



**Date:** March 1, 2014

**Participants:**

**Meeting starting and ending times:** 9:00 AM Start; 7:00 PM End

**Meeting location or format:** UC Irvine

**Facilitator(s):**

**Note taker:** Lewis Luartz

Agenda Item	Notes	Action item(s)
Roll Call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• San Diego<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ AS (a)</li><li>○ GSA (p)</li></ul></li><li>• Irvine<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ AS (p)</li><li>○ GSA (p)</li></ul></li><li>• UCLA (p)</li><li>• Riverside<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ AS (a)</li><li>○ GSA (p)</li></ul></li><li>• Santa Barbara<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ AS (p)</li><li>○ GSA (a)</li></ul></li><li>• Merced</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 10 Present</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ AS (p)</li> <li>○ GSA (a)</li> <li>• Berkeley           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ AS (p)</li> <li>○ GSA (p)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Davis           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ GSA (a)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Santa Cruz           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ AS (p)</li> <li>○ GSA (a)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• San Fran           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ AS (a)</li> <li>○ GSA (a)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Agenda Approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda Changes; motion?</li> <li>• Motion</li> <li>• Ash: question on clarification</li> <li>• Tony: question: grad/leg/breakout switch possible?</li> <li>• Safeena: changed that way</li> <li>• Any other questions? No.</li> <li>• All those in favor of approving agenda?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul>
Minutes from Last Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any questions?</li> <li>• Motion to approve. Seconded. No Objections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• President: meetings with Napolitano last month; receptive to bill of rights; excited to deal with several issues; saying they've done a lot on mental health; claims they haven't done enough; talking about tuition models, several of which will be discussed at UA; UC Mexico project up; Jen mentions there is a website up for UC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

Mexico City; discussed letter on grad issues; has discussed allocations of money; as of Spring Irvine undergraduates will be pulling out of the association. Any questions? None. Also recalled: AFSCME settled contract with service workers; people calling in now; and Santa Barbara sexual assault issue being reviewed.

- Board Chair: sick, so did not attend Napolitano meetings; 2<sup>nd</sup> round of interviews with Staff this Tuesday; campus visit from President Napolitano happened; had a press conference for a reintroduction of a type of CMED bill into Sacramento; Jen: Question on number of candidates moving forward: 4 moving forward.
- Secretary Finance Officer: Participated in Hiring Committee; spread the word about AFSCME contract; encourage everyone to spread the word as well.
- Executive Director:
- UCR: Hundred Student March on campus; got about 30-40 students to go
- Jen: where can I find the pictures?
- Aja: Facebook
- Tony: meeting for fossil free UC; meeting with them to pass resolution; week of action in the coming week tabling, getting postcards signed, etc. In last month had

seven lobby visits.

- Maryssa: week of action on week 7; very successful. President met with governor Brown and held his own; Aja was there too, and John asked the hard questions; 12 hour long council meeting to discuss divestment on 5 companies to divest, but it failed; the DA will not touch cases involving alcohol and sexual assault, so trying to get that changed and updated
- Santa Barbara: a few students experienced violent sexual assaults this last weekend. One of the responses was to ask chancellor and vice chancellor for a formal response; liked that the response was timely; motion beforehand, but there was a resolution passed about trigger warnings and a move to get faculty and TAs to let those out early; trigger warnings are regarding sexual assault.
- Merced: voted in solidarity for Santa Barbara; had a meeting with Chancellor regarding referendums; apparently they cannot pass fee resolutions; trying to get Fund the UC shirts right now.
- Berkeley: Safeena: biggest update are Fund the UC postcards, ended up endorsing efforts regarding Prop 13; as far as sexual assault policies, having students fill out

survey to go to the audit; a big push to ensure students are filling out any information they had and/or wanted to convey; also had Chancellor send out an email on resources available on campus- these include resource centers; campus passed a bill encouraging stronger repercussions on sexual assault.

- Vanessa: had a fund the UC week of action; about 250 postcards signed; trying to plan for SLC and getting delegations planned; another one planned for next week; starting on doing a week of action around fossil free UC as they have established Earth Week; incorporating a Fossil Free UC campaign event and maybe a photo session to get publicity; talking about doing a week of campaign issues like Fund the UC postcards and legalization of Cannabis; there is a big push on sexual assault information proliferation
- Executive Director: staff reports sent out the other night; Julian is coming back though, until then Louise, Bridget and Paul will continue supporting the position until he is good.
- Bridget: sent out a newsletter; call for information will be coming out at the end of each board meeting; sending out campus specific stuff will require obtaining specific

information from campuses, so they'd appreciate that soon after the meetings

- UC Regents: just finished UC Regent application recruitment; had a tuition models meeting with Nathan; different options students are looking at were discussed; stability on whatever actions are moving forward discussed; met with Jerlena and David on new policies regarding sexual assault; a big issue for students now is when they report sexual assault, there isn't necessarily a formal investigation; trying to get more UC engagement at the federal level as well; hoping to launch UC Caucus at LegCon; reaching out to students to participate in UC Caucus; meeting with the task force during next regents meeting
- Kareem: Clarification – on UC Caucus, a mandate will come out stating that we need to take a closer look at federal issues.
- Cynthia: important for us to lobby the Provost to ensure the task force from the last meeting will return; something that needs to be done ASAP since April is only a month away; would recommend someone in leadership from last year, who is also a professional student
- Jen: is the committee then a shell committee that does

not necessarily function within the campuses?

- Cynthia: Many people like academic senate members sit on the committee, and all are expected to convey information to the academic senate; uncertain what a shell committee is.
- Justin: has list of members here and can send out to the board if that is ok
- CSF: Clara's fight was cancelled, so Louise will update.
- Louise: item on agenda later today to update the ED and CSF job descriptions in regard to their work on CSF, which is cleaning up really and info on what to do if UA director is cut; if any specific questions, feel free to email Clara
- Council of Presidents: Justin: graduate students in Council and some from Grad/Prof met with Napolitano, including issues on PTSD to which we got a reply yesterday, brought up graduate funding issues, climate issues, nonresidential tuition, and professional development; the response was fairly positive; Napolitano had Aimee Dorr attend the meeting since it's her purview; minutes are available for anyone who wants them; Council of Presidents as a whole will be meeting this coming Tuesday (including Kareem).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eric (UCOP): as heard, lot of student meetings with Napolitano; asks to be very sharp with agenda and specific with requests as Napolitano has followed up with many of them; met up with undocumented students back in February and working on a website for undocumented students; focusing on getting staff trainings together to train and raise awareness of allies; also working on undocumented student services and after review can provide comments on those; been looking at a lot of policies on sexual assault and harassment now; the policy focuses on following new federal law now and aware of state issues as well; looking forward to future revision and feedback from students; also review campus based referenda before they're voted on, so feel free to approach UCOP if want any assistance or help in reviewing referenda.</li> </ul>	
<p>May Advocacy Day</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bridget: meeting with UCOP to organize advocacy days.</li> <li>May 13-14: UCOP will be paying with travel and hotels, so the sooner you have the groups settled the better so they can book travel</li> <li>Louise: each association can bring 3 people, but know that not all will be going with 3 people.</li> <li>UC San Fran GSA: will probably have 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UC San Diego GSA: will probably have 3</li> <li>• UC Riverside ASUCR: 3 should be good, but can potentially have more</li> <li>• UCLA: wants more</li> <li>• UC Merced: needs to talk to GSA</li> <li>• When should we have a number?</li> <li>• Louise: within the next month to book travel</li> </ul>	
<p>SLC Registration Fees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deadlines and delegation forms should be in right now; reg. fees are \$155 (member) and \$175 (non-member)</li> <li>• If any questions, please ask.</li> <li>• Sean: keynote confirmed as Speaker Perez, confirmed for rally Monday; in steering committee expect agenda out shortly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p>Internship Tax Credit Resolution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Presentation in Agenda</li> <li>• See Resolution as Amended</li> <li>• Jen: Motion to amend final clause.</li> <li>• Ash: question on clarification.</li> <li>• Ivan: objection; should say "UCSA board supports a tax credit"</li> <li>• Maryssa: for longevity, keep out as many names as possible</li> <li>• Kareem: likes the idea but doesn't seem it's necessary to have permits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolution Passed</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vote. No one supports.</li> <li>• Amendment proposed. Failed.</li> <li>• Sean: tying it to a specific assembly member may upset them.</li> <li>• All in favor of amendment? Vote.</li> <li>• All in favor of passing resolution? Passed</li> </ul>	
CMED Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sean presentation on CMED</li> <li>• See CMED presentation on Agenda.</li> <li>• Tony: for the first point on student appointed issue, will there be a process for that?</li> <li>• Sean: the bill doesn't outline a process, but we'll look into it</li> <li>• Tony: at a rate set, is it a sliding scale?</li> <li>• Sean: no it's not a sliding scale</li> <li>• The more coauthors we get the better.</li> <li>• Ash: in presentation, more than 50% of the money in bill is going to higher education; is that a high number?</li> <li>• Sean: it's always revolved around education, so we want to include education as the focus, although it was divided up among other public services</li> <li>• Any questions? None. End Presentation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Governing Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CSF update is cleaning up really.</li> <li>• ED job description only anticipates the cutting of the UA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passed Updates</li> <li>• Passed Updates on CSF</li> </ul>



<p>Update* ED, UA/ CSF/ CBP Job Description Update</p>	<p>director.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any questions?</li> <li>• Safeena: intent here was talking to Clara to make sure they agreed with the changes.</li> <li>• Motion to approve or questions/amendments?</li> <li>• Motion to approve. Seconded. No objections. Vote.</li> <li>• Louise: another motion: in the case that the UA director is not rehired, the UCSA Executive Director automatically gets CSF responsibilities. Is everyone fine with that?</li> <li>• Motion to approve this. Passed.</li> </ul>	<p>Responsibilities to UCSA ED in the case of not rehiring a UA Director.</p>
<p>Recess for 5 minutes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion Passed. Recess until 10:37</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passed Recess.</li> </ul>
<p>Higher Education Report Card</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet again at 10:37</li> <li>• Tim: Grad/prof campaign from last year reintroduced; idea presented at SLC last year but report card was presented at May regent lobby visit; this year though, there's a team of computer scientists helping and now 2 months ahead of schedule; can bring these up now; taken old bills and updated the report cards; will be distributed to leg committee later, and that information will be made available to everyone shortly</li> <li>• Ash: yields time.</li> <li>• How is weight determined?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

- Tim: takes the results, value of 1-3 on breadth, 1-3 on students, multiply together; but except for issues central to student
- Jen: there should be a breakdown of how they are scored if not already
- Bridget: putting weight back up on website since it was down on the site; it will look a look better soon.
- Ivan: minor details: what was the reasoning behind including correct vote?
- Time: correct vote is how they should have voted.
- Jen: more of why correct vote was included on the report card, since it can be problematic.
- Ivan: symbolic meaning to the word correct so it may be good to discuss.
- Vanessa: going into a meeting last year, some allies were offended because they were only getting a B for example, when they are some of the biggest supporters.
- Tim: true, and it is heavily student tailored for students by students; up to leg committee to decide however
- Sean: report cards are done by many associations; suggests utilizing budget bills to soften if it is not what we want it to be through budget trailer bills.
- Justin: people may be tired of hearing about HERC and

	<p>report cards, but in responding to Ivan's point may be good to write "UCSA's Position/Vote"; HERC is a collected manifestation of what UCSA looks at and supports, with one example being that the graduate dean at Irvine goes to lobby, but report cards do impact legislator votes; the budget itself is causing tuition and services to go up directly, so it doesn't need softening; being "forced to vote" for the budget is a cop out used since they could get involved in the budget earlier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to continue challenging them and moving forward with our plans to make positive change.</li> <li>• Ivan: they still need to backup whatever they vote for, but they need to represent the constituents; not take it personally.</li> <li>• Maryssa: more for it as an incentive than pushing them, so that they want to vote that way; also as UCSA is saying this, it is not just the board but also the entire UC system and thus the entire UC system is saying they do not agree with how they voted.</li> <li>• Tim: look forward to the next report card.</li> </ul>	
<p>Systemwide Response to Sexual</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alex: gave some background in campus report, and wanted to bring topic here to see what the committees are doing; would also want a more in depth discussion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

Assaults	<p>and feedback on what UCOP is doing policy-wise; campuses need to educate their students on binge drinking; thinking that by putting up a piece of legislation similar to that of the alcohol legislation, we can have similar programs implemented on UC campuses, as well as have that spread across public institutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Safeena: floor is open.</li><li>• Tony: fortunately no reported incidents on campus this year, but last year in February there were 3-4 instances; uncertain if they happened, but they were reported and administration did speak about the importance of being safe and being with other person; campus police have taken to patrolling during critical hours, and campus trying to bring more lights to campus</li><li>• Kareem: we are doing a press release as UCSA; as for UCR, the committee on sexual harassment and violence was inactive and now being re-started.</li><li>• Amber: open letter to Chancellor Yang; some of the concerns have been with police, including brutality and violence by police; also idea of having a center for survivors; maybe also have more preventative measures to change the culture on campuses; especially since minority women are more likely to be assaulted; in</li></ul>	
----------	---	--

addition, a wanted poster on campus that has created a backlash on campus based on racial grounds.

- Ivan: administration offered a lot of resources for sexual assault, but none of these involved the issues in changing the culture of sexual harassment on campus; although there are more police on campus now, it is now internalizing fear in students; it's something to keep in mind: what resources do we have and what cultures can we disassociate while having less regulatory practices implemented (i.e., inside out rather than bringing in something from the outside to fix these problems).
- Amber: having more escorts puts the pressure on women and survivors rather than taking up the issue of changing culture.
- Safeena: way ASUC has been dividing the work is that the office of the president has taken the lead on campus and cultural programming; fostering a lot of media attention for positive campaigns; it's spread a lot of the conversation outwards; UC Berkeley students have filed suits with the university due to their mishandling of the situations; one other thing is support circles and spaces, both of which have been positive; as far as the external, they are pretty divided from the internal office; they are

however trying to get more funding and measures for additional lighting, as well as escort services (Bearwalk) that help students get from point A to point B.

- Alex: agrees with Amber about changing culture, especially on SB campus; most of the assaults done on Isla Vista; the reports are low because they include only the ones reported on campus, which is wrong because they do not necessarily all get reported; if people do formal complaints against police officers, that goes on their police records, which is a big deal; however, there have been instances in which officers have not taken students seriously or been harassed by them, so they're taking steps to resolve these problems; they're working on getting more lightning on campus too; also working with county and they're doing a lighting phase in Isla Vista as well; however, these things have happened in the most lit places on Isla Vista, so more lightning may not help; as often this stuff happens with people you know (not stranger danger), this can be difficult; working on student run/led courses on training
- Jen: unclear about policy, but if you report and access resource on the campus, are they required to report it to the police?



- Eric (UCOP): not always; it depends on the resource; by contacting x, it will put in certain resources into action, and by contacting y it will put other certain resources into action.
- Jen: the first place I would think of contacting is the campus health resources center, so it would be definitely good to promote those resources that do what you want them to do.
- Jefferson: only 2 incidents ever reported at Merced; they have increased the services for rape prevention and harassment prevention training; looking into feasibility of paying for additional resources.
- Maryssa: UCLA been talking about this a lot this last year; they don't want to put the blame on the survivor, but make it a campus accountability issue; about 7 thousand students have take up the issue; spoken with Los Angeles police, campus escorts, services in the evenings, and because it affects so many communities, it's not necessarily housed in one student office; there's a consent team as well where students from a wide range of organizations come together; they are looking to have 8 different resources, including hotlines and resource centers in a centralized way so students have access to



	<p>this information; like 'alcohol.edu', they're working on 'consent.edu' in order to be proactive at this point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeena: any others? Best practices? What can UCSA do?</li> <li>• Alex: meeting on legislation regarding sexual harassment tomorrow, so maybe leg committee may want to take this on and work on it.</li> <li>• Safeena: for now let us discuss this over the list-serv, and then next board meeting we can check in and see if there is any additional development.</li> </ul>	
<p>UCSA Congress Bid and Agenda Updates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UC Riverside is looking into making a bid for Congress</li> <li>• Motion to move that discussion to tomorrow. No objections</li> <li>• Ash: move Culture in the Board to right now?</li> <li>• Safeena: that can be later today.</li> <li>• Motion to move the Discussion and Resolution in Support of Asian Pacific Coalition at UCLA to right now. Motioned. No Objections. Passed</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda Amendment to move "Congress Location Options" to tomorrow at 10:30</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p>Discussion and Resolution in Support of Asian Pacific Coalition at UCLA*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolution asking UCSA to be in solidarity with communities at UCLA and USC that was essentially a hate flier.</li> <li>• It was misogynistic and racist; as UCLA is the one campus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolution Approved.</li> </ul>

without a diversity requirement, hoping to get an endorsement at UCLA and so it spread

- Kareem: lot of work on this topic
- Safeena: modified this a bit to be UCSA specific (based on Berkeley resolution)
- Jen: any idea who sent this out?
- Maryssa: no, but last year there was a similar letter posted; there seems to be a hate crime every year at UCLA, so they want to be proactive
- Jen: mind-boggling document
- Safeena: they react and respond to such events, and hope to create a positive campus culture – and especially in this body, we want to be proactive by creating dialogue on these issues; hate crimes have happened at Berkeley every year as well, and it is absurd
- A lot of times, these documents seem to be for the purposes of making students frustrated; UCSD is looking to inform as many communities on campus, especially since some communities do not understand how this affects communities
- Ivan: has there been conversation with faculty on campus? Clarify missing diversity requirement?
- Maryssa: Yes in courses/classes.

- Ivan: maybe administration can sent out a letter on what is occurring on campus; often faculty do not realize what is going on and it would be good to see where they stand on it.
- Maryssa: they have tried but it has continuously failed, especially in the hard science and social sciences, as they push back on it.
- Ash: yield time to Timia: this has been an issue on many campuses and needs to be addressed, but it may be good to add a clause at the end for diversity of all groups if it is deemed appropriate.
- Alex: yield.
- Ivan: agrees that it should be that we stand with it, but it should also be for this particular issue; does not want it to lose the focus on what is going on; probably not what they're going for, but it is important.
- Maryssa: should keep the clause on the community specifically, but perhaps "Therefore be it resolved that UCSA stands in solidarity with all communities." And maybe something in addition about women.
- Jefferson: agrees, and believes we should edit the document so that it includes all ethnicities.
- Move to amend document with clause "THEREFORE BE IT



	<p>RESOLVED, that UCSA stands in solidarity with womyn, and other marginalized communities at UCLA and all UC campuses and all college campuses in promoting a safe learning environment"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion to approve resolution.</li> </ul>	
<p>Agenda Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion to move California State Budget Update up to now.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved</li> </ul>
<p>California State Budget Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See State Budget Update Presentation.</li> <li>• Sean: feel free to go on leg-info to track budget as it changes. For student testimony, contact Sean if you can go; likely 9 am on March 27 for first committee hearing; they will be discussing identical budgets that day</li> <li>• Ivan: comment/concern/thank you; uncertain where else to bring it up, but some students are involved in the funding granted to the Santa Cruz campus, but the question is whether the board can revisit some of the programs connecting schools to the prison system, and maybe look at that again (as we do the IGNITE fighting the prison pipeline)</li> <li>• Sean: the budget has been moving slow, but they'll be moving quicker overnight as we get closer to the deadline</li> <li>• Tony: what did you say about the LAO?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sean: LAO disagrees with governor agreement on tuition freeze; at the end of the freeze, will likely see slow tuition increase; proposing revenue streams to prevent this; LAO recommended do not freeze tuition, but increase 2% to keep up with inflation.</li> <li>• Tony: we can get everything we need from surplus</li> <li>• Sean: this has not been reported officially.</li> <li>• Tony: what about the Middle Class Scholarship?</li> <li>• Sean: LAO wants program run, but there are more qualified students than those originally budgeted for the Middle Class Scholarship (i.e., amount of awards will surpass the allocated amount)</li> <li>• Jen: does state need to vote on these bills individually?</li> <li>• Sean: yes. LAO says here's the money they get, this is how you spend it all; one vote for each trailer bill</li> <li>• Sean: anymore questions? There was talk about the oil severance tax to be put on the trailer bill, and is hesitant with this occurring because the budget trailer bill fights can be messy; not a big fan for advocating putting anything in a trailer bill because you don't know who can mess with you and get rid of your bill.</li> </ul>	
Recess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest Recess until lunch.</li> <li>• Right now, we keep lunch, then Irvine and budget, then</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pass Recess</li> </ul>



	breakouts and we are finished. We should be able to adjourn at 6:15.	
Lunch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12:05</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lunch</li> </ul>
Withdrawal of ASUCI from UCSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion on UCSA and its connection to its constituents</li> <li>• Open speaker's list</li> <li>• Melissa: EVP at UCI, a lot of discussions on campus where students have felt like withdrawing from UCSA due to decisions being made at UCSA; not necessarily what students agree with on campus or systemwide according to ASUCI; as EVP, would like to hear whether the belief is that UCSA is effective or ineffective</li> <li>• Newspaper article points</li> <li>• Maryssa: some are easier to address than others; is it fine to address the tangible ones</li> <li>• 1. Inaction on appointment of UC President</li> <li>• Tony: what does that mean?</li> <li>• Specifically, not taking a stance on it.</li> <li>• When president Napolitano was appointed, we welcomed her and then later the letter was removed in August; it took months before another statement was made; what was finally done was taken a stance on the appointment process, but not on Napolitano herself.</li> <li>• Amber: has everyone read the official response from the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motion to limit speakers to 1 minute fails.</li> <li>• Motion passes to limit general discussion to 10 minutes total</li> <li>• Motion to extend time for 20 minutes carries</li> <li>• Motion to end debate and move into possible next moves passes</li> <li>• Motion to break out passes.</li> </ul>

board and the ASUCI statement? And then how does everyone feel about that?

- Tony: What you just explained is more than just one issue; in regards to the statement, uncertain about the logistics; as for the topic, it is a large issue that required a lot of discussion; about 300 people responded to a UCSA survey; it was a topic that had to be heard from all perspectives before taking an official stance
- Problem: to go back to the students after knowing where they stand, since the decision was already made with the constituents, means it was an unnecessary amount of time.
- Ivan: never saw a negative decision from students not saying no to Napolitano; outreach and constituents resulted in more negative opinions towards Napolitano than those for Napolitano; it seemed very flaky and pick-and-choose in the sense that picking and choosing to listen is dangerous; there is some other aspect that we're not talking about when we discussed this conversation; we had about 312 responses and we saw that students did not want Napolitano to be our president, and it was something that is very popular, but the board decided not to talk about it; it seems like the ED's or even the



President's responsibility to look over the decisions we made and why we made, as a board.

- Maryssa: UCLA concerns; a lot of the constituency was a large part of the group that came to the action at Congress; expressed repeatedly that we need to take a stance; it goes to show that we need to determine where our priorities are, regardless of how we individually felt about Napolitano; the way she became president was something we all believed was an issue, because it was not very transparent at all and had no student input; essentially, whose voices are we willing to listen to? There were many students who did protest against Napolitano; survey bias is also an issue; just because someone does not necessarily say they oppose someone, does not mean they agree support someone; so is the issue that we care about how we look? We represent students at all our campuses and it should not necessarily be about how we look to the public eye.
- Ash: point of view presented, and not necessarily one I agree with; different views/perspectives are not necessarily a bad thing; I disagreed with the final decision, but I appreciated the time and debate that we had because democracy isn't fast, but well thought out;

it would have been a premature response to speak out against someone before they start doing their job; we know the problems, so let's propose solutions about the problems we have to discuss or are we airing out grievances?

- Tony: what were the expectations of UCI on this topic?
- Melissa: ASUCI just wanted to take a stance on the issue and solved what the students were asking for; so to take a stance at all.
- Safeena: not necessarily good to rehash the discussion on taking a stance.
- Ivan: one of the points brought up was having an overrepresentation of graduate students, and so by having both opinions voiced it may be better; an active voice and active listening is important on controversial issues, so perhaps voicing all opinions is important
- Kareem: the issue of having graduates and undergrads is not necessarily productive since the votes during the last year have not been partisan (all undergraduates and all graduates on opposing sides); so it may be productive to have ASUCI talk about their issues, and where these problems began/were predated.
- Motion for 1 minute per speaker. Objections? Yes. Vote

fails.

- Motion to limit discussion for 10 minutes in general. Vote, passes.
- Andrea: former EVP from UCI; believes in the power of UCSA; something conflicting is the reason why many board members are here, which is for many a means of building the resume; often some people act bored or act in a very political manner; some people take a lot of things personally in the space and ASUCI has already made their decision, so it would be more productive to address how we can now address student needs – this is coming from a place of understanding that this is a place where students need to represent student needs.
- Patrick: legislation pretty clear about the issues; the influence of the professional staff over decisions made by UCSA is a major issues; the UCSA has not necessarily suited the needs of students; with declining support of IGNITE this year in comparison to FIRE last year
- Alex: worked on the IGNITE campaign; several people responsible for working on the UCSA campaign, and all our success is mostly based on the work outside the board space, but we have currently not worked up to that potential.

- Kareem: 5 minutes left; any additional speakers?
- From UC Santa Cruz: my opinion may not matter that much in this conversation, but UCSA has been a great organization for me; as a student you never know what you may run into; I wanted to work on an internship tax credit and because of UCSA I was able to do that; I think staying connected to UCSA is an important way to do that; there can always be reforms, and problems can be resolved; I think things can be worked out.
- Alex: I agree with some of that; we have the potential; we have in past, and we may in the future, but we are not doing that now; a lot of the great things I've gained from organizing within the community, have shown that you can get a lot of things done outside UCSA as well.
- I see UCSA as a potential for student organizing, but it's not right now; but you didn't do anything this year; workers came to you, you did nothing; undocumented students came, and you did nothing; Napolitano came into power and you did nothing; the workers got their contract and UCSA didn't have to do anything; since the board did not decide on anything, and if you represent the voice of constituents, think about that next time (i.e., they, the students and workers, got what they needed

without UCSA).

- Safeena: one thought about moving forward is what can be done to restructure UCSA at this moment.
- Maryssa: it may be a good use of time, but it may not be productive if solely comprised of board members; not necessarily UCSA vs. UCI, but work together; how do we make it so the committee, if it was formed, would meet some, or all, of the concerns ASUCI has.
- Ash: a single university does not dictate the direction of the entire UC system; it's a slow process, so please bring the issues up and we can work on them; if your agenda wasn't met, then that just means we did not do what you wanted as a campus; we are not always supposed to agree, but we can compromise.
- Melissa: doesn't want it to make it a person issue, but sometimes there are students who are unable to be represented; those who are undocumented, those who are arrested, those who fight back; we talked to those students who work hard and have concerns we need to address.
- Maryssa: we should not marginalize students; we come to the space as UCSA; we come to the space only here for one reason, but there is a difference between campus-

specific constituents and campus-wide constituents;  
frustrating that we shut people out.

- Safeena: Motion to extend time?
- Ash: can we close the speaker's list?
- Safeena: we will need to close it after we finish it.
- Kareem: motion to extend time 20 minutes. Vote.
- Justin: Will keep comments brief; orthogonal observations: crystal ball prediction, this will be unproductive and we will not come up with a different opinion, and all opinions or action items devised are not going to be followed up; sitting down in smaller groups would be more useful; we spend a lot of time talking about conclusions that are not necessarily actionable; the product of UCSA is mostly done by the staff and executive of UCSA; but how much product has come from groups of people here doing works as groups as a collective? Not much; people are not doing this well enough as a team; maybe it's time to make the board a bit fast; perhaps a radical reconfiguration of the board; should we have times where we have undergraduates/graduates are in conversations on graduate/undergraduate issues? Perhaps not. Perhaps separation in groups would be productive; and perhaps

we should use the rest of the time to do something.

- Maryssa: Point of clarification: what would that mean?
- Kareem: closing debate means it ends the debate and we decide what to do.
- Ivan: point of clarification, would that end the first part of the motion?
- Kareem: motion is to end debate and move towards talking about a committee. Vote. Passes
- Ash: point of clarification, 10 minutes is not enough time to do anything, and a conversation outside the board is not useful
- Ivan: perhaps a pre-discussion and then a post-discussion while the guests are here; ex. AFSCME issues not resolved because they did not include certain things in the discussion; suggesting this because it makes more sense to discuss what we are going to discuss with our guest speakers
- Alex: since UCSB has been unhappy with UCSA, have been thinking of what next steps can be to finding solutions for UCSA; could be an ad-hoc committee; the people who are committed to seeing that task filled could be part of that committee; may be the best way to go about doing this; maybe we can then discuss ways

to re-organize UCSA; for example, diversity training sounds like a great idea, especially since this was not brought up previously

- Max: we should make a committee, and then formulate a response to ASUCI
- Justin: agree there needs to be a response, but a committee as we usually make one will not necessarily solve this problem; proposing we leave this square box of a room and make ideas together; we should spend an hour an a half doing that.
- Move to recess for an hour an hour and a half to do that
- Maryssa: we need to have sincere conversations on what to do next
- Ivan: we are losing a member school, so it's weird and we should really have a conversation on this
- Maryssa: ASUCI has not said they will be coming in during the fall, and I don't want to speak on behalf of ASUCI, but we should work on ways to make sure people want to stay and, on the other end, make them want to come back.
- UC Davis left why?
- Louise: they thought the board was too liberal.
- Motion to break out into groups to alleviate these



	concerns? Vote.	
Debrief from Group Sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Going to present in groups, possibly with time limits, and go from there.</li> <li>• Group 1: all problems thought of and emphasize space as student led; more organizing space; give ideas to new organizing director; when staff input is leadership-only it's not as effective as within a dialogue; knowing past issues from Congress, how campaigns went and certain problems were would be good; organizing docs have priority; rigidity of the space; possibly experimenting with Robert's Rules; more breakout and informal time when Robert's Rules are not necessary; example: more undergraduate and graduate spaces; campaign committees; less structured spaces, dividing time by issues, allowed to experiment with the space; understanding some of the suggestions may or may not work and trying out approaches and not specifically looking at one particular way; having CAC/Leg join together since it's counterproductive to not come back together after breakouts; campaigns in terms of salary and budget, it's a burden to not have more than 1 field organizer readily accessible or accountable; keep groups accountable for debriefing, as this will help with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

communication between graduates and undergraduates; diversity is important as well (i.e., system of addressing issues with certain people), also caucuses that can be at Congress, SLC, or when board members see fit; also addressing diversity and accessibility and not just affordability; also want to more than meeting just once a month, so literally sitting down and going back to grassroots.

- Group 2 (Justin speaking): some people think this was a waste of time, but it was an opportunity to get a mandate for this group moving forward; had a small group discussing some things, but we spend too much time deciding things and not enough doing thing; we may talk about organizing, deciding things but we need to spend more time doing things; there should be, as one example, the way ASUC and GSA at Berkeley decide things; undergrad and grad should decide things on their own, and unless both groups agree on something, that one particular group only speaks about one particular group; example is having roll and then breaking out in the agenda, then coming together and discussing the decisions; this empowers smaller groups to get more done as it is hard to get things done in large groups; we

can have extra time this way to get more things done; for campaigns, it would be great to have a standing committee, and while working on these campaigns on their own, and making decisions on their own, getting campaigns done and moving things forward; from my perspective, grad-prof already acts in this way, and it works as we get things done in that small way.

- Group 3: Ivan: the external/EVPs write about certain issues, and more of a blog or communication things; the Supreme Court was a way of doing that, a database of resolutions made available to students across the system, a transition agenda so that we can pass on issues to future boards; more phone calls as well, more communication in general; also a two year staggered campaign so that if we decide to make it 4 year we can do that later on; UCSA should have full ownership of all campaigns so decisions can be made on the board; increasing staff lobbying levels; (Alex) from what been hearing from Louise is that we would be having a new ED for fundraising, which would give us money to lobby legally; (Ivan): creating a table for what satisfies an issue for what is being satisfied through that campaign; at SOCC, people talked about what budget issues could

be improved upon so that when it does happen, the board knows what's going on; also caucus committees, such as finance and other issues they want to tackle; also means of voting for students online so that we know where the support for or against an issue is—this was talked about through UC Voice; having SLC legislator's held accountable in a sense to streamline the conversation more from SLC; UG Grad experience too – some are disconnected from this discussion, since as holders of positions on this board, maybe there are reasons why students aren't talking to us (i.e., because we are a bureaucratic organization); report back campus politics; regional meetings as well; congress and SLC have high positions as campaigning and elections are not necessarily a bit issue; at least we will have attempted more students in our conversations on campaigns; evaluations on EDs and EVPs would also be good.

- Safeena: several ideas on what we can do next; we can collect the ideas now.
- Maryssa: discussion on having full on discussion item on the agenda to revamp the mission of the organization; also talked about having a transitioning of information in

May to pass on to our successors; can we have a more concrete timeline? We have a crunch of (1) we are only going to be in these positions so much longer, and (2) if we want to make this organization more appealing to future boards, then we need to move fast.

- Safeena: We can definitely move fast on this; we can discuss this soon.
- Ivan: timeline of conversation for the issues we discussed? Maybe also include a mini-timeline for how long they think this will take.
- Darcie: new ED is coming in so we need to get this mission statement completed by next board meeting; otherwise our message to the new ED will be very polarized and confusing.
- Safeena: much of this may have to happen outside of the board space over the phone or by email.
- Bridget: we can make a Google doc to form groups and discuss this.
- Safeena: if there is an idea that got you excited about UCSA during the breakouts, please bring them forward so we can discuss them.
- Motion to do 30 minutes (UG/Grad), one hour (CAC/Leg), then 30 minutes (UG/Grad), Passed.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconvene at 5:30 to redistribute rooms.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

**Date: March 2, 2014**

**Participants:**

**Meeting starting and ending times: 9:00 AM Start; 10:45 AM End**

**Meeting location or format: UC Irvine**

**Facilitator(s):**

**Note taker:** Kareem Aref

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Action item(s)</b>
9:00 AM Contract Update from AFSCME Mary Virginia Watson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UC has finally settled with service workers</li> <li>• Still working on patient care contract</li> <li>• We can win this!</li> </ul>	



9:30 AM Legislative Bill Stances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adopt all stances at the recommendation of leg committee.</li><li>• Reference Legislative committee minutes</li><li>• Task leg with further reviewing bills to be approved before SLC over conference call</li></ul>	
10:15 AM Budget Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Closed Session</li></ul>	
10:30 AM Congress Location Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• UC Riverside will be withdrawing their bid in order to pursue a bid for the Student of Color Conference</li><li>• Potentially host in Northern California as most conferences have been in the south the past several years</li><li>• Staff will look into hotels with the capacity to host the event</li><li>• Monterey? San Jose? San Francisco?</li></ul>	
10:45 AM Adjourn		