

Date: 10/05/2013

Participants:

San Diego

- o AS (Present)
- o GSA (Present)

Irvine

- o AS (Present)
- o GSA (Present)

UCLA (Absent)

Riverside

- o AS (Present)
- o GSA (Present)

Santa Barbara

- o AS (Present)
- o GSA (Absent)

Merced

- o AS (Present)
- o GSA (Absent)

DRAFT

Berkeley

- o AS (Present)
- o GSA (Present)

Davis

- o GSA (Present)

Santa Cruz

- o AS (Present)
- o GSA (Present)

San Francisco

- o AS (Absent)
- o GSA (Absent)

Meeting starting and ending times:

Start: 9:32 AM

End: 7:38 PM

Meeting location or format:

Riverside

Facilitator(s): Safeena, Louise

DRAFT

Note taker: Lewis

Agenda Item	Notes	Action item(s)
Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve. Second. Approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda Approved
Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve. Second. Approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes Approved
Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President – Not Here • Board Chair - hiring • Secretary Finance Officer - budget • Campus Reports: • UCSD: Vanessa – Finalized who will be sitting on board • Also vote of no confidence on Napolitano • Merced: visit, letter of concerns • UCLA: Resolution on Napolitano; started as no confidence, but became a resolution regarding student concerns • Merced - Worried about Napolitano and ways to pass resolution • Berkeley AS – prop 13 reform; had to table reform due to campus problems; looking at Napolitano issues; and want campaign reform • Berkeley Grad – will not pass no confidence at this time, but will down the line • AS UCSB – senate had Napolitano resolution, but tabled due to some language; will follow up ASAP • Santa Cruz – IGNITE Campaign 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Reports – sent out; Bridget & Paul • UC Student Regents – met on Monday with Napolitano; did not say no to undocumented demands; interested in diversity pipeline; retention center at UC Merced; conference call regarding Fossil Fuel divestment campaign • Council on Student Fees – council meeting 1st time same weekend October 19-20 in Santa Barbara; preparing agenda at the moment • Council of Presidents - Absent • Office of the President - Absent 	
Liaison Elections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USSA Liaison • Labor Liaison • Orders of the day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aja Campbell new USSA Liaison • Labor Liaison Tabled.
President Napolitano Discussion and Resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASUC Resolution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resolution sent out is the Berkeley file (SB 02.pdf) ○ Motion to cap speakers' time to 1 minute. Vote. Failed. ○ Vanessa: General consensus of council at UCSD – Napolitano not fit to lead UC; want a detailed UCSA resolution; reasoning for no confidence vote: because of past as Secretary of Homeland Security, she is not fit for leading the mission statement of the UC; some demands were time sensitive and passed, but there are additional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reprioritize the questions: 2 to 1, and rewrite 1.

demands

- Holly: How does Napolitano's performance in her prior role affect her job as UC President?
- Eliot: Vote of no confidence before she has taken position makes no sense; doing her job in her prior position shows she can do a job.
- Ivan: as there are profits made from retention centers, and that statistics on retention of low level & non-criminals are high, then a vote of no confidence demonstrates the lack of confidence in a person doing their role
- Brianna: someone with experience was chosen; as for no confidence vote, seems to be separate conversation
- Holly: confusion; if we want someone to fill role effectively, but then before that person can do their job vote no confidence in that person, then we aren't giving them a chance
- Sana: Due to fear of certain groups of people created over time, there is a lack of respect for these groups and students
- Maryssa: when hiring individual, one looks at track record; what is important is how job is performed and what is carried out in that job; fact that she met with students was admirable,

but seemed more like a publicity stunt (i.e., making her image look good); transparency is an issue and UCSA should continue to take a stance on that; fulfilling UCSA mission

- Ash: people have been confusing things; US has problems with immigration policy and good idea is UCSA wants to follow up on these issues, but laws are in place and cannot be picked and chosen; as far as selection goes, no confidence cannot be given to those who are applying for a job, but rather to the employer (Regents); responsibility lies on employer, in this case Regents; vote of no confidence pushes Napolitano back rather than bringing her to the table; even if meeting with students is a publicity stunt, cannot blame someone for trying to fix her image
- Jefferson: feels Merced has a lot to gain from relationship with Napolitano; strong advocate for voter reform; she did her job well per her prior job description, so we can only hope she does her job well with her new job description
- Alex: ASUCSB senate along with forum, although generally dissenting views, but public and senate perspective is the transparency of the process;

student body is in favor of selection process reforms; would like to see action from board in today's meeting since all schools are now in session.

- Jen: board is split, so uncertain if productive to have a consensus on her taking role; likes Ash's point of turning tables to Regents and selection process
- Louise: staffed the student advisory committee; drafted letter so that UCSA will be consulted on process, which will be sent out soon; only people allowed to see the short list are the UC Regents
- Aja: huge division on Riverside campus among students; we should focus on the regents
- Safeena: yield time to UC Regent Sadia – Napolitano is a career politician, and when there is pressure against politicians, they make an effort; strategically look at how UCSA is operating because we are a political body, with lobbying power, so consider pressure
- Ivan: pressure we have been giving is interesting because of press and action by Napolitano to meet with students; the more pressure we give, the more she wants to meet with us; although we are a political organization, it is important to see

who is and is not being represented, i.e., what about those voices near us and those voices not being heard; would like to see formally written statements explaining choices

- Andrea (yielded): putting pressure on Napolitano got a meeting with her; expressing dissent does not destroy relationship but it creates conversation; wants UCSA to be an ally to undocumented students and would like to see action taken by the board; we want support.
- Seeing someone with an educational background and not do too well, it is disconcerting to see someone without an education background in that position
- Darcie: conversation around transparency; but one thing not said yet is where as our student regent voted against Napolitano, we had a student regent last year and voted for her; going to regents now will give them the opportunity to look at prior student regent board who voted in favor of her.
- Motion to continue 15 minutes then check. Second. Passed.
- Max: How do we go forward working with this person? Should be some kind of action to send a

message to the board of regents.

- Maryssa: agree with Darcie's point; we should follow up with Jonathan Stein; question to Louise: when committee makes these decisions, how limited or confidential are things?
- Louise: Extremely
- Maryssa: following up, we should address the fact that we had an issue with his voting of Napolitano and lack of transparency; perhaps reforming appointment process; we are elected by students, for students, and meeting with Napolitano via applied pressure works
- Ash: putting pressure on politician works; it's how we do it is the problem; what we have done may have brought her to the table, but a vote of no confidence would just stop her from meeting with us; she did great in her prior job according to her job description, so it stands to reason she will do great via her new job description; as we are elected representatives, it is our choice on where to go
- Vanessa: some things should be in a resolution; the board must say something, since not saying something says something; UCSA must ensure that, as a coalition, we support and advocate

for those demands; at last regents meeting Kareem and Vanessa got to meet chair and vice chair, but it's hard because of confidentiality agreements; a conversation must be had first; hearing that Napolitano was elected via the news is a slap in the face considering students were supposed to be involved; conversation on student regent reform may be necessary.

- Alex: we are talking about two things: 1) no confidence in Janet Napolitano, and 2) lack of transparency to what students want and how regents select a president; this must be addressed, and we should talk about a resolution such that the regents make the process more open to students; what can we do today to make things better for students in the future when this comes up again?
- Safeena: 10:55 AM right now; we have some on speakers list, but perhaps moving to action items on this after exhaustion
- Jen: caution using appointment as a political strategy; students who have a problem with Napolitano have made their opinions heard, but there is no consensus on the board; regental reform has been a large issue for years, so what is

the mission of this board?

- Sana: yielded to UCR student – demands to Napolitano kept getting similar response, i.e., “I’ll look into it”; she is thick skinned, so UCSA needs to take some action
- Tyler: to Louise - what is the composition of the student advisory committee?
- Louise: UCSA board’s discretion on format of committee although usually leadership from all campuses, some automatic spots, but applications are solicited
- Safeena: Berkeley senate looked at undocumented community demands and made a timeline wherein if they would not
- Brianna: how long do they wait to release information regarding UC president?
- Safeena: end of speaker’s list –
 - We need to say something specific
 - Separate idea of separating process and no confidence
 - No confidence in Napolitano
 - No confidence in Regents
 - Focusing on regental reform
 - Issue statement explaining actions
 - Discuss composition of committee

- How we can gain political position as a board

- Darcie: suggestion on what would we want in a resolution?
- Ivan: focus on questions asked, what we would like to be asked? Following up per campus on issues will show we are united.
- Alex: lack of accountability; we can mostly agree that the process by which she was selected isn't something we really want; this will happen again, so we should do something about it to make sure it's easier for future generations.
- Louise: this happened back in 2007, and nothing happened so action would be helpful
- Alex: we should make a list of questions and give disclaimer that we will be asking questions as she visits questions
- Vanessa: likes ideas, we need time to sit on this and address this; question about meetings; each campus has different needs and questions about Napolitano, so it would be great to put on UCSA site which questions were asked and what answers were given as well as correlating with IGNITE campaign; as for resolution, seems we will

not take a stand per se, but overall the transparency and process of regent reform is important

- How does board feel about creating separate resolutions on actions to be taken?
- Motion to break out into groups. Second, passed.
- Ash: three groups really, supporting break out for at least the two prior mentioned
- Maryssa: can we follow up on questions we will be asking Napolitano? We can be strategic working together with campuses.
- Safeena: time to work, 30 minutes, return 11:50 AM
 - Regental reform
 - Demands
- Return: sharing Google Docs when completed; 3 people working on it tonight and will be sent out tonight
- Demands: working on wording
- Revisit Demands and Letter
 - Alex: go through specific demands
- Forum Responses
 - Vanessa: Forum should stay up but maybe change questions being asked

- Move to change wording of question on UCSA website to be something along the spirit of what you would like to see from Janet Napolitano?
- Motion: to reprioritize the questions (question 2 to question 1, and rewriting 1). Seconded. Passed.
 - Ash: Question on first demand - Does Janet Napolitano have the legal authority to make the UC a sanctuary for undocumented students?
 - Maryssa: going through the Police Department is one way to do it.
 - Andrea: Napolitano would look into legality of sanctuary; when she visited Merced on Thursday she did promise she would do this; historically the president does have the historical ability to do this
 - Tony: Role of police not to stop the riots, but for the safety of the students
 - Ash: Police follow the law, not necessarily Napolitano; meshing of state and federal laws
 - Jen: maybe have someone who knows about this speak on it
 - Maryssa: still in the process of updating the documents; course on educating students would be promoting ethnic studies as well; speaking to sensitivity training, there should be some of that

	<p>but on some campuses there is no schedule of when this should be happening; this move would help make a time for when they should be training; wording is also an issue so any help is appreciated, since the wording is difficult; want UCPD to be the first contact, not outside police departments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Safeena: recommend we move onto next agenda item due to time and discuss these specific issues off the board. Would like to entertain a motion to move to lunch and system wide affairs committee. Seconded. Passed. 	
<p>Lunch and System Wide Affairs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 12:17 starts ● 1:45 ends 	
<p>Update from AFSCME</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Different phases to bargaining ● Workers side/union has the right to strike if/when there is an impasse; however, the employers only have to give a final offer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Essentially the boss ending negotiations and walking away from the bargaining table ○ For patient care workers; they took one and a half percent of their pay raise, for the others without a pay raise they took one and a half percent anyway. 	

- For service workers, they are seen as overpaid so they are given a pay cut
- Lowest paid workers in the system; over 99% are eligible for state assistance
- Most members are service staff
- Would have been worse if done in the summer
- UC is a public service; however 7 thousand executives at the UC make more than the governor; 700 more than the president
- Asking for fairness
- Currently in the middle of a contract fight, and launching bigger organization: Take Back UC
 - Things getting worse at University; widening income gap in the United States
 - Take Back UC is a bigger solution to the problem
 - Problems with the UC: Management layer hired at 5 times the rate of frontline workers
 - Faculty hiring decreases while management increases
 - 1 in 5 service workers get injured on the job as a result of unsafe conditions
 - We have not had a way to bring everyone together
- Take Back UC is a "move on.org" for the University
 - Advocates for issues above

- Positive is the ability to reach a larger audience than otherwise would be possible
- Website launched
- Two petitions launched
 - Safe staffing
 - Executive pensions
- Facebook page: 3000 people who 'Like' it.
- Website has several resources
 - Reaching out to several unions and organizations
 - Still in the beginning of Take Back UC
- Signed on: UAW 2865, Empower Patient Coalition
- Jen: Does Take Back UC have any campaigns?
 - Two petitions currently there
- Vanessa: reaching out to students, taxpayers, and patients, but what is the makeup of the steering committee?
 - Just starting, so uncertain of structure.
 - Will not be the union, but an external thing.
- For additional questions, go to the Facebook page or talk to Safeena for contact information
- Safeena: Coalition as a whole and UCSA being supportive of workers, but also of the decision-making; what would that look like
- Ivan: joining is a good idea; good way to get power,

	<p>and in spite of some disagreements we can still hold good relationships after resolving these disagreements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jen: more cautious because, while support with AFSCME is good, as it is written in the resolution how does this affect our campaigns; seems like a roundabout way to bring in UCSA into the table • Kareem: best way to move forward is to table the issue and make it an MLU • Alex: good to work together with coalition partners even if the issues do not necessarily affect AFSCME • Maryssa: in regard to the support that AFSCME wants, they haven't asked us to join in contract negotiations; still unclear what we're doing • Kelly: vague; unclear and, due to transparency, would like things to be more clear before signing on • Ash: Motion to table to UA. Seconded. Passed. • Ivan: Point of personal privilege – this happens not-so-uncommonly, so we should ask questions when they are here presenting and ask for questions 	
<p>Communications Director Media Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications Director Media Plan will be combined with UC Voice Update, as Tanay isn't here the SOCC Diversity Requirement Discussion is tabled, so we will follow up with Undergraduate and Graduate Committee Breakouts afterward. • Purpose is to walk through some things going on 	

- Updates to UCSA site, media strategy, and social media
- Job description includes communications, website, media relations, social media, campaign marketing, listserv robustness, in charge of conferences, and media relations at conferences
- Website
 - Current edits: updating calendar, contact information, and adding robustness to website
 - Transparency is an issue as well, and updating campaign summaries
 - Updating pages selected by staff as needed
 - Adding photos, campaign/committees specific pages, board of directors bios, photos, and contact pages
 - Send out bio, photo, preferred email, etc.
 - We have a blog feature so it would be good to use.
- Media strategy
 - Scheduling interviews, making sure people are comfortable with reporters, and media outreach.
- Media Plan
 - Will help inform any media/action campaign
 - Intake process, who's the audience, goal setting, deadline setting, time of execution, and draft

	<p>press material and social media content when desirable, followed by final review before execution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Press attendance at events/conferences when necessary ○ Followed by debriefing and something tangible to show we did our job well <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social Media <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Content calendar: will have content written out for conferences, events, etc. ○ Content creation: photos, videos, contact, polls, twitter chats ○ Expanding calendar: possible UC student promoted growth, expanding to new platforms and avenues ● Questions ● Maryssa: sending out to board ● Ivan: thank you for presentation ● Bridget: Update on UC Voice. Talked to web designer and authentication for each campus is necessary, so if everyone is ok with that she will go check that out. 	
<p>Undergraduate and Graduate Committee Breakouts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reconvene at 5:55 	

Date: 10/06/2013

Participants:

Meeting starting and ending times:

Start: 9:15 AM

End: 12:35 PM

Meeting location or format: Riverside

Facilitator(s): Safeena, Louise, Kareem

Note taker: Lewis

Agenda Item	Notes	Action item(s)
Personnel Policy and Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeena: EVPs were sent out personnel committee email; would like to nominate Tony, Darcie, and Jen to personnel committee. Entertaining motion to do this. • Motion, second, pass. • Safeena: Talking to UCLA about moving board meeting to Saturday versus Friday • Darcie: certain people have restrictions about traveling to board meeting (fellowships, labs) • Louise: UCSA personnel policy proposed amendments; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Personnel Policy passed. • Administrative Assistant • Updated Communications Director • Updated Executive Director • Updated Grad/Prof Issues Director Name • Updated Action Agendas to UCSA Campaigns

have not been updated since 2009; some portions not updated since 2004; worked with lawyer Margaret Murray on the policy.

- Louise: section 1 - should not be there; not the place to describe program; some parts should be specific regarding board chair.
- Louise: section 2 - disabilities and workplace harassment was not included; same with complaint procedure; copied almost identically from formal law.
- Louise: section 3 - California is an at-will state; this was not in previously
- Louise: section 4 - this was renamed to section 4; categories of employment; defines all directors and support staff (some were missing)
- Louise: for rules and management, not legal to withhold paychecks; with timesheets, exempt employees do not actually keep timesheets; ED is responsible for keeping vacation time and accrual and move accordingly to that
- Louise: for severance pay, lawyer did not want it in, but Safeena and Louise wanted to keep it in because most people do not get let go, they quit; recommended that two employees currently in that plan due to being here under those terms (longer than 1 year), so they are being grandfathered in.

- Updated Graduate & Professional Student Advocacy Director
- Updated Undergraduate Organizing Director Approved, and amended
- Updated University Affairs Director

- Aja: What does severance pay mean?
- Louise: It is for those who are let go in cases wherein we run out of money.
- Vanessa: who are the two grandfathered into the position?
- Louise: Me and Julian
- Jen: these are fine, but in exceptional cases we can arrange for severance packages
- Alex: not comfortable without lawyer consent first
- Louise and Safeena: lawyer did not want this section anyway, so we can cut this part out/re-written as desired
- Louise: section 5 - strikeouts, those sections did not exist anymore
- Louise: section 7 - pay periods, not salaries
- Vanessa: question regarding salaries and pay periods
- Louise: the board decides salaries when new employees are hired
- Louise: section 8 - health benefits, regular exempt employees start 1st day; either should be getting health benefit, or if having health benefits from other places, they should not be making a profit of it
- Louise: going to vacation time was messy; previously did not mention what would happen if hitting time; must take vacation time if hitting the cap, by hours;

same with hitting the cap with the ED, which was previously 200 hours (way too much); ED must track vacation; flex time not as relevant now; paid family & medical time was fixed, same with pregnancy and domestic partners

- Louise: section 9 - wants manuals created that specifically has processes in it; some parts of the bylaws need to be moved into the manuals; shouldn't take as much time to set up manual, but they should be taken out of the personnel policy and they need to be revised; ED evaluation should be looked at as well
- Louise: performance evaluation should be in the manual
- Darcie: second section 8 should be section 9
- Louise: numbers will be fixed
- Louise: section 10 - would set UCSA up for failure, so that was completely revamped; discipline and dismissal was still there and fixed; language was cleaned up in case of resignation
- Darcie: where does the workplace start and end for staff according to this then?
- Louise: no member of staff can go out to dinners/parties now
- Louise: section 11 - some concerns should be expressed but in a professional manner

- Louise: job descriptions left in and fixed; explicit that the president speaks for association, board members can speak for the association, but staff cannot
- Eliot: if the ED cannot speak for the association, then ED meetings need officers there to speak for association
- Louise: the ED should not enter into things or negotiate terms without consultation with the board
- Safeena: would like to entertain a motion to adopt personnel policy changes
- Motion, seconded. Vote. Passed
- Louise: Not reviewing ED and process manuals; they were cut out of the personnel policies.
- Louise: Administration Assistant – there was no job description for this position, so what they should do was first written up
- Alex: typo
- Louise: fixed
- Kelly: should we be more specific to part-time?
- Louise: we could do that but then be held to that
- Eliot: works part time as determined by budget?
- Motion to approve job description. Seconded. Voted. Passed
- Louise: moving to the Communications Director; no real changes.
- Motion to approve. Seconded, voted. Passed.

- Louise: moving to Executive Director, changes were adding fundraising duties, responsible for oversight of conferences with relevant staff, ED responsible; board coordination and communication encompasses yearly visioning plan; we don't do action agendas, we do campaigns; developing relationships with coalition partners, etc.; money updates should be monthly, such that the board knows exactly where money is each month as opposed to quarterly; continuing with financial management, that was made more succinct; as for fundraising, changed so that ED must move forward with fundraising; training and development opportunities for staff should happen; interns – controversy there, because they are not treated well traditionally, and interns should be paid minimum wage, so should we want those we need to talk about it
- Holly, Ash, Kelly: intern discrepancies, training, payment, should be fair
- Louise: agrees
- Motion. Second. Voted. Passed.
- Louise: Grad/Prof Director name change.
- Motion. Second. Voted. Passed.
- Louise: Leg Director Changes: Action Agenda to UCSA campaigns

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion. Second. Voted. Passed. • Louise: Field organizer position updates • Eliot: some discrepancies • Louise: will be fixed after approval • Motion. Second. Voted. Passed. • Safeena: entertain a motion to amend. • Motion. Second. Voted. Passed. • Louise: University Affairs Director – no content change except cut and paste of bargaining director • Kelly: Question – proportion of time allotted to certain duties • Louise: that should be re-allotted • Eliot: acronyms not spelled out throughout • Louise: being fixed • Motion. Second. Voted. Passed. • Louise: important for board to see staff expense policy; this was not there before; charge sheets will be turned in for using money 	
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget reviewed in close session 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergraduate Organizing Director salary approved • Admin Assistant bonus passed • Admin Assistant raise passed
Online education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeena: Online education should be supplemental, not replaced; Justin's suggestion was putting a form up • Tony: who gets these results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charging UA with looking at online education options

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Louise: Communications Director • Alex: not all students know what the model of online education is, so some informative method may be good before sending a survey • Bruno: who's making the decisions of the proposals? What will they look like? • Louise: many out right now; hodgepodge really, with no similarity across the board • Bruno: classroom environment concerns • Jen: start reaching out to UAW and see if TAs who have taught online courses can talk about their experiences • Tyler: distinction made with responses for someone who has taken versus someone who has not taken online courses • Vanessa: some documents on ILTA; what they've been doing is taking comments and drafting reports on this • Safeena: any motions? • Vanessa motions. • Motion. Seconded. Voted, Passed 	
Resolutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to pass the amended agenda. Seconded. Passed. • Discussion of resolutions. First the demands resolution. • Holly: due to contradictory citations and discussions that must be had, motion to table. • Motion. Second. Objected. Discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demands Resolution Passed • UCSA Presidential Hiring Process Resolution, as amended.

- Maryssa: not comfortable tabling resolutions.
- Marissa: we put forward resolutions without some citations at all, yet we table this one often.
- Brianna: we should work on this now
- Aja: how would it look if we did only the demands?
- Safeena: we would only have the demands and one whereas clause
- Holly: we would edit all the references?
- Tony: We would have the 3rd resolved clause struck?
- Safeena: clarification, we would not strike that one.
- Motion to table until November. Vote failed.
- Nilan (yielded by Kareem): we should do only resolutions
- Ivan: when folks make amendments, we should cite why (sources) and where contested validity actually is.
- Tony: 3 questions in the last whereas clause is – part c, they already have this (not true; depends on campus); part g, police departments coming in for general safety; AB540 training on issues, optional; and UC staff means how many UC workers; part h amendment proposal – staff be trained on issues
- Motion to amend. Second. Objected.
- Marissa: we should not be editing demands
- Bruno: if we only approach one part of staff and not all of them, then we need to reach all staff.

- Holly: clarification, who lists the demands?
- Safeena: undocumented students
- Maryssa: these students want UCSA to support them and their demands
- Safeena: amendment is to change H demand
- Vote on H demand. Voted. Failed.
- Tyler: would striking out everything except demands be fine?
- Andrea (yielded by Tyler): would not be comfortable with striking out all?
- Safeena: time is important so let us move on.
- Motion to end discussion. Second. Vote. Motion carries.
- Voting on resolution as presented to us.

Roll call vote:

San Diego

o AS (yes)

o GSA (no)

Irvine

o AS (yes)

o GSA (abstain)

UCLA (yes)

Riverside

- AS (yes)
- GSA (abstain)

Santa Barbara

- AS (yes)
- GSA ()

Merced

- AS (no)
- GSA ()

Berkeley

- AS (yes)
- GSA ()

Davis

- GSA (no)

Santa Cruz

- AS (yes)
- GSA (yes)

San Fran

- AS ()

DRAFT

GSA (yes)

Misunderstanding occurs in voting: abstentions are not counted in the tally.

Motion: All in favor of recalling the vote due to misunderstanding of abstentions in calling vote? Motion passed.

Roll call vote:

San Diego

AS (yes)

GSA (no)

Irvine

AS (yes)

GSA (abstain)

UCLA (yes)

Riverside

AS (yes)

GSA (no)

Santa Barbara

- AS (yes)
- GSA ()

Merced

- AS (no)
- GSA ()

Berkeley

- AS (yes)
- GSA ()

Davis

- GSA (no)

Santa Cruz

- AS (yes)
- GSA (yes)

San Fran

- AS ()
- GSA (yes)

Resolution Passed.

Motion to pass the UCSA Presidential Selection Resolution.

DRAFT

Motion to pass amendments.
Motion to adopt amendments. Seconded. Vote. Pass
Motion to pass UCSA resolution-UC Presidential Hiring Process.

Roll call vote:

San Diego

- AS (yes)
- GSA (yes)

Irvine

- AS (yes)
- GSA (yes)

UCLA (yes)

Riverside

- AS (yes)
- GSA (yes)

Santa Barbara

- AS (yes)
- GSA ()

Merced

- AS (yes)



	<p>o GSA ()</p> <p><u>Berkeley</u></p> <p>o AS (yes)</p> <p>o GSA ()</p> <p><u>Davis</u></p> <p>o GSA ()</p> <p><u>Santa Cruz</u></p> <p>o AS (yes)</p> <p>o GSA (yes)</p> <p><u>San Fran</u></p> <p>o AS ()</p> <p>o GSA (yes)</p> <p>Motion passed.</p>	
SLC Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Date for SLC.• Jen moves to reconsider April date.• Voting to hold SLC April 12-14• Vote, motion carries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SLC Date April 12-14
Important Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Entertain a motion to do 3 things:<ul style="list-style-type: none">o 1. Change calendar to reflect new March BOD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SOCC meeting moved to Saturday

	<p>meeting date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2. Change SOCC board meeting from Friday night to Saturday night • Motion to change calendar. • Discussion • Maryssa: what is the justification of changing the date of SOCC board meeting? • Darcie: some grad students cannot be there at that time • Alex: possible to split the meeting? • Jen: travel can take a long time, even from Irvine to Riverside. • Maryssa: we cannot start meeting or vote? • Louise: cannot call to order without quorum • Motion to make the meeting on Saturday. Vote. Passed. • Motion to have Irvine hosting board meeting March 1-2. Voted. Passed. • Motion to move conversation of board retreated/feedback online. Voted. Passed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irvine hosting board meeting March 1-2 • Board retreat feedback moved online
Adjourn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to adjourn. Second. Passed 12:35 PM 	