UCLA SSC Minutes - January 27, 2016

Attendance
Mia Bennett, Geography
Max Belletto, Anthropology
Richard Thai, Info Studies
Cecilia Tsai, Info Studies
Rebecca Bucher, Info Studies
Kevin Kind, East Asian Studies
Ian Coley, Math iacoley@math.ucla.edu
Iris Clever, History irisclever@ucla.edu
Cameron Burch, Public Policy, camburch@gmail.com
Sophia Sleap, Latin American Studies
Dan Zipp, Sociology
Francesca Parente, Poli Sci
Derek Lu, Asian American Studies
Dylan Connor, Geography

1. Report from Ian of Math and Physical Science Council (MPSC)
   a. Ian is the External President for Math and Physical Sciences Council (MPSC)
   b. Says MPSC started a “holy war” to bring balance back to GSA and ensure that the powers-that-be are doing their jobs according to the constitution.
   c. They don’t post meeting minutes, for instance. This is one constitutional violation.
   d. $2,000 was disbursed without an accurate recording by the GSA Cabinet.
   e. Francesca remarks that we (UCLA SSC) is one of 13 councils within the GSA. The GSA has a 4 person cabinet. Cabinet members run for office and are usually unopposed. Each council receives as many votes as it has 600 members.
   f. Ian continues and says that when the GSA Council is put under scrutiny, it shows that they are not doing their day jobs.
   g. A bill was passed at the last forum noting that they’ll do their day jobs according to Robertson’s Rules of Order.
   h. The President makes $800 a month, but he showed up 3 hours late to the meeting.
   i. We as the GSA Forum can deduct people from their stipends if they are not doing their jobs.
      i. For instance, no minutes from the committee meetings in Fall Quarter have been posted as of today - this is really a slap in the face.
   j. MPSC proposes to strip the Council members of their stipends. There are also no minute meetings posted from Council meetings.
   k. SSC Member asks if there is anything the GSA Council is doing well. Ian hesitates and is unable to answer.
   l. Richard says that during GSA meetings, he felt like he was in the dark most of the time. He had to figure out what was going on himself and he really didn’t know what was happening in the Cabinet.
m. New legislation will be proposed at the next meeting to assess whether they are doing their jobs or not.

n. Two people who are members of the Forum yet who do not have a vote (these are two members of the Housing Committee have been voting in flagrant violation of our governing documents. Furthermore, a revised budget for GSA puts $14,000 in their Cabinet - who knows what they will use it for!

2. Discussion of the proposed GSA Amendment in response to the controversy over the Diversity Forum

o. **UCLA SSC is to vote on whether we feel that there should be an amendment added to the GSA Constitution stating that GSA will not discriminate on the basis of political viewpoint, race, or sex for funding decisions.**

p. Francesca: Public universities cannot discriminate

q. Richard: One of the big issues we are trying to figure out is about whether GSA should introduce this legislation - but then if this passes, does that imply that GSA did discriminate?

2. ASUCLA suggests waiting until UCLA lawyers come to a conclusion before we pass any legislation. But then there is some sentiment that we should pass the legislation so that GSA can just move on.
   a. Lawyers said last week that they would try to come back before the next GSA Meeting with their advice.

3. The text of the resolution is read. This has been circulated via email.

4. Francesca: There are people in my department who are very pro-Israel and who do feel that any support for SJP is like a slap in the face, and they are very pleased that the Cabinet did this. While we can look at it and feel that it’s wrong to discriminate against a student group, there are students within the graduate student body who feel that SJP’s actions are personally hurtful.

5. Members within SSC express concern about how the legislation could be interpreted in the future - for instance, could we... Francesca: From what I understand, the Diversity Caucus, which is part of the GSA, wanted to host a Diversity Forum. Apparently, GSA has a stipulation of neutrality that any events hosted have to be neutral. We should not alienate any of the constituents of the GSA.

6. President of GSA, Milan Chaterjee, said it was GSA’s position that no one involved with the “Divest from Israel” movement should be allowed to participate in the Diversity Caucus. If you have any position whatsoever, you are not allowed to any funds.
   a. However, Divest from Israel feels this violates their 1st Amendment Rights, so they got lawyers involved
   b. The lawyers for Students for Justice for Palestine wrote that denying a student group funds due to political affiliation violates the First Amendment. This is established case law that hasn’t been challenged in many years and seems immutable.
c. GSA was told not to take a position until it has received counsel from UCLA lawyers. The issue is whether or not it violates 1st Amendment Rights.

7. UC Policy is that the group violates anti-Semitism.

8. nd up funding a KKK student group?
   a. Dan: Concerns about both the wording and how it will be interpreted in the future.

9. At the last GSA Forum meeting, people voted to table the vote on the resolution, so there is a possibility that the vote will be forced in two weeks.

10. Members within SSC discuss the possibility of proposing an amended version.
   a. Richard: We would just need to send it to them. Richard and Max can then introduce the amendment.
   b. Max: It would be most expeditious to make a list of bullet points, which we could then post to the local Google Drive

11. Dan: There are three points to discuss regarding the amendment.
   a. First: What to do with the original amendment?
   b. Second: What to do with our own possible amended version of the amendment?
      i. Some people find it unsatisfactory.
         1. The wording, which could potentially let us fund the KKK. As it is currently written, the amendment is ambiguous as to whether it means the GSA won’t give a student group funding or whether it won’t allow them to attend.
            a. Dylan asks how this wording is reactionary.
            b. Dan says that he doesn’t like when things are enumerated, as it makes it okay to do other, unlisted things.
            c. Francesca: It’s not as comprehensive as it could be. Prefers to get rid of the first sentence about the First Amendment because this opens up the door to the legal case.
   c. Third: How to vote with the third SSC representative slot?
      1. Max: There is pending action, so maybe we should wait. We should possibly not involve ourselves in an external legal battle.
      2. Sigin: But you also have to think about this group – there are repercussions, like no funding.
      3. Francesca: The vote has been tabled twice. We could try to motion again to table it. If that fails, then we could abstain from the vote.
      4. Sigin: UC Policy is biased and ridiculous in general about Israel. I would want to vote to pass it. I don’t think anything severe will happen to SSC or GSA in general even. Adherence to the First Amendment is already assumed.
5. Francesca: Reiterates that there are people who very much agree with the Cabinet’s actions, and those that strongly disagree. Got the sense from SJP that it wasn’t about neutrality – it was about SJP feeling actively discriminated against.

6. Max: Concern that we’re making an implicit accusation against one side or another and actively involving ourselves when it’s actually in competent hands. Abstention for voting would be best for policy for our group.
   1. Someone asks if that would be like saying that discrimination is okay?
   2. Max: The lawyers haven’t spoken yet. Abstaining isn’t taking a stance.

7. Richard: Amendment is good but we have to consider context. Most of us agree with the amendment, but we have to keep in mind context of what’s going on. I still feel we should wait to hear what Legal has to say. How we vote will imply whether we act by our intentions yet. Legal will revert hopefully within the next two weeks.

8. Kevin, Sigin, and Dylan would be in favor of passing it.

9. Francesca: I think we should draft a different version.

10. Richard: Other councils might have their own versions.

11. Dan: There is a spirit of the law that we like – we all agree that discrimination is bad.

12. Derek: Why do we need lawyers to tell us how we feel?

13. Dylan: Why is there a big GSA vote happening before the lawyers come in?
   1. Richard: They want to deal with this now because it has been an issue since December. Some groups feel that it has been dragging along for far too long.
   2. Dan: We should motion to table.
   3. Francesca: If that fails, then what?
   4. Max: We can abstain.

14. Francesca motions to vote, Max seconds. Majority internal vote.
   1. Vote 1: Whether to take the motion off the table
      1. Majority votes to take it off the table. So we have committed our three votes to take it off the table.
   2. Vote 2: How to vote in case it is taken off the table.
      1. 8 people vote Yes
      2. 7 people vote Abstention
      3. → 2 SSC votes will be for Yes, and 1 vote will be to abstain
   3. Vote 3: Whether SSC accepts a council member to attend as the third representative to GSA. Dylan offers to attend; SSC members in attendance approve.
15. Next GSA meeting is Wednesday, February 10 at 5:30 pm.

3. Requisitions
   1. Please see attached spreadsheet.
      a. Max requests balance for Anthropology
      b. Francesca motions to approve reqs, Max seconds. All in favor.

4. Event Fund
   2. Francesca asks if anyone has any concerns about the wording and offers a recap.
      a. Basically, at the last meeting we voted to create an Events Fund. Dylan and her laid out guidelines as follows:
         i. Each department’s cap is 25% of their new allocation for this year. Events will be additive if departments work together. All events must be done via cash advance. Application requires that it be an academic fund only. Fund cannot be used to sponsor end of year party, etc. We will require you to explain what the event is. Misuse of funds would be bad.
            1. If you draw from Events Fund before your allocation is up, please refer to the “Carryover Scenarios” document in the Google Drive. We are doing this to keep the funds equitable - it’s not fair if some departments spend a ton of money and expect SSC to cover you. You are hurting your future selves if you overdraw money.
         ii. Groups still are not guaranteed money from Discretionary Fund. We will not make any promises about what will and will not be covered.
      b. Ashley asks for potential scenarios.
         i. Dylan reads one: If you don’t do any academic events, you will not be subject to the 50% penalty.
      c. Sigin: Will Events Fund replace Discretionary Fund?
         1. No, it will be a separate allocation within it.
      d. Francesca: Are there any amendments to the fund?
         i. Max: To summarize, I understand that the Events Fund offers a potential 25% bonus. Though should a group use more than 25% for an event, it comes out of your allocation for the next year.
         ii. Sigin possibly thinks the cap may be too small.
         iii. Francesca: We already have a redistribution fund to top off the small departments. So there has already been a lot of money from the discretionary fund allocated to small departments. Otherwise some departments might only get $80. Plus, the 25% is already going off the already inflated amount of the $400 minimum.
         iv. Francesca and Sigin go back and forth on what the purpose of the Discretionary Fund is.
v. Francesca explains that the Redistirbution Fund is what is meant to disproportionately benefit the smaller departments - not the Discretionary Fund.

vi. Ashley thinks that there does need to be some sort of policy regarding use of the Discretionary Fund because in the past, it seems that some clubs came forward looking for reimbursement without knowing what money they have.

vii. Francesca: Dylan and I have put a lot of thought into how to allocate and structure the Events Fund.

viii. Dylan says that he, as representing the Geography Dept which is a mid-sized department, would not be in favor of increasing the funding for small departments, because right now mid-sized departments (50-60 people) are hardly more than double the small departments (which have like 9 people)

e. Francesca motions to vote on whether to vote on establishing Event Fund guidelines tonight.
   1. 6 people vote in favor, 2 vote against; 2 abstain

f. Francesca: Does anyone want to amend the guidelines?

g. Max: What is being argued is free money, and not enough free money.

h. Francesca motions to vote, Max seconds
   i. 7 in favor; 1 opposed; 2 abstains

ii. **Events Budget passes.**

5. History Event

i. “Caged or Uncaged” - asking for money from Events Fund. Budget is needed for YRL, lunch, honorarium for a professor, coffee, etc. Requesting $371 for their event (which would not be used for the honorarium). Hoping for 50-60 attendees. This will be a reimbursement instead of a cash advance because event is soon.

j. Max motions to vote, Francesca seconds.
   i. All in favor, motion passes.

6. Social Event

k. Ashley: Gumbo Pot - but they don’t deliver - so she will have to go get food

l. Max: Will try to get a room reserved in Haines Hall 3rd Floor.

m. **Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 17 at 5:30 pm**