I. Call to Order – 7:40pm
II. Opening Roll Call
III. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Motion, seconded
   b. Objection; Jacob
      i. Remove AR 4-021 from New Business
         1. Seconded, approved
   c. Objection; Catherine
      i. Move election/recall to after Old Business; seconded; approved
      ii. POI: Why? A- New vice speaker doesn’t have to do this today
      iii. Motion to move election to after Old Business, seconded, approved
   d. Objection; Aaron
      i. Add Aaron Cahen to Representative Reports; seconded; approved
   e. Objection; Katy
      i. Add Katy to Representative Reports; seconded; approved
   f. Motion to approve agenda as amended, seconded, approved
IV. Approval of the Previous Minutes
   a. Minutes from 14th meeting on December 1st, 2015 (Sent via email)
   b. Motion, seconded, approved
V. Guest Speakers
VI. Community Concerns
   a. SAFE: Nadia K., Haleeman A., Devin J., Danielle R., Pooled Time
      i. We ultimately respect the Ethics Committee decision, these decisions matter. For the last 2 weeks SAFE has received hate mail from students on campus. Since this hasn’t been clarified, SAFE did not submit a review to the Ethics Committee, a CSG member did. I am shocked. There is still miscommunication as to why SAFE is upset. The problem wasn’t whether or not Jesse has the right to address his opinions, he should not have the ability to scream at the students he represents supposedly. The issue here isn’t that we believe that Jesse should have to shed his opinions because he’s on CSG. When his speech crosses the line of publicly berating a student, to assume that behavior is ok is the issue. The reason for all this was to have a dialogue to discuss things. We had a table with pamphlets, all of SAFE was trying to do was start a discussion on our own terms. The article mentioned calls us all anti-Semitic because Jesse holds pro-Israel beliefs, readers are not being exposed to the video. This reaction from the media discourages any SAFE Palestinian members from starting discussions on campus or coming to CSG for fear of being labeled anti-Semitic. SAFE has been called anti-Semitic by many newspapers, which is
enough to get any Palestinians being barred from the country and also has an effect on study abroad to Palestine. Something that no other student group has to deal with. Palestinian voices are being silenced. By not helping us or listening to our concerns you have helped to further silence students. Hi I’m Devin Jones. Raise your hand if you’ve been on Birthright or to Israel, keep them raised if you’re Palestinian. None? What I’m trying to demonstrate is that there are power dynamics on this campus. My mom came here in the 70’s/80’s and said there is a Zionist presence on this campus. It’s been a campus for Jews and Zionist at a time when they were not accepted, that’s turned into a campus that turns down anti-Zionist views. You’re seeing the embodiment of that. I’m not taking issue with the ethics discussion, as the result of the decision do we have the same right to say something in the same manner as Jesse did. Last year we had the cops called on us for showing up to an event. There’s a quote I want to read that aligns with this, true on this campus. “When you’re accustomed to privilege, equality feels like oppression.” Who has taken an Arab-Israeli conflict class? How many of those professors were Palestinian, zero. The classes taught here on those issues are taught by White Jewish males. I’m calling into question the narrative of Zionism, on this campus, it’s present in the national media. On November 9th the wall was one of the only times to voice our narrative on this campus. Jesse centered his voice on the death of a friend. The Palestinians were trying to call out state policy that effects them daily on a campus that says its okay. What did Jesse do, he centered his voice. I want to give you couple facts for perspective. To this date, since October 1st, the number of Israeli Jews killed is 20, Palestinians, 100. 5 times the number. More Palestinian children killed than the total number of Israel Jews. We’re calling out state policy and you put one person ahead of everyone else, we have a problem. We’re talking about censorship as the main issue, when Jesse comes up to us and yells that’s censorship, which I made clear to the Ethics Committee. Not being able to respond to him was a problem, but the problem is that Palestinians narrative is beaten away, a CSG member silenced us again. Going into this I didn’t expect anything to happen, I thank the Ethics Committee for taking this seriously because we never get taken seriously. To Jesse, I told you, the day your friend dies you experience what it’s like to be Palestinian. But you have not received hate mail, you can visit your family in Israel because your name is in papers.

1. Jesse - That country I can go into because I’m a Jew

ii. Devin - I want to make it clear what Palestinians deal with and how the power dynamic on this campus works…that’s all I have to say. Even
within the past hour we’ve been sitting in the Union, on Yik Yak we’re being equated with terrorist groups like Hamas, being told we’re anti-Semitic and advocate for the killing of all Jewish people, we experience this on a day-to-day basis. Situations like these, we have the right to peacefully protest, we’ve been getting this backlash and not having nay affirmation from CSG that we have the right to hold our own things. All its doing is making this climate worse. Its unsafe, sometimes I don’t want to be considered Palestinian on this campus because of things like this. On Yik Yak one hour ago was “SAFE is allied with Hezbollah.”

VII. Executive Communications

a. Cooper

i. Thanks to the SAFE reps for sharing. I met with Schlissel to discuss things, to share a few talking points. On the strategic plan for inclusion, we try to have these sessions at times students can show up, not 9 in the morning, also making it clear where student can go to have their voices heard. Students get lost in and we want to make it clear they can follow their concerns all the way up. Mental health resources…what the student Union renovations, restorative space is important. Course evaluations took up a majority of the conversation. On security and safety and active shooter situations were discussed, it’s jarring as it stands and it’s a reality we need to be prepared to combat the unpredictable. Any further question’s reach out to me. Jacob talked about this, the Golden Apple Award is extremely important to all students, the only student nominated awards recognizing one professor, CSG wants to continue our commitment to the faculty. I’ll be discussing the changes later on. I don’t want to go on negative note, but we’ve had 20 resolutions pass so far, a majority of them procedural, more so Exec in nature. Want to remind you what you ran on, do self-reflection, 20 isn’t bad but nowhere near good enough. I know we can do a lot better. If you need a creative session Exec and myself are open to that. Recharge over break.

b. Steven

i. With Joe, I’ve been working on the sexual assault PSA, if you want to get involved we’d love to have you. I’ve been doing research on other CAPS at other schools, if anyone has connections hit me up.

c. Sean

i. Tomorrow Race and Ethnicity requirement review meeting, I’ll be presenting student feedback to address three pillars to be improved, course content, structure, support, with race and ethnicity at the forefront we will fight to make it clear that students find it to be of utmost importance. I’ll be highlighting the importance of dialogue in discussions and additional
GSI training for capability of facilitating dialogues. We’re fighting to obtain support for faculty and students for courses for the upper level writing requirement. Course evaluations, we remain committed to providing professor specific data, surrounding the policies of content of course evaluations, release of course specific grade distribution. Bicentennial is 2017, for next semester we will be working hard to establish programming of stories of lesser-known students from the past 200 years. Next semester, inviting commission chairs I will invite to speak, I want to see much more collaboration between assembly and commissions next semester.

d. Anushka
   i. Student organization consulting groups, student orgs like 180, we’re looking to have them provide consulting to student orgs. It’s a monster of a project, with 3 people helping, I’d love other input, encourage your org leadership to complete the survey.

e. Jacob
   i. Going to SRAC Friday for student statement of rights and responsibilities for the 7 amendments CSG proposed, thank you those who helped for your hard work. Cooper and I will be meeting with VP Lynch and Harper, I met with Oscar today, I’ll keep you updated. By January 15th should have vote.

f. Kevin
   i. Update on budget, wrapping up liabilities. I intend to present budget at first meeting next semester and a report of this semester. Also available to the public to see balances of budget, look for that in January, on SOFC we have a proposal later but looks like they’re closing the books at full utilization of 194k, tremendous accomplishment, it’s a guessing game the team got it down to a science this semester.

g. Alex
   i. December 16th, we’ll have a table in the Ugli, 1-4pm stop by, happy finals thing with Kind bars, candy, I’ll send a doodle.

VIII. Report of the Speaker
   a. Noah
      i. This is our last meeting of the semester, don’t show up next week. Good luck on exams. Please keep working on your initiatives over break. To reps who are leaving us to go abroad, thanks for your time here, have a great time. Special thanks to Catherine. Our next meeting on January 12th, committees will be required to meet once before then, as well as committee/commission attendance.

b. Catherine
i. It’s been great, best of luck, I’ll be happy to help.

IX. Representative Reports
   a. David Schafer
      i. Hello, wanted to provide you update on mental health work. We introduced a resolution passed a month ago, been working hard behind the scenes. School by school, we are discussing with the deans of each school, 19, I’ll start with Pharmacy and Kines. They’ve officially adopted the language on the syllabi for Winter 2016, shout out to Hannah from Pharmacy/Kines, SMTD is interested as well. We met with Ford school, she introduced the language and is working, and she believes that the language will be adopted. We met with LSA Dean, who liked the idea and presented it to Dean Martin who is in favor of the idea as well. I’ll be attending LSA Student Government meeting tomorrow at 8pm, they’ll be passing the same resolution we passed. I drafted language to send out to LSA faculty. LEO, the umbrella union for lecturers, over 900, they adopted the language this Monday. Met with GEO today, over 1900 here, they are also a big fan, posting it on their FB and website, they’ll be sending out a mass email. Law school, Sarah is doing great work with them, a little slower process with them. Meeting with Ross dean next Monday. Met with Engineering Student Government and they’re interested and working with deans. Want to thank all of you for the help. I made a hand out I’ll post in FB group.

b. Thomas Hislop
   i. We met with Ryan, they’re working on testing accommodations center for students with disabilities, right now it’s only for LSA students in the basement of MLB. They need more room, last year 6% of seniors used the facility, this year 40% of freshmen. They’re looking to make a new center. Goal is to use CSG and deans to get regents to sign on to this.
      1. Joe - Thanks Thomas, I’ll be gone next semester, it’s important that all schools have access to this testing center, over 1200 students are eligible in LSA by itself, its unfair…
   ii. Thomas - Hoping to make north campus center as well.
      1. Joe - Introducing language to make testing center known on multiple syllabi is really useful, everyone takes exams.
   iii. Thomas - Let us know if you want to get involved.
      1. David - Timeline? A – Want to present to us in January, 5 years for the buildings.
      2. Lucky – Expanded rooms temporarily? A- Yes, a good question.
      3. Cooper – We’ve offered this space and financial support, unfortunately law school policies are constrictive right now it
won’t work. I’ve pushed back they haven’t given me a clear answer. This is more of a 5-year plan.

4. Sean – Talking about syllabus language, thought about working together to do a 1 pager in front of every syllabus? A – Yes, thought about that, an idea, a lot of schools have the disability info.

c. Aaron Cahen

i. Hi, I mentioned last week we’ve been building a survey to get an idea of where you think we should be going as a student government. Where we are and where we should be going. We want your feedback, have 5 questions right now, if you have ideas let me know we want feedback. We hope that you guys will answer this so we have data to work with. Student Government provides services for the student body. What should we be offering as a student government to justify its existence? What do you personally want to accomplish, what initiatives have impressed you, what’s most important for UM students and the University as an institution, and you personally? We’d ask to submit the school you represent, so we can see trends. We’ll be sending it out within the next week or two. Please answer it. Composting, we need more people, we have Planet Blue proposals, need more human power. Please come talk to me.

1. David - I’m confused is survey internal for CSG? A – Starting with internal, will expand to student body if it goes well, then compare data from two surveys.

2. Cooper- Yield to me? Unfortunately the genesis of the survey is…what percentage of assembly members are doing anything? Around 50 percent. What do people actually care about, can we jar their memory? This is an accountability structure. We can sit down and find out how we can help, we’re having this stagnant energy that’s crippling the student body and our ability to do things. Someone might be too busy…how do we empower them? Overall goals are to propel to get engaged and doing more. 50% engagement is embarrassing.

ii. Aaron - What does CSG do/provide, it’ll answer the question of why we exist.

1. Ben - Internal accountability committee for check ins with reps to hold ourselves accountable? A – Not a bad idea, it can get tricky having peers, something to look into

2. Katy – Is a question what do you care about and have you done anything? A- Great idea.

d. Katy Culver
   i. Hi, about bussing, in September we gave north campus freshmen a survey asking about game day bussing experiences, compiled results, have had issues meeting with the bussing guy. We’re meeting Friday, want to let you know. 75% of North campus uses the bus on game day. 75% who rode say they want bussing before 10:30am. Bussing added wasn’t being utilized to full extent. So students can get to game day, there are other points we’ll present so they can alter their schedules for next year. We still want to work on bussing, especially weekend and later times, if you want to be involved we can keep working with them.

X. Committee Reports
   a. Rules Committee (Report Attached)
      i. Ramon – Hi, on our report you can see we included a longer report. We want to be as transparent as possible. There was nothing changed about the 2 resolutions, Jared thinks we don’t need one of them so keep that in mind. When you vote keep that in mind. Other than that, have a flair for the dramatic.
   b. Finance Committee
      i. Eva – Changed Golden Apple resolution, we’ll talk about it later. 9:15 Wednesday, see you there.
   c. Communications Committee
      i. Taylor – We’ll meet Sunday, to help with CSG sponsored in holiday finals kits. Let me know if you want to help pass out the kits.
   d. Resolutions Committee
      i. Lucky – Nothing happened.
   e. Ethics Committee (Report Attached)
      i. Thomas – Thanks everyone who was a part of this. I’m going to read the report, I don’t think some people read it and it’s important you hear it. Don’t want to lose some of the words. On Thursday, SAFE held a demonstration in the diag. Between classes, LSA Rep Jesse Arm approached them, first 2 students then to a SAFE leader, questioning the timing of the display. He requested to exchange contact info. After viewing video evidence, we have unanimously decided that the assembly takes no action for his involvement. He did not engage in unethical behavior. In Article 8, Section 1 it states that no authority shall infringe on student’s freedom of speech, etc. SAFE had the right to assemble, Arm had the right to voice his opinion. After deliberating, Betman and I decided to view the video evidence. The Ethics Committee believes this investigation can lead to an important discussion of narratives on this
campus. Members of the committee and members of the assembly may question whether something else may be appropriate. In Article 8, Section 3 of the constitution, students shall be free from all rules, etc….without clear definitions, the committee cannot issue a warning this time. The operating procedure does not identify when they’d be appropriate to issue, we believe it would undermine the student body constitution. The committee feels it is not appropriate to deliver a warning when the meaning of warning isn’t defined. The Ethics Committee went through this process with no precedent. This was the 1st Ethics Committee investigation ever. Ethics requests that Rules define when it’s appropriate to deliver them. And whether students have the right to legal counsel in these hearings. Representatives should be held to a higher standard than the average student, however we do not have to shed our personal beliefs and opinions when we run for this office. His language could be interpreted as hurtful, just as the demonstration could be considered hurtful. Arm spoke with emotion, he spoke passionately but remained inside his amendment rights. He asked for all students present to take moment of silence, didn’t identity himself as a Rep of CSG or even mention CSG. He did not curse nor use hateful language. He should not be penalized for being passionate. Reps should work to be respectful and mindful. UM – Ann Arbor is an exemplary place of higher learning. The impassioned exchange of ideas is what we were founded on. SAFE has a right to discuss issues, as Rep Arm has a right to speak peacefully. Constitution of the student body urges us to collaborate with other students. This expression cannot be censored and the emotional responses students have are real and valuable. I hope CSG continues to support both sides, and want to make clear that you have the right to demonstrate and that we had no choice in the matter in what the media defined you as.

ii. Motion to extend time by 2.5 minutes, seconded, approved

1. David – I commend you, I’d like to draw your attention to words you used. Rep Arm questioned time and taste of display…back of report under conclusion, you used the phrase dialogue…from watching video at no point did he engage in dialogue. Curious as to why you used spoke instead of yelled. And used dialogue A - Tone of voice came up again and again, we received different opinions on what tone was used. Not screaming, spoke was right choice. Timing was direct quote from Rep Arm. Some people hadn’t seen the video, video can speak for the event.

iii. Motion to suspend rules to extend time, seconded, approved by 5 minutes
iv. Motion to amend 5 minutes to 10 minutes
v. Motion to send conversation to ethics meeting
vi. Debate to extend time and suspend rules
   1. Sierra - Does the assembly vote? A – Yes by suspending the rules
      we’d be continuing as Thomas’ question, after someone can
      motion to adopt recommendations.
   2. Joe – We’ll need 15 minutes at least. A – We’re moving into
      debate to suspend rules for 10 minutes.

vii. Motion to suspend rules for 10 minutes

viii. Motion to suspend rules for 10 minutes, seconded, approved
ix. Rule suspended for 10 minutes to continue Ethics Committee report.
   1. Jared – The rules are not suspended, we’re allowing conversation
      to continue for 10 minutes
   2. Trevis - Debate about process…did you have stepping-stones? A –
      It’s not clear what we’re supposed to do right now, they needed an
      Ethics Committee sometime in the past, made 3 rules, hasn’t been
      touched since. There’s a lot to do. It’s tough to do but possible, we
      need to define the ability to have counsel.

x. Joe – Need to define rules for Ethic Committee, wrote the decision with 0
   precedent. It’s not good.
   1. Jacob – What was the structure? A – I reached out to both parties,
      asked them for names, emailed, asked Arm to set time, idea was to
      have dialogue/conversation, and ask questions, if they felt specific
      words such as hate crime could go with the situation and went
      from there.
   2. Meredith- Laying out Ethics Committee…template for resolution
      would be helpful? A – We just made one, yeah. This format is
      typical law format.

      mean by engaging in discourse? 2. Hurtful and emotion violence,
      do you not think we’re invalidating what that SAFE member said?
   3. In terms of CSG as a body being a forum that allows a public
      forum for student expression, how does Jesse as an authority relate
      to the idea of CSG allowing expression on campus? A –
      Discourse…we use synonyms as well, I understand where you’re
      coming from, it was an emotionally charged conversation.
Hurtful…I want to talk about, I chose it for an important reason. I’m sure you’re aware of what’s going on at Yale… at one point a professor was speaking to an African American student…professor said to student I understand it hurts but just because its hurtful does not mean we can’t have this conversation. Hurt is subjective. That’s why I chose hurtful, it’s important. I understand Jesse and SAFE were hurt, it doesn’t mean they have to stop talking. CSG being public forum of course I don’t want every conversation to look like that, I can’t tell everyone how to speak to others, I hope CSG works to have student leaders talking about important issues. That’s the CSG I picture.

4. Sloane – Any involvement of 3rd party, totally unbiased could be involved? A – Hope that’s what Ethics Committee will be, we watched the video many times, tried to hear both sides, were not able to talk to 3rd party students involved.

xi. Katy – Ethics procedural doesn’t say anything, if we didn’t have Thomas and Joe it would have gone much worse, we had good leadership.

1. Ben – is Ethics Committee supposed to benefit us internally? A – Conduct of reps involved in student government is the Ethics Committee, that’s something Thomas has pointed out.

2. Jacob – 5 reps is suitable? Application to fill 3 non-chair spots? All 5 should be required to meet together? A – 5 is good number, allowed for conversation, application would be great, 4 of 5 should be present, chair and vice chair should have to be there. It’s important.

xii. Sierra – All questions about wording we brought up, we felt words were best representation.

1. Michael POI- Who’s on Ethics Committee?

xiii. Joe POI - How do we go about confirming?

1. Jared - We don’t have to vote on nothing, because no action was recommended, we don’t vote, there is no action to be taken we don’t vote.
   b. Michael POI- This is end of it? A – Yes, if there’s a different motion can be later. There are 5 possible actions, we are taking none.

XI. New Business

a. A.R. 5-022: A Resolution to Clarify the CSG Operating Procedures

i. Jacob – I wrote this again, CSJ didn’t want excessive entanglement, I’ve heard both sides and had compromise. This is a resolution I wrote that
that says while appointment for exec nominations would not go to whole committee, chair would meet with chief justice and president to figure out who would move forward. We’ll be receiving more CSJ nominations. We have a few vacancies. I’m happy to answer questions.

1. Zach - Run through process of how student gets nominated for CSJ? A – Application process is intense, you have numerous essays, analysis of governing documents, took about 45 hours, current justices pour over it, their standards are high, interviews, and justices come together to decide who they want to put forth to executive, chief and exec decide who to put forward. The assembly would vote on it with up to 8 questions on each nominee. It’s a brutal process.

2. David – I think it goes towards clearing ground that had come between us. That meeting when it does occur how does voting/decision work? What if they disagree, does it have to be unanimous? A – It’s a conversation, chief justice only brings those they believe are suitable and presents them to the court, they’ll always be supportive of the candidate. Beyond that it’s a conversation, there’s a high standard to be met. Cooper asked challenging questions, I ask good questions, I know everyone else will. I don’t think there will be issues.

   ii. Comments to improve
   iii. Referred to Rules Committee

b. A.R. 5-023: A Resolution to Increase the Number of Committees Allowed Within the Student Organization Funding Commission (SOFC)

   i. Last week we voted on increasing from 30 to 45, chair thought of a new way to incorporate more members into the process, which would require 3 committees, we’re limited to 2 right now, want to change from 2 to 2 or 3 committees. Straightforward, ask any questions.

   1. Jared –Resolution count? A – At the time that was correct, since then they did a reflection of what worked and this is the result of that.

   2. Kevin – Not as much an increase but something SOFC has been tinkering with for over a year, we’ve seen a request from the board to have more of a commitment, this is so that one individual will not have entire groups application to give groups fair chance at funding. For groups to come 2/3 of the time. Aimed at trying to keep people engaged in CSG, involved.
3. Michael - Reason 2 or 3 other than 15 increase? A – I don’t see why need for more than 3, you hit a wall with more than 3 with scheduling if 4 committees, SOFC has had great recruitment this year. It could go back down to 2 in future semesters.

4. Michael - Follow up - So 2 or 3 is sweet spot to hold committee to? A – Yes don’t want to bid future chairs.

   ii. Comments to improve
   iii. Referred to Rules Committee

XII. Old Business
   a. A.R. 5-018: A Resolution to Fund the 2016 Golden Apple Award and Lecture
      i. Second reads
      ii. Cooper – Thanks Noah, like I mentioned we’ll be going through some of the changes. The first whereas clause…it’s super powerful, we’ve all had professors change our perspective and its our chance to commit $300 to help the award go through. As far as CSG appointed member we were granted that, that’s to Noah’s discretion as the speaker…we’re showing respect and admiration for teachers on campus.
   1. Katy – For last lecture, can you define that? A – Like last meal, if you could pick one teacher who would that be?
      iii. Proposed amendments - none
      iv. Third reads
      v. Vote
         1. Michael POI - Not all reps added.
            a. Vote: Yes 33; No 0
               i. Resolution passes unanimously
               ii. Noah - If interested in serving, think about it.
                  1. Michael POI - Time requirement? A – We’ll find out.
   b. A.R. 5-019: A Resolution to Amend and Update the Compiled Code
      i. Second reads
      ii. Jacob - Another procedural thing, called UMPD Oversight Committee not DPS Oversight Committee, just changing name.
      iii. Proposed amendments - none
      iv. Third reads
      v. Vote
         1. Yes 32; No 0; 1 abstention
            a. Resolution passes
   c. A.R. 5-020: A Resolution to Update and Amend the Election Code
      i. Second reads
ii. Jacob - Would like to note I’ve been quick. While I respect the advice and opinion of the rules committee, I do believe it’s important for candidates. The UEC passed statute about votes earlier in the semester. Assembly passed last week a resolution to have at least 3 votes if a write in candidate, must be 3 unique voters needed to be eligible for seat. In packet for candidates, constitution not in there, doesn’t distinguish point from vote, this clarifies the difference

1. David – If I run and receive 2 votes, do you have the uniq names?
   A – System shows that, no student will ever see who voted for who. There is a process to go through exceptions, for example if from the School of Natural Resources, technically every individual in the school is in Rackham, but we still have seat for that, Clyde would have to do more research.

2. David - Follow up – Clyde? A – Clyde takes part in all elections, for example Michael had 0 votes, 5 exceptions. There’s a lot of exceptions

iii. Proposed amendments? - none

iv. Third reads

v. Vote

   1. Yes 32; No 1; 1 abstention
      a. POI - What’s happening? A – Updating spreadsheet, copy and pasting formulas
      b. Resolution passes

XIII. Election and Recall of Members

   a. Election of Vice Speaker of the Assembly

      i. Lucky; nominate Hannah, seconded
      ii. Cameron; nominate Zach, seconded
      iii. David; nominate Emma, seconded

1. Hannah: Hi everyone, I've seen how this works and spoken with Catherine about the responsibilities from her, I’m quick with emails for any questions you have. I’m excited to gain knowledge of inner workings of CSG, out of my comfort zone but I’m excited about it, if you have questions ask.


2. Zach: Hi everyone, Catherine’s doing a great job, I know and can pronounce everyone’s name, it comes back to Cooper, I see this position as higher leadership position. I spent 3 semesters on CSG, I’d like to take a bigger position, this is going to be a stressful one probably more serious and intense. I have the leadership to be a
strong presence to support Noah. I’ll take questions, I think I could fulfill all the roles.

3. Emma: Hi guys, David said I would be good at this, I have a decent speaking voice.

iv. Questions

1. Michael – For Hannah; Zach brought up wanting to work towards doing more… what are some ways you can help this body be quicker?
   a. Hannah: Talking to people to get excited about doing things, I was shy last year but I didn’t talk to a lot of people, I’ve grown out of that and I’m working on some initiatives.
   b. Zach: I haven’t had a lot of great ideas myself this term but noticed I’ve been able to contribute a lot of the discussions. I’m a sounding board for others, I’m a friendly guy and easily approachable. I’m going to try to play up my strengths in helping other grow their ideas.
   c. Emma: Remove nomination in interest of time

2. Ramon: If you had to chose Pokémon?
   a. Zach: Pikachu, he’s my go to guy
   b. Hannah: Ponyta

v. Motion to appoint Kevin and Alex as tellers, seconded, approved

1. Michael POI – Clyde?

vi. Vote

1. Congratulations Hannah

b. Election of Finance Committee Chair

i. Lucky: nominate Ben, seconded
ii. Motion to elect Ben, seconded, approved

2. Congratulations Ben

c. Election of Finance Committee Vice Chair

i. Ben; nominate Trevis, seconded
ii. Nominate Austin; seconded

1. Trevis: I did Econ in undergrad, I want to put my Public Policy spin to it, there’s a lot of folks from Ross, the maize and blue project opened up a lot of questions, I want to see that develop, I’m interested in the topics discussed.
2. Austin: I see this as a way to take leadership, I’m good at numbers/finance, Ross vs. Econ it is what it is, got more money on increasing CSG fee, my roommate is in SOFC, more participation
with SOFC is good way to look into more brainstorming approaches.

iii. Questions

1. Joe – Ross vs. Econ…Grad vs. Undergrad it is what it is?
   a. Austin: I plan on going to grad school, I don’t see any major experience gap I wouldn’t be able to overcome, my past work speaks for itself, grad vs. undergrad I think I’m qualified, I don’t think it makes a difference.
   b. Trevis: Going to the meetings. It’s important that, looking at the budget is great but providing opportunities to work with student orgs. It goes back to being able to communicate with different people who come in, that’s the bottom line for me, I just want to help student orgs.

2. Kevin: SOFC is main funding arm, CSG remains separate, what do you see as role of finance committee in terms of creating events?
   a. Trevis: Maize and blue project, they’re a student org, I know traditionally, SOFC is for student orgs, that situation was ambiguous, how are we going to help them? To turn them away and say sorry go to SOFC that’s unfair, we didn’t do that, there will be more student orgs and initiatives I want to help develop that. It was ambiguous, luckily Jacob the hero of CSG came through, and we should have a structure/idea.
   b. Austin: Doesn’t have to be turning them away, fostering collaboration is a good place to start. It’s compliance and research into minimizing costs and looking at feasibility, should be more brainstorming and taking initiative, there’s a lot of ground to come up with ideas of how to spend discretionary.

3. Cooper: You mentioned increasing student fee, from my research was extensive process, and can you explain that?
   a. Austin: Basically Michael came to us, I was an intern, had this idea, we had a hunch more and more student orgs would ask for money, we went through a decade of SOFC data and put together excel sheets and graphs showing the rate of disbursement increasing. $2 dollars is justified
   b. Trevis: I don’t have any involvement with student fee, at my previous university and working on technicalities in the real world, raising fees anywhere can be challenging.
4. Ben: First finance committee meeting, goal was making greater reach. Do you believe you’ll be able to reach out to groups?
   a. Trevis: I was approached about running for vice chair by Jacob M., we’ve been lacking providing funding to grad students, I’m involved in Rackham too, getting involved across the board and in diversity is important.
   b. Austin: It goes hand in hand with communications, personally within Ross I’ve been working on office hours, that could be good but doesn’t speak to the outreach thing, there’s research to be done there. Communication will help. Outreach is important to understand the value of going to orgs.

5. Michael: One barrier for some student orgs especially those run and started by students of lower/middle income, who can’t work in the reimbursement system SOAS has, what would you do to better help them run their orgs to the best of their ability?
   a. Austin; I didn’t know that was such a big issue, and I empathize with that situation, maybe useful to look at flipping that situation, I see no reason has to be on reimbursement schedule.
   b. Trevis: One thing we could do is help them have fundraiser events, it gets touchy giving them money, holding fundraisers in the union or space we could take on the cost, providing ways to make the cost as minimal as possible to build a foundation through the discretionary funds, there’s leeway, looking for ways to help student orgs. Should keep an open door to all student orgs.

6. Zach: I’m sure you have friends connected on campus, how would you manage outreach by remaining impartial, removing conflicts of interest you may have?
   a. Trevis: Telling someone about available resources and supporting organizations are different conversations. Informing them about opportunities...I would be straightforward throughout the process that the assembly has to vote on these different issues.
   b. Austin: I don’t think impartiality will be an issue, it’d be easy to stay impartial

iv. Vote

1. Congratulations Trevis

d. Election of Ethics Committee Vice Chair
i. Katy; nominate Sloane, seconded
ii. Michael, nominate myself, seconded

1. Sloane: Hi everyone, I’ve talked with Thomas and feel I’d be a good candidate in this position. This is the perfect opportunity for me to get more involved my experience as a Ford student and on exec boards will help me, I have firsthand experiences investigating conflicts, I thank you for your consideration, I’m looking forward to improving ethics committee and procedures

2. Michael: Hi everyone; when I saw ethics committee report, I want to work on accountability measures so that we’re being accountable to each other and the entire student body, with our own personal missions we are still held accountable, outside of my personal feelings, the fact it passed unanimously was concerning to me. I don’t agree with the decision, I do want to strengthen it, not a lot of thought was put into holding ourselves accountable.

iii. Questions

1. Ben - Michael you said a different opinion than what was produced, how can you say that without going through the due process, except your own personal opinion.
   a. Michael: Not my own personal opinion, I think the report is a result of those processes, while I have faith that the process was done in earnest, I do think based on the argumentation that reasons they’re giving, I see flaws in the reasoning, I could have added a different perspective than those reasons. I would have added a different opinion.
   b. Sloane: I don’t think my personal opinion should be considered in running for this position, I don’t know the full procedure of the ethics committee yet but I hope to.

2. Cam: Being able to relate to people is important, can you speak on your experience with different groups of people?
   a. Sloane: I’ve had a lot of involvement on campus, CSG has helped me talk to more groups of people, I’m in the Ford school which has brought me an opportunity to work with different people, I was on KOA exec board and Sigma Kappa exec board, I’ve been able to work through the power dynamic in terms of being relatable I’m open to listening and trying to understand but not overshadow perspectives.
   b. Michael: That’s a key part of this, the first part…it’s a process, you don’t go into a situation blind, it s
psychological fact, acknowledging the bias you might have is important, I tend to be very relatable I’m open about my experiences and the things coloring my thinking and try to give as objective of an opinion as I can. I’ve been a leader on campus almost my entire 5 years, don’t lead for 3 years and not have to be relatable. I started a successful organization, I’m a teacher, and you don’t see 150 students everyday and be effective without being able to relate to those students. In terms of relatability, taking different perspectives, I identity as biracial, as I’ve explored that its taken a lot of navigating.

3. Jesse; there has been 1 investigation in the history, do you believe that it’s the gravest ethical offense that’s occurred in this assembly, have you seen video of my exchange?
   a. Michael: Yes seen it 5 times, I’ve only been involved last year and this year, to my understanding last year don’t know of any major ethical things that should have been brought up. Statistically, not likely no other ethical investigations haven’t come up, to the extent of is it the gravest by default yes.
   b. Sloane: I saw the video, can’t speak to what happened before I was here, important to look back what the committee is for and see what more we can be doing to work more cohesively to work better with student body and CSG.

4. Joe - How would you handle situation where you had close personal ties but other people didn’t know?
   a. Sloane: I would be upfront about my close ties, but by taking this position I’d be taking on accountability to everyone, I can overcome trying to be neutral and be unbiased. It’s impossible to erase bias and I want to recognize that.
   b. Michael: I echo Sloane’s point of full transparency, If I have closer ties than CSG co-rep I would acknowledge that it would be hypocritical to say I’m unbiased. I can’t necessarily say what I would do in every case but first point of action would be acknowledging it. If fellow members thought it would take away I would recurs myself.

5. Lucky: 3rd party system, any recommendations on assisting ethics committee in future?
a. Michael: I believe having 3rd party is important but we have to be careful to call them unbiased, it’s important to the discussion, I also want to work on the idea of restorative justice, I didn’t hear a lot about that, if you’re going to have an ethical breach there need to be restorative measures outside of being punitive. It doesn’t help us grow at all.

b. Sloane: 3rd party was just a suggestion, I’m opening up the discussion. Something I was thinking about I’d like to do research into what other student governments have done. It’s difficult to be completely unbiased. In terms of growth I agree there’s more that could be done but don’t agree on comment about restorative justice.

6. Ben: I’d like to quote Michael in a CSG FB post from divestment, you wrote an essay about Jewish students and oppression. You said couldn’t separate identities to argument but referenced bringing your identity to the proceedings.

   a. Michael: I see how that’s hypocritical, for some context, I’m going to stick to calling it oppression, the argumentation used I felt was not them considering outside of their identities. You cannot remove your identity from your decisions. When I say removing identity it means considering it, in you have to acknowledge it colors your reasoning

   b. Sloane: I can’t comment on FB post, I recognize I can’t remove identities from conflicts that may come up but want to make sure dialogues are happening and working with bias and I would be as honest as possible.

iv. Vote

1. Congratulations Sloane

XIV. Motions and Other Business

   a. Steven POI - Will wait to nominate Golden Apple Commission to figure out time commitment.

   b. Zach POI - Knowledge as to when they make the decision? A –Around March.

   c. Michael – Motion despite Ethics Committee’s report to impose formal warning on Rep Arm in full acknowledgment that the ethics committee will work out what that entails next semester.

   i. Jacob POI – Just to be clear if action is taken, ethics committee can’t determine after the fact what warning is, if we chose to give him something it is whatever we decide it is today. We can’t delegate it to
them its against the constitution both ours and the United States’ it’s up to Jared and the speaker if we chose to impose that.

ii. Michael - Motion to impose formal warning that other ethics investigation will be...I’ll be bring motion back in January, I retract it.

iii. Ben – Statute of limitations on bringing it back? A – Unclear, there’s a lot of ambiguity around everything in relation to the ethics committee, I’ll yield to Thomas

iv. Thomas - We can either, my understanding is, take no action or accept or modify ethics committee recommendation

v. Jared - Assembly can create committee…assembly doesn’t trust ethics committee and would pass motion and resolution to do select committee.

1. Jesse POI - As someone directly affected by this how long does it go on? At some point is there going to be an effort to do what’s appropriate for my well-being?
   a. Jacob - Questions may be taken to CSJ, they may feel there is precedent in other documents that would set a statute of limitations. As for now it doesn’t state we put finals before our assembly work. If there are ambiguities I encourage anyone to reach out to CSJ and I’m happy to do that in your official capacity.
   b. Ben POI - November 19th it happened, Michael joined assembly on December 1st , it is appropriate for him to interfere with process? A – Rules don’t say anything about that, up for interpretation.
   d. Ben - Motion to close meeting, seconded
      i. Joe POI - What did you say? A – Would have to suspend rules again.

XV. Announcements and Matters Arising
   a. Jared – No rules tomorrow
   b. Ramon – Join us in rules in new year
   c. Catherine - Midnight Bookclub on Friday
   d. Michael – Thanks for pronouncing my last name right, shout out to grad students on CSG, bridging the gap, it's unprecedented, also to put out an APB on I also have things to do but as a body we have to give our full attention to what’s happening, I saw a lot of people zoned out, for social media use, I understand it’s dry, it’s no excuse. We have an obligation to be here as long as we are.
   e. Allie – My last meeting, I’m concerned investigation with Jesse still being talked about, it’s concerning that we’re arguing over a student who voiced his opinions. Jesse is a human being, one of our peers, it makes me very upset.
   f. Austin – I want to register concern with a lot of the questions/comments being made every week now, have respect in mind the way you address the assembly.
g. David – Commend ethics for a wonderfully delivered report, I suggest for you to work with Jared and rules to set definitive guidelines about what warnings, etc. mean, I also want to thank everyone, I had a fun time. I ask a lot of questions, it’s good that we’re going outside of our comfort zone. Lastly I got an email during this meeting from School of Information friend, they approved language, all undergrad courses in S of I will have mental health syllabus language.

h. Lucky – Thanks for the cookie post, I work for GlobeMed, we have a local partner, we’ve been having trouble with scheduling, hit me up with recommendations of local organizations.

i. Trevis – Have a good break, thanks for putting me in this position, feel free to approach me. I’d like to acknowledge, we had an IGR training and someone said CSG is fine, this conversation is an example of identities being challenged. That’s something to note, embrace these conversations. It is frustrating but these conversations are necessary. It’s bigger than CSG it’s going on everywhere. It’s a learning opportunity for all of us as students.

j. Tristan- Take care of yourselves, it’s important to seek out difference and diversity.

k. Joe – Thanks for this assembly, I’m looking forward to working with Steven on the video and on testing accommodations.

l. Ben – Finance committee will not meet tomorrow.

m. Bryce - Working on Art 2.0 next semester to help us decide better on our classes, I’ll be sending you a survey.

n. Katy – Come to Comm on Sunday

o. Cam – Commend everyone for voicing their opinions, conflict is necessary for progress. Being light hearted is cool.


q. Jesse – Thanks to the ethics committee, also honestly it’s been a lot for me but the reasons I ran are because I want to see mental health, sexual assault, improvement on campus, etc. I didn’t run to be an advocate for Israel. It’s frustrating keeping our identities in mind. To feel like I’m constantly being looked at like Jew or Israel. I’ve grown tired of it. I understand the investigation took place, if this is going to drag on so be it, but my goals are not related to my status as a Jewish student. It doesn’t cloud my judgment or ethicality. I’m Jesse who wants to see a better campus and I hope I can move on.

r. Cooper – Congrats to new positions, thanks to those who didn’t win I respect it. David, phenomenal job with mental health, etc. DPSS video series, we’re getting ready to commit money to DPSS for video series for answers to questions that students have. Aaron’s survey it’s raw right now, the point is to engage all of you. Katy, thanks for the phenomenal job with bussing. All the grad students thank you
for being a part of this assembly, you are leaders for your schools and we appreciate you being here.

s. David – Thanks for bringing DPSS up I forgot, they want us to work together to create questions.

t. Noah – If you authored a resolution stay after to sign.

XVI. Closing Roll Call

XVII. Adjournment – 10:47pm