates at least once per quarter until project completion.
- Funding proposals requesting support for student sustainability work up to $300 (i.e., student support fund) must be a full-time, currently enrolled student, must not be receiving course credit or additional compensation for this work, must record approximate hours of sustainability work and its impact on campus, and must report outcomes to the TGIF Grant Coordinator by the end of the academic year.
- The committee shall indicate the preferences of the committee in applications within the TGIF Guidelines and update them as necessary.

PROJECT PROPOSALS THAT MUST BE REQUESTED AS LOANS

Many projects may result in cost savings or revenues to the person or group submitting the project proposal to the TGIF Grant-making Committee. Where reasonable and at its discretion, the Committee may require that all or part of the project funding be dispersed as a loan (instead of a grant) to be repaid to TGIF over a reasonable time period. This time period will be negotiated by the Grant-making Committee and the person or group proposing the project before funds are awarded. In exceptional cases, the Committee also has the authority to negotiate that a portion of all subsequent revenues (after the loan has been repaid) shall go into TGIF. Detailed income and expense reports are required from recipients and are subject to audit by the Grant-making Committee.

SECTION 3.4 – ADDITIONAL PROJECT CRITERIA AT DISCRETION OF COMMITTEE

The Grant-Making Committee may determine additional requirements or preferences for each year's funding cycle, provided that these additional criteria are:

- Consistent with the overall mission of TGIF.
- Consistent with the requirements and preferences outlined in these guidelines.

SECTION 3.5 - GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSED PROJECTS

The Grant-Making Committee shall give preference and priority to project proposals that also meet the following criteria in this section. However, meeting these criteria is not required for projects to be considered for TGIF funding:

- Preference will be given to projects that demonstrate the greatest reduction in UCLA's negative environmental impacts for the least cost.
- Preference will be given to projects that are able to repay the Fund, even if such repayment would not be required by Section 3.3 above.
- Preference will be given to projects with a strong student leadership component.
- Preference will be given to projects that can obtain matching funds from sources other than TGIF.
- Preference will be given to projects impacting UCLA's sustainability "closer to home." For example, priority will be given to projects that directly address sustainability on campus over projects which address UCLA's environmental impacts on wider Los Angeles.
- Preference will be given to projects that promote environmental justice.
- Preference will be given to projects that source materials from sustainable/ ethical vendors.
- Preference will be given to projects that justify the need for each item as related to the event (i.e. "swag" such as tshirts and mugs should be described in terms of the impact on the project or the necessity to individuals receiving it).

ARTICLE 4 – OTHER RULES GOVERNING TGIF FUNDS

SECTION 4.1- GUIDELINES FOR ALLOCATIONS AND FOR UNALLOCATED FUNDS

● Any funds not allocated in a given year shall remain in the TGIF account for future use.
● Funds allocated to a project that are not spent within the project timeframe shall be returned to TGIF for reallocation.
● Requests to extend the project deadline may be submitted to the Committee for review and subsequent approval when appropriate.
● Standing funds should be invested in a socially and environmentally responsible manner.
● TGIF funds are not to be used or reallocated for purposes other than those described in this document.
● TGIF shall continue to operate even after student fees are no longer collected into the Fund, as long as sufficient money remains in the TGIF account.

ARTICLE 5 – ACCOUNTABILITY, RECORDS AND REPORTS

SECTION 5.1 – TGIF'S ACCOUNTABILITY TO THE STUDENT BODY

TGIF shall be accountable and transparent to the student body, and therefore shall:

● Make all its records (outlined in Section 5.3) available to the public via the TGIF website, and upon request for records not maintained on the website in compliance with Article VI.C.5. of the USA Bylaws. This shall be the responsibility of the Grant Coordinator to respond to a request for records (outlined in Section 2.1).

● Submit an annual report toy USAC.
● Issue an annual report following approval from USAC to GSA, Campus Sustainability Committee, General Services and the Chancellor's Office.
● Submit periodic reports to all members of the Undergraduate Students Association Council in conjunction with the Committee Chair.

SECTION 5.2 – ACCOUNTABILITY OF PROJECTS

● All projects funded by TGIF shall submit a report to the Grant Coordinator at appropriate time points previously outlined by the Grant-making Committee. The report must include a budget detailing the spending of all funds.

● If upon review of project reports, the Grant-making committee determines that the project's funds are being used irresponsibly or the goals of the project are not being met, the committee may choose to put the projects on "probation," meaning the project leaders have an allotted time period to make adjustments in order to fulfill the committee's expectations. If after this time period the committee's expectations are not met, the committee may require all unspent funds to be returned to TGIF.

SECTION 5.3 – RECORDS AND REPORTS

TGIF must keep on record:

● Minutes of all meetings of the Grant-making Committee indicating the time and place of holding such meetings, the names of those present, and the proceedings thereof.
● Complete books and records of account, including accounts of its properties and business transactions and accounts of its assets, receipts, disbursements, gains and losses.
● Record of projects selected each year and the funds allocated to each.
● Project progress reports from recipients of TGIF monies.
● Copies of all annual reports which TGIF has issued to USAC and posted publicly on the TGIF website. USAC, GSA, Campus Sustainability Committee, General Services and the Chancellor's Office.

ARTICLE 6 – FORMATION OF THE GRANT-MAKING COMMITTEE

The Facilities Commissioner of USAC will act as ex-officio Committee Chair unless otherwise specified and will be responsible for instigating and overseeing the formation of the Grant-making Committee. This formation must occur by June 30th September 1 of each academic year.

ARTICLE 7 – AMENDMENT OF GUIDELINES

Any changes to this document will follow all regulations regarding amending guidelines to USA funds. USAC should work in

conjunction with the Grant-making Committee and the Grant Coordinator when amending these guidelines.

- No opposition, TGIF Guidelines pass by consent

<u>FAC Bylaw Change*</u>   Cooper

USAC BYLAW CHANGE SUBMISSION FORM

Was Bylaw Change forwarded from Constitutional Review Committee (CRC)?		❑ Yes		No ❑
Record of CRC vote:	For: 3	Against: 0		Abstain: 0

Proposed Bylaw Change submitted to USAC by: (if applicable)	Name:_Sachi Cooper_____ Position: _Facilities Commissioner _____

Proposed change(s) apply to the following Article(s) (including section(s)) of USAC Bylaws:

Article IV, Section B, 9, iii, 17
Article IV, Section B, 9, iv
Article IV, Section B, 9, v
Article II, Section C, 4, i
Article II, Section C, 5, i, iv
Article II, Section C, 4, viii, iii

Summarize and Attach the Bylaw change(s) you are submitting:

(Additions should be in **bold** and removals should be noted with a ~~strikethrough~~)

Article IV, Section B, 9, iii, 17
17. The ~~Computer~~ **Commuter** Committee

Article IV, Section B, 9, iv
iv. The Facilities ~~Commissioner~~ **Commission** shall be headed by the Facilities Commissioner and will include the following **projects**:
1. Access on Board
2. ~~Black~~ **Blank** Space
3. Project LIT (Lighting, Infrastructure, Transportation)
4. Sustainagoals
    a. Bruin Bazaar
    b. ~~Water Works~~ **Environmental Justice**
    c. Reusable Dining Materials on Campus

Article IV, Section B, 9, v
The Facilities Commissioner shall spearhead and/or participate in the following:
1. Bruin Bazaar
2. **Safe Parking at UCLA**
3. Disability Awareness Week
4. Safety Awareness Week
5. Waste Awareness Week
6. **Homelessness Awareness Week**

Article II, Section C, 4, i
~~The following one (1) year positions receiving an honorarium payment, to be appointed by the Facilities Commissioner 10~~
~~i. The Green Initiative Fund (TGIF) Undergraduate Student Representatives: four (4) appointments~~

Article II, Section C, 5, i, iv

~~iv. The Green Initiative Fund Student Body Representative: two (2) atlarge appointments for a one year term and two (2) appointments from the Student Sustainability Leadership Council (SSLC). The Facilities Commissioner serves as a Chair.~~

Article II, Section C, 4, h, iii

The Green Initiative Fund (TGIF) Undergraduate Student Representatives: two (2) stipended at-large appointments for a one (1) year term and two (2) stipended appointments from ~~the Student Sustainability Leadership Council (SSLC)~~ **groups registered as "Environmental" undergraduate student organizations under SOLE** for a one (1) year term.

For USAC Internal Vice President Use Only (Required):			
Date Approved by Council:			
Record of Council vote:	For:	Against:	Abstain:
Internal Vice President Signature:_____ Date:_____			
Email completed Submission Form to Student Government Services (sgs@asucla.ucla.edu)			

For Student Support Services Use Only:	
Input by:	Date:
New File Name:	

- Emily moves to approve FAC bylaw changes, Jonathan seconds
- By motion of 11-0-0 the motion passes, FAC bylaw changes are approved

~~Transfer Student Rep Bylaw Change*~~ ~~Bravo~~

International Student Rep Bylaw Change*   Madini

USAC BYLAW CHANGE SUBMISSION FORM

Was Bylaw Change forwarded from Constitutional Review Committee (CRC)?		Yes ❑		No ❑
Record of CRC vote:	For: 0		Against: 0	Abstain: 0

Proposed Bylaw Change submitted to USAC by: (if applicable)	Name:Bakur Madini Position: International Student Representative_____

Proposed change(s) apply to the following Article(s) (including section(s)) of USAC Bylaws:

Article IV, Section M, 1.
Article IV, Section M, 2
Article IV, Section M, 4.a

Summarize and Attach the Bylaw change(s) you are submitting:

(Additions should be in **bold** and removals should be noted with a ~~strikethrough~~)

Article IV, Section M, 1.

1. The International Student Representative (ISR) responsibilities shall include, but are not limited to:

a. Representing the collective interests of the international-identifying students

b. Actively soliciting from the student body information concerning international student needs or as they pertain to the student population as a whole.

c. Meeting with the Dashew Center Director on a quarterly basis to raise the constituencies' concerns and strategize for addressing these needs

d. Collaborating with appropriate entities to help organize:

      i.   International Education Week

      ii.   International Career Fair

      iii. International Culture Night
      iv. International Town Hall(s)

e. Promote Dashew and international-oriented events on social media

f. Relaying the gathered information regarding student issues pertaining to nonresidents to Council.

g. To disseminate news and updates pertinent to international student affairs.

h. ISR should offer support to the International Student Leadership Coalition (ISLC) through:

    i. Sending two representatives, including the ISR if possible, to the ISLC meetings regularly.

    ii. Promoting events and initiatives through its networks.

    iii. Leveraging the advocacy

i. Represent UCLA international undergraduates in the UC International Student Coalition and nominate other representatives to the collation as the need arises.

    i. Liaison between UC International Student Coalition and GSA to nominate a graduate international representative to the Coalition and solicit international graduate input to the UC International Student Coalition if such a representative is not appointed.

    ii. Liaison, in collaboration with the External Vice President, between council and the UC International Student Coalition.

Article IV, Section M, 2.

2. To promote, initiate, and support efforts that encourage improved support and inclusion for international students; the International Student Representative shall serve as the liaison representative between international students and, including, but not limited to, the following campus entities:

    i. The Dashew Center for International Students and Scholars

ii. The Career Center

iii. Counseling and Psychological Services

iv. Office of Residential life

v. College Academic Counseling

vi. UCLA **Dashew** International Student Ambassadors

vii. International Student Leadership Coalition

viii. Bruin Resource Center

      i. Economic Crisis Response Team

      ii. Transfer Resource Center

      iii. Veteran Resource Center

ix. New Student and Transition Programs

x. First Year Experience

xi. The International Institute

xii. UCLA Case Management Services

Article IV, Section M, 4.a (Change 4.a to be 5)

4. The International Student Representative shall collaborate with campus entities and cultural organizations that support undocumented students and out-of-state students in addition to facilitating their support through the office's infrastructure.

    ~~a. The International Student Representative shall work with the External Vice President in order to advocate for the needs of the international student population on a UC, state, and federal level.~~

5. The International Student Representative shall work with the External Vice President in order to advocate for the needs of the international student population on a UC, state, and federal level.

For USAC Internal Vice President Use Only (Required):			
Date Approved by Council:			
Record of Council vote:	For:	Against:	Abstain:
Internal Vice President Signature:		Date:	

For Student Support Services Use Only:	
Input by:	Date:
New File Name:	

- Sachi moves to approve the ISR bylaw changes, Emily seconds
- By motion of 11-0-0 the motion passes, ISR bylaw changes are approved

AAC/ISR Bylaw Change*   Madini

USAC BYLAW CHANGE SUBMISSION FORM

Was Bylaw Change forwarded from Constitutional Review Committee (CRC)?		Yes ❑	No ❑
Record of CRC vote:	For: 0	Against: 0	Abstain: 0

Proposed Bylaw Change submitted to USAC by: (if applicable)	Name:_Breeze Velazquez, Bakur Madini Position: Academic Affairs Commissioner_, International Student Representative

Proposed change(s) apply to the following Article(s) (including section(s)) of USAC Bylaws:
Article II, Section C, 4, f. Article II, Section C, 4, Article IV, Section B, 5, iii. Article IV, Section M,

Summarize and Attach the Bylaw change(s) you are submitting:
(Additions should be in **bold** and removals should be noted with a ~~strikethrough~~)

Article II, Section C, 4, f.
f. The following appointments to the Academic Senate Committees, receiving a
stipend, to be appointed by the Academic Affairs Commissioner

~~iii. Legislative Assembly one (1) appointments for a one (1) year term~~

~~xi. Committee on International Education: one (1) appointment for a one (1) year term~~

Article II, Section C.4. **K.**
k. The following appointments, to be appointed by the International Student Representative:
i. Academic Senate Committees
 a. **Legislative Assembly: one (1) appointment for one (1) year terms**
 b. **Committee on International Education: one (1) appointment for a one (1) year term**

Article IV, Section B, 5, iii.(**1, 2**)
iii. To appoint, subject to the Council's approval, all student
representatives to the Academic Senate Committees, unless the

Academic Affairs Commissioner chooses to sit on the committee, except for the following positions which shall be appointed by:

    1.The Transfer Student Representative, subject to the Council's approval, in collaboration with the Academic Affairs Commissioner:
        i. UgC (Undergraduate Council) (2)
        ii. LgA (Legislative Assembly) (2)
        iii. CODEI (Committee on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion) (1)
    2. The International Student Representative, subject to the Council's approval, in collaboration with the Academic Affairs Commissioner:
        i. LgA (Legislative Assembly) (1)
        ii.CIE (Committee on International Education) (1)
Article IV, Section M, **6.**
6. The International Student Representative shall appoint, subject to the council's approval, undergraduate students to the following committees, in collaboration with the Academic Affairs Commissioner:
ii. Academic Senate
    a.   **LgA (Legislative Assembly) (1)**
    b.   **CIE (Committee on International Education) (1)**

Please Note two things:
1- The change to Article IV, Section B.5.ii in regards to the TSR appointment doesn;t change the language, it just moves it into a separate subpoint.
2- For adding clause 6 to Article IV Section M, currently there is only up to article 4, but another proposed bylaw change that has been submitted simultaneously changes clause 4.a to be clause 5; thus is the reason for numbering the change in here as 6.

For USAC Internal Vice President Use Only (Required):

Date Approved by Council:

Record of Council vote:	For:	Against:	Abstain:

Internal Vice
President Signature:_____ Date:_____
Email completed Submission Form to Student Government Services (sgs@asucla.ucla.edu)

For Student Support Services Use Only:

Input by:	Date:

New File Name:

- Emily moves to approve the AAC/ISR bylaw changes, Zuleika seconds
- By motion of 10-0-0 the motion passes, AAC/ISR bylaw changes are approved

A Resolution to Support a Los Angeles Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Stop at UCLA*   Arasasingham
A RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT A LOS ANGELES METRO SEPULVEDA TRANSIT CORRIDOR STOP AT UCLA

Primary Sponsors:
Aidan Arasasingham, External Vice President

Co-Sponsors:
Zuleika Bravo, Transfer Student Representative
Sachi Cooper, Facilities Commissioner

WHEREAS, approximately 81% of the UCLA population, including about 65% of students, regularly commuted to campus through walking, biking, driving, and transit according to the UCLA 2019 State of Transportation report; and

WHEREAS, it is likely that the commuter population of UCLA could increase for the 2021-2022 school year and beyond given the anticipated hybrid teaching style and the uncertainty of the state of the pandemic; and

WHEREAS, parking permits and daily passes can be expensive, making them inaccessible for many community members; and

WHEREAS, parking competition is extremely fierce and it can be very difficult to ensure a spot where one will not incur citations given the number of people trying to park on campus every day; and

WHEREAS, UCLA transportation aims to reduce the employee drive alone rate and fleet greenhouse gas emissions through sustainable transportation programs, demonstrating a commitment to promoting greener forms of transportation; and

WHEREAS, an underground station on UCLA's campus would create a faster, more convenient, more affordable, and more sustainable alternative for commuters to UCLA and Westwood; and

WHEREAS, this station would be the highest traffic non-transfer station in the entire Metro system; and

WHEREAS, UCLA's 2019-2026 Sustainable Transportation Plan was already created to formulate a plan for the introduction of the Metro Purple Line to the Westwood neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, commuters arriving from the Purple Line should have a direct rail connection to UCLA, rather than a bus or walking transfer, which would add additional time to a commute; and

WHEREAS, this Metro stop will not only alleviate transportation issues for the UCLA commuter students, but also allow for a more accessible way for students from working-class communities to visit a college campus.

THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the UCLA USAC council stresses the need for a UCLA underground station for the Sepulveda Transit Corridor, with a direct connection to the Purple Line.

- Promise motions to approve a Resolution to Support a Los Angeles Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Stop at UCLA, Zuleika seconds
- By a vote of 10-0-0 the motion passes, A Resolution to Support a Los angeles Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Stop at UCLA is approved

A Resolution in Support of the Open COVID Pledge*   Arasasingham
RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE OPEN COVID PLEDGE

Primary Sponsors:
Aidan Arasasingham, External Vice President

Co-Sponsors:
Christina Read, Student Wellness Commissioner
Noe Garcia, Financial Supports Commissioner

WHEREAS, UCLA is a public research institution that receives worldwide support and over a billion dollars in research funding, UCLA should promote health equity on a global scale while accelerating product development and removing barriers to access;

WHEREAS, the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) is comprised of several teams that share responsibility for realizing EDI's mission to uphold dignity for all, thus including those that would benefit from inclusive and equitable access to intellectual property related to COVID-19 treatment and technologies;

WHEREAS, COVID-19 research at UCLA spans across seven basic science departments and fourteen clinical departments with $7.8 million dollars funded and 380 registered projects across UCLA Health, suggesting that beneficial and life-saving research related to the pandemic is to be expected in the foreseeable future[1];

WHEREAS, the clinical and research strengths of UCLA Health and the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA position the university to make a transformative and enduring impact on this global pandemic, as mentioned by UCLA David Geffen School of Medicine[1];

WHEREAS, UCLA has underperformed in Universities Allied for Essential Medicines (UAEM) Report Card 2020 which measures the university's commitment to equitable biomedical research and licensing practices, scoring an overall grade of D-, even during a global pandemic[2];

WHEREAS, open access not only allows for increased dissemination and application of scientific advances in developing nations, but also encourages more diverse scientific collaboration, response, and critique -- all critical for achievement of global health equity;

[1]

WHEREAS, the UC system signed an open access agreement with Elsevier, with President Michael Drake noting that the agreement was a landmark achievement for "open, equitable access to information," emphasizing the importance of sharing scientific knowledge especially during a global pandemic that requires international collaboration[3];

WHEREAS, the Open COVID Pledge makes intellectual property available free of charge for use in ending the COVID-19 pandemic and minimizing the impact of disease[4];

WHEREAS, intellectual property restrictions represent a primary reason for artificial vaccine scarcity and delays in the distribution of COVID-19 technologies to low and middle-income countries, many of whom are currently projected to obtain vaccines only in 2022;

WHEREAS, the Open COVID pledge exemplifies UCLA's primary purpose as a research university, which is the creation, dissemination, preservation and application of knowledge for the betterment of our global society [4,5];

WHEREAS, the WHO COVID-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP) corresponds with UCLA's stated value for open access to information, as it calls on the global community to voluntarily share knowledge, intellectual property and data to accelerate product development while facilitating equitable and affordable access to COVID-19 technologies [5,6];

THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED, that UCLA should join the global movement for a People's Vaccine and take two concrete steps toward equitable access to COVID-19 related scientific knowledge: signing the Open COVID Pledge (OCP) and contributing to the World Health Organization's (WHO) COVID-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP);

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that by signing the OCP and contributing to C-TAP, UCLA has the chance to make history again: to become a leader -- within the UC and across world -- in the fight for a free and equitable vaccine; to speed the distribution of life-saving technologies; and to further the cause of open access that UC championed with its praiseworthy Elsevier agreement;

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that the UCLA Undergraduate Student Association supports the Open Covid Pledge and the World Health Organization's COVID-19 Technology Access Pool;

LET IT BE FINALLY RESOLVED, that the UCLA Undergraduate Student Association calls upon and demands that Chancellor Gene Block and Vice Chancellor of Health Sciences John Mazziota sign onto the Open Covid Pledge.[2]

---

[1] https://medschool.ucla.edu/coronavirus-information/research
[2] https://globalhealthgrades.org/
[3] https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-news-uc-secures-landmark-open-access-deal-world-s-largest-scientific-publisher
[4] https://opencovidpledge.org

2

[4] https://opencovidpledge.org

[5] https://www.ucla.edu/about/mission-and-values

- Emily moves to approve A Resolution in Support of the Open COVID Pledge, Christina seconds
- By vote of 10-0-0 the motion passes, A Resolution in Support of the Open COVID Pledge is approved

A Resolution in Restructuring the Basic Needs Committee & Creating a Basic Needs Student Advisory Board*
Bravo

A Resolution in Restructuring the Basic Needs Committee & Creating a Basic Needs Student Advisory Board

Sponsored by:
Zuleika Bravo, Transfer Student Representative
Emily Luong, Internal Vice President
Aidan Arasasingham, External Vice President
Justin Rodriguez, General Representative 2
Noe Garcia, Financial Supports Commissioner

Supporting Organizations:
Transfer Leadership Coalition
Afrikan Student Union
MEChA de UCLA

WHEREAS, the UCLA Basic Needs Committee lacks student voices and productive collaboration such that undergraduate students are largely unaware of the resources and programs available, with only one student organization being represented on the committee and other students being internal to the Community Programs Office[3];

WHEREAS, the UCLA Basic Needs Committee does not widely promote its meetings to the student body and has not updated their website with meeting minutes for the 2020-2021 academic year[4];

WHEREAS, an updated budget was posted on October 2020[5] for a three-year span, but does not provide detailed yearly breakdowns of expenditures or outreached for departmental or student input for budget allocations;

WHEREAS, the UCLA Basic Needs Committee is housed under the Community Programs Office and directly managed by CPO administrators, and this is not the first instance in which they have failed to address or comment on the lack of financial reports provided to the public[6];

WHEREAS, the UCLA Basic Needs Committee justify their lack of transparency on the basis of sensitive information when basic needs is not a delicate subject nor a place to disclose individual, private information but rather a hub of resources to support, aid, and/or provide fundamental necessities to the most vulnerable communities;

WHEREAS, a letter on January 29, 2021 from CPO staff acknowledged the fluctuation of transfer applicants for the Food Box Distribution events and that their *team has managed these new challenges—including decreased student and full-time staff support for event execution, increased reliance on outreach without in-person word-of-mouth, and ever-changing COVID-19-related public health restrictions—and will continue to work collaboratively with our campus partners to reach these student communities*[7] yet have not reassessed their outreach to different student groups and organizations outside of the CPO Office;

---

[6] https://www.who.int/initiatives/covid-19-technology-access-pool

[3] Basic Needs Organizational Flow Chart - https://basicneeds.ucla.edu/file/1c075ae5-4528-411f-9714-b274330afc54

[4] Meeting Notes 2020-2021 - https://basicneeds.ucla.edu/meeting-notes-2020-21

[5] UCLA Basic Needs Plan - https://basicneeds.ucla.edu/file/91c72d75-427b-4205-b242-98ecd086d9be

[6] https://dailybruin.com/2020/01/14/public-information-is-lacking-for-over-2-million-used-by-two-campus-committees

[7] "CPO Basic Needs Transfer Student Data 2019-21" - Antonio Sandoval - January 29, 2021 sent via email

THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED, that every academic year the UCLA Basic Needs Committee be comprised of two subcommittees with a one-term co-chair each: a Basic Needs Committee with department representatives, external partners, and student organizations and a Basic Needs Student Advisory Board with student leads to represent each respective program under the UCLA Basic Needs Framework to best advocate for current issues and voice student input;

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that UCLA update their definition of Basic Needs in alignment with current unforeseeable events and that it actively transition to the UC's intervention pyramid approach[8] in such that overtime its framework is structured on the premise of proactivity;

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that the UCLA Basic Needs Committee work in collaboration with the UC Basic Needs Village and other UCs such as the University of California, Santa Cruz[9] and the University of California, Berkeley[10] who have both administrative-led and student-led facilitation and committees and additionally have compiled a comprehensive list of student offices, clubs, and/or organizations in which they shall maintain communication with throughout each academic year;

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that the UCLA Basic Needs Committee publish quarterly transparency reports and assessments and an annual end of the year report to identify gaps in programming to better coordinate and serve the student body;

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED, that UCLA require a case management team for its Basic Need Committee that is committed to advocating for and actively outreaching to students in underserved communities;

LET IT FINALLY BE RESOLVED, that the Undergraduate Students' Association Council supports and promotes both the creation of a student-led basic needs committee entitled the Basic Needs Student Advisory Board and the restructuring of the UCLA Basic Needs Committee to include other departments and student organizations.

- Promise motions to approve A Resolution in Restructuring the Basic Needs Committee and Creating a Basic Needs Student Advisory Board, Noe seconds
- By vote of 11-0-0 the motion passes, A Resolution in Restructuring the Basic Needs Committee and Creating a Basic Needs Student Advisory Board is approved

XI. Adjournment*   Riley
- Naomi adjourns the meeting at 9:26pm

Good and Welfare

* Indicates Action Item
# Indicates Consent Item
@Indicates Executive Session Item

---

[8] Basic Needs Intervention Pyramid - https://sites.google.com/berkeley.edu/bnc-dashboard#h.radtxe9z8b5n
[9] The UCSC Basic Needs Team - https://basicneeds.ucsc.edu/about/basic-needs-team.html
[10] Basic Needs Security Report - https://diversity.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/ucb_basic_needs_report.pdf