



Student Union Assembly Meeting Minutes

SUA Mailstop: SOAR, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz CA 95064 • P: 831.459.4838
suaparli@ucsc.edu • sua.ucsc.edu

**Winter 2019 Quarter Session
Tuesday 19 Feb 2019
8:00pm Oakes Learning Center**

Assembly Members Present: Ayo Banjo, Citlalli Aquino, Davon Thomas, Bella Bullock, Cameron Elliott, Ryan Sparno, Alexandrina Chavez, Tommy Ramirez, Saúl Soto, Claudia Paz Flores, Sydney Eliot, Soma Badri, Rojina Bozorgnia, Amy Calderwood, Venkatesh Nagubandi, Joshua Anh Ta, Emma Cunningham, Zolt Brown-Dunn, Owen Sweeney, Anna Romstad, Stephan Edgar, Aakriti Singh, Sharu Suriya, Azlan Jaher, David Miller Shevelv

Assembly Members Absent: Lauren Woo, Enrique Yarce, Natasha Bramer, Alicia Freedman, Leighton Mair, Yonatan Tekla, Ce-Lai Fong, Moushmi Gazula, Francisco Diaz (alt.- Taryn Damore), Michelle Moreno, Jessica Zubia Calsada, Andrew Romero, Sam Grewal (alt.- Nate Hornbuckle), Naliyah Martinez/Zaire Pickett (alt.- Colby Xavier Riley), Robert Parke, Kayla Beaman, Sunpreet Mahil

Yet-to-be-Filled: MEChA representative, Bayanihan representative

8:05 PM: Call to order

8:06PM: Roll Call**8:19PM: Approval of the Agenda**

Zach: Are there any motions regarding tonight's agenda?

David: Point of information. May a motion to amend be made before the agenda is approved? I reserve the right to make a motion: Discuss the administration oversight committee. Forming a committee in this space will allow us to discuss what topics we want to prioritize. I want ten minutes for this I guess at the end of the meeting. The second part is that this agenda includes committee breakouts. We have repeatedly asked for the committee to be formed in an open process. That being said, I motion to amend the agenda to allocate ten minutes for the discussion of the administration oversight committee and to exclude[?] the committee breakouts.

Zach: I have a motion by David to remove committee sessions from the agenda.

Owen: Point of information —are you proposing that breakout groups be cancelled.

David: No just the committee breakouts, so we would still have that 9:15-10 pm.

Owen: Can you highlight the part he is suggesting eliminating?

Zach: I took it off. I have a motion by David to take off committee sessions and instead put formation of administration oversight committee to ten minutes.

Owen: I second.

Emma: I feel that the fifteen minutes for breaking out would actually be beneficial in this situation because there's so many funding requests.

Zach: Just to clear things up. We're talking about two separate things. Committee sessions is that twenty minute chunk at the end of the meeting. The breakout groups is what we do for the funding requests.

Emma: Oh okay. I withdraw my objection.

Zach: Any objections regarding the change? Seeing none the motion passes.

Cameron: I motion to remove the breakout groups from the funding deliberations.

Regina: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections?

Venkatesh: I feel like the breakouts make the funding deliberations faster and more effective. If the entire space is trying to get through one agenda item, that usually tends to take longer.

Zach: Amending the agenda is not debatable so we will be voting to remove breakout groups. 4 in favor --14 opposed. The motion doesn't pass.

Zolt: Last time I wasn't able to make the meeting. As far as I know, it hasn't been live-streamed. All the videos are all over the place. I was just wondering if we could have a definitive location where we can watch these livestreams. If we could have transparency and a clear location where these are located.

Zach: It should just be updated on the website. I'm not saying that I know that they're on there. Sua.ucsc.edu.

Nikayla: I think they're on Youtube. It's Student Union Assembly UCSC. The last meeting that's on here is from the 12th; it's in two parts.

Zolt: Are we being live-streamed right now? Because it says live-streamed, but as far as I know they're just videos.

Ayo: We are not being live-streamed. We have a video being recorded in the back. One of the issues with livestream is that Ben couldn't be here today. There's also minutes on the websites and that's our main way of showing transparency on the website. I liked the idea of livestream that people can interact during the meetings. We want to polish the process and talk about how we can get more people in watching a livestream. If anyone is interested in taking lead on that as well.

Cameron: Motion to approve the agenda.

David: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections? Seeing none the motion passes. Zolt we can talk more after the meeting if you want to.

8:24PM: Approval of the Previous Meeting's Minutes

David: Motion to approve the minutes.

Anna: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections? Seeing none we have passed the minutes.

8:24PM: Announcements and Public Comments

Citlalli: So there was a Title IX case and the person who was accused was expelled and [?] and he sued them and he won. I know that we discussed the department of education changes and that we were against them. One of the changes would have allowed the addition of cross-examination of victims. That was not happening yet because the department of education change had not happened and even if they did we had a hope of getting rid of them in the future. That hope is now gone. We are now mandated by law in the state of California to allow the respondent to cross-examine the complainant in front of an unbiased party. All Title IX cases have been frozen because of this. This is only applicable to statements where the evidence is based on witness statements; so basically all cases. I'm in the middle of Title IX case right now and the whole thing was caught on camera. Even though it is only supposed to be based on those witness statements, it's going to affect everyone. They're only supposed to enforce this in cases where the punishment is suspension or expulsion. If you're asking for anything less than that, then it will not affect you. I could not think of a person who would go through the whole Title IX process for anything less than suspension. I don't know what punishment would be less than suspension. Nobody would go through that process just to get conduct probation. This decision was made exactly a week ago. This is new. It has not been integrated into Title IX policies. That's why cases have been frozen because they haven't been given direction on how to handle this. What they're doing right now is meeting on an individual meeting basis with every single person involved in a case so that they can hear it from Title IX first before seeing it on the internet. That's why Title IX hasn't made an announcement yet. This is going to affect everyone in California. USC had the chance to appeal this decision and they chose not to. I just want to encourage y'all to not be angry with our Title IX office. They are unhappy about this too and they have no choice but to comply with this as well. If you're upset about disciplinary decisions, you can take that to conduct.

Ayo: I'm sure y'all have read a letter that was posted on Facebook. It was detailing cases, students going through microaggressive behavior from their professor. They've seen racial gap, pay-equality...There's a lot of bad words that I want to use right now, but I can't. They really messed up these students. The students navigated the system to hold the professor accountable and reported him to Title IX. There has not been a single move on this for the past six months. Because of that the UAW2866, The UC Student Worker Union, put out a statement or letter that went out, detailing everything. Our goal is to hopefully create a response from the SUA. That's why I asked for the Intelligence Committee and Student worker protections or anyone that wants to help try and solve this situation and give a message to students. I asked for those members to come at 7 and we had a pretty low turnout. I'm hopeful that we can start having conversations in this space or sometime soon. We met with Chancellor Blumenthal today and we talked about this letter as well as...do you want to start with the letter first?

Citlalli: So you know confidentiality [?]. Apparently there's been no action in the past six months, this case is still ongoing and still being investigated. I reached out to title ix and asked if that's the case, why hasn't that student heard from you in six months? The process is much longer for faculty than it is for students. They use a standard of preponderant[?]evidence which means likely it happened and they decide from there if they think it happened. With faculty, they go through the entire investigation again because they have a contract with the university. They go to the charges committee, which is made of other faculty members --they're friends. They basically do a second trial and get lawyers involved. If a student reports this, they're going to be facing lawyers. The process is very long. As far as [?]they are still deciding what punishment they're going to take. We're hoping that it will be done by the end of June, but it's not for sure. Additionally, because of this event a lot of other names were brought to me and I have been investigating them on a case by case basis. If you do feel like there is a faculty member that should be reported, it's a much lengthier and difficult process, but we can do it and you shouldn't do it alone.

Zach: Citlalli, I don't want to undermine the incredible importance of what you're saying. We are at time on this agenda item.

David: Motion to extend time by fifteen minutes.

Amy: Second.

Citlalli: Thank you. The last thing I want to say is when we met with George Blumenthal we finally had some progress with the snail[?] movement. He had already read our resolution that we passed last week in SUA. The combination of so many people bringing it to his attention, he is finally thinking about it. It's not a 'no' anymore. He's going to have Vice Provost of Student Success Jaye Padgett draft a proposal of how this is going to look at. I sent him an email asking if I could be involved in the process of drafting a proposal and I asked Blumenthal to reach out to Jaye Padgett and tell him to involve students in the process.

Ayo: That was about it. We got some agreements to also create a scholarship fund for students that are active on campus; who are helping to contribute to their community. We are going to bring this up to the UC Alumni Association to see if we could start raising funds for activist scholarship award. If we do finalize everything we will create a committee within SUA that will be about accessing scholarships and distributing it to students.

Owen: Point of information: Was student Housing West discussed?

Citlalli: Yes. They are going to be taking that to the regents to have that finalized and he made it clear that this was not negotiable.

Zolt: I'm not sure how many of you are aware that UCSC has not been recycling since November. Everything is being landfilled right now.

Lauren: After doing some research into that, the reason is because students were mixing so much trash in the recycling and they didn't have the capacity to hire more people to sort through that. They decided they can't do that right now. I personally didn't want to bring a lot of attention to it because I don't want students to feel discouraged from recycling in general. I'm afraid that it would just never happen in general.

Bella: As far as that goes, I've talked to the sustainability office and they said most of the recycling is supposed to go to China actually where they manufacture and reuse plastics. Right now China isn't really taking plastic waste because there's just so much. Just keep that in mind that wherever you are, plastic waste is bad in general. Start preventing coffee shops and places on campus to stop selling plastic bottles. If you have ideas on how to reduce plastic waste that's a better way to make sure that we don't have to recycle as much.

Zolt: Also [?] has clam shells that can't be recycled and totally ruins the facilities. I think it would be worth trying to get a resolution to ban clam[?] shell containers from campus.

Zach: Four really quick things: March 1st is the deadline to submit feedback for the strategic academic plan. I also wanted to mention that I got an email from somebody that works at the ITS department and also in GSA and is looking for five undergraduate students to test out authentication tests for logging in with the gold password. You would need your phone as well to authenticate the gold password. I would like to get a temperature check if y'all would be interested in Lucy Rojas from Dean of Students department presenting campus referenda for this year's campus election. Okay, I'm seeing a lot of yes. Lastly, going through the recording from last meeting as well as talking with Nikayla, for people to keep on enunciating and speaking loudly so that Nikayla can really get down what you're saying.

Owen: Fellow SUA members, yesterday I attended the student advisory council on student housing west. It is a facility that is as big as another college. They're hoping to put where student housing family currently sits. They're planning to move those people to East Meadow. There have been a lot of emotions against this by alumni, students, in general in the past year. It's coming to an end —they're presenting it to the regents for final approval in two weeks. Out of curiosity I went to see the involvement that students have. When I went yesterday, it feels like we don't have a voice at all. That's the biggest committee that SCOC has. The agenda was completely set up by the developers and the administration. They were asking about things like "how big do we want the bathrooms" which to me is arbitrary. I asked them to compare the space they were describing with

something else on campus and they couldn't respond. There was no discussion about what we wanted. They only presented us with options A or B --no alternative solution. There was this fitness room they were describing in building one and a student asked for this to be designed in a manner with windows against the wall, similar to the OPERS structure. The architects negated the suggestion citing as aesthetics of a hallway with a [?] view better than what the student wanted even though several students were of support for the student. The architects preferred their own opinion over the students. They were only presenting things that were "most discussed" of last year's advisory council. I just want to bring to y'all's attention that it's like. Maybe we don't have a voice of how this is getting built, but we should make sure that it's something we like. Maybe we can draft a resolution regarding complaints about this. If you want to talk to me about Student Housing West I'm trying to organize against it quickly before this March 13th regents meeting.

Venkatesh: I propose moving this on to closing remarks so that we can get on with business and do everything first.

Zach: Temperature check. I'm seeing a few negative, some mixed responses, and a few yes. Does someone want to introduce a motion?

Owen: Motion to extend time by three minutes.

Sydney: Second.

Owen: Did anyone have any comments?

Zolt: The new Student Housing West isn't in anyway sustainable. Despite the fact that we have a dying planet, like new buildings are, like there have been simple techniques such as passive design which is where buildings are built so that they don't have to run AC in the summer or heat in the winter. There's hundreds of ways to build a building green. They are being built as cheap as possible. I talked to a lot of people at Porter and they were saying it took a lot to make the buildings feel like home. The designs are sterile. These spaces aren't considerate for [?], I think you guys get the idea. The building is not being built with sustainability or carbon contributions[?] in mind.

David: I want to be clear on something and that's you're all paying us to be a puppet[?]. I'm speaking in a very strong way because we've been doing this for weeks now and the reason this committee exists is not to make decisions. It's that the administration can turn around and say "we had student feedback". I have to say I am disgusted by the way this has been done. It's not the administrations, it's not coming out of their salaries. It's your student fees. They're paying for SCOC for us to be there. Everyday when I walk in there, I ask myself are we doing any good or are we just letting the administration [?] until they shove it down our throats. At this point I haven't received any sort of clear movement from my space as Stevenson representative or from their space as to whether we are opposing it or just rolling over. I don't know what we're supposed to do here. I'm personally at wits end and feel like we're being used.

Owen: Can I propose that I draft a resolution regarding student voice on this committee and present it next week?

People agree

Colby: I just think it's ridiculous that the school adds more students when they don't have housing, programming, proper resources. It's going to make every issue that we have that much harder. I'm obviously not a part of this space regularly, but any effort that y'all create I and BSU would be happy to help.

Bella: The week before finals, week ten, we are going to be having a Wellness Week. We are going to have four different days. Day number four will be under Lauren and SAS. The first day is going to be essential oils and DIY face masks, second day is massage therapy, and third day is yoga. I will be sending out an itinerary and google form so you can make an appointment for the massage therapy, it's all free. Additionally, I recently have become an Xfinity ambassador. If y'all didn't know, Xfinity is something y'all all pay for and many people don't know about. It's streaming and wifi you can get on campus and get free stuff. If you login you can enter to win a contest for a mini-drone. If you have any questions, I'll be passing around flyers.

Joshua: I know that we are talking about student contributions. My space expressed the worry that the SUA president was not at these senate meetings. The SUA president is one

of the only that can talk to the faculty of what the undergraduate students want in the senate as well as what to do with faculty. Our space is disappointed in the president not being able to be there and not appointing someone to bring up these issues that are important to the students.

Ayo: Thank you for bringing that to this space. Unfortunately at that time I had to travel and I knew I could not be there. Lauren is the vp of student academic affairs and has a relationship with these people and navigates spaces to talk with them. The meeting was supposed to be originally in early January where I was supposed to bring up the issues out and they cancelled it and rescheduled it to February. The day of the meeting was the same day as my flight to New York. We had a discussion at a second meeting in January where I discussed the housing allocation proposal issue, and other things. The chair of the academic senate are going to create a joint resolution of next steps in terms of administration leadership. The new updates that we have today were not included in that discussion. I'm looking forward to working with Lauren and the academic senate on creating much more of a pipeline of information from them to us.

David: Point of information —Can I just get a clarification on something that brought up earlier. Did the administration refuse to comply with our resolution which asked them to just appear before us to report on the housing issues.

Citlalli: They made it seem --he does not want to meet with us.

David: Is there a refusal in writing?

Citlalli: No.

Davon: Motion to extend time by three minutes.

David: Second.

Cameron: Objection. We are over 40 minutes on announcements and i'd like to get through the agenda.

Zach: 10 opposed. 1 in favor.

8:58PM: Sigma Zeta Aepi Funding Request

John: Good evening everybody. I'm from Sigma Zeta Aepi. Our proposal is for our annual winter charity [?] which we do every year. It is a charity basketball tournament where we have organizations from around campus compete and we have students buy tickets to [?], sell shirts and drinks. 100% of the profits go to Camp Kesem. Last year we netted 1,200 dollars and the proposal --which I believe was for \$600-- that would take care of costs for the gym space rental, school employees to help manage it and run the PA system, and [?] the costs so more of the funds go directly to charity. I didn't print out the budget, but last year we spent \$500 for four hours rental for west field house. The event staff were \$70 for 4.5 hours. Shirts \$400. Drinks were \$100. The total was \$875. The shirts paid for themselves and so did the drinks. Are there any questions?

Cameron: How much are you asking us for?

John: I believe it's \$600.

Nikayla: Where is the money donated to again?

John: Camp Kesem and the Walnut Avenue Women's Center?

Zach: When do you need the money by?

John: The event is scheduled for March 10th, so we can afford to host the event right now, but we can donate all the costs to charities.

Emma: Do you have an estimate of the amount of people that are going to attend this year?

John: Last year we had ten orgs and so now we are going to have at least eight.

Zach: Any more questions? Thank you for coming and for your patience.

Davon: What exactly should be happening during public comment? I understand a lot of things get pushed behind schedule. A lot of folks have a lot of conversation. Some seem like they should be their own agenda items.

Zach: I see what you're saying. My take on public comment is time to talk about collective issues. However, I would encourage people to maybe amend the agenda or request an agenda item by sending me an email ahead of time. Is that an adequate response for your concern?

Davon: That is an adequate response, yeah.

9:03PM: Drag Ball Funding Request

Tommy: Hi everyone, I'm Tommy. I'm from Rachel Carson. I'm looking for funding for Drag Ball this year. If you don't know what Drag Ball is, it's an event created by Oakes and Rachel Carson student life people. We have this big drag ball, a big drag competition and we educate about drag culture. It's an opportunity to share experiences. It's a significant event for the community, county, and larger area. People come in for this event. We do see about 300 people come to this event every year. We have an average budget around \$2,500 every single year. We usually pay around \$550 for our performers. We are looking for this event to expand and we've been having the same performer come. We are looking for new performers. For that reason we are requesting \$1,500. We have gone to senates and we haven't got any funding from SUA or SOFA in previous years. We are looking to increase the pay for performers and have student performers host the event. We would be compensating students on campus for hosting. Our general budget is usually: \$500 for performers, \$500 for DJ, \$300 for decorations, photo booth, stuff like that. We usually spend around \$2,600. We are really hoping to expand our event and have SUA help advertise and support. Any questions?

Zach: Seeing no questions, we will be moving on to the next agenda item.

9:07PM: SUA Constitutional Changes Presentation

Stephan: Hi everybody. I'm going to stand up because I've been sitting on my ass. I hope that y'all are having a fantastic evening. I have been working on something called the SUA Constitutional Amendment. Just to introduce myself: my name is Stephan Edgar. My pronouns are he/him/his. I am a college nine representative but I am presenting this without any endorsements from any groups. After acquiring feedbacks from various individuals, I'm now introducing it to the SUA space. My goal tonight is to introduce and not debate because debates can take a while. I'm going to be presenting a lot of information that is relevant to the constitutional amendment. It's really important for you to go back to your spaces and present this. You can also contact me at

sedgar@uscs.edu. A couple things about me: I'm ironically a computer science major that's pitching legislation. I do have a couple years of experience of writing legislation at my community college. I rewrote the entire constitution and bylaws because they had issues with money laundering. Their [?] government literally bought a beer pong table and then lost it! Computer science is my focus, but additionally I'm hoping to go into disaster relief and emergency network operations. I'm mostly saying that so y'all are aware of any biases that I may have. Couple of other things: I've served as a parliamentarian, chief of justice, and president of associated student body before. I'm hoping to bring all of that experience in this amendment that I'm pitching to you today.

The SUA constitution was last amended in May of 2015. There are some issues with the current constitution. One: it doesn't really acknowledge that student organizations do anything. We also have some structural failings when it comes to enforcement of the constitution. There's no consequences for violating anything. One of my focuses has been on trying to find a good balance between transparency, accountability, and also hire folks on restorativeness over [?]. Organization names are outdated. A lot are really quick fixes. I closed a sh!tload of loopholes. A few of the ideas that have gone into this amendment have included ways to shorten our meetings. In addition, clarifying ambiguous authority. Also elements of executive authority and also providing new guidance so the pressure isn't entirely on them. Also the existing power capabilities of student organizations, and enhancing and adding upon the rights of students. All of these were my essential priorities. Everything in red is changes. Most of the articles in the constitution have some sort of change whether their cosmetic or major restructurings. I'm going to go over them article by article, but I'm not going to get into the specific language because none of us here have time for that. A couple quick things, because I'm going through the process with the Dean of students I am required to use Microsoft Word. If you need a more accessible format of this please let me know.

Article I: I actually created a preamble to the SUA constitution --which it did not currently have. The preamble is basically an initial statement of intent that goes over the fundamental underlying causes for why the constitution exists in the first place. Why do we have a constitution instead of just a big list community agreements? Why take a more bureaucratic approach? I know a lot of students are fed up with institutions of bureaucracy. Going into more details, article I includes explicitly expanding the scope of SUA activities to “local state and national levels”. Originally the current version is system wide. It’s really important to inspire activities and opportunities at a much higher level. Calling out systems of oppression as a primary target for SUA actions. Systems of oppression are not explicitly noted in the SUA constitution. Including that as the first part of the constitution is essential. In addition, we remove the dependence of the legal definition of discrimination in favor of an SUA-officiated definition not subject to national changes.

Article II: The parliamentarian will be able to recuse themselves when a conflict of interest exists. There will be an explicit requirement for the executive board to work with student organizations. It won’t be like something that is passed over. It will now be a requirement in their responsibilities to work with student orgs that share common purposes with SUA in the hopes of encouraging that kind of connection and communication across groups that aren’t represented well in this space. Additionally, fix student org names. Clarify the process through which student orgs can opt out of voting membership. Expand the amount of time that an agenda must be posted in advance of a meeting, hoping to prevent meetings front-loaded with last-minute agenda requests. This is one of the core ideas for minimizing the amount of time that we spend on isolated[?] SUA meetings. It also puts us in line with something called the California Ralph M. Brown Act. This is basically legislation that’s statewide and impacts everything that receives public funding. I think it’s very important for this space be representative and this legislation is a great way to accomplish that. Also, am I speaking too fast? Awesome, it’s just a lot to cover. I also worked on refining options for summer quorum

and restricted SUA decision-making without quorum. Originally it says something along the line that SUA may not make any votes without quorum. Because SUA can operate on a consensus basis which is a loophole. Basically, you don't have to vote if you have consensus. If everybody agrees on something you could theoretically make a decision without quorum because it's not explicitly stated. So that's changed. In addition to that, we expanded upon the sharing of information between college student governments/ student organizations and the Parliamentarian for accurate record-keeping of representatives. That's more to ensure that college student governments and student orgs submit info to the Parliamentarian so it can be updated on the website in a timely manner.

Article III: Officers, representatives, and staff- All officers are now required to create and prepare transitional documentation aimed at assisting their successors in filling their roles, aimed at preventing the "trial by fire." This idea is centered around the problem that various executive officers have brought up to me before where they come into their position without any training. This would demand that these executive officers that have legislation or documentation that can brief, inform, and empower their successors to come in a continue institutional memory that SUA has lacked in previous years. Vice President of Student Life (VPSL) is given the responsibility of administering the Food Pantry as a Constitutional duty. We allowed for a new transition period during the filling of a Presidential vacancy whereas the IVP temporarily fills the role at the discretion of the Assembly. (Max 2 weeks) The IVP fills that role with discretion from the assembly for two weeks. The idea is basically the IVP can [?] until that president can really take on that responsibility. This kind of change would be subject to approval from both the assembly and the IVP. Having the option there is meant to smoothen the transition. Complete utter, and unapologetic overhaul of the Executive Board Recall process. (III.G.1). I don't like the current executive board recall process because it requires that even chair meets together at the exact same time which I don't think has ever happened. I know that the chair I have talked to certainly hasn't.

Zolt: Council chairs [?].

Stephan: This new recall process would ensure that every *space* not every chair gets a vote. It makes it a more representative process.

Article IV: Relationship Between College Governments, Student Organizations, and the Student Union Assembly. This actually acknowledges that the Student Organizations do things. (Seriously, they just... weren't in this article at all previously). I thought that the language I put in was pretty good. We are opening the door for student orgs regardless of their voting status to come to the SUA on assistance 'on any issue to protect and assure the rights of their members and fellow students.' I'm also willing to hear suggestions on that front as well. We also are creating a new process that allows college governments and student organizations to offer dissent towards an action made by the SUA, designed as a check on the SUA and an empowerment of our constituent bodies. (IV.C) Section C within that article. It's basically a process where any college government or student organization can come to the SUA that says 'we acknowledge that you're doing this and we disagree with it'. You have to state that you do not have our support when it comes to this particular item. If we don't have a consensus of all the students we represent then we should not act like we do.

Article V: Committees is a simple change. This removes the barrier that only elected representatives have to sit on committees. This says that by default all representatives would sit on committees as a requirement for their duties. However, there is a stipulation that is "...or as otherwise stipulated in the SUA Bylaws." Since the sua vision committee will be looking at bylaw amendments in the future, that's something I did not do a vast role on if it was not representative of all the matters.

Article VI: This is the big one! The Judicial Council is replacing the Constitutional Interpretation Commission. It sounds a lot cooler so you're welcome for that in the first place. The Judicial Council has a much bigger scope than what that other thing was. The Judicial council would resolve constitutional crises and serve as a hybrid of how SUA conducts itself in terms of its actions and also as conduct committee. I'm going to recommend that everyone please read it because it's a *huge* change. The Judicial Council would essentially be a committee that is chaired by the SUA Parliamentarian and would

have membership including representatives from college student governments and organizations to ensure that those voices are uplifted and upheld. It would be run and administered by SCOC because --in my opinion-- they are the best suited to make determinations of qualified applicants. This would be a high stress position because it would serve as an investigative body of the SUA. If there was an instance of SUA members that whose conduct was in disagreement with the space, the judicial council would be activated and make a determination if the actions were constitutional, unconstitutional, constitutionally irrelevant, or insufficient information. There's certain stipulations for all four of these. There's also a [?] where anything that the judicial council decides comes to this space and then the SUA determines if they're going to do anything about it. This incorporates a check and balances system. I wanted to bring a version of that that is tailored toward the unique needs for the SUA and UCSC students

This is a big thank you. If you go on the presentation in the shared drive and click on that bubble it will take you to the updated constitutional amendment changes. Send me all of the feedback that you are willing to generate. I'm planning to go through the entire listing of SOAR and requesting feedback from the student organizations regarding these changes. I am also planning to present this to college student governments I am presenting this as one person. I'm also operating on a deadline because I have to provide sponsorships to the Dean of Students by April 3rd. I'm doing the best that I can to provide good changes in a good time frame that SUA can agree on. And we can articulate and move forward and be awesome and thank you for your time.

applause

Zach: One thing I wanted to mention: I had talked with Citlalli and it's actually not possible to have the judicial council be through SCOC, this is as of two hours ago so that's why it's not on there yet, but it would need to be through SUA.

Stephan: Okay, yeah we can have a conversation about that, but that's news to me.

Davon: Are you taking questions or comments?

Stephan: At the moment I'd really like to introduce and get everybody understanding, read through it, and either email me or bring it up at the next meeting.

Davon: For this to end up on the ballot there would have to be a two-thirds vote by SUA, or two-thirds of the college senates, or 10% petition by the campus student [?]. If your deadline which is right after spring break. When would you hope for SUA to sponsor it for you to send it [?] by April 3rd?

Stephan: Correct. The kind of adaptations I'm hoping for is that the timeline depends on just how serious changes need to be made in order for the SUA to sponsor it. However, the best case scenario is feedback next week, request sponsorship the week after. The worst case scenario is request sponsorship the very last week that we can. The goal is if I can get enough feedback to ask for sponsorship two weeks from today.

Davon: So that would be March 12th ?

Stephan: Yes. Motion to extend time by one minute.

David: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections? Seeing none, Saul? Oh you weren't on stack? Then we have nobody left on stack. Next on the agenda is Ayo's agenda item. He and Citlalli left to go to the City Council meeting to talk about [?] so I'll need one of y'all to table this.

9:33 PM: Funding Proposals for Undergraduate Education and Student Success

David: Motion to table agenda item till next week.

Anna: Second.

Zach: Any objections? Seeing none we will be moving onto the next agenda item.

Davon: Is the administration oversight committee also Ayo?

Zach: No.

Davon: Okay good.

9:34PM: Funding Deliberations

-Breakout Groups (15 minutes)

Meeting resumed 9:53 pm

Group 2: We gave \$1,000 for blaQOUT, QFS \$500 which is a very small portion of their budget. Full \$300 for suturing kits Doctors without borders. Bone Marrow we gave \$200 because the budget was mainly for advertising. Student Life \$500. There were some concerns about how much the wellness ambassadors need to work and we just wanted to hold off a little bit to see how many hours they need before we start giving more money. Holi we gave \$2,000 because we really can't give them their full budget despite how cool their event is.

Group 3: We decided on \$800 for blaQOUT for the same reason because we don't have a lot of money left. QFS we did \$750 because we think it's really cool, but we don't have enough money left. Doctors without borders \$300. Bone marrow \$275 because that's [?]. Student life \$1,000 because we think it's a good thing to start. Holi \$3,500 because it is the biggest event on campus and they need money for all the powder.

Group 4: We gave blaQOUT \$2,000 just because it's the first year it's being hosted at UCSC and we want to do everything we can to ensure that goes well. The QFS \$1,500 is very important as well and we allocated that amount. We didn't give the MSF anything because there's other places they can get funding and it's a small amount and it's a reoccurring event. For the bone marrow we said \$400 because a lot of the money is for advertising but we don't have a lot of money just for that. For student life we said \$1,000 because the work that's being done is important. For Holi \$4,000. It's an event that's before Spring SOFA so they can't get funding from Spring SOFA. We were left with about \$2,000.

Group 5: For us we decided to find BlaQOUT \$1,000 because it seems like a reputable cause. QFS we gave \$500 which is about a quarter for what they're asking. Doctors without Borders is \$150. Bone marrow is \$500, we like the event. Student life we decided to fund \$800 and keep the food pantry alive. Holi -\$3,000 since it is the biggest event on campus.

Group 6: BlaQOUT and Holi last year were both fully-funded. BlaQOUT last year asked for thirteen thousand[??] so it's unfortunate that we don't have the capacity to fully fund

this year. We are recommending that we fund \$2,000. \$1,500 would come from programming and \$500 is in a SUA line item already. It is also considered an intersectional-ly oppressed identity. QFS is \$1,500 because we like that event and know that a lot of people went to that event last year. MSF has already gone to the senates and are only asking for suturing kits \$0, I know they already have the money and we don't know if they're going to be passed down. Bone Marrow is very important, it's a health related thing, but unfortunately a lot of money so we came to \$400. Student life \$500 Stevenson didn't feel it was fair for SUA to take money from SUA organizations. Last year Tamera came in and asked for more money and it needs to be addressed with a line item or something. Holi, \$4150 because it's the largest event on campus and it's a shame that we can't fully fund everything.

-Indian Student Association Holi Festival (5 minutes)

Zach: Thank you so we are going to start with the Holi festival. Again I know that there is a lot of mixed feelings about this. We do have \$15,000 in Spring SOFA money. Holi also did originally apply for funds through SOFA and SOFA had [?] \$4,000 which [?] for them to come back to SUA to ask for the remainder so I don't know if that's a factor at all. Any discussion on Holi specifically?

Venkatesh: I think we should fund them \$4,000. They are already not getting what they need so we should give them as much as we can. I think \$4,000 for 8,000 students for one event is 50 cents per students is pretty reasonable.

Aakriti: Did we use up all the Winter SOFA money or do we have some left?

Zach: I will look at the documents. It looks like we have just under \$1,000 left —\$998 left.

Aakriti: I know that in SOFA we would consider funding ISA what's leftover. I would like to say that we fund the \$998 from SOFA in addition to the \$4,000 to them.

Zach: Venkatesh was that a motion?

Venkatesh: Sure.

Zach: Is there a second to Venkatesh's motion? Then an amendment by Aakriti?

Soma: Second (for motion).

Stephan: Second (for amendment).

Zach: Are there any objections? Okay so because there's no objections to the \$4,998.22, that then replaces the original \$4,000 motion. Now we would be speaking on the \$4,998.22. If no one speaks on it or if we call to question we are going to vote this down.

Zolt: So we have \$10,000 for the rest of Winter or the year?

Zach: That is what's left in SUA programming. That's for the rest of the year. We have a line item for Spring SOFA which is \$15,000.

Zolt: So we are putting about half of our funds into one request?

Zach: It would be [?] percent of that number because \$998.22 is coming from a different pot of leftover money.

Aakriti: Motion to call to question.

Bella: Second.

Zach: Seeing no objections we will be funding \$4,998.22 to Holi Festival.

-Doctors Without Borders (MSF) Funding Request (5 minutes)

Zach: Does anyone want to speak on Doctors Without Borders. If no one speaks on it then we move on and they don't get their funding.

Emma: Talking to my space, I heard that this organization is mostly if not completely funded by other organizations including our own. They probably do not need more money. The first few iterations of this event will have the funding it needs. Also because it's such a small number it would be easy to fund in Spring SOFA.

Venkatesh: To add on to that they could come back to Spring SOFA so I don't think we should fund them right now especially since our funding budget is so tight right now.

Zach: If no one speaks on this then we can move on.

Emma: Motion to not fund.

Venkatesh: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections? Seeing no objections we will be moving on to the Queer Fashion Show.

Colby: Can I speak on the budget for Holi?

Zach: We already voted on that.

Colby: So it can't be changed?

Zach: Yeah that's my understanding.

Colby: I was under the impression that I couldn't say anything, but after talking to someone next to me I could.

Zach: Oh, i'm really sorry. What did I do to give you that impression

Colby: Ummm no. That was my misconception. I'm glad that you asked.

Zach: I'm sorry about that. Stephan do you have anything?

Stephan: I'm looking it up right now. I'm under the impression that you can supercede a previous action of the SUA [?] and I don't see anything in the SUA bylaws for SOFA that would say no.

Zach: Do you mind if we come back to that?

Colby: No, not at all.

-Queer Fashion Show Funding Request (5 minutes)

Zach: Does anybody want to speak on Queer Fashion Show?

Zolt: I think it's important to fund them and put priority towards events that are being put on by students. There's a lot of events where other bodies. QFS is something that we have been doing at UCSC for a long time that is made by and for the students. Showing people that they can and should express themselves in all ways.

Venkatesh: I see the value and think it's an important event. I would motion to fund them \$1,500.

Zach: Did you have a motion to fully fund or was that a recommendation?

Zolt: That was a motion to fully fund, but i'll sit on it.

Zach: I do want to respect what you would like and we don't have to vote on it. I'm sorry if I'm not being clear enough. We are afforded the privilege of voting on where fees are going to end up so if y'all think something is really important than we could fully fund it. I just want to be clear that there aren't any rules.

Zolt: Politically I would like to fully fund this event. Equitably? As far as I know they've gone to student governments to get funding [?]. I think that sums it up. I also think it's important to consider how much funding we have and not be too eager to fund.

Zach: Do you rescind your motion?

Zolt: No.

Zach: We have a motion to fully fund QFS \$2,000 from programming by Zolt.

Colby: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections?

Davon: Objection. I think \$2,000 is too much. I think \$1,500 is a good number and we should stand by that number.

Zach: Okay so we'll be moving into a debate. Motion by Venkatesh to fund \$1,500 from programming.

Cameron: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections?

Colby: (Objection) Yeah I mean y'all just took out money from other places to fund this Holi event when they're definitely going to get money from other places because this is a huge event. It's pretty niche and it's educating the campus. There's clearly educational and [?] to it and I think that that needs to be funded fully.

Sharu: Motion to call to question.

Davon: Second.

Cameron: Point of clarification—for which motion? The \$1,500?

Zolt: Point of information: You said that you felt \$2,000 was too much, but \$1,500 was just right. You just gave your opinion. Can you elaborate on that?

Davon: No, I said what I said. If you must understand, I would like to address the fact that there are still a lot more funding requests this quarter.

Zach: I'mma stop y'all real quick because I want to respect y'all's opinions. I do want to make sure that people aren't feeling attacked. We can reconsider Holi so that is something that we can do. We want to make sure we use "I centered" language. There

was a motion for \$2,000 and there was a motion for \$1,500 and both were objected to. Now we're calling to question.

Zolt: I'm just confused by the semantics here. I made one motion that was objected to. And another motion was objected to. Are we trying to amend my motion?

Zach: What's going on right now is if we were to pass this motion which may or may not happen. The amendment was. We open further discussion. If we approve \$1,500 we would bring that back to the main motion.

Zolt: I feel that though we discussed the issue on paper. I feel like no discussion actually took place. I feel like I talked about it and there was another motion that nobody said anything.

Zach: All those in favor of calling to question 18 in favor, 4 opposed.

We'll now be moving into a vote.

All those in favor of making \$1,500 the main motion: 17 in favor

All those opposed: 2 opposed.

If we vote yes then we will adopt this number.

All those in favor of \$1,500: 16 in favor.

All those opposed: zero.

Colby: Can I motion to reopen discussion on Holi.

Owen: Second.

Zach: Any objections?

Cameron: Objection. We never really do that. I've never heard that being done before.

We need to move through the rest and revisit it later.

Zach: So this motion can be brought up later. I don't think this is debatable.

Stephan: It is debatable because the original motion was [?].

Colby: Because y'all haven't done something historically in the past and because you want to go home, you don't think we should debate this? [?]. There have been a lot of things that historically are not okay [?].

Venkatesh: Regardless of that objection was we should talk about Holi last because the first time around almost everyone was in favor of the number that was passed. Right

now if we change it we're going to have to change it and change it. Since Holi is already allocated the most money then we can talk about that at the end and reduce it if needed.

Owen: I am in support of this discussion about Holi because there are [?] from my space about funding the event.

Zach: Would anyone else like to speak?

Owen: I kinda like Venkatesh's idea. Would we be tabling the discussion after the other funding requests?

Zach: Yes. Colby would you like to amend it to talk about this at the end? Who seconded on that motion to re-talk about Holi?

Zolt: I feel like there wasn't really a motion.

Colby: This is saying that we are tabling it till after the other funding requests.

Zach: My understanding is that we will talk about this after the Office of Student Life

Owen: Yes.

Zach: Is there an objection? Seeing none will move on to the BlaqOUT funding requests.

-Blaqout Funding Request (5 minutes)

Ryan: Motion to fund \$1,000 just from looking at the boards around the room.

Regina: Second.

Cameron: Objection. We funded them \$1,300 last year. It's an intersectional-ly oppressed identity and they're hosting this year. I'd like to amend the motion to fund blaqOUT \$2,000 from programming. In addition to the \$500 from the line item so that would make it a total of \$2,500 to fully fund.

Zach: So we have \$1,000 as the main motion and \$2,000 as the amended. Is there a second?

Owen: Second.

Zolt: Objection. I think that \$2,000 might be a lot to fund when we have such a small budget. We might want to consider amending this funding request to \$1,500.

Owen: Question —are we out of SOFA funding for winter?

Zach: Yes. Zolt I want to value what you have to say, but I want to let everyone have an opportunity to speak. I have a motion for \$1,500 for blaQOUT. Is there a second? Seeing no second we don't consider the motion.

Bella: We just voted about how we want to fund the Queer fashion show because they're an unrecognized [?] community. BlaQOUT was specifically made because the Black community felt like they could not fit in within the Queer community. We have to consider the fact that we want all this money for the QFS and not support this blaQOUT conference. I would like to motion to fund \$2,000 from programming and the \$500 from the line item. Can we just call to question?

Zach: Yes. So I have a motion by Bella to call to question, is there a second?

Regina: Second.

Zach: We will be voting on the \$2,000 from programming (and \$500 from line item)

All those in favor: 20

All those opposed: 0

If there's no objections to \$2,000 from programming then we will pass this.

No objections

-UCSC Bone Marrow Committee Funding Request (5 minutes)

Zach: Would anybody like to speak on this?

Cameron: I would like to motion to fund \$400 because it is an important event that can save lives.

Regina: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections?

Amy: I think that a smaller number would be better, just from looking at the room. I don't think they need \$400.

Bella: How is everybody doing with motions? Can I get how are we right now, good? Let's have more discussion.

Owen: I reserve my right to make a motion. I agree with you Amy. They are going to the college senates and have other avenues of funding. With that, I motion to fund \$100.

Anna: Second.

Regina: Objection. We just said that we wanted to discuss more and then we just went straight into a motion.

Colby: I don't think \$100 is enough. I just think it should be closer to what they're asking for.

Zach: So people are aware it is \$800.

Owen: I would like to rescind my motion.

Anna: The reason I seconded it is because most of the money is going to advertising. We do not have the money to fund things that are not essentials for the event.

Colby: Thank you for that information.

Regina: Stuff like this is really important to me. My thirteen year old cousin is one of those twelve people in the world that needed a bone marrow transplant. So this is super important to me. Only funding it \$100 is kind of shameful.

Davon: Is there a motion on the table right now?

Regina: Didn't he rescind that motion?

Davon: I think we should fund \$350. I do trust Anna's judgment since it's mainly advertising. What are the essentials of the event?

Anna: My understanding of this is they need to rent the space and have people there to do the swabs.

Zach: All the information for these people on this is in last week's folder. We are out of time on this agenda item.

Cameron: Motion to extend time by five minutes.

Bella: Second.

Zach: Any objections? Seeing none we have an additional five minutes.

Amy: I don't agree with \$400 but I also don't agree with \$100. \$350 sounds good to me.

Sharu: Based on what I read on the minutes from last week's meeting they said the majority of that would be going to advertising.

Davon: Is everything advertising?

Sharu: I don't know how I feel about paying for Sammy the Slug. I think \$300 is a good number.

Cameron: It doesn't make sense to me. Imagine you have a blood drive and no one shows up because no one knows about it. It's definitely necessary.

Aakriti: Based on their budget they have enough money to hold the event and I do think advertising is important but I would recommend a lower number.

Zach: Colby?

Colby: ...Just that he had something to say

Venkatesh: I motion to amend to \$350.

Zach: Is there a second?

Regina: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections? Seeing none, we have adopted \$350 as the main motion. Next we are moving directly to the next agenda item.

-Office of Student Life Funding Request (5 minutes)

Ryan: Motion to fund \$1,000 from SUA programming.

Venkatesh: Second.

Cameron: Objection. Point of clarification: how much money do we have in the budget now?

Alexandrina: Point of inquiry: the new treasurer doesn't have input[?] in this?

Zach: No, he couldn't make it tonight. All of this information is accurate, but we don't have their financial input.

Emma: It's \$3,043.22 is left.

Cameron: I object. We have two more funding requests next week. We're still in Winter quarter and I don't think it's fair for SUA to request money from itself when there are other outside groups asking for it.

Colby: Can I make a new motion for \$500 from SUA programming.

Amy: Second.

Bella: Right now, the Student Life Office has been using it's funds to feed students. If you look at what we've been spending and tracking. That's where a lot of the budget goes. Student life office every year has been the one to have to help with that. A lot of it went to the pantry and make sure the students. Just to keep that in mind that a lot of it went to the pantry. Even so the pantry isn't supposed to be under the Student Life office. It should be the whole SUA.

Zach: Are you objecting at all?

Bella: I don't want to sway them.

Davon: You are a voting member of SUA.

Zach: In general when the person in the room who is a voting member who is also requesting the funding, SUA expects that person to switch hats. You are representing that position.

Chase: Objection. I would propose increasing it to \$700. Like Bella said, a lot of the money goes towards the food pantry. There are orgs that come in for funding assistance. We are working with BSU at the moment to get them funding. It's not just the SUA asking for its own money.

Davon: The argument that SUA shouldn't be requesting money for itself is valid and also invalid at the same time. I thinking from an equity standpoint. My office travels more than any of the other offices combined then I need more money for traveling. So if her office needs more money for programming then the other five offices then I think we should support that. We should have a more general conversation about line items. Student organizations come and request money from our offices all the time.

Zach: I would suggest to avoid referring to people's points as valid and invalid. You can say I disagree with it or find evidence against it.

Davon: Oh you're 100% correct. I agree and disagree with it.

Cameron: Motion to extend time by five minutes.

Regina: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections?

Colby: I would stand by \$500.

Zach: Sorry. The motion is to extend time.

Colby: Ohhh.

Cameron: It's good that y'all fund different groups out of your office. That's a whole separate thing. It shouldn't be an argument for this. The food pantry is separate from that. We should be addressing the budgetary issue. Last year, Tamera came and requested money. I think it needs to be addressed instead of just having funding requests.

Emma: So I would say that if, kind of along similar lines I have another point to add. If the Office of Student Line needs more money for programming we should increase the line item. If we don't have enough money right now to fund organizations that are asking for funding from us, it doesn't make sense that to say that we should fix institutional problems in offices. That means we're not allowing those student orgs to get the same funding that they could have. I think that's on us not on them. They came here, they spent their time and I don't feel that it's fair to say we have an issue to where we don't have enough money for programming and cut funding on programs that are really important for the student life office or cut funding for student orgs that come in. In my opinion the student orgs win out because they are not a part of this space and they don't have regular access to those funds.

Lauren: Point of inquiry —what is the main motion?

Colby: I agree with your points. I think the money can go to other places. There are other orgs that need the funding and it sounds like there are institutional issues about [?].

Saul: Is the funding request going to money for student salary? [?] The financial aid office has a lot of money. It might be easier to maybe do work study.

Zolt: I do think a prior student made a good point that it is our burden to fund employees enough. This is our mistake and we shouldn't punish student orgs for it. We are decreasing people's accessibility to funding because of an oversight that we made previously.

Zach: We are out of time on this agenda item.

Venkatesh: Motion to extend time by five minutes.

Amy: Second.

Zach: Are there any objections? Seeing none...Sharu?

Sharu: I just have a quick question, when do we have to be out of this space by?

Zach: Umm, now. Bao Nhia and I got an email the other day is that we usually keep this really nice so my personal choice is to stay until we get kicked out and bank on the reputation.

Venkatesh: I think we should focus more on programming and less on fixing our mistakes. With that I'd like to call to question.

David: Second.

Bella: Objection.

Zach: Moving into a vote —

Zolt: This means that what we tabled earlier will not be funded tonight?

Zach: We are voting if we are continuing discussion on Student Life funding request.

13 in favor. All those opposed: 2. The motion passes; we'll move directly into a vote. This would eliminate \$1,000 and have \$500 as a main motion.

16 in favor. None opposed.

Are there any objections to approving the \$500?

Zolt: Objection —I think that we should figure out a way to get the office this funding, but not through programming.

Emma: I don't necessarily feel that it's fair to completely gut this request because although we have a problem I don't feel that it's fair to not fund anything because this is going to be money they use to put on programs for the rest of the year.

Bella: I think that \$500 is very bare minimum but it's doable. Doing zero it's really hard. We can barely get money as it is. I think if we go on with the five hundred that people keep that in mind it doesn't make sense to give \$3,000 in each office when they're not doing the same amount of programming that my office does.

Colby: Motion to extend time by five minutes.

David: Objection. Yea it's late.

Zach: All those in favor of extending time by five minutes: 3 in favor: 11 opposed.
 All those in favor of adopting \$500 for student life from programming 17 in favor. 3 opposed.

-Revisiting Discussion About Holi-

Amy: I think it's a good idea to get more money back into programming is to take a thousand off. I think taking \$1,000 away would be a simple solution.

Ryan: We already went through this and voted to fund them \$4,998.22. Since we already agreed to do it, I feel like we should let it stand.

Venkatesh: They have no other funding bodies to go to. If they don't get this money, they're not getting this money from anywhere else. They can't get money from SOFA programming. Which is also a celebration of their culture.

Owen: With all due respect to the ISA and the culture that Holi represents. The objections from my space is that Holi is more of a giant party where people are getting drunk. I personally have been to the event before and I could resonate with those concerns because I wouldn't want to support that kind of culture.

Zolt: A previous speaker said that the SUA is the only funding body, but I know they've gone around to student senates because we approved them of money.

Emma: Part of the —this is like. They have a specific amount of time. So the reason they can't go to anymore funding bodies is because they need this money now because they need it by a certain date, otherwise the event can't happen. That's my understanding.

Aakriti: I know that the ISA are really depending on us for this money and I know that this number is very low for them. We are actually funding a lot less than what they were expecting and I think we should keep this number.

Colby: I don't appreciate democratically agreeing to table this and not having a discussion. It shouldn't be up to any funding body to see that an event gets fully funded and done to the orgs ideal vision. The reality is that this is a huge event, has a crunch for time, and serves a lot of people but it isn't as educational as other events.

Venkatesh: Motion to extend time by five minutes.

Emma: Second.

David: Objection. First it's late. Second, we keep on talking about this and nothing new is really being said. I think we reached a reasonable resolution earlier. At this point the question is: Do we value continuing this discussion which isn't really adding any substance and we'll continue being here later and later?

Cameron: Point of clarification, what's the motion?

Zach: We voted for \$4,998.22. We then voted to re-address this.

All those in favor of five more minutes 8. Opposed:13.

10:00PM: Committee Sessions

David: Point of information: we have one thing remaining. We don't have something currently which is a sense of focus for us to be able to look at what administration activity is doing. This body has not made the decision that this is something that we want to look at. I think this body should use regular order and procedures to establish a way that we can look at what administration is doing. We should establish a committee that keeps eyes on them. I can go into all reasons why this is essential to do right now. At the end of the day, I think we can agree that administration oversight is good and there's no harm in all coming together tonight and saying it's past eleven we need to get this done and we can't afford to not have a system of oversight. That being said. I motion to form the administration oversight committee with Owen Sweeney as interim chair for a period not to exceed 10 business days during which he will set up the committee.

Zach: So I have a motion by David. Is there a second?

Zolt: Second

Anna: Objection. What does this do? Is there any sort of literature on this?

Ryan: Wasn't this already part of the SUA intelligence committee?

David: I had a huge issue with one of the other members which it was made clear that it wasn't up to the whole group of deciding what we get to investigate. By doing this I want to create a space where we can decide what we want to investigate instead of a few specific members dictating it.

Davon: When Ayo presented all the committees to this space with writing I did not approve. I wouldn't rightfully approve something without literature presented either. The literature has to be existent and good. So yeah, no.

David: We come back to you in ten business day with a proposal for a committee chair, proposed time, and proposed bylaws for this committee. At that point you can approve our chair or you can choose not to. If you don't approve the chair then the committee dies.

Venkatesh: If we are going to do it in ten days then can we do this in two weeks because there's no literature right now?

Owen: I would suggest that we make this an exploratory [?] committee. Just to let you know it's happening. We'll come back with a suggestion for next meeting

Alexandrina: I just feel that [?] creating the committee is worrying about [?] and then choosing a chair.

Bella: There is no point in talking or voting on it. I don't want to be rude or anything. Do what a previous speaker showed the assembly we could review it and bring it back to our spaces. It gives us more to work with.

David: I'll be entirely honest, Owen and I are working on this 40 hours a week. Neither of us has time to write detailed bylaws.

Owen: It takes more than two people to figure out wtf administration is doing behind our backs.

David: We want you all to be involved in this, that's why we want to form this committee and work with those that are interested over the next ten days.

Lauren: I reserve my right to make a motion. I also don't feel comfortable approving something without any literature or legislation. I motion to close stack

David: I withdraw my motion.

Zolt: Second.

Zach: I have Venkatesh next.

11:23 PM: Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Venkatesh: Motion to adjourn.

Joshua: Second.

Meeting adjourned 11:23