

SUA 5.09.17

Assembly Members Present: Tias Webster (President), Grace Shefcik (VP of Internal Affairs), Judith Gutierrez (VP of External Affairs), Hector Navarro (VP of Diversity and Inclusion), Jessica Xu (VP of Academic Affairs), Tamra Owens (VP of Student Life), Vicente Lovelace (Cowell), Bryna Haugen (Cowell), Rick Takeuchi (Cowell), Andrew Szkolnik (Stevenson), Katie Keeshen (Stevenson), Kaia Partlow (Stevenson), Nicki Thompson (Crown), Hannah Brown (Merrill), Ire Gomez Chavez (Merrill), Lily Green (Merrill), Jacob Jones (Porter), Amanda (Porter Alternate), Ted Jaich (Porter), Quinn (Kresge Alternate), Celinda Montoya (Kresge), Ian Gregorio (Kresge), Imelda Mercado (Oakes), Burcu Birol (Oakes), Thomas Ramirez (Rachel Carson), Matthew Forman (Rachel Carson), Kiryl Karpiuk (College 9), Katherine Le (College 9), Samantha Sanchez (College 9), Tama Semo (College 10), Libby Pearman (College 10), Noah (College 10 Alternate), Joselyne (MEchA Alternate), Arleah Aguilar (FSA), Cibyl Engel (PRISM)

Assembly Members Absent: Michiko Soto (Crown), Brooke Dalton (Oakes), Lolo Fuka (APISA), Erica Green (SANAI), Imari Reynolds (AB/SA), Alejandro Navarro (MESH), Eli Guzman-Martin (QTPOCC)

Meeting Called to Order at: **8:02PM**

Roll Call: Chloe at **8:05PM**

Approval of Agenda: 8:05PM

Tias: Motion to add Bylaw Review under New Business

Burcu: Second

No Objection

Tamra: Motion to approve the agenda

Katherine: Second

No Objections

Approval of Minutes: 8:07PM

Katie: I was at the meeting and so was Andrew and Judith

Ire: I was also here but I came late.

Katie: Motion to approve the minutes

Lily: Second

No Objections

Announcements and Public Comment: 8:07PM

Tias: The SUA Overhaul committee is rescheduled for tomorrow wednesday night from 7-9PM at the Student Union Building. There will be cookies but I only have 25 unbudgeted minutes of my life.

Katie: Rock n Roll on the knoll is this saturday and it will be on the Stevenson Knoll

Lily: After that Merrill is hosting an event so come check it out

Tamra: Imari wanted to thank you all for the supplies. The food pantry is opening next wednesday you guys should come. The concert that was on saturday thank you for coming over 700 people ended up coming. Also can I have my nametag it has been missing for a while.

Ian: Along with multiple events saturday there is a march that starts in the quarry plaza and it will end at 2PM. It is a festival celebrating LGBTQ.

Hector: I received email about the volunteer so hit me up after the meeting

Cibyl: This friday at the town hall tickets will be sold everyday. It is a 1920s themed Queer Prom.

Presentation 8:10PM

Resolution to Reinstate Nandini Bhattacharya (20 minutes)

- Asking for support and endorsement of this resolution
- Lecturer Nandini was laid off and she cares a lot of our students
- Dean said there was nothing he can do. It has to go through a union and contract issue however after reading the response there is actually something they can do. They have decision power.
- Nandini was laid off because they decided to hire two other professors from the senate, due to that the budget for lecturers had to be cut off
- It was cut from seniority and Nandini had the least seniority

- They decided to hire other professors and it was to focus on Math 2 and Math 3 however why not keep Professor Nandini since she was doing a good job especially regarding student of color
- We also have individual petitions, if you like to sign please sign now.

Hector: What are the other demands besides reinstating Nandini?

Other demands is to for PBSI to work with HSI so that everyone can work together. Nandini is going to keep lecturing until Winter 2018 however there is a possibility she can stop and it is up to PBSI

Katherine: Is there a due date for the petition

Right now there is no due date a way to bring it back to your space is to get more petitions. We can send a template if the colleges are willing to print out some on there own.

Tama: Thank you for presenting. I believe the visiting professor program had a role to play in the point of terminating Nandini in the way to increase research ranking. Do you have any comment on that

Yeah, there is a whole cycle where a professor retire to age and they would hire a new PHD student who will fill that position. But according to the professor there wasn't much conversation and they decided to hire two other professors and the main focus was to help develop undergraduate and graduate students in higher math. They had to allocate money and that is why there is no money.

Tama: I believe Unions were mentioned but I heard PBSI has been working around the lecturer union instead of an impediment. Can you comment on PBSI relationship with union and if there is a history of undermining

I don't think I can comment much since I personally don't know that much but in regard to union they do have a contract with the university and there are certain things that they will not take into consideration in terms of laying off. They can't take into consideration on diversity, race, gender except for seniority. There is going to be renegotiation of the contract by 2020. Nothing can be done till 2020 but it was a decision to hire two other professors. One of them is suppose to focus on math 2 and math 3. Why do this instead of keeping Nandini. It gets muddy and

complicated and it was their decision to hire two other professors but it wasn't their decision to lay off two other people.

Tama: How was the chancellor meeting today can you comment on that today?

We presented him with what's going on and he was familiar with Nandini. He said he supports diversity and he liked Nandini. He said he was willing to support us in our campaign and he didn't state how that we can achieve our goal. The main thing we took away from it was that he was willing to hold PBSI accountable for meeting students needs. If the student needs Nandini then we can have chancellor push for that. That is one of the big things from going to chancellor meeting.

Hector: When we met with the chancellor we brought this up and he mentioned that he doesn't get into matters on a department level. In the end of the day he has the ultimate say if the dispute goes bigger. At this point he wasn't willing to step in.

That was the answer he kind of gave us too.

Sam: It says that the resolution that she would come back for the remainder of the HSI Grant. How long is that?

There are three different grants each with different requirements. There is one that focus more on connecting bridge between transfer students and another that focus on STEM. All have different times for example the last one is up till 2021.

Sam: So would this mean that they won't go around the resolution. I would add to include all of the grants so that this won't happen.

The thing is that she is involved in two of the grants. She is in the ones that end in 2020 and 2021.

Hector: So How can she be involved and they dismiss her? The math 2 class was changed and she is spearheading that. Are they not doing that anymore now that she's gone.

That is the problem is to keep her on board for the research. Also HSI bought the class from the university so that she can keep teaching. HSI is keeping her on.

Grace: Do you know if there is any student in MechA on the HS math committee reviewing this grant?

I am personally an intern for it.

Housing Survey Results (20 minutes) **8:27PM**

- Lobby Corp created the housing survey
- Student Life office working on food pantry and for our office was expanded this way
- 460,000 students struggle with housing insecurity but there is no data for the UC
- Action plan is to collect data specific of UCSC, destigmatize the issue of homelessness, etc.
- Over 1,000 students responded and a lot of students who responded were first years and it doesn't help in the data on homelessness
- 59% on campus 37% Off
- Off Campus housing funding comes from financial aid or family help. Cost of living off campus is between 700-900 dollars.
- Many see the increase in rent and many had to borrow money and there was an increase in utility.
- This campaign will be vital so if we can get student participation then students will listen

Alice: In Lobby Corp. you all were working with a data collector to make it more valid. Are you going to do more since it doesn't have a lot of participants

Judith: I feel like we need more student involvement since we need more participation from students off campus. I would want to bring this up on a bigger scale to encourage other campuses to get data like this.

Adam: Because of the lack of numbers what are the main conclusions that you and your team has made off of this after this survey.

Judith: We haven't made any conclusions since it is based on the data we managed to get. But at the end of the day homelessness exist so that is the main point. I think it is a conversation that needs to start and the threat of a big embarrassment might get people involved

Burcu: Is there a possibility to separate on campus vs. off campus. Clearly on campus individual have housing and have the means to get their food through food plans. The off campus housing needs to have their own distinguished results. Was this survey sent out to graduate students? I thought graduate students should be involved.

Judith: I'm no techie so I don't know how to separate it. However those who chose on campus can put no comment so that could be a marker. This was not sent to graduate students but that is a good point.

Hector: So the campus is building more beds for students, how affordable are those going to be. Are they the same price for the dorms.

Judith: I think at the end of the day it is the chancellor's decision regarding price since a lot of students where singles are turned to doubles and the price would be the same.

Tias: Actually following up on that we brought up the same question and she gave the same response trying to get 14000 bed by 2018 and she said it would be the best in the long run. No one would donate money to build beds but they would to build a library.

Hector: You had a slide with the price students pay for housing, I am interested to see what happens at other campuses. I would be interested to see the numbers relative to merced/riverside.

Judith: I think systemwide like Alice suggested is a good idea. Students came here and realised how expensive it is to live here and they are struggling even with every right to be here. I don't think students think much of struggle till they are here.

Grace: They haven't selected because the building they are doing they haven't selected the contractor. There is a committee and if you are interested they are looking for a student from the East Side. It is the scoping period where they are receive public comments till the 11th. I'm still working on getting project to be extended.

Bryna: My cousin went to UC Davis and she had a single for 700 dollars away 5 minutes away from campus. I remember asking her which college I should go to

and she told me Davis is more expensive but I just thought it is interesting that maybe not all students understand what they are walking into. It does take a bit of digging to understand what it is like living somewhere. If I understood the impacts financially of living here. This is a whole crazy housing crisis which is similar to what Berkeley is going through. We should make sure students don't have the situation a lot of students have now.

Tommy: I am not sure if you are aware of the situation but some landlord started a bidding war with the student. He got 30 different groups to go and hiked the rent to about 6000 for a four bedroom house.

Judith: And they are not held accountable for it.

Alice: Going off of that but have you asked the student body about testimonial. I think testimonials provide a personal edge. A lot of students thought this was coming from admin and there were a lot of negative impact. I think asking students to give personal testimony is good.

Tias: Sorry we talked today about tenant rights because there was a whole issue happening in Berkeley and we asked if we can devote some legal resources against tenant law violations. If it happened it would mean that they would have to take out legal representation from undocumented which is not good. She said that is not a housing issue but a graduate students not being paid enough. So I asked if we can subsidize and pay more to graduate students. And she said no.

New Business

Bylaw Review (10 minutes)

- There has been a small Bylaw rule within the election committee but what happened was that the normal process was that they turn in a packet that had a certain number of signatures. Once validated they can be confirmed by election commissioner. Essentially a single one of the candidate had everything in order except one of them could not be validated since someone was messy and it was passed on by the Dean of Students. This was an issue of the name not readable and the candidate was contacted and in my mind that mean the verification took place. Instead the candidate was told they were ineligible to run. Regardless the commission took a vote and voted they should be allowed to vote but since they don't have the power they were removed from ballot. If the person do get back on the ballot then

they will be able to have another orientation and get back on the ballot. It is something we can easily fix. Everything as I understand the candidate should be allowed to run

- Danny: Just to add, so I presented this to the Dean of student and the Dean told me to talk to the commissioner and the commission has no vote on this. So in the majority they decided to give the candidate a chance. In the pass people have been disqualified but as a commissioner I am just making sure everything is fair. I would prefer people to overlook this and decide without bias. The candidate in question did meet with me and we did have a makeup orientation. Currently right now until the assembly decided what to do they are running.

Grace: First I would say there are a handful of people and everyone was brought anonymously since no one knew who they were. To me it's about jurisdiction of commissioner but in my opinion no. Nowhere does it say that the elections commission can take it to vote. On the nomination petition in order for petition to be valid the following requirements is shown. It says you are recommended to get bare minimum and if you think this is unfair then that is something that needs to be debated at a later time. The fact is that the signature is not complete and the packet cannot be confirmed. In my opinion that candidate should be disqualified and the commissioner had no right to make that decision.

Bryna: From my understanding the person only got the bare minimum?

Grace: No they had more than the bare minimum but each college's need three and for one of the colleges there was only three and one was not verified.

Bryna: I am torn but having more than the bare minimum shows that the person had the ability to outreach. I don't know what the total number is is it 50?

It's 50.

Bryna: Out of 50 people and you only had 3 people from one college that is disappointing but I do think having as many people running is the most democratic. I don't know how I will feel but I think there are valid points on both sides. This can be easily resolved had there been more signatures. I don't think it is that hard but that is just my opinion. I don't know how I will vote in the end but I think I agree a little bit more with Grace then the other.

Adam: I am not going to put much opinion on this but I do have what the election commissioner put out.

Hector: Those are all good points. Grace, question when you say incomplete were they missing a certain component or was it just sloppy

Grace; The last name was missing and the first name was illegible.

Tias: Can you confirm how many signature they got?

Danny: They got 78 signatures but from one college that person only had 3 and that is why this became a problem.

Kiryl: You said it was verified but Grace said not so whats happening.

Danny: At first it was not verified and the Assistant Dean of Student sent it back to us. But the candidate came back and brought back the signature and the assistant hasn't confirmed that. I just got the info today.

Tamra: Motion to extend time by 10 minutes

Lily: Second

No objection.

Tommy: If they had the first and last name but a question for Grace, when they went back it wasn't on time were they asked to bring it back by deadline.

Grace: They were not asked but it was after the packets were due but you have to follow the timeline of the elections. It's still late.

Hector: Actually hearing from Danny how many signature they had but he isn't capable of outreaching and I know I personally went through this and personally this person got the signature but I personally think we should let them run.

Hana: Are we deciding if the election commision have jurisdiction or are we deciding if the signature is valid.

Tias: Either way it means we need to decide what the Bylaw means. Essentially I do believe the verification period does extend pass the time of being turned in. I think it is fine and essentially we can say we do believe the Bylaw is valid and

they are eligible. But we can say multiple things like the commissioner do not have jurisdiction and the candidate is illegible or etc.

Ted: Is the candidate aware that their candidacy is under question.

Danny: I did tell that person to await on this decision but in the meantime he can run.

Bryna: Point of privilege, can we use gender neutral language. We are not suppose to know the gender.

Libby: At this point would someone run unopposed.

Grace: We are not allowed to know.

Tamra: What do we motion exactly when we vote.

Jane: In the bylaws under the section about elections Subsection C.V it talks about disqualification and to be honest it doesn't appear that it can be overturned by the assembly.

Tias: Essentially there are a rainbow of ways. We can vote to interpret the bylaws to allow the signature to be verified and that even if the commissioners office verify it then they can be a candidate. There is a counter option to what I just said. There can also be a motion that says any person with invalidate signatures are disqualified no matter what the commissioners said. We are voting on the rules.

Tamra: So I reserve my right to make a motion. The reason why we need 3 from each college is that we are suppose to represent all colleges. I think it is good enough if that person has a confirmation signature even if it messy it is fair because this person has the signature. I motion to let this person run.

Bryna: Point of information but if in the wild case it's not verified tomorrow I don't want us to allow this to run.

Tamra: Motion to extend time by 10 minutes

Burcu: Second

No Objections.

Burcu: I don't really know what this space will decide on. I personally will abstain but whatever your decision is this will be what we will abide on from now. Some rules are vague and I don't want to encourage vagueness but I want you all to be aware.

Adam: i think we need to make sure whatever we decide it will set precedent for the next years. Not deciding whether the person will or will not but who has the jurisdiction. If Tamra's motion pass it needs to be known who has jurisdiction.

Lily: It seems the candidate did everything in their power. I do believe they should run and I do believe in precedent but this will help make the SUA more accessible for those to run.

Tommy: I know everyone cares about my opinion and I came to the decision that this person did everything right. I would feel uncomfortable looking at my own petition. I believe they have all the parts and I think it is invalid to say they can't run.

Tias: I reserve my right to make an amendment, the dean of student did invalidate the signature. It means they can't tell but the election commissioner verified it since they had the ID numbers. Onto the motion please don't pass the motion as it currently shows. I can amend it, Motion to amend the main motion such that the SUA officially endorsed the interpretation of the bylaws in which the candidate signatures can be verified even after the deadline for tuning in nominee applications and after the dean of students has compared the signatures to a static of id numbers.

Rick: Second

Bryna: Objection I am hoping in the future this never comes up. I am not comfortable for leaving an infinite amount of time for verification. Can we add a limitation.

Jane: I believe that such a change would have to be done through a bylaw amendment. Our decision would not have long lasting impact.

Ted: I reserve my right but we are now entering the discussion of a discussion within a discussion. So I call to question to vote on an amendment.

Tamra: Objection to call to question. I thought we are not allowed to object.

Bryna: Point of information if I rescind my objection can we move to vote.

Jane: No.

Moving into a vote to vote: All those in favor (29) All those opposed (3)

Moving into a vote on amendment: All those in favor (24) All those opposed (3)

Amendment passes. Our new main motion is the amendment.

Tamra: What are we talking about now?

Jane: Our current main motion is that the SUA endorses the Bylaw interpretation.

Tamra: Call to question

Ted: Second

No Objection

Move into vote of the main motion: In favor (23) All those opposed (4)

The Motion passes so SUA endorses Bylaw interpretation.

Tama: As a one last question the person confirmed it was cross referenced with other campaign packets.

Grace: And this is contingent in that the Dean right?

Tias: Not necessarily

Grace: Question for Danny, was there a signature provided that was the full name and is it the one provided to dean of students.

Danny: Well the person sent me the invalid one but I don't have a current signature from the person.

Grace: Was it confirmed that the last name given to you actually match the student ID

Danny: I don't have the information. They did however send me two new signatures but I scanned it wrong so it will be corrected today.

Burcu: So is it validated? Or is it not.

Lily: Motion to extend time by 5 minutes

Sam: Second

No Objections

Jane: The process for overturning the past decision that option is available.

Grace: it is my understanding that the signature can be verified but the dean of student could not verify it because we did not find the full name. It is my interpretation that we should confirm the student id number match the full name. That this is contingent that the last name provided is the last name.

Kiryl: Since the motion is an endorsement I think the decision of the body has no real effect, all we did was recommend that they accept the signature.

Danny: I brought this up because I did not go further and disqualify someone without an opinion that is why we went to the commission and the commission made a decision to allow the people to run. I want a larger group of people to decide the fate of the person. I think what we were trying to ask is that should the commission be allowed to decide. I know the rules are vague but that is why we came to you to see the next step.

Jane: Does anyone have a response to the previous question?

Kiryl: All we did is that the election commission recommend to accept the candidate.

Tamra: It is in my understanding that we are allowing the commission to have jurisdiction because that is why Danny came to us in the first place. I think we should move on.

Old Business 9:36PM

Funding Deliberation: Suicide Prevention Walk (10 minutes)

- Requesting \$200

Tias: I am a touch worried about burning people out. I do believe we should help this event and I am trying to find the exact count that can give us an estimate but I am sure that we have enough money to cover this. I motion to fully fund.

Lily: Second
No Objections

Tama: I motion to amend to draw \$200 from SUA Programming to fully fund this event. Can we recommend that they go to SOFA for funding in the future.

Noah: Second
No Objection

Funding Deliberation: SUA Elections (10 minutes) **9:39PM**

- Request \$6000 - Cost of Classroom Unit 2

Tias: I believe the standing cost is \$350 and it seems that it will be \$5,650

Burcu: Two things is there a specific line item for election funding or does it come from programming.

Tamra: It comes from programming.

Buruc: Motion to fully fund from programming

Ian: Second
No Objections

Endorsement Deliberation: ALI Resolution (10 minutes) **9:41PM**

Katie: Motion to endorse

Rick: Second

Tias: Objection, I am concerned with the speed of what we are doing so I would like to move this into a vote.

Vicente: Are there any recommendation to publicize the resolution

Katherine: That can be an possibility it will be noted if we are endorsing it.

Vicente: If I can make a stipulation that we publish this onto SUA website

Tias: Technically all adopted SUA resolutions will be published.

Vicente: I motion to add the recommendation that we work with the DRC to publish this on a relevant page on their website.

Jane: We can try again if no one second this because you didn't include the motion to endorse.

Bryna: I would like to move to amend the current motion to include what Vicente said.

Ted: Second
No Objections

No Objections to new main motion, New motion is adopted.

Endorsement Deliberation: All-Gender Bathroom Resolution (10 minutes) **9:46PM**

Lily: Motion to endorse the resolution
Jessica: Second
No Objections

Closing Remarks and Adjournment: 9:47PM

Chloe: Can everyone come to me if you are late so I don't mark you as absent?
Thank you.

Jane: How do you like this new no tables thing?

Bryna: A strong no from Vicente and a yes from everyone else.

Jane: If anyone doesn't like the setup then come talk to me or come earlier than me.

Tias: The SUA Overhaul meeting is tomorrow with hypothetical meetings.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:49PM