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**Call to Order** (5:30-5:31 pm)

Chiao-Wen calls the assembly to order

**Approval of Minutes from the last Forum Meeting on Wednesday, December 2nd,**

**2015** (5:31-5:32 pm)

**Officer Report**, (5:32-5:40 pm)

 *Milan Chatterjee, GSA President*

o *Chiao-Wen –* The president is not here yet so we are moving onto Joel.

 *Joel Lanzaga, Vice President of Academic Affairs*

o Joel – I just wanted to give a few updates. First and foremost we’re working on the academic program review. This is an annual cycle where we review 16 different programs to see if we’re going to take them forward. Information on those programs is available on the senate website. Now specifically, within some of the councils, in particular on Grad Council, we are working on ensuring robust protecting for whistleblowers concerned about all this wrongdoing from faculty and their

peers. I want to make sure that, when being a TA or working at some kind of academic internship, you’re not in a situation where you feel like there’s repercussions if you whistleblow. That’s something that Michael Skiles is helping me with.

o We’re also making sure that UCLA takes better care to not simply just open and close programs. We recently closed a program that was a business school program in South America. We want to make sure that going forward we review these more thoroughly in advance so we don’t

get to the stage where we have to close programs so quickly.

o In the committee on teaching there are a few errors that we are focused on. One is online teaching; we’re currently working on addressing these issues from the faculty perspective. The second initiative is the less- commonly-taught courses initiative. So we have some courses that are just taught within the system of the UC so we are trying to review them more thoroughly. We are also talking about student distractions due to personal devices: how can we handle this going forward?

o On the committee for diversity and equal opportunities, we are reviewing the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. We’re also taking a look at some of these programs that are under review, for example Chicano Studies.

o Faculty welfare—we are continuing the discussion on the UC retirement planning.

o I just want to give a heads up on a few other cross campus events that

we’re hosting.

 In collaboration with UCLA Anderson, a social event on February 6 from 9:30pm to 2am, at the studios where Mad Men was filmed. Live band, open bar, silent auction to raise money for charity. We’ll hand out flyers for this.

 We’re partnering with UCLA Health, the Fielding School of Public Health, and the Business and Science Center to have our second annual health care conference, so I’ll be handing out flyers for that. I encourage more grad student participation. We have some of our faculty and alumni from a lot of grad programs represented within

this conference, so it’s a good highlight of the strength of the UCLA

health system

 *Andres Schneider, Vice President of External Affairs*

o One of the main issues that I have been working on with Michael Skiles is trying to advocate for more transparency and to avoid further increase in rents not only in the Weyburn complex but in other grad student housing locations as well. In the interest of time, I’m going to try to skip details and move forward to Chiao-Wen

 *Chiao-Wen Lan, Vice President of Internal Affairs*

o The GSRC oversight committee has been established. We have students, faculty, and staff on the committee. We will do strategic planning for the next three years. We have identified a potential candidate for the Melnitz Movies director position.

o GSA is in discussion with the grad division about the student wellbeing survey. The grad division would welcome any of your feedback; I will send out the draft again so that any student can give feedback on the survey.

 *Larry Lai and Wendy Green, Co-Directors of SRC*

o The SRC wants to promote sustainability on campus by providing resources and funding for sustainability events.

o Undergrad and grad sustainability mixer happening this quarter.

Undergrads can talk to grads who are working on sustainability related

projects

o We will have a panel of people who work in sustainability-related fields. If any of you are interested, we would be more than happy to have you come.

o Another event coming up is the sustainability speaker series. Around week

5 there will be a food sustainability speaker.

o We are continuing to hold the CSA box program, which basically a

farmer’s market box that is sent to our office. You can order them and pick

them up weekly on Wednesday’s. They come in two sizes.

**New UC Policy Review** (5:40-5:50 pm)

 *Kathleen Salvaty, Title IX Coordinator*

 Kathleen is not here currently, as of 5:46pm

**Council Allocation and GSA Surplus Fund** (5:46-6:00 pm)

 *Roy Champawat, Director UCLA Student Union*

 *Debra Simmons, Accounting Manager ASUCLA Student Government Accounting*

 Roy Champawat – Follow the documents. We have two major issues that we want to work through. One is surplus and one is the council allocations and the council carry-over. The first doc in the package is how we identify the surplus. We identify the surplus and then propose allocations of that surplus into various accounts. This doc identifies the total revenue and expenses that came through the GSA accounts. Monies still remaining after the business of last year’s

association: there is restricted surplus that often needs to stay within the intention of a donor. With monies in accounts like that, they are not available for general

repurposing. $125,476, similar to last year’s level, a relatively very large surplus. The next page, column that says CHANGES shows how much money transferred over from last year to this year. The president and VPI are proposing

some of the accounts that this money can be placed into. This follows the pattern of the last years. Each year, the largest piece of money that comes into

discretionary events is coming from this. This is a somewhat substantial enabling amount of funding. To be clear, that’s what we are seeking approval of. You can offer changes into the distribution of these monies. The other two biggest pieces of money are a large piece left in a forum discretionary account and a cabinet discretionary account. A discretionary account allows the money to be used by forum as needs arise, if forum so votes. It allows for quick ease of action to address things that come up. Little bit of money into Melnitz in the past years.

Any questions?

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – Why is putting some money back into the councils not an option? Or why is it not the idea?

 Roy Champawat – It is an option. As it relates to councils, we usually call that kind of surplus council-carryover. You are still at liberty to propose what you are saying. Last year, council carryover was distributed into the councils last year. There are monies that are carrying over for the councils in a similar manner. Where there is a carry-over or a surplus it shows that a meaningful use has not been found for the funds that have been entrusted to that council or group. Given that we have a very large surplus, you could reallocate money to councils,

though it would be unusual. A level of surplus this large is unusual.

 Stacey Meeker – Could you tell me what the final publications carry-over allocation is?

 Roy Champawat – I think it was about 70-80 thousand that carried over

 Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) - We don’t have power to vote for what cabinet

discretionary goes towards.

 Roy Champawat – So the codes and the systems going back for quite a long time – we go to the university enrollment projection. There are self-supporting programs within the Anderson School and they have some separate numbers. That’s how we get to the figure on here that we see as 10483; that identifies the pool of money available for distribution. We then determine last year’s actual enrollment. Enrollment starts high, falls off in winter and falls off in spring. The system has to be controlled by actuals and not projections of enrollment. That’s

the reason why the enrollment and the allocation are controlled by the actuals from the previous year. Where additional monies are collected, that money would essentially become part of the council carryover into the next year. That’s how

we make sure that we don’t budget outside the actuals. Chiao-Wen will send out the website of the source data that we use. It’s a breathtaking listing of disciplines. I would like to offer to make a date maybe next week when any of the interested councils may come and go into a little more detail. I know you have to be able to represent these issues with clarity to your councils. The pool of money derives from a slightly smaller set of grad students than the number reported by discipline. A shortfall should be made up over time because the carryover will

stay within the channel.

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – Can you explain this issue with Management not being counted here as graduate students? If you’re a self-supporting student in Anderson you do not pay these fees?

 Roy Champawat – We’ve been grappling with the advent of more self-supporting programs. They do not derive any state support. All of Anderson has now

switched to that methodology. When a school switches to self-supporting it has a choice of whether or not to participate in the full set of fees. Anderson opted in, they’re not opting out of any fees, so the pool of money is there.

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – As far as you know, everyone in Anderson is still paying those same fees, so they should be getting those fees back?

 Roy Champawat – Yes. So to go back to the question of surplus. There is a very large piece of money that is in forum discretionary. Over time there is a pressure on your fees because none of them are indexed by inflation. Each year, while we seem to have a very large surplus, there is an underlying strain on the budget of eroding purchasing power. In some ways, a surplus means that the reckoning

day is further out in the future. A good-sized surplus is a little bit comforting. At the same time, you are kind of charged to spend the money, not to not spend it. The proposal on the table would be this distribution; you guys are at liberty to propose changes. That’s for you guys to decide.

 Roy Champawat - If some of you are looking at the amount that’s in your SGA

account, this money is still pending

 Forum representative - Is there anywhere that we can see how much money is still remaining in the budgets, to see how we are doing?

 Roy Champawat - Not a place that we can see it readily enough to inform your decision

 Debbie- It’s on the website right now

 Roy Champawat - it’s the weekly budget report. Different councils have different outcomes; each one is a little different.

 Forum rep - Does the carryover keep carrying over year after year after year?

 Roy Champawat – the rules are that it carries over once and then after that it moves over to the central office.

 Biological Sciences representative - What three quarters do you average? Fall winter spring?

 Roy Champawat – Exactly

 Biological Sciences rep – what is the 95%?

 Roy Champawat – Okay so this is a fiscal prudence mechanism. Each year, you’re only going to allocate for expenditure 95% of the money that you have, just in case anything goes wrong. It stays within the channels.

 Biological Sciences rep - So we can expect five percent more at the end of the year?

 Debbie – We are dealing with the 2014-15 surplus right now. The carryover is based on the council carryover from last year. So that 5% will come back next

year.

 Chiao-Wen Lan – Any more questions before we make a motion regarding the surplus?

**Approval of the Enrollment** (6:00-6:02 pm)

 Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) proposes to table the motion

o Biological Sciences seconds

 As a clarifying question, Michael Skiles (WHRA) – so does that

mean that we cannot spend any money until the next forum?

 Roy – No you will still have some funding

o Motion passes 12-2. This approval will be voted on at the next forum meeting.

***Kathleen Salvaty, Title IX Coordinator*** (6:03-6:10 pm)

 Kathleen Salvaty - We have a new UC wide policy on sexual violence and sexual harassment, with new procedures for responses to these occurrences. I wanted to highlight a couple of key changes. The definitions of sexual violence and sexual harassment have changed. The big change in how the university is differentiating how they respond is that in the past, when a student was accused, that was handled by the dean of student conduct, like an alcohol violation. That’s not the case anymore. Now, at all UC campuses, when a complaint comes in, it will be investigated by an investigator from the title IX office, who will present the investigation with facts and recommendations. After this, there is an appeal hearing that both sides are able to request. The other big change is the definition of a “responsible employee.” It is someone who, when they learn information about an incident of sexual violence, they have a responsibility to report that to me. The policy now makes it very clear who is a responsible employee. With regards to a student experiencing harassment or violence, anyone at UCLA is responsible for reporting that to the title IX coordinator. That really includes teaching assistants, even someone who works in the Carl’s Jr. if they hear it in the course of their work. Faculty are responsible employees for any incident of sexual violence that they hear of in the course of their work. If they hear of a colleague experiencing these things, they are responsible for reporting that to us. Reporting is easy, you can email me, call me; there is no set form. If you’re more comfortable reporting it to your supervisor that’s okay as long as it makes its way to me. You report what you know, the information that you have. At that point,

you have discharged your duty. I make sure that the student is aware of their options and confidential resources. We need to know to reach out to the student and make sure that they are aware of their resources and reporting options. I am available to answer any questions.

 Forum rep - What is our responsibility to tell students ahead of time that we are mandated to report these things? Does it have to be on our syllabus?

 Kathleen Salvaty - It does not have to be on your syllabus, we are working to educate students about this. If you feel that a student is about to disclose something to you, I would tell them then that you are obliged to report what you

hear. The main confidential resource for students is the CARE office, the university has no obligation to respond when the student goes to her with this.

 Forum rep - Does a report to your office trigger an automatic law enforcement response?

 Kathleen Salvaty - We work with UCPD, we have a case management team.

Every report that we get is consulted with the CMT, but we don’t share names. We don’t make a criminal report. We make sure that victims know that they have the right to report to law enforcement and the right to report to us.

 Forum rep - Is there a different procedure for students who are assaulted by people who are not UC community members?

 Kathleen Salvaty - We are limited in what kind of actions we can take. The student still has all of the same resources, but I can’t take the same administrative action.

 Forum rep - If a student comes to you with a secondhand report, what do we do?

 Kathleen Salvaty - Report it to me exactly as you got it. We will go from there.

**GSA Code and Constitutional Amendment** (6:03-6:23 pm)

a. Amendment 7.10.2, *Rahim Kurwa & Yacoub Kureh*

a. Rahim Kurwa – the reason that we are here is to talk about a problem that sort of fell on us, and on you all, due to a set of incidents that happened in October of last year when members of the GSA cabinet imposed funding restrictions on a student group for its affiliations. That violated the law; that’s not up for debate. GSA cannot impose viewpoint restrictions in the allocation of funding; that is a denial of free speech. That’s not something that you as the forum did, it happened without your knowledge. It’s very important to us that this problem is resolved. Free speech is an absolute, no matter what. There is an issue of accountability and transparency and there is an issue of what is going to happen going forward, how we are going to fix this problem. That is why we proposed an amendment last forum. We think that the university should engage in training regarding the first amendment and an apology should be issued to the diversity caucus.

b. Brendan Mamme– I do a lot of work on free speech issues. We are very much concerned about this funding restriction. Viewpoint discrimination is the highest evil that the first amendment was designed to prevent. It doesn’t matter that the speech may be deemed controversial by some; it makes no difference here. Any restrictions that seek to limit funding to student groups based on their viewpoint are plainly unconstitutional. The policy of the GSA that any association with a group that supports divestment will not be funded—that violates the first amendment. We would urge the GSA to adopt the amendment that Rahim and Yacoub are presenting.

c. Rahim Kurwa – SJP advocates for divestment from companies that are involved in human rights violations in the occupied Palestinian territory. There is some real urgency to dealing with this issue. This problem began in October, and there is still no resolution. That means that grad students are all sitting around and wondering what the policy really is here. The longer that this debate goes on, the more of a chilling effect that it has on people’s speech. Something that should be a bedrock principle is put in an air of confusion. There is a lot of work that needs to be done to increase

transparency and communication. We have been in touch with UCLA legal council and the office of public records at UCLA and we are waiting to

hear on meeting and voting records. We are waiting for more direction. You may want to either consider passing this kind of amendment now, or get more feedback from legal council and then consider it again later. We think that you should do something, because the problem is labeled as a GSA problem

d. Brendan Mamme– it’s not entirely necessary to delay a vote on the proposed amendment. The case law that says viewpoint discrimination is illegal is going to remain the case law. Adopting the amendment today would be perfectly within your capacity. Nowhere is freedom of speech more important than in the university environment.

e. Roy Champawat – GSA is a unit of the university. As has been said, this matter has been under review and we are awaiting an articulation of a

statement that will characterize certain aspects to inform this body, relative to what had occurred. When this amendment came in, we forwarded that

to campus legal as well. Campus legal’s guidance is that it would be best, from a legal advisory standpoint, if we were to discuss but not make decisions at this point, pending the guidance being issued. I know that it seems like a lot of time but these are your lawyers poised to weigh in on this issue and advise you. You may choose to stand down on passing any of these things, out of a show of fairness and even-handedness. If you’re not going to do one at this time, you may want to do a similar action on all of these issues that are in this same family. It is your government; you can do what you choose to do here.

f. Andreas Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – I want to inform all the forum members

that this piece of legislation, according to Vice Chancellor Blum, has strong legal implications not only for the cabinet but also for all forum voting members. I would encourage the postponement of a vote on this issue

g. Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – What are we expecting legal to say? I

don’t get the issue with how this is laid out. Why are we not voting on it?

h. Chiao-Wen Lan – The forum can decide whether to table this again or to vote on it at this meeting.

i. Andres Schneider - We have other legal advice. GSA’s objective is not to engage in these kinds of things. That’s my personal view. We have legal advice that there was no violation of the first amendment whatsoever. I want to remind you that last forum we passed around a letter that said there was no violation of the first amendment.

j. Forum rep, no name card - When will we hear back from legal?

k. Roy Champawat – I am confident that it will be before the next forum l. Forum rep, no name card - Hasn’t the case law been settled on this

several times? What is UCLA mulling over? It seems like very basic student government procedure.

m. Roy Champawat – As an element of the government, you can speak. You can take a controversial position. Government speech is separate from individual speech. The conclusion may not seem clear to casual observers. You have legal representation and guidance where it is necessary, and it has been activated. It would seem prudent to allow that

guidance to come out; we don’t know what it is going to say. We can all sit

here and speculate. This body has taken no actions relative to this underlying subject matter; this matter was not brought to forum. It would be prudent to be cautious taking a step into this issue.

n. Management representative – I share your frustration, as this does seem like a simple matter. We have lawyers working for us, and they have told us to wait. It’s incredibly frustrating, because law moves so slowly. I would urge us to wait until we have the advice.

o. Brendan Mamme – The Supreme Court has ruled on this issue. The constitution prohibits discrimination in funding allocation based on the viewpoint of a group.

p. Madison – By voting this in, could we be somehow implicating ourselves or admitting to some violation of the 1st amendment?

q. Roy Champawat – That’s a speculation that we need to be cautious about.

At this point, the forum has not been directly involved in this matter. It would seem prudent to have your lawyers guide you before you enter into this matter. You know who your lawyers are.

r. Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) - This is something that we want to move forward on. Do we want to leave something like this open? I feel like we have had enough time tabling it until this meeting. I don’t know what UCLA legal is going to say. I don’t see what GSA’s problem could be passing something like this

s. Edwin Eshaghzadeh (Dentistry) – One thing that came to mind, I’m wondering- if we move forward with voting on this, will there be implications in taking a stand? To follow up with your concern; if we wait, we will allow ourselves time to see what legal advice we get and to see if these implications could come into play. As a forum, do we lose anything

tabling it until the next meeting?

a. Andres Schneider – When they describe the problem in the amendment, it clearly says that GSA violated the first amendment.

b. Rahim Kurwa – That’s not the amendment; that’s the description

c. Andres Schneider – The description, I correct myself. We passed out information last forum that this did not happen. The only thing that GSA cabinet wants on this issue is neutrality. The only thing that we want to communicate is that we don’t want to alienate the graduate community. We want to be friendly and neutral, and communicate that idea.

d. Ian Coley (MPSC) – the bill that we tabled is not this piece of paper, the bill has nowhere in it that the GSA violated the first amendment. GSA does not endorse the content of this handout, but can still vote on the content of the amendment.

e. Rahim Kurwa – I want to emphasize exactly what is at stake here. What Andreas said was extraordinarily disingenuous and dishonest. I don’t want to bring this issue to you. GSA did not behave with neutrality; it was stalking, basically. Even if you want to be neutral, I don’t think it’s fair to enforce neutrality. The real issue here is that for several months now, the damage to the GSA community’s understanding of free speech is continuing. People are under the assumption that they don’t have the right to free speech. That’s why you as the forum have the responsibility to vote on these issues. This problem was made for you, and now you are responsible for it. If you do decide to table this and bring it up in three weeks, then I think you need to go even farther. I think the people who

suffered under this deserve a real apology from the GSA. Especially the people from the diversity caucus, who were really put through a nightmare situation. I think you should print something in the Daily Bruin and make your views very clear and clear the air very fully.

f. Chiao-Wen Lan – In the interest of time, the forum should decide whether to move on this.

g. Ian Coley (MPSC) motions to move the amendment off the table i. MPSC seconds the motion to consider the amendment

ii. 2-17 the motion fails, amendment will be tabled until the next forum meeting

b. GSA Discretionary Fund Amendment 7.5.4.1, Michael Skiles

a. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – Regardless of whether we agree or disagree with the amendment that was just tabled, I think we can all agree that going forward, GSA needs to operate in an open and transparent fashion and that its officers need to be held accountable for any wrongdoing. I’m presenting two amendments. The first one is that all funding requests be submitted to the discretionary funding department, which would ensure that funding is allocated based on objective discretionary funding guidelines that are set by forum and can be reviewed at any time. This is also good for GSA cabinet members because it absolves them of the opportunity to commit or be accused of transgression. It will also increase

transparency. There’s no possibility for this sort of problem to arise again if we adopt these amendments. The second amendment forbids the GSA from participating in or supporting discrimination. This amendment enshrines the principle that the GSA represents all graduate students.

This amendment is strictly enforceable, as it is followed by an existing code that states that violations of the code of ethics will be referred to forum for consideration. The legislation that I am proposing ensures that

all funding decisions will be made transparently and according to objective guidelines set by forum and will require GSA members to act respectfully and without bias or discrimination or face consequences.

b. Roy Champawat – The first item seems certainly very prudent. In terms of the second amendment, I would again put forward that guidance from campus legal would advise you to hold off from any such kind of action.

It’s complicated language and raises some speech questions, which the university legal is already looking into. Prudence would dictate not making changes on anything seeable as a speech question.

c. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – this language comes from existing UC Regents language. Chancellor Blum has not noted any particular problem with this

legislation and this is just an extrapolation that Roy is making. No claims about any laws or amendments are made in the nondiscrimination amendment that I am putting forward right now

d. Roy Champawat – I think we need to look at the language and its presence in regent documents

e. Ian Coley (MPSC) – the UC is looking to retool its statements against intolerance right now, so I think that’s up in the air if it’s the strict verbage that they’re using. Currently, the GSA discretionary funding in the line item budget right now has $0 in it, so I would not support this amendment at all. This is bad.

f. Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – I second what Ian is saying. The language of the second amendment seems like a longer way of saying what the first proposed amendment said.

a. Roy Champawat – I know there are a lot of lines that talk about discretionary funding, I believe that it has $3000 in it.

b. Forum rep, no name card – Can we change the location to a fund that has an existing budget in it?

c. Biological Sciences rep - Do we lose access to some money as a result of this amendment? There’s really not enough information for me to vote on this at this point.

d. Roy Champawat – I suspect that perhaps the language is citing an account that is dormant and that is contingent. There is currently $3000 in the account that most graduate student event funding comes from. Prudence would dictate that, if all event funding is directed to this fund,

then the objective criteria can be reviewed all at once.

e. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – I’m very open to any amendment that would make it clear that we are talking about the right pot/account. The intention is to make sure that all of the money and requests are not going to the president or to cabinet or to particular cabinet members because that is where there is serious worry that there is no accountability, objective guidelines, or scrutiny. If we adopt this, we probably should move at our next meeting to move money into the pot.

f. May Bhetraratana – I currently have $21,000 to work with

g. Roy Champawat – So there is some money. You all postponed putting more money into the put with the surplus choice you made earlier

h. Stacey Meeker – To speak to this information question, over the years it seems that more and more ad hoc requests have come to cabinet, usually framed as an emergency or a last minute effort. Cabinet has generally, almost always, agreed to fund almost anything that seems legitimate. The problem is that this is not what cabinet is supposed to be doing. Usually, there is just a rubber stamp for whatever comes through, people are not voting with biases. We need to have cabinet’s work go back to being cabinet, which is overseeing the running of offices. We’re not political people, we do it this in order to use our expertise to help people. I would suggest that, even if it seems that it is postponing something, there needs to be a review of the different funds and how they work and an analysis of what funding people needs. The number of last minute requests may indicate that present avenues aren’t working. Maybe not every group can get the money from discretionary funding that they need for what they

want to do. We should think about the big picture, reforming some of the infrastructure here. There needs to be a reevaluation to account for the changes that have occurred. I think it’s terrible that our community has been put through this; I have been a staunch supporter of free speech and I think that the cabinet has been put in a difficult situation. Our intentions are honorable. We don’t do this because we want to do bad things to people and we certainly don’t do this for the money.

i. Ian Coley (MPSC) – Trying to pigeonhole where student organizations go, I don’t know. I think that this change proposed in front of us does not address the issue. I think our finances are more complex than I know.

Before voting on any financial measures or policies, I would like to know a little more. I would like to go to that meeting.

j. Roy Champawat – If there are merits to something like cabinet or forum discretionary, it’s timeliness. It’s a more nimble and reactive piece of money.

k. Stacey Meeker– This is a useful discussion. Roy’s point about timeliness is well taken. Cabinet can act faster than the normal process of another funding source. It puts cabinet in a difficult position to be having to respond to these various funding emergencies. How do you make such a flexible fund fair and accessible to everyone, so that it is not just available to the first-comer?

l. Chiao-Wen Lan – does anyone move to approve this amendment on discretionary funding?

i. Michael Skiles (WHRA) motions to approve this amendment

1. Housing seconds

2. Two for, eight against, the amendment does not pass c. GSA Code of Ethics 1.2.2, Michael Skiles (WHRA)

a. Roy Champawat – Legal council has advised us to wait.

b. Ian Coley (MPSC) – I move to table this motion indefinitely until we hear from legal.

i. MPSC seconds the motion

ii. 19 to nothing, motion to table carries

**Public Comments** (6:26-6:35pm)

Chiao-Wen Lan – In the interest of time, please limit your comments to two minutes, thank you.

**Lauren Schaeffer and Mahmood Khan**

 Mahmood Khan – We are here specifically as members of UAW 2865. We are here to express our grave reservations regarding the recently adopted sexual harassment policy. The resulting policy does not reflect a number of critical concerns of our membership.

 Lauren Schaeffer – We regard the new policy as inadequate for what it does not do and potentially counterproductive for what it does do. We have three main objections to the new policy:

o The first involves mandatory reporting, consent and confidentiality. While the current requirement of mandatory reporting might be an attempt to overcome a culture of passive complicity on the part of bystanders, the policy as currently formulated might have the effect of further isolating and

deepening the silence so many survivors currently endure. Reports may trigger a formal Title IX investigation, even without the consent of the survivor and even where confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. This decreases the likelihood of even informal reporting. We request further clarification regarding the mandatory reporting requirement and insist that any policy must empower and try to respect the agency of any survivors.

o The next objection involves deadlines and remedies. The policy fails to specify concrete deadlines for the initiation and conclusion of Title IX investigations leaves remedies up to university discretion. It is difficult for survivors to make informed decisions about reporting. Members who have registered complaints with the Title IX office report that it has taken more

than a year in some cases to even receive an initial assessment. Justice delayed, justice denied. Without concrete deadlines and specified remedies, we cannot have confidence in the Title IX process.

o Our third objection involves the statute of limitations. Current university policy establishes a three-year statute of limitations for complaints against faculty members’ conduct, including sexual harassment and sexual violence. A revised policy must mandate an exception to this three-year statute of limitations.

o In conclusion, the union expresses grave reservations concerning the new policy. We would like to invite the GSA to work with us in moving forward

in formulating a policies procedure and culture necessary to achieve a university free of sexual harassment and sexual violence. We will be around afterwards if anyone would like to speak with us.

**Stephanie Tsoi and Katie Guglielmino - GradGames**

 Katie Guglielmino (Medicine) – The med school plans GradGames every year.

You all work really hard during the year and we really like to have this event where we bring all of the grad schools together. Last year, about 450 people competed. We had ten sports and played 220 games in four days and ended it with a grad bar. This year we are adding bubble soccer. Registration starts in March and is open for three weeks and then the event is March 28-31. That should be the first week that most programs are back after spring break. People pay $20 individually, that gets you three sports, and then compile into teams for

the respective categories. See you all there!

**Michael Skiles – Hammer Night at the Museum Event**

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) - Thank you GSA for coprogramming with us what will be a very fun night at the museum this Friday at the Hammer Museum. We’ll have a very nice wine and hors d’ouevres reception.188 grad students have already RSVP’d. The event is open to the entire grad student community, not just Weyburn residents. We are looking forward to this as a grad student wide event. We have done this event with the GSA many times before. It has always been wildly successful as a chance for grad students of all departments to mingle,

meet their peers, and enjoy the whole Hammer Museum.

**Knox Brown**

 Knox Brown I would like to recognize and commend Milan for maintaining GSA’s neutrality on this issue. I also would like to express support for Michael Skile’s amendments that he has put forward tonight. This is about ensuring that the GSA creates an environment that is welcoming and inclusive to all of the people that GSA represents. A vote for this amendment is a vote against speech that marginalizes anybody on this campus.

**Joshua Saidoff**

 Joshua Saidoff - I have an open letter with 71 signatories that I will read in part now. “We urge you to ensure that the GSA does not become a body politicized by the….” There is a constituency that appreciates this group’s decision to maintain neutrality on this issue. We respect the principle and legal decision to stay out of the fray, if you will.

Chiao-Wen Lan – That ends the public comments period

**Resolutions (**6:35-6:39)

Ian Coley (MPSC) – I move that we hear Joshua’s resolution first

 The motion is seconded

 The motion carries, with 0 votes against

 *Joshua Saidoff, InformedGrads* – reads resolution aloud, printed copy provided to forum attendees. “The GSA does not support or condone anti-Semitic speech or action in any form…” I would ask that somebody would put this on the floor.

o Michael Skiles (WHRA) moves to adopt this resolution

o Housing seconds

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – we need to make sure we have discussion time before

adopting this resolution

 Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – I feel that this is outside of the realm of GSA.

What happened online was horrible, but GSA is trying to remain neutral, and adopting this would not be remaining neutral.

 Biological Sciences rep – This may set the precedent that this is our issue that we care strongly about. I don’t think that we should take this one stance and ignore others; that almost seems discriminatory.

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – the UC has already issued a system wide statement against all intolerance, not just anti-Semitism. Adopting this resolution would be making the choice that the University of California did not make, by speaking directly to anti-Semitism and not to all intolerance

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) – the Jewish community has just suffered a series of very vitriolic attacks. It’s appalling and ridiculous and I don’t see why we as a

GSA cannot say that we do not stand for anti-Semitism and that this is abhorrent. Whenever one of our constituent communities is being marginalized or attacked, we should stand with that constituency.

 Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – the diversity caucus also felt attacked. If we

pass this, why did we not pass anything earlier about discrimination? Do we have to involve UC legal?

 Roy Champawat – I believe that this body can take positions, that’s government speech.

 Biological Sciences rep – if you’re going to take a resolution saying that you support the Jewish community, it would only be fair and balanced to say the exact same thing about any kind of discriminatory act towards Palestinians. That

would make it a fair, balanced, and neutral act. By making this resolution, you’re

kind of saying that we hold one community to be more valuable than another.

 Social Sciences representative – I think that this resolution is different because we are not being asked to amend anything. The Facebook post on the previous page is appalling and I am very sorry. I think that saying that we are appalled and that we do not support hatred is reasonable. This is not a funding decision, this is a question of whether or not we are going to tolerate this within our community and the clear answer is no, this will not be tolerated

 Edwin Eshaghzadeh (Denistry) – I also think that this is a different than the earlier things discussed. This is a non-binding resolution, not an amendment. It doesn’t regard funding or politics or conflict.

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) moves to adopt

o Housing seconds the motion

o 13 for, 4 against, the motion carries and the resolution is adopted

**Ian Coley, External Vice President, MPSC**

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – what brings me here today is cleaning up our mess. There are things that GSA is supposed to be doing that we don’t. All meetings must have minutes and tallies of votes taken. If you look at the website, you can’t find meeting minutes. This is a matter of transparency. Secondly, financial and budgetary information need to be more accessible and more understood. Why is the budget that is made not reflecting the amount of money that is being spent? Our forum meetings are not being held to a parliamentary procedure. With a more orderly system, we would be able to do a lot more. We have to table things so that we have time to discuss with our councils when we find things very important. All of those things should be settled in the intervening time between when something is introduced and the next meeting.

 The main action is that the GSA adhere to the code and the constitution, start following Robert’s rules, start doing things officially. The second thing is that we actively punish GSA members who do not do their jobs. Our money goes to pay the stipends of cabinet members. When they are not doing their jobs, they should not get our money. We need to take actions for things like meeting minutes being mysteriously missing, for not being able to get the information that we need to tell people what the GSA is doing. We need to penalize people for not doing their jobs. We need to reclaim the money that they’re supposed to be getting from us so that we can program for ourselves if we want to or disperse the money wherever we want. And then the last major point is that MPSC and others find it very important to

see all meeting minutes from all committee meetings in fall quarter put up within one week after this legislation passes. We want meeting minutes up one week after the resolution is passed. That is far after the ten days after a meeting ends that is set out in the constitution. So, one week, get the minutes up, because they have to be there, because they were supposed to be being taken. If they’re not there, then we have to think about it. But, we need to start punishing the chairs of committees for not doing their jobs. And, in doing so, hopefully we can get a more efficient government

running here. After this bill passes, we would assess how things are doing at the next forum meeting in terms of people meeting their code and constitutional obligations. That’s it.

 Chiao-Wen Lan – Any questions regarding this bill?

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) – Is this meant to be a nonbinding resolution or are you actually proposing to amend several codes?

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – There are no code changes in here. Everything cited in here is what is already existent. The only binding thing in here is that we agree to penalize people for not posting minutes at the rate that is set out and we agree to talk about how GSA cabinet members are performing at the next forum.

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) – So you don’t seem to have cited any code that requires

that minutes be recorded at cabinet meeting.

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – The cabinet is a committee and all committee meetings need to have minutes according to article 7 section C number 2. Maybe the reverse of that.

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) – I don’t believe that the cabinet is defined as a committee

under that language.

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – We can argue for specifics if you want, however, we are lacking other committee meeting minutes as well. We’re lacking all minutes.

 Chiao-Wen Lan – Any other questions regarding this bill? None from the forum members?

 Joshua Saidoff– how is this not just an attempt at a legislative coup? Trying to say that we are going to review people very strenuously and punish and sanction people for that.

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – GSA forum is invited to review the efficacy of their officers. We are supposed to deduct stipends and remove people from their positions. That is part of our job as forum. Disciplinary sanctions require a two-thirds vote to be implemented. Regardless of whether this bill passes, is tabled indefinitely, the first two action clauses here are already in the code and constitution. I am merely bringing them to your attention

 Biological Sciences rep – Can you list very specific requests that you would like us to approve? You say minutes are not being kept, what are you referring to?

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – It says in the code that all committee meetings must keep minutes and voting records, to be published within ten days and available upon

request. I believe that GSA should enforce its entire code and constitution

 Biological Sciences rep – So are you passing anything new?

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – We would like to see minutes from past meetings. If they are

not up within seven days of this passing, we will vote to deduct funding and stipends.

 Biological Sciences rep – So we are going to ask for meeting minutes and potentially investigate GSA members at the next meeting?

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) – the constitution talks about cabinet, forum, and subsidiary committees. Nowhere does it say that cabinet is a committee or that cabinet has to take minutes. It is not clear that cabinet is a committee. This could be like passing an

ex post facto law. You can’t now make illegal something that wasn’t illegal before. At

the very least, it isn’t clear that cabinet counts as a committee under the constitution

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – You’re missing the point. The point is not to punish the cabinet.

The point is that we want our GSA cabinet members to do better.

 Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – Does that mean you are okay with cabinet not doing their jobs and just using our money? (Addressed to Michael)

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) – Do you see most executive bodies releasing meeting minutes? Do you see President Obama releasing his meeting minutes?

 Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – I don’t see a problem with keeping people accountable and doing their job.

 Michael Skiles (WHRA) – We can’t say that cabinet meetings minutes were due in the past when that is not true

 Social Sciences rep – I understand the spirit of the bill and am not against accountability. I think where I’m drawing some concern is in the specific language

about how we are going to be punishing cabinet members or officers for not doing there job. Maybe we should take an intermediary step first before condemning them for something that wasn’t in the constitution or wasn’t clear to begin with. The things you’re asking for seem to go beyond a general sense of accountability, you’re asking for actionable items rather than expressing a general desire for accountability

 Andres Schneider – If you have a requirement or express of desire in terms of what we should be doing, if you want the minutes, come to me! Let’s grab a coffee, let’s talk, you can have all of the minutes you want

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – MPSC met with members of the cabinet months ago and you--

 Andres Schneider – We are not hiding anything. If you want to bring the forum into a higher level, GSA is you all.

 Edwin Eshaghzadeh (Dentistry) – I want to say that I love the fact that you brought in

Robert’s Rules of order. It would be great if we could follow that. I would like to know what the word committee describes, especially in terms of penalizing people for past actions. I would like to make an amendment to take out the punishing clause “be it enacted”

o Ian Coley (MPSC) seconds the motion

o 8 for, 0 opposed, the motion carries

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – the minutes are still required to be posted, we just are not required to punish them

 Roy Champawat – it seems to me that we are getting into a lot of discussions about the codes and constitution of the GSA and the body does not have the codes in front of them right now. It seems like what you should do is make sure what the codes

are, what the operative sections of the codes are, whether or not they are being followed. Inform yourselves about what is required, what is not required, what the mechanisms are.

 Milan Chaterjee– Good evening everyone, I had an urgent academic commitment that has come up. Thank you all for sitting through what has been an almost three-

hour meeting, it takes a lot of patient and commitment to sit through. I think our time was a little wasted today; we have bigger and better things to do to represent the entire UCLA graduate student community. I was informed that an attorney gave council, but we have the office of legal affairs; please feel free to get in touch with them.

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – what does this have to do with the bill that is being discussed right now?

 Milan Chaterjee– I was supposed to give an officer report

 Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – yields her comment to a public comment

 Rahim Kurwa – if there is a resolution that the GSA is acting upon in denying funding to people, if there are minutes that happen at a meeting where fundamental things are being determined, don’t we have a right to see those things? That just seems

like that’s really messed up. We have asked and these things weren’t given to us, so

now we have to go to the university.

 Biological Sciences rep – can we ask then that there be minutes provided by the next meeting?

 Ian Coley (MPSC) – those minutes were already supposed to have been provided

 Roy Champawat – there is a question that seems to be unresolved about whether that body needs to take minutes. You need to see whether that is the case or not, I know that it has been asserted, but it has also been challenged.

 Social Sciences rep – moves to reintroduce part of the formerly struck clause

o Ian Coley (MPSC) seconds

 May Bhetraratana – forum meeting minutes are up on the website, are the academic councils also considered to be committees?

 Various reps – our meeting minutes are available

 Social Sciences moves to reintroduce part of the formerly struck clause, keeping the parentheses stricken

o Ian Coley (MPSC) seconds

o 7 to 5, the motion carries and the sentence is reintroduced to the bill

 Ian Coley (MPSC) moves to vote on the resolution

o Social Sciences seconds

o 10 to 4, motion carries and the bill is approved

**Bruin Shelter**

 *Louis Tse, eGSA*

 Can I motion to table to what I would like to talk about until the next forum?

o Seconded

 Bruin Shelter coming fall 2016, run by UCLA students, the second of its kind in

the country. I will tell you much more about it next forum. See you in three weeks.

**Adjournment** (8:36 pm)