

SUA Meeting Minutes 11/12/2015

Assembly Members Present: Imari Reynolds (Cowell), Bryna Haugen (Cowell), Tyler Papp (Cowell), Gema Rodriguez (Stevenson), **Alternate** Jeffrey Stoll (Stevenson), August Valera (Crown), Tias Webster (Crown), Jane Loughboro (Crown), Lara Loesel (Merrill), Morgan Smith (Merrill), Bianca (B) Moncada-Martin (Merrill), Roxanna Gutierrez (Porter), Amanda Kazden (Porter), Eli Guzman- Martin (Porter), **Alternate** Liza (Kresge), Winnie Sidhu (Kresge), Tara Parcella (Kresge), Tamra Owens (Oakes), **Alternate** Ray (Oakes), Kiana Coleman (Oakes), Wayne Ledgister (Eight), Simba Khadder (Eight), Kaimana Carney (Eight), Rohit Dhar (Nine), **Alternate** Dante (Nine), Ramneet Bajwa (Ten), Danny Milla (Ten), Tama Semo (Ten), **Alternate** Lina Abdelsalam (A/BSA), Theresa Atanoa (APISA), Vanessa Sadsad (QSU), Gilbert Paredes (MEChA), Erica Green (SANAI), Art Motta (Organizing Director), Seamus Howard (Vice President of Academic Affairs), Sauli Colio (Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion), Guillermo Rogel (Vice President of External Affairs), Jabari Brown (Vice President of Internal Affairs), Julie Foster (President).

Assembly Members Absent: Daniel Bernstein (Stevenson), Kyra Brandt (Stevenson), Jackie Roger (Kresge), Suini Torres (Oakes), Katherine Le (Nine), Anthony Gonzalez (Nine), Lisa Washington (A/BSA).

Approval of the Agenda:

Rohit: **Motion to approve agenda.**

Ray: **Second.**

Eli: **Objection.** I want to add something. **Motion to add 10 min after SOCC for SJP to present an appeal of previous chairs decision.**

Tama: **Second.**

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

B: **Motion to approve.**

Rohit: **Second.**

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

Approval of the Previous Meeting's Minutes:

Rohit: **Motion to approve.**

Bryna: **Second.**

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

Announcements and Public Comment:

Theresa: This Friday at C9/10 MPR E Squared will be having their E Squared Day with free food and games and you could win \$100 for the bookstore!

Guillermo: Office of External Affairs is still registering people to vote. If you register to vote, you can get a T-shirt and the Fund the UC shirts are also going for \$10, if you're interested in helping out let me know.

Julie: SOFA is happening on Friday at 6 PM. Housing forum on Wednesday next week at 5:30 PM at Kresge Town Hall, let me know if you'd like to be involved in that.

Art: Reminder that this Thursday is the Million Student March, we will meet in the Quarry Plaza at 1 PM. Tomorrow is a holiday but at 2 PM there will be a poster making party the SUA office.

Jabari: Battle of the Balds still happening Nov 30th, I have two positions filled, still need three more. The SCOC general meeting will happen sometime this week. C4 happening at Dec 4th at Cervantes and Velasquez.

Presentations:

Guillermo: **Motion to interchange UCSA Sage presentation and SJP appeal.**

Gema: **Second.**

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

Student of Color Conference Report back:

Testimonies: There was a lot of cross campus resource sharing. We talked about Filipino studies and Tagalog language classes. We talked about how different campuses fought for these things and how they have worked together to create a coalition to study abroad in the Philippines.

I learned a lot of things but I do want to say that one of the things I appreciated about SOCC was the safe space as people of color.

The SOCC was so beneficial and I think it is so important to get off campus and to go with other fellow Santa Cruz students and start conversations with other students on other campuses. I felt that the workshops, they were super important for the healing process. Being on the Berkeley campus and talking to other students about how their campuses are shows the differences in funding and resources between campuses. I was also part of the grad student mentor program and I was paired up with a grad student and what they do is reflect on the conference. Now she is also mentoring me on how to get into professional school.

Maliyah: Two things that I wanted to bring up, one of them was that the conference teaches us how to make systemic change, which is the second wave. It teaches us how to build coalitions; at

the conference we were making different bonds between different campuses. We connected based on group issues that we experienced. One example of systemic change and coalition building was a hands on action. All UC students came together to support UC workers. They are known for making very little and working a lot. They aren't able to take days off either. These are harsh conditions.

So some issues that students of color face on this campus are that there are not enough resources for the ethnic resource centers, not enough spaces for queer people of color, and a lack of outreach and retention of African American/Black and Native American students. Some next steps that we want to take some steps to change our campuses. We will be meeting before winter break regarding how to tackle these issues. Some things that are important are that we want to continue the conversation.

Julie: SUA every year deals with the budget, and I was wondering if SOCC was beneficial to the students if there was more funding.

Yes, need more students = more coalitions. More funding would increase participation and it gave us a place to talk. On this campus, we feel kind of silenced and we are able to speak about our own stories. We need to engage students and I think that that is a great way to increase voices and increase visibility of students of color. Also, it may not seem like it but it is retention based because it shows the students that what they are experiencing is real and that it is an issue. These people already understand what is happening and it allows for a deeper understanding of the issues.

UCSA Sage Presentation:

UCSA is statewide student association. It is like SUA at the statewide level. UCSA does a lot of interuniversity work and your president and EVP work with Napolitano. We support you all in local advocacy and we connect different coalitions on campus. In terms of how we are funded, if students want access to UCSA benefits, those are funded by the mandatory membership fees. If SUA wants access, you need to figure out \$1.30 and access membership. We want students to choose and be able to opt out of the fee. SAGE stands for student advocacy, governance and engagement. Those who show up are the ones making the decisions. We compete with a lot of other organizations that have more voice than us.

Current problems, there is poor representation and fallout from controversial decisions. UCSA benefits everyone, but associations pay different dues or none at all. There is budget unpredictability, restraints on staff retention and dues become stagnant over time. All action has consequences, even if it's a good decision. Some groups end up leaving regardless of the decisions. There were a lot of elements in the air because we cannot predict the budget that we will have for the year because they either pay minimum or above the general rate that we ask.

The Main Principles: This is what drives SAGE forward. UCSA has a half century of proven advocacy and activism for students. This is an administrative change, not a new fee. Students choose to fund UCSA through an opt out system.

SAGE fund would be maintained by student representatives from every campus. SAGE would create a stable source of funds to sustain the student movement in CA and we can predict what the budget will look like and plan for the long term.

Potential Revenue Uses: So with the revenue, we will be able to improve student representation in the statewide and federal affairs and expand the conference schedule. Students want us to recognize student accomplishments and increasing access to UCSA. We want students who have experienced the demands of the UC system to be at the meetings where policy is being made. They want improvements to staffing and bring tech presence into the 21st century.

Some Future Actions: Leading up to the January regents meeting we would invite you all to join other associations in weighing in on the SAGE proposal.

Guillermo: **Motion to add 10 minutes.**

B: **Second.**

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

We would like you all to take the student input survey at ucsa.org/sage.

Seamus: So what exactly would students be paying?

Right now we are trying to see if we need to change policy or create policy. We need to know if this money would also be able to return to aid. SAGE adjusts the current mandatory fee for inflation, so about \$4-6.

Seamus: Since UCSB pays such a large portion of UCSA dues, would the impact for the smaller campuses increase or decrease the amount in UCSA budget?

Our budget would increase a bit. Most associations pay \$1.30 per student and the lowest pays 88 cents per students. We believe that the opt out rate would be 8-10 percent of students.

August: Do you know of any UC campuses who have approved this?

Berkeley Grads/Undergrads, Merced Grads/Undergrads, Santa Cruz Grads, and Davis grads.

Seamus: For the opt-out procedure, do you know how that would be displayed?

Two different ways of doing that, which is you pay the fee and then file for reimbursement. In the CSUs, at the time of registration it is right there for the opt in/opt out option.

SJP Appeal of Previous Chair's Decision:

On May 27th, 2014, SJP (Students for Justice in Palestine) submitted a resolution which was calling for “university socially responsible investment” which passed with a 2/3rds votes. Everyone went home for the summer and then Chair Umer sent an email over the summer that the resolution hadn't passed due to a technical error. We are now just bringing this because now there is an appeal process. Right now we are focusing on lack of due process rather than the fact that the bill should have passed but we will go through those circumstances.

Some reasons we are seeking the appeal is that the resolution did pass but the wrong section of the bylaws had been suspended. The assembly had suspended the wrong section of the bylaws. However, Umer had no authority under SUA bylaws or Robert's Rules to rule or not implement a resolution that the assembly has passed. Video recording and witness testimonies indicate that people voted based on the correct section of bylaws, no matter what he said/thought. Notes indicate that Umer himself knew the intention was the suspend bylaws section requiring a 2/3 majority. Umer's claim was disingenuous and in bad faith. He announced that the resolution had passed. Umer based his claims on unapproved SUA meeting notes as well. So, in conclusion, Umer's ruling was undemocratic and based on false claims. The SUA Chair's actions should be overruled by the assembly. In addition, in 2014 when divestment passed, there were several orgs in support of this. Again, we also have two letters of support from people who were in SUA who knew exactly what they were voting on in the meeting.

Vanessa: Could you explain the impact of this decision to the new body?

SJP: As it stands now, the resolution is not passed. The resolution was to divest from certain companies that were investing in Israeli military. The content of the resolution right now is not so important except that it was highly politicized. We didn't receive due process and are just asking for due process.

Simba: Let's just stick with what is being asked right now and not talk about the resolution itself. We are talking about a past Chair's decision. Note that the email from Shaz came after the last SUA meeting and there was an entire summer and very silencing for the people who were there.

Art: Reserve my right to make a motion. I don't want to get into debate right now. All the information is on the SUA website. You can see the history of the last 4 years of SUA history and minutes. In 2013-2014, you can see the documents that were released by Chair Umer. Even the original resolution is there. **I would motion to table this to next week so that we can talk about this next week.** And if you have questions about the process you can talk to Ray.

Simba: **Second.**

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

Old Business:

SCOC Constitutional Edit Deliberation

Rohit: **Motion to accept the edits to the SCOC constitution.**

Bryna: **Second.**

Julie: **Objection.** One of the things they were trying to change is when they have general meetings. I think that general meetings should happen at a specific time, and right now it is at the discretion of officers. I feel like we should have a minimum amount of times per quarter.

Seamus: I disagree, I think that SCOC did pass this and this was their intention as well as the steering boards. This is their constitution and we do have power to edit it. If there are any edits to be made, I would like to bring this back to SCOC to see what they think. General meetings haven't happened for the last 2-3 years.

Simba: I would like to hear from the IVP to see the reasoning behind this.

Jabari: I do agree with Julie that we do need to set a definite date and time and the wording is very vague. As far as I'm seeing now, SCOC general meetings haven't happened in the last few years, I restarted them and so far there hasn't been much of a high turnout, but being in a space where students are appointed other students to the committees, I think it is good for the student population to have a voice in here. I would say that no more than once a month. The first meeting we had a max of five people. I would encourage you all to come to these meetings and invite your constituents to these meetings.

Julie: Reserve my right to make a motion, my thing with SCOC is that they are within SUA and we are supposed to have a pretty good connection. If they go off and do whatever they want, it is not entirely up to them. I just really think it is beneficial for students to go the general meetings to see what positions and committees are available. **Motion to amend this language and change from "at discretion of SCOC officers" to "at least twice a quarter"**.

Vanessa: **Second.**

August: **Objection.** I'd like to hear what Jabari has to say.

Jabari: It is still pretty vague and I think that maybe we could do every month of the quarter.

Tamra: I sit on SCOC and I agree that we should have at least twice a quarter.

Guillermo: I like the language that Julie was saying. I myself have sat on two different committees, and meeting weekly would maybe be a waste of time. Depending on the committee, progress could move very slowly. Making a fun event out of it is better.

Vanessa: Having sat on committees, I would support Julie's recommendation, it is on our constitution and it is vague so that there is more flexibility.

Vanessa: **Motion to add 5 minutes.**

Seamus: **Second.**

Simba: **Objection.**

Vote to Extend Time (Simple Majority):

In favor: **19** | Opposed: **7** | Abstentions: **13, adding five minutes.**

Seamus: SUA can force SCOC to do something via Jabari. Specifically doing something, though there is nothing in the bylaws that says we have that kind of power. We can remove committee reps.

Ray (*Oakes*): For Jabari and Julie, there is a low attendance, how would you advertise to the general student body?

August: I am not in support of the motion because I think it is limited future IVPs when they are making these meetings. As far as I am concerned, SCOC is allowed to modify the constitution every year. As far as changing it to what Julie requested, I don't think it's that big of a deal since Jabari also agrees with it.

Imari: Reserve my right to make a motion, it seems pretty simple that they can meet twice a quarter, it's just about being transparent and getting information from their reps. **I call to question.**

Rohit: **Second.**

Ray: Are there any objections? Seeing none, **call to question passes.**

Vote to amend this language and change from "at discretion of SCOC officers" to "at least twice a quarter" (Simple Majority).

In favor: **33** | Opposed: **0** | Abstentions: **5, amended constitutional language.**

Imari: **Call to question.**

Rohit: **Second.**

Ray: Are there any objections? Seeing none, **call to question passes.**

Vote to adopt all changes to SCOC constitution (Simple Majority)

In favor: **38** | Opposed: **0** | Abstentions: **1, adopted the changes to SCOC constitution.**

Ad Hoc Presidential Budget Deliberation

Julie: Ad hoc committee met twice last week and there were 4 people from the assembly space. That being said, we didn't get a whole lot of input. This will be put up on the website. For the first half of the first meeting, we debated the standing rule and we figured that the standing rule was talking about may 5th above the standing rule, those three things were SOCC, SLC, and printing and copy expenses. What is most important is the budget column "G" and you have that comparison with the first thing that I proposed.

The total revenue did not change, is still 448,703. We changed the reserve fund. The reserve fund is a line item that comes from the budget. It comes into a carry forward. Last year the budget that was approved did not have reserve funds and there was assumed a zero carryforward. The reserve funds had to be reinstated from the carryforward from last year. Everything else was adjusted to accommodate for that. The reserve fund itself would have come to \$4600 from the carry forward. The general fund was \$15,09.84 and SUA programming is \$35,722.96. There's not much under stipends and staff, nothing changed in officer pay or in the intern pay. One thing we did change was the Associate Elections Commissioner and changed it from \$500 to \$800, which is what it has been for the last few years. Another thing that we added is student staff benefits which is something that we are charged for processing payment. We added the stipulation that we would revisit this in the spring and reallocate the money. That brings us at about \$3700 for student staff benefits. For office supplies, nothing much changed. There are a few changes here, no changes to president travel. We did change the UC regents meeting lobbying, from \$1000 to \$2600 because there was a motion to cut it by \$1000 but it was put *as* \$1000 so it should be \$2600. We changed the line item name of General Lobbying to UC Regents Meeting Lobbying. There is also a stipulation that this would only be used for travel. We also increased LegCon by \$4000 and now it is at \$6000 and now it is open to not only board members. For dues for UCSA there were both opinions of increasing or decreasing those payments. In past years, we have had conferences that UCSC has hosted, and the VP of diversity mentioned that there would be a Womxn of Color Conference, and we allocated \$6000 for a one day conference, and a stipulation that the money is not touched until the budget is passed.

Another big change, last year there was a motion to cut sponsorship funding but to allow student funding for not just registered student organizations. And they decided to put in \$10,000 into Sponsorship for Other Undergrad Programming or SOUP. We left fall, winter and spring the same. SOFA will allocate Fall, Winter, and Spring SUP, and the assembly will allocate SOUP. The ad hoc committee did not change anything under officer programming but was stipulated that there was a report on how the money was spent.

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

Simba: **Second.**

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

Guillermo: I had a few points, for UC regents lobbying line item. It's really difficult to lobby there because they are in UCSF and they have a lot of police blocking the meeting. Also you only have a minute of public comment. I'm just saying it's difficult to get past the minute restriction. I sent you all an email regarding UCSA dues. When Kevin (UCSA) was presenting, there was some unpredictability in the budget because of the minimum dues. So even just taking a \$7000 dollar hit we had to readjust for a lot. This is why I am asking to increase from \$24,000-31,000. We had budgeted for 31,000. Last year this was cut because we were in a budget crunch but now we are in a carry forward, I think that we should increase the funds.

Seamus: I differ with Guillermo on UCSA dues, because I believe that money can come back to the students in a different way. That money could be put into the SUP funding. I would actually be in favor of decreasing those dues.

Simba: I agree with Seamus, my understanding in the first meeting was that it would be good to pay UCSA the amount that we said we would but that next quarter we would cut those dues. I feel like that money could be more useful here. It is in our best interest to get UCSC students money their money back.

Guillermo: The SUA is not a funding body. We have \$48,000 allocated to fund student orgs. We have other senates and CORE council. If it was up to me, I would cut RSO funding completely because I am tired of SUA not furthering its own campaigns. I'm willing to help groups who ask us for funding if we are a big majority of the campaign. For UCSA, I would completely oppose cutting the minimum, and when you are talking about increasing resources, with more staff we can have more staff working at UCSA. I want you all to be at the meetings that we have and even now we are going to have \$22,000 extra to go to DC to lobby. If we limit the budget for the state level we are limiting our presence. I'd like you all to think about the work that we do that impacts the students on these campuses.

Bryna: Us as an independent organization from UCSA, I don't think that we should be basing this decision on UCSA's budget allocations. I think UCSA is valuable and I wouldn't be for cutting the budget for those dues.

Seamus: **Motion to add 10 minutes.**

Vanessa: **Second.**

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

Julie: Two things, Guillermo, if you think that UC Regents meeting lobbying isn't good, I would ask you to amend it to something else because the ad hoc committee wanted it to go to something known. Another thing, for the idea of cutting UCSA dues to the minimum, at the ad hoc committee we pay them 3 times a year, and I told them I wasn't comfortable to cut the first

quarter, so we were going to leave it the first time and then cut it to the minimum the next two times. The two options are increasing to \$31,000 or cutting it down.

Seamus: **Motion to cut UCSA dues to \$22,411.80 for the next two quarters.**

B: **Second.**

Vanessa: **Objection.** I disagree with decreasing the fees in UCSA since we are an advocating body.

Julie: To cut it at all, we are still pulling the rug out regardless. They know that we are supposed to give them \$24,000. We are still taking \$1,500 from their budget that they already allocated.

Guillermo: I think that cutting it right now is really inappropriate and rude and not a lot of thought. I saw that there was hesitation to second the motion. I will emphasize again that we are not a funding body.

Sauli: I wanted to speak on the fact that we just had 4 students come and talk about their experience at SOCC which is put on by UCSA and cutting that, we are disallowing students to be represented.

Simba: I reserve my right to make a motion, after listening more to conversation, I don't think that we should cut it, but I would be against raising dues. I feel like the money could go back to the students via UCSA. **I motion to amend the main motion to keep dues at \$24,000.**

Seamus: **Second.**

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

Rohit: **Call to question.**

Tamra: **Second.**

Bryna: **Objection.**

Vote to vote (2/3rds)

In favor: **17** | Opposed: **14** | Abstentions: **6**, **call to question fails.**

Bryna: I feel like we haven't talked about the potential of increasing funds for UCSA. I think that we as a student body have the potential to fund something larger that creates larger change. I think it's worth discussing increasing the amount.

Vanessa: **Motion to add 5 minutes.**

Eli: **Second.**

B: Objection.

Vote to extend time by 5 minutes (Simple Majority):

In favor: **27** | Opposed: **4** | Abstentions: **6**, **extension of time passes.**

Eli: I believe that we should keep it at the level that we are at right now and give more funding to UCSA. My primary reason is that UCSA is one of the ways that we are able to, as students, have a voice. I think that we should always support the student voice. I think that we should increase funding, maybe not \$7,000.

Guillermo: We have a carry-forward, and this is a unique time, and I think that we can allocate more money. I would like to have a motion to table this after you all have talked to your colleges.

Julie: Echoing what Guillermo said, anything that we are amending is just the ad hoc proposal and I want to clarify that tomorrow is a holiday and I'll be available to talk about it.

Vanessa: We have a motion to decrease dues. UCSA and USSA both do similar things for the students. They do bring campaigns for students especially for students of color and school to prison pipelines. If we are going to emphasize local, why aren't we doing that with the national association. We should increase our own campaigns on campus.

Simba: **Motion to add 10 minutes.**

Ray (*Oakes*): **Second.**

B: Objection.

Vote to extend time by 10 minutes:

In favor: **7** | Opposed: **14** | Abstentions: **11**, **extension of time fails.** Moving on.

Guillermo: **Motion to interchange closed session and resolution.**

Theresa: **Second.**

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

Resolutions:

Simba: **I motion to adopt the resolution.**

Rohit: **Second.**

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

-Closed Session-