I. Call to Order – 7:40pm

II. Opening Roll Call

III. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Motion
   b. Lamin – Motion to add 5008 to new business, seconded; approved
   c. David – Motion to include Thomas Islop to the Michigan Union Board of Representatives, seconded; approved
   d. Motion to approve amended agenda; seconded, approved

IV. Approval of the Previous Minutes
   a. Minutes from 7th meeting on October 6th, 2015 (Sent via email)
   b. Motion to approve, seconded; approved

V. Guest Speakers
   a. Holly Rider-Milkovich – Director of SAPAC
      i. This is a full room! Do my 30 minutes count as I’m getting my way up here? My name is Holly Rider-Milkovich, and I’m the director of SAPAC. I’m here to talk to you about the amendments that are proposed in the new student sexual misconduct policy. We won’t have adequate time tonight, but I do encourage you to come to our round tables, which are 90 minutes each. I want to divide my time with you today into a couple areas – 15 minutes about the changes, and 15 minutes for questions. There are changes in two areas; additions to definitions, specifically around misconduct, and changes to the process. Intimate partner violence is not included in the sexual misconduct policy (SMP), but only in Student Rights and Responsibilities (SRR). These are often co-occurring, however. Under our current policy, a student would have to file a complaint with OSCR, and take two additional steps. Moving everything to SMP would allow it to occur in the same process and evidentiary standard. We are also adding stalking to the policy; it’s already been addressed some, but to add it specifically to call it out will increase the visibility and allow more people to be helped. Adding a definition of intimate partner will also help with the SMP; this differs from “fan behavior.” We are also proposing to provide additional prohibited conduct when people violate interim measures during an investigation. This will make things handled more efficiently and effectively and sends the message that this will not be tolerated. We have more clearly defined consent in the SMP as well, specifically around incapacitation, coercion and force. What we’re seeking
to do is create transparent information about the threshold. Information has been added about definition of force, and of coercion. Threat of reputational harm will be added as a coercive force. Process changes: Underneath our current policy, the way the appeals process happens is that students move through findings and sanctioning, and at the end, both students can appeal both at the same time. We propose that either student can appeal them at their respective stages, instead of having to wait until the end to do both. The number of appeals and grounds for appeals, and access to them, remains the same. We hope this will shorten the time and make this easier for students. We are also making changes to the appeals board, which has 3 appointees from various levels of campus life. There will also be one external reviewer, external to the institution, a neutral party, to review the findings. We’ll have significant legal expertise surrounding sexual misconduct, and will make the ultimate decision. Sanctions will be viewed by an appeals board containing someone from CSG, a law faculty member, and a third faculty member appointed by the president. There are two other areas to cover: One is the identification of witnesses; currently they are identified by number. We would like the students to be named in order to have better due process rights for the parties involved. Last but not least, we are providing information about how past sexual history is used; we need to outline that it is rare that it is brought up, and only when particularly relevant to the situation. Those are the main ideas, hopefully that was clear. Questions?

ii. Jacob – With the independent reviewer, will students have a say on who it is, and will we be fronting the cost? A – Great question; not sure about compensation, we’ll get a better outcome if we do compensate well. Doubt students will front the cost. How we will ID the external reviewer is also not yet decided.

iii. Alex – Is it mandatory for students to be named? A – No, but it would be helpful.

iv. Alex (follow-up) – Would it be held against the person if they don’t provide them? A – No, but the question is if there is a picture that can be painted fully without all the names.

v. Aaron – Is there a concern with naming witnesses, that they may be coerced in order to gain a more favorable outcome? A – We have heard from other students, especially around the potential “chilling effect,” that students will be less willing to take part. This makes investigations less meaningful. But we want to hear more about what you think, and what it would do.
vi. Jacob – What’s the deterrent for perjury? What’s keeping them from lying? A – New category called “obligation of those included in investigation.” Witnesses will be required to provide truthful information, and lying will subject people to disciplinary action.

vii. Jacob (follow-up) – Disciplinary action under the student statement? A – Yes

viii. Steven H. – How do we protect witnesses? A – There is a protection policy under which students will be protected. However, there are actions that can technically be viewed as retaliatory, but we can’t act on, for example a defamation of character lawsuit. It’s not a blanket force field, but there are also sorts of protections. Students also experience deleterious impacts that are hard to define, for example being contacted less and getting a cold shoulder from friends.

ix. Sloane – Have you thought about whether or not to allow witnesses to choose to release their names? A – We thought about it, but it would not be effective in terms of due process protection.

x. Erin – Have you considered conducting a focus group around concerns regarding being a witness/being put in that situation? A – A part of my longer presentation would be that this an iterative process; nothing is written in stone, and we are very malleable. We definitely hear you when you say “this will have a chilling effect.”


xii. Aaron – If a victim and assailant are in the same classes or living space, is there a possibility that a victim would be forced to be around their assailant? A – No. During the process, they will be kept separate from each other.

xiii. Zachary – Does that mean the students would be given different or separate classes? A – Depends on circumstances; dining halls, facilities for working out, etc. are easier to monitor. We don’t want to impede education process until we have a finding, but there are ways around it. Examples: Move people into differing sections, one-on-one with professor to keep up until process is over, Skyping into class.

xiv. David – Can you talk more about the incapacitation threshold, other universities’ stances, where witnesses come in? A – This is where we need your help. Office for Civil Rights, which governs Title IX makes the threshold. One person vs another is not enough under this definition. As defined “The issue is whether the respondent knew or should have known…” that consent was valid due to incapacitation. Either outright, or reasonable knowledge. What are factors that a respondent should have
known or knew? Merely consuming alcohol does not create that knowledge; falling down, passing out, getting sick, over consumption, etc. is a better indicator.

xv. Zachary – What language do we use, or how do we address the situation, when both parties are incapacitated? A – The policy is silent on that because it governs the behavior of the person who is taking the action. This is a null factor.

xvi. Jacob – Could you walk me through the timeline? How does it work for instance, if the violation occurs tomorrow, but the person comes forward in February; which policy is this under? A – The policy under which the misconduct is reported is the one which will be used.

xvii. Jacob (follow-up) – So how does that work if I do something that doesn’t violate today, but will next semester? A – We will still act under the new policy.

xviii. Jacob (follow-up) – The statement won’t remove intimate partner violence until July…what happens to a violation in February? A – There is a clause for that that allows interim measures while we complete the amendment process.

xix. Sarah – Is there something there in the policy that addresses the questions Jacob’s asking? I’m noticing an issue; under most criminal law, action is based on when the crime occurred, not when it was reported. A – Thank you; you’re the first person to mention that. I’ll make note of it.

xx. David – What will you do if someone comes forward after people have graduated? A – The policy does not apply because they are alums, not students; will apply resources and support. They could still come to SAPAC if they’d like.

xxi. Jacob – Motion to extend time by 10 minutes, seconded; approved

xxii. Sloane – When I went through SAPAC training, we were told that any alcohol ingested means consent can’t be given; has that changed? A – Well what I’m hoping that you hear is that we have a hard time deciding whether or not consent was given when alcohol is involved. In the best possible scenario, people are engaging in sober, enthusiastically verbally consented sex.

xxiii. Thomas – What is SAPAC doing to deal with misinterpretations around an alleged gap between UM and SAPAC in defining consent? A – Not the Daily’s best moment; we clarified. The definitions are not the same, but ours is technically better.

xxiv. Joe – We can only expel but what can SAPAC do if the victim wants to file criminal charges? A – We share resources, and let students know that they have the right to file a police report, and to participate in a criminal
trial. We can help and give support from getting PPOs to standing with judge, to helping talk to officers.

xxv. Zachary – Is there still a University process if the victim wants to pursue criminal charges? A – Office of Institutional Equity will still conduct; compelling federal guidance says that we must move forward because student’s rights might be violated if we do not. We are sensitive to the needs of the legal system and also the needs of parties involved. But we will not wait.

xxvi. Jacob – In light of unfortunate events at other universities, what is the policy doing to deal with sexual hazing? A – Organizations and groups, as well as individuals, can and will be held accountable.

xxvii. Daniel – What is the average amount of time that the process takes? A – Usually people say “too long,” but we have a goal of 60 days. Sometimes it can take 3 months or even more time, some of this due to the nature of student life, for instance, if a student is studying abroad.

xxviii. Daniel (follow-up): How many cases are heard every year? A – About 75. All of that information is available through a report.

xxix. With regard to sexual hazing, does the 60 days still apply, since there are more people involved? A – Not sure, because we haven’t held groups accountable under this policy yet. There will still be the same process.

xxx. Jacob – Motion to extend time by 5 minutes, seconded; approved

xxxi. Cameron – Number of cases have been increasing; is this due to more things happening or more awareness of resources? A – Both. Our student survey on sexual misconduct was very helpful in finding out about both reported and unreported cases. We’re getting more reports because of the nature of the process, the fact that this issue has hit the national spotlight, and because of increased visibility. Only 3.6 of people who experienced sexual misconduct in the last 6 months have reported it to the university; we need to increase confidence in our process in order to increase this number.

xxxii. David – How do you engage students outside of round tables, throughout the whole year, and how do you make clear which place a student can go first so that there is a streamlined process? A – I’m 150% behind you on having awareness across student lifespan. Data tells us that awareness around this issue tends to wear off around the beginning of sophomore year. No university, except for Harvard, has a program for sophomores through seniors around sexual misconduct that we do for freshman. That’s somewhere that we can be leaders, and I think that we can do that here. As far as order, that depends on interests and needs; if they come to SAPAC we can cover everything, but it depends on individual needs.
xxxiii. Sloane – Will there be changes to or revamping of Relationship Remix so that it lasts longer? A – We need a “booster shot” that speaks to the current life circumstances to upperclassmen.

xxxiv. Sarah (comment) – I appreciate the witness policy because it’s always good to increase due process.

VI. Community Concerns
   a. Maria (tuition equality for undocumented students) – Student at SSW, also undocumented. Is in support of 5008. In-state tuition is extended to undocumented undergraduates, but does not extend to the graduate level. Part of community, grew up in Michigan; has lived in Detroit area since 9. Financial motive for UM to give in-state to grad students. Received extra scholarship to cover SSW costs, but that could have been given to someone else. Clarity on documented status: basically means that you do not have national citizen status.
   b. Blaine (Boycott Israel) – Thank you Maria for bringing this resolution to bring assistance to undocumented students. This is an important issue, just like the issue of boycotting Israel. Thank you for reading my submission to the Daily, as well as the resolution I submitted. Israel incinerated 2,224 Palestinians in just as little as two summers ago, and continue to kill and harm Palestinians, with nearly complete impunity. Where is the tribunal? This is it. I think I’ve talked more than you want me to, so I’ll open up to questions
   i. Question: Brittney – When did your concern for black students and Detroit become usurped into boycotting Israel? A – It’s been a part of the resolution from the beginning.
   ii. Brittney (follow-up): Not the resolution, just in general, the switch from just Boycott Israel to including black issues; when was that? A – Have always found Detroit issues and black enrollment issues important; the relationship between these things and boycotting Israel makes for a realistic partnership.
   c. BAMN – Pools time, will discuss 5008
   i. Kate – People saw yesterday that the official enrollment numbers came out, and we saw that this is the first time since 2005 that not only has diversity increased, but there has also not been a drop in minority enrollment. This is a real victory, but it is not adequate, because we need more. We must continue to place pressure on the University to keep their word, because if they were keeping it fully, they wouldn’t be pursuing charges against the protestors. I also want to talk about the scholarship in place for undocumented students; recently someone contacted admissions, and were essentially given the runaround about whether or not the scholarship would be continued. If you’re trying to apply to UM that’s not a very welcoming action, and can deter undocumented students from
applying. You as a body need to take a stand, and say that you can’t just take something like that away. Additionally, the scholarship needs to be better publicized, because many people who could use it don’t even know that it exists. That allows the university to take a stand.

ii. John – I just want to reiterate some things: Kedra Ishop said that we need to continue our forward momentum. But who is “we”? “We” are not Kedra Ishop or Mark Schlissel, the students make the changes, and protestors make the changes, people like us. At our tribunal last week, we had a police officer come in and intimidate us, and effectively shut the tribunal down. 1 in 122 people on Earth is displaced as a refugee, that’s a statistic from The Guardian. So we need to be more sensitive to that; there is no such thing as neutrality in this world of xenophobic hate. Support the DREAM Act and make UM a sanctuary campus.

iii. Keysha – Nothing prepared like last time, but I want to make a couple of points. This is a repeating cycle; for example in 2002 we took a sexual misconduct case to court and won, and the university took appealed to a different judge and got the victory overturned. But at the same time, the University was actively campaigning the idea that they did not tolerate sexual assault. There is also a mixed message when you go to schools in Detroit and tell kids that UM is an option for them, and then black enrollment doesn’t reflect that. This is not a safe or welcoming place for marginalized people. The change that I’ve seen on this campus is the result of students; we are the answer and we are the power that makes the University representative of the society that we live in and want to have.

Questions?

1. Jacob – What was the 2002 trial? A – 1998 trial initially. Plaintiff was Maureen Johnson, school of music student who was sexually harassed by professor; case was the first one of its kind to be won but the university got it overturned. She left school after having her financial aid cut, and ended up being a phone tech instead of pursuing her dream of being an oboe player.

2. Erin – Have not mentioned BSU, BBUM and the Black Action Movements at all. Do you attribute the work of the increase solely to BAMN? A – We constantly say that it’s a student movement, not just BAMN, but when we come here, it’s just us. And in this moment we’re supporting a resolution. I can’t really speak for BSU because I don’t know what they do or what’s going on there.

3. Brittney – How can you say that you are part of a movement of students when you don’t know what one of the most prominent orgs of color is doing? A – Well I’m not a part of that organization,
I’m part of the student movement itself. So that’s all I can really say to answer that. (Kate: I’ve been here since 1998 and I know that we’ve tried many times in the past to work with BSU)

4. Brittney (follow-up): Is that true? Because I’ve been here as well in years past and from what I recall, BSU and BAMN were always at odds. A – John Regardless of the past, we will work with anyone who shares our common goals.

iv. Motion to extend time by 3 minutes, seconded; approved

1. Jessie – As a 19yo student who ran on things like coffee carts and sexual misconduct, how is this under my purview? A – I saw a 23yo immigrant whose whole life was here be deported because the law wasn’t on his side. Just because something is lawful doesn’t mean it’s just. You can make the decision on your own though as to whether or not you want to support.

2. Jessie – Being a person who wants to see a better world doesn’t necessarily qualify me. On what basis should I support this, as someone who isn’t as knowledgeable? A – We can’t wait until we’re done with school to make change. It will be too late then. There are things you can do now.

3. Jessie – Why not direct these efforts toward the Michigan State Legislature? A – This is not about you personally, or the assembly determining law. We want the assembly and the University to make a joint call with BAMN to the legislature in order to give voice to this issue and make it more visible. But there’s nothing illegal about openly stating that this is a place that supports undocumented students.

VII. Executive Communications

a. Cooper – Thank you Noah. I have four things and then everyone has something to say. The Haze, the play around sexual assault, and also untested rape kits, is something that we still want to make happen. Farah has come forward to take the lead on that, and I applaud all of you who expressed interest. I know that also there has been a lot of conversation around whether or not to release faculty evals, and we’re still working on that. Also, the National Diversity Convention will be occurring soon, and a lot of our concerns today were about us not just saying words but taking actions. It is November 13-14 at Mt. St. Mary’s College. All costs will be covered through CSG, and I’d like to have some people go. I volunteered at this all my years here, wheelchair vets basketball game Nov 1 at Crisler; doors at 2, tipoff at 3.

b. Steven – Hope everyone’s surviving this week; I know it’s tough for a lot of you. We still have some committees to fill, so if you’re interested and know someone
who is, let me know. Tomorrow mass meeting; know you’re busy. Have fun this weekend but be safe.

c. Sean – Cabinet met first time this weekend in almost full fashion; commission reports will be due 3 weeks from the date of the first meeting. Check the Google calendar for meeting times. CSG website has been updated, check to see who you want to work with.

d. Alex – 10/24 there are 2 5ks that we’ve been asked to support, and we’ve been asked specifically. Asking 15 volunteers for each; that’s ambitious, but I know what wonderful people you are. Not everyone has liked the FB or followed Twitter and IG; please do so.

e. Jacob – First report of the Elections Director is before you. Last day to resign in order to have your seat filled in the Nov election is Oct. 18. We saw very promising number around a decrease in alcohol transports this weekend, and had 1100 swipes in the early hour. Bursley, Hill, SQ will open an hour early this Saturday. Like Holly mentioned, 3 round tables 10/21 5:30-7 is first.

f. Kevin – I’ll talk later this evening about second reads on dining initiative
   i. Cameron – Where/when is the mass meeting tomorrow? A – 6-8 Ballroom VIII. Report of the Speaker
   a. 10/27 East Room of Pierpont for assembly meeting
   b. No meeting next week due to Fall Break
   c. Committee and Commission attendance is not required for this week; you just need to have one by our next meeting on the 27th
   d. Mass meeting and game day dining hall volunteering will both count as attendance; please go, you will meet people
   e. If you have something to tell me during this meeting, don’t text me because I don’t look at my phone
   f. Laura Galinski – resigned; a few Rackham reps have as well
   g. Anything you want to be on the agenda needs to be sent to csg.speakers by 6pm on Sunday, so that it will be there for us to have questions and comments about

IX. Representative Reports
X. Committee Reports
   a. Rules Committee
      i. Written report attached in agenda
      ii. Jared – The main thing we worked on was election code resolution, and one thing we added was something the ED suggested; letting the UEC give opinions. We also talked a lot about the campaign email stuff. There is a difference between a campaign email and a ‘get out the vote’ email, and we will let the UEC decide that. Also don’t like the idea of people owning an email list sending email to campaign, because non-owners who might want to cannot. Banning emails might just be the best idea. We
can’t control non-candidates, so the UEC will decide on how much conspiring took place. Write-in cutoff will remain low so that we don’t discourage people from it. A lot of people, like me, have gotten in on very low votes, and now I’m here talking about election code.

b. Finance Committee
   i. Jake isn’t here; minutes attached; will talk more during Dining resolution

c. Communications Committee
   i. None present
   ii. Alex – Was present; will get attendance for going to events mentioned
   iii. Cameron – Was present, interviewed Sloane for her spot

d. Executive Nominations Committee
   i. David – It was an easier week for us, with only 4 confirmations

e. Resolutions Committee
   i. People have been coming to Lucky and I about set date; Sunday 11am tentative
   ii. Clarification – Boycott Israel resolution says that it is before resolutions committee, is not

XI. Election and Recall of Members

a. Confirmation of Matthew Fleischer as Chair of Inclusive Campus Environment Commission
   i. Sean – Matt is a sophomore but is very experienced with working with administrators; testament he accepted position Friday and sent racial and gender equity visions within two days.
   ii. Matt – Hi, I’m Matt. I’m a SAPAC volunteer, so I’ve gotten 40 hours of training, also on Athletic Committee, on a co-team with the Dean of Students Office, met one-on-one with President as well as via Fireside Chat. Many years of training in LGBTQ, Gender Equity, and Racial Equity issues. My goal is to advocate, not to represent at an administrative level, also chose sub-commission chairs
      1. Farah – Talk about racial and LGBTQ equity work previously? A – Joined LGBTQ, changed it to gender and sexuality alliance; joined Pride to help with diversity/inclusion; Black Student Union; Asian/Pacific Islander; White Privilege Awareness and Education center. Expert in knowing what white privilege is, and how to best advocate for groups. Other admins I will be talking to are white men.
      iii. David – Has extensive experience, is very qualified
   iv. Motion to approve

b. Confirmation of Blake McCarren as Chair of External Relations Commission
i. Sean - Previous chair of Voice Your Vote; has worked at state and federal level governments; previous commission experience, understands ERC best

ii. Blake – Thank you for having me; junior, been a part of commission structure since freshman year. Took over VYV sophomore year
   1. Jessie – Your resume is pretty partisan outside of VYV; how are you going to effectively be a resource on both sides of the aisle? A – In my work with the commissions in the last 3 years I’ve been completely non-partisan. Worked with dorm storms, and voter registration.
   2. Jessie – Who checks your ability to be non-partisan, or do you check it yourself? A – That would require a lot of monitoring (Jacob – I check it) (Jessie – Who checks yours?)
   3. Speaker intervention

iii. David – Was a little nervous about partisan aspect of previous experience, but that’s natural, it’s politics. But I think you have shown that you’re able to be non-partisan, and you have previous experience being non-partisan.

iv. Motion to confirm, seconded; approved
c. Confirmation of Andrew Rizzi to Medical Affairs Advisory Committee
   i. Jacob – We are afforded one graduate student seat on this committee; second highest vote-getter for rep seat; unable to attend since being a med student has various rigors, shown by fact that ours resign
   1. Zachary – As a 2nd year med student he’s obviously very busy; are you confident that he can give his all? A – 6 meetings over the next 8 months, 2 hours each
   2. Zachary (follow-up) – Naïve to suggest that all he’ll do is 2 hours per meeting A – I appreciate the question, being familiar with SACUA process; non-voting, solely there in an advisory role; he’s there to just sit, ask questions, and say what’s best for student interest; not naïve
   ii. David – Andrew is more than qualified with his experience in the medical school, and very fit to operate in an advisory role. I trust Andrew as well as Jacob, and so we endorse

iii. Motion, second; approved
d. Confirmation of Thomas Hislop to the Michigan Union Board of Representatives
   i. Jacob – Hopefully you all know Thomas Hislop, LSA Rep. The MUBR will play an instrumental role in the renovation process, and Thomas has done a great job of catching up in terms of info
   ii. Thomas – Architectural students’ voices need to be heard
iii. David – I know Thomas, he’s a good friend; he and Ben will make a strong 1-2 punch on the MUBR, endorse
iv. Motion to approve, seconded; approved

XII. New Business
a. A.R. 5-008
   i. First reads
   ii. Lamin – Hello everyone. We’ve been working on this resolution for a little while now, and you can read through it and sort of get what the real issue is. There are problems around undocumented students because there parents came here, they have lived the majority of their lives; 8% of births in US were to one illegal immigrant parent. This isn’t about the bigger political issues around immigration, like whether or not people should stay here, or the racist comments that were often made about them. This is about the fact that we have a number of students on this campus who experience barriers to full citizenship. One of these barriers is higher education. That is part of why we want to make UM a sanctuary campus; that means that ICE, immigration, cannot come onto campus and forcibly remove students for deportation. Very recently a Republican representative in Michigan suggested that we defund sanctuary cities, which is something that we need to fight against. Higher education is a pathway to citizenship that could be beneficial to undocumented students, to make them more productive members of society and a benefit to the country. In order for that to happen though, these students need financial aid, which is not as readily available. Even the resources that are specifically for undocumented students are at risk of being cut. DACA and DREAM are viable options. DACA allows people to work for two years, and renew every two years; costs $400 for each renewal though. University should assist. The rest of it is sort of just having the word out there and going to different newspapers and trying to have a movement around it that pushes for all of these things. The American policies that are in place regarding undocumented students make undocumented students “others,” and to be free of that label, citizenship is necessary…pathway

   1. Zachary – You’ve talked about education as a pathway to citizenship; what sort of barriers get in the way of achieving citizenship before college? A – A lot of it is based in resources; you need resources to become a documented person in this country. And higher education gives you access to that. For example the USCIS makes 80% of its revenues from documenting citizens. So higher ed allows people to get out of lower-income, paycheck-to-paycheck jobs.
3. Ben (follow-up) – How can you be accepted to the university without an SSN, or having information the Common App requires? A – Not sure
4. Thomas – Currently AA is a sanctuary city; is the University separate? A – No.
5. Thomas (follow-up) – So why is this coming before us then? A – We want the University to take a more public stance.
6. Jessie – Where are the resources for covering fees and documentation? A – Those could come from scholarships and other university funding.
7. Jessie (follow-up) – Where would the revenues come from A – This is a very rich university, we wouldn’t need to turn a profit
8. David – Are undocumented students not allowed to utilize Student Legal Services? A – I don’t think so, but fear could keep people from going because they might be reported.
9. Hannah – If you’re an undocumented student does it automatically defer to out-of-state fees once you become a grad student? A – Yes.
10. Kevin – Is this asking for money directly from CSG? A – No.
11. Jacob – Would this require CSG reps to make direct contact with admins or regents? A – Yes.
12. David – I know there is a shaky history between BAMN and the President/regents, but you call on them to act; have you met with them outside of last April’s incident? A – No we have not
13. Thomas – You say that students are being attacked; is there a UM loophole that keeps them from abiding by Ann Arbor sanctuary rules? A – A good parallel is the difference in marijuana policies between the University and the City of Ann Arbor; the city is very lax but on university property, consequences are strict.
14. Jessie – What is meant by lines 57-60 in the resolution? A – The thing we’re saying here is ‘What happened in WWII and the Holocaust?’ The othering of a person which requires them to not have rights under the law

iii. Comments on how to improve
1. Zachary – Carefully word, because it suggests we will start another WWII
2. Jessie – In my personal politics, I’m all for this, but the wording; these lines in particular are offensive to me. This situation is not comparable to Nazi Germany.

3. Jared – We can’t command Schlissel or regents to do anything, but we can challenge

4. Benjamin – Immediately accepting undocumented students and increasing numbers suggests that we overlook qualifications

5. Cameron – Great resolution, on the right path; clean up language

6. Jacob – We cannot fund lobbying efforts, so I encourage you to remove any language that has to do with anything financial that could be tied back to resources; limit direct contact with officials in the language

7. Zachary – More footnotes; give definitions around the terminology that you’re using

8. Sean – I have a lot of international students who are worried about not getting permanent work visas; maybe include language about that

iv. Referred to resolutions committee

XIII. Old Business

a. A.R. 5-006: A Resolution to Amend the Election Code
i. Second reads
ii. Jared – Laid a lot of this out already; yield time to questions
iii. Sarah – Talked about this a lot in rules committee; part of what makes laws great is keeping them vague. More hard lines = more loopholes. Questions?
   1. Jacob – Backup elections director loses right to vote if they step into the ED’s role; is there a reason you didn’t want that? A – We’ve covered that in the election code
   2. Ben – In the interest of being vague, lines 35-39 seem to be the opposite of vague? A – No, we can’t keep everything open-ended, or there wouldn’t be order. We’re not creating a hard line here, which would be mandating no emails at all, but a soft line that better defines emails. (Jared: A more specific rule would be saying what listserves must begin with)
iv. Sarah – Note that the UEC Elections Director is completely on board
v. Vote: Yes – 28, No – 1, Abstain – 0; resolution passes

b. A.R. 5-007: A Resolution to Fund the Dining Hall Gameday Pilot Program
i. Second reads
ii. Kevin – Good evening, going to keep this short; talked to Steve. Costs needed: replacement of food consumed because they’ve opened early;
people cost because chefs and personnel need to run the kitchen. We womped on NW 38-0 on the field, but we also helped 1100 students. 3 more games; MSU at 3:30, and the other two are TBD. Noon games are higher cost than later afternoon games because of even earlier open times. Overall goals are student safety and health. We need to find effective times to open the dining halls based on game times. Biggest change to resolution is amount requested from the assembly; this has been raised to $15,000. This is based on the incurred costs of Dining, and projected costs. Want to absorb costs make it a pilot program

iii. Eva – We wanted to increase overall expenditure because the legislative budget spent around $1000 out of about $2000 we have to spend. We see that people are turning out, so we need to put our money where our mouth is. We can make this work with money that we haven’t even spent in the past. Executive tends to spend a lot more and legislative goes untouched, so that’s why we’re taking this approach. Questions?

1. Jared – Why did you only focus on 2014 spending, and not 2013, when we were more active? What would be the cost? A – No records from 13-14 treasurer; approximately $10-12k on first 3 games, $1200-1500 this past game, so we’re estimating based on that. Also considering looking into other bodies that represent large groups of students to help accommodate costs.

2. Allie – How much did we give to legis disc? A- $29k

3. Allie (follow-up) – Given the fact that we’re prone to spend more than we project; do you think that it could be problematic to give over a third … A – Given the time frame for CSG, and the amount of time that we have to spend the money, I think it can work. Providing the financial resources is important (Eva – Additionally we’ve talked about this at the meeting, and there’s not a lot of buzz around the money from legis disc)

4. Zach – What if any conversations have been had with dining about success of the program and what future expenses might be? A – Stress that it’s a pilot program; beneficial for Dining to know regardless of reason that students want it to be open earlier

5. Zach (follow-up) – What have you heard from Dining’s end, though about how this is going? A – I had a conversation with Dining this past week; they want to help out in any capacity possible (Jacob – Steve, the director of Dining, is one of the best administrators to work with and is very open to accommodating student needs. As long as we can show evidence that this is helpful to students, he will support us)
6. Ben – Do we expect the new commission chairs to be coming for legis disc? A – Sean: Commissions have their own funds

7. Jared – Do we have a report on the amount of money spent of alcohol transports, to contrast? A – We’re asking for them, from OSCR, but we’ve been encouraged not to share them for a couple reasons. Firstly, that some of the numbers might conflict. Secondly, they can’t be given the stamp of approval, legally speaking.

8. Jared (follow-up) – Is it possible to have, at the end of the season, an update on numbers on how the initiative has… A – We definitely want those numbers, and thus far we’ve seen that we’re making an impact

9. Daniel – We’ll still be providing volunteer swipers, right? A – Yes, for the remaining three games.

iv. Third reads

v. Vote: Yes – 28, No – 0, Abstain – 0; passes unanimously

XIV. Motions and Other Business

XV. Announcements and Matters Arising

a. Jared – Rules normal time and place; come out. Last assembly we didn’t do much, but the one before, we had 7 resolutions that spent money out of the legis disc. If you want ideas on what to do, go on the website.

b. Lamin – Thursday I’ll be meeting with a bunch of undocumented students at either 6 or 7; I don’t personally embody this subject, so I’d encourage you to come see people who are experiencing this firsthand. I’m not asking us to change immigration law, I’m…

c. Erin – Update on busing initiative; 300 people filled out, 75% said they utilize on game day; 32% said they wanted buses before 8:30; 43% said between 8:30 and 10; 75% want more buses before they’re even being added to the routes; Tim, Katie and I will be pulling this together and presenting to Cooper and the director of transportation by next Wednesday

d. David – IGR is hosting a dialogue tomorrow at 7pm regarding gun violence on college campuses, shouldn’t be long, food might be provided; syllabus initiative is moving along, done drafting language, various directors support the initiative so I feel very hopeful; revisions welcome, plan to introduce resolution soon; help with mental health

e. Cam – Very interested in music, especially rap music; want to bring a rapper to speak about US climate; have seen Lil B, Chance, Kanye

f. Thomas – About to pull the plug on Blue Bucks in the Big House; marketing campaign before Rutgers; tell your friends about it, or to use it
g. Jessie – Thursday, here in the Pendleton Room, screening of The Honor Diaries; speaker from Human Rights Council will be in
h. Emma – Had meeting with Exec. Director of Dance Marathon last week. DM has indicated that they’d like CSG to have a team; it’s a low time commitment, and we will raise $300…
i. Bryce – Looking for a graphic design project
j. Ben – First meeting of MUBR was yesterday; tomorrow is the 55th anniversary of the Peace Corps being founded on the Michigan Steps; 11/13-11/14 Regional conference of the American College Union Association; release of infographic regarding Union renovation process; architects will come to campus every two weeks to hear from students, not just campus leaders, so let them know what you want to see
k. Jacob – Want to thank the authors of the election code resolution; they did a great job after I came to them a couple weeks ago. If you’re an appointed rep you need to run in November, so file your paperwork between 10/15 and 10/30
l. Sean – I think Cam’s idea is great; reach out to Matt Fleisher because I’ve been talking to him; DeMario Longmire heading subcommission around sexual misconduct
m. Alex – More volunteers needed for 5ks, especially the Purple Run, which benefits SafeHouse
n. Cooper – For those of you who stayed and showed up, I want to extend my gratitude because I know we’re in the midst of papers and midterms. Having to look around the room and figure out if we have quorum is difficult for me to watch. It’s hard to see people leaving each meeting, especially because no matter what, student issues matter, and we have to engage students. As an example, last week (girl with flashlight). Look at your friends and let them know that we’re here to work and not just have something to put on our resume. Thank you and have a good fall break.
o. Noah – Utilize CSG speakers to be put down for a rep report if you want to talk about issues and initiatives, stick around to sign passed resolutions

XVI. Closing Roll Call
XVII. Adjournment – 10:30pm