UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION COUNCIL

August 23, 2006
417 Kerckhoff Hall
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Araabi, Caba, Cendana, Dehar, Doria, Kaisey, McLaren, Nelson, Park, Price, Sargent, Saucedo, Schuster, Tuttle, Williams, Zai

ABSENT: Jang, Malik, Dr. Berky Nelson

GUESTS: Heather Gonzales, Andy Green, Steven Ly, Sherlyn Mossahebfar, Terry Pang

I. A. Call to Order
- Kaisey called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

B. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

The Attendance Sheet was passed around.

II. Approval of the Agenda

- Dehar, Price, Park, Doria, Zai, and Schuster asked to be added to the Officer and Member Reports.
- Park removed the Special Presentation on the University of California Students Association (UCSA) and United States Student Association Campaigns.
- Kaisey removed the appointment for the Student Affairs Budget Review Director. She also said that she would be doing the Presidential Appointments before the Academic Senate Appointments, as her appointees were present and Schuster’s were not.
- Price moved by General Consent and Caba seconded to approve the Agenda as amended.
- Kaisey asked if there were any objections to approval by General Consent. There being none, the Agenda was approved, as amended, by General Consent.

III. Approval of the Minutes

There were no Minutes this week.

IV. Special Presentations

There were no Special Presentations this week.

V. Appointments

*Presidential Appointments
- Park said that Council should stop this farce of an appointments process, as it was being manipulated to appoint only Bruin United supporters, and said, for that reason, that no appointments should be brought forward at this time.
- Caba said that a lot of outreach had been done, and she felt like, after looking at the applicants that had been chosen, they were all supporters of Bruins United. She additionally said she thought Kaisey should have reached out to the organizations that had been working on these issues. She said that all the points she had made about the Presidential Appointments could be applied to Schuster’s Academic Senate Appointments.
- Kaisey said that the issue there had not been enough advertisements run about the positions had not been previously brought up, and this was the first that she was hearing any concerns about that. She said that she had asked all members of USAC to outreach to the committees that were being referred to, and said that this outreach had apparently not been done by the very people who were now complaining. Kaisey said that she had honestly tried. She said that she outstretched her hand, but she was instead shot-down. She said that she had done her best to select for appointment the best individuals from the applications that she had received. Kaisey said that this was the result of being politically blocked in the past, and she was hurt that Council members thought that she had not tried. She reiterated that she had tried, but that she had been rejected. She lastly said that nobody on Council had gotten in touch with her with their suggestions.

- Saucedo said that Kaisey had not been talking to any of the campus committees, and said he felt she was abusing her presidential privilege. He said she had not met with certain committees that the Bylaws specifically dictated that she was to outreach to, and talk with. He said it was ridiculous that she was going ahead and doing what she wanted by brushing off these committees and the applicants that they could offer to the list of possible Presidential Appointees.

- Kaisey replied by saying that she had gotten in touch with the Campus Sustainability Committee, and she would not be going forward with that appointment until further discussion with them. She said that perhaps she had not taken the first step with that committee, but she had been receptive to them.

- Schuster said that he had been criticized for having his appointments buried in the application process. He said that if that was the case, then all of the USAC offices were guilty of that. Schuster said that he had received an enormous amount of applications, and had done his best to select the best applicants.

- Araabi said it was very clear to him that all of Kaisey’s nominees had only one thing in common, which was that they were all Bruins United supporters. He said that they were unqualified, but had been selected for appointment only because of their political affiliation. Araabi said that three of the four individuals forwarded for the Student Health Advocacy Collective (SHAC) had absolutely no experience with student health whatsoever. He additionally said that the only qualification the appointee for the Student Activities Center Board of Governors (SACBOG) had was that she played basketball on their courts. Araabi said that all he saw was an effort by Bruins United to expand their political base on the UCLA Campus.

- Kaisey said that it was simply wrong to say that all of these individuals came from a Bruins United base. She said that, for example, she had done a lot of work to try to bring in transfer students, who didn’t know where Kerckhoff was on the campus, let alone have any political affiliation. Kaisey said that with the SACBOG appointment, the appointee’s qualification was that she would be able to bring USAC’s perspective to the SACBOG. She said that with the Student Initiated Access Committee (SIAC) appointment pending, her nominee had not worked with the SIAC, but he was someone whom USAC could work with and who would represent USAC’s interests and concerns to the SIAC.

- Doria said that Council had a great advantage this year because no slate had a majority on USAC. He said that, for any vote to go through, at least one of the Independents on Council would have to vote in favor, and to say that the appointees were unqualified would be a slap in the face of the Independents to say that they were all in Bruins United’s back pocket.

- Cendana said that Doria should work on his math, because there were only five Students First Slate Members on Council. He said that he had given Kaisey the benefit of the doubt, and had actually spent time defending her to his slate-mates. Cendana asked why she had been overlooking highly qualified candidates and was, instead, appointing individuals because they were with Bruins United. He said that the Students First members of Council would not be able to vote for these nominees, and that they would not stay at the meeting, either.

Immediately after Cendana’s statement, Samir Araabi, Marivell Caba, Gregory Cendana, Tina Park, and Carlos Saucedo left the meeting.

Council lost quorum at 7:20pm
- Kaisey explained to the remainder of Council and its guests that she had been working with Students First to compromise as they had done with her on the last appointments. She said that Cendana had not been willing to compromise on one single appointment. Kaisey said that she simply did not know what to do.

- Tuttle said that last year a Council member had walked out of the meeting to break quorum. He said he mentioned this to point out that this type of action could be destabilizing. Tuttle said that political blocking by breaking quorum was a very high profile thing to do. He also said that this government did not exist within a vacuum, but was rather interwoven with many other entities. Tuttle said that the danger of intentionally breaking quorum was that the behavior would spread like a fever. He said that his recommendation was to not play this game. He said that it was not a favorable legacy to leave and, while one could not control the behavior of others, one could control one’s own behavior. Tuttle lastly noted that sometimes in negotiations, it was useful to balance the room by inviting individuals on each sides of the caucus to participate.

- Kaisey said that was specifically what they had all done. She said that Cendana had, in fact, been the most open-minded, and they had been working together toward a compromise. Kaisey said that anyone he would have brought into the room would only have further polarized the discussion, and thus made it more difficult to reach that compromise.

- Tuttle said that it is very hard to be the leader of a sub-caucus group when there are people who are so firm in their positions. He additionally said that one of the advantages of a large and powerful government was that there were always more appointments to help even the score. Tuttle said that each side might have a couple of appointments that they really wanted, and they might need to find additional spots, or possibly add some, to even things out. He said that his final suggestion was that, if there was to be no meeting tonight, he encouraged the President to reach out in the time between this and the next meeting.

- Williams said that he was a businessman, not a politician, and while he was not as convinced about this whole qualification issue, saying that, personally, he thought that most of them were pretty equally qualified, he understood that there were certain positions that each slate wanted over others. Williams said that his recommendation was to split up the appointments. He said that he was not sure why this process had become so personal with everyone. Williams recommended that they all sit down together again, find out which appointments were appointees were most important to each slate, pick the appointees, and make this happen.

- Kaisey said that she had tried all that already. Zai backed up Kaisey’s statement by saying that she had been working very hard to make this happen.

- Williams said that they should all just put a bunch of index cards on a table with the name of every appointment and then divide them equally. He said, however, that if either slate was saying, “Appoint all of our people or no quorum,” then there was a definite problem.

- Doria pointed out to Council that a Committee of the Whole could exist for ten minutes if there was no quorum in existence.

- Tuttle said that the question was whether or not there was a time limit on how long there could be a Committee of the Whole, to which the answer was probably “yes”, though he was not sure what that time limit was. He said that if the people who had walked out were congregated somewhere in the area, then perhaps they could be reasoned with and brought back into the meeting. Tuttle said that the President might want to consider calling this part of this discussion closed, and pursuing it elsewhere away from the table. He said that perhaps Council should try to reconvene in 15 minutes. Tuttle reminded Council that the fulcrum for any discussion should be the president.

- Kaisey called the meeting to a short recess in order to try to re-establish quorum.

Council went into recess at 7:35pm

Council returned from recess at 8:07pm
- Kaisey called the meeting back to order at 8:07pm.
- Doria said that, since Council had been unable to reestablish quorum, perhaps they should talk away from the table and then try to reconvene a week later.
- Doria moved by General Consent and Schuster seconded to recess until Thursday, August 31st, at 6:00 pm.
- Kaisey asked if there were any objections to recessing by General Consent. There being none, Council was recessed until Thursday, August 31st, at 6:00 pm.

_Council went into recess at 8:11pm on Tuesday, August 23rd._
Council returned from recess on Thursday, August 31st, meeting as a Committee of the Whole. The members of Council who were present and who counted for quorum were Ravi Dehar, Shaun Doria, Marwa Kaisey, Joline Price, and Nat Schuster. Also present were Heather Gonzales, Andy Green, Steven Ly, Pat McLaren, Kim Menaster, Sherlyn Mossahebfar, Dr. Berky Nelson, Todd Sargent, Dr. Rick Tuttle, and Bob Williams.

- Kaisey called a meeting of a Committee of the Whole to order at 6:12 pm on Thursday, August 31st.
- Kaisey explained to everyone present that the two slates had talked through the whole appointments mess. She said that the meeting was designed to be one in which they would talk about the issues and figure out where to go from there. Kaisey said that she had gone there willing to compromise with Cendana and Park, but she said that she had been given an ultimatum to pull all of the Presidential and Academic Senate Appointments or there would not be quorum at the next meeting. She said that she had proposed doing all of the non-controversial appointments at the present meeting and pulling the others, but that had not been an acceptable option either, aside from the fact that Students First wouldn’t even declare which appointments were important to them. She said that this had left the two sides at a stalemate, and said that she felt like she was facing both an ultimatum and an unwillingness to compromise. Kaisey said that things were starting to suffer, such as progress on the Muslim and Jewish Student Groups’ combined efforts, which had fallen through due to a lack of communication. She said that, at this point, she wanted to get some feedback from the members of Council who were present on what to do next.

- Dehar said that he had the unique position of being unaffiliated with either group, and he said that he could potentially meet as a moderator between the two slates. (As an aside, he said with a sly smile on his face, that, for those who were interested, he did accept bribes and gifts.)
- Kim Menaster, Malik’s representative at the meeting, told Council that she worked with the LAPD, and said that they were currently in mediation with the ACLU. She suggested that Council might want to consider bringing in an outside mediator to help resolve the problems.
- Nelson said that something similar had happened last quarter and, while he had not had the opportunity to talk with either side, he had made an observation. He said that he was curious about what areas the other slate was not willing to compromise on, and which they were. Nelson said that, in the past, the division had been over appointments to the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) and the ASUCLA Board of Directors (BOD.) He said that this year, however, the contested positions seemed to be about completely different committees or boards.
- Kaisey said that she actually did not know which ones were the most contested, as she had not been given a list of priorities. She said that when she had tried to create a list of the non-contested versus the contested ones, she had been unable to do so.
- Nelson said that he would guess that, given the diversity of the students coming in, the Students First slate might see SIOC/SIAC as a preserve for them. He said that other committees that had to do with enrollment might also be of special interest to members of the Students First slate. Nelson said that with other things where appointments seemed to be strictly political, it seemed to him that these positions seemed to be less about politics and more about survival. He said that there were groups of people who had not being given access to the University who potentially made up the constituency of the Students First Slate, and perhaps they were holding out on an issue of survival. Nelson stressed that he was just speculating and making an observation, and had not actually talked to anyone about this.
- Kaisey said that she understood why these were such sensitive committees and why those positions were important, so she had not hard-lined to get her people on those groups. She said that all she had wanted to do was to have Students First present their preferences to her. Kaisey said that she had been told by Students First that it was the process that they were unhappy about, She said this didn’t make sense to her because these were all Presidential Appointments, which all go through the ARC interview and evaluations, and which are then presented to Council which has the option to approve or disapprove them.
- Nelson asked if Students First wanted assurance that their appointees got voted in.
- Sargent said that Students First knew that, if Council met quorum, Students First members realized they didn’t have enough votes to vote down a nominee they did not like.
- Kaisey said that she had asked them to offer her a compromise in return but they had not even given her that.
- Williams said that he would go back to the suggestion he made last week. He said that the problem was that Students First didn’t have enough votes to get someone through. Williams said that they were protecting themselves from being in a situation in which they could lose the vote. He said that he thought there should be a list of all the appointed positions and of all nominees so that each side could just pick who they wanted. Williams said it seemed as though nobody even had a grasp on who wanted what. Kaisey again said that she had tried to present that suggestion, but Students First had not been willing to work with her.
- Sargent said that members of Students First with whom he had spoken said that they didn’t feel as though they had been respected at the table. He said they felt that they had a right to certain positions and, as of now, there didn’t seem like to be much room for compromise.
- Williams said it seemed to him that Council was playing with fire because, if Council didn’t move forward with appointments, then the Chancellor could take those appointments away from USAC and make them himself.
- Schuster said that he didn’t buy into the whole “preserve” issue. He said that there was one seat on SIAC, and he thought it wasn’t about the vote, but about the fact that it is a stipended position. Schuster said he thought that this was also the issue regarding SACBOG. He said that nobody on the campus was being kept out of committees, and it was his opinion that it was just about Students First trying to work the Daily Bruin, make Kaisey look bad, work the student body, and try to give their constituents stipended positions which they could also list on their résumés. Schuster said that this was the third meeting where he had tried to get the Academic Senate Appointments taken care of, and his office was being stalled because of the inaction of Council and the political blocking by Students First.
- Nelson said that it seemed that there was a lot of speculation going on. He said that he was concerned about the students, and said further that he was also beginning to get the impression that Students First would rather see everything go down in flames than to lose certain committee positions to Bruins United.
- Kaisey said that there were appointments that Bruins United had been blocked from for years, and they wanted the right to get some of those positions now.
- Tuttle said that it seemed as though there was considerable agreement that there were 3 or 4 or 5 positions that spoke to the fundamental values of the Students First members. He said that this was the very art of politics, and the goal was to try to work something out together. Tuttle said that the other side seemed to be pretty determined. He said that there would be some opportunities at their upcoming retreat to talk things out. He said that this was a political division not unlike the current division in the country. Tuttle suggested that Council should relax a little about this matter and see what could be worked out at the retreat. He recommended thinking more globally; beyond the scope of just the appointments under discussion. Tuttle also suggested reopening the search to include other people on campus who could potentially make both sides happy.
- Kaisey said that she wanted to work with Students First, but she also didn’t want to reward their behavior of bullying the rest of Council.
- Tuttle said he thought it should be recognized that, while this was inconvenient, Students First was exercisng its political right. He said that this was the card they were playing, and this was hardly a position of dominance that they were acting from, but rather a faction that was acting out of deep concern. Kaisey said that she believed they had another card they could play, which was for them to talk to her.
- Schuster said, in response to Tuttle’s comments, he felt some of the statements being made at the table that were a insulting to both the students who were present at the table as well as to those who were absent. He said that it was improper to pigeonhole members of a given slate as all holding the same beliefs. Schuster said that it was also inaccurate to call Students First the strong-willed ones, as Bruins United shouldn’t have to play nice just because Students First is playing rough. Schuster pointed out that there were eight seats on SIAC and four undergraduate seats on SACBOG, and that there was plenty room for both slates to make appointments and compromises.
- Dehar told Council that another thing he could try would be for him to talk to Jang since they were both Independents and try to figure out why Students First was doing this. He said that he and Jang together could always make a majority vote along with Students First, so if they could convince him and Jang that Kaisey’s candidates were unqualified then they could always be voted down.

- Tuttle responded to Schuster that he must be doing something right if he was insulting both sides, but he said that Schuster had gotten right to the point of the issue. He said that if there were productive and legitimate discussions on these issues, then progress could be made. Tuttle said he felt that there was hope to be had in the recognition that the values of people on both sides were important.

- McLaren asked if the University still had an Ombudsman and asked if this issue would be an appropriate one for them to hear. Nelson said that it did, and said that there was an entire office dedicated to that purpose. McLaren asked Nelson how quickly he thought Council could get an appointment with the Ombudsman’s office. Nelson said that he thought it could be done rather quickly if Council was interested in pursuing that option.

*Assistant Budget Review Director*

- Cabrera said that the Student Organizations Operational Fund (SOOF) Hearings were beginning on September 7th, and said that the Budget Review Committee was going to have problems in meeting quorum for approximately ten time slots. For that reason, she was asking Council to appoint an Assistant Budget Review Director at tonight’s meeting so that the BRC could ensure having quorum for every session. She said that, based on the number of SOOF applications submitted last year, she expected that they would receive in the range of 100-120 applications. Cabrera then introduced Terry Pang, a fourth-year economics major. She said she believed that Pang would be an unbiased appointee because he is not affiliated with any particular student group. She said she thought that he would make an excellent Assistant Budget Review Director (ABRD) because of his related experience.

- Price asked Pang if he had any experience with the SOOF process, to which Pang said that he did not have experience with it on campus. Pang said that, at his job, however, he dealt with project proposals all the time.

- Kaisey asked how Cabrera had found Terry Pang. Cabrera said that she had found out about him through Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) and through the business fraternity.

- Doria asked how Pang was familiar with the funding process if he had not done anything with SOOF before. Pang said that he was not familiar with the funding process on campus, but he was familiar with the funding process in general.

- Kaisey asked Pang what he thought student groups used their funding for, to which Pang said that he thought it was for student clubs.

- Schuster asked Pang exactly what he did at his job, to which Pang said that he dealt with accounts, proposals, time sheets, accounts receivable and accounts payable, and other things as well.

- Doria asked Pang how long he had been at UCLA, to which Pang said that he had been at UCLA since his freshman year.

- Kaisey asked if Pang was affiliated with any student groups, to which Pang said that he was in the music club.

- Schuster asked what groups Pang had been Treasurer of. Pang replied the Anime Club, the Robotics Club, and intramural sports.

- Doria asked if Pang had a Facebook profile, saying that he had tried to find Pang on Facebook so he could read his profile before the meeting. Pang answered “no”, and then said that he did not support cyber-stalking.

- Schuster asked Cabrera how many applicants she had talked to, to which Cabrera replied that she had talked to a couple of people.

- Kaisey asked Pang to spend a lot of time learning about the Budget Review Committee and particularly what his responsibilities would be if he were appointed as ABRD, and she asked that he do this prior to the time that Council would be voting on whether or not to appoint him.
VI. Fund Allocations

The Contingency Fund Allocation Recommendations are attached to the minutes. Owing to a lack of quorum, Council could not take action, therefore, the Finance Committee Chairperson, Michael Miller, had no other option than to consider them as Discretionary Funding.

VII. Officer and Member Reports

Academic Affairs Commissioner – Nat Schuster
- Schuster said that this year the AAC was going to have counselors at the Student Activities Fair. He said that his first-year-initiative individual was recruiting counselors from around campus to come to the fair to meet with new students. Schuster also said that he would be trying to branch out to other campuses to collaborate on academic issues, and he would be touching base with Loyola-Marymount University (LMU) and the University of Southern California (USC).

Campus Events Commissioner – Ravi Dehar
- Dehar said that, in the coming weeks, he would be asking Council for money to cover the Bruin Bash deficit, and would update them on that later. He said that the Fall film calendar had also been printed.

General Representative #2 – Joline Price
- Price said that she was working very hard on mental health issues, and told Council that there would be a Mental Health Fair on October 18th. She said that she had also met with the Office of Residential Life and would be coordinating efforts with them, including creating passive boards for the Resident Advisors to oversee.

Chancellor’s Representative – Dr. Berky Nelson
- Nelson said that he had been talking with Kaisey about the new Student Activities Guidelines. He said that nobody needed to read the whole document, but said that there were certain things that had to be taken care of and the revision of these guidelines was one of those things. Nelson explained that, under the new rules, things could be done through affiliation, which would allow for USAC to support other groups. He also said that there would no longer be a non-discrimination statement. He said it had been decided that CSP would no longer require a signed Statement of Discrimination, but said that funding bodies could still require such a document. Nelson asked Council to please look especially at issue #3 when they reviewed the document.
- Kaisey asked why the non-discriminatory clause had been taken out. Nelson said that there was no longer a designation between Officially Recognized Student Organizations (ORSOs) and Independent Groups, but rather there would only be Registered Student Groups. He said that they could not prevent groups from forming if they discriminated, but they could withhold funding if groups discriminated.

President – Marwa Kaisey
President Marwa Kaisey’s Officer Report is attached to the Minutes.
Questions and Comments followed Kaisey’s Report.
- Nelson said that the international student position had actually been filled by an administrator from Fullerton.
- Price said that it might be good to get more than just the presidents of the student governments together from the different universities. She also said that she thought it might be interesting to have a joint meeting with the USC Student Government during Blue and Gold Week.
- Schuster said that there was some real value in talking to people at other schools, as they could go in on speaker circuits together to save money and time and do things that couldn’t be done by just one campus.
VIII. New Business

Retreat Discussion
- Kaisey passed around sample agendas for the USAC retreat. She said that she had split up the facilitation of the retreat such that every member of Council would get to facilitate one part of it. Kaisey asked if each person could try to look up some information on what they would be teaching the rest of Council. She asked if anyone still had an Action Agenda Form that they had not given to her, to which Doria said that he would get his to her by the end of the night.
- Dehar asked how the Action Agenda Items worked, to which Kaisey said that Council would select just a couple of them and that they would select a large number of focus items.
- Nelson said that the earlier Council left campus for Arrowhead, the better, because there were no street lights and it was dark at night. He said it was also a good idea to get back to campus before dark.
- Dehar asked why the leave times were so scattered. Price explained that someone who was scheduled to ride with Dehar probably couldn’t get here any earlier.

IX. Announcements
- McLaren said that she had several different forms to give to Council, such as Key Request Forms and an information sheet on how to access the Voice Mail System. She asked if they would like her to distribute them at the table, or to have them in their Retreat Binders. Kaisey liked the idea of having them in the Retreat Binders. Steven Ly, Kaisey’s Office Manager, said that he was making 30 binders for the retreat, so said that if McLaren gave him 30 copies of each form, he would insert them. McLaren then handed USAC’s Parking Permit Application Forms to Kaisey so Kaisey could issue them to those who wanted to purchase a parking permit.
- Doria moved and Price seconded to adjourn until 9:00 pm on Monday, September 4th.
- McLaren pointed out that, since Monday, September 4th was the Labor Day Holiday, the building might be locked at that time.
- Tuttle asked what the point of the planned snap-count meeting was, to which Doria said that the appointments were time-sensitive and, with that meeting time it was guaranteed that the rest of Council members had to be around since they would all be returning to campus from the retreat.
- Nelson said that there were a lot of activities planned over the weekend, including a football game and USAC’s three-day retreat. He said that he didn’t know what kind of success there was going to be unless Council could guarantee that everyone was going to be there. Nelson said that the meeting sounded contingent to him on how well the bonding activities went at their retreat.
- Schuster said that his problem was that he would be leaving on Tuesday, the 5th, to begin his staff retreat, and he needed to have his Academic Senate Appointees in place before the Academic Senate’s first meeting which was scheduled for September 15th.
- Kaisey pointed out that, if Malik and Jang came to the meeting, then Council would have quorum, in which case Students First would have to come to the meeting or risk the appointments all going through without them being present to vote at all.
- Tuttle asked if the intent was to continue this meeting and pick it up where this one left off, to which Doria said that it was. Tuttle said that he was worried about having the meeting on Monday, because everyone was going to be tired after a long weekend.
- Nelson suggested that this be done at the retreat itself. He said that it would be most efficacious to get everything worked out at the retreat and then conduct the actual vote when Council got back to campus after the retreat. Doria said his concern with that suggestion was that the retreat was not an open meeting, as students could not attend.
- Kaisey said that she would make a special effort to talk with everyone about appointments before and during the retreat.
- McLaren said that she was concerned about the transparency issue. She said that to meet at 9:00pm on a holiday without due notice to any student entities might be viewed as less than full transparency.
- Tuttle said that if it is stated that a meeting is open ahead of the date of that meeting, then it was such. He said that if Council preferred, the meeting could also be scheduled pending the agreement of the President. Tuttle said that his impression was that Nelson and Kaisey were
talking about some kind of notice going to the parties who had left the previous Council meeting. Kaisey said that was all fine, but pointed out that the reality was that Council could meet quorum without any Students First members in attendance.

- McLaren asked if the current meeting was an open meeting, to which Kaisey said that it was and that she had emailed the Daily Bruin to let them know.

- Tuttle said that this was a tough call as to whether or not to schedule this meeting on Labor Day night.

- Kaisey said that she had not heard any other options. Tuttle said that Council could meet at 6:00am on Tuesday before Schuster left for his staff retreat.

- Dehar said that that was a problem for him and for other Council members who had jobs that they had to go to during the day.

- Schuster said that he didn’t think anyone would take USAC seriously if they were in total gridlock until the beginning of the school year. He said that it was unfortunate that it was the only time the meeting could be held, but USAC could do this.

*The Committee of the Whole decided to try to reconvene, as a Council, on Monday, September 4th, at 9:00 pm.*
Council reconvened on Monday, September 4th. All elected members of Council were present, in addition to Andy Green, Steven Ly, Dr. Berky Nelson, and Dr. Rick Tuttle.

- Kaisey called the meeting of August 23rd back to order at 9:13 pm on Monday, September 4th
- Kaisey reminded Council that they were still working on the same Agenda, and reviewed what would be gone over at the meeting. Kaisey said that she would be pulling the Presidential Appointments for the Campus Sustainability Committee and SIAC in order to revisit applicants for those positions and to have discussions with the respective committees. She also encouraged Council to Call the Question on the upcoming appointments because many of these candidates had already been discussed at length.

X. Appointments (continued)

*Presidential Appointments

Chancellor’s Enrollment Advisory Committee (CEAC)
- Price moved and Schuster seconded to approve the appointment of Cindy Fang to the Chancellor’s Enrollment Advisory Committee.
- Park reiterated her earlier concerns that Fang had not displayed any knowledge of the actual committee to which she was being appointed. She added that there were more qualified candidates, one in particular being D’artagnan Scorza. She said that Fang’s application was not stellar and said that the in-meeting interview had also not convinced her of Fang’s qualifications for this position.
- Araabi said that in Fang’s application, there seemed to be no reference to the diversity issues affecting UCLA, which was particularly important in light of the recent admissions crises taking place at UCLA.
- Schuster said that there was a misrepresentation being perpetrated regarding Fang’s application, as Fang was incredibly qualified for the position and had a lot of experience working with USAC and the administration, the key example being the Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (USIE) Program. He said that Fang was prepared to work with the new Chancellor as she had experience working with the administration in addition to her numerous other qualifications.
- Doria said that it would be very advantageous to have Fang on this committee since she had such a strong relationship with Schuster and they would be working together.
- Cendana said that in Fang’s interview, he had been displeased by her answer to his concerns about the admissions numbers of Black students at UCLA. He said that she had presented the issue as being about yield, which he knew was not the only issue at hand.
- Schuster said that he had every confidence that in the next cycle of admissions, things were going to be very different. He said that there were changes in the admissions procedures that would be exercised for the first time, and then yield would come into play to help improve those numbers still further.
- Price moved and Schuster seconded to Call the Question on the motion to approve the appointment of Cindy Fang to the Chancellor’s Enrollment Advisory Committee.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the motion to approve the appointment of Cindy Fang to the Chancellor’s Enrollment Advisory Committee with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Council voted not to approve the appointment of Cindy Fang to the Chancellor’s Enrollment Advisory Committee with a vote of 4 in favor, 8 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Committee on Instructional Improvements Program (CIIP)
- Schuster moved and Price seconded to approve the appointment of Jen Lorp to the Committee on Instructional Improvements Program.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Jen Lorp to the Committee on Instructional Improvements Program with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
Student Activities Center Board of Governors (SACBOG)
- Kaisey said that Julianne Ahdout had a lot of experience working on various committees involved with funding, and would be an excellent addition to the SACBOG.
- Price moved and Schuster seconded to approve the appointment of Julianne Ahdout to the Student Activities Center Board of Governors.
- Araabi said that he understood wanting to appoint someone with a USAC perspective, but did not think that was worth sacrificing knowledge about the Student Activities Center (SAC) itself. He said that she had self-admitted no experience with the SAC other than playing basketball on its courts.
- Kaisey said that she would not have forwarded Ahdout if she had not been qualified, and said that Ahdout had fielded all of Council’s questions excellently during the meeting that she had been present for.
- Price said that she thought it was good that Ahdout would be speaking on behalf of USAC since there were three other seats on the board that were filled by non-USAC undergraduates.
- Doria said that he had gotten the impression that Ahdout had a perfect understanding of all the activities that took place within the SAC, and understood that the primary issue there was space, for which she even had ideas about how to address.
- Cendana said that he understood the reasoning behind wanting someone who had a USAC perspective, but he felt that it was important to understand the historical context of the SAC and which groups filled it.
- Park said that by appointing Ahdout, Council was overlooking other applicants that were much more qualified. She said that one individual in particular was a building manager in the SAC who had been on the committee last year.
- Schuster made a Point of Order that these were the Presidential Appointments, and that it was both rude and improper to discuss other applicants in contrast to those selected by the President for appointment.
- Park said that she simply felt it necessary to point out that there were other qualified applicants.
- Schuster said that he thought it a shame that these discussions had been postponed so long after the applicants had been present at the meeting. He said that Ahdout had answered all of the questions posed to her by Council perfectly, with the exception that she didn’t know exact dates. Schuster said that she knew about the projects in SAC and, while Ahdout may not have been involved with any of those projects, that was a good thing, as she would be a representative of USAC on that board.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Julianne Ahdout to the Student Activities Center Board of Governors with a vote of 6 in favor, 6 opposed, 0 abstentions, and Kaisey voting in favor to break the tie.

Drug Free Schools Committee
- Doria moved and Price seconded to approve the appointment of Clinton Jang to the Drug Free Schools Committee.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Clinton Jang to the Drug Free Schools Committee with a vote of 7 in favor, 0 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

Eating and Activities Taskforce
- Schuster moved and Doria seconded to approve the appointment of Addar Weintraub to the Eating and Activities Taskforce.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Addar Weintraub to the Eating and Activities Taskforce with a vote of 7 in favor, 0 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

Financial Aid Policy Committee
- Doria tried to make a motion to approve both candidates, but Tuttle explained that with appointments like this the vote should be split into doing the two separately.
- Zai moved and Saucedo seconded to approve the appointment of Evan Parzych to the Financial Aid Policy Committee.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Evan Parzych to the Financial Aid Policy Committee with a vote of 5 in favor, 1 opposed, and 6 abstentions.
- Zai moved and Price seconded to approve the appointment of Manuel Alex Moya to the Financial Aid Policy Committee.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Manuel Alex Moya to the Financial Aid Policy Committee with a vote of 6 in favor, 0 opposed, and 6 abstentions.

**Student Conduct Committee**
- Cendana moved and Price seconded to approve the appointment of Danielle Malvini to the Student Conduct Committee.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Danielle Malvini to the Student Conduct Committee with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
- Price moved and Saucedo seconded to approve the appointment of Heather Gonzales to the Student Conduct Committee.
- Araabi said that for Gonzales, the Student Conduct Committee wasn’t even one of her three choices. Kaisey said that Gonzales had re-applied after Kaisey re-opened the application process, and it had been Kaisey who had accidentally attached the first application instead of the second.
- Park moved and Araabi moved to table the motion to approve the appointment of Heather Gonzales to the Student Conduct Committee until her correct application could be produced for Council.
- Council voted to table the motion to approve the appointment of Heather Gonzales to the Student Conduct Committee until her correct application could be produced for Council with a vote of 7 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Kaisey asked if the motion had been that the appointment gets automatically taken from the table when the application is available. Tuttle suggested recessing for enough time to review the application and then voting.
- Doria moved to make a Special Order of the Day for an automatic 5-minute recess to be taken once Heather Gonzales’ application was made available so that it could be reviewed.
- Park said that this all seemed unnecessary and lengthy.
- Doria withdrew his motion for a Special Order of the Day.

**Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC)**
- Schuster moved and Zai seconded to approve the appointment of Sherlyn Mossahebfar to the Student Fee Advisory Committee.
- Araabi said that he had sat in on the ARC meeting with Mossahebfar, and said that, while she had been very passionate about the position, it seemed like she really didn’t know what SFAC did or what she would be doing on SFAC. He said that it really seemed like Mossahebfar didn’t know what she would be doing on that committee, and this was clearly one of the most important committees, so background knowledge and understanding seemed very important.
- Price said that she had also sat in on the interview, and said that she had gotten a very different impression. She said that Mossahebfar had been very enthusiastic and excited about the committee, and also seemed to have a thorough understanding of precisely what SFAC does.
- Kaisey said that Mossahebfar really did her research. She said that Mossahebfar had read the charter, read old minutes, and had also talked to people about the position.
- Cendana said that it was his former seat on SFAC that Mossahebfar was taking over, and it seemed to him like she still didn’t have a good grasp of what the committee does and how she would function as a member of that committee. He said that he didn’t feel comfortable with her replacing him.
- Doria said that he had also been at the interview, and it seemed like Mossahebfar really understood the committee and what her role would be.
- Miller said that he had been at the interview, and he had personally thought that Mossahebfar seemed very qualified and enthusiastic.
- Zai said that Mossahebfar had a very impressive background and also had specific ideas about how to reach out to students and do other things in the position. She said that she had been very impressed with the applicants, though Mossahebfar had been the most impressive.
- Araabi said that nobody had seemed to disagree with the same opinions he was voicing when he stated them immediately following the interview itself, and added that he had asked Mossahebfar three times what she would be doing on the committee, to which she had never been able to muster a decent answer.
- Saucedo asked what the ARC decision had been on Mossahebfar, to which Cendana said that they had recommended Mossahebfar’s appointment with a vote of 2 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Cendana moved and Price seconded to Call the Question on the Motion to approve the appointment of Sherlyn Mossahebfar to the Student Fee Advisory Committee.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the Motion to approve the appointment of Sherlyn Mossahebfar to the Student Fee Advisory Committee with a vote of 9 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
- Council voted not to approve the appointment of Sherlyn Mossahebfar to the Student Fee Advisory Committee with a vote of 4 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Transportation Services Advisory Board
- Zai moved and Jang seconded to approve the appointment of Steven Ly to the Transportation Services Advisory Board.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Steven Ly to the Transportation Services Advisory Board with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Price moved and Cendana seconded to approve the appointment of Seth Wulkan to the Transportation Services Advisory Board.
- Araabi said that in contrast to his recent negativity, he wanted to interject how qualified and well suited to the job Wulkan was.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Seth Wulkan to the Transportation Services Advisory Board with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

University Recreation Advisory Board
- Price moved and Schuster seconded to approve the appointment of Alex Budak to the University Recreation Advisory Board.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Alex Budak to the University Recreation Advisory Board with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 4 abstentions.
- Schuster moved and Doria seconded to approve the appointment of Howard Lin to the University Recreation Advisory Board.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Howard Lin to the University Recreation Advisory Board with a vote of 9 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Student Conduct Committee (continued)
- Steven Ly told Council that he had returned from Kaisey’s office with Heather Gonzales’ application.
- Doria moved and Zai seconded to untable the motion to approve the appointment of Heather Gonzales to the Student Conduct Committee.
- Council voted to untable the motion to approve the appointment of Heather Gonzales to the Student Conduct Committee with a vote of 6 in favor, 4 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
- Doria moved and Schuster seconded to take a 10-minute recess to review Heather Gonzales’ application.
- Council voted to take a 10-minute recess to review Heather Gonzales’ application with a vote of 10 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Council went into recess at 10:01pm
Council returned from recess at 10:11pm

- Kaisey called the meeting back to order at 10:11 pm.
- Kaisey reminded Council that they were still working under a motion on the table.
- Saucedo said that from the edited application, it did not seem like Gonzalez had been interested in the Student Conduct Committee, and there was only one line in which she even referenced the committee itself.
- Doria said that seven lines from the bottom of the application, one could see that Gonzales had experience with Mock Trial. He also said that, while most of what Gonzales had written had been pertaining to her first choice committee, it still seemed like she had the skills and experience needed to serve on this committee.
- Cendana said that he had spoken with Gonzalez on the phone about this committee and he had not been impressed.
- Council voted not to approve the appointment of Heather Gonzales to the Student Conduct Committee with a vote of 4 in favor, 8 opposed, and 0 abstentions.
- Doria said that he hoped Council might reconsider the applicant if more information were available pertaining to the specific committee. Cendana said that he would not, as her lack of preparation for the appointment indicated that she was equally unprepared for the committee.

*Academic Senate Appointments*

**Undergraduate Council**

- Schuster said that he would start off with the Undergraduate Council. He said that this committee worked on everything having to do with the undergraduates. Schuster said that this year the committee would also start working on Get Out the Vote. He said that for each of these committees, he had hand-picked the individuals specifically based on their diversity of experience both in USAC and on campus.
- Tuttle asked if this would be the arena in which to bring up things like the issue of the undergraduate business major and minor. Schuster said that was something to be talked about elsewhere, but Tuttle suggested that it would be a good idea to be heard in this forum.
- Schuster said that this committee was another great example of undergraduate direction. He said that the committee that had talked about the undergraduate business program had made an advisory petition to the Anderson School of Business. Schuster said that the first person he was forwarding was Drew Petersen. He said that Petersen was on a first name basis with Judy Smith, had worked on ECP, and was the head of academic policy in Schuster’s office among other things.
- Schuster moved and Doria seconded to approve the appointment of Drew Petersen to the Undergraduate Council.
- Araabi said that it didn’t seem like Petersen had a lot of relevant experience. He said that one of the listed experiences was that Peterson had taken a year off to appreciate what students really did, which did not seem to apply at all.
- Steven Ly said that Petersen was incredibly qualified for this position. He said that Petersen knew about the GE Cluster Issue, transfer issues, the ECP issue, and still others.
- Schuster said that it should be noted that Araabi thought that it was a bad idea for individuals to take a year off of class to get involved on campus, which was ludicrous. He said that Petersen had focused very hard on academics in his first year, and was now hitting them hard again in this, his third year, after being very involved during his second year.
- Doria read from Petersen’s application to demonstrate his knowledge and understanding of the position.
- Cendana moved and Doria seconded to Call the Question on the motion to approve the appointment of Drew Petersen to the Undergraduate Council.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the motion to approve the appointment of Drew Petersen to the Undergraduate Council with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Drew Petersen to the Undergraduate Council with a vote of 7 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
- Schuster said that his second appointee to the Undergraduate Council, Adar Weintraub, had been working on the business minor and was also working on other issues in the Academic Affairs Office. He said that she had actually been working in both the EVP’s office and the AAC, and her ability to work well with both students and administrators would make her well-suited to be USAC’s liaison to the Undergraduate Council.

- Schuster moved and Zai seconded to approve the appointment of Adar Weintraub to the Undergraduate Council.

- Park said that it seemed like all four of the candidates seemed to have an area of focus, but two of them seemed to be focused on the business minor, while none were focused on the admissions issue. She also noted that Weintraub had been inconsistent as a staff member of the EVP office.

- Cendana said that he had a concern because if Council was trying to expand their base to include more students, it seemed unreasonable that an individual could be appointed to both a Presidential Appointment and an Academic Senate Appointment. Schuster replied that by that reasoning, anyone who worked in a USAC office should not have an additional appointment. He said that the Academic Senate was to the Academic Affairs Commission as UCSA and USSA was to the External Vice President’s Office.

- Kaisey said that if Weintraub was voted down for appointment to the Undergraduate Council because Council Members had concerns about her availability, then she would ask Weintraub to step down from the Eating and Activities Task Force, and then bring her back to the table for appointment.

- Council voted to approve the appointment of Adar Weintraub to the Undergraduate Council with a vote of 5 in favor, 5 opposed, 2 abstentions, and Kaisey voting in favor to break the tie.

- Schuster said that his next appointee to the Undergraduate Council was Kay D’Souza. He said that D’Souza was working on the USIE Program, and said that the administration really liked what was has happening with that. He said that D’Souza was also very qualified in other regards and had a lot of leadership experience on campus. Schuster said that she had shown a lot of initiative on campus.

- Schuster moved and Price seconded to approve the appointment of Kay D’Souza to the Undergraduate Council.

- Council voted to approve the appointment of Kay D’Souza to the Undergraduate Council with a vote of 8 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

- Schuster said that his fourth, and final, appointment to the Undergraduate Council was Ed Wu who would be the representative for South Campus on this committee. He said that Wu had served as a SHA, and as a student supervisor on campus, and would also be working on South Campus policy in the Academic Affairs Commission office. Schuster said that Wu had experience and even specific ideas about things he wanted to see done.

- Schuster moved and Doria seconded to approve the appointment of Ed Wu to the Undergraduate Council.

- Price asked what Schuster was doing on South Campus. Schuster said that AAC was working on grading policy on South Campus, making it easier to change majors on South Campus, and some other campaigns as well.

- Council voted to approve the appointment of Ed Wu to the Undergraduate Council with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

**Committee on Planning and Budget**

- Schuster said that Parsa Sobhani had spent so much time in this office it had been surprising that she had actually not been on this committee. He said that Sobhani had a lot of experience dealing with the flow of money and with allocation of SARF and AAC Mini Grants. Schuster said that Sobhani had been the Academic Affairs Commissioner at her high school, and that her wide ranging experience in high school was very impressive.

- Schuster moved and Price seconded to approve the appointment of Parsa Sobhani to the Committee on Planning and Budget.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Parsa Sobhani to the Committee on Planning and Budget with a vote of 8 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

- Shuster said that his second appointee to the Committee on Planning and Budget was Bryan Park who has been working very hard within the AAC, and lately has also been working on the AAC retreat. He said that B. Park also had experience working on the hill with students and with the administration.

- Schuster moved and Saucedo seconded to approve the appointment of Bryan Park to the Committee on Planning and Budget.

- Council voted to approve the appointment of Bryan Park to the Committee on Planning and Budget with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS)

- Schuster said that Alex Budan’s application was the single most impressive one that he had gotten from any of his staffers. He said that Budan had experience with advocacy, standing up for students, and striving above the status quo. Schuster said that Budan was also the founder of The Den, and worked on Academic Policy with a goal to go into the field of Academic Policy after college. He also said that Budan had conducted actual research on admissions numbers, and would be recognized by the faculty as bringing that academic experience and information to the committee.

- Schuster moved and Price seconded to approve the appointment of Alex Budan to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools.

- Park said that she had already talked to Schuster about this matter, but wanted to state here at the meeting that there had been another candidate who was probably one of the most knowledgeable persons on campus and perhaps in the state about the major issue that CUARS will be dealing with in the coming years. She said that this issue was not going to go as smoothly as Council thought it might, and it was important to have an appointee who was well prepared to handle that.

- Doria made the Point of Order again that it was not pertinent, and it was also disrespectful to the president and the rest of Council, to bring up other candidates during appointments.

- Price said that she had been very impressed by the application, and said that Budan had even had to apply on an appeal in order to sit on this committee. She said that she saw him as someone who could speak on behalf of all students.

- Araabi said that he considered this the single most important appointment, and said that he had very strong reservations about Budan. He said that in the application, there was absolutely no mention of the diversity crisis, and not even diversity at all, let alone the very numbers that were receiving national attention.

- Doria said that he was excited to see that Budan took a holistic approach to admissions, as this was something that he had heard as a call for from students on campus.

- Schuster said that not only was it disrespectful for Park to bring up another applicant, but Park’s applicant’s application had been turned in very late, and long after Schuster had made his decision. He also said that his approach was to have two appointees to this committee that had very diverse opinions. Schuster said that Budan took a holistic approach to admissions, while Melvin Jimenez, the co-appointee that he would be bringing forward next, had a very diversity-based approach.

- Cendana said that he kept hearing people talking about representing the student voice, but the very students who needed to be spoken for were those who were being kept out of the university, not the ones that were already in and comfortable.

- Price said that if Council did not represent the student body as a whole then they did a disservice to the students who elected them to Council.

- Schuster said that Jimenez be giving a voice to the students who were not being admitted to UCLA. He said that with Budan and Jimenez together, there would be voices looking at both the problem and at the solution.

- Doria said that looking at the experience Budan had with his research on K-12 admissions, combined with his review of admissions policies, made him very well-suited to this position.
- Schuster said that it was important to have that research background because CUARS meetings centered on looking at admissions numbers and reports. He said that Budan had founded The Den, had worked on the Senior Cabinet, and also had other areas of involvement on campus.
- Araabi said that he had been bothered by the fact that, in Budan’s application, there had been no connection drawn between a holistic approach and the diversity crisis. He also said that he did not feel that working in The Den was pertinent to the diversity crisis that was plaguing the university.

Araabi moved and Cendana seconded to Call the Question on the motion to approve the appointment of Alex Budan to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools.

Council voted to Call the Question on the motion to approve the appointment of Alex Budan to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Council voted not to approve Alex Budan to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools with a vote of 4 in favor, 6 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

- Doria moved and Price seconded for a 5-minute recess of Council.
- Council voted not to take a 5-minute recess with a vote of 4 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Committee on Intercollegiate Athletes
- Schuster said that Boris Lipkin was an athlete on campus, and also had experience as an EVP on his residence hall floor.
- Schuster moved and Cendana seconded to approve the appointment of Boris Lipkin to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletes.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Boris Lipkin to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletes with a vote of 11 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Committee on Teaching
- Schuster said that Kelly Haddigan had been the organizer of the Golden Paw Award last year, and she had applied for the Committee on Teaching.
- Schuster moved and Price seconded to approve the appointment of Kelly Haddigan to the Committee on Teaching.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Kelly Haddigan to the Committee on Teaching with a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

Library Committee
- Schuster said that Stephanie Chang had worked in the library.
- Schuster moved and Malik seconded to approve the appointment of Stephanie Chang to the Library Committee.
- Park asked what Chang’s interest was with the Library Committee, as it was always one of the stranger committees that people applied for. Schuster said that he honestly didn’t know, but she applied for it, she was the only applicant for it, and that was that.
- Council voted to approve the appointment of Stephanie Chang to the Library Committee with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

*Assistant Budget Review Director

- Kaisey said that Terence Pang had been at the Committee of the Whole meeting on August 31st, and, speaking frankly, said that he seemed grossly unqualified. She said that she would not feel comfortable appointing him permanently, but they did need someone to sit in on the SOOF hearings this week in order to establish quorum at every session of the hearings which begin in four days from now. Kaisey said that she would suggest appointing Pang to fill the position until he could be replace by someone with better qualifications.
- Price said that, as she understood it, the ABRD could only be counted toward quorum when the Budget Review Director (BRD) was absent. She said that she thought that Cabrera, the BRD,
could attend the next two weeks of hearings, but she would be absent sometime after the next USAC meeting during which Council could appoint an ABRD.

- Kaisey asked exactly when Cabrera was leaving on her trip, to which Miller said that she was leaving on September 18th, and that there would be a USAC meeting the day after she left, on September 19th.

*After some informal discussion, it appeared that there was no urgency for an ABRD to be appointed at this meeting.*

- Cendana moved and Doria seconded to table the appointment of the Assistant Budget Review Director.

*Council voted to table the appointment of the Assistant Budget Review Director with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.*

*Academic Senate Appointments (continued)*

**Education Abroad Committee**

- Schuster apologized for forgetting one of his appointments. He told Council that Haddar had a lot of experience, an international focus, and travel study experience.

- Schuster moved and Cendana seconded to approve the appointment of Haddar to the Education Abroad Committee.

- Schuster apologized for the application not being attached to the Agenda packet or brought to the meeting, and said that he could try to get it.

- Price moved and Zai seconded for Council to take a 5-minute recess.

*Council voted to take a 5-minute recess with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 abstentions.*

**Council went into recess at 11:09 pm**

**Council returned from recess at 11:14 pm**

- Kaisey called the meeting back to order at 11:14 pm.

- Schuster said that he had been unable to get the application, and that he would hold off on the Haddar’s appointment until the next meeting.

**XI. Old Business (continued)**

***A Resolution In Support of Fostering Dialogue on Campus Regarding the Middle East Conflict between Israel and Arab and Muslim Nations***

- Schuster said that this issue was something that he thought, as leaders, USAC had the unique position to support dialogue between two groups who traditionally didn’t dialogue. He said that there were speakers that were going to be in Northern California in October, and they would be coming down to UCLA afterwards. Schuster said that they had also made a recommendation of other groups that might be brought to UCLA to talk about this issue. He then passed out some programming ideas to Council.

- Doria moved and Zai seconded to approve the Resolution In Support of Fostering Dialogue on Campus Regarding the Middle East Conflict between Israel and Arab and Muslim Nations.

- Schuster said that the Resolution in the packet was the revised edition. He said that the paragraph talking about students disinterested in dialoguing had been taken out, and some other minor changes had been made that were suggested at the last meeting where the Resolution had been discussed.

- Park said that the big thing in the resolution to talk about seemed like the last clause. She said that it seemed like it was pointed toward the role of USAC, and she was uncomfortable with solidifying that role. Park said that she would like to vote for the resolution, but would not be able to do so because of that last clause.

- Price asked what Park’s specific concerns were with the last clause, to which Park said that she disagreed with the role of USAC as it was outlined in the clause. Price asked if Park was in favor of taking controversial stances over being an “honest broker.” Park said that it was all very vague, and she would be in favor of just cutting the clause out altogether.
- Saucedo said that he was a little confused about the last clause as well, as it was very subjective about what stances USAC could and could not take on various issues.
- Schuster said that the key thing to read was that USAC should not take stances on controversial issues which would jeopardize their ability to bridge two communities together. He said that he thought everyone understood what an “honest broker” was.
- Andy Green said that when there were issues that divided communities on campus, and then the student government took a stance on one side of a given issue, it alienated one of the two groups. Green said that USAC had the ability to bridge groups, and said that the previous resolution had offended and alienated many members of the Jewish community on campus.
- Zai seconded Green’s feelings, and said that Council needed to hold them to a higher standard and prevent the breakdown of communication lines among groups on campus.
- Araabi said that this issue had come up the last time the resolution had been brought up, but asked if the resolution was about setting precedent on what USAC did about the conflict in the Middle East, or was it a response to the last resolution. He said that the resolution seemed to be scattered, and he would like the opportunity to all meet and work on the resolution to iron out some of the issues.
- Schuster said that the resolution was a response to members of the community, encouraging them to participate in inter-group dialogue. He said that this was about the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, about the Iran issue, about the Lebanon Conflict, and about everything. Schuster said that he really hoped everyone would come to see his speakers and films, as this was something that this Council could do to identify and address a very important issue on campus.
- Park said that it had been mentioned that every issue could be divisive, and to pass the resolution as written would imply that Council would not be able to take a stance.
- Price said that the Resolution said that USAC could sponsor debates, but not that it would. She also said that she fundamentally disagreed with Park, and said that one of the greatest things USAC could do would be to promote dialogue among student groups. Price said that efforts done here at UCLA would be carried out into the world by these individuals upon graduation.
- Price moved and Doria seconded to Call the Question on the motion to approve the Resolution In Support of Fostering Dialogue on Campus Regarding the Middle East Conflict between Israel and Arab and Muslim Nations.
- Council voted to Call the Question on the motion to approve the Resolution In Support of Fostering Dialogue on Campus Regarding the Middle East Conflict between Israel and Arab and Muslim Nations with a vote of 7 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.
- Cendana moved and Park seconded to instead close the speakers list after the addition of Zai with each speaker being allocated 30 seconds.
- Nelson said that everybody probably recognized that students were going to talk about issues, but what he saw as problematic with the last clause was that it was unclear and should perhaps be rewritten.
- Saucedo said he thought it was problematic to set precedent that USAC could not take stances on political issues.
- Schuster said that he might suggest changing the last clause to be pointed toward this given issue.
- Schuster made a friendly amendment to make the last clause read, “… honest broker on this issue.”
- Tuttle said that last year he and Neesby had come to the realization that authors could not make friendly amendments in that way as, once a motion for approval was on the table, the resolution became the property of the body.
- Schuster moved and Jang seconded to make the last line of the resolution read, “…honest broker on that issue.”
- Kaisey asked if there were any objections to making the last line of the resolution read, “…honest broker on that issue.” There being none, the resolution was so changed.
- Schuster moved and Price seconded to reopen the speakers list.
- Council voted not to reopen the speakers list with a vote of 4 in favor, 6 opposed, and 2 abstentions.
- Doria said that he thought the amendment to the last clause weakened it, and he did not like that it was being weakened to appease a minority on Council.
- Arrabi said that he liked it, as it made the resolution pointed toward the Middle East issue. He said that there were actually a lot of problems with the resolution, and he personally thought that it needed to be reworked before being voted on.
- Kaisey said that she thought the amendment weakened it but, if that was what it took to get the resolution passed, then she thought the amendment was worth it.
- Schuster said that, as opposed to feeling that the amendment weakened the resolution, he disagreed, saying that he thought it now met everyone’s needs.
- Zai said that even Council itself was divided on the issue, but she felt that Council had to preserve the diversity of student opinion.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution In Support of Fostering Dialogue on Campus Regarding the Middle East Conflict between Israel and Arab and Muslim Nations, as amended, with a vote of 6 in favor, 5 opposed, and 1 abstention.

XII. New Business (continued)

*Resolution Recognizing Connie Foster, Head of Dining Services*

- Price said that she, Schuster, and Cendana had worked closely with Connie Foster from Dining Services on the campaign for Kosher and Halal Food on the Hill.
- Schuster said that he had recently found out that Foster has cancer, and said that the resolution was to thank her for everything that she had done.
- Price moved and Jang seconded to approve the Resolution Recognizing Connie Foster, Head of Dining Services.
- Cendana said that he wanted something concrete to come out of the resolution, and his suggestion would be the USAC line item, which would allow for the $1,300 surplus from the retreat to go toward a gift for Foster.
- Ly said that he had recently found out that account was closed, so that was no longer an option.
- Schuster said that he thought the resolution, itself, might be the best gift.
- Council voted to approve the Resolution Recognizing Connie Foster, Head of Dining Services, with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

XIII. Announcements (continued)

- Kaisey said that the next meeting would be on Tuesday, September 12th at 7:00 pm. Cendana asked if it could be pushed back until 8:00pm due to Resident Advisor training. Price said that she didn’t think the RAs would be able to attend that evening at any time. Kaisey said that the meeting would still be at 7:00 pm.

XIV. Signing of the Attendance Sheet

_The Attendance Sheet was passed around._

XV. Adjournment

- Park moved and Dehar seconded to adjourn.
- Kaisey asked if there were any objections to adjourning. There being none, Council voted to adjourn at 12:01am with a unanimous vote of 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

XVI. Good and Welfare

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Keesler
USAC Minutes Taker