Assembly Members Present: Art Motta (MEChA), Alternate Michael (QSU), Cristal Gonzalez (SANAI), Jose Cadenas (Cowell), Alternate Imari Reynolds (Cowell), Seamus Howard (Cowell), Colin Hortman (Stevenson), Kyra Brandt (Stevenson), Alternate Roy (Crown), Andrew Paolini (Crown), Aykezar Adil (Crown), Chandler Moeller (Merrill), Alternate Bianca (Merrill), Roxanna Gutierrez (Porter), Alternate Clara (Porter), Serene Jneid (Porter), Winnie Sidhu (Kresge), Shannon Earl (Kresge), Jackie Roger (Kresge), Suini Torres (Oakes), Kiana Coleman (Oakes), Tamra Owens (Oakes), Roshni Advani (Eight), Alternate Noah Thoron (Eight), Simba Khadder (Eight), Lance McNeil (Nine), Shubhankar Sharan (Nine), Alternate Rohit (Nine), Ramneet Bajwa (Ten), Vanessa Sadsad (Ten), Brad Mleynek (OD), Max Hufft (CoAA), Israel Molina (CoD), Louise Cabansay (EVC), Justin Lardinois (Chair).

Assembly Members Absent: Yang Kong (Cowell), Ricardo Sainz (Stevenson), Michael Markson (Crown), Kartik Ashok (Merrill), Alexandra Kasper (Merrill), Adham Taman (Porter), Ray Inoue (Eight), Sam Shaw (Nine), Daniel Iglesias (Ten), Haedyn Christie (QSU), Kaysi Wheeler (IVC).

Approval of the Agenda:

Israel: Motion to add 15 minutes after investment bill to discuss elections commission.

Michael: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

Serene: Motion to add 10 minutes for SJP before investment before elections commissions.

Roxanna: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

Israel: Motion to approve.

Colin: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

Reading of the Previous Meeting’s Minutes

Israel: Motion to approve the minutes.

Vanessa: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

Announcements and Public Comment
Max: Tomorrow I’m submitting a presentation for the next academic senate meeting we’re going to go over the CLASS survey. We’re going to go over the main majors that have been impacted by the prerequisite pyramids. I’m telling them they should probably do something about this. If anyone would like to add anything to that, my office hours are Monday 12:30.

Jackie: **Motion to add 10 minutes for Advocate America sponsorship after Pre-dental society.**

Shannon: **Second.**

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, **motion passes.**

Justin: A few meetings ago, we talked about asking the chance to modify the language in measure 8, and he’s receptive to it, he asked me to write a letter telling him what we wanted. He said he’d consult with his staff and legal counsel to make sure that he can do it.

Kyra: Rock and roll on the knoll will be taking place on May 23rd from 10-12 PM there will be lots of art music and a really good time. It’ll be on the Stevenson Knoll.

Art: We all smile the same language is the theme of the MCC and that will be this Saturday from 12-6 on Oakes lower lawn. There will be many ethnic groups there selling their products.

Vanessa: on May 20th at 7 PM the UCSC democrats will be holding an event where students will have an opportunity to work with those involved in local affairs, among those who will be attending are Mark Stone’s office along with the field director and vice chair for the santa cruz county democrats.

Ayke: Crown is holding their annual casino night from 8-11 please come through!

Art: This Friday is the float to vote jaws movie screening.

Brad: My office is looking to make the student union a 24 hours study space right before finals. I’m going to SUGB to maybe get some funding, if you’re interested in helping with that process let me know.

Michael: The QSU and Theta Pi Sigma is putting on their queer prom at the Kresge town hall and it is an open donation event for the Santa Cruz AIDS project and aids life cycle.

Art: MEChA is holding its Quinceanera on May 30th from 7-12 downstairs in the 9/10 MPR. It is a collaboration of many student orgs, come through!

Ayke: Queer fashion show is happening on Friday and Saturday night, they’re selling tickets in the quarry.

Colin: Relay for life is happening and there will be activities through the night.
Bi: Merrill college is hosting a giant board game night from 9-11 in the Merrill multicultural center.

**Presentations:**

**Pre-Dental Society**

I’m one of the board members from pre dental society. Thank you for having me here. Basically I’m here to ask if we could possibly utilize the remaining funds that you granted us for our senior board members. This is the first time we’re doing this. We just wanted to relieve some of the financial burden. The stoles would be to acknowledge the time and effort that the seniors have contributed to the organization. We have 200-300 left in our funds. We didn’t utilize all our supplies, so as a result we still had some remaining funds left.

Jose: Do you know how much each stole costs?

Pre-Dental Society: $50

Jose: Are you trying to pay for all of the stoles or are you going to use all of the money?

Pre-Dental Society: We’re hoping for each person to contribute a little for themselves. It’s just to alleviate the personal costs.

Israel: **Motion to approve the request.**

Roshni: **Second.**

**Sponsorship Request:**

Sergio: As some of you may recall I was here a couple weeks ago. I’m doing a build on that today. I’ve narrowed it down to specific problems that we could tackle. I’d like to start with a small antecedent. When you’re in elementary school, you get asked what you want to be when you grow up. What I saw back then, was that I felt my dreams narrow down. From an early age, they ask you to be something, and you better start thinking about it now. It has to be something that your parents agree with. When my parents asked me what I wanted to be, I said a doctor. I always wanted to say that I wanted to be superman. I don’t have super powers, but as I grew older, I realize that the superman that the world needs is compassion. This is something that our society incredibly lacks in. A lot of people say that it’s not. My job gives me a skewed version. Advocate American is not attacking your usual problems. It’s not political, its not religious. It’s something that we just take for granted. Ask anybody what the solution for any problem is. It never revolves around them. They always ask people to do something else. That’s something I want to get down here. The organization affects everyone at the immediate level using an app called 7 cups of tea. It’s available online and on the Appstore and the Playstore. 7 cups of tea allows you to be heard and to listen. It is pure and sincere listening. It’s not the same as your friends, where you have to take care of someone. You could listen or be heard by someone else,
any time. I’m hoping that this advocate America could be a part of something greater. This
generation will finally be the birth of hope and that this room can change the world. It comes
down to the individual level. It doesn’t come down to making campaigns, the main problems I’m
trying to address is suicide risk. In this university, we’re doing a horrible job when I comes to
mental health. To be quite honest people are dying. No one knows. Somebody commits suicide,
and you think well that was their choice. That’s a problem in society. In all the animal species,
humans are the most likely species to kill itself out of any other. And it goes past suicide. It
comes as retention, which comes from high stress and financial hardship. I’m completely sure
that this could be something that will help the high stress situation. In our generation, we are
under the impression that some expressions are wrong. Loneliness, sadness, fear, we don’t want
to be associated with them. We keep these from people. Emotions are pure, on a fundamental
level. It is responses from your body. We don’t confront these emotions. If you feel sad, you
distract yourself. And if you feel scared, you assume things, that things will work out. That is a
coping strategy and it is highly inefficient. If you feel sad, scare or lonely, talk to somebody, it is
hard for many people. We live in a generation that is sacrificed to networking. We don’t care if
we’re actually receiving some intellectual content, we just want to not feel alone. It’s those rare
moments when you’re excited to talk to someone else. We’re just waiting for the exact moment
to reply and to tell how we’re doing and how we’d deal with it. It’s basic things that we’re doing
wrong. Just recapping, emotions on itself are pure things, they are part of nature. We need to be
able to differentiate things and not classify them as bad emotions. The same way we differentiate
light from darkness. Curiosity from the absence of facts. We must learn to differentiate ourselves
and never blame ourselves for how we feel. The real things that we want to tackle are prejudice.
It’s hard to admit, we think we’re perfect the way we are. It’s hard for us to admit we’re not
perfect. So, I’d like to end to fight against this darkness, the darkness of ignorance. Thank you.

Max: **Motion to extend five minutes.**

Tamra: **Second.**

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, **motion passes.**

Sergio: We have an abstract that has been approved by professors. Both professors that we talked
to, our provost from the engineer program completely supported it. It’s only one of many
abstracts that the engineering team has been working on. We are working to help low income
places such as Haiti and other places where electricity is very short. I was able to narrow it down
with the engineering team before we presented to the sustainability office. We needed to prove
that it works. It does work because I made it work in high school, with just trash. It would be
great t have it up and running and to ship it to places where it’s needed. I believe it’s $700 of it
which is just basic parts, tiny steel beams and electric crystals. They are not very efficient
because they break at times. The other item is for advocate America. It’s a 600 item, which I was
able to choose from the programs that I did in the past. I went to a lot of summer sessions and
they talked to us about how to make any principle hip in the community., you have to make it
apply to the larges demographic that you can. We’d have to play by what’s popular and what’s cool.

Seamus: You’re asking for $700 for Advocate America and $600 for what exactly?

Sergio: It doesn’t have a name it’s an electric generator that is camouflaged to discourage theft.

Max: motion to extend 5 minutes.

Seamus: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

Art: I just wanted to ask what this is going to be used for.

Sergio: You go to very impoverished areas and you ask to see what is the reason for crime, famine. A very low level solution is education. They can’t educate themselves because they don’t have electricity. They work all day and when they stop working, they can’t do anything because there’s no light to read or electricity for a computer to work. We have a pretty good system set up. We’re trying to upgrade it so that we can power one laptop per child. They sent us a computer to make it operational with that device. This will help people educate themselves at night. This could improve their lives significantly. More job opportunities would be provided.

Andrew: From what I understand, this is something you’re using to provide electricity for those in impoverished areas.

Sergio: Yes, and if using other kinds of power it becomes a target for stealing.

Seamus: First, how much do we have in general fund?

Franchesca: $8004.12

Seamus: Motion to fund $1300 from general fund.

Serene: Second.

Imari: Objection. I’m not sure how this is working with the body

Sergio: The device itself has 6 different people working on it, they’re doing this as their senior project and their time is concrete. If it gets patented, it is a guarantee that they’ll get into a high corporate manufacturing firm. I’m trying to focus on Haiti, none of them will get paid for this. We’re willing to commit to that. It is a humanitarian focus.

Winnie: Motion to extend five minutes.

Tamra: Second.
Clara: **Objection.**

In favor: 6 | Opposed: 11 | Abstentions: 11, **no time extension.**

**Presentations:**

SJP: We largely support the sentiment in bill but we just wanted to address some issues in this space. Terms like conflict get thrown around a lot. One kind of conflict is a hurt feeling, interpersonal feelings. Another kind of conflict is political conflict, where different people have different feelings of how we should organize ourselves. Another conflict is one that is motivated by hate. That is something that is motivated by islamophobia or anti-Semitism. We do want to make sure that there are different types of conflicts. We call interpersonal conflicts based on hate, when those should be kept completely separate. Another thing is that geography gets mixed up a lot. That is a distinct conflict over land and how society should be organized. It doesn’t fall neatly and SJP tries to make that clear. Recently we hosted a great Israeli anthropologist and Arab Jews actually have a lot in common with Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, and we try to foster those kinds of solidarities. This isn’t a conflict between nationalities and races and ethnicities. We like to use the word joint struggle. One campus there are interpersonal conflict because there are different groups with different ideas. Those are political conflicts; those are interpersonal and not fueled by hate. These debates are rich and healthy for the campus. Moving on, we have 6 concerns that we wanted to address; when it comes to this bill, the Palestinians community wasn’t consulted with the crafting of this bill. In our view we have a lot of great ideas for this. We also think it’s a problem when the communities that are going to be affected aren’t asked for their opinion. We are reflecting that call and we are acting on it. This is something that is going to affect them and we asked them if this was something they wanted us to do, and our first concern was to ask that communities who will be affected by this bill be consulted first.

Concern #2: This clause: “WHEREAS, a peaceful solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict requires mutual respect and recognition of multiple narratives...” The problem with this is that is associates interpersonal conflict with political action. We recommend striking this.

Concern #3: We would like to change “WHEREAS, to maintain a safe and inclusive campus environment, tensions between students related to foreign conflicts including but not limited to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, should be resolved in a healthy and collaborative manner rather than be exacerbated...” to replace with: “WHEREAS, to maintain a healthy and rich political climate on campus, students engaged in debates related to foreign conflicts, including but not limited to the topic of Israel/Palestine, should not confuse political debate with interpersonal strife...”.

Concern #4: The bill says, “WHEREAS, strengthening the Palestinian economy, encouraging economic cooperation between Israelis and Palestinians...”, we’re not sure if Palestinians and Israelis even want this, and we believe that SUA should not be taking a political stance that is not
representative of the student population. So we recommend to change this to “WHEREAS, strengthening the Palestinian economy, encouraging economic cooperation between Israelis and Palestinians as long as Israelis and Palestinians mutually agree to it”

Concern #5: “WHEREAS, both Israelis and Palestinians deserve the right to self-determination, including the right to live in a secure, free and independent states of their own and to determine their own future...” This clause refers to the two state solution. Again, there hasn’t been a consensus between the Israelis and the Palestinian on what kind of government they want. They want to focus on political change. This focuses on a very specific type of solution and it might not necessarily fit the facts on the ground for the next 5-10 years. So we recommend to change to: “WHEREAS, Israelis and Palestinians are already engaging in joint struggle against oppression...” we feel that is more reflective of what’s actually happening.

Finally, Concern #6: There are several groups listed in this bill and it’s concerning because those organizations engage in what Palestinians refer to as normalization, which is “the participation in any project, initiative or activity, in Palestine or internationally, that aims (implicitly or explicitly) to bring together Palestinians (and/or Arabs) and Israelis (people or institutions) without placing as its goal resistance to and exposure of the Israeli occupation and all forms of discrimination and oppression against the Palestinian people.” Whether you agree with this or not, this is what Palestinians want. You have to say what the Palestinians want, not what you want. Any organization that advocates for Palestinians should represent their voice. So just to give you an example of how normalization works, some person wrote “In the activity of the Peres Center for Peace there is no evident effort being made to change the political and socioeconomic status quo in the occupied territories, but just the opposite: Efforts are being made to train the Palestinian population to accept its inferiority and prepare it to survive under the arbitrary constraints imposed by Israel, to guarantee the ethnic superiority of the Jews. With patronizing colonialism, the center presents an olive grower who is discovering the advantages of cooperative marketing; a pediatrician who is receiving professional training in Israeli hospitals; and a Palestinian importer who is learning the secrets of transporting merchandise via Israeli ports, “ the writer goes on to say that ethnicity doesn’t help this situation. Anti-normalization organizations make sure that Israelis and Palestinians work together in joint struggle. These organizations want these people to work together. Another organization is the Middle East Insurance Initiative, the bill says that it’s endorsed by the current leader of the Palestinian authority, but what the bill doesn’t state is that Palestinians actually elected an official out of office. The Israelis in the US armed the Palestinian authority and actually the Palestinian force is trained by the US. They actually repress Palestinians. In conclusion, everyone wants peace. Maybe they want peace under the barrel of the gun, but everyone wants peace. This is not a good description for this issue here. Hiding behind the word peace, makes it hard to work with this. Being polite is not all the same as being peaceful. Rich political debate is often contentious because feelings get hurt. That’s how political debate should work. It should be full of debate.
We just want you to keep that in mind and take in our suggestions, and thanks for having me here.

Ayke: **Motion to extend time by 10 minutes.**

Louise: **Second.**

Shannon: **Objection.**

In favor: 25 | Opposed: 3 | Abstentions: 3 **motion passes.**

Simba: I hear what you’re saying, I feel it’s out of place taking this resolution that we heard and editing it, but have you talked to the people who originally wrote this, and ask them if it was doable? Is that a possibility?

SJP: Yeah but you all were going to make a vote tonight. We can amend or approve this.

Roy: So wonderful presentation, I have some things based on your presentation, you refer to Palestinians worried about participating in dialogues on campus. You also came here on behalf on SJP. Then in the end of the presentation you end with words like dialogue. My question is, in order to get any sort of input or consultation from other groups on campus, I’m pretty sure that would include some kind of dialogue, which it clearly states that Palestinians are not open to do. So it kind of bothers me how SJP is speaking on behalf of those who are worried of participating in that kind of dialogue.

SJP: The only thing that it says that words like dialogue should not be used as a cover to stifle debate. Everyone dialogues with each other, but the point is that dialogue has acquired this separate meaning that is meant to stifle political debate. So organizations will say things like instead of taking action, support your group. It’s not that Palestinians are not in any way not open to dialogue, it’s just what is meant by that word, SJP would have loved to be consulted with the bill. We’re not in any way close to dialogue.

Andrew: So in the conclusion you say that words like dialogue and conclusiveness and respect, stifle political debate, am I correct in inferring that there is an implicit accusation that that is what resolution is doing?

SJP: That’s up for you to decide. In one way it is relevant because these normalization initiatives are grafted onto words like dialogue and mutual respect and understanding. It’s hiding and stifling a political process that we’re trying to uncover.

Spencer: In your initial definitions of conflict, you have that political conflicts can be intense and constructive no matter how antagonistic. So are we to believe that there is zero overlap between both types of conflict?
SJP: In general there should be when you’re trying to analyze what kind of conflict is going on. They don’t fit every situation perfectly. But we should be able to differentiate each one, so that we can figure out what stuff each conflict is about.

Spencer: You also said that in concern #4, you stated that do Palestinians and Israelis actually want to strengthening the Palestinian economy, encouraging economic cooperation between Israelis and Palestinians...”, do you have any statistics that say otherwise?

SJP: There can’t be just haphazard economic integration. It doesn’t actually help us in any way. Because the bill doesn’t cite any information from Palestinians, there is no way to tell that they really want that.

Spencer: In the EcoPeace for water project, both Palestinians and Israelis and Jordanians were contacted and are very for collaboration to solve the water crisis.

SJP: After a bit, there were a bunch of Palestinians and Jordanians that didn’t want that. The bill should get the political positions right of those they are representing.

Spencer: If their political principles come from a hateful and non-constructive argument, are their political principles against cooperation?

SJP: Their political principles are rational and they are trying to preserve the notion of being Palestinian. They actually have a lot of great reasons for refusing to participate in these projects. If the bill is trying to say that Palestinians are full of hate and that’s the reason that they think that this, you still have to represent them the way they are.

**Resolutions:**

**Investment Bill:**

Simba: Reserve my right to make a motion, due to a lot of talk and things that have come up, I **motion to table this to next week.**

Roshni: Second.

Roy: **Objection.**

In favor: 18 | Opposed: 9 | Abstentions: 5, **motion passes.**

Max: **Motion for a five minute recess.**

Vanessa: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, **motion passes.**

-Closed Session-
**Budget Discussion**

Brad: How much is left in the deficit?

Justin: $4,957.

Brad: We’ve done a pretty good job at doing what we have, and I think if we really try to talk about the rest of it, I motion to reserve the remainder of the deficit from our general fund to be left to cover that deficit. Otherwise I know where this discussion is headed and it won’t be productive and it finishes the budget discussion and we can all go home.

Max: **Second.**

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, **motion passes.**

Serene: How much money is left in the general fund?

Franchesca: $8,004.12.

Justin: **Motion is out of order.**

Brad: Can we as a body just agree not to use the amount of money to use that to cover the deficit? I’d rather just have one simple solution.

Franchesca: I just want to say that last year, the carry forward was counted as counted income, and that turned out pretty badly and I can see the same thing happening again. We’re counting on money to still be there. I’d like the body to work as hard as they can to zero out that deficit. If the body has a clear set of rules by which it functions, that’s very fiscally responsible and if the body wants to work as hard as they can to get the deficit to zero I would recommend that.

Shub: The point of negotiations has passed by this time and just because we want an easy solution that doesn’t mean we should do this.

Max: How much did we cut last meeting? Where it would be fulfilled by measure 8 cuts? Second, how much are the savings of the Measure 8 reform?

Justin: There were two items that that was made for, student of color conference, $12000 to $9000 and then SLC which was reduced from $10000 to $7000. Were we to change this requirement, this would save us $11,360.

Louise: I believe the motion was that those would be the first priority for reallocation.

Brad: I think we talked about this last week, if the chancellor does this, we would still have to move all that money, so going back to what Franchesca was saying about banking on carry-forward, let’s just make the cuts and finish it tonight. We can put the same stipulations that we did on the conferences.
Colin: Reserve my right to make a motion, I hope that someone suggests something different, I’m hoping that we replenish eh funds that we cut, and I know that people don’t like doing it, but there are huge line items for RSO funding. I motion to cut $1000 from fall $3000 from winter and $1000 from Spring, with the stipulation that those would be the first things if possible to replenish next year if we have a carry forward.

Noah: Second.

Andrew: Objection. I think the funding that we’ve been cutting from Student Orgs is too much, we should find other places. I wanted to bring up USSA.

Jose: Reserve my right to make a motion, I hate cutting from student orgs and I think that should be the last thing, but I think we should try to make an effort, motion to amend to cut $1000 from each quarter.

Vanessa: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, amendment passes.

Art: Reserve my right to make an amendment, in the bylaws it says that a line item for RSO should be allocated if permitted. I saw this in years prior and they even created a bylaw to stipulate this. As much as I value the money in this line item. I think we can go ahead in creating the award per organization. I motion to amend that we cut $4000 from each line item.

Vanessa: Second.

Max: Objection.

Andrew: One of the things mentioned in this amendment, is that we could put more money into programming. I do speak against cutting $4000 from each line item, but it would nice to make sure that we had some allocated money for programming.

Vanessa: If we cut $12000 now that same set of money would still be $31000 which is still sufficient to fund the student bodies on this campus. We are moving towards being only a bank of a funding body and to say that cutting $4000 is an egregious amount, I want to know how you are all ready to cut $6000 from conferences and you were all ready to cut USSA conferences too.

Jose: Reserve my right to make a motion, I don’t agree with taking 4000 from each quarter just because we took away $10000 from sponsorship. So that’s less money that we’ll be able to give out. Call to question.

Roshni: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

Vote to make amendment to cut $4000 from each line item.
In favor: 4 | Opposed: 25 | Abstentions: 2, amendment fails.

Max: Call to question.

Seamus: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

Vote to pass motion to cut 1000 from fall, winter and spring line items with the stipulation that these funds be restored with measure 8:

In favor: 22 | Opposed: 7 | Abstentions: 2, motion passes.

Brad: Motion to take $333 from each line item under programming.

Rohit: Second.

Art: Objection.

Brad: Move to amend so that the same stipulation is added to these items.

Rohit: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

Max: We have people running for office suggesting to cut their own programming dollars and people who are also running for office also objecting.

Suini: I reserve my right to make a motion, I think it’s a good amendment, call to question.

Serene: Second.

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, motion passes.

In favor: 23 | Opposed: 2 | Abstentions: 5, amendment passes.

-Meeting adjourned-