

Student Union Assembly  
Tuesday, 5/29/2013

Meeting called to order at 6:00PM by DT Amajoyi (Chair)

**Assembly Members Present:** DT Amajoyi (Chair), Kevin Huang (OD), Rocio Zamora (COD), Shaz Umer (IVC), Shiku Muhire (COAA), Victor Velasco (EVC), Brittany Smith (CoSoC), Kevin Flannery (Cowell), Linh Ngo (Cowell), Nicolette Johnson (Cowell), Brad Mleynek (Crown), Corbin Hall (Crown), Max Hufft (Crown Alt.), Gina Maschio (Crown Alt.), Ian Bernstein (Eight), Louise Cabansay (Eight), Roshni Advani (Eight), Kelsey Rousseve (Kresge), Aimee Wade (Kresge Alt.), Lyle Green-Nickerson (Kresge), Maria Jennings (LL), Justin McClendon (Merrill), Michael Liber (Merrill), Vanessa Morales (Merrill), CJ Ocampo (Nine), Iden Yekan (Nine), Gabby Areas (Oakes), Alfonso Quintero (Oakes Alt.), Linda Moua (Oakes), Melody Aguilar (Oakes), Jocqui Smollett (ABSA), Shadin Awad (ABSA Alt.), Marinel Yoro (APISA), Ivan Medina (MeCHA), Steven Hernandez (QSU), Shingo Brann (Porter), Mick Del Rosario (Porter Alt.), Charlsie Chang (Stevenson), Guillermo "Ghandi" Rogel (Stevenson), Lila Blackney (Stevenon Alt.), Sammie Vega (Stevenson), Megana Kunda (Ten), Rebecca Brown (Ten), Tony Milgram (Ten), Eric Rubin (Treasurer), Brooklynn Ackerman, Michael Amster,

**Assembly Members Absent:** Giovanni Maldonado (Crown), Carl Eadler (Kresge), Shanna Ballesteros (Nine), Kayla Oh (Oakes), Daniel Fernandez (QSU Alt.), Nallely Ramirez (MeCHA), Varaun Bradley (ABSA Alt.), Daniel Lewis (Porter), Michael Barney (Porter Alt.), Adrianna Gonzales (Intern COD)

**Approval of the Agenda**

Ghandi: I reserve my right to make a **motion** to table this discussion and vote until next year. Some colleges did not meet.

DT: We will talk about that. Your motion is to table the JSU resolution. That was a motion made my Ghandi.

Charlsie: **Second.**

Alfonso: **Objection.**

Rebecca: **Point of clarification**, is this our last meeting of the year?

Alfonso: We should at least have a conversation.

DT: We will move on to discussion.

Rebecca: Since we have another meeting, we can have a conversation on it but not vote on it.

DT: For each of these line items, we will be having our first discussion.

Max: Crown did not meet due to the holiday. I really appreciate that this issue is being brought up but not right now. I am speaking on behalf of Crown. This is a large issue. We really should have a large whole month. To rush it in the end, it's disrespectful. I support this move to pull it out from the agenda.

Rocio: I think it's disrespectful to dismiss their efforts till next year.

DT: This is an open forum type environment.

Iden: I don't think there is anything wrong with discussing this. We don't have to vote on it this year. I understand this is a contentious deal. The people who come to this space came here and it would be disrespectful if we didn't talk about it. All discussion is good so we should have one.

Victor: I understand the biggest concern that it is disrespectful for the organizers allocated to this issues. I would want to move my time to them. I know that if it's not the appropriate time now, when will it ever be? Yes it's towards the end of year, discussions like this happen all the time.

Alfonso: I would like it if people said their senate and not their college. I would like to echo Iden's comment. We should at least have a discussion.

Tony: We are not making the decision. Even though we ask the people here, how many students are here versus the entire student body?

Ivan: I think that it's important that we know about the motion. I'm here representing MEChA. We thought this is a very important issue so we took the time out to talk about this. Challenge yourself to think about what will work for your college.

DT: The motion is to table it to next year. It doesn't mean we cannot discuss it this year.

Louise: **Point of clarification**, the motion is to table the discussion and the vote.

DT: The motion is to table it to next year, discussion and vote. We will call this to a vote.

Justin: **Friendly amendment**, can we have it two votes to separate the discussion from the vote and split it?

DT: Is this a friendly amendment?

Ghandi: No.

DT: I will be calling out names for the vote.

**Roll call vote:**

Yes: 7

No: 21

Abstention: 3

**Motion fails.**

DT: Are there any other changes we would like to make on the agenda?

Tony: **Motion** to remove JSU resolution.

Lila: **Second.**

Rebecca: **Point of clarification**, what is the resolution?

DT: This is the new resolution, last one, we had a CJP resolution. Then we had another resolution. This one is an actual resolution which is different from the Refutement resolution.

Melody: Please state why.

Tony: I was told by a member of JSU that it isn't relevant to the discussion.

Danny: As far as JSU resolution, as far as I understand, we were not intending to add a resolution. When we saw it on the agenda, we were surprised. There is not a resolution we are proposing.

DT: Are you guys giving a presentation?

Danny: It's safe to say we should move to remove it from the agenda.

DT: From my understanding, we are getting rid of that item and we will have more time for discussion. Any other changes?

Kevin: Motion to add resolution regarding immigration and citizenship to the slot that was removed.

Lyle: **Second.**

Rebecca: Do you think this will be a controversial conversation? I object because we have other resolutions. We need more insight since its late in the year.

Shiku: We haven't seen much attendance in SUA so we should take advantage of it.

Kevin: It was also a big issue. I'm just following it the same way. I'm just presenting.

Iden: **Yield.**

Justin: **Yield.**

DT: Any other discussion. We will move to a vote.

**All those in favor of adding Pathway to Citizen and Comprehensive Immigration Reform**

Yes: 34

No: 0

Abstention: 3

**Motion passes; it is now added to the agenda.**

Rocio: **Motion** to show a short video for my announcement at the end of the announcements.

Shaz: **Second.**

Shaz: **Motion** to move SCOC presentation.

Justin: **Second.**

Shiku: If there is an announcement, does that mean there is no discussion?

DT: It's just a presentation.

Justin: **Motion** to approve the agenda.

Rebecca: **Second.**

### **Reading of the Previous Meetings' Minutes**

DT: If there are any amendments to the minutes.

Lila: I'm a Stevenson Rep, not alternate.

Ivan: MEChA is everything caps but the H. during the CJP announcement, where it says "in addition, can we get a list of sources", I didn't say that.

Ian: It was me.

Lyle: I just want to make a correction that Carl wasn't here, it was Aimee Wade.

Lila: **Motion** to approve the minutes.

Ghandi: **Second.**

DT: So moved.

### **Announcements**

Justin: I am here with the Dean of Students office. We have been surveying all year. We are trying to get to 2000. I have surveys here that represent student life and student retention. While you are on your way out, they will be available. we are trying to reach our goal. They will be out there.

Lyle: if we take one, do we give it to you?

Justin: You can leave them out there, they are all anonymous.

Lila: There will be Stevenson carnival at Stevenson knoll, 5-7PM this Friday 31<sup>st</sup>.

Iman: I am from African Student Union, we having our second annual cultural show at the College 9/10 MPR downstairs this Saturday. There will be Ethiopian food. It'll be the cheapest cultural show being 5 dollars.

Steven: This Saturday is Kresge pride. There will be activities. We will be having free stuff. There is a festival downtown at 11AM Sunday.

Jocqui: There will be a dance Cowell/Stevenson dining hall, 10-1AM. We will have a good time.

Brittany: This last Friday was the SUA banquet, if didn't have a chance to go, we have certificates for you because we do appreciate your work. There is a table of them outside.

Rebecca: Two announcements: one, when you are done doing Kresge pride and going to the dance, come support at Relay for Life at OPERS June 2nd, 24 hours. Whatever you are doing, just come. People are selling different things. It's all for cancer research. Next week, SUGB is having a banquet, Monday 10-11:30AM at Student Union, pancakes and bacon. Friday, there will be a dead week dinner from 5-7PM, we are going to have pasta and play games. It's all free food.

Shiku: We are having a event, myself and partnership with College 9 res life, Where are the People of Color, Thursday 6-8PM at the very top floor of SUA. It's a part of a larger campaign.

Tony: **Yield.**

Vanessa: Merrill and Women's Center are Merrill Cultural Center Fashion Show, Thursday at 7PM.

Rocio: Some of you know that we hosted the Color of Gendered Violence. We are closing at Social Science Two. I will show you the trailer. It will be this Friday May 31<sup>st</sup>, room 71. There will be free food and drinks. Link:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8ipnQjrRXnU&list=UUPLJEZvnPfdsxOwIBio49dw&index>

DT: Are there any questions for Rocio?

Lisa: I'm the Committee vice Chair about SCOC. I am here to make sure you all feel free and welcome when you come to our banquet. It's time to step back from the nitty-gritty details and to make our campus a better place. There will be a multitier cake. Join me Friday at the redwood lounge at 5PM.

### **Community Agreements presented by DT**

DT: Going over community agreements. I'll talk about it briefly. We will discuss it.

DT: All of you know why you are here in this space. A lot of folks have felt unsafe in this space recently. A lot of you have no contact agreements in this space. When it gets to that point when I am getting screenshots, emails, or phone calls concerning folks feeling unsafe and feeling attacked in this space, that is when it starts to be too much; That's where it becomes an issue with me. I want you to be able to be safe at this space. This is something many students feel strongly about. If this space is trying to be what we say we are trying to be, this type of behavior cannot continue. You all need to be held accountable and so I do. The fact that we have differences in opinion and ideologies is not a problem, I think it's great we work in a space with so much diversity and we should celebrate that. When it comes to a point of defamation of character, hateful speech on social media sites, people attacking each other in this space then people swearing that they will never come back to this space. I was completely neutral this election period, a few things played into me becoming neutral. But this was the end result because I am/was very disappointed at what I saw, and the type of campaigning both sides were engaging in. I do not say that lightly. My biggest concern for elections this year was that we have a safe and fair process. It's not just people in elections, but the people who support different individuals and different groups who need to be accountable for this behavior. I am not here to hinder your freedom of speech and opinion, but I am asking that you take this all very seriously and be accountable for your actions. It literally hinders our ability to do work when there are so many complaints about people in this space because it gives the perception to admin that we only deal with petty politics (a room full of people attacking each other). How do we expect members of Congress to reach across the table and address issues such as the Middle Class Scholarship,

Cal Grant Bills, or the Affordable Care Act...when we can't even do that ourselves. What right do we have to ask them to work together.. Really ask that of yourselves. As the current SUA chair, I have been in this space for four years now, and I know for a fact that we can do better. If you want to be better, You have to do better. I learned a great deal this year. I did come into this space with a bias because I was a part of a slate, and it took me an entire quarter to unlearn that behavior and really start to be open to working with everybody. I had to do this because I realized this was the only way we could be effective. I came to this space saying let's talk, and I wasn't ready to listen. It took me an entire quarter. If separate sides aren't willing to talk, next year will be very difficult for you. Elections results will be announced tomorrow at the SUA. Whoever wins, you all need to learn to work together, a precedent has already been set to do otherwise during elections, but you will need to break that. That is my spiel, realize for me to do this now, it is quite serious because I have known about all this for a while and I haven't treated you all any different, I treat you all with respect and respect you on the human level, but things need to change. You can't continue on like this. No one likes to be talked to behind their back. Everyone wants to be listened to. The fact we have people running in elections, the underlying fact is that they want to serve. I say all of this out of honest and sincere disappointment, but I also out of honest and sincere hope as well. \*Continues on to read community agreements\*(link to the community agreements) if folks don't want to do spirit fingers. No snaps.

Brad: We should keep it consistent from last meeting and keep it.

CJ: Traditionally, its inhuman for me to feel me. I am having a problem with if we going to do these spirit fingers. We do have a lot of issues and I don't want to get into the argument.

Michael A: I don't like it at all. We shouldn't have it.

Linda: Can everybody vote for this?

DT: That is a lot of people we have to count.

**For or against spirit fingers vote:**

Yes: 11

No: 20

Abstention: 6

**No spirit fingers.**

**General SUA Materials Funding Request presentation by DT**

Kelsey: The number doesn't make sense. What about the taxes?

DT: Our operations manager is the one who created this.

Justin: Are we voting on this?

DT: It's up to you. I am just presenting it today.

Iden: I **motion** to fully fund for the materials.

Rebecca: **Second.**

Lyle: **Point of clarification**, where are we getting the funds from?

DT: The web tech intern line item.

DT: If there are no objections, motion passes. Congrats to the new officers for their new officers and their new officer supplies.

### **Council of Chairs Budget Presentation presented by Ghandi and Justin**

DT: This is a point of clarification for next year; There is something I want to address. It says that: "k. Shall use the Executive Vice Chair of the Student Committees on Committees to help run the appointment process of SCOC and run the partnership. The Internal Vice Chair shall work or be a resource on all internal campus wide issues that come forth from the SCOC, e<sup>2</sup>: Engaging Education, Campus Sustainability Council or the Student Union Assembly." <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0Bwc24Y6WBhQnWndMem5wM3NfNms/edit?pli=1>  
As you can clearly see, the Council of Chairs is to be convened in conjunction with all these other groups/ parties. But they were not. It is also the SUA Chair that is to convene this Council, but all year now and last week Friday, it was again convened by our IVC, Shaz. No one else was notified, not me nor the organization chairs. I bring this up on the same note of respecting one another and ensuring that we operate in a constitutional manner, and that we are all held accountable. I could have gotten really upset about this, but I decided to instead forgive and move on for the betterment of this space. I am a very direct person, so I made sure to address the issue of the continued convening of the Council of Chairs with the IVC, Shaz Umer, to let him know that he is not the one to be doing this and that it is in fact unconstitutional to not have procedurally abided by what our Constitution says. So this is just a point of clarification for you all that will be in the space next year, to ensure that you operate in a constitutional manner. I did hear that the meeting went well. I appreciate that there was good work, and that is why I put the Council of Chairs on the agenda to present. I think we should at least hear the recommendations and actual numbers they have put forth. Please read the constitution clearly next time to avoid issues such as these. I am not upset, because moving the body from A to B is my main concern. So I will turn it over to our presenters

Ghandi: The reason we had this meeting was because it was the conversations were going in circles. The IVC called an emergency meeting. There was a rep from each college. There were unanimous decisions. The council of chairs is the chairs from each college and it was just talk

about the budget. It was all on the table and we could talk about anything. The key talking points were conference, dues, permits, cuts, SCOC and proposal and the new line item. (Power Point Presentation)

Rebecca: When we talked about permits, what about the scratchers?

Ghandi: They can use that money to buy scratcher or use it to buy their own permits. Tem, you basically took over the tech intern so we would use that line item money for permits.

Justin: Even though local affairs are important, there are two interns under the EVC office, the EVC has the power to give a name or description of the two interns. One of the unnamed interns can be used for this purpose.

Ghandi: The Local Affairs intern hasn't been hired for 3 years.

Justin: Basically, the SUA body would be saving money instead of spending money. Half of what we pay to the IVC should be paid to the IVC programming which is \$1800. So we pulled \$1750 and put \$180. We raised each of the officers programming by 50 except the chair so there is no hierarchy in the programming of the offices.

Ghandi: This is a great compromise. The stipulation is that there will be a carry forward to the line item.

Michael A: Why is it only on campus?

Ghandi: We needed a line item for specifically on campus.

Melody: Can you reiterate where the money is coming from?

Justin: We are using the money from the cut intern positions.

Michael A: Where did you come up with the cap?

Ghandi: We decided it was a good amount.

Linda: So it'll be up for grabs from any officers?

Justin: Yes.

Ghandi: The IVC will still have their office. If more officers collaborate for a project, they could put on a bigger event. It could make for really good projects.

Shiku: How is that different from what are available to different officers?

Ghandi: The sense we got is that each officers have what they need for events. We put the stipulation so we can have bigger events.

Jocqui: Something that I was wondering was that, you said all the chairs were reps invited. I wasn't invited.

DT: You convene in a council of chairs meeting, in addition to doing that, the CPC's and the advisers should be invited. Only the council of chairs was invited.

Rebecca: So was this just an informal meeting?

DT: It was a meeting of council of chairs.

Shiku: My concern is that I don't feel comfortable about finishing this presentation but the orgs were not invited and they were invited.

DT: Like I was saying before, I recognize that this was done unconstitutionally, but great work was still done. The ends do not justify the means, but I want to respect the folks that worked so hard. This isn't all final; we still have the budget discussion. Great work was still done and I would love for them personally to finish their presentation.

Shiku: I absolutely agree, but I do realize this wasn't touched by the orgs but there are those folks that needed to be there. I do recognize that this is a compromise, I'm just concerned with that the folk that needed to be there to contribute weren't invited and weren't there.

Ghandi: It was a productive meeting and we had reps from each college there. This was a proposal from each college.

Tony: What I think that I understand the orgs were not there, so, everybody here is a board member, we are saying that we are coming to you with numbers. Everyone still has a say about what this is and it'll be help continue the conversation now.

Rebecca: **Yield.**

Victor: If someone can just clarify, what is student life?

DT: This is specific to Shiku's issue.

Ryan: I would like to speak from an organization QSU, for this space, it would be beneficial, but I really don't appreciate that my voice was there and this was an exclusive group. It doesn't account for the voices that didn't have the big 6.

Ivan: I also think that it's unfortunate. The means don't justify the ends. It's not constitutional, I feel disrespected when I hear unanimous.

Brad: I just want to reiterate that it's just a recommendation and if you don't agree with it, and we happen to have a motion for it, show it in the vote. These guys did do work and yes there were organizations that weren't invited. Just show what you think is right in the vote.

Rebecca: My main this that there are concrete numbers. Yes, it's great to have reservations about the body. We have numbers that we can discuss. That has been really difficult from our space. Disagree with the people who came up with them, just look at the numbers. You can agree or not agree.

Vanessa: My point is that this space keeps saying it was an unconstitutional meeting. The constitution says the chair has to meet with them once, but the constitution doesn't say that the council of chairs can't meet without the chair.

DT: The issue was that the chair wasn't notified. As myself, I forgave this person. It's not worth it for me. I care about this space. It's not about me or this individual. You all can text and tweet backlash or gossip about this all you want, but it doesn't concern me. I not taking it personally, I simply wanted to acknowledge that something wrong was done. In regards to whether or not the meeting actually was unconstitutional, you start getting into the nitty gritty of interpretation of the constitution, and you can interpret this any way you want. But the language is right there in front of us showcasing how things should be done. Also adding that I have already done addressed this issue with the IVC on another occasion, and the fact that he continued to do it, did not abide by the previous agreements we made regarding the issues, and convened this council without even so much as notifying me as the Chair, that says something too about whether this was a right or wrong action.

Shiku: My **motion** was that we should table this so we can include the other reps.

Steven: **Second.**

Justin: This is the slide. There is nothing left.

DT: My intention is to pass a budget today.

Shiku: I **rescind** it.

Ryan: I have an "ouch", to be told to move on makes me feel silenced. Big reminder, I really felt like we weren't heard.

DT: I apologize about that.

Rebecca: I had numbers, my recommendation the money we have for the conferences,

Ghandi: That's not going to happen; the compromise will never be reached.

Ivan: **Point of clarification**, can I ask why you have the conclusion?

Rebecca: From what I heard from them, I'm just representing those who I talked to; they don't feel the impact from the conferences. I think these conferences are great. With the budget we have, I think it would be better served for the line items for our officers.

DT: I have a suggestion to move this forward, my recommendation is that we pass this by a block so we can start passing things instead of a huge budget. How do folks feel about that?

CJ: Can we do with what you said?

Kevin: I **reserve my right to make a motion**, I think it's a good compromise and vote for it and see where it goes. I am going to move to approve the council of chair's suggestions.

DT: This is a combination of what happened the budget emergency meeting and the council of chairs. For the parking permits, every officer would get \$198.

Ghandi: **Second.**

Ivan: **Friendly amendment**, there should be a stipulation depending on the amount of money taken. It should come to the board.

DT: If it goes over \$500 dollars, it should be come to board. Regardless of the stipulation, it should go to the SUA body to be discussed.

Kevin: It's friendly.

Louise: Can I make another **friendly amendment**? In the presentation, it also said it would change the name for the IVC committee. In the bylaws, if that new line item is created, we should change the bylaws to outreach committee.

DT: So if we pass this budget, the student life outreach committee we be changed to "IVC outreach committee" and there would be the reflected name change in the bylaws.

Victor: I would like to make a friendly amendment. I would actually suggest that one of the general interns be cut. It's be really easy to neglect local affairs so I feel if we cut the local affairs position, it would actually increase the stands that it would be affect the local affairs more.

DT: Is that friendly to the seconder?

Ghandi: Yes.

DT: Another friendly amendment is to talk about the parking permits, is it friendly?

Kevin: It's friendly.

Shiku: With the stipulation of the conferences, I was curious to know for the people who help delegate. If there are folks that don't meet the criteria, how would that come into play?

Tony: I think that the stipulations should be treated as a recommendation.

Shiku: Can we clarify what a stipulation is versus a recommendation?

DT: What we are saying that, if you stipulate, it has to happen.

Maria: **Point of clarification**, I've been to several conferences and we never had a problem getting students. I don't think a stipulation or recommendation would do anything.

Justin: It was one person per college.

Victor: I can present that information in the next ten minutes.

Rebecca: When it comes to the conferences, it feels like that the colleges don't really see. If you go to a conference, you have to come back with a presentation so you have something to give back. I feel like our campus isn't getting the benefit of that.

Rebecca: Mine was a suggestion to remove the conferences and talk them separate concerning the talk about the conferences and their effects on campus.

Brad: **Point of clarification**, wouldn't that change the entire budget?

DT: The student life item would be affected and yes it may change. The stipulation is that everything has to come to the body. There was a second by Ghandi. Is there any objection?

Rebecca: **Objection**, I think there should be a roll call vote.

Ivan: If it's not friendly to the second, we can't vote on it right?

Mick: **Point of clarification**, what are we voting on?

DT: We are voting on the draft budget, some include have the recommendations of the emergency meeting and the council of chairs.

Justin: This motion entails the stipulation of conferences that one student per college, USSA dues will be granted \$8000, permits will be cut to \$188, cut the tech intern under the SUA chair, friendly amendment to cut one of the general interns, the SCOC proposal to move \$1800 to each office excluding chairs, and to create new line item under SUA programming where two officers have to work together with the friendly amendment that any money pulled out has to come to the body and the changes to the bylaws.

Louise: **Point of clarification**, to change the name of the committee to “Outreach Committee”.

Melody: Where would this leave these conferences?

Shiku: The budget was introduced; I’m curious as a space how we are going to see these conferences.

DT: We can pass this motion and see the changes be reflected, then talk about the conferences.

Kevin: We are not revisiting the budget.

DT: If the body wishes the revisit conferences, we can revisit. I’m hearing conferences are issue. I’m saying what we should do is pass what we have now.

**This roll call vote is to pass the draft budget.**

Yes: 24

No: 7

Abstention: 5

**Motion passes. We have next year’s budget.**

Rebecca: Is this changing the title?

DT: The item would be called “IVC Outreach” and the bylaws would reflect that. We need to vote and it would be 3/4ths.

Kevin: It would add the stipulation written in the bylaws as well.

Kelsey: Can we make a friendly with no numbers for the USSA membership?

Ivan: Can we amend to have the minimum they put for that year?

DT: The friendly amendment is to have the minimum change whenever USSA changes their dues.

DT: Right now, we are doing a bylaw change, what’s happening right now is that, one: we will change our bylaws that the new committee is called IVC outreach, two: in order to access the

new line item, two officers have to work together and it has to be talked to about the body, and thee: anytime USSA increases or decreases their funds, we will reach that number. This requires a 3/4<sup>th</sup> vote.

Max: **Friendly amendment**, I ask that we do not include the change the USSA, if they change their amount by 4x, it's a very hard amount to reach. The wording could be dangerous and we are changing something that could not be easily changed.

Kevin: I just want to make a response, as members, we always have a vote, we always have a voice. DT: Would it be okay that we change the minimum to .50 cents. Is it friendly?

Alfonso: We just created a precedent that the budget was passed with even though some voices weren't heard; we need create consequences because we cannot continue to silence voices.

DT: There was sentiment that we want to address the conferences.

Rebecca: **Motion** to go revisit to the conferences conversation.

Vanessa: **Second.**

Shiku: **Objection**, we just passed a budget and something about the conferences that if there was a problem, it would have been discussed.

Kevin: Revisiting motions takes a 2/3rd vote.

Rebecca: My opinion that I was under the impression that we would revisit with the conferences. I apologize but this what I want to talk about.

Iden: My college senate says we should talk about it.

Alfonso: What's the point of passing a budget if we don't agree on them?

DT: This would require a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> vote. They have the right to call for a revisitation.

Kelsey: **Yield.**

Ivan: **Call to question** regarding the re-visitation of conference line items, period.

**Revisiting the conferences of the budget:**

Yes: 2

No: 22

Abstention: 12

**Motion fails, we will not revisit. Conferences will remain the same.**

Iden: Am I supposed to go back to my senate and tell them that their votes were unheard. I don't understand why no one wants to talk about this. I think there are people who do want to have this discussion. Should I just tell them that they don't want to talk about it?

Rebecca: My thing was, is there any way we can talk about it in the bylaws. My thing is that for people who go to conferences, they should be accountable to outreach when they come back with a presentation.

Victor: I want to echo with the last two people, and I am interested that the people who want to give back to what they've learned.

Ivan: In regards to going back to the constituency, it's a democracy.

Kevin: My question where we are on the agenda right now. It just got voted so we should move on.

DT: What we are discussing is still relevant to the budget so we have to respect that. Folks, we need to move forward. Honestly, you tell them what you have been doing for the last five weeks. We've been talking about it. It was done democratically. It was passed almost unanimously. It was passed with a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority that we will not revisit it.

**CJ: Yield.**

Justin: I was going to report the final number. The final number is \$7,238.32.

Shiku: My concerns are also that DT asked the officers to talk about the permits. I was wondering about where the discussion is for the parking permits and why and how we use them.

DT: All the officers prepared a presentation. Have them on a document and we can send that out.

Shiku: Would it be purposeful since we passed the budget? I would like to have this space discuss it.

DT: It could be on next week's agenda.

Shiku: **I reserve my right to make a** motion to open up discussion about officers parking permits.

Tony: **Second.**

Lila: I felt like we had a really good compromise. A lot of the college senates opposed parking permits for the officers. Why go back and revisit a really contentious issue that could result in more arguing?

Shiku: I do agree that we have a lot of discussion. I would like to present data and visual to show the colleges. Out of the respect of the time that we used to create this data, I would like discussion.

**Vote to discuss the permits, adding it to the agenda.**

Yes: 14

No: 18

Abstention: 4

**Motion does not pass; it is not added to the agenda.**

Gabby: I really like the idea to present the idea for the future maybe.

DT: We can send them out with the minutes.

.

Justin: If anyone wanted to make any suggestion about the conferences such as accountability.

Rebecca: I have the skeleton but I don't have the language.

Victor: Could I recommend that the folks go back to their spaces and it's nice to get feedback from spaces. It'll allow folks to speak about this.

Rebecca: Can I make a request that for people who know who went to colleges, if you feel like you know people who have different opinions, can you outreach to them so we can get feedback.

Vanessa: I know Merrill didn't have a meeting this week.

Shiku: For senates, are meeting open to all students, I got the feeling that many seem closed.

Rebecca: You are open to come but we also want people from our college to input.

Ivan: I felt that when I went to college spaces, I had the feeling that they questioned "why are you here"?

DT: Any other business? Speak now or forever hold your peace.

Mick: **Motion** to recess for 20 minutes.

Linda: **Second.**

Brittany: SUA operates on a weird time so can we all is here at 15 minutes.

DT: Come back at 9:15PM.

Mick: It is friendly.

### **Recess until 9:20PM**

Kevin: In the interest of time, I just put it on the projector. This is a resolution in regards to a bill. You can look it up. It just recently passed to the judiciary committee. It also reflects to the central coast coalition for the immigration reform. This resolution has come from a format from that committee. The SUA supported the dream act. This is just an extension of the dream act. It's in support for a work visa program. There are both be it resolved clauses.

Lyle: I was just wondering if this will be e-mailed out to us?

Kevin: Yes.

Kevin: It would be in support of a path to citizenship and work visa. Also, you can add amendments to this. I would just request that if you have an amendment, please bring it up next meeting.

Ivan: We actually had a meeting with the U.S. Committee of public engagement. This is what we as a body thinks.

DT: Are there any other questions?

Ivan: If anyone has additional questions, I can help with that.

### **Discussion whether to discuss and vote:**

DT: My recommendation is that for the STAND conflict free and divestment. We would call for a vote to vote. We can address them first and move to discussion. We can pick it up next week.

Lila: I reserve my right to make a motion; Stevenson hasn't had the time to outreach to talk to people in our colleges. I **motion to table** the voting of both divestment resolutions to next meeting.

Ivan: Correct me if I am wrong, if we already voted to not vote on it, why is this a discussion?

Rocio: We talked about outreach to different constituencies, people made the extra effort to speak to others. It's a dismissal of their efforts.

Ivan: I challenge the chair because we already talked about the votes. I'm challenging the chair discussing the motion because we already voted and it has failed.

Tony: Correct me if I'm mistaken, the motion was to strike that from the agenda, not to actually vote on them.

Lila: Rescind my **motion**.

Ghandi: **Motion** to discuss both resolutions.

Justin: **Second**.

DT: I'm giving you all a sense of agency about how we will go about this. Is there any objection to discussing these items? We will be discussing.

Ghandi: **Point of clarification**, how many colleges actually presented these resolutions?

DT: If your org or college discussed the STAND resolution, please raise your hand.

Max: Due to the timing that this was presented, our last meeting doesn't have external things. We've given honor to the seniors graduating and their work they put in for our college. It's doing a disservice. We are silencing an entire college senate.

Ryan: We should really pause for a minute and listen to what Gabby said. I know other UC's has discussed this issue. If it's priority, you can make time.

Rebecca: We are having this discussing earlier, is there any other way that we can read the language.

DT: The **motion** on the floor was to table the vote.

Justin: **Point of clarification**, if this motion was to table the vote and discussion, by reintroducing a vote to vote, is that a different motion or the same motion?

DT: I am going to move this forward; we will be discussing them tonight. I am calling a vote for us to vote on it tonight, next week, or next year.

Kevin: Gabby just said we can't revisit this motion.

DT: Ian will help me count.

**All those in favor voting on the STAND resolution tonight:**

Yes: 12

No: 18

Abstentions: 6

**We will not be voting on the STAND resolution tonight.**

DT: Voting on it tonight is out of the question.

Kevin: I **motion** to put voting on the STAND resolution for next week's meeting.

Ian: **Second.**

DT: Are there objections to put this on next week's agenda? So moved.

Alfonso: Can we ask the senates that won't be meeting call for a special meeting?

Brad: Speaking for Crown, I'd be happy to hear it. Crown senate should make the effort.

DT: No objections, voting will be next week.

**Vote for or against voting on divestment resolution tonight:**

Yes: 12

No: 21

Abstention: 4

**There will be no voting on the divestment resolution tonight.**

CJ: I **motion** to vote on the divestment resolution vote to next week.

Alfonso: **Second.**

Tony: Seeing how this issue has a lot of contention and senates might not be meeting, we should hold up on this.

Iman: This was presented last week, any conversations should be done. By putting it off a year, it's lazy on our part.

Nicolette: We brought it back to our Cowell space. People in our senate needed to get educated. Senates that haven't talked about it yet have a week to do it.

Gabby: As a rep for Oakes, I sent the info to senates. We could have a discussion. I think one meeting would be fine.

DT: If I could speak freely with where I stand, I say we discuss today. This is an issue we are not afraid to address. Contentious issues like this should be discussed. We should respect the folks that work hard. My suggestion is we vote on it next year. College senates are open to hosting forums. By discussing it, it brings attraction to our campus.

Gabby: Tabling means putting it off. The second point is whether there is not enough time. This has come up across the state. They all discussed this and it happened in the same night. It's a new assembly body next year. It's unconstitutional. You either vote on it, or you bring a new entire bill. So, either do it tonight, because you have a lot of students.

Vanessa: As someone who voted no, I am open for discussion.

DT: Current motion is to reconsider the motion. It belongs to body. If folks wanted to change, they can.

Rebecca: I feel like that people aren't entirely clear.

DT: Since the motion is on the floor, it belongs to the body.

Nora: We should have a right to vote tonight because people are being silenced.

Iden: Can we go through the agenda? We literally spent 30 minutes to get to that point.

DT: I want folks to know the reason we are doing this. We can get continue on and we can discuss. I'm trying to respect people and their desire whether they want to vote.

Lila: **Second.**

Stephanie: **Objection**, we already voted, if we were to vote. Where is the productivity and discussion over the summer?

DT: Motion on the floor to reconsider the vote and the discussion of the resolution.

Vanessa: We can either separate it or vote or discuss it tonight.

DT: The motion as a whole goes back on the agenda.

Danny: I was under the assumption that we voted that we made this vote to prevent this. Reopening the matter, it puts the bureaucratic to waste.

**Vote to reconsider discussion of the divestment:**

Yes: 21

No: 13

Abstentions: 2

**Motion passes to reconsider discussion.**

Lila: **Motion** to amend the original motion to table the voting.

Tony: **Second.**

Ghandi: It's going to be a different body so next year, it's going to be no.

Rebecca: **Motion** to proceed with the agenda.

Lyle: **Second.**

### **STAND: Conflict Free Campus Initiative Discussion**

Iden: I think would say my personal opinion, this is something we should support. It's not really a contentious issue.

Iman: I'm a member of the ABSA, this proposal is very important. It has been brought up and we had a event about it. I ask STAND to reconsider and work with ASU. We should collaborate.

Charlsie: Thursday, they will have their movie 7:30 at Namaste lounge.

Rebecca: I recognize that there are issues.

Shiku: As a member of the ASU, we should think critically about the space, there is a white savior approach. Stand has been collecting good information but they should talk to people who can relate and have ties with those countries.

Rebecca: Can you explain the language "white savior"?

Ryan: I guess I want to take a minute and address about the "white savior complex". I just think that with this issue specifically, it's important that we be cautious about the race relations in the room and beyond. We shouldn't use language and we should challenge ourselves regarding that

### **Vote in favor of approving and passing the STAND resolution:**

Yes: 18

No: 9

Abstention: 8

**Motion passes, resolution passes.**

### **Divestment Resolution Discussion:**

DT: For this discussion, we've set up microphones and will allow 2 minutes for them talking. These two microphones are just here for people to hear each other. Brittany will keep count of the 2 minutes. We will reset after every speaker. During this conversation, you are addressing me as chair but you are speaking to the SUA body.

Brad: **Point of clarification**, the microphones are for everyone right?

DT: Yes, the mics are amplified be watch your tone. I will be trying to control for tone.

Brad: **Motion** to extend meeting to 11PM.

Max: **Second.**

Mick: **Friendly amendment**, 11:30PM.

Brad: **Friendly.**

DT: Eric will be crowd control. Brittany will be right here controlling for time. Tem will be taking minutes. People will be saying their testimony.

Danny: I'm 4<sup>th</sup> year History student and Merrill student, former president of Alpha Epsilon Pi and cofounder of the Jewish student union. The reason I strongly stand against this resolution is because the way it makes students feel on campus and the way it will be extremely divisive. What this is not effective dialogue. It's not allowing for us to come to a space that is safe and having effective conversation. It's essentially silencing that. One of my big concerns as a student is that not only I feel safe and my friends feel safe at UCSC, we as slugs pride us on willing to listen to someone. We are willing to listen to dialogue. This is because we are saying a step towards to neutrality, yet it isn't a step toward neutrality.

Taylor: I am a student at Merrill. I wanted to talk about the issue of human rights. Not only has the Secretary of the state, but all of the US, the UN, the international court our justice, amnesty have a problem with how they treat their citizens. In 2012, they said that not only did they express their concerns with the Israeli treatment of Palestinian, there were human rights violations. They listed human rights violation ass: excessive use of force, improper use of detention and its procedures. When every human rights organization sees the wrong, our tuition money cannot fund the defamation of the Palestinian people. I really encourage you to vote yes on divestment.

Aaron: Film and digital media major. I'm currently president of Alpha Epsilon Pi. I can ensure you as an organization; we are against this divestment bill. Singling out Israel, out of all the other countries in the world, is insulting. As an org, we have Jewish and Palestinian students. It's insulting and intolerant. If this resolution passes, I would not feel comfortable on campus that I called my home for three years. It's a divestment that alienates me and my brothers and all the other advocates. A divestment from Israel is a divestment from the people that make this campus great. Aside from all our other chapters, we have our brothers that served. They want peace for the sake of their family and friends. Israel is a global leader in technology and innovation, there is a reason why the regents spoken against the BDS movement. You should vote no on this resolution. It doesn't improve the student relations.

Amrit: I'm a recent grad of UCSC. I am speaking in support of the divestment. I think it's unfortunate that this resolution has been interpreted in the manner that polarizes and paints an unclear picture of what the divestment truly is. I believe the resolution intends to highlight the role that multinational corporations play globally. I would use an analogy of prostitution. Prostitution exists as a triad, it includes three main actors: the prostitute, the pimp, and the customer. These three actors promote the dichotomy of objectification, oppression, and standardization of gender and sexual roles. The pimp provides access to the service. The pimp is the multinational corporation, they benefit. Multinational corporations are not friends with other communities. They oppress.

Lisa: I am your average Jewish student. I hate to say it but every generation has their form of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is perpetuated by BDS. I think the most important point hasn't been brought up. This resolution is simply symbolic. UC regents said they won't divest. By passing this resolution, you are creating a rift in the student body. It'll stop the Jewish flow into this community. It'll be a rift that perpetuates equality. The purpose of this resolution is to delegitimize the existence of Israel. As a student, I do not feel safe. Is this standard you create here at UCSC? Is this the home you claim Santa Cruz is? If you understand my situation, I thank you. For those of you, who are still deciding, think of the atmosphere you are creating. Do you want UCSC to be associated with a hateful and hurtful stance?

Marnie: I am a Jew who does not fit in the status quo; I learned these values in Hebrew school. I'm learning about nationalism and racism. Judaism is not a monolith. I support divestment. I am sick of the treatment of Palestine's. I am disgusted by the presentation last week because it marginalized the other side. They will probably feel really angry that. No matter who's identity, fighting for divestment is important for the community.

Elaine: In the article, this trend began this representation. It originated in Western Europe, the politics talking about Israel. The UCSC divestment bill is not the same divestment. However the term, the word loses its strength. This resolution, Jewish people are not a monolith community. Being Jewish is not the same as being from Israel. Patriotism and nationalism are different. There has been a case about the use of apartheid. As a student as a global citizen, this is it. This is what happens.

Stephanie: I am here to show this bill is not pro-Israel or against. This is a move to neutrality. We as tuition payers need to know where our money is going. Through a divestment of corporation, I see my way that my tuition dollars do not violate human right violations. To keep our duty, this is only one step forward.

Aaron: This is why I have a problem with this bill. It shows only one side of this contentious history. It sets a double standard to Israel, including Jordan. It does not Palestinian terrorism.by

passing a bill, it validates a claim that Israel is an apartheid state. They are completely different stipulations. That being said, I am entirely against. This is simply untrue.

DT: I ask reps that they should pay attention. You make this final vote.

Nora: The system labeled me women of color. I'm not for oppression or occupation. The divestment bill isn't anti-Israel or anti-Semitic. We choose to defy the UCSC credibility as a whole. I am fighting for dignity and the principles with UCSC. Divestment bill is a tool for me to offer our voices to the voiceless and to the oppressed and to stand in solidarity with Palestinians. I am very frustrated with this space. We should stand for equality and justice. Thank you.

Rachel: Hi everyone, my name is Rachel. I'm active in the Jewish community. I urge you all to vote against the divestment bill because this bill suggests that the Palestinian conflict is one-sided. It oversimplified the conflict that is two-sided. They showed the separating barrier and showed its effects on Palestinians in the region. It's very important to look at the Israeli side. Put yourself in the Israeli government's shoes. Your country faces a lot of attacks. What are you supposed to do? It's your job to protect your citizens. You built a fence to protect them. The fence decreases attacks. I'm not saying Israel is completely innocent and free, I'm saying UC students should effectively look at the conflict and both sides. This bill only addresses the Palestinian conflict. We need to be fair to both sides and both should be addressed and one side.

Mayan: I was born in Israel. This is a discussion of basic human rights. Growing up in Israel, I was presented with one narrative. It was portrayed that all Palestinians. I joined the mandatory army. They were used by the government to oppress the Palestinians. Once I questioned the Israeli narrative, I look at Palestine. I encourage you to read and watch the Israeli government and the oppression. As a Jewish student, I support divestment because I care about Israel and Palestine. It has no future denying. It is my home.

Omer: I was also born in Israel. I'm against this bill. It doesn't address the narrative of the other side. It talks about the apartheid. It talks about the wall between the West Bank and Israel. I am only going to address one point due to time. The point I want to talk about the barrier. It's being called a human rights violation. This barrier was brought up because of the second intifada. The Palestine terrorists came with their only purpose to kill Israeli civilians. Like any other country, they build a wall to provide security. Suicide bombings are virtually nonexistent. However the amount of lives being saved cannot be argued. This is a complex issue. I hope you take that into consideration.

Nadia: I come from a village where. Fingerprint a contract that would thus only allow Jews to own land. Nor can the houses of Palestinians be fixed. If Palestinians. It is a caterpillar that often

moves builders when the home is too cramped to live in. Our money supports this brutality against civilization. My tuition goes to the oppression of my family.

Edmond: Persian American Jew. I am against divestment. Many students are not aware of what this student states. They haven't even talked to their senates. SUA is not representing a body as a whole because the students haven't had the opportunity to learn and be held accountable. Stevenson council came to the conclusion that. I am here to propose to table the votes next year until we get a majority of the people about the resolution.

Amrit: Simply put, multinational organizations are not neutral. After WW1, the power of international trade shifted. This shift is the gradual realization, political. However the reciprocal also brings true. Furthermore, American and multinational corporations are the most powerful concentrations of power.

Alicia: Persian American Jew, sister of Sigma Alpha Epsilon Pi, I learned about dialogue. You can see people are not happy. This is not working together and we are better than this. This is a very politicize approach. As students, we should together. Divestment is so harmful to campus and it widens gaps I spent time at social justice. Why can't we all work together? I do agree as college students make a difference in the Palestine and Jewish conflict. So should we pass this construct. To vote yes is to I urge you to vote no on divestment. The SUA will marginalize the community.

Matt: I just want to say a few words about the concept of neutrality. This university already actively supports the decisions. It's an active decision. You can't sidestep this issue. Whatever decision is active and is real.

Rebecca: Merrill Student. I come from a mix African student and Jewish background. I would want to address the campus climate because if we pass this, it shows that this is not a safe campus climate. We should be respectful of that as well. Just so there is no confusion. There are thousands of undocumented Palestinians in Israeli. It has not stopped this migration happening. It cuts Palestine of the land. In the same village that I was shot at by the Israeli military, the same military that I wanted to be a part of when I was a kid. Every single week, pedestrians across the West Bank protest nonviolently. You won't hear about that but it happens every single week. Every single week, we should be respectful of. Then maybe there is something that is wrong here. Please vote yes on divestment.

Nicolias: As a feminist, I am anti-war, I support divestment. Israel is a beacon of democracy. There are many other countries. This argument is just a tool. This argument is ultimately. If we wanted to play human rights violators in. countries such as Syria have been subjected to sanctions. The opposite can be said by involvement for Israel. 3.1 billion dollars in 2013. Today,

US sent \$13 billion in bilateral assistance. The support we are not holding Israel to a double standard.

Iden: Going against the government isn't going against the people. Every single person should question the acts of their government no matter what country. I question the mentality that the Jewish people should not question. I'm a citizen of this country. I question these governments' policies all the time. It doesn't mean I'm anti-American. People are framing this anti-Semitic. This is not an attack on the state of Israel, even if it is its okay to look at the government and question its policies. There is no question that the Israel government is violating human rights. People should question themselves why they blindly support their government.

Karen: 4<sup>th</sup> year porter, born in Israel. I agree we look at human rights violations. I am pro-Palestine and pro-Israeli. I do not have a problem in terms of divestment. The only issue is language. If human rights are the issue, the resolution states that the Israel is an apartheid state. If we want to politicize, no part of the resolution should have Israel. As an Israeli student, personally knowing that a student government I elected that will pass the election, automatically blaming my country for problems, is a problem. If you want to divest, please by all means. Just don't add Israel to the resolution.

Shannon: I heard a lot about this bill. It would be tension. As a Muslim student, whenever you speak about occupation, it's coined a terrorist phrase. By us investing, I think we are not remaining neutral. By divesting, we are not remaining neutral. Why should our school feel the same. We keep hearing feelings. There are people hearing

Jocelyn: I am coming to you as a student. I have been told that. This agenda. So I struggled with that idea. I was being told that it's anti-Semitic. Something is not racist or homophobic. Why should I define anti-Semitic?

Mick: I reserve my right to make a motion to extend the meeting to 12:30AM.

Shannon: **Second.**

Nadia: I represent Oakes. I was also one of the coordinators of know your rights week. We had reached over 200 students. We talked about marginalized groups. We had 60 people in the planning. During those weeks, we knew the divestment bill was coming up. I would like to say also as a student, I agree with questioning your government. It's possible to be, as a Pakistani, I recognize that.

Ryan: Second year from student from Merrill. I also I want to say that I personally support this resolution. I mentioned this because some of the corporations are involved with the US-Mexico border. It's important to call out certain instances of injustice. It's important that we consider this

as a starting point but we do not lose this specificity of this resolution. I just want to reiterate, we as QSU, we voted yes for this divestment.

Gabby: I am a Kresge class of 2012 alum. I'm a Jewish student, although I hate I have to say that, as if it makes my voice more credible than Palestinians who lost their homes. I just got back from Israel and I travelled there for four months. I saw Palestinians living in tents with no running water and no sewage. I saw a split system of roads where Palestinians are not allowed to use and cannot share the same busses. If they marry someone who lives in the West Bank, they cannot live together. I had a Mexican-American friend who was patted down for drugs because he had dark skins. I saw houses being bulldozed by caterpillars. I don't think tuition should be supporting them.

Ivan: I am here in behalf of myself and MEChA. They also endorse the bill. We are in solidarity with that movement. I wanted to talk about the things said. Last week, I said we are not all U.S. citizens. I know when I hear things like terrorist or criminal; it's very conducive for me to not want to listen. I know some folks around the room in the room are shaking their heads right now. It's more important because I'm not a part of either community and I'm very open-minded and is trying to figure out where I am at and I am trying to actively listen to both sides. Personally, I feel like I'm at a place of wanting to divest from multinational companies, not because we are against Israel or against the Jewish community. It should be considered my closely. We were looking at HR 35, one of the questions I had for myself that I understand that it may be problematic. Like this too, where in this resolution are the places of contention so we can talk about them efficiently. I think I haven't heard that. It's more of scare tactics. I think for both parties should challenge each other so they can solve this by compromise and in peace.

Kamran: I am Merrill Student, officer under Muslim Student Association. The MSA endorsed this divestment. There is a broad coalition. Coming from my personal perspective, its seen as you cannot criticize the. That style meats dialog. When you say things like that, it immediately disengages. Also, looking and speaking about silence, the idea of tabling the resolution, there is a legitimate concern. This is a bill that shouldn't be the end. This is a tactic of tabling is a tactic of silencing people.

Victor: I have questions. Are people present? It's starting to feel like folks aren't here. My next question for folks is against the resolution. Can you please address what the corporations are doing? I was wondering if I could be provided more contexts.

Gina: 3<sup>rd</sup> year Jewish studies major. If there are 100 people, it is Jewish law, even is just one person and they are in danger of getting in sick. I'm feeling really cold right now because it makes me feel extremely uncomfortable. I want to have a dialogue with the other side. It's make a decision really fast. I do want the other sides opinions. I urge you, you need to take into consideration and it makes me feel uncomfortable. My mom always says to me, it takes two

people to argue. I think this bill is an argument. We should continue this. We should continue talking about this this year and next year.

Daniel: 1<sup>st</sup> year student.. One of these quotes that Nelson Mandela stance with this issue. I actually have another quote. He said to the many people, I say Israel worked closely with the apartheid regime. They did not participate in any atrocities. South America was one of the first countries that. The fact that Israel had any support at this time was incredible. Israel did not cooperate with South African apartheid. Israel is kind of like Palestine. I am not speaking of Israel's past. I am speaking

Edgar: Graduated last year. I am for divestment and solidarity with the Palestinian people. I think of U.S support in dictatorships in Latin America. I am also against the military conference. I just found out today, Chiapas used its military is receive Israeli aid to train police. My own struggle as a Mexican, I couldn't ask that at the expense of the oppression of other people.

Nora: I learned a lot. I am a Somali from Somalia. Conflict resolution has been a passion of mine. I am a product of war. It's not about neutrality right now. It's matter of acting. We are not going to I would appreciate we stand in solidarity of the Palestinian people. No child should go through checkpoints just to go to school every day. No woman should be widowed and denied their rights. We all know that these students go through this. I think being neutral means being silent. I ask you all to be bold about it. It's a matter of rights.

Lila: While as a Stevenson senate opposes the resolution, I actually as a student am in support of divestment. Regents don't have the right to enable human rights violation. As a rep, I urge the SUA body to forget your own opinions to vote your college or organization.

Amanda: I think the best way. It was my mother's 50<sup>th</sup> birthday. I flew to LA. The skirt I wanted to wear didn't fit. I could it over my thighs. I tried on another skirt and my mom's pants and they didn't fit. I put on this dress. I got self-conscious. My mother is in my room. How could you do that to me? Either I could step back. I left on that plane, I am so sorry and I am so embarrassed. How could I have done that, the next day, wish I could huge. We could empathize, divestment is not progressive. I am asking you to vote no on this bill so we can get on the same page.

Rebecca: I am coming to you as a student. I come to you as a student who is not anti-Israeli and not against the Jewish community. The fact of the matter is that I know so many people in it. I'm here to talk about the people in Palestine, specifically the people who are suffering. It's an oppressive system. It's a system perpetuated by a stem. I come here because of an article I read by the New York Times. It was center about a single man on the West Bank born in the 60's. He grew up under the constant loss of his village. Every day, they would try to march to the spring. It has been half mile away. It speaks volumes. We should take the issues of Palestine.

Linda: In terms of the resolution of the language, would that language be accepted by both parties?

CJ: Second year, College 9 rep. I like to commend Lila and Rebecca, because they stepped out of their roles at reps and acted on the issues as a whole. Let's be honest, college senates are not representative of the entire college. I went around and 50 signatures in support of divestment. I really like to encourage us to do a little bit what Lila and Rebecca did. If they feel it, we cannot be disembodied subjects. It's unhealthy. Who are we silencing if we do not pass divestment? If we don't pass divestment, we are silencing with a lot of people in solidarity. As lastly, I really like to challenge the thought that Obama and the government are credible sources because they deported a huge amount of immigrants.

Sammie: I come before this room to talk about the resolution. It considers Israel being. The apartheid is code for the reprehensive form of racism. It's a softer form. The intent is the same. The use of the word of apartheid is not analysis, it's branding. Palestinians do not want to be Israeli citizens. They have their own governments. Israel made peace officers. A peace treaty was officer which would stop the fighting and it would have led to a creation Palestine state. I urge you all to take the time. If neutrality isn't your concern, remember you are speaking on behalf. Vote no on this highly.

Ivan: I am feeling unsafe and it should be addressed.

DT: Please folks, watch your tone, speak to me. Do not single out an individual.

Nara: College 8 student. I'm a Palestine refugee. I've seen people have their home destroyed by caterpillars leaving my family displaced. Our university is not neutral when it come to this conflict. The absolute least is to take a stand where our hard earned tuition money goes. If we cannot divest, what's left? We are here to standing against justice. I urge you all to vote yes on divestment.

Chanel: This issue is going to divide some people. You ask someone what their favorite color, you'll get a lot of different answers. Also, forget if you are Palestine, Jewish, etc. take the pride back for the moment. We will never meet these people on the other side of the world. There are farmers losing their land. It's not cool to say the least of it. Yes, we disagree on this. If a child is losing their parent, it's not right. It's your dollar and it's going to person. The product will shoot a parent or destroy a home. What do you believe in?

Breem: One of the parents here. They claimed that they have a right to build that wall. I don't see a problem building that wall. I don't want it coming out the tuition. I was very hurt that the tuition that I've paying has been killing my relatives. We are just investing.

Visan: I'm from Oakes. My family was refused entry. My family was put into the jail cell. There was a lady at the airport and someone followed us asking whether we hated Israel. The bill is about money. We all need to take a step back. UCSC is set as an institution set for social justice. Oh I am going to be a factory worker. We need to take a look at America's. My grandmother has been always telling me that her husband was always crossing a checkpoint. She is scared of forgetting. We are just telling stories of what happened but we need to reminder we need to help others.

Dora: I am a member of the Santa Cruz community. I've been married to a graduate. I am member for Jewish members for peace. I urge you all to join with me. We heard a moving testimony. We can see that the investments are leading to oppression they are leading to death. As one of your reps, think about the issue, what it will mean to the UCSC and its money? There are other places you can divest. Once again, I'm very proud of the committee. Thank you

Barry: I am been a part of the SUA. I had the honor serving under the IVC. I like to introduce you a letter by a member of the parliament Dr. Kenneth, president of the African Christian party. This is dated April 10, 2013. As a South African, I am deeply disturbed. In my view, Israel cannot be viewed as apartheid. As a black. I could not vote. The Palestinians are not Israelis. Please vote no.

Brad: I do not affiliate myself with any race; it's something that I have done as a personal choice. I want to show you have a standpoint in this. I don't know have an Israeli or Palestinian background. To start off, I want to thank everybody. We've had this discussion about student life. This had been one of these most educational experiences. This is stuff I will actually reminder. Thank you. With that said, I just want, to say my advice, it's hard for SUA to really put their name on this. It's difficult. This is a difficult situation and we all agree. People are saying you have to forget about feelings. Everybody has gone through something that has killed them. Feelings are a part of human rights. We got realize that this is UCSC. We have to insure that all students here feel safe. I really hope we have more discussions about this in the upcoming years because it's actually something worthwhile.

Corbin: I want to bring a different standpoint; I just want to speak about the divestment itself. If it weren't for the strong language in this, I wouldn't be against it. For that to do that, it's a misuse for funds. The strong language used for the divestment proposal. Me, coming from political, I'm an independent conservative. I felt uncomfortable stating my opinion times. I love this school. I felt apprehensive. This is a much larger community. It affects far more people. It truly makes you feel uncomfortable.

Bo: A word that has been continuous used is security. Depriving Palestinians of their land and not promoting violence against the military. It has ultimately led to more violence. Companies that are invested have directly benefited in the imprisonment of the Palestinian people. Jewish

families know the idea of displacement. The displacement of one group should not lead to the displacement of others.

Tony: I am not speaking as a rep, but as a student. Something that I am seeing said over and over again is the issue of human rights. That being said, I look at you being said as the language. Are we trying to stop human rights movements or patronize Jewish students? I would love to hear answer. It's not making anyone feel unsafe. I am coming to you as a proud Jewish student. Don't actively silence my voice.

Nadia: College 10 student. I wanted to briefly talk about this. We should step up if basic human rights are being hindered in any way, such as shelter or food access. We have an obligation as students. I am against anything regarding my tuition money going and supporting any type of things hindering human life.

Mick: **Motion** to extend time to 1:00AM. I encourage those who haven't spoken to please up and let those who have spoken step back.

Rebecca: Would it possible to limit it to people who hasn't spoken before?

Iden: **Friendly amendment**, I don't think we should. We should just allow the people who haven't spoken to speak first.

Shaz: I agree.

Melody: I agree.

Lila: **Second**.

DT: No objections? So moved.

Ahmed: Student of Kresge College. I want to talk about check points. We want to keep the citizens within because we have government in Gaza and West Bank. People were voted by Palestinians. I also as a Palestinian, they have to go three checkpoints to get out of my country. I urge you all to vote yes on the divestment.

Brooklynn: I don't know what going on about the conflict. I'm not going to slip and say facts. Being here is a history lesson. I find the wording in this bill very problematic. Somebody said earlier something about humanitarian rights. But, I think it's more important that we should attack the multinational companies than the government. We encourage you that we should be careful and be educated before your vote.

Nargis: Officer of MSA. Not voting for this bill is not actively oppressing people. The tuition money goes to oppressing people. At least human rights are the main point.

Guest: Affiliated with Oakes. Many people have stated that if it passes, the impact would be strongly impacted. The reason I'm the US, the people here made a statement. They were not support of the government; He went from a doctor to 7/11 cashier. We support people and their rights. Not governments. Thailand and Malaysia, we choose to support my people and my country.

Danny: This story goes back to a kingdom and a king. This king has a special ring with a Ruby on it. One day, as he was waking up, the ring fell and cracked. The king sent out a declaration through the kingdom to repair the crack. They want the prize that comes for that. No one who came could fix the crack. One day, a small little man came.. He comes back after a week and he hands the ring back though the crack was not mended. Now in the ring, there is a carved rose. Before we had the option to let the crack proliferate, but we have the opportunity to create a rose. Thank you.

Rachel: I would like to emphasize that our main goals are here to support people. I urge you not to vote for this divestment bill. It only acknowledges one side and only one bill. If you don't want a people on campus to feel marginalized, plain and simple, don't vote for this bill. Every single thing people have outline as that it is Israel's fault. Ultimately, it's what the bill suggests. That will happen if SUA does not take a stance. We are not shy about pointing out errors.

Gabby: As for the argument, this body has set this precedent. You voted on divestment before. We have supported other symbolic resolution. As a point of apartheid being a contentious term, there are international differences of what apartheid is. Yes, Arabs can serve but they could not be part of the government. 80% of people are below the poverty line. Like I said, I saw things that I saw were apartheid as a person. I do encourage you to vote.

Nora: I just want to address. I wanted to read the proposal about them. It was a controversial proposal. Not only did this proposal. It states that the right to self-determination is unique to the Jewish nation. I do have an opportunity to divest. Corporations have been against equality for everybody. It's not about being Jewish or Muslim, its human rights.

Alicia: I am all for human rights. I am not saying Israel is perfect. I am not saying that Israel is not perfect. However, that is being said. If the wording in this bill, if I had voting rights, I would vote for it. The fact that Israel is being demonized is what concerns me. How come this bill does not address those? I literally urge someone to take a look at the wording of this bill. And ask how this is not an attack on Israel.

Ryan: I do want to say thank you to the body. I do want to say. Know your rights week. Many students come together to support this bill. You heard many reasons. I just want to return to the content of the bill. Really read thoroughly through this resolution. At the end of the day, it targets 5 multinational corporations. I think that we heard about Israel and its apartheid. Why should we single out Israel? This is a very important issue. You got to be specific. This is a great starting point.

Elise: I just want to address a few things. When someone felt uncomfortable, a moment a Jewish student feels like there being attacked, it's indirectly delegitimized. We talked about that is this issue. If this was a safe community that valued me as a student, it would be open to the dialogue of both sides. Thank you.

Aaron: I really want to address the allegations. The policies are a safeguard. I quote: divestments, other independent expert said "civilians are not intentionally targeted" the death of any civilian. Not all attacks. This is not an apartheid and it's offensive to call it. I call on you the leaders of this community. To vote no is to encourage real dialogue between both sides.

Amanda: College 8. Let's acknowledge that people's homes are being demonized. Let's acknowledge that people are dying on both sides. Whereas this conversation ends in a few hours, it will happen day after day. What we say here is important. Let's get into Israel's shoes and they believe what they are doing is defense that is Israel's perspective. If our intention is to move forward with cause to stop people's homes, we cannot call out another side. It makes Israel more defensive. The problem here is the occupation. The problem is not Israel.

Channel: The initial connection between multinational was created. Diversity specifically in regards multinational corporations where each fact. This polarization has been aggravated. Do we want UCSC to support that? Do you as students want your tuition to support this?

Shannon: Three points, not playing the oppression Olympics. This is the first step. The next one is that it's an attack on the Israeli voice for Muslim students; this campus is continuously attacking my voice. If we are concerned with marginalizing voices, it's already happening. We have been quoting people. Remind yourself is that they aren't paying your fees. Obama does not care if you are working at the dining hall. This is your money. You get to choose where to put it. Again, we keep quoting, it's really contested. Obviously these are really contentious terms. Don't put your money somewhere

Nom: 2<sup>nd</sup> year, moved to Israel. I heard a lot of people talking about the intentions of the bill. I want to look at the outcome. What it is, I did a little experience. I think it's very representative. I went to people; there is a bill that is being proposed to be divesting into companies who support Israel. People said it gives them a negative association of Israel. There is so some sort of bill out

there. I want to look as the outcome. If someone heard about a bill like that and I told them I was from Israel. I would like to be looked at for who I am. I don't want this campus in that way.

Kamran: I just want to speak briefly. I have a few points. One of them is looking at the definition of anti-Semitism and citing sources. I am not contesting; we should look at them critically. That could also play. Secondly, someone else brought up to divestment what it can do. There is a lineage. The UC divesting from South Africa was very important. Someone else told me Jewish students were also created in this bill to see before you. I encourage voting yes.

Victor: Good morning everyone. It's kind of unfortunate that we could not have dialogue of this issue. I will repeat them again. Please address and justify, how can Palestine's are created by. In addition, if divestment does pass, does pro-peace conversation just end if it doesn't pass, how it would make Jewish students feel more comfortable? I encourage you all to talk to each other. Statistics are important but nothing breaks your own testaments. There is already conversation with the language and possible amendments. Thank you all for being here and discussing this contentious topic.

Lila: I reserve my right to make a motion; I would like some time to take it all in. I **motion** to table vote to next week.

Lyle: **Second.**

Ivan: I **object.** I don't feel because 3 colleges did not meet considering all colleges, we would have to wait.

Lyle: I know I came here as Kresge not taking as a side. I learned so much and I really want to go back to my space to discuss with them.

Charlsie: Stevenson isn't ready to vote.

Brittany: I just want to bring up the point that colleges. All colleges have not been represented tonight. Those are people members of our colleges.

Tony: There was so much information today that we should bring back to our college and it'll help make a more educated decision.

Brad: It was 3 colleges 1 organization that did not meet. Some of us had Memorial Day. With that said, I find it unfair to the people that came to this space that heard these stories and come from an uneducated background. It's unfair to make these students to make a decision for the school. I want all students to think it's difficult with two weeks' time. There is not a SUA member that is an expert on this thing. I am still learning. I just wanted to say that.

Corbin: I wanted to table because I personally really hoped and go to my college and ask people about it with the list about things about it. I would love a chance to do that and I think others would.

Kamran: I just wanted to say that I understand the point going back to colleges. My only concern I mentioned earlier that I don't want that happen to not vote it next year. I think that I feel like it should really go out of their way. They should make emergency meetings and have conversations. This is an issue I want to see voted on this year.

Sammie: I am not a voting rep this quarter. I often hear about accountability. I hear a lot of students saying about accountable. I ask people to be consistent and to listen to students. I can't imagine 3 colleges and 1 orgs not meeting.

Iden: **Call to question**, I want to make a friendly to vote next week.

Shaz: **Second**.

Tony: **Objection**. We shouldn't set the precedent that we will for sure vote.

Iden: We have to vote on this by the end of the year.

Shaz: Once you introduce a resolution, according to the bylaws, it has to be considered. It has to be done within the same academic year.

Kamran: I agree with you that I don't like the idea that you have to, but at the same time, it is the last SUA meeting. We should make this a priority to educate people.

DT: Are folks clear that we have to vote? If people want to bring up info, they can do that.

Rebecca: What was the original motion?

Lila: Tabling voting next week.

Shiku: Are all colleges committed to bringing this back to this space?

Ryan: **Point of order**, if we do vote to table voting next year. The chair should hold people accountable.

Justin: Under the constitution, representatives should have 1 hour of weekly office hours.

Jocelyn: Is there a list of office hours?

Brittany: Could I get a time and location so I can put it on the SUA website?

DT: Can folks get their office hours and location to Brittany by noon tomorrow. Can reps do that?

Mick: **Point of order**, there is still a vote on call to question.

Kevin: If this motion fails, we vote on this today?

**Motion to vote next week**

Yes: 25

No: 7

Abstention: 2

**Motion passes, voting will take place next week.**

DT: Now it's a vote to vote. Being that the final numbers were 25 yes, 7 no, and 2 abstentions. Since we did vote next week, and you will have office hours I ask that this topic is presented without a bias and people could form their own opinions so you can represent them.

Ivan: If we feel the chair isn't doing their job, what would the officers do?

DT: I can get the actual language for you.

DT: We just passed the motion to table the voting to happen next week.

Ghandi: **Motion to adjourn.**

Rebecca: **Second.**

**Adjournment** at 1:30AM