Assembly Members Present: Art Motta (MEChA), Haedyn Christie (QSU), Cristal Gonzalez (SANAI), Jose Cadenas (Cowell), Alternate Imari Reynolds (Cowell), Seamus Howard (Cowell), Alternate Austin (Stevenson), Kyra Brandt (Stevenson), Ricardo Sainz (Stevenson), Andrew Paolini (Crown), Aykezar Adil (Crown), Chandler Moeller (Merrill), Alexandra Kasper (Merrill), Roxanna Gutierrez (Porter), Adham Taman (Porter), Serene Jneid (Porter), Winnie Sidhu (Kresge), Jackie Roger (Kresge), Suini Torres (Oakes), Kiana Coleman (Oakes), Tamra Owens (Oakes), Simba Khadder (Eight), Noah Thoron (Eight), Alternate Rohit (Ten), Lance McNeil (Nine), Shubhankar Sharan (Nine), Ramneet Bajwa (Ten), Daniel Iglesias (Ten), Vanessa Sadsad (Ten), Brad Mleynek (OD), Max Hufft (CoAA), Israel Molina (CoD), Louise Cabansay (EVC), Kaysi Wheeler (IVC), Justin Lardinois (Chair).

Assembly Members Absent: Yang Kong (Cowell), Colin Hortman (Stevenson), Michael Markson (Crown), Kartik Ashok (Merrill), Shannon Earl (Kresge), Roshni Advani (Eight), Sam Shaw (Nine).

Approval of the Agenda:

Art: Move to add 10 minutes under presentations after SUA advisor, presentation “Social Media Used as a Tool for Cultural Appropriation.”

Adham: Second.

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

Simba: Motion to add 10 minutes after NSBE for a funding request for bus app and student app.

Max: Second.

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

Brad: Motion to approve.

Max: Second.

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

Reading of the Previous Meeting’s Minutes:

Kyra: Motion to approve minutes.

Rohit: Second.

Announcements and Public Comment:
Justin: Tomorrow is the run off election for college ten so that’s gonna be from midnight tomorrow and the election will only be open for college ten affiliates.

Ghandi: The office of civil rights is going to be here tomorrow and bits’ going to be from 11-12 in SHOP in the mural room, this is a chance for student leaders to advocate for sexual assault policy. This is specifically for members for SUA and senates.

**Presentations:**

SUA advisor: Hello everyone I’m the SUA advisor, my position is a result of an audit from previous students. I’m an alumni myself and I’ve worked at Oakes and Merrill. I know I’m working with the officer but I’m also here for the assembly for anyone who needs work to get done. I’m working on finding space for SUA next year. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Right now I’m stationed at Hahn.

**New Business:**

Social Media as a Tool for Cultural Appropriation:

Thank you for all of your time. I’m a rep for SANAI, and I come here today to discuss issues of social media and an incident that occurred over this past weekend. With respect, I would like to express my view of the incident as a Native American student. Throughout history, American Indians have been oppressed daily. If you take a step back, you can see that these injustices are around us. We the American Indian people do not exist in the American conscience. If we do not exist in the American conscience, then hate crimes are not something. If we remain silent, we are allowing inherent prejudice to exist in our communities. The few American Indian students on campus represent their tribes. In totality, the incident provides an opportunity for American Indian students to speak out. We should be able to challenge views as students and I thank you for your time. We have a letter that we posted to the CHP. [Reads letter] We are here to educate and to spread awareness because there is not a lot of representation for our communities. It is vital for us to come together with our cultural values and bridge out cultural boundaries.

Candidate Campaign Spending Reimbursement:

Justin: By our bylaws, candidates who apply for candidacy can receive reimbursement. With every candidate that turned in a packet, that totals $4500. Last year’s assembly only allocated $3000. I’m coming to SUA to ask for the difference. I’ll note that due to a communication issue with the previous elections commissioner, I’ve asked the candidates via an honor system to confirm if they asked for reimbursement.

Shub: **Move to fund that line item $1500 from the general fund.**

Kaysi: **Second.**

Justin: Are there any objections? Seeing none, **motion passes.**
Parliamentarian/Organization Representation Applications:

Justin: The SUA constitutional amendments passed. We have to appoint a parliamentarian to chair the meetings next year and fill the open seats for five more organizations. I’ve put up an application for both the parliamentarian and the organizing reps, any candidate that gets at least 5 advance votes will be interviewed in assembly meeting. I’ve talked about this with the officers, not everyone agrees that we should do this in spring quarter.

Adham: Specifically for the organization reps, I don’t think it’s our place to pick those positions especially because it’s one week to submit their applications and I think that it’s really not fair and I think that the next SUA should have that decision.

Andrew: I feel that we should enact any changes that we can. In terms of not being ready, the applications have been out this week, but these amendments have been out already and people have been talking about it. It’s not exactly a last moment thing.

Max: I think when it comes to functionality and what we can and can’t do, I think that one thing we need to take care of is taking care of the parliamentarian. We start meeting at the end of October. We need to get the parliamentarian appointed by the end of spring, however when it comes to reps, I think that deserves some quality time. I don’t know if we’ll have good outreach in one week. Also going through all of that in one meeting, I think that might put too much strain for next year. I want to have good reps.

Gandi: I think that student orgs deserve more time because there are organizations who have a rep who don’t even send the rep into the SUA and its going to take time to reach out to the organizations but it’s not just going to all of a sudden change the culture surrounding the SUA. We don’t meet until the third week in October and we need to do it right.

Louise: I agree, there are provisions in the actual constitution, any constitutional amendments that are passed have a full year to be implemented. Neither the parliamentarian nor the orgs have a transition period, so that would be up to the assembly, I think we really need to make this process a quality process for choosing the five new reps and choosing the parliamentarian. We had to recall both our elections commissioner and our associate elections commissioner and that took a while. It take a ¾ vote to remove a parliamentarian.

Max: In terms of the parliamentarian, I really think that we should be bringing in the parliamentarian. Some of the power of the president is going to be handed to the parliamentarian, and I want to make sure that the parliamentarian knows what their job is and I really think that we should be having a parliamentarian that we trust and we can see running a meeting well. We can’t bring in the officers at a different time than the officers.
Kaysi: I agree with Max and I think that we should get the parliamentarian this year because a lot is going to happen especially with tuition hikes and all, and having parliamentarian would be nice to have them communicating already.

Brad: When I wrote these amendments, I had the intention of the parliamentarian of being decided at the end of spring quarter after results came out, because I thought it would be wise for a space that has been working together for a year and has seen how meetings have been planned that it would be good for that body to decide who the parliamentarian should be. As for the organizations, I was assuming that the applications would be out a little longer. So I’m for the parliamentarian, but student organizations should be given more time.

Andrew: In that case, I think we should preferably pick the orgs next quarter.

Vanessa: As we recall, this was part of my struggle of what a parliamentarian is versus what a president should be. Recall that the parliamentarian is in charge of procedure, which we can postpone until next quarter. The parliamentarian isn’t supposed to have everyone bond, that is the job of the chair. The parliamentarian’s sole purpose is to be the guiding light in terms of our Constitution and Roberts rules and the Brown Act. Because everything that Louise stated about our bylaws, it’s up to the assembly ought to make a decision on what we think is best for the student body.

Unknown: **Motion to extend 5 minutes.**

Vanessa: **Second.**

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

Israel: I agree that we should pick the organizations next year but I think it’s really important to appoint the parliamentarian this year because the parliamentarian is going to be working with the officers and go over Robert’s rules and it’s a very complicated process. On top of that I had concerns about the way that the parliamentarian would be appointed next year because it would be a majority of the assembly approving someone. I think there are possibilities of bias and an unfair parliamentarian being elected by the assembly because all they need is a majority.

Justin: Just to be clear, the main role of the parliamentarian is to run the SUA meetings.

Max: Most of you have been here all year, and we turn over every year. Every assembly is a new assembly. It was a struggle when we were learning about the rules. We’re eventually going to figure it out, and come fall, we’re not going to have the freshest opinion on who the parliamentarian should be. **Motion to move forward with application for parliamentarian.**

Serene: **Second.**

Shub: **Objection.** I’m just thinking about it in terms of hiring for the student body. A week isn’t enough or the entire student body to figure out there is a job and then apply for it. You’re
excluding a large portion of the student body who would be interested. I think it would be great to have the process happen in fall so that they have time to learn about Robert’s rules.

Vanessa: Every assembly whether its last fall or next fall, I think everyone here has their own learning curve and it will be the same next year, and I think we need to take some time in watching what we do and what we say. A smoother transition for hiring as well as getting equipped with the whole process would be better in fall.

Louise: I think we need to decide what we actually want for the selection process. The only way to remove a parliamentarian is by ¾ vote. The only thing the constitution tells us what to do is how to get rid of the parliamentarian

Jose: **Call to question.**

Kaysi: **Second.**

Art: **Objection.**

Vote to vote:

In favor: **17** | Opposed: **11** | Abstentions: **3**, **call to question fails.**

Brad: **Motion to extend 10 minutes.**

Daniel: **Second.**

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

Art: I just fear of us discussing this way too early. This announcement was made on Monday and some groups haven’t even met or received an email regarding this. This conversation is very driven by the SUA officers and I encourage other reps to speak up.

Kaysi: If we extend the deadline to Sunday night, that would give time to all the groups meet up. However, a parliamentarian is very important to the assembly and it is important that they start working with the officers. I highly suggest that we move forward and we can extend the deadline to Sunday.

Max: Reserve my right to make a motion, **call to question**, I haven’t seen anyone else put themselves on stack that haven’t talked already.

Jose: **Second.**

Lance: **Objection.**

Vote to vote:

In favor: **17** | Opposed: **15** | Abstentions: **2**, **call to question fails.**
Adham: I agree with what’s been said about the organization but I’m completely against appointing parliamentarian this year, and everyone has all these other things right now, and people might not be going to their senates right now dealing with finals stress. I really think that we need to wait until next year.

Vanessa: Along with everything that’s been said I would like to reiterate that it is the responsibility of the president to create a unifying body, and the parliamentarian would be in charge of learning Robert’s rules and running the meeting.

Gandhi: Even if we extend the deadline, it’s going to be someone in this space that’s going to be appointed. We don’t even have a procedure for how we pick the parliamentarian. This is someone who will be coming from this space who knows about the biases. I don’t think that this assembly has the capacity or the will to put in this much effort to selecting someone who would be good for the position.

Imari: I’ve heard everyone’s opinions on this and I think that this is a rushed decision based on the fact that you think that you need time to prepare and you need time to pick a competent person for this position. I feel like this assembly couldn’t pick an elections commissioner correctly so that’s something to think about.

Lance: So I just wanted to express a few things, I think we all understand that we have more than enough time and we shouldn’t rush this process. The way we are run is by the constitution and every way we make decisions are by a rule and we don’t even have a rule for how to make the decision for the parliamentarian. Whenever we did hiring, we didn’t give it just a week. No organization said that they were going to be putting this job out for just a week when students are less involved and focusing on their studies. What we stand for is all the students here so I ask that the assembly sit here and represent the students right now who would like to apply for this position. Let’s not push our own agendas and think about the integrity that this person will have to hold in order to be successful next year.

Kaysi: Motion to extend five minutes.

Max: Second.

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

Brad: I think there’s definitely two sides that are pushing their own agendas here and it happens, but honestly I’m speaking on just keeping the SUA moving. Justin was in the chairs office before he became chair and he was exposed to all the Roberts rules and that doesn’t just come from two weeks of learning to facilitate a space, it comes from time and dedication of learning. The chair person is elected the year before to run the space. I’ve gotten messages inquiring about the position and they’re not in the space and they are more interested in the position. There are other
people who are interested. If you have the motivation and drive to be in this position, then I’m all for that. motion to amend to send out the application via campus wide email.

Andrew: **Second.**

Vanessa: **Objection.**

Adham: I don’t know what sending an email will do since it’s not ample time to do so.

Jackie: I just wanted to let people know that a parliamentarian isn’t a rep for an org, and these organizations are very important. However, for parliamentarian it is more like a job, and anyone who has experience in SUA I think that that would be something that we should look at.

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

Max: **Second.**

Max: Reserve my right to make a motion, I think that we can all agree that a campus wide email is good outreach. I think it’s a start but there’s a lot more outreach that we can do from there. Let’s just vote on this and move on. **Call to question.**

Andrew: **Second.**

Vanessa: **Objection.**

In favor: **23** | Opposed: **6** | Abstentions: **4**, call to question passes.

Vote on amendment:

In favor: **22** | Opposed: **5** | Abstentions: **4**, amendment passes.

Andrew: The thing about appointing the parliamentarian next year is that, coming from personal experience, I didn’t know much coming into the SUA space and I wouldn’t know how to vote on the parliamentarian.

Louise: Justin has been very good at being neutral, if we don’t have a parliamentarian, the president knows that they will have to chair the space if the parliamentarian has not been appointed. How long will it take us to debate about if we’re even going to do this? I’d like to reiterate that neither in the constitution nor the bylaws do we have a procedure on how to appoint this person. There’s still going to only be a week. There will be an institutional memory of what a parliamentarian should be. Another thing, it doesn’t just have to be someone in SUA, there are countless organizations on this campus that chair their own meetings. By limiting this to a week, we limit the people who can apply to this, and we need to give this the due diligence it needs.

Lance: **Motion to extend five minutes.**
Kaysi: Second.

Israel: Objection.

Vote to extend time:

In favor: 14 | Opposed: 5 | Abstentions: 11, motion to extend time passes.

Lance: I would like to make a motion that the assembly instead of appointing a next week that we recommend the appointment of the parliamentarian, including the stipulation of sending out a campus wide email.

Vanessa: Second.

Max: Objection.

Max: Reserve my right to make a motion, move to amend this a conditional appointment, so that what happens is that we have a conditional appointment for this person and they would run the meetings until they or another person was appointed.

Alexandra: Second.

Louise: Objection. We already have a position for that, it’s called the president and they are supposed to preside until the parliamentarian is appointed. I don’t want a lack of due diligence in terms of appointed a parliamentarian.

Daniel: Reserve my right to make a motion, I would like to table this.

Chandler: Second.

Max: Objection.

Vote to table:

In favor: 13 | Opposed: 9 | Abstentions: 8, discussion is tabled.

Officer Diversity Training:

Justin McClendon: I’ve emailed Justin amendments of the resolution since the constitutional amendments passed to reflect the new changes.

Brad: Would it be possible for the SUA leadership to participate in the Fall Orientation that the RAs take? All these topics are touched upon in those trainings and going through this year as an RA I thought they were fairly efficient, would that be satisfactory? Otherwise, I motion to adopt the amendments.

Rohit: Second.
Adham: **Motion to adopt this bylaw amendment.**

Alexandra: **Second.**

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

**Appeal of Chairs Decision**

Adham: Just to clarify since I was the one who presented this, this is basically something that’s loosely adapted from Robert’s rules of order, and it’s just to appeal the chair’s unilateral decision. We don’t have one in our bylaws and it’s a way for us and the rest of the student body to appeal the chair’s decision.

Vanessa: Just to reflect past and future language, **I motion to reflect the university language to “appeal of presiding officer” decision.**

Lance: **Second.**

Simba: **Objection.**

Imari: Based on that information, we just got from Justin, I would say that we should not amend it, **call to question.**

Adham: **Second.**

Vote to amend language from “officer” to “presiding officer”

In favor: 1 | Opposed: 19 | Abstentions: 13, amendment fails.

Brad: I have concerns and I’m just going to be completely transparent about this, but I do believe that this bylaw amendment is being made to appeal a certain decision made by previous chair Shaz Umer regarding the divestment of Israeli Palestine more, and it was a decision that hadn’t ever been made before. The only reason I’m voicing this concern is because I couldn’t think of any chair decision in the past that has been recorded. It’s fairly obvious that it’s only for one decision and my only suggestion that this appeal process starts at a certain time, and anything that happens in the past, this appeal process starts now, but anything before, shouldn’t. I’m well aware of what this is for and I don’t like the intention behind it.

Andrew: That was my concern as well. Overturning any chair’s decision in the past could be made by a certain party who didn’t like the chair of last year. The chair would also not be able to explain themselves and I think it’s unfair to say that any appeal can be made at any time. I would rather have this start at a certain time, like say next year.

Imari: I can’t really speak on the intentions on last year, but as far as an appeal process, **I motion to adopt this bylaw.**
Simba: **Second.**

Andrew: **Objection.**

Adham: I understand your concerns but at the same time, this appeal should have been in our bylaws to begin with. In our constitution, it says that we work under Robert’s rules of order. Robert’s rules of order say that we have an appeal process.

Simba: We should be able to appeal that if anyone is in a higher level of power that the people should be able to appeal it.

Brad: I’m not against the appeal process, I’m more against the intentions of this. It’s just a little bothersome just because there’s only going to be one chair decision that’s going to be brought up. I like the idea of having an appeal process, but I’m not a fan of the intention.

Imari: I think like Brad said that this should be implemented, and there’s still a vote on this and if your concern is only on one decision, you’ll still have a vote on it.

Shub: I don’t see how it’s a bad thing if this is being brought up to correct something in the past, but I don’t see how that’s relevant at all, but it makes sense if somethings broken and we want to fix that. If there was no contentious decision made in the past, this wouldn’t even be brought up. This is obviously something that people want to talk about.

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

Seamus: **Second.**

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

Vanessa: I think it’s interesting that it’s valid to note that Brad and Imari and Adham want this bylaw and there’s also a valid point in terms of who are these appeals reflecting and are those opinions being considered. The appeal is there for a reason so that people can defend their reason for said appeal.

Simba: So I think we all agree that being able to appeal something is a good thing, and we’re taking one case and saying “except that one”, especially if we didn’t have power to do so at the time.

Seamus: Reserve my right to make a motion, seeing that we’re going in circles, I **motion to table.**

Rohit: **Second.**

Imari: **Objection.**

Vote to table:
In favor: 14 | Opposed: 9 | Abstentions: 7, discussion is tabled.

**Old business:**

**Budget Discussion:**

Justin: Two important things, the constitutional amendments passed, we need money to pay the parliamentarian but that money is already here. In addition, the chancellor has decided to proceed with changing Measure 8.

Israel: **Motion to reduce UCSA dues from $32160 to $24000.**

Kaysi: **Second.**

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

Kaysi: **Motion to put back $2000 each in both of the conferences and restore all RSO funding.**

Israel: **Second.**

Vanessa: **Objection.**

Brad: **Call to question.**

Andrew: **Second.**

Vote to vote:

In favor: 33 | Opposed: 0 | Abstentions: 1

Brad: **Motion to amend all line items to reflect the new constitution.**

Israel: **Second.**

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

Art: **Move to fund $200 for the programming line item for all six officers.**

Jose: **Second.**

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

Israel: **Objection.** We’ve never worked with a surplus and we don’t really know the actual population of the school, so I think it would be wise to move forward with a surplus and see what the assembly thinks next year.

Andrew: **Call to question.**
Kaysi: **Second.**

In favor: **18** | Opposed: **10** | Abstentions: **6**

Brad: Reserve my right to make a motion, **motion to pass the budget.**

Kaysi: **Second.**

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

**Funding Requests**

**National Society of Black Engineers**

We had everything planned out for this Saturday and it wasn’t until when we went to submit our POs that we noticed that we didn't have the $1000 that we needed. We were acting with thinking that we would have $1000 more for our event and it’s going to be difficult to plan still for the event that we wanted to have. This budget is based off of online prices.

Kaysi: How much are you asking for?

NSBE: It’s just under $550.

Kaysi: **Motion to fund them $550 from the general fund.**

Israel: **Second.**

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

**Bus App:**

Just to update you all with the bus app, as you may have heard, the bus app is out and working on all the loops and it’s been a pretty clean release. We already have 2-3000 unique users already. However, so far, most of this stuff came out of pocket, and they’re not free, so I’m coming to SUA for funding for the bus app, and another project that is in the works is the student app and it’s by the students for the students. We don’t want to give it to ITS and if we can’t fund it ourselves then we have to give it to ITS. It’s pretty rare to have a student led, student run thing and we have 9 developers on the app and more people to do some stuff with the web. iOS is coming soon too. For the student app, it will go to servers, this will go towards summer testing and fall quarter release so that freshmen can get this in their hand and it can circulate quickly. 11$ for the domain name. We also need $200 for server stuff for the month and extra testing stuff when it comes to servers. The domain name, and we want money for hardware, which is 200 for testing prototype the metro tracker. Once we have a prototype, we can show it to metro and then $600 to make side signs just to make the buses look better. This $600 would be for LED boards as such.
Justin: So if SUA funded this, where would the funds be transferred to?

Simba: We have a professor who is going to be the middle man for this.

Vanessa: Many of the people who saw this app were very in favor of this. **I would like to fully fund this from the general fund $1522.**

Kaysi: **Second.**

Andrew: **Objection.**

Brad: First, thank you, is this one time funding or do you see in the future more funding requests?

Simba: To answer that, yes we will need funding again, and we’re open sourcing the code and it will be available for everyone to see, and it opens up the funding to other places as well. It would also be great to have a student organization funding us, but it’s definitely a possibility.

Art: **Move to amend this to $922,** because I believe that TAPS should put signs on the bus. I’m all for this except for the TAPS fee.

**No second, motion dies**

Serene: When Sergio came in for funding last week, we weren’t sure who was supervising him, I see a very large parallel between how Sergio is doing it and how Simba is doing it and I feel like there’s a discrepancy.

Imari: I think there’s a big difference between what Sergio came in for and what Simba’s here for. When he said that this wouldn’t affect many students here, this one is much more beneficial to students than what Sergio was doing.

Kaysi: **Call to question.**

Serene: **Second.**

Brad: **Acclimation.**

Vanessa: **Motion for two minute recess.**

Daniel: **Second.**

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

**Resolutions:**

**Divest from Turkey**
The Armenian Student Association is here to present their divestment bill from Turkey. This has been passed unanimously in five UCs already. Our agenda today is to outline the Republic of Turkey’s denial and perpetuation of the Armenian Genocide and cite the specific UC investments in the Republic of Turkey totaling over 70 million. We want to divest current funds and prohibit future investments until justice is done. We are here to raise awareness about the Armenian Genocide and necessary recognition and reparation, and holding UCSC and the UC Regents accountable for ethical investments of students’ tuition.

This resolution is not a smear campaign against turkey, in an attempt to downplay any of the nation’s commendable efforts.

Some concerns that you may have with this resolution is that “The Armenian genocide was so long ago, why bring it up today?” The genocide is still going on due to the denial of the Armenian government. There is a lack of US recognition and turkey’s gag rule on foreign policy. Turkish students are taught that the Armenian genocide did not actually happen and are given contradictory stories.

“Armenian genocide dialogue is not outlawed in the Republic of Turkey” According to President Erdogan, “there was no genocide” and the Turkish government will actively counter allegations” about the Armenian Genocide.

Finally, the resolution does not devalue the good deeds made by the Turkish government, due to the fact that it perpetuates a crime against humanity, and you may say that divestment is not the way to go, but this is an opportunity for the SUA to help in this. Investment is a tacit endorsement. Turkey’s government has spent millions of dollars to deny what is happening in Armenia.

In the last slide you see the UCSA educating people about the genocide, for the closing words, as survivors of Armenian genocide, our money here more. By passing this resolution, UC Santa Cruz is sending the message that it does not support genocide denial. Five other UCs have already unanimously passed this resolution. With that said, I am confident that this senate will not fail to pass it as well.

**Investment Bill:**

Imari: When we were talking about this in Cowell, we decided that we were going to vote no on this because of the level of sketchiness, I asked the presenters if they had gone to SJP and I got vague answers, so I think we should vote no on this.

Adham: There are two parts of this and every time I read this it makes less and less sense. First of all, regardless of what the organizations are, I find it kind of weird to invest in a non-profit organization, like that doesn’t really sound like a sound investment to me. In addition, it frankly presents a false narrative of Palestinians and Israelis having equal footing, which is completely
false. It just seems like they want to solve anything. In the words of Nelson Mandela, only free men can talk for peace, and the Palestinians are not a free people.

Daniel: College Ten unanimously against this for various reasons. They were just against this, and my vote is no.

Vanessa: I want to bring this full circle, from College Ten, people have had a lot of discrepancy and there were a lot of folks who were on one side or another and there were questions of if this body was being representative of the whole student body. **I motion to postpone this indefinitely with the condition that the groups meet with each other.** I whole heartedly think that in terms of our 15000 students need us to be focusing on other things that are quite far more urgent in terms of affordability and other issues that affect them directly.

Daniel: **Second.**

Ricardo: **Objection.**

Vanessa: **Motion to rescind motion.**

Noah: College eight supports what it wants to do but we have concerns of how it was presented and we are split between saying no or abstaining.

Andrew: Last time we left on here, it was said that people wanted to take it back to their colleges and talk about the various organizations. And then reach some kind of political compromise. Now we are here and we have people saying that their colleges have unanimously voted no on this, but I think that’s kind of BS I think we need to have more debate and discussion about this. I find it disappointing that some people are saying that they’re voting no on this.

Unknown: **Motion to extend time by 20 minutes.**

Chandler: **Second.**

Imari: Reserve my right to make a motion, **call to question.**

Roxanna: **Second.**

Brad: **Objection.**

Vote to vote:

In favor: **16** | Opposed: **11** | Abstentions: **7**, **call to question fails.**

Kyra: We brought this back to Stevenson, and I spoke to some people outside of student council and they really felt like this was too big of an issue for SUA to take a stand on this for the whole school, so I know that we’re staying as neutral as we can for this. How can you expect us to vote for the students at this school. I have personal opinions on this and I think you all know how you
want to vote. I just don’t know how much we can discuss at this point and I just want you to think about all the students on this campus and how you represent them.

Brad: I have a quick point, speaking as a former chair of crown student senate, I’m really bothered by the fact that colleges are unanimously voting a certain way on this bill and I really want to commend Stevenson the way they’re voting because that’s way more representative voting all yes or no. We have students who are for the bill who are probably affiliated with your college and you’re not representing them. It’s very difficult to do enough outreach for us to get the message out to everyone.

Kiana: I just want to say that I’ve met with one person from each party and I just don’t feel like there’s going to be any mutual agreement on this bill and we’ve probably talked about this with our colleges and we probably know how they feel.

August: Crown felt like this was a good bill and then SJP brought in their amendments because for the first time, we had both sides of the dialogue and we had the amendments happen. We know that we’re getting input from both sides. I feel like although we can never satisfy everyone, but there’s no such thing as perfect representation, but out of all the bills that we’ve seen for this, this year I feel like this is the closest we’ve ever gotten. I don’t want to vote yes, no, abstention for the fourth year in a row. This resolution has some hope and we can change it. If you’re not comfortable with this resolution, make the changes because this is your opportunity to do so.

Jackie: Kresge was probably the only college who didn’t have any specific direction. We had people in the middle for the most part.

Spencer: We didn’t really reach a completely compromise for this bill but there was a lot of mutual understanding. However, it wasn’t anything that specifically determined how this bill was presented.

Simba: we’re not picking a side here. We’re voting for what’s there. Also in terms of “how can you vote unanimously one way”, if you try to research all the SUA things, you won’t see resolutions that weren’t passed. From what I’ve seen from most colleges, that’s what they’re saying is that they’re not fully in support of this. This bill has caused a lot of good discussion. However, discussion isn’t enough, there needs to be more action. The bill itself, I still can’t agree with the way it is presented. It doesn’t really hit the issue on the head, and it skirts around the issue. We’re saying this issue is really big and some people are saying that we as SUA can’t handle the issue. Someone’s gotta take a side and if we can’t come to a conclusion, then we shouldn’t pass it.

Seamus: Our College did vote unanimously to have us three vote no and I will be voting no for that reason. Coming into this discussion, I felt very uncomfortable that this space cannot be respected as neutral. There have been many political jabs here but lastly, I just want to say that this has been brought up for many years and if we look at our questionnaire about our relevancy,
for a lot of people, SUA isn’t relevant. And this is basically us trying to say that what we say is what the whole student body supports. This debate seems very worth happening, but I feel like it’s too heated.

Imari: Reserve my right to make a motion, I feel like to say that colleges can’t vote unanimously is not correct, we’re voting on this bill, it’s not pro-Palestinian or pro-Israeli, this is about peace. This bill isn’t peaceful, you have one group of people sitting on one side and another group sitting on the other. With that I call to question.

Adham: Roll call vote.

Seamus: Objection.

Vote to roll call:

In favor: 6 | Opposed: 11 | Abstentions: 17, call for roll call vote fails.

Vote on resolution:

In favor: 10 | Opposed: 18 | Abstentions: 7, resolution fails.

Imari: Motion to bring up the parliamentarian discussion.

Max: Second.

Louise: There are transition clauses for the whole year to be enacted. Pretty much anything doesn’t have to be enacted unless the assembly wants to.

Max: I really think for the functionality for us, we need to do this right now. We need a parliamentarian to function in the fall, and the assembly in fall can appoint their own parliamentarian.

Jose: Call to question.

Vote on secondary amendment, that the parliamentarian would serve until the next fall of their term until the new parliamentarian was appointed.

In favor: 15 | Opposed: 14 | Abstentions: 6, secondary amendment passes.

Louise: I just want to bring up the point there’s no place that says how we hire a parliamentarian.

Brad: The chair of our body has made a decision to make this application process and has brought the decision for the body to make, and the chair is chairing that meeting. That’s the influence that there is right now. However on this one, I’ve always thought that he’s had the best interest of SUA, and for that reason of the chair chairing his own meeting, that’s why the parliamentarian position is so important. Basically if next year’s body decides, I just don’t see
how that wouldn’t be stopped, and I just feel like there would be so much influence on that parliamentarian. That’s why I believe that the parliamentarian should be chosen this year. That’s why in senates, we appoint someone at the end of the year for next year. It’s so that they have someone with experience who can run a meeting. I’m ready to vote on this.

Kaysi: **Motion to extend time by 5 minutes.**

Vanessa: **Second.**

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

Vanessa: A lot of people in this space are profoundly confusing the role of the president and the parliamentarian. The parliamentarian is supposed to rule in order of Robert’s Rules and the president can have their own agenda. The parliamentarian is only supposed to call for an agenda. You all are clearly pushing this, saying that you want them to have two hours’ worth of experience to lead the meeting.

Art: I just wanted to add to this discussion that to this transition to next year, there’s already a position of the president to take up those duties of leading the meeting, and I think that we’re just adding more commenting mess to this process.

Jose: **Call to question.**

Seamus: **Second.**

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

Vote on amendment to go through with hiring process until a new one is appointed next year.

In favor: **16 | Opposed: 12 | Abstentions: 6,** **amendment passes.**

Kaysi: **Motion to extend time by five minutes.**

Seamus: **Second.**

Max: **Call to question.**

Seamus: **Second.**

In favor: **20 | Opposed: 11 | Abstentions: 4**

Imari: **Motion to appoint student orgs until next year and close applications.**

Max: **Second.**

Brad: **Objection.** I don’t know if there’s any harm in leaving the application up, maybe we can take it down and have it start up with the new officer group and they can make any edits to the
application. I don’t see any problem with it being open beforehand, and it just allows more time for student orgs to apply.

Imari: **Motion to amend my motion to keep the applications open.**

Max: **Second.**

Art: **Objection.** I think that student orgs should be appointed as soon as possible, and I think that if we can’t make a decision we then can put it off until next year.

Seamus: **Call to question.**

Max: **Second.**

Kaysi: **Objection.**

Vote to vote:

In favor: 22 | Opposed: 5 | Abstentions: 2, **call to question passes.**

Vote to leave applications open and wait until next year’s assembly’s decision

In favor: 28 | Opposed: 1 | Abstentions: 5, **amendment passes.**

Vote on main motion:

In favor: 30 | Opposed: 0 | Abstentions: 5