UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
COUNCIL

Tuesday January 31, 2006
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Biniek, Doan, Hawkins, Kaisey, Malik, McLaren, Nelson, Sassounian, Sargent, Smeets, Tuttle, Vardner, Villasin, Williams, Wood, Zai

ABSENT: Kaminsky, Neesby, Pham


I. A. Call to Order
   - Wood called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet
   Villasin passed around the Attendance Sheet

II. Approval of the Agenda
   - Malik asked to remove the action on the OSAC guidelines. Vardner said that parliamentary, the action would need to be retabled, not removed.
   - Biniek asked if the Election Code Revision Discussion could be moved to after Special Presentations.
   - Sassounian, Smeets, Vardner, and Hawkins asked to be included in the Officer and Member reports.
   - Sassounian moved and Biniek seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
   - Zai called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the Agenda was approved, as amended, by Acclamation.

III. Approval of the Minutes
   - January 17, 2006
     - Kaisey moved and Biniek seconded to approve the Minutes as submitted.
     - Council voted to approve the Minutes of January 17, 2006 as submitted with a vote of 7 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

IV. Special Presentations

Universal Healthcare – Erica Brode and Elisabeth Berger, American Medical Students Association (AMSA)
   - Erica Brode said that the goal of AMSA was to begin the momentum on campus about the importance of global health care. She said that they wanted to educate the student body, because there was legislation in congress about the issue right now. Brode said that the bill was called CHIRA, and would create a universal health care system for the state of California. She said that they wanted to create a coalition of students on campus who would either support or oppose this bill, but would at least take a stance.
   - Elisabeth Berger said that this coalition was open to anyone, and everyone was encouraged to come and represent their student group.
- Brode said that their goal was to establish a campus-attended debate type of thing. She said that it seemed like most people agreed that they needed universal health care, but there seemed to be a difference of opinion about how to get there.
- Berger said that they wanted to get USAC’s help since, after all, they represented the student body, and they hoped that USAC would actually join the coalition.
- Kaisey asked if all of the organizations were behind the bill, to which Brode said that the coalition would just be about educating the student body, though some of the student groups had taken action in support of the bill.

V. New Business

A. *Resolution in Support of Education Regarding Healthcare Access
- Elisabeth Berger said that the resolution referenced the Student Health Insurance Plan (SHIP), and the whole idea was to make it so that everyone who needed care would be able to receive it, even here on our own campus. After some discussion, Brode said that the second WHEREAS should be struck.
- Smeets said that on the last WHEREAS, he suggested adding the pros and cons of the action to the text to make it more balanced. Biniek said that she liked it the way it was, since universal health care was something that everyone was behind, and she had actually thought that the resolution was a little weak. Smeets again stated his view that the resolution should reflect the group’s desire to educate about the pros and cons, and the text should reflect that.
- Sassounian said that the resolution was very good, but she would be in support of making a stronger statement in the resolution that USAC supported access to healthcare. Biniek said that her suggestion would be lowercasing “Universal” in the resolution, to reflect that they were in support of the concept rather than the specific bill.
- Brode suggested adding “access” to health care in the seventh “WHEREAS.”
- Biniek moved and Doan seconded to approve the Resolution in Support of Education Regarding Healthcare Access.

B. Resolution in Support of Education Regarding Healthcare Access
- Biniek moved and Sassounian seconded to amend the last “WHEREAS” to “about both sides of universal health care” and to add an additional “Therefore” to read that “USAC supports access to Universal health care.”
- Zai moved to have the word “universal” in the Resolution be spelled with a lower-case ‘u’.
- Nelson asked Brode and Berger what some of the arguments against universal health care were. Brode answered that it would decrease salaries and would decrease the quality of health care as well as access to specialized treatment. She said, however, that AMSA’s point was to educate people about the bill so that they could decide on their own.
- Wood also encouraged increasing the action by USAC upon approval of this bill, and suggested adding another statement reading, “Therefore, USAC will support AMSA’s efforts with letter-writing and call-ins in support of the bill.”
- Biniek moved to add “THEREFORE, USAC will support AMSA’s efforts with letter-writing and call-ins in support of the bill.”
- Kaisey said that she did not see why the final “Therefore” was necessary, since it seemed to be stated already, to which Wood said that she felt it was important to actually hold USAC accountable for taking some form of action.
- Zai said that she didn’t know much about the issue, but asked if adding such a statement would undermine USAC’s intent to educate students about the pros and cons of this issue.
- Sassounian said that she did not think that any depth was added to the resolution by the additional “Therefore.” She said she thought that all they should do would be to support AMSA’s goal to educate the student body about this issue. Sassounian added that she did not think anyone was opposed to access to healthcare.
- Biniek said that she thought that the way Wood had worded the final “WHEREAS” was a good reflection of their stance and, while USAC supported certain ideas, they would also be educating students about it.
- Brode reminded council that the Coalition itself was just a vehicle for people to come together to talk about the issue, and that such discussions might result in the formation of groups that would take a stance on the issues, one way or another.
- Biniek asked if there were any resources available to Council to learn more about this issue, to which Brode replied that their website was www.amsabruins.com. She said that they could also get information from the California Physicians Alliance.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution in Support of Education Regarding Healthcare Access, as amended, with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

VI. Special Presentations (cont’d)

Muslim Students Association
- Aliyah Hussaini from the Muslim Students Association (MSA) introduced herself to Council.
- Adam El-Sayed from the MSA also introduced himself to Council.
- Hussaini said that a lot of people don’t know about the many service projects that are sponsored by MSA, and that they wanted to make this presentation to USAC tonight to make sure that they were aware of these projects. She then gave an overview of MSA’s projects that help students both on and off campus. She said the projects were the first Muslim Student newspaper in the nation, Al-Talib; the Incarcerated Youth Development Program; a high school outreach program in Watts; a free health clinic; and a food program for the homeless. Hussaini said that MSA revolved around these projects, and they were very passionate about reaching out to people and educating them about the Muslim community. She also said that they did a lot of programming around campus. She said that this week was Islamic Awareness Week, and they had an event taking place every night of the week. Hussaini said that one of their ongoing concerns was the safety of Muslim students, particularly in post-9-11 America.

- Wood asked about MSA’s letter-writing campaign to the Governor. Hussaini replied that MSA West would be conducting a letter-writing campaign to the Governor regarding the attack on financial aid. She said that while the Governor had taken some positive steps recently, they were not enough, and more was needed.
- Kaisey expressed her thanks to Hussaini and El-Sayed for MSA’s efforts in helping to dispel stereotypes and to educate the student body.

VII. New Business (cont’d)

B. Election Code Revision Discussion
- Anat Herzog, Election Board Chair, began by saying that she had been emailing to council the revised Election Code over the last week as it got revised time and time again. She said she wanted to open a forum for any questions or concerns. Herzog then gave some details about specific changes she was recommending. Herzog said that she had removed the position of Logistics Chair because the responsibilities of that position had been placed under the External Relations Chair. She explained further that the External Relations Chair was also the liaison to other groups interested in the proceedings of the USAC elections. Herzog also said that she was thinking about striking the requirement of a candidate debate, as the endorsement hearings often served as a debate. She said that change, if recommended, would be included in the next version of the E-Code. Herzog said that she had also made some improvements to the rules for the endorsement hearings. She said that she had also rewritten the part about the campaigning radius around polling stations, since voting was now done electronically. Herzog said that it had just been changed to read that campaigning could no longer be done during voting hours.
- Tuttle asked if there was a privacy clause, to which Herzog said that there was not. Tuttle said that there should be, as he could foresee there being chains of votes in fraternity and sorority houses, where the younger members were instructed by the older members to vote for certain candidates.
- Kaisey asked if campaigning on behalf of another person included student organizations who had endorsed certain candidates, to which Herzog said that it applied just to individuals.
- Tuttle asked when this would be coming back to Council for a vote, to which Herzog said it would be up for a vote at the next meeting. Tuttle said he understood that this was a working draft right now, but asked when the final draft would be ready, and how much time Council would have to review that document before the meeting. Herzog said that she hoped the final
draft would be done several days before the next meeting so Council would have time to review all the proposed changes.

- Zai said that on page 5, it should read “Housing Regulations”, not “Office of Residential Life Regulations.” Herzog said that she had been in touch with the Office of Residential Life and that they were the ones who were actually trying to regulate campaigning, so she stood by the reference to ORL rather than “Housing Regulations.”

- Herzog said that page 8 addressed voter privacy, and she had changed the language to reflect the fact that voting was now done electronically.

- Tuttle asked if there was any reference to a voter’s right to privacy. He made the point that it was important to clarify the difference between an individual’s rights to privacy while voting, versus the online voting system. Tuttle said that he was concerned about train voting. Herzog said that it had actually happened last year, as in the residence halls, individuals had been aggressively encouraged to vote, and watched over while casting those votes. She said that this was why the code had been changed to try to prevent that type of behavior. Tuttle expressed his shock at this egregious violation of voter privacy. He said that apparently they would need to now do large-scale education in the residence halls to prevent this kind of thing. Herzog said that this was why the position of External Relations Chair had been created as a way to try to curb exactly those kinds of situations.

- Wood said that she was sure everyone on Council agreed with this, but Tuttle countered that apparently it was not actually operational. He said that if this was beginning to become the norm, then this needed to be stopped, and he was glad that this was brought out into the open.

- Williams raised the question of whether the E-Code, as it is now written, would make it okay for someone to encourage others to vote, while not looking over their shoulder while they voted and taking away their privacy.

- Nelson said that what he saw as Council’s concern was that, anytime rules and guidelines were decided upon, there needed to be a safeguard put in place so that they would not be caught off guard when problems did arise. He said that the earlier Council’s concern seemed to be with the safeguards, and he suggested that this was an invaluable lesson that this Council should take to heart.

- Biniek asked if this new code required that voting would always be online, to which Herzog said that MyUCLA was the current system used. She said that she could rewrite the code to reflect that other options would be available, including the regression to paper ballots. Vardner said that he saw no problem with leaving MyUCLA in the code, as the code was changed every year anyway. He said that if MyUCLA was ever veered away from, then he would want Council to reopen discussion anyway, so there was no need to account for that in the document.

- Herzog said that she had also updated the definitions in the code in V.A.1, and said that she had outlined the forming of slates and elaborated on campaign literature.

- Vardner suggested changing “student body” in V.A.1.a. to “association”.

- Sassounian, referring to Article V.A.1.e., asked what the definition of campaigning groups was. Herzog said that this had always been a tricky subject without complete campaign rosters. She said that the rule of thumb was for anyone campaigning for another would be held responsible by the individual for whom they were campaigning. She said that the only problem with that would be if there was someone trying to sabotage another’s campaign, but she said that ambiguities like that were what the E-Board was for.

- Herzog said that she had defined a subscription listserv, because there had been concerns last year about On Campus Housing Council (OCHC) mass-emailing their constituents. She also said that she had added that any networking sites like thefacebook.com would be treated as emails.

- Williams said that ASUCLA had been involved in the election process last year because of the referendum, and said that he had a lot of trouble understanding the ASUCLA Board could do could not do based on USAC’s Election Code. He said that all he was trying to do was to disseminate information about what passage of the referenda would accomplish. Williams said that he had spent a lot of time reviewing the E-Code to determine what he could do, and to determine whether or not he was breaking any rules. Herzog said that she completely understood Williams’ dilemma, and said that was exactly why she was recommending that the
definitions be revised and clarified. She also said that this was one of the purposes of the
candidate orientation meetings.
-Herzog said that, on Page 19 she had clarified the rules regarding endorsement hearings, and said
that she felt that those should be required. She said that allowing people to leave them or skip
them would be counterproductive to the whole point of the hearings. Nelson asked how this
would be enforced, to which Herzog said that groups that did not stay the whole time would not
be officially recognized as endorsing any candidates.
- Herzog said that a lot of changes had been made to Article VII on page 20 regarding Validation.
She said that she had added time limits on signature validation, since delaying validation could
potentially delay a Special Election. Herzog also said that in E.1 she had added that Special
Elections had to take place at least 10 days prior to the General Election.
- Tuttle asked Council if there were any slate-motivated changes to the election code, to which
Biniek said that there were not. Tuttle said that he would recommend talking to Mike Cohn
about any questions or concerns in interpretation.
- Herzog said that on the bottom of page 23, in Article IX.C.1, she had updated the code regarding
violations of the Election Code. She said that she had added the four factors that would be
weighed with regard to all violations.
- Vardner said that, in terms of expense accounts, the point was to show how much was spent on
an individual’s campaign. He said that there were two ways to report the expenses, either as the
direct effect of funds spent on their own campaign, or as the indirect effects of pooled funds by
slates. Herzog said that was something that needed consideration, and she would discuss it with
him.
- Vardner asked if there had been changes to the definitions about campaigning, because it had
seemed like it was written to target slates and early campaigning. He asked what kinds of
provisions were in place to prevent slates from breaking the rules. Vardner said that slates tend
_to flier outside of allotted time and outside of allotted areas. Herzog said that until anyone was
declared a candidate, there was really nothing that they could control. She also said that she
thought the Election Code was general enough to encompass all types of illegal campaigning.
Herzog said that the danger of the more vague definition was that the Election Board Chair
would have to be very clear with the candidates about what could and could not be done.
- Tuttle asked why one’s candidacy didn’t begin the moment that they picked up the application
for candidacy. He said that the way he saw it, when someone decided to run, their candidacy
had begun. Tuttle asked how long the process usually took between picking up their application
and handing it back in. Herzog said that, technically, one could start campaigning the day that
they began Fall Quarter.
- Vardner asked Nelson what the rules were about distribution of literature on campus, to which
Nelson said that anyone could distribute anything. Vardner lastly said that he thought it was a
good idea for there to be a debate between candidates. He also said that since there was a
tabulation of votes, using Single Transferable Voting would reduce the need for additional
elections and runoff elections. Herzog said that she had thought about that, and her opinion was
that transferable votes take away a person’s right to change their mind, and if there was an
opportunity for them to change their vote, then it took away the opportunity for them not to vote
at all. She said that as she saw it, she did not think it would work logistically.
- Sassounian said that she did not follow the thinking along the lines of taking away a vote by
using the Single Transferable Voting System, to which Herzog said that in runoff elections,
everyone voted again, and in that instance they had the opportunity to change their vote or not to
vote at all. Herzog said that some voters may not wish to vote for anyone except a certain
candidate, and they would then not want their votes helping to elect another candidate.
- Nelson, getting back to Vardner’s earlier comments, said that slates were not allowed to enter the
meetings of their opposition and pass out literature.
- Biniek said that runoff elections increased campaigning, and she said that she thought it was
really important to have that opportunity to make sure that students made the decisions that they
really wanted to make.
- Vardner said that he thought it was bad every time people decided not to vote in a runoff
election, and in using Single Transferable Voting, an additional week would be allowed for all
candidates to campaign, since there would not need to be time allotted for a runoff election.
Herzog said that she thought the difference was that in a runoff election, voters already knew who was in office, which could potentially influence who they voted for to create the body as a whole.

- Zai said that, right now, the current voting system did not allow students to change their minds either. She said that in the Single Transferable Vote system students would have that additional week to really make up their minds about who to vote for. Herzog said that what she saw as the big point was that the time preceding the general election was used for voters to make up their mind, and the time between the election and the runoff were for students to decide who they wanted to supplement the already elected members with.

- Doan asked when Herzog would be appointing the rest of the E-Board, to which Herzog said that applications were due on Friday, February 3rd, and she had already interviewed several people. She said that she hoped she would have appointees for Council at the next meeting, but that she couldn’t guarantee that she’d have enough at that time for a full E-Board.

- Biniek thanked Herzog for all her hard work, and council applauded.

- Herzog encouraged Council members who felt passionately about any Election Code issues to see her outside of the meeting.

VIII. Appointments

There were no Appointments this week.

IX. Fund Allocations

- Villasin said that $7,171.34 had been requested from Contingency, with $3,972.26 recommended for allocation. She said that, upon Council’s approval of the recommended allocations, the running total in the Contingency Fund would drop from $95,926.74 to $91,954.48.

- Villasin said that the first date to submit applications for Contingency Capital Items would be Monday, February 13 by 5:00p.m. She said they would continue to accept applications each Monday until the funds for Capital Items ran out.

- Sassounian asked why “Where’s the Love” had been funded more than 800 dollars with no documentation. Villasin said that they were granted funding for an honorarium, and said that there were a lot of times when no documentation is available for an honorarium.

- Zai said that it looked like a lot of groups did not have documentation, to which Villasin said that the groups without documentation had explained things well enough to her to justify FiCom’s recommendation. She said further that transportation did not require documentation.

- Biniek said that these same questions had been raised over and over, and asked that people please take the time to review more closely the details provided with each of FiCom’s recommendations.

- Hawkins moved and Malik seconded to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations.

- Council voted to approve the Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations with a vote of 7 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

The Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations are attached to the minutes.

X. Officer and Member Reports

Facilities Commissioner – Joseph Vardner

- Vardner said that his office was working on Sustainability. He also said that he had a TSAB meeting, and Parking Services would be giving Council a presentation in two weeks time. Vardner also said that the parking space allocation system would be revised, and new items would be added including points for families and community service. He also said that the penalties for lying on applications would be increased. Vardner said that the penalty of not getting parking when people didn’t really need it in the first place was not an adequate penalty. He also said that he had met with VC Pete Blackman, and they had talked about upcoming construction opportunities. Vardner said that the largest construction project coming up would
be the UCLA hospital, which would cost an enormous amount. He said that it would take 15 years to complete.

Cultural Affairs Commissioner – Todd Hawkins
- Hawkins said that his office had a hip hop show coming up featuring an on-campus group. He said that the jazz series in Kerckhoff Coffee House was going really well, and the house had been packed last week, with standing room only. Hawkins also said that his office was commemorating Black History Month with screenings, exhibits in galleries, and other collaborations. He ended by saying that the dates for Jazz/Reggae Festival had been set for Memorial Day weekend, and would be held on Sunday, May 28 and Monday, May 29. Hawkins said that the theme this year would be the Festival’s 20th Anniversary. He said that there would be receptions preceding the event honoring certain members of the administration.
- Sassounian told Hawkins how excited she was about the whole thing.

Financial Supports Commissioner – Ryan Smeets
- Smeets said that they had finished the financial aid workshops last week, and would be working on new projects in the coming weeks. He said that the turnout had been low thus far, but they were hoping to get better turnout for the FAFSA workshops. Smeets also said that they were looking into creating an endowment.

Academic Affairs Commissioner – Michelle Sassounian
- Sassounian said that the Academic Supports Campaign for pre-med and pre-law was working on the program to be held later in the quarter. She said that they had just finished a massive survey of physicians, and wanted to get that information to first and second year students. Sassounian also said that the AAC was looking at the issue of academic freedom and the Bruin Alumni Association paying students to turn over their notes or tapes about liberal professors. She said that it had sparked a debate on campus about the role of professors on campus, and she had attended a panel/teach-in on the issue. She said that she had been unimpressed, as it had digressed into a liberal/conservative debate. She said that she was looking into creating an Academic Senate forum on the issue, and her office would be looking into how professors could be protected in the classroom. Sassounian also told Council that the USIE courses were going along well, and she had seen the syllabi from several of the classes.
- Doan suggested that, if Sassounian needed help with the pre-professional programs, she might want to talk to the alumni association.

Community Service Commissioner – Farheen Malik
- Malik said that Battle of the Bands had been a big hit, with $15,000 raised. She said that it had gone very smoothly, and she was still wrapping up the details from it. Malik said that she was also working with the Mayor’s office, and they had expressed interest in the upcoming appreciation week for the CSC service directors. She also said that they were working on the service record, and hopefully it would be going to the administration soon. Malik said that Week 8 was planned for Advocacy week, and she would also be working on involvement through the arts. She lastly said that the CSC alumni were forming a group that would advise the current CSC projects.

External Vice President – Jeannie Biniek
- Biniek said that tomorrow the House of Representatives would vote on Budget Reconciliation. She said that one of the representatives from Michigan had changed his vote to “no”, so now by her count they were down to needing only two more votes. Biniek said that her office had made 39 calls today on Bruin Walk, and hopefully she would have good news to report in 24 hours. She said that the next campaign had gotten started last week, and she would tell Council more as it developed. Biniek also said that there had been a training session for USSA last weekend, and it was cool to see that USAC was a part of something larger. She said that the Student Regent selection was also coming up. Biniek said that if anyone was interested, it was a two-year appointment, and it was a great opportunity. She also said that there would be an AIDS walk for
women and children on April 22nd. Biniek said that this was an annual thing, and she was hoping to have the turnout from last year doubled.

**Internal Vice President – Kristina Doan**
- Doan said that she had sent out the appointee evaluation form today, just to see what they were all up to. She said that they also wanted to emphasize shared governance, and asked for feedback about whether or not the students were being shut out by their committees because they were students. Doan said that she had asked for all of the evaluations to be turned in during the next week. She said that she was also working on the USAC concentrations, particularly the one on sustainability. Doan said that if anyone had feedback on what they were doing regarding outreach to the hill to let her know so it could be included in the newsletter.

**President – Jenny Wood**
*President Jenny Wood’s Officer Report is attached to the Minutes.*

**Questions and Comments followed Wood’s Report.**
- Kaisey asked how the Grassroots Organizing Weekend went, to which Wood said that it had been really positive and productive. Kaisey asked how often they came to campus, to which Biniek replied that the last one held at UCLA had been two years ago.
- Tuttle asked what the National Society of Collegiate Scholars was, to which Wood said that it was an honors organization which also performed service.

**XI. Old Business**

**B. Campus Community Concentration Discussion**
- Kaisey said that she wanted updates from offices on how they were doing on their concentrations. She said that her office was working on the South Campus Activities Fair to try to target that population better.
- Hawkins said that his office was trying to work with as many different groups on campus as possible to promote the Jazz/Reggae Festival.
- Biniek said that her office had begun updating the Student Action Network weekly.
- Hawkins said that the Students Arts Festival would be a much larger event this year than it had been in years past.
- Vardner said that with the Bruin Defense Force, they had shown a movie at night with amplified sound and had gotten no complaints from the neighbors. Tuttle asked him how he had monitored the sound, to which Vardner said that he had walked some distance away until he could not hear it. Tuttle suggested that Vardner document this for future councils.
- Hawkins said that his office was also working on the Hip Hop Explosion.
- Kaisey asked Council to update her by email if there were any other happenings.
- Vardner told Council that he would be meeting with Housing to talk with them about attracting third and fourth-year students. He also said that they were working on creating alumni events, and said that one of the reasons that alumni were hard to find were because there wasn’t much for alumni to do here on campus.
- Kaisey said that her office had also created a calendar of upcoming events, passed it out to Council, and asked that they let her know if anything needed to be updated. She told Council that Kaminsky was also working on handouts for Welcome Week asking for donations, and she was working on putting together a very professional looking packet.

**C. Sustainability Concentration Discussion**
- Vardner told Council just what sustainability was, and gave them a broad definition to the effect of meeting the needs of today without sacrificing the needs of tomorrow. He said that this was very hard to accomplish, but realistically it was just a simple progression. Vardner said that there would always be more people, so humanity would have to figure out how to produce more while using the same or less. He said that a popular approach was the Blended Value Theory, in which organizations would produce output that is more than economical.
- Tuttle asked Vardner if the market recognized the Blended Value Theory, to which Vardner said that some years ago the Dow Jones had formed a Sustainability Index, which had consistently outperformed the Dow Jones index.

- Vardner said that Environmental Value was about Eco-Efficiency. He said that this was doing more while using less. Vardner said that there were many student-initiated programs, and listed a few of them for council. He said that there was a new recycling program for students on the hill, which could potentially include recycling bins in rooms and a competition. Vardner also said that there was a campus communal farm program being discussed, which would include the establishment of a campus farm that could potentially use campus-grown foods in the dining halls. Vardner said that students were also working with Santa Monica Sustainable Works to educate businesses about sustainability. He also said that two solar panels had been put on Boelter hall, and they were going to see how much electricity they generated. Vardner said that the new bike center would also encourage students to ride their bikes, by offering cheaper repairs and by developing a bike path around campus.

- Tuttle asked Vardner if there was going to be a bike loan system initiated, to which Vardner said that it was planned for Spring Quarter.

- Vardner said that ASUCLA was also looking into making purchases based on sustainability. He said that a lot of these efforts were spearheaded by the Campus Sustainability Committee. Vardner said that there were a lot of things that Council could do to help with Sustainability. He said that this included using motion sensors in offices, turning off computers when not in use, and encouraging more recycling. Vardner said that a challenge facing UCLA was that the attitude on campus was wrong. He said that they wanted to make efficiency and less waste a daily priority, changing the campus culture. Vardner said that in the future, underway projects would be continued, existing policies and procedures would be changed, and campus awareness of sustainability would have to become a priority.

- Smeets suggested making SOOF applications electronic, and Doan suggested reducing cover pages on reports.

- Keesler suggested that someone try to pressure the county of Los Angeles to create a county-wide recycling program with curb-side pickup, like they have in many other counties in Southern California.

XII. Announcements

- Wood said that there would be a state of education address next Wednesday by the director of education. She also said that she would be appointing the members of the USABOD Programming Committee at next week’s meeting.

- Kaisey said that there would be an AIDS mobile testing unit on campus on Thursday.

XIII. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

Villasin passed around the attendance sheet.

XIV. Adjournment

- Vardner moved and Sassounian seconded to adjourn.

- Biniek called for Acclamation. Wood asked if there were any objections to approval by Acclamation. There being none, the meeting was adjourned at 10:13 p.m. by Acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker