



TUESDAY, MARCH 15TH, 2011
TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING OF THE 2010-2011 SENATE

Call to Order (0:00.22)

Start Time: 7:00

Roll Call (0:00:27):

Finance: Senator Tran, Senator Juaire, excused

Student Activities: Chair Adams, Senator Lederer-Plaskett, unexcused

COLA: Senator Cooper, Senator Sadek, excused

CODEEE: Chair Herman, excused

Student Action: Chair Simmons, unexcused

Public Relations: Senator Boutwell, excused

Academic Affairs: Senator Ballas, excused, Senator Alleger, unexcused

Approval of the Minutes (0:01.04)

From 3/1/11 – passes

Public Forum (0:01.19)

Alicia Taylor, Office of Student Community Relations

Alicia Taylor: Thank you all for having me. I will be brief because I know you have a long meeting ahead of you. I'm Alicia Taylor, I work in the Office of Student Community Relations here at UVM and I am here on behalf of the Women's Center and the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference Planning Committee and to let you all know about the conference that is coming up. You might wonder what do we mean by rape culture in the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference. What we mean is prevalent norms, attitudes, practices, and media that condone, normalize, and excuse sexual violence of all forms. The conference is meant to look at what is rape culture and what can we do to change, shift, and alter it. The conference is happening on Tuesday April 12 here in the Davis Center from 8:00am- 4:00 pm on the fourth floor. You can come for all or part of the day. You can work it around your class schedule. A lot of students are asking professors if they will give extra credit for attending the conference and we totally encourage and support that. There are going to be three workshops sessions throughout the day as well as a keynote and an action oriented session. We want it to be student friendly and we want students to come, we want you all to be the highest numbers at the conference. We've had students involved in the planning of the conference, a student designed the poster you will see around campus soon. We really want students involved

in this day. Students are also leading the sessions at the workshops and that should be great as well. We do have a national keynote speaker, Samhita, who is the executive editor for *feministing.com*. She is going to talk about the use of social media and online organizing to change rape culture and end gender based sexual violence. Registration is open and available now. It's online at the Women's Center website you can find a link to the conference. You can sign up there for a section of the day. We also do need volunteers. If you are interested in volunteering we are going to have a training session. Volunteers will be room monitors, help with registration, table, clean up and set up. We would love to have you and on the registration you can check if you are interested in volunteering. We really just hope you all can join us and I just want to say thank you to the SGA for your support this year and in past years. We've had a lot of student groups support the conference and we'd love to have you all come to the conference and be a part of it. It's a great opportunity that is free. It's a free conference for students, faculty, and staff and lunch is provided. Any questions?

Open the Floor for Questions (0:04.32)

Senator Yeager: Can you repeat the date?

Alicia Taylor: Tuesday April 12 from 8:00am -4:00pm. You can come for all or part of the day depending on what works for your class schedule.

Avery Pittman, on the *Water Tower* (0:04.58)

Avery: Hi, I have some sheets of paper I would like to hand out here. If you want to share with your counterparts, people. I'm Avery Pittman and I'm here to talk about why the *Water Tower* article is dangerous and is promoting rape culture. I feel like I want this is an explanation of my paradigm about what was put out in that *Water Tower* article. It's encouraging coercive intercourse and that is sexual assault. Because we are all students and we all pay a student activities fee, having my money go to an article that endorses sexual assault makes me outraged. I'm outraged by it. I also feel like the *Water Tower's* response to this article has been encouraging but is not enough at this point. Words have power and words that promote an environment that promotes rape culture need to be counteracted. I understand that it's a first amendment issue and offering or creating a punitive measure would be countering their legal rights and we can't do that. I would like to see this body hold up our common ground and say we don't support sexual assault, we don't support coercive sexual intercourse, we don't support the views of this article and we as this body think campus should be a safe space for all bodies.

Monique: I'm Monique Seitz. Just jumping off of what Avery said, I'm going to be a presenter at the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference for a student section. We will be discussing exactly what is rape culture and what constitutes it as well as advocacy on campus. This article hits home. As someone who has been trained as a crisis hotline worker and a social change worker by a local rape crisis agency, this article is infuriating and it's highly insulting. This is my life's work, working with survivors and people who have been affected by sexual assault, both primary and secondary survivors. Something

like this article that is being published by the university's alternative newspaper that my money is going to is not ok. I understand while my protests may seem emotional and personal, it has been a personal attack on me as a human being. People who commit acts of sexual assault understand that there is an outline through which they will commit these acts. This article is an outline saying and approving of sexual assault. It endorses it, it is blatantly obvious. While Avery and I are asking for you not to reprimand them but to say to the university this is a place we expect to be safe. We have a blue light system set up for a reason. We have the Paradigm Project that I was formerly a part of for a reason. It is now dissolved into another section of the Women's Center. We have these reasons set up for a reason and yet we maintain a level of invisibility in regards to something such as sexual assault and it is evident by the publication of this article. I'm asking you as a person who is a student and a member of the community that something of this article happens, preferably like Avery stated and I'm not quite sure what else to say. Thank you so much for listening and we hope some sort of resolution comes of this. The voices of many have been heard there are many people who have been outraged by this article. Thank you for your time.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:09.46)

Senator Bennington: Thank you so much for coming in and speaking to this. It's really great when students come in address their concerns to this body. I think you answered my first question which was resolution being written. I want to ask more specifically what the best thing you could see coming from this body would be and also what steps you have been taking with the *Water Tower* if you had been in communication with them and if you had requested anything of them.

Monique: I myself and two others have been in communication with the *Water Tower*. We originally requested a public apology which was presented although not hastily. It includes the words allegations which is victim blaming and not conducive to the conversation responding to a mistake made. I've been in correspondence with them. We then proposed a group of people write a twofold space in the *Water Tower* discussing topics we felt were suitable. The *Water Tower* said no and instead offered us the ability to write one article. We said we would wait until Thursday to give them a response. We have also been in communication with the director of the Women and Gender Studies department, Felicia Kornbluh, who was extremely upset and has given us her full backing as well as her ability to write a letter and say this opinion does not represent the opinions of the Women and Gender Studies department. We've also been in communication with the Women's center who has also given us their full backing and support.

Molly Kelly-Yahner, *Water Tower* (0:12.09)

Molly: Hi everyone, I'm Molly Kelly-Yahner.

Alex: And I'm Alex Pinto.

Molly: We're the editors of the *Water Tower*. We just want to thank everyone for letting us come to this meeting. The biggest thing we want to accomplish is addressing members of the community and facing this issue head on. We really want to reiterate our apology about this article. We know the one we released seemed a bit broad and simplistic but we were going for reaching everyone. We published it in our most recent issue today. Even people who maybe haven't read the article or weren't uncomfortable with it knew that there was a problem and that we were so so profusely sorry. The biggest thing we're hoping to accomplish from this is let everyone know it was never nor will it be ever again to condone any form of non-consensual sex, sexual assault or rape. There is not tolerance for that and we have not tolerance for that and we made a huge mistake in printing something that made people feel that was accepted and laid out with a guide to achieve that. Second of all, we just want to say that this is something that we have learned a lot from and we will never repeat this mistake again. The UVM community is so important to us and we would never want to lose that trust and lose that connection with all of you. We hope that you can work with us on learning from this and moving past this.

Alex: We are aware of the responsibility we have as a publication that a lot of people read and the power that words have. In light of that responsibility we have a process by which all articles go before they go to print. In this instance, it did not go through that process. There was a miscommunication, I won't bore you with the details. Basically, an article went to print that was not condoned by all the proper sources that would normally see an article and certainly not by everyone in the *Water Tower* by any stretch of the imagination. I just want to say that our doors are open for any kind of communication with anyone in the community. We want to work with everyone to make this as right as we can.

Molly: Just adding on to that we've been in correspondence, as Monique said, to get some sort of resolution from all of this. If an article isn't what people are going for, we're very open with sitting down and meeting with people and talking about something else. I know I will be attending the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference to educate myself even more. We're very open to Emails, phone calls, sit downs, one on ones, with anyone who wants to give us some feedback. Thank you all, again, for letting us come to this and speak our piece.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:16.13)

Chair Filstein: Thank you guys for coming in to speak to that issue. It seems that you are very sincere in your apology and that the article slipped through. I was wondering why the request to have a two page dialogue in the issue and sincere debate about the topics was denied?

Molly: I think a bit of it was misunderstanding because the phrase I saw came out was for a full paper with us being part of it but not really having our editorial roles. The thing with that is we want to balance that with news, reflections, tunes, creative stuff. We don't want to take away from them for an entire issue as well. We can meet in the middle, give

them a couple pages instead of a whole issue. We're open to talking about that. The first proposal was for an whole issue without our full editorial input.

Alex: Also, we're willing to work in other ways than the content of our paper just because everyone in our paper works hard and it's the mistakes of the editors and we don't want to take it out on our writers. We can use our status as a publication in a number of other ways than the actual printing.

Chair Adams: I want to elaborate a little bit. I emailed them yesterday which was a little bit later than I intended. They were very quick to respond and to come in tonight and share their piece and to sit down and meet so I wanted to thank you guys for that. It was refreshing. I actually want to further bring up that you guys always accept outside submissions to go through your editing process. To there's always the opportunity for that.

Molly: We have meetings every Tuesday at 8 and they are open to anyone. That's a time for anyone to come by and talk to us after this. Know we're always there, down the hall in the Chittenden bank room.

Senator Yeager: I understand there has also been an outcry from the gay community as well because of a choice word that was used in it. I know it wasn't directly cited in the letter of apology in this week's edition. Could you touch upon or address their concerns as well.

Alex: That was an oversight on our part if we did not include that in our apology. We couldn't meet with each other and we've been writing back and forth long distance, it's been difficult. We do apologize, again, if what we put out there is inadequate.

Molly: We're definitely open to working with the gay community as well. I guess I don't understand your question, were we going to mention using that word or were we going to work with people that were hurt by that word?

Senator Yeager: I don't know if you've heard the same outcry and if so acknowledge it somehow in the paper? We've heard outcries from it.

Molly: That's definitely on our list of the large clean up that this is. We're trying to take each part step by step and make sure we cover all our bases and each part of the article before we respond right away with a not fully thought out apology or actual response through our own forum that we run. We're still trying to work with people who were hurt by this to find that resolution and through that resolution we would most likely address the specific part of the article that was problematic.

Students from Hillel/VSI (0:21.29)

Hailey: I'm Hailey Stern, I'm a sophomore at UVM and I'm the president of Vermont Students for Israel and I'm also a member of Hillel.

Marty: I'm Marty Levigne, I'm also a sophomore at UVM.

Hailey: With us we have a multitude of members from Hillel, Vermont Students for Israel and people that are in both groups but believe in what we're about to say. As most of you know there is a campaign to divest from the military occupation, of companies that are profiting from the so called military occupation from Palestine. We are here and the SGA is going to decide whether or not to vote on it. We are here to present why this resolution, this campaign for divestment is not good for the university. We have a presentation.

Marty: We also have bunch of people from clubs here [inaudible]. Put your hands up and acknowledge that you are here with us.

Senator Caster: Point of Information: The resolution is on emergency business, however I was not going to speak for it and then table it and introduce it into new business for next week and the vote will take place next week so that senators can inform themselves.

Hailey: Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. It is the only country in the entire Middle East that, as you can see, is the only country that has human rights for everybody, including Palestinians, which you may not have realized before. In all of these countries, it is the only country where homosexuality is legal. In the IDF which is the Israel military, not only do gay men and women have always been allowed to serve in the military. Since 1993 accessibility and special accommodations have been given to gay men and women. The proposal for divestment has been made at all these universities and none have been passed. For many reasons including their claims of anti-Semitism and because there is no valid claim for divestment. Israel's size is 1/6 of 1% of the Arab world. The population is 22% Arab. Israel has 1,300,000 Israeli Arab citizens, 20% of its population, and recognizes and gives privileges to 15 different religions. Arabs can and do serve in the Israeli military. There are Palestinian members of the Knesset house which is the Israeli legislative house. Also, there are Arabs serving on the Supreme Court, have high military positions, and have equal rights. The security fence along the West Bank which I'm sure you have heard of was built starting in early 2000 and up in 2002, was built because many terrorists were living in the West Bank and coming into Israel and bombing civilian areas, targeting civilians, not targeting people that have committed crimes or people that were hurting Palestinians. It was completely civilians. My uncle died by a suicide bomber in 2002. The security fence, I've been there before. You can see it in the news, it's an easy access to get through to the West Bank and the border is easier to cross than the U.S. Canadian border. Israel wants peace. That is the first thing they want. Compromises, they have offered 97.5% of the land that Palestine wanted they've offered and they've said no. The money that the Palestinian authority has gotten, it gets billions of dollars a year in aid but you still see a lot of hurt going on and poverty in this area. The money is there and it's just not being distributed to the people that need it. All the aid, all the food, Israel is giving food, Israel is giving aid and the government is not providing it to their constituents.

Marty: They profit by selling the aid they're given and distributing it and not among the people it was intended for.

Hailey: The Palestinian people's Charter calls for the destruction of Israel, as well as the Hamas Charter which is a political organization and terrorist organization. Israel is the establishment of the Jewish state. Jews have lived and identified with this state for thousands of years. The Old Testament, the New Testament and the Koran all referred to this area as the land of the Jews. Even if one is not religious, these old documents are another way to show that Jews are indigenous to Israel and the surrounding area. Even though immigration has occurred since the 1890s, Jews have lived there for 2000 years. They were expelled but Jews still lived there. You can speak your mind on most campuses in America or Israel, but not in the Middle East. Here, if a similar proposal calling for any other, students don't have any rights, basically. As you can see in this chart, Jordan's students have partial academic freedom, partial artistic expression, and partial entry of articles, books and newspapers. Israel has all of these. Know the facts before you form an opinion on the Middle East. For more facts on the Middle East, go to this website and I just want to say this this has come up under emergency business. I don't believe this is giving you guys enough time to look at the facts, both sides, everything. I know that this is being tabled which is a great start already, so I encourage all of you guys to really research and I know I am a source and there's a million different professors that can provide you with some facts. There internet is a great resource, TV, news shows, newspapers. Make sure you know the facts before you start pointing fingers.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:32.44)

Senator Bennington: Thanks for coming in, it's great to give all sides of the story. I'm just wondering if you have the ability to forward this presentation to the body to have information and also if you have a list of references.

Hailey: They're on this website and they're also in the notes or I have them on hand and I can email them to Claire and she can email them to you.

Nolan Rampy, Students for Justice in Palestine (0:33.46)

Nolan: Just for starters, we need to be careful about what this proposal is about. This is not divestment from Israel, which is about the presentation you just say. This is divestment of American companies that profit from illegal occupation. You'll notice that the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza rights were never mentioned and the rights of Palestinians in those territories were never brought up. I'll go ahead and continue. The illegal occupation of Gaza and the West Bank and East Jerusalem is currently entering its 44th year. This is the longest running occupation in the world today. To give a thorough account of all the crimes and human rights abuses Israel has committed would keep us here all night. In light of time constraints, I'm going to focus on Israel's three week assault on Gaza that took place a little more than 2 years ago. On December 27, 2008, Israel began Operation Cast Lead, a vicious assault which the UN fact finding mission found as a "deliberately disproportionate attack, designed to punish, humiliate and

terrorize the civilian population.” Let’s take just a minute to mention a handful of the incidences that are documented in this report. The IDF attacked the field office of the United Nations Relief Agency while it was housing 600-700 civilians. Directly and deliberately attacked the Al Wafa hospital with White phosphorous shells causing panic among sick and wounded who had to be evacuated. Used Palestinian civilians as human shields and also attacked a Palestinian farm, flattening chicken coops using an armored bulldozer, killing all 31,000 chickens inside and in the process destroying all of the materials necessary for business. It’s worth noting that this farm supplied Gaza with 10% of its egg supply. Investigators determined that a deliberate and systematic policy of attacking industrial facilities, food production, water treatment plants, and including Gaza’s only cement packaging plant was done by Israel and this may amount to war crimes. I’ve limited my comments to the 2007-2008 assault on Gaza, however I do not want to create the impression that this is the only incident that is relevant. In fact, I don’t even need to point to specific incidences because the occupation is an ongoing daily reality to the Palestinians. As I speak to you, Israel is demolishing homes of Palestinian families and building Israeli settlements in their place. We must face the reality that Israel’s crimes have been made possible by our government and corporations that provide weapons and services to the Israeli Defense Force. The F15 jets, apache helicopters, and guided air to surface weapons used in operation Cast Lead were provided Boeing. Lockheed Martin, the single biggest overseas provider of weapons to Israel has provide Israel with the MK4000, battle tanks, S16 bombers and the hell fire missile system, all of which have been used against Palestinians. In addition to which, these are both companies that UVM holds investments in. I’d like to finish by addressing the topic of Israel’s security and how it relates to a divestment proposal. You will typically hear Israeli apologists arguing for the illegal separation wall , the siege of Gaza, and the 150+ check points in the West Bank are needed to protect Israel because of the existential threat from its Arab neighbors. Let’s take just a moment to look at the validity of this argument. For decades now, the UN annually votes on a resolution for a peaceful settlement in Palestine. The terms of this settlement are the inadmissibility of terrorism required by war, the withdrawal of Israel to the pre-1967 borders and the realization of inalienable rights of the Palestinians towards the right of self-determination. If you look at the history of the voting record on this resolution, it’s 155 votes in favor and 2 in opposition. The two in opposition are Israel and the United States. I should clarify here, as time has gone on they actually have gotten additional support from Micronesia and a couple of others, not exactly heavy hitters. For decades now Israel and the United States have stood in opposition to the rest of world in the rejection of this proposal. To take it a step further, let’s take a look at other countries that are supposedly hell bent on Israel’s destruction. The Arab League which includes the Palestinian Authority, Lebanon, and Iran has endorsed a resolution that is almost identical to that of the UN. In this resolution not only do they agree to recognize Israel, but also to establish normal relations with Israel once it has implemented the internationally agreed upon terms for peace. Again, what are these terms for peace? It’s simply that Israel abide by international law. That’s it. Israel could have peace tomorrow if it wanted to and all it would have to do is abide by international law. However, Israel with the political cover provided by the United States, has been able to defy the international consensus and unilaterally block a resolution to this conflict. As you can see, an argument about Israel’s security does not hold water. I

would like to go a little bit further because I would like to be very clear on my response to this argument. Not only does the occupation have nothing to do with Israel's security, the occupation is making Israel less secure. The action of Israel and the U.S. has placed the Middle East on a trajectory that cannot possibly be maintained. As we've already seen, the support of the U.S. Government and its corporations have allowed Israel to continue on this path, maintain its belligerent stance on international law and basic human rights. If we want to see all of the people in the Middle East, that means Jews and Arabs, safe and secure, then we should be adamantly opposed to the occupations and endorse strategies to bring an end to it. I understand that this resolution has been tabled so that everyone has a chance to be better informed on the subject. I think this is a good thing. I'd like to make a couple of reading recommendations for you. Check out the Goldstone report which is the UN fact finding report on Operation Cast Lead. Read Separate and Unequal, the Human Rights Watch report on Israel's discriminatory treatment of Palestinians in the West Bank. Read Amnesty International report Fueling Conflict, foreign arms supplies to Israel and Gaza. Or, if you want an Israeli perspective, take a look at B'tselem, which is the human rights organization based in Israel. All of these sources are available for free online and can be looked up in a simple Google search. I encourage you to set aside preconceptions you may have had and take an honest look at the occupation. By endorsing this proposal to have UVM divest in companies that directly profit from the occupation, we are joining an international grassroots movement. This proposal deserves our support.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:41.53)

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I have a few questions for you lumped together. Are you aware of the fact that if we were to divest from Israel the university would lose not millions but billions of dollars? It would be leaving us with even greater budget gaps and the way this will come down has been vetoed at other universities, not just based on the fact that it potentially but resolutions like this are polarizing but also financially it doesn't necessarily make sense.

Nolan: First I just want to be careful because language is important. We are not proposing divestment from Israel. We are proposing divestment from American corporations that profit from an illegal occupation. Language is important when we talk about this stuff. In addition to that, it's not entirely clear to me that UVM cannot find other places that aren't equally if not more profitable to place these funds. We simply withdraw from these companies and place them elsewhere. It's not clear to me why this would be a financial hit. These companies that UVM is invested in are actually a relatively small portion of UVM's divestment portfolio. In addition to that, as you learn about the suffering that the Palestinians go through on a day to day basis, I have a difficult time justifying not divesting because of the loss of some money. I may have different priorities, I'm not sure.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Even if you set aside the financial potential losses, to respond to that, even if you're divesting from [inaudible] participation in what is not a nation because it is not formally recognized as a nation, being Palestine, have you

considered the fact that additionally there are an intense numbers of students who a) disagree... are you familiar with the fact that the statistics that show that the terrorist attacks in that area they occupy have dropped? There is statistical evidence that what has occurred actually has benefited certain populations. When you state that what they're doing is illegal in these regions, you're quoting sources from the UN which statistically has a much greater interest in protecting the rights of Arab nations for a number of reasons including the fact that they have control of oil and there are more of them.

Nolan: To answer the question about the wall being effective, this all takes place within the context of an occupation. Just to be clear, the International Court of Justice issued an advisory opinion stating this was illegal. Not only that but over 85% of wall is currently being built on Palestinian land and it's also cutting off Palestinians from the majority of arable, farmable regions. Building an enormous wall is one way to stop attacks. There is another way to stop attacks: end the occupation. These suicide bombings are not coming from people because they are inherently more violent, that would be a racist assumption that I assuming none of us share here. These attacks extend from the suffering of the people that have no resort but to blow themselves up. This should show there is something very wrong that is going on in this particular system. These bombings are in response to the occupation. So how do we get the bombs to stop? We end the occupation. It's very simple. Let's just take another example of the IRA in Ireland, very clearly a terrorist organization that was killing civilians while Britain was occupying them. Britain had a way to defend self. Stop colonizing Ireland. You know what, that worked. When Britain stopped colonizing Ireland, the bombings stopped. It's very simple and it's the same here. Get Israel to abide by international law, end the occupation and resistance to the occupation will end.

Jeff: I'm Jeff Ayers, I'm the managing editor of *The Vermont Cynic* but I'm not speaking in that capacity right now. When you say Britain ended the violence by pulling Ireland, and you say Israel could do that by pulling out of Palestine, isn't that rewarding terrorist actions? Isn't that saying that they won by suicide bombing? I feel like that's rewarding terrorist actions.

Nolan: No it's not. Suicide bombings are completely indefensible. Let me just talk for a second about this issue in particular because is important. Ending this occupation is as much about protecting Israelis as it is about identifying the civil human rights of Palestinians. In Israel right now among children living at the border there are clinically diagnosable levels of anxiety and other disorders. Roughly, depending on the age group, of 70-90% among children who have anxiety about rocket attacks. Families living next to the border when an alarm goes off in the middle of the night about rocket fire sometimes have to choose between running into their bomb shelter and saving themselves or running to grab their 5 year old child and maybe not making it to the shelter. No one should have to do this, no one should have to live like that. The question is, how do we end it. Those rocket attacks are indefensible. Bombings that target civilians are indefensible. The question is how do we stop it. The answer is to end the occupation. There are certain tactics that none of us would ever defend that the Palestinians pursue, attacks that are indefensible. That doesn't mean we don't grant them basic human rights and that doesn't

mean that we don't work for the most simple and equitable way to do that. There has been a resolution in front of the UN bring a peaceful end to this conflict for decades now. Israel and the United States have stood isolated from the rest of world in keeping peace from happening and thus hurting Israeli civilians who have to live with this rotten life.

Chair Adams: I wanted to thank you for coming in. Student for Justice in Palestine is pursuing recognition. They're also one of the fastest constitution returners, just so everyone knows that. My questions is actually quite simple. Could you email out those resources to either myself or Claire just so everyone is in the loop?

Senator Caster: I'd like to thank you. We've been in correspondence. I'd like to thank you for making the point that though brute force works it doesn't necessarily mean that it's legal.

Speaker Chevrier: Thank you for coming. I just wanted to ask you to clarify when you said the way to end the suicide bombing is by ending the occupation, I was wondering if you were aware of fact that, as someone pointed out, that 85% of attacks went down when the wall erected. There was an interview with the head of the Palestinian state asking how come it's so much better in 2003 than in 2002 and he said because people can't get over to blow themselves up anymore. I was wondering if you could speak to that and the word occupation makes me think of Nazi Germany and Nazi Germany was bad, I definitely want to vote for what you're saying but when you think about the actual terms on both sides what your thoughts are for that.

Nolan: The whole thing with the wall is, that's great for Israel. We can continue the occupation without any of the blowback. My point here is that for anyone who is not clear there was the 6 days war in 1967 in which Israel engaged in a war on 3 different fronts and the territories that are relevant here are the West Bank and Gaza which they acquired in assault in the 6 days war. Regardless of whether you think Israel's attack was justified is irrelevant because the point here is that under international law it is illegal to gain territory through war, you just can't do it. Whether you think that Israel's assault was justified, once hostilities ceased, Israel is under obligation to return to its borders. Israel has not done that. Israel has continued to occupy. They are not just occupying, they are colonizing and settling this territory. The issue with the wall there is that these attacks that Israel is facing is a cry from these people who are saying get out of our land. This is illegal, this is unjust. They live in soul crushing poverty. The answer is not to maintain the occupation and just build a wall. That justifies human rights abuses that are taking place. That's not an answer. The answer is to give the Palestinians the same thing that we want to give the Israelis, the same thing the Israelis expect, which is sovereign state, which is equal status citizenship, which is inalienable rights of self-determination. That is the answer, not building a wall and maintaining the occupation.

Stephanie: I just have a question for you. You said that all of this would be solved if Israel would just yield back to its pre-1967 borders and then there wouldn't be any terrorist attacks. How do you address the fact that there were several terrorist attacks prior to 1967 since the 20s, there have been numerous terrorist attacks that occurred before

anything happened in 1967 and also I think the day after Israel offered back pretty much 90% of all of the land, no we're not going to take it back, we're not going to make peace with you.

Nolan: The question about terrorist attacks dating back to the 1920s is somewhat of a complicated question but I will try to answer succinctly. That is the founding of the Israeli Zionist state started as a project of colonization. The beginning of the founding of the Jewish state was that Jews were going to move into Palestinian areas and get Palestinians off the land in order to set up a Jewish state. In addition to this they got the help of Great Britain who was overseeing the territory from 1945 when they took it over from the Ottoman Empire. They enlisted the help of Britain. Quite reasonably, Arabs didn't appreciate having their land taken from them and being colonized. This resulted in a back and forth of hostilities. Again, these things are indefensible. The root of this comes from a colonial settler project. If you go back and read the history of it, the Zionists understood that this was going to create a great deal of hostility in the Arab region so they began setting up the [inaudible], and so that is the source of the hostility. It does go way back and this is a difficult situation, but the occupation is making it worse.

Stephanie: You didn't answer my question how can you say that they would, you know that there were things going on before that, so how can you say that everything would be solved if they retreated to the pre-1967 borders. Also, what do you say about when they disengaged from the Gaza strip and lots of green houses and everything. The green houses were destroyed and there was chaos in that area and there were more attacks than ever.

Nolan: This issue about attacks, the first question about issues of attacks, how do I know that attacks won't happen if they go back to 1967 borders. Clearly I can't predict the future. All I or anyone else can go on is what they've said, which is what I mentioned in my talk. The entire Arab League has endorsed a resolution saying they will both recognize the state of Israel and they will establish normal relations with them if they will adhere to pre-1967 borders. There is a very easy way to find out if they were being honest. Take them up on it. If they are going to make that proposal and say they are going to establish normal relations. Accept the proposal and see if they stick by their word. We've got to remember, Israel loses very little by this. Israel is the 4th largest army in the world. Israel is armed to the teeth. They are by far the leading super power in the Middle East. They can crush anyone at a moments notice. Israel's state of security by taking up the Arab League on this offer is not threatened in the least.

Audience Member: You said that Israel has very little to risk by tying to take up the Arab League on this. They're risking their lives and their nationality. The Arab League and the Arab nations surrounding them have a long history of lying to them and a huge ideological conflict. What they're risking is their country, their state and their lives. How do you propose they do this when the negative outcome is the destruction of Israel? How do you propose they just risk that and trust the Arab League?

Nolan: I guess one of the short answers to that is giving the Palestinians their rights. We have got to understand the Palestinians have absolutely no army right now. The rockets they fire are home made. Giving the Palestinians, this isn't about Iran and Lebanon which relations with Israel are what they are. Israel has nothing but gain from taking the Arab League up on this offer. The only thing that we are talking about is the removal of occupation in Gaza and the West Bank. These people have absolutely no army, literally none. I fail to see how giving these marginalized people the right of sovereignty and self-determination is an existential threat to Israel. What is potentially an existential threat to Israel is pursuing this path. This path is not sustainable. What I'm saying is continuing this occupation is inflaming anger in the Arab world and isolating Israel internationally. There are some very real concerns about attacks on Israel. Continuing an illegal occupation is making those concerns worse and attacks more likely. If you want to see stability in the Middle East, you should be pursuing Israel to abide by international law. That's how we get stability and peace.

Senator Sadek: What I want to say first is that a lot of things you are talking about do seem to have this idea that by divesting we will see stability or some solution to this. I want to know what your thoughts are on this because you seem to think that this is going to solve that problem and I don't necessarily know where you see that happening.

Drew: I'd just like to go off of what John said as well, specifically looking at what this proposal would like to do. I'm wondering why if we look at the history of what other universities have voted against this kind of resolution. You say this isn't a divestment from Israel, but I'm wondering what the perception of UVM is if we come out in favor of this. Doesn't that come across as a strong divestment of Israel and what will that say of our university?

Nolan: The perception of the university depends on the stance that you take here. If you don't support occupation, if you think that everyone deserves equal human rights and you think that settlements in occupied territories are wrong, then UVM coming out and divesting from companies that profit from this is going to send a very clear message about the values that govern our investments. Speaking to the effectiveness of this proposal, this is actually part of a broader movement. In 2005 the Palestinian Civil Society called for boycott divestment sanctions (BDS) international. This is the same technique that was used to end Apartheid South Africa. The technique is that companies that profit from whether its Apartheid South Africa or companies that profit from an illegal occupation as a grassroots movement takes root and more entities begin to divest, it begins to hurt the bottom line of those companies so much so that they then have to end business with Israel in order to attract investment again. As that extends, Israel then has to end the occupation, return to abiding by international law in order to attract foreign investment. UVM singularly divesting isn't going to do a bit of good. It will have us falling in line with values we say, but it's a grassroots movement and it's one that we would be joining.

Audience Member #2: First I want to apologize for taking up so much of you guys time. You have a lot of issues to discuss and this is a larger issue than 50 or 60 college students

can be discussing. I notice that you keep bringing up that if you end the occupation it will be all better. In 2005 there was the beginning to pull out of Gaza and the dismantling of Israeli settlements. I was actually living there at the time, outside Gaza, and there was still an increase in rocket fires. I don't know how you can say there [inaudible] in Gaza. I'm going to do my follow up now because I know how you're going to respond, while there is a blockade they let in water and food and supplies. A strip mall was recently built in Gaza. They are able to get things in stop but they stop things like weapon shipments that tried to come in this past weekend that were stopped. I think it's really to say that this is a full occupation. Yes there are still settlements in the West Bank that aren't protected. This weekend a family of 7, 2 escaped. [Inaudible] by Palestinian terrorists, so I can't say completely that there is an occupation and Israelis are super safe in the West Bank. Everyone is in trouble and I don't see how this opinion of what is supposed to be done. My question is to speak upon do you know much about the actual pull out from Gaza?

Nolan: To speak about the actual pull out from Gaza, the actual settlements were removed. This is why we now refer to it as the siege of Gaza. Any human rights organization you look at will say this is nominal because what is still going on is control of their seaports in which when Gaza fisherman go out more than 5 miles, Israeli gun boats fire at them. There is a brutal siege of their, I'm not sure where he's getting his information from about supplies getting in into Gaza but a united relief agency is providing food to the majority of Palestinians there and import levels in 2008 before the siege began were roughly 17% of what they were even before Hamas had taken power. It is an occupation in every sense of the word. They control seaports, land ports, the air, and telecommunications. People in Gaza who get visas to leave to go to a foreign university are denied the right to leave. The Gaza settlements were dismantled and you know what they did with them? They moved them over to the West Bank.

Hailey: I know you guys, I want to take this back to what the actual proposal says and it references the United Nations. I was just wondering if you know and that you are aware that the United Nations is not an unbiased entity. The countries that are on it there is Israel and over 20 Arab countries that most of which in their charters and constitutions state that Israel should be destroyed. The UN's validity is questioned because the UN has never condoned other countries for human rights violations and the proposal as I understood it is calling on Israel's human rights. Israel in the territories is doing human rights violations. Libya, which is a country that has been in the news lately, sits on the human rights council yet still commits serious violations of the code that it backs up. Sri Lanka, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Darfur, they've never condoned them yet they condoned Israel. Condemned, so sorry. I want to know what you have to say about that and why you used the UN when they clearly have a bias against Israel?

Senator Caster: Point of Information: Libya was just kicked off the human rights council.

Nolan: There's a couple important points here. The UN is a deeply flawed organization. I think we should separate things like the ideals and laws they aspire to which is what this resolution aspires to versus the way that they get carried out and implemented which as

you said are deeply flawed. The idea that the United States is one of the leading representatives is ridiculous if we are going to go by that. The reason that I care about Israel, all those other nations that you mentioned are deplorable and it's wrong that the United Nations is not coming out in opposition to them. The reason that we're targeting the occupation in Israel is because of the role of the United States in allowing it to happen. I may deplore what Libya does, but the fact is there is not a whole lot I can do about it because in many of these cases the United States has done nothing to support these regimes. However, the United States has been solely responsible for supporting Israel and we are responsible for the actions of our government.

Senator Goodnow: Thank you both sides for coming in. It's great to hear different information and get some resources. I'm going to make my point really quick, I really just have a point of clarification. I obviously am not as educated as you guys are on this subject but I am educated on international law and I think it's really fantastic you are using that. Self-determination has been brought up a lot and as far as I'm aware article 7 says that it's not officially recognized as human right. I'm curious how you are using that where you are interpreting a different part of international law that I'm not familiar with, I just could use it better for follow up information for me for next week.

Nolan: If you'd like what I can do, I am nowhere near an expert on international law, I will certainly be back next week. I can focus my when I get up and speak next week on the specifics of international law. I'd be more than happy to do that. I would encourage everyone to look at the 4th Geneva Convention which deals with occupation and what is legal and illegal in the context of an occupation.

Marlee: Hi Nolan, I wanted to thank you for being so well prepared tonight. As a member of the socially responsible investment working group it's very relieving for me to hear that we're dealing with people who are so well read on issues that they are presenting but I did find on speaking tonight just to gauge the opinions of everyone that showed up and I'm really happy that there's been such a dynamic conversation. The issue I wanted to say something about was an issue of language. From what I remember the proposal demands that university divest from American companies profiting from the Israeli war and military and/or illegal occupation of Palestine. What I'm hearing tonight, what I've heard from you is a combination of the illegal occupation and not about the Israeli military. I'm wondering if the proposal would pass without the first part of it and just condemning the occupation?

Nolan: To address there, it is about illegal occupation and we are specifically targeting the illegal occupation. In addition to that there are a great deal of weapons and armaments that are used for enforcing the illegal occupation. There is the day to day siege on civilians. For instance Motorola taking part in the vast and intricate system and network that is required to control the civilian population. Then there are the Lockheed Martins and the Boeings and the General Dynamics that use weapons that are then used in the occupied territories. I would be reticent to say yes to that but I also can't speak from the group. This is something we should have a conversation about. I certainly can't speak for the group as a whole, though I would be interested to speak in more detail about that.

Senator Caster: I just wanted to say in bringing it back to the concept of divestment, the previous divestment cited international law where it cited the cluster bomb treaty. The Board of Trustees report cited the Cluster Bomb treaty to give a definition of what cluster bombs were and that's a treaty that the U.S. didn't sign. I think that's interesting.

Alex: I just wanted to say that there's 4 students here from Students for Justice in Palestine. A lot of these questions might also be answered as we speak as well.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I would like to preface my question with fact that the Miriam-Webster definition of occupy is the possession, use, or settlement of land, which theoretically means that everywhere the U.S. goes we are holding an occupation. I would like to object to the use of the word occupation.

Senator Caster: Point of Information: The definition of occupation he's using is defined by international law not Miriam-Webster.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I'd like to further state that your choice of who is defining what. Amnesty International judging their human rights standards and the UN are equally polarizing statements given that you have. I'd like to further the questions that have been asked by saying I believe the issue we are dealing with and the legislation at hand is the fact that it is solely targeting Israel. Although you are not divesting from Israel as a nation but you are targeting Israel as a nation. I think people in this room would be more comfortable if we were divesting from other Arab nations because we do have war profiteers that we are funding that are not Israeli sponsored. I want to know why you feel comfortable saying we should divest from people supporting Israel and not feel religiously oppressed.

Nolan: Because I am not proposing we divest from people who support Israel. I'm proposing we divest from war profiteers who profit from an illegal occupation. When UVM divested from Apartheid South Africa, the presence of other oppressive regimes in Africa does nothing to delegitimize the movement. I have a lot of issues with U.S. foreign policy and I have a lot of issues with just about every nation in the world. This is a direct part of the reason this is an easily solvable. Israel could have peace tomorrow if it wanted to but it doesn't and the reason is because it's protected by our government and our corporations. That doesn't mean I wouldn't engage in other campaigns.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I'd like to further ask you why you are willing to make that statement but at the same time you're stating...pass.

Audience Member #3: That was a great point. I'd also like to follow up on what John said, practically, for UVM students who are paying a lot in tuition right now, what is that going to do for us? Is the benefit of some ideology of rejecting this as opposed to us as students being hurt right now. I also want to reiterate her question because I don't think you answered it. Why should we specifically target Israel when UVM and our

investments profit in a lot of other war torn countries? Why should we specifically target Israel over other countries?

Senator Bennington: Point of Information: The Board of Trustees has adopted a stance that the university can target investments based on moral and ethical grounds above financial benefits.

Audience Member #3: I would just like to see their stand point on that. I read our common ground and what they define as good. What would your response be, why should we hurt ourselves as students to stand up for something that not all students may believe in.

Nolan: I guess the short answer is because it's the right thing to do. I don't see how we would be hurting ourselves as students and I also don't see anything, it is unfortunate that student's feelings would get hurt but I couldn't tell Palestinians that I didn't go to help them because feelings were going to be hurts. This is just too important and the assault is too great.

Monique, Water Tower (1:21.36)

Monique: Just a clarification and a few things to address. We're not asking for any kind of infringement on the First Amendment, we're asking SGA to issue a statement as a representative the of student body that you all are not endorsing the encouragement of rape or rape culture and more so sexual assault. Just to clarify a few terms for you all, sexual violence is a much more general term for the other terms following underneath it which is sexual assault. Rape is sexual assault in the state of Vermont. Rape and sexual assault is the unwanted coercion into sexual intercourse. Molly or Alex didn't mention anything of the mistake made in the editorial process to me and I was the person to be in correspondence with them from when this all started. I also think there was a misunderstanding about our request about the two fold.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:22.52)

Chair Adams: Are you asking us to pass a resolution totally separate of the *Water Tower* issue?

Avery: It should be addressing the issues brought up by the *Water Tower* article. You are a governing body bringing our sentiments [inaudible]. Whoever drafts that resolution has the power to draft [inaudible]. What is important to us is a strong statement coming from the body saying that we do not condone anything that endorses sexual assault and rape culture.

Senator Lovell: Would more general crimes are bad be ok?

Chair Adams: I would be happy. I have Avery's email, I'll be in touch with you guys we can talk about what you want to see.

Alex, Students for Justice in Palestine (1:24.18)

Alex: Hi, I'm Alex. I'm with Students for Justice in Palestine. I'm not going to talk all night, obviously we'll be talking about this again next week. I think it is great that you decided to put it off because it is such a huge and long conflict and we all really need to know our stuff for. While you do your homework and research on the conflict there are two things I want to address now. A lot has already come up tonight. One is this notion of anti-Semitism and how that plays a role on the attack on the occupation and as well also this idea that divestment is not an appropriate action. First, I think to suggest BDS is anti-Semitic is to equate Zionism with Judaism. One is a nationalism one is a religion. While it's something that Zionists do often I think there is a clear distinction that should be pointed out. The Zionist nationalist movement really didn't pick up until horrors of the Holocaust. Many Jews downright reject Zionism and reject the colonial settler's state. I can denounce and take action against U.S. imperialism whether it's historical colonialism or the support of dictators around the world but I can do this without attacking Americans. This is because they are the practices of the state or a government. Likewise, it's not Israelis or Jews that are impacted by this campaign. These are American companies, huge multinational companies as well, which is ultimately addressing that these are state policies which is very different than the people. Furthermore, Nolan brought up actions of the Israeli state that are putting it in this unstable position. It's the occupation of Palestinian land and the oppression of the Palestinian people that are leading it towards these general hostilities throughout the Middle East towards Israel. As long as it continues its action with a U.S. backed oppressive regime, it's going to be compromising its very existence. I think this campaign not only aims towards divestment but also towards a real stability in the region. Just as backing a [inaudible] is nonsense stability. Genuine democracy in the area can include a Jewish state and a Muslim state. It just doesn't work. UVM is complicit in this occupation with our investments even though it's in direct opposition to International law. My point is it's not Israel we're taking action against and it's certainly not Judaism. The only defense for the actions of Israel are based on nationalism. They're based on a Zionist justification and I think it's important that we look at the political conflict and the imperial nature of the situation. My second point is about why divestment is an appropriate approach. First, it's the occupation and the settlements we are divesting from. I'm glad that points been made because it's so easy to lump this into divesting from Israel. We're divesting in companies profiting from the occupation. It has only been around since 2005, it's extremely young. The divestment campaign against Apartheid South Africa took decades to build and its culmination in the 80s led to the demise of the Apartheid state but it took decades to build. This one's been around 6 years. A few institutions have divested and it would be really exciting if UVM was next. Apartheid South Africa took over a year or maybe two semesters, certainly more than a year. It died down then came back. It was rejected by the administration and the Board of Trustees. It took two entire semesters of activism. Taking over Waterman Building, constant petitioning, handing out information. SGA was huge behind the push for divestment. It took decades to build and I think the institutions that have rejected their divestment campaigns is no less than UVM rejecting the campaign for Apartheid South Africa until a social movement changed that. This is part of a social movement, a grassroots movement. It's a call from Palestinian civil society circumventing the state and saying we can democratically together change the situation for the better. As any real progressive change in the U.S., it's grassroots, it's the people coming together and making the move. There is one more

attack against divestment I'm sure that you are going to come across while you do your research, I think it's great you are giving yourself another week, and that is it's going to hurt the Israeli's and Palestinians. Divestment from South Africa created problems for all South Africans but those who ran the state, the wealthy, needed to be addressed and this was the only way to address the ruling classes. Effect the ruling classes profits and change actually occurs. Divest from the occupation and countries stop doing business make it too expensive to maintain the occupation and it's a political statement. My name is Alex Buckingham abuckham@uvm.edu. While you're doing your homework if you come across questions that aren't here right now you should feel free to email me. I'd be happy to help you out with resources and to answer certain questions because it's bound to happen, there's so much information. A lot of people here are well versed on conflict. We've decided not to bring everyone up here because it's getting late, there's a lot of other questions. We'll be coming back next week as well with coming back including questions you've already asked, a stronger argument for companies we're attacking. I really don't want to keep you here any longer. If you want to ask any questions just write it down and I'll get back to you, but I need to get going as well.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:32.13)

Chair Adams: Point of Information: I'll send out Alex's email so you all have it and I will send out the president of VSI's email as well.

Sidney Steeler, on the *Water Tower*

Sidney: Hi everyone, my name is Sidney Steeler and I'm a sophomore. I want to talk a little bit about the *Water Tower*, not too long. I was pretty offended personally and then talking to students I heard a lot of people I spoke with and it's been a pretty broad group I would say felt pretty attacked by article. I don't know if people from the *Water Tower* are here. I think it would be cool to send the author to the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference, I don't know if that's in your jurisdiction.

Senator M. White: Point of Information: It's not

Sidney: I'll redirect this train of thought somewhere else about the repercussions for the article. I was really upset especially with the like timing in the political structure of America with the Planned Parenthood attack. I feel like there are a lot of attacks on women and I'm really torn up about that. With personal experiences through friends and media and all these different forms getting information condoning date rape, giving girls drugs, condoning date rape through means to get someone to have sex with you and then not having public funds to go through, the whole thing is just really offensive and I think that SGA should definitely pass a resolution in support of the student population not condoning this type of thing, especially if it's not intentional. I think there should definitely be an SGA resolution.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:34.49)

Chair Adams: Thank you for coming in and thank you, you additionally came to our committee meeting which is really awesome to hear your input there. Just so you know the writer is actually not a member of the *Water Tower*. He just submitted the article so they can't even hold him accountable.

Sidney: I've had some problems with the *Water Tower* recently. I have a lot to say but I feel like it's getting into your time. I really would love if you could pass a resolution in favor of my opinion.

Senator Tepper: Point of Information: you can feel free to email anyone on senate with your concerns.

Senator Bennington: Thanks for coming in. Sorry that we are making you feel rushed we are your senate and we will listen to you as long as you want to talk.

Tamar, speaking on the Divestment Proposal (1:36.13)

Tamar: This is unorthodox because I'm speaking about the divestment proposal and it's unorthodox because I'm going to speak mostly about emotions and not facts which might be more interesting. I'm Tamar, I'm an Israeli citizen. I was born and raised there. I was an Israeli citizen, born and raised there for the first 5 years of my life. I don't love public speaking but I feel like this is important. I have an ongoing relationship with Israel, I have spent time there every year of my life. I have friends and family there. I have experienced a diverse range of emotions there. I enjoyed hiking in the north with my cousins, spending time in Jerusalem with my grandparents. I've also cried at the separation wall, I've interned with the Israeli human rights organization and my father is a founding member. I come from this lineage of social justice and works strongly in works strongly for social justice. I'm here to give voice to my values and I'm not spouting facts. I'm not speaking as a representative of anything or Jstreet which is a group starting on campus with Sam. I'm not speaking on behalf of those, just as myself. I'm speaking out of a place of love, which i don't think you normally equate with this topic. I love Israel, I love justice. That doesn't have to be mutually exclusive. To be clear just because I love Israel doesn't mean I love Israeli policy. I love Israel because my loved ones live there and I have a deep connection to those people. Dr. Cornell West said "justice is what love looks like in public" and I love him. I will publically declare my love. I love Israel but I don't love the occupation. The Israeli government's occupation of Palestinian land speaking post-'67 is unjust, there is no doubt in my mind. The second class treatment of Palestinian citizens is unconscionable and goes against all my values as a Jew, as an Israeli, as an American, as a person in the world. I am committed to struggle for peace for Israelis and Palestinians and settlements stand as huge obstacles. Clearly the status quo is not sustainable. There is no reason that the University of Vermont which is on the cutting edge of education that focuses mostly on sustainability should be connected in any way to an unjust sustainable system, therefore I encourage SGA to further research this and speak about language and ultimately endorse this resolution. I am staunchly for this divestment because I'm invested in social justice in peace. You

have to invest your social energy and values and your love. I will end on that note of love.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:40.17)

Senator Caster: Thank you.

Sam Hendler, (1:40.28)

Sam: Hi guys, I'm Sam Hendler I'm a junior community development and applied economics major. I'm co-leading the JStreet U group that is a fledgling young group here at UVM. I have a long and personally challenging relationship with Israel. I'm Jewish, I've visited many times over the course of my life, most recently last spring. I spent 6 months studying at the Arabad Institute for environmental studies in southern Israel. These studies gave me a unique perspective on the Israeli Palestinian conflict. 1/3 of my classmates, including my roommate, were Palestinians. The young Palestinians women wore ?? and class breaks were designed so that Muslim students could pray the mandated 5 times per day. Another 1/3 of my classmates were Israeli. You can imagine there was a lot of interesting discussion, this type of forum is not new to me. I participated in a research project in a small village in the West Bank, one that felt the severe side effects of being a small village right next to an expanding settlement. Through all of this I built some of my closest friendships with Palestinians and Israelis alike, and bonded with what we saw around us. What is happening in the West Bank and Gaza saddens me. From the lack of services to the lack of freedom of movement, Palestinians are suffering in unacceptable ways. Our job now is to evaluate whether divestment is an appropriate action for our University to take to create positive change in this deeply troubled situation. I feel strongly that this proposal does not do that. I am not here to vilify or question the motives of those who call for divestment. If I were a Palestinian living in the West Bank or Gaza I would hope to have the restraint and mindfulness to act in a non-violent nature in the BDS movement. However, that does not mean divestment is appropriate. For me on personal moral level, I have a problem with any divestment proposal that proposes a blanket divestment from anything having to do with the Israeli military. This would imply that we do not support Israel's right to defend itself through its military. It would also imply that services like first aid that are very important in that area will go through conflict in the next years are not appropriate things for companies to be doing. I can't support any proposal that doesn't somehow delineate between the military and settlement specifically. I personally can't support anything that doesn't do that. On a strategic level, I feel that divestment is a poor tactic that will not produce positive change. In a world full of radicalization, it is not us making what is a radical decision that will create the change I want to see. Instead it will be to bring people back to the middle that will create change. If encouraging one body that actually has power over Israel to use that to make powerful change. That one body, of course, is the U.S. government. In the paradigm of American Israeli relations, this would be a radical one. You can see that other universities have seen this kind of proposal and to my knowledge, there may be one or two of them that have passed it, but to my knowledge one has. It is my belief that radical actions against Israel will only prompt Israel to take radical defense actions. Instead of eroding our relationship with Israel, we should be encouraging our government to take advantage of the strength of this relationship and move more forcibly towards a peaceful resolution. We should lobby Vermont senators including Bernie Sanders who

spoke personally with students from Vermont at the Jstreet national convention about his commitment towards a peaceful resolution. A letter condemning violence of all forms from the violent slaughter in Ithamar that was brought up earlier, but also to the structural violence which with the stroke of a pen and in the name of security can be just as devastating. Instead of destroying bridges we should be building bridges. We could be building partnerships with Palestinian universities such as Al Quds University in East Jerusalem or Bethlehem University so our students can see firsthand what is happening. We could have student trips that take on infrastructure problems in the West Bank that will actually improve the day to day lives of Palestinians now. When day come that a peaceful resolution is possible, Palestinians will have a country within which they can flourish. I know firsthand how badly those projects are needed. This is undoubtedly a complicated situation. For me divestment is not the answer. I ask you to please vote against this resolution.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:46.26)

Senator Bennington: Point of Information: This would not be a blanket divestment from companies invested in the Israeli military profiting from the occupation. It would simply mandate I guess the Board of Trustees to sanction a third party of investors to look into the issue.

Sam: Referring to a specific line from the proposal, does anyone have the proposal on them? “And to divest from campiness contractually involved with and profiting from the occupation by supplying products to the Israeli military.” My interpretation was that any company supplying products to the Israeli military would be thus profiting from the occupation.

Senator Bennington: That’s the just the process of how they go. You mentioned bridging between other universities in Palestine. I wonder if you have any knowledge of other universities that are doing that or how we could start doing that.

Sam: I had founded a group called Dorm room diplomacy that is starting on Monday. We have developed connections with Bethlehem University and Am Nerage (?) University. We’re doing video conferences with UVM students once a week. We’re doing video conferences once a week, two hour sessions with a facilitator for American students. Things like this we can be doing here on campus. We can encourage students to go on programs where they actually meet people who are there. That’s just a couple things I can think of off the top of my head.

Old Business (1:49.04)

Bill Consolidating Class Councils (1:49.10)

Senator Yeager: *[reads bill]*.

Chair Adams: They’re combining. It’s much simpler for us because it shrinks four clubs into one and usually it goes the other way.

Senator Yeager: And it's much better for first years because they will actually have some kind of structure going into class council

Vote on Bill Consolidating Class Councils - passes

Bill Allocating Funds to Salsa and Swing Society (1:51.43)

Chair Mallea: I am going to read the bill as usual and if you have any questions let me know. [*Reads bill*].

Vote on Bill Allocating Funds to Salsa and Swing - passes

Bill Allocating Funds to Shooting Sports (1:53.07)

Chair Mallea: I'd like to propose in the agenda that it be consistent and be changed to bill allocating funds not bill allocating money. [*Reads bill*].

Open the Floor for Questions (1:54.11)

Chair Adams: Do you know how many people they are sending to nationals?

Chair Mallea: Yes I do. They are sending... the original request was for \$4,500 and I'd have to check my notes how many people they are sending. Does anyone remember? Sorry I don't remember.

Vote on Bill Allocating Funds to Shooting Club – passes

Emergency Business (1:55.17)

Bill Allocating Funds to Women's Club Volleyball (1:55.20)

Chair Mallea: [*reads bill*].

Open the Floor for Questions (1:56.15)

Senator Moise: Friendly amendment to add an o in Houston, Texas.

Vote on Bill Allocating Funds to Women's Club Volleyball – passes

Bill Allocating Funds to Exploring Discrimination and Bias Conference (1:56.46)

Chair Mallea: This one is a little bit different. We've been having conversations before spring break and since break. Clubs and conferences and UVM students who are not members of SGA recognized clubs really aren't eligible for funding. After speaking to people who running the Exploring Discrimination and Bias Conference, Pat Brown

suggested they go through the diversity enhancement fund. Just to give some history before I read this bill, the diversity enhancement fund was created originally for non SGA clubs and students who wanted to put on conferences but maybe weren't recognized as an SGA club would be eligible for this funding. Although we haven't been operating that way currently, this is an option we can use.[*reads bill*]. The reason why we brought this up although it is less than \$2,000 was to make Senate aware that we were allocating money to a group that is not SGA recognized and make sure that was ok with senate.

Open Floor for Questions (1:58.37)

Chair Filstein: How much did they originally ask for?

Chair Mallea: \$450

Chair Filstein: Why didn't we grant them the full amount?

Chair Mallea: They said the cost dropped so they were only requesting \$400.

Senator Caster: Just to reiterate in terms of what this means. Could any group of collective request from this funding pool? And how much was in this funding allocation? How much money is allocated for the diversity enhancement fund?

Chair Mallea: The diversity enhancement fund is part of the supplemental funding process. There are different categories, there is uniforms, there's nationals, there is gas, there's cultural diversity. Right now when you look at spread sheet. Previously the fund was originally created for non-SGA clubs and it hasn't been operating that way in the past. Treasurer Salsgiver and I have been working really hard to see if we can create an additional fund in next year's budget for non-SGA recognized clubs to put on events for the University of Vermont community. We've been working on that. Right now, the cultural diversity and enhancement fund started out the year with \$9,500 and currently has \$6,760.

Chair Adams: I just want to say I think this is a great way to use the cultural diversity fund. I think tonight has shown that we need to encourage students to attend conferences like this and it's a good step to put our money where our mouth is.

Vote on Bill Allocating Funds to Exploring Discrimination and Bias Conference – passes

New Business (2:00.56)

Senator Caster: Resolution Endorsing the Potential Divestiture of the University Investments from Companies Profiting from the Occupation of Palestine.

Chair Adams: Motion Censuring President Mensah

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Resolution Greek Life on their Progress towards Dismantling Rape Culture

Senator Rifken: Resolution Asking for State Level Funding at the University of Vermont

Executive Reports (2:01.38)

Speaker Chevrier: Sorry we have to do this tonight. I will email out the rest of my report but right now we have to do Constitutional amendments. They have been on table since 2 weeks ago so it says we now have to vote to open the constitution. It says that an amendment is not allowed to be presented on same night as we open the constitution but they were presented two weeks ago as laid out by the constitution. We now have to open the Constitution with a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote. Then we'll have to pass the amendments with a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote. Elections will not be able to run the way the Constitution Committee has been talking about if we don't discuss this now so let's go on.

Senator Rifken: We are opening the constitution for elections stuff as well?

Speaker Chevrier: Thank you for your question. It's not about election stuff. We are opening the constitution to talk about how half of you are on-campus and half of you are off-campus and that affects elections because it affects who we are allowed to elect.

Vote on Opening the Constitution – passes

Speaker Chevrier: Here are the changes. We've thrown in a couple changes because opening the constitution is really difficult. It used to be that the attendance policy is a sole power of the speaker which is kind of ridiculous and last year there were problems where the speaker wanted to choose what chairs wanted to do in their own committees so we're adding something that says committee chairs are responsible for creating their own attendance policy for committee meetings and then notifying the speaker of violations and regular rules for the speaker to make rules about actual senate.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:04.12)

Chair Adams: Sorry can you scroll up is this in the senator, shouldn't it be in your members have to attend all meetings in accordance with attendance policy of the chair and add it as a responsibility of the chairs in that section?

Speaker Chevrier: The reason why we chose to put it here is because says everywhere that everyone has to abide by the attendance policy so we added it under general guidelines to give committee chairs that option.

Chair Filstein: Can you explain what this is? I don't how I feel about different senators having different expectations in regards to committee meetings.

Speaker Chevrier: Last year, Speaker Dru Ellis only allowed one unexcused absence and 2 excused absences before you had to have a meeting with her. That included committee meetings and regular meetings and if you were absent at the beginning of the meeting and at the end of the meeting that was two absences. A lot of chairs got angry and fostered anger in exec and that was bad. I think Chairs should be able to have ownership of their own meetings. That was the idea behind it. We also brought it to you guys and you can totally vote it down. If you vote against the amendment it will just remain the speaker's job.

Senator Benner: Have you thought about potentially making it so the committee chair policy has to be approved by speaker just in case the policy is wildly inappropriate. Friendly amendment to creating an attendance policy with approval by the speaker.

Speaker Chevrier: It won't let me edit it so denied.

Chair Adams: Friendly amendment to change it from the executive committee shall be responsible for creating an attendance policy for their committee meetings and chairs shall be responsible for notifying the speaker of any violations.

Speaker Chevrier: I'll accept that one and will add it pending this amendment being approved.

Senator Rifken: Can you read that one more time?

Speaker Chevrier: *[re-reads change]*.

Senator Rifken: I just want to make sure that there is not referring simply to the executive committee and not chairs of committees.

President Mensah: Point of Information: The executive committee does refer to the 7 committee chairs. The exec branch is the 3.

Chair Filstein: Friendly amendment to add the word standing committees so it's directly referring to us here.

Chair Adams: I wanted to take out their own and change it to an attendance policy.

Speaker Chevrier: We're going to change it to *[reads change]*.

Chair Adams: and chairs shall be responsible for notifying the speaker.

Vote on Change to Constitution - Passes

Speaker Chevrier: I'll talk about this now. This just has to do with getting rid of on and off campus. There's a whole bunch of different places, I don't think it's necessary to vote on every change I think we can just delete on and off campus divisions. We've done a lot

of research on it and we're trying to figure out why it is that we still have on and off campus. Half of this body is on-campus and half of this body is off-camps. I've talked with a lot of comparable school around the area and very few of them do it this way because they say it's confusing and tricky. A few of them already had it but they have gotten rid of it and said now they're working better. Some of them do still like it. We're trying to figure if anyone actually only votes because they only talk to people that are on and off campus. We talked about different ways of doing things. We said maybe we could totally do it by year instead but do you really only talk to people in your year? Are you only representing people in your year? Then we thought about having quotas from each college but then we might have 8 seats always open because no one from Nursing and Health Sciences ever seems to want to be on this body. Then we would have a less effective body with more open spots. If we held open spots it would be skewing it for other colleges who would then be able to fill the priorly held positions. This is a whole big cluster fluff and we think that we should get rid of it. I've talked to some people who are terrified for this free for all and another word for free for all is popular vote. Last year it took 7 votes to get on from off campus and it took 212 to get on from on campus. That's ridiculous. That's not a popular vote. We voted last year this senate voted against the Electoral College in general because we want a popular vote and I think we should do the same for our elections. Last year I was chair of Student Activities and even though my lease was for off campus, I lived in the Davis Center. A lot of people have a terrible fear that things are going to go awry but that's why the constitution committee exists. If this doesn't work it's their duty to revisit this next year and maybe reinstate on and off campus or some future better idea.

Senator Rifken: Point of Inquiry: I want to discuss it and would this be the appropriate time for discussions.

Speaker Chevrier: If anyone has questions this is the time. This is kind of like bills you can just state your mind and I won't have opportunity to respond.

Senator Caster: I just wanted to say that particularly enjoyed your quote right there "a free for all is just another name for a popular vote."

Senator Vitagliano: Can we go to section in the constitution that we're talking about?

Speaker Chevrier: That's right here, I can read it to you right now. I skipped to this part. [reads old version]. We are voting to get rid of that. That's what we're voting on right now. There are 2 separate issues that we're going to tackle later on how many seats to hold for first years.

Chair Adams: Just sort of point of inquiry is it not a conflict of interest for all of us running to then vote on this?

Speaker Chevrier: The truth is most of what we're voting on is a conflict of interest whether it's priority registration either you had it or you wanted it. This is something we have to vote on because we are the only people able to do so.

Senator Rifken: I have a couple points for leaving it in for the moment. Though this might not be the best way of running it I think that having nothing in there could be a little bit dangerous and there are opposing viewpoints. Just saying that our university is different in the way we do have similar proportion of on campus students and off campus students. I know from my experience in the residence halls you kind of have a greater number people close to you, you have a very easy way to campaign and get friends signatures and that plays a huge part into this. If I were living off campus campaigning against all these people that are in the residence halls, it would mean more work for me. Maybe that's what we want to do. I just think that's an important consideration.

Senator M. White: The argument for what we are doing here. The lowest 14 vote getters for last year, 2 remain. Off campus people that got on that are still here all got roughly 200 votes.

Speaker Chevrier: I got the most senatorial votes and I was off campus last year and I got the most votes out of everyone.

Chair Adams: You also ran a Presidential campaign. I don't feel comfortable getting rid of this I'm going to abstain because I'm running and I do see it as a conflict of interest. Second of all I think it would be interesting to explore doing this as a proportion of class year. It could be an interesting way of combining them both. For example, Senator Vitagliano is living on campus next year and I'll be off campus next year but we'll both be seniors.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I just like to echo Katie's concerns that there is a similar, while the concerns of off campus and on campus students aren't super polarizing I think they do exist and to just get rid of it is too sweeping a gesture. I think that just getting rid of it takes away the only real structure in voting. Even if you had had those lowest 14, basically if you look at it the lowest 14 people still would have been on senate if there had been a general election. I'm wrong never mind. Ultimately what it comes down to is you have a policy in place right now for presidential campaign. I have to go door to door right now with someone when I go to the dorms because I live off campus and you're putting a direct advantage in the hands of students that live on campus because they live in dorms.

Chair Adams: Point of Information: You're not allowed to go door to door.

Speaker Chevrier: Point of Information: you are allowed to go door to door but only if you are with someone who lives in that residence hall.

Senator Vitagliano: I'm in support of this change because when you look back to last year's elections there were people with very minimal votes to get on to the body but that's taking away from on campus students that did really want to be part of this body but they didn't receive enough votes but they could have been a beneficial asset to SGA but weren't given opportunity with this restriction.

Senator Mason: I don't know if there is a better alternative to this for people who don't feel comfortable getting rid of it. I can see supporting the on campus off campus thing if it was the same amount of votes that you had to get in order to get on to the body universally. Ideally if you are a junior, senior and you've been through your first two years you should probably know enough people. My first lecture hall was 200 people not that they actually know me. Speak up I'm sure you can get enough votes. If someone has to get like 12 votes and someone has to get like 300 votes to get on to the body. That's just not fair at all, not cool with me.

Senator Rifken: 2 points for most of us last year's election was the first election we've seen but in the past it hasn't always been this skewed this was new least year and we were surprised. I'm just putting that out there for people who have not been a part of elections in the past in past. The second thing is I know this has been out for two weeks and I talked to friends about this too but the fact that it hasn't really been out to students makes me nervous because we're changing their representation right now and that makes me a little bit wary for this.

Senator Yeager: To go off of Senator Rifken's point, let's say that the entire senate is represented by on campus students. What about all the positions that need off campus representatives like the Board of Trustees selection committee or anything like that. That would all have to change as well. Right now it's 50/50, I think it should be potentially more on and less off campus but I still think that off campus should be represented or at least guaranteed.

Speaker Chevrier: In Constitution Committee we've already gone through every one of these questions in depth trying to figure out a better way to do this and we couldn't which is why we're here today proposing this. As far as class year, there are a couple of people in here who are going to be 5th year seniors. Do we pull the plug and say they don't get it then seniors get an unrepresented larger proportion. Also, there are less seniors than there are first years and that changes every year so every year we have to open the constitution and hypothesize how many seats there are going to be for each class proportional with 42 senators and then change it every year. Plus, how many of you only talk to people in your grade? I'm a senior and I'm mostly in first year classes because of the way I did my majors backwards, so if I only talk to people in my classes then I would be the only one in my class that is talking to only seniors. As far as the way that it worked in previous years my first year running, 2008, it was much harder to get on from off campus so Senator Rifken was saying it's not always much harder for on campus it was definitely not even prior to next year either. It took a lot more votes to get on from off campus than on campus. Then with the Eco block there were a lot of people from the Greenhouse and Slade it went the other way and it was much harder to get on from on campus. It was never even that you needed exactly 100 votes to get on from on campus and off campus that just never would have happened. As far as off campus representation having to change I have no idea what you're talking about. As far as trying to figure out different random committee around campus that would be the duty of the vice president, I'm assuming that it's going to be a person in this room it would be their duty to look harder

because they would not be able to ask their cohorts on senate. It's not exactly even right now. There are more people living on campus then off campus. Also what do you do about transfer students that are technically seniors. What would we do about continuing ed students if they are now able to be degree seeking could come for 90 years. As far as class break up. Do you only talk to people who live on campus or off campus to figure out what you want to do on senate? Do you think that you are only voting a certain way because you have a lease or because you are in a res hall? I know that when I was a senator I was definitely failing at that job because most of my friends were mixed. I don't see any reason to keep unless you are planning to only ever talk to someone who lives in the same place as you.

Chair Adams: Continuing ed students don't pay the student activities fee so they would never eligible. I do think you do have a different perspective. As a senior, my views tend to ally more with Senator Mason and Moise then they do with Senator Ravech even though all three of those people live on campus. Also, we don't have to change the constitution every year to change the proportion. We could write in that would be the duty of the elections chair and then it could come up as a bill. In that case the senate would still have some control over it, we could just delegate it as a responsibility of the elections chair.

Senator Mustacchi: Personally as an upper classmen I do know what the concerns for the on campus students are because I've been in that position, but if I were on campus, I really wouldn't have a clue about what seniors are concerned about living off campus. I understand where you're coming from with the two few votes. I think it would be nice if there was at least 10 seats reserved for on campus off campus and the rest be a free for all or a popular vote so at least there would be some guarantee that the off campus representation would be there.

Senator DeVivo: I wanted to point out what senator M. White pointed out, the people who want to be here and work hard, anyone who really wants to be on senate can get enough votes to be on senate. I think that we're all in enough classes and everyone at this school knows enough people and the people that are involved in things and have relationships through being involved in things can do that. If we were going to do a scenario where it was up to the elections chair, I would really like to know how in a given year to year we could possibly get that ratio because as Speaker Chevrier put it, in one year it completely flip flopped. I don't know how we would get that ratio and predict the future.

Speaker Chevrier: We put a lot of time and effort into this. If you don't want it don't vote for it. I just don't see that it's working and in conversation that I've had a lot of people say it's not working and if they have some sort of terror of this free for all popular vote then they haven't come up with other suggestions that are. Lastly, IRA is an entire body meant to deal with on campus issues. That leans it towards on campus issues and away from off campus. Greek life has always been a confusing issue because first and second years are allowed to live in Greek housing [inaudible] will be erased if we pass this. [reads change].

Vote on this Change - fails

Speaker Chevrier: The next one is if there are 3 empty, this is making the Constitution the same exact thing that we already updated in the operational documents, making it 3 empty seats and 2 weeks, it has to do with mid-term elections.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:30.38)

Senator Rifken: Would this are we just striking this? Will this just be for the operational documents? Is there a need for it in the Constitution?

Speaker Chevrier: It's under composition under section d that specified elections regulation in the operational documents. It's up to you if that's necessary in the constitution as well.

Vote on this change – passes

Chair Filstein: It was my understanding that the Constitution was supposed to be open for two weeks. Did we not just vote to open it now?

Speaker Chevrier: It says that the amendments have to be on the table for two weeks. I sent this out two weeks and it says that it has to be public so sent it to Jess to publicize on the website two weeks ago.

Senator Filstein: So it doesn't need to be open for two weeks that was just how we've done it in the past?

Speaker Chevrier: No I just checked it. *[reads rule]*.

Chair Adams: Can we add those friendly amendments?

Speaker Chevrier: Yes, friendly amendments are different than proposed amendments. Now the other thing is that we need to change the Constitution right here because it was changed under President and Vice President, that change was made when I was away, that you don't have to be a full time student. You have to be an undergraduate degree seeking student taking 4 or more credits, so we thought it would be prudent to make the qualifications the same for President, Vice President and Senate, making the constitution agree with itself.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:33.16)

Chair Adams: Friendly Amendment to change it to students paying the student activities fee. That's what we hold our clubs to, I think that's what we should have for ourselves.

Speaker Chevrier: Point of Information: Then you don't have to be a student. Any community member can pay the student activities fee.

Chair Adams: I would then change it to undergraduate degree seeking students paying the Student Activities fee because that's arbitrarily set at 4 credits but it could change.

Speaker Chevrier: I am going to say no to that just because then we would have to go back and change the other places in our constitution and our operational documents because a friendly amendment wasn't given then and so the other places say taking 4 credits or more. That's what it's says.

Vote on this Change – passes

Speaker Chevrier: This is the big one. We decided we should change, this was thinking that the on and off campus thing would pass and it didn't. Right now we currently hold 5 seats for first year elections and we wanted to boost that to 7 and make that so be a little more classy divided. Also, I think it's silly that first years are the largest class and we only hold 5 seats for them. It is likely that throughout the year first years are appointed but not sometime when it's harder to get on and off campus. We wanted to change it to 7.

Senator Ravech: Doesn't that decrease amount of students for on campus in the spring?

Speaker Chevrier: It will change the amount of open seats so it will be from

Senator M. White: Point of Information: We'll have 35 seats if we do change it to 7 then we're going to have 35 seats open in this elections so on campus and off campus are going to be up and down by one.

Speaker Chevrier: First years are always on campus so it would take 7 seats away from on campus right now.

Vote on this change – fails

Speaker Chevrier: This is unchanged again because this was the same thing. I believe that's it. I'll email the rest of my report.

Vote to Close the Constitution – passes

Vice President Maciewicz (2:37.34): I hope everyone had a great spring break and had a little time to relax. A few updates. I went to the campus leadership forum today and a few updates about the budget. I hope all of you saw President Fogel's campus wide email that he sent out. I urge you all to read it there are some graphs I think are informative. I sent one out last night I believe last night basically says same thing. Look that over especially if interested in the budget. We will be talking about it more. See Senator Rifken, I know she's doing awesome things with the Budget Ad Hoc and I know Vice President Cate for Finance and Investment is coming to the next meeting. Check that out if you are interested. What I learned today is that the university is pushing for 0% salary increase for all employees including unionized faculty and staff. For unionized employees it is up

to a collective bargaining agreement which means that the administration and the unions need to go back and forth to reach an agreement. The administration is quite firm that they would like to see no one get a raise this year to help balance the budget and keep cuts and tuition down but that is up to the union process so we don't know for sure what that is going to look like. Several representatives of the faculty and staff were upset that President Fogel had just appointed a new business dean whose salary is in excess of \$300,000. With benefits it's almost half a million dollars making the business dean the second highest paid person at the university only after President Fogel. He will be making more than the Provost and a lot of them were upset of the timing and the irresponsibility of that decision. The administration did say that is the going salary for a Business School Dean and you really can't recruit one for less and that they just cost more money than a professor of social science. It was quite heated take it for what it is but the moral of that story is that whether the faculty will agree to a 0% increase this year seems more up in the air because of how upset they are about the business school search. We'll see how that all ends up. Provost Knodell also expressed interest in coming to talk to us in the next few weeks about growing internationalization at UVM, expanding programs to bring students from other countries to UVM. The university is very committed to its program with China, USSP< expand that to other countries and increase the number of students who are international students as part of a way to enrich UVM culture and campus. She will explain it all to you and I will leave that up to her. She will be coming whenever she can schedule a time. Not next week but the meeting after we will be voting on end of the year senate awards. There are 3 awards that I run. One is the SGA service award which is the senator who has best promoted community service and devotion to the community. The next one is the SGA diversity award which is for the senator who best promotes an unbiased welcoming community through their work on SGA and final is the Gormley award which is for outstanding senator senior who made the biggest difference in their time on senate. The Gormley family comes to our end of the year banquet and they have endowed some money for this award so we will meet all of them. Their son served on senate in 1980s and he passed away so they created this award to honor service in SGA. We will be voting on this March 29, it's two weeks away. Whatever two weeks from today is. We will be voting on it at senate during my report you can vote for who you want to be. At the banquet I will present a plaque and Gormleys will present something to whoever gets that award. I'm moving ahead with the reorganization of back room called the cage. I've been cleaning it, it is a magnet for junk and clutter, so getting crap out of there. Also reassigning the locked space. A lot of clubs who have them don't exist or don't use them so we're just reassigning them. Asking clubs who want space there to justify why they need it. Introducing it to clubs that want locked locker space in the cage. Reorganization hasn't been done since 2008 with Kesha and DaVaughn Vincent Bryant. I think over half of the lockers are for clubs that don't exist or just don't need it. That's my ending project to get that back room in order. I know a lot of clubs would love locked space in the Galaxy space and they can't get it. That's something I promise can make happen before I leave. Office improvements are in progress, the painting is going on. Most of the new signs we ordered are up except the one in the hallway. That is starting to finish itself up. I sent out an email about the kitchen a couple days ago. I will explain it again for right now. We changed the code. The kitchen will be open during all normal business hours for anyone who wants to use it

which is 8am to 4:30pm. If you would like the code for after business hours, please come see me and I will most likely give it to you. If the kitchen is handled responsibly then my goal in the next week or two is to keep it open at all times granted that the space is kept cleanly and not abused. There was an act of vandalism on the door which sort of disturbed me and the office staff and I certainly don't appreciate. We are going to continue with this open door policy and hoping to remove this as an issue. I hope you know that we are trying to seek a compromise. The people who work with the SGA every day feel really offended by the way the space is treated but at the same time I we're all students and I see the benefit of keeping it open. I'm really trying to make both sides happy and move towards an open policy but I can say people vandalizing and intentionally disrespecting the decisions I make is pretty offensive to me and the job I do. I would ask that you don't do that. It was pretty disturbing when Blanka and Jess got there this morning. If you have any ideas or criticisms about the kitchen please come talk to me. I think it's much more productive to do it face to face than in email or posting things on the walls or doors of the office. That's not how business should be done, it's unprofessional and we should all know better. The last thing is remember to save the dates for the two end of the year banquets. April 5 is the one President Fogel is hosting for us. You should have gotten an email from his event planner. It's April 5 from 5:30-7:00. Then there's the one that Kofi, Liz and I are throwing before our last meeting April 12. Both in Billings, both will be a great time and I hope you can make it and celebrate all the things we've done this year.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:45.59)

Chair Mallea: I appreciate that you brought up the Business School dean issues. I feel that I'm really torn on this issue. I sat on the search committee to find the new dean and it was a really long rigorous process. There were a lot of qualified candidates and we were unsure if Sanjay Sharma was going to accept the position or not. I'm also really torn because he has such a high salary, higher than the provost. I'm just curious if anything was mentioned in the search committee about the end result or if they suggested maybe we should have looked for a candidate that was less qualified.

Vice President Maciewicz: Who we mostly heard from was representatives from the faculty senate. They expressed no frustrations in his selection but his price tag. More the opinion that if he could only be hired for \$320,000 plus benefits which comes out to about \$500,000 a year then we should have passed and gone to someone else. There was also the suggestion that private gifts to the business school could also covers his salary for a couple of years while the university is going through hard times. It was not any attack on him because he's actually well known in his field as being a brilliant business school administrator but the timing of him costing so much money and departments being asked to cut down or freeze hiring. President Fogel and Knodell didn't really touch the issue. There was a lot of push back from the faculty though.

Chair Mallea: Point of Information: I'd also like to point out I loved the article that Kofi sent out but his wife also came to UVM and is a professor in the Business School which

was a little bit of the area of controversy because she's not on salary as well. It's really expensive.

Senator O'Brien: I'm curious if you if Richard Cate is going to say anything about the budget proposal?

Vice President Maciewicz: He's coming to next budget ad hoc meeting. I'm sure he would be more than willing to come to senate but I don't know of any plans yet.

Senator Rifken: Point of Information: he has given me times to come in and so we're going to have to work with that for budget ad hoc. Not this week but next week at some point.

Senator Alleger: talking about the cage, there's also a storage area by the loading dock for club football and stuff. We have a locker there and was talking with some of the guys that work down there and it seems like stuff has been there for a long time. In the mood of spring cleaning maybe we should get that space so some clubs could use it.

Vice President Maciewicz: I don't directly manage that space, it's done through DC Operations, but I sit on a 3 person committee who advises Davis Center policy and I'm one of them along with Alan Josie and Pat Brown. I can definitely bring it up to them. It would be more their call. I know SGA also has some space down there but I will bring that up to them next time is see them. I don't know what the process is but I will get back to you.

Chair Adams: Point of Information: I believe the space you are talking about is used for so it only gets touched in the summer.

President Mensah (2:49.58): Happy Tuesday everyone quickly welcome back. We had an interesting meeting tonight and hopefully most of you were able to have a relaxing spring break. I see some of you including David came back tan so hopefully that is indicative of a good spring break. So Priority registration I feel like there might still be some confusion about where the resolution that was passed last semester with priority registration actually went and what the outcome of that was. I know that Senator Tran sent out an email over the break about the communication she received in the honors college. Just to clarify exactly what is happening with priority registration, starting next month when we register for classes, 50% of groups will have the one day registration which is up to the department chairs to determine which groups will receive priority registration. They will register on Monday April 4, the students that have overall priority registration. The other 50% of priority registration will have priority in class which is what Academic Affairs called for. Students that have in class registration will register at 6:30 am and the rest of the class will register at 7:00. Priority seniors will register at 6:30 am on Tuesday the 5th and other seniors that have normal will register at 7:00. Juniors so priority registration juniors will register at 6:30 am in class priority registration juniors at 6:30 and then the other folks that have that 50% will register at 7:00 am. I hope that makes more sense as to what's happening. Again, 50% of groups within honors college, athletics, access,

whatever, will have access to priority where all register on Monday April 4th for folks that have the other 50% of priority registration that falls into the in class time will registers at 6:30am instead of the regular time which will be open to other students at 7:00am. Course evaluations, I was in touch with Gary Derr over the break and we're finally getting somewhere. Professor Larry Kost who is the chair of the Educational and Research Technologies committee of Faculty Senate should be reaching out to Senator Caster and Chair Filstein to make a meeting to talk about the progress of course evaluations. David touched on this, I'm not going to touch too much on the kitchen. The move was a way to try to not limit the traffic but limit the amount of mess that accumulates on daily basis in the space. It was felt that this would be the best way to monitor this since you cannot actually have a list of students and as David mentioned what happened this morning was not only disrespectful to his decision but also to the office staff. Hopefully we don't see that again. I'm also still working the search committee that is looking for a new director of affirmative action and equal opportunity. We have one of our weekly meetings tomorrow. We just opened up the search for applicants to make sure we are getting as diverse of an applicant pool as possible. Friday David and I will be meeting with students that might be attending UVM students next year that might be given the Simon Scholarship next year and we'll be talking about SGA and how to get involved on campus and it's through the College of Arts and Sciences. A few minutes ago before we went into reports there was a motion to censure me. I don't have much to say on that because there was an email sent out by Chair Adams, and I did respond to that. As expressed in my response I really do think it's an unnecessary censure. I had every intention at the ending of last week to sign the legislation that was passed before spring break and I'm in full support of all the bills and resolutions that were passed by you all. So I do apologize to the senators that passed the bills and resolutions that I wasn't able to sign them. If you felt disrespected by my not signing the resolutions I do apologize and welcome the opportunity to have such discussions. I'm fully aware that not signing resolutions on time is inappropriate and I really do feel bad because there have been a few weeks in the spring semester that Claire will say you have to sign something and I will say drat, I forgot. I always try to be on top of things and as I mentioned it has now been added to my weekly agenda items on my calendar so every week I know I will be signing the legislation by Thursday so it's not going to be an issue. I really do feel bad and I assure you that it won't happen again during the next 5 weeks, mostly thanks to my handy dandy iPhone. I don't think there's a real need to censure me on the basis I wasn't able to sign legislation last week due to various reasons and I've taken the proper measures to make sure that doesn't happen again. I would like more of you all to send nominations for senator of week. I don't always get to see what you all awesome senators are doing. The last senator of the week was Senator Dougherty who was nominated by some of his Finance committee members and I really do appreciate your nominations so hopefully in the next few days I will be able to receive a few more nominations from committees and committee chairs so people on senate can get recognition that are doing really good work. David and I have monthly meetings with the senior administration and Jane Knodell will be there, she wasn't able David and I topics to bring up at these meetings so I want to formally let you know a week in advance because it's next week Wednesday that we will be meeting with Jane Knodell, Tom Gustafson, Chris Lucier and the usual suspects. If you have any topics of discussion that

you would like us to bring up at these meetings let me know. We will be sure to report back to you the following Tuesday.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:58.32)

Chair Adams: My question is going back to priority registration, you said it's going to be up to department chairs so I'm really confused how that's going to work.

Chair Filstein: I think what Kofi meant to say is that different groups that get priority registration, athletes, advocats, honors, etc., the leaders of each of those groups is going to decide what 50% is going to get it and it's going to be up to 50%. I think, Senator Cesario, was telling me that maybe no one will get it because they want to be more equitable. So it's just going to be up to the leaders of those groups.

Senator M. White: Going back to the censure thing, I don't really know where I stand on the whole situation we talked about tonight so I wanted to bring this up. We acted on some of these bills without your signature which means you put us all in the position where we weren't sure what we can do and can't do and I didn't think that was the proper way that a leader should be treating the people that have to work under them.

President Mensah: Again as I mention to you last night I do apologize that I wasn't able to sign the legislation last week Wednesday. I came into the office around Thursday and I had every intention of signing it and I guess my memory just lapses sometimes and I forgot to go over to the COLA desk and sign the legislation. It wasn't any intention to veto the legislation or any intent to devalue the resolutions that were passed because the resolutions we passed are extremely important especially with the library on extended library hours and a lot of students are in favor of being able to go to a 24 hour library. Sadly, I wasn't able to get to them.

Senator M. White: So for things like allocating funds which I know you did, how do you propose we move on with things like that?

President Mensah: That's something that next year's senate can decide because I know for a fact I won't forget to sign legislation again. In that case I think with something in that case it was important that the club that was recognized wasn't penalized because I forgot to do my duty and so I'm happy they were able to access the funds to get to their spring break destination.

Chair Adams: Point of Information: Deomononyms was the club that was recognized last week one, wasn't allocated money that was true and two, they aren't able to get a [inaudible] because I wasn't comfortable going ahead without knowing you supported it because it was kind of a controversial recognition.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Just to echo the general frustrations that we had with that. My legislation was extremely time sensitive and it remains time sensitive and I actually looked this morning and you still haven't signed it. Because they're going to vote as early

as tomorrow or as late as next week, it kind of invalidated the fact that we spent a good amount of time debating whether it belonged on emergency business and I would like to endorse the idea for you to take steps to make sure it doesn't happen again and I was disheartened because I put in a lot of time and effort. At least a dozen members of the senate worked on that legislation and it generally left people feeling not just offended but futile within this body makes it makes us look like a generally useless body when we push paper and then can't do anything about it.

President Mensah: Again I just want to address the fact that you all are not a useless body. In the past year you all have been great and tremendous and passing great bills and resolutions and bills that the student body whether or not the majority has been in favor or not, they are happy with a lot of things that have come up. I do apologize my flight just landed just before the senate meeting so I went straight to my office working on grabbing some information for this senate meeting. Again, the bills and resolutions will be signed before I leave this building tonight. If anyone sitting here felt that I was devaluing your work that was not my intent. As someone who has been in great discussions and trainings and workshop about social justice about intent versus impact I do understand the impact that my failure to sign the resolutions how it impacted folks, but I do want to let you know that won't happen again as I have taken the proper steps to make sure that won't happen again.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: In the future I would also urge you to take strides to make sure that if you were to forget there are options and ways to sign it. I don't know if you had access to a scanner but there are probably ways given your addiction to your iPhone's technologies that you could sign it. It might suck because it's a lot more but there are a million and one ways at this point that you can get it sent back and would have remedied the problem.

Speaker Chevrier: I'm sorry to do this but it was 3 weeks in a row you didn't sign the legislation. 4 weeks ago when you forgot to sign the legislation you said it wouldn't happen again and then three weeks ago you said it wouldn't happen again so right now you're saying it won't happen again so I was wondering if maybe the motion to censure has already changed your actions because I didn't clearly so maybe saying you are not devaluing the senate is one thing but I feel like you haven't been listening to me for the whole entire year and it's just this past three weeks that have been on a row.

President Mensah: It has nothing to do with the threat of a censure. More so to the fact that the first week I wasn't able to sign the legislation 3 weeks ago, as I mentioned it slipped my mind, it wasn't because I wasn't listening to you, I do, then you say it needs to be signed that's the first thing I do right away. The second week I was ill. As some of you might know two weeks ago after the senate meeting I went straight to my apartment and didn't leave for a week. The last thing on my mind was signing the legislation because I was just focusing on getting better. The third week was last week because I was rushing to get home for an interview on Friday morning/afternoon. The threat of a censure has nothing to do with my motivation to make sure that future legislation will be signed on time. It's just the fact of the matter that I realized that I can easily input it into

my phone. My memory is not the best. I just want you to know that I do listen when you tell me to do things and I make it a point to sign it by Fridays. The threat of a censure doesn't have much to do with that I just think it's unnecessary since I am making the proper steps for future.

Senator Yeager: In terms of the Lynx, could you send out the emails of other potential candidates.

President Mensah: I'm waiting on Pat Brown to get back to me since he went to a few conferences before spring break and during spring break. As soon as he gets back to me I can send the Lynx working group. The one I know of is square crop since the past year.

Senator Bennington: I wrote that letter that was sent to you. I don't endorse the censure. I think that you have already made strides and have faith in you and you're human and you make mistakes. I question anyone is the point of the censure to make President Mensah look bad or is the point of the censure to let him know that we're disappointed and we hope he improves and get him to improves. If it is, it seems like he has made a promise to this body and it's not necessary to censure him and risk all the bad crap that came of the last censure.

Senator Lovell: There is an iPhone app called zosh which lets you download PDFs, edit them, and sign it with a stylus.

President Mensah: If for some reason I cannot physically sign legislation in the next 5 weeks I will be sure to use that app.

Committee Reports (3:09.14)

COLA:

Chair Morgan: Could everyone who lives off campus raise their hand. Take your hand down if you were not here during the summer. If you moved from an apartment in May to June raise your hand. If you stayed in Burlington over the summer and you are off campus raise your hand. Everyone who has ever moved in an apartment if you stayed in your apartment and you stayed in Burlington from year to year raise your hand. Would anyone be interested in possibly going to move out trash summit put on by OSCR next Tuesday? It's from 2-4 pm at the code enforcement office. Spring Move out Project, the director of Code Enforcement Bill Ward, he's relatively new, he's only been working there for about a year. He was disappointed in what we had seen for turnout for spring move out last year. It seemed a lot of students moved out earlier than in the past 10 years so as a result a lot of students just left their trash on the curbs and green spaces in the city which hadn't been the case in recent memory. He wanted to do a summit of a lot of landlords in working with the school and Champlain College. He requested that at least 4 students came and gives their insight as to why they moved out early and could they bring their used goods to spring move out project and not just throw them on the curb. The Police Luncheon is next Tuesday 12:30 to 1:30 in the Sugar Maple Ballroom. There will be 50 sandwiches, so minus the 15 or so for police officers there are going to be like

35 and it will be first come first serve. I would love to see a lot of senators there, but I'm asking a favor of the senators that go, please engage in conversation because it could be really awkward. We didn't want to have a structured conversation because we didn't want it to turn into I hate the police, this is why they're terrible. I was kind of hoping that a conversation over food would be a lot less stressful since they'll be there wearing street clothes and they're not going to be like I'm a police officer. I had some really great interactions with a police officer at the Community Coalition Common Ground Summit and I didn't know they were police officers until like twenty minutes after based on their positions on different issues. It would be really cool if we're engaged and other students would want to be students be engaged. We were hoping that senators would be at the door so people wouldn't just come in, take a sandwich, and leave and try to usher them into a conversation. I don't want people coming in taking sandwiches and leaving. How many people are interested in attending Tuesday next week 12:30-1:30 in the sugar maple ballroom. Tell all your friends. My worst fear is we have 15 police officers there and no one wants to talk to them. Next week is the community coalition, next Friday, my very good friend Senator Fitzgerald the Party Registration czar is going to be presenting what she's found so far for party registration and it's really cool. We've made a lot of progress. Things are moving a lot faster than I thought this year. If people want to talk to her you can. Senator Rifken is bringing up resolution in support of level funding from the state, I'm hoping next week. Once we write it we'll send it out early so everyone can see it. We might have to table it because it's very important to us and the university.

Open the Floor for Questions (3:14.54)

Speaker Chevrier: Would you be willing to write excused absences for the police lunch? I know in previous years the COLA chair has written excused absences in SGA letterhead formally asking students to be excused to go to the event. I know Chris Shackett did it.

Chair Morgan: Who do I send it to?

Speaker Chevrier: A student would have to request it from you. You would have to say formally from the SGA and sign it love Lucas Morgan then the student would give it to their professor.

CODEEE (3:15.41):

Senator Vitagliano: Chair Herman is sorry he's unable to attend. He's sick and will be emailing his report.

Student Action (3:16.00):

Chair Simmons: I will also be emailing out my report and I would like to point out that Claire said the F Word today.

Public Relations (3:16.20):

Chair Monteforte: I will also be emailing out my report.

Academic Affairs (3:16.31):

Chair Filstein: I'm not going to email out the report but will keep it pithy since President Mensah touched on most of our issues. From an official AA edict/decreed we are officially disappointed that we were kind of deceived by the administration about priority registration. By having it being at 6:30 and then 7:00 and not the day before because they told us there was going to be a two tiered system but in essence it's a three tiered system. Faculty Senate on Monday for those of you sad slash lucky individuals who will be here next semester have revoked fall recess. The beginning of the fall semester to Thanksgiving is a long time and there's that one three day weekend that's amazing. You don't have that anymore.

Open the Floor for Questions (3:17.28)

Senator Rifken: Fall recess, is that because they are adding more days to Thanksgiving and I went to a lot of meetings last year talking about keeping the fall recess.

Chair Filstein: Fall semester is 4 days shorter than Spring Semester and they wanted to alleviate that discrepancy. Basically they opened the calendar and Faculty got all excited about it and said let's take away the week of Thanksgiving and make it 3 days off and there were all these crazy proposals and they were voting and they were behaving worse than we do. One member was like, guys what are we doing, this is insane, but in that whole rigmarole they took away fall recess to give them one more day in the fall.

Speaker Chevrier: What day did they take away? Did they take away the random Monday that they added 2 years ago after the suicides because SGA rallied to try to get rid of that and was created and Thanksgiving was taken away and begged them to do what you're saying.

Chair Filstein: There is going to be a week for Thanksgiving. The only thing that changed is that one Monday is now a day of class.

Finance (3:19.04):

Chair Mallea: Thanks for passing all of my legislation tonight. It was kind of a mellow week as far as hearings go. Kind of what you saw and a few random requests. Budgets are done, but unfortunately we were a little too generous with allocations when it came down to it so we had to do budget cuts. Hopefully everyone is happy and we will be starting the appeals hearing process next week.

Student Activities (3:19.44):

Chair Mallea: I was late because I was downstairs wrapping things and that's not cool and I will email out my report as an I'm sorry.

Senatorial Forum (3:20.02):

Senator Tepper: Hi everybody. I signed out a packet today so I would appreciate if you could all don your lovely signatures on this piece of paper to help me run for senate next for next school year.

Senator M. White: Something that happened earlier that I kind of wanted to touch upon was public forum. I'm upset that we rushed people. I would much rather us rush us and just email out all our report. I would love to hear everything they had to say and I was kind of disappointed that we rushed them and that we all toned out after a while. That question answer session with Nolan was incredible. I would love to see more time on public forum, less time doing stuff for ourselves.

Senator Yeager: Thank you everyone for passing my bill. I'm officially not a bill virgin anymore.

Speaker Chevrier: I have a bunch to say. One, I'm sorry for trying to cut it short, I was getting lots of notes saying why did you not put limits on and that's why I normally ask that people email me and tell me that they're coming to public forum. Alicia Taylor gave three dates that she would be willing to come and I said this date was the best because before yesterday we didn't have anyone on it and we could have had her come next week instead or two weeks instead. That's why I tried to cut it short. Previous conversations with this same body said I should put on time limits but I will just let it go for as long as possible. You have to tell me what I want and then I will give it to you. We talked a little bit about how in previous years senatorial forum was a place for dialogue to occur about future legislation. This is me speaking as Claire Chevrier, Jew who has visited Israel and the West Bank. I honestly don't think we should vote on this piece of legislation. Half of the people we're supposed representing were upset and hurt by this bill and half of them are really really for it and hurt by suggestions that people don't want to vote for it. I think if we were to do our duty as representatives it would be 50/50 and it would come to me to vote it and that would suck and I don't think this is something we should be voting on. Another thing is there are people that have PhDs in the Israeli conflict that don't suggest they are experts. In two weeks there is no way we can know enough about this subject to adequately vote. There are two reasons why people should abstain, one is conflict of interest so if you were a Palestinian or Israeli and second is if you don't feel knowledgeable. I know that if I were a senator that got a vote I wouldn't vote because I'm not knowledgeable and I'm probably more knowledgeable than a lot of you on this. I've seen a whole bunch of people cry this week because they feel that it's anti-Semitic, even though those claims have been suggested, and it has been touched upon and we should not be voting on legislation that makes people feel alienated. That's not how I feel but people have brought that up to me. How can we vote on something that will make someone feel as though they're not wanted on this campus. As far as the *Water Tower* Molly said the words that she was sorry and that the *Water Tower* was not at all condoning non-consensual sex or rape. Non-consensual sex is rape and I think it has to do with a general lack of education about rape. I would encourage everyone even if you haven't accidentally pissed off feminists or anybody. People were seriously offended and I think it's because people are not up to date on what's offensive. I think everyone should go to the Dismantling Rape Culture because it's really important and you don't want to

piss off your peers and as representatives you don't want to piss off the people you are representing. I know it was incredibly difficult to come up here and talk to us how dare we do something that offends them. Last but not least, we passed legislation last week.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I'd like to echo a lot of those concerns. I was emailed last night by about 4 or 5 members of Hillel asking me to sit down with them because they know I attend a lot of their events and I'm their liaison, but that wasn't the context of why I received their emails. I basically was speaking with them and sat down with them today, but there are some really hurt feelings from people who didn't come tonight because they were uncomfortable with speaking to the group and they were afraid they would be put on the spot no matter how much I told them that was not the case. When this idea of divestment initially came up I spoke to people from Hillel about it because we thought we would be equally divesting from all war profiteers in Middle East. That would include those who profit from Arab actions as well as Israeli actions. Just for my own point, can you raise your hand if you've ever driven a car. Then you've used oil which is something we profit off of from Arab nations. Before anything is said that we shouldn't be doing it all together, I think we need to either broaden or scrap the legislation. There are so many people that are feeling alienated and it does [inaudible] our common ground. The illusion has been put out that we could solve thousands of years or religious conflict by divesting from Israel and that's just not realistic and it is hurtful, both as someone who identifies as Jewish and people I have spoken to as our constituents and for the record, the Jewish population because whether or not you are Jewish, as we saw today there are Israelis that support the legislation, that makes up 20% of our constituency so that is something we need to think about.

Chair Simmons: I love the idea of broadening it a little bit. I disagree this isn't something we should be talking about. We as Americans are complicit in to a very great extent. I also have a problem with all of this rhetoric of targeting Israel and anti-Semitism I think is totally inappropriate to be in reference here because it shouldn't have anything to do with what we're doing here. I think we witness a totally dramatically unequal state of affairs in that part of the world. As United States citizens we have a role in that. Our government gives an extraordinary amount of money to one side of that struggle. I think that's very serious and that's something if we don't know anything about shame on us and we have an extra week so I think we should do a little bit of research. I thought it was very interesting the different kind of resources given to us by the two opposing sides. I think it's very legitimate for us to be talking about. I'm not trying to say that we're going to solve thousands of years of struggles without actions. I thought Nolan was totally off when he said Israel could have peace tomorrow if they wanted it. It's just not true. It's a conflict that has been around for a long time and it will be around for a long time. Using those two things to address it and think about it or use our power in defending it is wrong. I am an American and I dig this country in a lot of ways and I criticize it and I think I damn well should criticize it when it needs to be criticized. I don't think that should take away Americanness or offend people and if it does then maybe people need to be offended a little bit. If that's what's going to happen then I say that's totally appropriate.

Senator Caster: I'd like to challenge that notion. People are saying why don't we divest from Arab countries and honestly, that's a joke. If you really think about exactly what you are saying, who are we doing got divest from? The Palestinian black market for Soviet Arms? The Palestinian black market for IEDs? I'm really confused as to what multinational corporation has been funding specifically Hezbollah? The rhetoric of that debate is uninformed and misrepresented it can only be seen as a political rhetoric to dismantle this argument. That's the only legitimate thing I can see from why don't we disinvest from Hezbollah? I disagree with that and I have to really ask ourselves to challenge that notion and be very specific in exactly what that argument is asking for. As Chair Simmons just pointed out, it has nothing to do with anti-Semitism, it has nothing to do with the state of Israel. It comes from a love for the Middle East, for the desire of security and that there is an injustice going on, and who gives a damn what rationale you'll be provided with. It's an injustice. Yes, brute force works to defend yourself against terrorism, but that doesn't make it legal. You can kill as many people as you wanted and we could have just incinerated the country of Iraq but that's illegal. The occupation of Iraq is still illegal. Force is not legal, please take that into account. When people tell you that the all is ok because it defends against terrorists, well yeah, of course it would. There is still a question of what humanity do we have when we build massive walls and keep people inside and deny them food and rights and privileges. Please take that into account.

Senator Bennington: Going back to what Senator White said about public forum, he pretty much said what I wanted to except, we're senators, dammit. We are here to listen to students when they want to come in and if you want to put time limits on them so you don't have to sit here so long then maybe you shouldn't be on Senate. Honestly, I'm pretty amazed that many students just came in here, that's pretty awesome we provided that forum. Whether or not we pass this or even vote on it, it's pretty awesome that debate just happened here. I went outside and Nolan was talking to people that were criticizing him and it was awesome that they were having a discussion about it and we facilitated that. To reiterate, I talked to people who were on Public Forum and they felt really rushed. I am pretty embarrassed that we made someone feel rushed that came to speak to us and I hope that you can all reflect on that. That totally sucks that someone came into address the senate and was like cool thanks for rushing me and making me feel like I can't talk. Lastly, in terms of letting you know who is going to come in on public forum, I know when I introduced the resolution I had no idea who was going to come so I can't really let you know if I don't know. I think if we don't want people to have the ability to come in and speak then we should do away with public forum and operate behind closed doors.

Senator Tepper: One, just wanted to say as someone who also identifies as being Jewish I don't think it's fair to say one view is representative of the Jewish student population because that's just wrong. Going back to the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference, if you're going to excuse people for the cop luncheon is there a way we can get out of class for that?

Senator Mason: I'm just interested in getting information based on this whole debate that we had before us today. I'd definitely would encourage everyone to do that. I agree with Claire, to make a decision on it today would not be a good idea for me because I need to know more information on each side to make a good judgment call. Then I wanted to speak on the censure thing, off my personal thing and I've expressed this with others senators as well, I just feel like it's a waste of our time. I do feel bad about the legislation that was not signed. I do feel it was unacceptable and that it should have been brought up but the censure thing it's kind of like a tit for tat thing. We don't censure everyone, we censure one person for this and then maybe we see someone else who didn't do something now I need to censure this person was offered before in an email. I just really hope we get over that issue and hopefully no one sends out some huge email out tonight about it. Seriously, the email on the senate listserv is getting ridiculous. It's like I did this and I didn't mean to do that and I'm so tired and someone's like F that and I'm so sick of it. Please stop about the tit for tat things. I feel good about the legislation we passed and I do think we're doing great things. Let's not take two steps forwards and four steps back with tit for tat things.

Senator Rifken: Really quick, I just wanted to say on the whole debate we had earlier, just remembering what the real issue is and making sure we don't move into the pro-Israel pro-Palestine argument because I don't think we have the right to make a decision on that. On budget updates as David said the administration sent out an email today, you guys should all take a look at that, and go to the budget website I can send it out. Richard Cate gave us some dates for next week he's going to come to budget ad hoc. If any senators want to come to that you're more than welcome to come. Lastly if anyone wants to help out with the resolution for level funding let me know. Gathering information and stuff like that.

Senator Vitagliano: First I just want to state that I believe what I believe we should do in regards to the whole resolution that we're tabling. I truly believe that we should remain neutral on this because we do have students that are affected on both sides of the argument and the issue and they have strong feelings in respect to those arguments. I think that we should just remain neutral respecting those sides. Unless we know definitely how the majority of the student body feels I think we should remain neutral.

Vice President Maciewicz: I just wanted to take the time to reiterate what Senator Vitagliano said only because in my past lives as senator I authored a lot of legislation that took a very political stance. I always would question myself whether or not it was appropriate for SGA to say x,y, or z. I always drew down a) is it really important to the student body and b) is it an issue that morally you can take one side or the other. All those are really come down to the person but if this is an issue that affects students and this is something that from my standpoint if you were a reasonable person could you see right or wrong, an injustice. If it fell on injustice and I felt our voice would be important. I would urge caution weighing into this issue. It's been going on for 1000s of years. I really don't personally believe that a concrete wall solves or creates anything. These issues in the Middle East and the creation of Israel in the 1940s go much deeper than that and they go deeper than religion to identity and state. I would just urge you all to take a

step back. I am not comfortable but I am also not voting in picking which side the best interests in humanity lie. Israel has done some horrible things to the Palestinian people, but I think it's a very legitimate argument that Palestinians, either affiliated with the government or independently, have done a fair amount of reciprocity to the Israelis. I don't think that this is a place where our voice does a lot of good but does more harm. I'm sure one side or the other can get a majority of votes but I don't see that as helping the cause of the student body. I see it more as creating a lot of hurt. These people's religion, identity, state, I would just urge restraint and maybe some reconsideration.

Speaker Chevrier: Motion for Informal Poll on whether or not you want me to have time limits or not.

Senator Mason: Is this for a time limit for students or anybody coming in?

Speaker Chevrier: Anybody coming in on public forum.

Senator Bennington: Would that mean that we couldn't stand here and question or debate with someone for half an hour because there was a time limit or does that just mean that their initial statements have a time limit?

Speaker Chevrier: First of all I want to point out that we're not voting on it, we're just voting to have the poll and what the poll consists of is should there be any time limits on public forum. I know that half the people that snapped when Senator Bennington said there should be no time limits are people that told me to put time limits. I am a little confused and I'm seeking your help. If you raise your hand and say you don't want time limits then I will never do it again but if you tell me you do want time limits I'm going to keep doing it even if I get yelled at.

Vote on having an Informal Poll - passes

Vote on informal poll whether or not you want me to have time limits or not – against time limits

Speaker Chevrier: The other thing I wanted to say is I know that people I love and respect said boo when I brought up the idea of anti-Semitism which I completely get but I felt the need to speak for those who were crying yesterday. When I was in the meeting with someone from Hillel because they requested a meeting with me after they heard about this resolution. This woman crying to me said how come we're not trying to divest from Libyan oil because Libyan oil is directly funding Gaddafi's regime and using that money to bomb his own people, or how come we're not divesting from the craziness in Sri Lanka and how come we're not divesting from things in North Korea, or how come we're not divesting from the United States that is doing terrible things in Iraq. Her answer was the only thing I can think of is anti-Semitism. It sucks that that card has been pulled but she doesn't think it's a card. She actually feels very hurt by this suggestion. She's terrified for the repercussions this could have for Israel if a forward thinking university like ours passes this one and other ones that have looked into it but decided it wasn't

plausible. If we show it is plausible what does that mean for the people of Israel? What does that mean for people whose lives were saved because the wall was erected? How can we vote on something that's going to make half of our university really upset? I know we're talking about it's a human issue but the sucky thing about being a representative is you're supposed to represent the views of your constituents and half the people on this campus are really hurt. Well it's probably 33% are really angry, 33% are for it and 33% don't give a crap and wish we could do more about the library. There's a lot of people. Normally when we're talking about one person showed up for the bill so we should vote for them. A lot of people showed up for both and so I think that we should be representatives and not vote on this.

Chair Adams: First I have a question what happened if the majority of people abstain from voting but a couple of members of the body still vote that bill still passes, correct? I really think this is an interesting issue and we should all be doing our due diligence. I personally do better by talking, as everyone knows, so I would recommend Friday at my house, perhaps some other time at the Davis Center sitting around and actually talking about this issue and perhaps inviting Vermont Students for Israel and Students for Justice in Palestine to join us after time that frame to bounce ideas off of. I really want to know what you think about the *Water Tower* and that conversation and whether or not we want to look at a resolution. I spoke with Chair Herman and decided if it's something the body wants us to pursue we will look into it. I've met with Avery and whoever else who came who wants to meet with me in seeing what they want to see happen. Obviously you saw how upset Molly was. Still trying to get the facts straight on what exactly happened there. On a separate note we had PSAC yesterday and Jane Knodell was talking about that budget and how we're going to have 0% raises for the faculty and staff and what that was going to do. What she said was it would allow small investments in gen ed and the TRI.

Senator Caster: Point of Information: She said, we're going to put a little bit of money in to TRI. Those were her exact words.

Chair Adams: last year they swore up and down that no undergraduate money was going to fund the TRI and we said there is no way it's not and now it totally is going to fund TRI. I don't know how we as a body feel about that but it really upset me. However I didn't have a question for her on that besides generally disdain.

Chair Monteforte: I also wanted to remind everyone that public forum is not the only time we can discuss with students. As Claire said and I will probably say in my report it's elections season! We are having debates next week 21st and 22nd Monday will be in Brennan's at 6:00 and Tuesday will be right here at senate at 7:00. Please tell people, encourage them to go. We have a lot of questions. Encourage people to vote. Voting will be on Thursday on the Lynx. Also senate packets went out today so please get as many to run as you can. Tell your people do your good work

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Isn't there one at 2:00 on Monday as well?

Senator M. White: Two things first doth not Benner [inaudible]. Secondly, packets every time we have elections we talk about how we shouldn't be doing packets in here not to be the dick that brings this up every time but I'm going to be the dick. That was super sexist. Sorry. The point of the packets is to go out and talk to people that are going to be voting. I know these people are going to be voting, but they already know you. They already know what you want to do. You aren't going up to them individually and saying hi, I'm Mike White here's what I'm going to do, you're just sending it around and hoping they blindly sign it. Please stop doing that, it's 150 people that's not that hard. I know I wasn't a super great example of this earlier this year but I threw away the rest of my signatures so I can go out and do it again for senate.

Senator Goodnow: I want to address the *Water Tower* thing really quickly. I'd like to address it now before a resolution possibly gets put forth. I think it's absolutely ridiculous passing a resolution that says that SGA doesn't approve of rape, non-consensual sex and things of that nature, because no one here does. I feel like that makes a mockery of what a resolution does. I want to put that point forth as my opinion and also if that resolution does get drafted and put forward I will probably have to vote for it because I don't approve of those things. If we're going start putting resolutions forth of crimes we don't approve of then I want to say I don't approve of robbing people. I would love to talk to you more Chair Adams.

Chair Adams: My conflict in doing is I think if it helps upset students on campus then it is our duty to make them feel better. My qualm is condemning an action of one of our organization that technically did nothing wrong.

Senator Tepper: I apologize for passing around my packet. If you want to take your signature back feel free but I probably won't throw them out. Going along with how we receive our public forum guests I really don't like to whine lack about this kind of stuff but I noticed a lack of respect when Alicia was up there talking. A bunch of people were still talking and settling down. She's one of the sweetest people ever and I just felt really bad. Also, going off of what Chair said that it's not our place to be debating public forum guests. You can talk to them afterwards, you can ask them questions but it's just not appropriate to be debating them to make them feel uncomfortable or rushed.

Senator Bennington: To address something about the Palestine resolution. I think it approaches the idea that investments are really tricky. Maybe some people on Finance can back me up on this. The investment portfolio is really big and it's changing all the time and you look it's not like there's a list, and sorry Finance, I don't know why you would know this because you do SGA finance. I have a report of all the companies that we're invested in and it's really hard to find out does Lockheed Martin manufacture cluster bombs right now because maybe they did two years ago and maybe they're not right now but maybe they will again in three years. It's really complicated and that's why it goes to a third party and that's why these resolutions for divestment are not us saying we are divesting from this company and this company, it's saying we're going to look at this issue and let someone who is better informed we can pay to see is this a company that is supplying weapons that are using weapons to kill civilians. Do we want to be

invested in that company? Maybe not. Moving on to address Senator Goodnow's comments, I don't think we'd be writing a resolution saying we're against rape. I think people have suggested that we write a resolution saying we are against one of our student endorsed and funded newspapers publishing articles that condone and endorse rape culture. That is not saying we're against rape. The reductionist approach of let's just pass resolutions saying we're against robbing people or starting fires is totally irrelevant. We're talking if they publish an article that says you should go rob people that are weak looking then we could pass a resolution saying you should stop writing articles that are trying to create victims out of weak people. It's just troubling that we can reduce it to this let's just pass resolutions about crimes. Also, there are students coming in here that are clearly offended. There are so many students that are offended by this. We have to act on this, we can't fail to act. The *Water Tower* has admitted that they've made a mistake so it's not like they're telling us we're blowing this out of proportion. The people that came in here don't the apology was adequate because it was just apologizing saying that the author was anonymous and we messed up and it didn't go through the editorial process and they need to step up from that and show that it's not going to slip through the cracks again. I think a resolution is one step that we can take to make sure that doesn't happen again because I'm offended when people I love on this campus are reading that kind of crap in our newspaper.

Senator Lovell: To speak quickly on investments front, admittedly I haven't looked at UVM's investment portfolio, but as of 10 years ago the global market for weapons manufacturing decreased quite a bit so a lot of militaries went into the civilian market so they're doing business with a good portion of companies. While it might not be obvious, I bet we could find some way in which Google has bought technology from Israeli military troops. In about 5 minutes of googling I found 13 subdivisions of the Israeli military with very strange names that make them seem not at all connected but they are. It's not them attempting to hide it, it's just them sub dividing in to civilian areas. It would be really incredibly difficult to divest from a military that has the diverse nature and a giant military like Israel's is.

Chair Mallea: Hi guys, so I think we've had some really productive discussions tonight. Something unrelated yet relevant to the senate, Chair Filstein pointed out that I completely forgot to mention the board of trustees selection committee. I was chair of the committee representing Greek life and senators such as Senator Yeager, Chair Filstein, Vice President Maciewicz, President Mensah and other representatives from IRA and the Medical School and Graduate Students also sat on the committee and a we had numerous amounts of applicants and the committee has decided to appoint Senator DeVivo. If you have questions about how the process ran or any questions or concerns, please talk to me.

Speaker Chevrier: I wanted to touch on a few things. One about money going to the TRI I would be all for someone writing a resolution in support of the administration keeping their word about the TRI. We have it in our minutes from last year that absolutely no resources were going to be allocated for that. I specifically remember that was cut short by a time limit so I wasn't able to ask my questions, but I remember going back for the minutes and it says President Fogel "there will not be any resources, it isn't a

zero sum game.” Also I wanted to support what Senator Bennington said about the *Water Tower* and also point out that Chair Adams said the she and Chair Herman were waiting to see what the body wants but the body is supposed to want what the students want and they said they want a resolution so I see no reason not to have a resolution for new business next week. Also I wanted to give a quick point of information because maybe everyone doesn’t know, but every single Israeli citizen has to go into the army at one point. They have to do a minimum 2 years. Most people go right before college, but their army is huge in that way. The Israeli army does so many things that have absolutely nothing to do with Palestine. The first people to be on the ground in Haiti was Israeli’s from the IDF providing aid. If the Board of Trustees passed this divestment proposal we would potentially be taking money away from the program that brought aid to Haiti.

Senator Caster: I guess I’d just like to speak to that the divestment proposal is specifically for the occupation. Maybe Google has directly profited from the occupation and the illegal wall but I would find that connection difficult. Perhaps we should make the resolution more specific and more poignant to the occupation and the things that have been deemed by the international community illegal, like the wall. As far as this neutrality, in the words of Howard Zinn “you can’t be neutral on a moving train,” I don’t know the source of the second quote but “the deepest part of hell is made for those who remain neutral in a time of crisis.” There are many Palestinians who say it’s a crisis and it has been called a crisis by numerous international agencies, numerous humanitarian associations. Use your intellectual resources, use the knowledge you have and make a decision. I understand the sensitivity but again, this is not an opportunity to not take a stand. If you feel as though you shouldn’t take a stand then don’t do it, but again, this is a humanitarian crisis for segment of the population. I’m not a citizen of the United States, I’m a citizen of humanity. That’s my perspective. That’s how I look at my decisions and as a representative for SGA I’ve been communicating with a numbers of students who have been advocating for this for a very long time. That’s the constituent’s base I’m responding to.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: To address concerns with the resolution. I’d like to reiterate it’s not rape they’re objecting to, it’s rape culture. There’s a whole smear campaign well my opponent hasn’t taken a stance on cancer, I’m anti-cancer. No one is inherently pro a crime but the reality is that rape culture thrives in almost every community and taking a stance on it whether it’s to calm angry students does have value, especially when we’re coming up to the rape culture conference and take back the night. Take a look at there former love of my life Justin Bieber who says that rape happens for reason, Check out the *Rolling Stone* this month.

Senator Lovell: Point of Information: The Biebs then went on to admit he was a teenager and didn’t know much about life.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Moving forward, I would also like to say in regards to the divestment bill I say all of the statements I made tonight with the utmost respect for the work that Senator Caster has put into that resolution. The fact of the matter is he is about to educate a room full of us who are student leaders who for the most part knew very

little about what's going on with that situation and with the years of history we really should know about but don't know a lot about. I personally, I'm a geography major and I'm obviously biased so I encourage you all to go talk to Professor Morse in the Geography department. She speaks really well and really neutrally about the subject. I'll talk to her about coming to public forum. She's really awesome and I would encourage everyone to email her or meet up with her or really anyone in the Geography department, it's a really neutral department.

Chair Adams: I want to correct what I said for Jeff Ayers over there and for the rest of you. When I said that the *Water Tower* did nothing wrong I mean the *Water Tower* did not violate a policy before everyone passes me notes. I will totally legislate if you want to vote on it but I don't know what the be it resolved is because we could say we won't fund those clubs if we want but I just don't know what people want in terms of the *Water Tower*.

Senator DeVivo: We've talked about the *Water Tower* a lot. I want to make sure that we are in some way addressing the rape culture that was brought up with this whole article. If everyone knew that rape was wrong then rape wouldn't happen, in this community or everywhere. It's for us to address because there are so many uneducated people that aren't going to go to the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference, and maybe somebody reads this and learns something because ultimately that's what we need to do. I don't want it to be about every time a newspaper or publication has hurt someone's feelings because as member of Greek life the *Water Tower* has hurt my feelings countless amounts of times. If we want to start writing resolutions every time our feelings get I don't agree with that but this actually gives us an opportunity to educate other people that this is clearly wrong for someone who didn't initially see it as wrong. Obviously people's feelings were hurt, but I've heard people say it's funny, I don't care, maybe I don't have the ability and maybe one person doesn't have the ability to convince someone but us as a body maybe we can. And the good people like Jeff over there at *The Cynic* might write about it and people might read it.

President Mensah: Thank you so much. First of all I want to congratulate the senatorial body because I think for tonight you all have utilized senatorial forum for what it is meant to be utilized for more so than I have in the past. I haven't seen it used to reflect on passed resolutions and bills that have been passed over the past hours since my first or second year serving on senate. I am appreciative that you all are utilizing senatorial forum more to talk about these types of issues. Two quick things to touch on with the *Water Tower* a lot of people have been in communication with Amanda and a few folks have emailed me from the *Water Tower* and students that felt offended and I feel like one of the best ways I think to address what happened with the *Water Tower* issue is have that conversation. I was extremely happy that the *Water Tower* realized they had offended students and did make that public apology, granted the public apology wasn't to the level that some students wanted but I'm appreciative of the fact that they were able to make a public apology. I think the next step is to set up a meeting with members of senate and have discussions as to how we don't want to see this happen in the future. Senator Goodnow is addressing what lines are we forming when we're saying are we going to

write a resolution saying we don't approve of this, this, or this, which essentially we know we don't approve so are we being redundant? Second thing is the resolution for supporting the divestment from companies that are profiteering from the occupation in Palestine. As Vice President Maciewicz mentioned it does fall on a tricky line in debating this and voting on this. I do think it is important to realize what the resolution is trying to do which is to remove UVM investment from supporting what is essentially an evil occupation on a territory that isn't legally recognized as a country. Granted, I think, I forget what his name is, he is a bit of a high optimistic that simply removing the occupation on Palestine is going to stop all the terrorism because I especially don't think that's going to be the immediate result of that but I do think the important discussion and things leading to that such as this divestment from companies that are profiteering from an illegal occupation of this territory that has been fought over for thousands of years really is an important step in the communication between these two territories that are sort of vying for livelihood and the future of one country as opposed to a territory that really isn't recognized as a country.

Senator M. White: Two things, wilt thou [inaudible]. Second of all I just wanted to bring up there was another group that was sort of brutalized in the article and that was LGBTQA folks. I know I was pretty offended in the use of the word faggy and a lot of references as gay folks being a way to screws chicks. That was really rough. I took that a little bit rougher than I took the whole than rape culture side. There's a whole group of people we're leaving out of this discussion.

Chair Simmons: The use of this logic of saying that Palestine doesn't have a state and is therefore less legitimate or less has rights to claims is just so far from what anyone should be able to say. The problem is they don't have a state so saying they don't have the same legitimacy as other human beings because they don't have a state which they're being denied against their will is boggling to my mind.

Chair Adams: I'm already setting up a meeting with the *Water Tower*. Two, CODEEE and SAC will be working to draft something. Still wondering what the whereas is. If we all think student leaders need to be more informed on social justice, my successor can put that into the policy workshops. Food for thought, I'd really love to know what you think. I don't like making things mandatory that are unnecessary but if you think it is necessary then we can make that happen.

Senatorial Comments/Announcements (4:11.12)

Senator M. White: Friends, uvmers, it's the Ides of March today. This week is the first week of the month of service so I would love to see you all Friday at first, Rock the Casa, second of all, Kyle DeVivo's wonderful sleep out for the soldiers.

Senator DeVivo: Friday, starting at 4, but you should go to Chi Alpha Theta's rock the casa first, we will be there 24 hours. We will be there all night so when you're drunk going downtown or uptown or wherever you are going at 2 in the morning we will be sitting there collecting donations for the Fischer House which goes to supporting families

of wounded soldiers who have to stay in Veteran's Hospitals for extended periods of time. It basically provides them lodging so they can be with their families after they come back from overseas or any assignment where they might be injured in battle. We will be there 24 hours from Friday at 4 until Saturday 4 or 5 just to stay for rush hours. I would love to see all of you, there is going to be a bake sale, grilled cheese, a raffle with 4 Yankees tickets, 4 Red Sox tickets, a Lowe's gift cards, restaurant gift cards, a whole bunch of fun stuff so please stop by. We have a bunch of sponsors. Stop by and make a donation if you can. Our goal is \$10,000.

Vice President Maciewicz: I mentioned this once before. As you know we were talking about homophobia in the *Water Tower*. One of the final projects I'm working on before I leave UVM is with two fellow students called silence = suicide. Next month is UVM Pride Month who honors Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered friends and coworkers. Part of what we're doing is a teach in which is to raise awareness on how to speak out about homophobia in your own life and if you are experiencing it where to get help. Unfortunately a lot of your friends, acquaintances, and coworkers lose the battle with mental health because of oppression they've faced in their lives. Suicide is sometimes the only way they feel they have a chance to escape it. We're trying to raise awareness that it does get better and there's a lot of people that can help you. We are going to do teach ins in classrooms. You can come see me and I can fill you in with more details and you can decide if you'd like to help out. We're just going to be doing 2-3 minute presentations in big lecture halls, especially with younger first and second year students to expose them to the idea of mental health and being out in college and where to go if you need help.

Chair Mallea: I just wanted to remind everyone if anyone is interested in playing dodgeball this and the proceeds go to the Women's Rape Crisis Center in downtown Burlington. If you have any questions about the times or anything let me know.

Speaker Chevrier: One I wanted to split up my announcements. Elections, as Chair Monteforte said you can sign out your packet right now. Even if you're not running you can help. You can stand up in your lecture halls and tell them how much you loved senate and tell them how much you added to the University of Vermont and how you added and to the universe as a whole through your time here at senate and ask them to run. If you have any ideas of how to reach historically underrepresented colleges or people, let me know and I'll reach out to them. I've already emailed the Nursing and Health Sciences and a couple other colleges we've never had on senate in my years here. Senator Lederer-Plaskett and you all passed the bill asking Congress not to cut Planned Parenthood money. I happily cosponsored the legislation because I had seen a lot of students really angry about the proposed cuts, but there are a lot of other really scary things they are proposing to cut. For instance, Americore has cut huge amounts of funding to Americore and now it's up to the Senate to hold the fort but it's looking kind of scary. They also wanted to cut huge amounts to public broadcasting so say goodbye to NPR the As You Know it. It's really scary. So we legislated on one specific aspect of it because the student voice was asking us to, but that doesn't mean that you personally can't do what you can. Tepper and I both called our senators today begging them not to take away Americore

because that means I will be unemployed next year, so please do your part in that as well even though we haven't voted to pass legislation on it.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I wanted to clarify something, I was going to make a pitch for Dodging for Domestic Violence. My team is short a couple of people and I would very much like to go out and kick ass on Saturday. I would like to open it up to anyone who is interested. You all got my email over spring break. Right now we have a kick ass team for Battle of the Chefs for campus kitchen. I have 4-5 people and I'd very much like to make it 7 so get please get back to me if you're interested because I'd really like to have an SGA team. Lastly, you'll see my presidential campaign take a total hit on Thursday because March Madness starts. I'd really like to start a bracket pool for anyone who is available or interested. I have a real problem when it comes to college basketball and UVM broke my heart by choking this year. If you are interested let me know and just send me a text, email, or catch me after.

Chair Adams: I was super proud of all the club people that came in but it's totally evidence that clubs have an impact and that students do care about SGA and that's totally how they find out what we're doing. I was totally proud of all of us because I thought we handled the censure well. It's something that I don't want us to spend a lot of time debating. President Mensah and I had talked earlier and both stuck to our word about answering questions but not getting heated about it. I would encourage you if you have any questions for me, I feel like the email is very well written, to almost come in with your decision and talk to myself, President Mensah or each other and I think we should just vote next week, to be honest.

Senator Moise: Other than being a senator I'm also on the Step Team. We now have tickets on sale for our show and if you don't know what stepping is you can ask or watch something.

Chair Simmons: I think it would be really cool if we had brackets posted on the wall or something, that would be fun. BUG is close to launch. A ton of fun things going on. I would like to publically thank Kyle DeVivo and say he is the best man for the job of Board of Trustees and if anyone feels otherwise... I'm going to take the high road, unlike our speaker, and not say the F word right now. There's a lot of fun things going on don't have to do with stupid shit that I have to assign you to, but like fun events that are going on that I would love to have any and everyone's participation.

Senator DeVivo: I forgot another event that I could announce next week too but I want to do it now. My fraternity is sort of Cosponsoring, mostly just paying for a couple things and booking a room for Top Cats and Zest are having a charity concert on March 25 at 8pm over there. What is the charity? It's Medi something. I want to say like Medicare or something? I will email all of you. I don't know how much they are charging. Put it on your calendars because it's a really good cause and we're going to have at least 250-300 people come and it's part of the month of service.

Chair Adams: One, I think we should make sure everybody knows about elections because there were a lot of senators sitting in this room who didn't know that packets went out this morning and if we didn't know that then nobody else does. Two, I earlier offered coming to my house or doing something in the Davis Center. Nod of heads come to my house at 5? Do something at the Davis Center Thursday? You are all welcome to come to my apartment Friday at 5 to discuss Palestine and Israel. Shout out to Senator Mason who by far had the best comments tonight.

Senator Rifken: 27 DAYS!

Senator Tepper: Will you be living here this summer? Are you interested in fresh local organic produce? Then sign up for UVM's student farm Common Grounds CSA share for an extremely reasonable price. We'll be tabling Friday afternoon and next Thursday afternoon with raffle tickets. You could win a half share. Free groceries all summer.

Speaker Chevrier: Elections committee please stay for like 20 seconds afterwards. Also, I didn't say the F word, I said cluster fluff which is a new flavor at Ben and Jerry's, supporting a semi-local business.

Senator Yeager: To do a plug for Leon the mini-golf extravaganza is tomorrow night, up here in this room. Check it out. I don't know what it's going to be like but it should be fun.

Senator DeVivo: Medlife, I realized how stupid I just sounded.

Senator Bennington: Since Tepper beat me to it, if you're going to be living here this summer, you have a chance to support better fresh, organic, local produce, eggs, raw milk, and meat and my employment. It's Tamarack Hollow Farm located off the 127 bike path in the Winooski flood lane. It has been operating for three years and this year for the first time ever they are operating a full plate farm share. Basically, there are a couple different packages but every week you get vegetables, pork, some chicken, eggs, raw milk. I don't know if you've had raw milk before but it is dank. They are awesome people. They are farming on an abandoned dairy farm in Burlington. It's not like the vegetable gardens we have in Burlington, it's a real farm.

Roll Call:

Finance: Senator Juairé, Senator Tran, excused

Student Action: All Present

COLA: Senator Cooper, excused

CODEEE: Chair Herman, excused

Student Action: All Present

Public Relations: Senator Boutwell, Senator Benner, Senator O'Brien, excused

Academic Affairs: Senator Ballas, excused

Adjournment:

End Time: 11:25pm