



AGENDA
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL
June 8, 2021
7 PM PST
Zoom: <https://ucla.zoom.us/j/97123303841>

I. Call to Order

Velazquez

- Breeze calls the meeting to order at 7:02pm

A. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

- Signed via Google Docs

II. Approval of Agenda*

Gatica

- Promise moves to approve the agenda as amended, Jane seconds
- By motion of 13-0-0 the motion passes, agenda is approved as amended

III. Approval of the minutes*

Gatica

6/1/2021

- Promise motions to approve 6/1/2021 minutes, Herman seconds
- By motion of 13-0-0 the motion passes, 6/1/2021 minutes are approved

IV. Public Comment

Velazquez

Lauren: I just wanted to start off with saying that invisible disabilities are still disabilities, and disabled students should not be begging for accommodations that we are legally entitled to and protected for under the Americans with Disabilities Act. These students getting this accommodation decides whether or not we are successful in our classes because that is just the scope of it. Disabled students are more likely to drop out and I'm tired of public commenting. I've had to comment for transfer housing, I shouldn't have to beg this school to treat me like a fair individual, it is just really upsetting how ableist and inaccessible and how and how I've had such a horrible time at UCLA and it's just not acceptable. They can't just treat students from these communities like little diversity tokens and then toss us to the side and ignore us but prop us up when they need to show like "oh yeah we're diverse, we care about people at UCLA". No, that is not okay. This is a gross act the way it was done, it was done on a Friday where we couldn't comment on Monday and I think that it goes to show that this school does not care about disabled people at all and honestly I'm ashamed to be a student here and be associated with such an ableist institution that picks and chooses what it's going to prop up because this is not a school for all, no. This is a school for who we're going to prioritize and I don't that's right, I don't think that's fair, and I don't think that's aligned with True Bruin values. Thank you.

Dej: I wanted to piggyback off of what the last woman said. I think the thing that upset me the most was like the date that it was done. Part of me naively is saying like oh, maybe it just so happened to be like that. But even if they wanted to do it, I think it would have been way more respectful for them to do it in a different quarter so we could have had time. The fact that they did it the Friday before, I just found it really disrespectful. I just don't understand why that happened or how that happened. .

Tessa: So I'm really upset about this. I'm shocked at the lack of transparency and the lack of notice from my understanding. This decision was made almost a year ago, and to not have told students that, for me personally, I took the last two quarters off for obvious reasons. If I had known that his was going to happen I would have probably taken classes those quarters so this upsets my academic plan a lot. It will change going forward, I was planning on double majoring, I don't know if that'll be possible now. And like the previous comment said, this hurts retention of disabled students, and it's a really shocking move but I want to add that disabled students don't just deserve to have access to UCLA, we should be able to thrive and make connections and not have these barriers to education. And although a 15 unit cap is probably doable for a lot of people, I know for me personally it's going to hurt my health, it's going to make me choose between my academic schedule and like succeeding and having health impacts. I have gone through so many cycles at this school of doing a few quarters and then having to take time off because it just has such devastating impacts on my health, and this move is going to make that worse for sure. I'm so tired of having to fight these same

battles and feeling like I'm not heard or listened to or respected at all, like where's our seat at the table. We're the ones who understand this, we're the ones who live this, we're the ones who this is impacting. Why don't we have a seat.

Tadeo: Hello. I would like to say one thing that I found particularly upsetting about the email was the way that it was worded where it said it was to prevent priority enrollment from having an impact on availability for other students not receiving priority enrollment, and I feel like what's really difficult about that statement is that it creates this sense of by trying to level the playing field for disabled students, you're harming other students. I mean, first of all, I would like to know how many disabled students in general are utilizing the full 19 units. First of all, students who have priority enrollment, because not all of them have priority enrollment. And then out of them, how many of them are even using the 19 units, because I don't feel personally that it would be enough to threaten the level of enrollment for other students whereas for us it's like make or break. It's extremely important. I know that for my major, and this is not even considering a minor, this is just graduating in four years, that I have to take four classes every quarter for the rest of my four years here except for one quarter. And you know there have been so many things going on with my disabilities that priority enrollment is really important, you know it helps with scheduling the tests, the double time, that's something that other students have to worry about. I know a three hour test is like six hours for me and that's going to overlap with, I mean basically I can't have two finals on the same day, not like other students. And so that's really important when you're really important when you're taking four classes, because that's four days out of the five days that finals week is. And then if I'm forced to not take four classes, I'm not on track to graduate in time, my family pays over \$50,000 a year in medical bills. And I have a Cal Grant. If my Cal Grant is jeopardized by going over the four year limit, that's unacceptable. My family should not be having to take out money, and I shouldn't be having to take out money because this is, I feel like it's a simple thing. I just don't feel like there are enough disabled students using 19 units to throw off the enrollment for the entire school.

Submitted Public Comment:

Quinn: Hello council my name is Quinn O'Connor, and I don't think I have formally introduced myself to the new 2021-2022 council yet, so welcome. I am here to comment on the CAE Academic Senate hearing happening later on tonight, I am grateful that this is finally happening. This is kind of unscripted, I have had quite the busy week because obviously all these events have transpired during week nine to ten to now we are in finals week, and it has been exhausting to say the least as a disabled student leader, constantly being forced to advocate and using my free labor and time personally since June of 2020. I have been in meetings with CAE and Student Affairs leadership on disabled student issues and hopeful partnerships that never actually came to fruitfulness because of this constant lack of transparency on Student Affairs and CAE's part. But besides that, I am extremely extremely frustrated by the events that have continued to transpire over the years, even before I started advocating on behalf of disabled students. But I just think it is incredibly disrespectful of Student Affairs and the UCLA Administration to take advantage of disabled students' time and they continue to do so. I hope that this is kind of a turning point, because of the events that have transpired especially in the past couple of weeks, the Disabled Student Union has finally decided to take more of a stand and because of that we have, as you probably all know we have for this specific issue, we have been able to amass over 800 signatures, 832 signatures to be exact, from the UCLA community, undergrad, graduates, staff, lecturers, the general public as well. I think that more than anything should show you all that this is an issue that honestly is literally breaking the law, and the CAE has broken the law in the past, they have had lawsuits against them in the past that have been settled and they're not super out in the open because obviously UCLA loves to cover things up as much as possible to save face but you know I think that in order to actually make change we need to have government officials involve, we need to have legal entities involved because nobody's going to make the change and usually isn't going to be forced to do anything unless they are legally entitled to and that is a sad realization that I've come to over the past year of trying to advocate for students. And knowing that nothing changed at all, and they continue to disrespect us and disrespect our time and my time, personally if I got paid minimum wage to be in all the meetings and exert all the energy that I have on the specific issue, I would be very set as a college student. I know that you will probably hear a lot of the context later on tonight and from other public comments so I just wanted to use my public comment to personally just express my frustration, but also at the same time hope for actual tangible change finally after a year coming, honestly years before me as well but in my case a year that I had fought for this, and I think that it is such a shame that it had to come to this point, and I tried not to get it to this point. I remember being in multiple meetings telling Dean Blandizzi and telling Dr. Khedi that I wanted to work with them and that because of the positions that they are in as admin they can't really take much of a stand but they need to tell us so that the Disabled Student Union could work for them and advocate for the students and help them advocate and here we are. So I would like to personally like to not that Dean Blandizzi is leaving, which congratulations I guess, you get to not be held as accountable as you honestly probably should be for wasting my time for a year, but I call on Dr. Khedi to take a stand and advocate and stand with the Disabled Student Union stand with the students that you are supposed

to serve in your capacity as a Center for Accessible Education Director. I think that we can make this change that we need to make if you can stand with us and advocate for the reversal of this decision and start on a clean slate where we can work together as students and staff to make UCLA a more accessible space and make UCLA legally accommodating at the very bare minimum Thank you.

Anonymous Public Comment 1: We all know CAE reduced units from 19 to 15 in an attempt to be equitable to those with priority. With the unit reduction, CAE students are capped at 15 units regardless of the pass number. Regents Scholars also had priority enrollment reduced from 13 units to 10 units, HOWEVER, they will be able to enroll in all 19 units under their first pass. CAE students are now getting less units than the Regents group. Even CAE students in regents are staying capped at 15. What kind of treatment is this? Furthermore, if UCLA is letting Regents enroll in all 19 units under the first pass, how is that equitable to those without priority? The classes will now be full before second pass even opens.

Rowan Bryan: Priority enrollment for 19 units is a necessity for me because of my disabilities. **I cannot risk any chance of not getting into a class that fits into my medical schedule.** I have constant doctor appointments as well as hour-long medical treatments to do in the morning every day. This makes it almost impossible to go to class in the morning and I need priority enrollment to ensure I get into afternoon and or evening classes. I have to repeat these same medical treatments at night at specific hours so I can't just "fall asleep early". Schedule of doctors appointments is not up to me, doctors work in the morning, I can't work around that. I also rely on BruinAccess to take me to and from classes. The van only goes to campus on the hour which is very inconvenient and means I need to make sure my classes are at very specific times. I am basically stranded on campus with no way to charge my oxygen tank or move up hills or stairs in between classes. The battery on my oxygen tank only can last a few hours without dying and putting me in a state of emergency. **I need** to make sure I am enrolled in classes that give me enough time to charge my oxygen concentrator, rest because I have limited energy, do medical treatments, and go to doctors appointments.

Athya: My name is Athya Uthayakumar and I'm a third-year Computer Science major. I'm writing to express my disappointment with the changes to disabled student priority enrollment. This sudden change from 19-21 units to 15 units would affect disabled students' ability to enroll in accessible classes and access the classes they need to graduate in time. I support the Disabled Student Union's condemnation of the change, and ask that the administration and USAC be more considerate of the input of disabled student leaders when making decisions:

- Public comment concluded at 7:28pm

V. Funding

- None

VI. Special Presentations

CAE/Senate Hearing

Ni

Jane: Hi everyone. Thank you for being here, and thank you Dean Blandizzi and Dr. Kehdi and Dr. Galvan for being here. So I'm first going to kind of like give everyone who might not know a background of the situation that we're currently talking about and then everyone on council can discuss this and talk about moving forward. So as an overview for the situation, in May 2020 a decision was made by the undergraduate council of the Academic Senate to reduce the amount of units that students with CAE accommodations get during priority enrollment from like 19 or 21 depending on their school to 15 units. This decision was made based on a recommendation from the priority enrollment ad hoc committee, who made the decision in collaboration with the CAE and the ADA 504 compliance officer. Then, disabled students were not informed of this decision until Friday May 27th or 31st or something, so a Friday in 2021. And then priority enrollment starts like June 14th and 15th. So there was very little communication in between that and there was like an 11 month period where no communication was made, and since then the Disabled Student Union has drafted a letter and a petition the community stakeholders have signed in opposition to this decision that currently has more than 850 signatures. Today we have Dean Blandizzi, Adriana Galvan and Norma Khedi here so we can all discuss and ask them questions and talk about this decision.

Angie: We wanted to turn it over to Norma and Maria and we wanted to kind of walk us through the process of the decision from their administrative standpoint and talk us through how and why the priority enrollment ad hoc committee came to the decision

and why disabled students weren't included in the decision making process since this policy does affect them directly and they are a really huge stakeholder in this as you saw during public comment and the over 12 pages of student testimony.

Maria Blandizzi: I can start us out. First let me introduce myself because I haven't met everyone in the Zoom. So my name is Dean Blandizzi and I'm currently the Dean of Students. I appreciate the outreach and the invitation to come into this space to engage in discussion and in thinking about who was best posed to talk through the background I asked Adriana Galvan as well as the Chair of the Undergraduate Academic Council to think about how best to engage in the conversation with you all. And obviously, Dr. Norma Khedi the Director of the Center for Accessible Education is with us as well. So I think at this point I know there are a number of questions and Jane I appreciate the baseline that you offered us. I think it would be best to hear from Dean Galvan initially as to the background to how we got to this point and then we can engage in conversation.

Galvan: Thank you all for inviting us here today. So I'll give a little bit of background, and I was the Chair of the priority enrollment ad hoc committee when I was a member of the undergraduate council and this committee was commissioned or charged by the then Chair of the undergraduate council Rober Gold because in discussions with Academic Senate faculty there was a question about how priority enrollment was allocated to different groups on campus and why there was a lack of uniformity and the number of units that were allocated to each of the groups and whether or not the priority enrollment was achieving its intended mission that was established back in 1990. So as some background, priority enrollment and the allocations have been reviewed about every 10 years or so. The last time this was reviewed was in 2009 and at that point there was a massive reduction in the number of students who received priority enrollment because at that time about 33% of students on UCLA campus were receiving priority enrollment. That, of course, had the unintended consequence of making the entire process less valuable for all the students because 33% were receiving priority enrollment. So we were charged, in January 2019 we met for about a year and a half and bimonthly meetings and we reviewed data on the number of students receiving priority enrollment, and the number of units. The way the number of units that were used for priority enrollment, the average is 13 units that are used for priority enrollment by week three. Initially, it's actually 15 units, the number that is used, and we consulted with various stakeholders. So I think one of the previous comments was about this decision being made in collaboration with CAE and I want to say that that's actually not the case, we invited CAE to one of our meetings and they answered some of the questions we had about the number of students who are receiving priority enrollment, who are registered with CAE, the reasons why it's necessary, etc. We also reviewed in the committee proposals from other student groups who asked to receive priority enrollment and so those were the basis of the decision. I'm happy to go into more detail if it's of interest. And so in June 2020 we made the recommendations to the undergraduate council at which point it was approved by the council. And I will say that there were several questions about representation from students. There was a USAC representative. And the reason that occurred is because whenever an ad hoc committee is charged on the undergraduate council, the USAC members who are present are invited to participate and serve on the committee. And I should say that USAC determines who is represented on undergraduate council so I encourage students who are within a group if there's interest to reach out to the representatives to be represented on the undergraduate council.

Breeze: Thank you for that. I will say this, that representative they've already graduated at this point or they're about to graduate, so I think when we're making decisions like this, I respect you and I know that we've worked together in the space this past year but I just don't think it's right, also that student might have not been fully present. The decision should have been distributed to more students. I didn't receive this information when I started in September so that I could have had more context and could have told student leaders that I appointed this is what we're going to be tackling this year. I really would've appreciated that transparency on my end. I don't think it's right to frame it on specific students because we're really suppose to be united on one front and that student, I don't know who was present that day but yeah that's just my end of it.

Angelina: I think it's also important to point out that the student rep that sits on undergraduate council can't necessarily represent the wide range of needs and experiences of every single community on campus like the disabled student community so they rely heavily on recommendations from departments who are supposed to advocate and represent and really take a stance to fight for the well being and the rights that disabled students are entitled to.

Jane: So you mentioned that CAE was at one of the meetings but they weren't a part of the decision making process, is there a reason why CAE wasn't more part of the decision making process and at what point was the ADA 504 office contacted.

Adriana: So that person was at the same meeting as senior leadership, it was in the Spring of 2020. The reason that CAE was not a part of the decision is because we were making the decision across different populations at UCLA and so none of those other populations were represented in on this ad hoc committee either.

Blandizzi: I think it might also be helpful in terms of shared governance and how important it is that the undergraduate council of the Academic Senate is charged with thinking through a litany of issues that impact the student experience at the undergraduate level and so when decisions are made, it's not just by one group or one individual set of people, so it wouldn't be just the CAE making a decision or wouldn't just be the undergraduate Academic Senate committee making a decision and it also goes to the full Academic Senate for endorsement and review.

Adriana: The recommendations that the committee made were then forwarded to the undergraduate council and the undergraduate council discussed it at their subsequent meeting and then all the members of the undergraduate council review it for two weeks and then have a discussion and vote.

Promise: I have a few questions but the first one that I want to start with is what was the impetus for reducing the amount of priority enrollment in the first place?

Adriana: So, what I mentioned is that in 2009 33% of students were receiving priority enrollment and at that point there was a major reduction in removing priority enrollment from various groups. For example, at one point I think student leaders received, students on the newspaper received it and so that's what happened at that time. The current revision and examination of the priority enrollment was motivated by the data showing there was a trend towards an uptick in the number of students and units that were granted through priority enrollment. So this was an attempt to determine how we can ensure that 10% of the population receives priority enrollment so that we do not reach that 33% level.

Blandizzi: I appreciate the question and I also don't want to rush to thinking about the solution until we have the opportunity to fully vet all the questions but Promise you were leading us into thinking about what's next and where do we go and how do we address the concerns that have come forward. So when we're ready for that conversation then we want to make sure that we stay in conversation and today in this evening's conversation we'll get there but we don't want to cut short.

Jane: I have a question, since the decision was made in 2020, why weren't people notified until May 2021?

Blandizzi: What I will offer is that we, I was the interim Director of the Center for Accessible Education during this time period. So I was the Dean of Students as well as the interim Director because we needed to search for our director, but we also were the university that was in a hiring freeze because of Covid. So while we were trying to adjust to the realities of remote instruction and I was charged with trying to understand and manage the Center for Accessible education, I was informed of the undergraduate council's decision on June 9 2020 and we were in the process of trying to advocate for the hiring of the Director position which we were able to do that summer. So it was on me to communicate to the community, and that did not occur while I was the interim director. So from an accountability perspective that should have been me that I communicated more actively with the broader campus about that, or I should have coordinated that communication with the impacted communities and I did not do that at the time. That doesn't take away that it's an impact and I acknowledge that too. So when we acknowledge the impact we want to also think about ways to think about how to manage the impact. There are two things that I think we want to make sure that we share with you, one about student representation and how voices are going to come into the Center for Accessible education and two about how we can think through an exceptions process so that moving forward we think thoughtfully about how students that really need 19 units of priority enrollment can seek that through an exceptions process.

Blandizzi: I also want to say that we're not breaking the law. I want to be really clear that this change is not breaking the law. I understand the concerns that are presented in the conversation, I understand the need for and the clear legal requirement and mandate the the university has to make sure that disabled students have equitable access to the curriculum. Students with disabilities will maintain access to priority enrollment just at a lower level than they were previously and in looking at the data that Dean Galvan offered we saw that by and large students with disabilities were tapping into 15 units of priority enrollment.

Herman: I have a few comments and questions. First I want to go back to a comment that Dean Galvan made earlier about students with disabilities or students with CAE accommodations being able to sort of request on a case by case basis to have their priority enrollment on the high end depending on students. I did want to say that I don't think it's right to assume a baseline of lower need for students with disabilities rather than starting everyone on the most equitable baseline possible. I think this also connects me to the issue of labor that will be put upon CAE to have to review more case by case students having to submit those requests which will increase the labor that they have to do simply to increase requests that could be avoided simply by giving

everyone that priority access. That makes it the most equitable for students receiving those accommodations, rather than having those who are working in the CAE go through the added labor of reviewing those applications when they could be focusing their efforts more towards actually providing those accommodations services to students.

Adriana: I think you raised a very important point about the labor that's going to take to review the exemptions and I leave it to my colleagues to think through that. I can speak more specifically to the decision making around the other groups and specifically regent scholars. So I agree with you that the original reason they received priority enrollment was as a recruitment tool. So the reduction for the regent scholars went from 13 to 10. Over time, the discussion that the committee had was that eventually would be phased out rather than removed completely but that will be in the hands of the next ad hoc committee. The second to last recommendation was that the undergraduate council establish a standing ad hoc committee to review the data and commit to reviewing the data for all students to see whether it's working.

Tessa: I think it is unfair for disabled students to bear the brunt of your failures to communicate this policy change effectively. I'm wondering why there wasn't a postponement once you realized that we were giving dangerously little time to disabled students to make these arrangements. I'd like to add that beyond being ableist it's also classist for students who simply don't have the money to make last minute arrangements because being disabled is really expensive and if there's going to be an exemptions process in the future that's great but if the policy is going into effect now that is still going to have a very real impact. So is there going to be anything done to take accountability with actions rather than just words.

Adriana: I can speak to that. I think the immediate next steps would be to engage in further conversation about thinking about what the exemption process might look like for this going forward.

Blandizzi: I think either thing to offer also is that Tessa you asked what did we do immediately to acknowledge that this was having an impact and we engaged with the registrar's office to see what possibilities could exist to reverse course or change course at the same time acknowledging that just because there might have been no ability to do that, this is a shared governance model and this decision doesn't get reversed without also going back to the appropriate entities that made the decision.

Tessa: Thank you for saying that. Our lives are being impacted really intensely by this. I'm hearing a lot of conversation about the future and continuing conversations and thinking about starting initiatives and stuff but we do need solutions now. You have the luxury of time and we don't have that at all. So I'm glad that you will be moving forward with more intentionality than you've displayed in the past but it's really disappointing on this end.

Blandizzi: So it would be helpful, in addition to speaking with your disability advisor and counselor, oftentimes when there are students in distress we also have case management services available to assist you so you don't have to come forward now with that request but if it would be helpful I'll offer my email in the chat and we can connect you to additional support structures with the immediacy of the reality.

VII. Appointments

UCLA Board of Directors

Velazquez, Kamara, De Dios

Wudia Kamara :

- Jane moves to appoint Wudia Kamara for the ASUCLA BOD appointment, Maya seconds
- By motion of 14-0-0 the motion passes, Wudia Kamara appointed to ASUCLA BOD

- Cassandra moves to appoint Megan De Dios to the ASUCLA BOD as an alternate, Sarah seconds
- By motion of 14-0-0 the motion passes, Megan De Dios appointed to the ASUCLA BOD as an alternate

VIII. Officer Reports

- None

IX. Old Business

- None

X. New Business

- None

XI. Adjournment*

Velazquez

- Breeze adjourns at 9:36pm

Good and Welfare;

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