



TUESDAY, MARCH 22ND, 2011
TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING OF THE 2010-2011 SENATE

Call to Order (0:01.00)

Start Time: 8:01pm

Roll Call (0:01.03):

Finance: All Excused

Student Activities: Senator Yeager, excused

COLA: All Present

CODEEE: Senator Cesario, unexcused

Student Action: All Present

Public Relations: All Present

Academic Affairs: Senator Ballas, Senator Knowles-Thompson, excused

Approval of the Minutes (0:01.30)

From 3/15/11 – passes

Public Forum (0:01.55)

Ari, Vermont Students for Israel

Ari: Hey, Hello everyone thank you all for your time and effort that you put into looking into the issue at hand. I'm sure you all spent a bunch of time and it wasn't fun but I hope you at least for yourself found out more. It's a complicated issue and people spend years and years learning about the Palestinian Israeli conflict and it's very complicated and thank you all also to make the decision to table the issue. It is a complicated issue and it's not something that's resolved with finger pointing on either side. It's not something that's resolved by saying they did that they did that because it's a very circular issue. That's really all I have to say. Thank you all.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:03.36)

Chair Simmons: Thanks for coming, I think you hit the nail on the head that there is a lot of historical round and round and we're not going to get anywhere with more finger pointing. I think also it's important to remember that in the place we occupy as students at the University of Vermont, which is in some ways very powerful and in other ways it's not. In our capacity as students, what would you say would be, you can say nothing and leave it there, but what would you say would be the best way to put our best foot forward?

Ari: I think it would be we can promote an honest dialogue. Rather than having films and either side say this is what they did to me to me and this is what they did to them, we can have films and discussions and speakers that acknowledge the complexities, acknowledge all the parties

involved, acknowledge the historical context and still acknowledge that they will never be able to acknowledge everything.

Senator Bennington: Seeing as we've tabled the resolution would you support the resolution going to the student body as a referendum to vote on it or do you think it's better to wait and enter that dialogue process now?

Ari: I'm honestly not sure what that would involve.

Senator Bennington: the resolution as is or maybe a little bit different going to the student body and they get to vote on whether or not they would adopt that resolution.

Ari: I think that's interesting, but I don't really know. I'm not sure how much the student body would vote and I'm not sure among the student body that would vote that although they might feel informed would really be informed. That's an issue.

Nolan Rampy (0:05.53)

Nolan: Ok. hello again. So after speaking with some of the senators and other people after last week's meeting I just wanted to come back up and make some clarifying points that I made weren't well understood or that I didn't do a good job of articulating and I'd like to talk a little bit about how we can create a constructive dialogue about how to move forward. The first thing I want to talk about that I address last week was the right to self-defense, particularly when I brought up the example of Britain and the IRA. I would like to be very clear about what I was saying when I said that. The idea here when the question of Israel's right to self-defense is absolutely. Every country has the right to self-defense. The question is do you have the right to use force? While that may sometimes be the case, you have some more explanatory work to do. There is a right to self-defense but there is not a right to use force. I hope we can all agree that the use of violence is always a last resort. This is especially true in the case of states that have a monopoly on the use of force and power. For instance, to use a different example, we would all agree that during WWII Germany had the right to defend itself. I expect that none of us would agree they had the right to use force. To defend itself was withdrawing back within its borders, that would keep Germany safe. Let's take the United States for example. The United States military absolutely has the right to defend itself against attacks in Iraq. The way they have a right do that is withdrawing back into their borders, no violence necessary. The same logic applies here. Israel absolutely has the right to defend itself by ending the occupation. To go a little bit further and go specifically to what I was saying with Britain and the IRA. The IRA's actions were illegal. Two things should happen. Britain can exercise the right to defend itself, by ending the occupation in Ireland, and then also, the IRA, the people who set off bombs should be put on trial, along with the members of the British government who were complicit or played a part in the occupation. Both parties broke the law, neither is justified, both are illegal, both should be put on trial. I just want to be clear on my position there. I also understand there was a good amount of misunderstanding about my statement that Israel could have peace tomorrow. I was hoping this was clear that I was being hyperbolic when I said that. I was making a pretty obvious exaggeration in what I was saying. To be a little more clear, what I should say is that Israel could immediately begin the road to peace. Peace is a long way away, but justice has to precede peace. Justice comes first, peace comes later. The thing that I want to articulate is the fact that there has been a peace proposal. Everyone says it's complicated, the two sides can't agree on anything, which is true, but the fact is there has been a peace proposal on the table that Israel has rejected. That is what I wanted to highlight there. I did not mean to literally imply that there would be peace in the Middle East tomorrow. I understand that this resolution has been tabled, partly due to

lack of information and understanding. I think this is a good idea. Partly from talking to other people I don't think people are informed enough on this issue to make an informed decision. Apparently the idea has been floated in the SGA about having public forum debates. I wholeheartedly endorse that. Students for Justice in Palestine will be more than happy to participate in any forums that SGA wants to sponsor. I'd like to, given the divisiveness of this issue, I want to do something to see if we can set some agreeable parameters for this debate. Partly because when I was reflecting on the discussion afterwards, I realized how often we went off on tangents that while intellectually interesting, didn't have much to do with the proposal itself. I'd like to see if we can narrow this down to come up with some parameters for what is a constructive dialogue. I'd like to start with just reading a couple sections of Our Common Ground and then also talk about the divestment proposal. Two sections that are most relevant is the section on justice. "As a just community, we unite against all forms of injustice, including, but not limited to, racism. We reject bigotry, oppression, degradation, and harassment, and we challenge injustice toward any member of our community." The other relevant section is on responsibility. "We are personally and collectively responsible for our words and deeds. We stand together to uphold our common ground." The divestment proposal argues that UVM should divest from corporations that directly profit off the occupation because "prolonged military settlement in Palestine involves illegal settlements, in occupied territory and actions such as the illegal construction of a separation wall in the Palestinian territory, are unacceptable to the university and the university should not profit from these actions." So, the divestment proposal is very clear here. While it's true that the Middle East is complex, no one will disagree with that, the question that is put before us is very simple. Is it in line with the values expressed in Our Common Ground statement, to invest in companies that profit from abuses in human rights. That is the question that we need to address going forward. That is the issue, that is the subject that this divestment proposal put forward. It seems to me that there are only two potentially relevant answers to this. One is the claims of the proposal are false. For instance, Palestinian homes aren't actually being demolished. Israel doesn't engage in collective punishment. Civilians aren't targeted in military campaigns. Palestinians do have freedom of movement meaning that in actuality women aren't forced to give birth at check points because they won't let her through to a hospital. That is the first answer, that the claims made are factually inaccurate. The second response is despite the human rights abuses, we should continue to invest in the companies that contribute to and profit from these human rights abuses for reasons x, y, and z. Whoever wants to make that argument that we should continue to invest and put that argument forward. If this were to win out I would suggest we also would follow up with a campaign to do away with the Our Common Ground statement, because our action would clearly be guided by values that are different than the ones expressed in the current statement. Again, the questions that are put forward, the issue is complex but the question before us is actually very simple and narrow. Do we want to invest in companies that profit from human rights abuses? If anyone wants to put forward a third alternative that I missed, but those seem like they are the only two relevant responses and anything else is taking us off on a tangent. In order to have constructive dialogue proceed, not just tonight but probably for the rest of the semester and next year that we stick within this parameter in addressing these questions.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:15.32)

Audience Member: I just have a few questions. One, you started at the beginning with Israel has a right to defend itself but not by use of force, only by ending the so called occupation. My question is how is it possible, clearly when they left out of Gaza, that was part could be seen as a step towards Israel defending itself. What happened when Israel came out of Gaza is that more rockets began to be fired into Israel and violence was greatly increased. How could you define

something such as ending the what you call occupation, like they did in Gaza, as defending themselves when clearly result in further violence?

Nolan: This came up last week as well and in 2005 Israel removed settlements from Gaza and took those settlers and put them in the West Bank. However, the occupation in any meaningful sense of the word, still continues. Israel controls imports and exports into Gaza. They control the air, they control the water. Fishermen aren't allowed to go more than about 5 miles off the coast without being shot at by Israeli gun boats. Gazan individuals who have the opportunity to be educated in other countries are denied by Israel the right to leave Gaza. When I'm talking about ending the occupation I'm talking about giving people sovereignty over their land. You can't talk about sovereignty in any meaningful sense of the word when a foreign power forcefully controls your land borders, your sea borders, the air, your telecommunications, your right to leave, your imports and exports. This wasn't an ending of the occupation in any meaningful sense of the word. What I talked about earlier with justice preceding peace, there is not justice in Gaza right now and justice has to precede peace.

Chair Simmons: If you could talk more about the divestment proposal, that was the questions being brought to us, I was wondering if we could narrow it down to specifics and we could go with that. If that wasn't the question before you as a student in the university and sharing the space at the university who have legitimate concerns of other populations in mind. Keeping in mind all of the populations and the real suffering that they're both going through, do you see divestment as the way want to move forward as a whole university to towards a better way having our voice heard or do you see another way forward, another way to advocate for justice?

Nolan: I apologize if I don't entirely understand your question, feel free to clarify me. There are a variety of ways to pursue peace but strongly worded letters aren't going to do it. They haven't done it for over 4 decades now. I view this as the most effective way, partly because the Palestinians themselves have called for it. In 2005 they called for people internationally to adopt boycott divestment and sanction campaigns. This is the same technique that ended Apartheid South Africa. Part of what is so appealing about it is that it is non-violent and it is actually one of the more moderate approaches there is. It is simply a refusal to engage with companies participate in human rights abuses. It has a genuine possibility of working and make a real change. I heard you mention earlier that us at UVM not having a lot of power and this is absolutely not true. I apologize if I misunderstood you. Some of you may be aware that Israel in the past couple of days within a section of their military is going to be dedicated to keeping an eye on boycott divestment sanctions movements in the West. Part of the Israeli defense force is now a branch being created to keep tabs on boycott divestment sanction campaigns going on in the West. That's how concerned they are about this because it actually does have a chance to be effective. I do advocate for divestment moving forward because of the possibility to be effective.

Senator Caster: Could you speak about the recent UN resolution and perhaps comments made by Angela Merkel?

Nolan: I can't comment particularly on Angela Merkel, however the UN recently put forward a resolution about the occupation and the settlements which are explicitly illegal. While the U.S. unfortunately once again vetoed, the U.S. representative Susan Rice issued a statement acknowledging the illegality of the settlements. This is a very significant move. Unfortunately they still vetoed it for other reasons. Susan Rice, the U.S. Representative to the UN issued a statement saying unequivocally, the settlements in the West Bank are illegal.

Senator Bennington: I'd like to preface this question with a quote. Nelson Mandela in 1997 said that roughly "We, South Africans, know too well that our freedom will not be fully realized until the freedom of the Palestinians people is achieved." I think he would definitely spread that to everyone in the rest of the world. I'm wondering, in addition to a possible divestment in lieu of recent protests in Palestine, if calling for a more unified government between Hamas and the Palestinian Authority, do you think there is any way, along with a divestment proposal, could support a unification of, to have really one governing authority ? is not going to negotiate with Hamas so it's got to be the Palestinian authority. If you have any thoughts, obviously, we could write strongly worded letters, but if there is any way that can be tied into a divestment proposal to greater strengthen it as a tool of peace?

Nolan: Off the top of my head that's a big subject that I don't have any particular comment on but I would be more than happy to engage in dialogue on and how we can extend the divestment resolution including that. For anyone that's not aware, it used to be Gaza and the West Bank were ruled together and then when Hamas came to power, the U.S., I believe in conjunction with Israel helped back a coup in the West Bank so that's why you now have 2 separate ruling bodies with Gaza being ruled by Hamas and the West Bank being ruled by the PA.

Audience Member 2: I'm just curious and correct me if I'm wrong, part of the divestment is to divest from Motorola and do you know what percentage of Motorola's resources goes towards supporting the IDF?

Nolan: I don't off top of my head.

Audience Member 2: The reason I'm asking that is because I think that's a really important thing to know because if it is a small percentage I feel like punishing an entire company is going to have ripple effects that are going to hurt other people in that company. I think divesting from a company for something they do I think it's important to know what amount of their money they allocate towards those actions because it will affect other people and Motorola is a vast organization.

Senator Caster: Point of Information: I did receive an email about this that I will send out to the Senate. Motorola has a \$90 million contract to provide the Israeli army with its advanced mountain road cell phone system. It's wholly developed subsidiary to Israel has a contract to develop encrypted wireless communications for the military featuring vehicle mounted antennae. It also has antenna and military installations in the West Bank. Source: InterfaithPeaceInitiative.com and I can distribute this if you'd like.

Audience Member 2: I was just wondering what portion goes to Israel because 90 Million sounds like a lot to us but to them it's not that much.

Nolan: I think that's a really good point that we do need to address because this came up last week as well saying these companies have multiple business ties with Israel and we can't focus the divestment directly. For instance Lockheed Martin we can't say you can't use these weapons, we can't control them. Some of the weapons might be used for normal defense purposes and some of them might be used in the occupation. This divestment proposal would have the whole thing taken back. I want to be very clear on this this that is absolutely the case and I support that and here's why. It's only moral and rational to say if I'm supplying your arms, if I'm giving you Apache helicopters, and I'm giving you F15s and I'm giving you missile systems, and sometimes that's going to be used against civilians, that's going to be used illegally, then we are cutting business ties until you end that illegal activity, because I will not be a part of the killing of

civilians. I will not supply a government that attacks civilians, that maintains an illegal occupation. As long as any of my materials are going to that and I can't control that, then we are cutting off business ties. That is absolutely the case and I support it and I won't apologize for it. As soon as the occupation and illegal activity ends, you resume normal business practices. That's fine. For this period of time since we can't control what goes to illegal activities, you cut off business. It seems like that's the only moral thing to do.

Stephanie: I have another question we're talking about as long as babies are being born at checkpoints and something like that, have you considered have anything to say about the fact that on the Palestinian side they use the back of ambulances to smuggle weapons into Israel, to attempt to smuggle weapons and dangerous things into Israel and they set off bombs from schools and mosques. Then whenever Israel does something back you look at it and say they did this but you're not really looking in context. What do you have to say?

Nolan: First off if you want to send me whatever Non-Governmental Organization is putting forward in claims I would be happy to address that. I haven't heard about that in the reports that I read. However, there is another good point that needs to be addressed here. There are absolutely human rights abuses taking place here on the side of the Palestinians. The point is, we, the U.S. aren't doing anything to support... My positions and the position for Students for Justice in Palestine is very clear. We don't want the U.S. involved. We are responsible for our actions and the actions of our government and corporations and we don't want to be a part of any human rights violations on either side. If anyone would like to point to investments that we have in Palestinian companies that then are used for military, please let me know, we will put those in the divestment proposal. As far as I know, we are not invested in a single Palestinian company that then contributes to rocket fire. I am of the opinion that if any human rights abuses are taking place on either side, we don't support either side. We're already halfway there, we already do nothing to support the human rights abuses that Hamas and other militant organizations engage in. We're half way there, let's go all the way there and stop supporting the human rights abuses that Israel engages in. It's a very straightforward, fair proposal.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: Thanks for coming back in. I'm not sure if you're aware of the resolution regarding Lockheed Martin that we passed a few months back. Are you familiar? I was just wondering in what direction you stood with the original resolution in terms of calling to question whether we as a community here should be getting involved with a group that has numerous civil rights and discrimination bias charges against it or if you advocating letting them come here because it does seem like a similar issue.

Nolan: I'm very staunchly opposed to Burlington doing business with Lockheed Martin, it's a terrible idea.

Vice President Maciewicz: Hi everyone, I just wanted to say I appreciate all of you coming and I just wanted to ask if there was any plan to continue this dialogue outside of senate. I feel like it has become a back and forth between our different guests and I think it's serving as a proxy to a larger dialogue and we should move it out of this room. You guys have all the guests coming the last two meetings have any plans to create a dialogue outside of this room.

Speaker Chevrier: Point of Information: I just quickly Googled Palestinian ambulance bombs and I got 1,860,000 results. The first bunch have to do with ambulances being saddled with bombs or armed gunmen so if you want to look that up there's plenty of information on the web.

Nolan: I just want to reiterate, my whole point is that we aren't doing anything to support the human rights abuses the Palestinian side is engaging in. We're already half divested from the abuses that take place in this conflict. Now let's go the whole way and not support any of the human rights abuses that take place in this conflict.

Senator Bennington: I think a lot of people have received emails from Chair Simmons about starting the dialogue process. I would like to formally offer my assistance in starting that. I think it would be great if we moved it out of this room and took the debate, put it on the shelf, and got into a dialogue and start making progress. You can email me, wbenning@uvm.edu unless Chair Simmons has already taken care of it, in which case, good job.

Chair Simmons: We have been having a dialogue with some senators. I got a sense that some senators were really had it up to here with the talk so I didn't want to push it down that road. I think one of the best things that can come of this is more students talking about it, having more students thinking about it. I think it's something this country has systematically swept under the rug and is not talked about. I don't think that's good because I think we can do better. I think the state of affairs is pretty poor. I didn't mean to say we're powerless, I think as students here we're very powerful and what we say to our own government is significant. I think we can urge them to do better for both Israelis and Palestinians. I would like to talk about that. I would like everyone here to think about what the best way to do that is, what the best forum to engage that is and we'll be in touch.

Hailey, Vermont Students for Israel (0:36.40)

Hailey: Hi I'm Hailey. I'm president of Vermont Students for Israel. I just wanted to thank you all for tabling this because I don't think a week is enough to learn about the conflict, I think we can all agree with that. Also, I just want to point out, I know this is being tabled and I know the SRI is reviewing the divestment proposal. I'm not going to talk about that, I just wanted to talk strictly about the proposal in that you pointed out that this is about human rights violations. I don't understand why it's just Israel because there are countries all over the world, the United States included, that are performing human rights violations and there are so many companies that UVM is invested in so pointing out Israel is really wrong. I'm sure there are other companies that are involved because you were just doing research against Israel's actions. I'm not disagreeing with you because obviously we have really different points of view and that's good that we're in a place where there is open dialogue but I don't think that human rights abuses are enough reasons to divest. That can't possibly be your only motivation. If you are interested in human rights abuses you have to go through the entire UVM portfolio and research every single company and every single country in this world that has human rights violations going on. You can't disagree with that. I really don't understand how. There must be some other thing going on with some other point if Israel is the only country that is being divested from if human rights violations are the main reasons why.

Open the Floor for Questions (0:39.01)

Senator Tepper: Thanks for coming in. I just wanted to ask if you were aware that anyone can bring forth a proposal to the Socially Responsible Investment working group about any company and if you were aware that portfolio is available for viewing.

Hailey: I'm aware of that and in this proposal it's citing human rights violations and human rights violations are done by, there's 200 countries in the world and I'm sure it is done by over half of them.

Senator M. White: Great point, we totally should be looking into human rights violations other than just Israel. I would like to ask you if you would like to begin that process today, systematically going through countries that have human rights violations anywhere human rights violations everywhere.

Hailey: Yeah, I don't see why not. I think they're wrong, there is so much to be learned by all of us. I am not well versed on the subject. I think I'm well versed on stuff about Israel but but human rights violations across the board I don't see that as being wrong.

Senator Bennington: So I have spent time combing through that list of investments and I'd be happy to email it to you because it's not really publically available. It's not online which really sucks, you have to talk to Marie Tiemann who is the endowment accountant. I guess I'm wondering if you would really consider taking the time to start looking into other companies that might be involved in other conflicts and if you would be interested in putting together a separate dialogue to talk about how we invest at this university and how we can change it. Some people that are on the subcommittee of the board for socially responsible investment thing the process think the process is horrible and we should change it. If students like yourself and Nolan that are very passionate can join forces and say let's stop investing in all companies that are participating in human rights abuses we can make some progress.

Hailey: yeah, sure.

Senator O'Brien: Thank you so much for coming in. I was curious talking about how countries all over the world commit human rights violations and how UVMs investing in more companies besides Israel that commit human rights violations. Do you think in saying that there are people behind it an ulterior motive and do you think that's constructive going into a dialogue or debate with students that have different beliefs or making that claim there are ulterior motives besides saying this is just about Israel?

Hailey: I think there are ulterior motives, yes. I think going into a dialogue, the dialogues if it is not about divestment, because divestment does have ulterior motives deep inside. I don't think in a dialogue talking about the Israel Palestine conflict, that would be different, there is no ulterior motive because we're just talking about what's going on and engaging in conversation about what is going on because there is so much going on. In the divestment, yeah, I think there are ulterior motives because no other countries being cited.

Senator O'Brien: Would you feel comfortable talking about what you think those ulterior motives are?

Hailey: I will say one thing, I don't believe that the students and professor that wrote this proposal were about anti-Semitism. I'm not saying that. I'm not accusing them of that. I do think the deeper grassroots divestment movement does have deeper anti-Semitic background. Right now, I'm not speaking on behalf of my group, but this what I'm about to say, I don't believe this is anti-Semitic, personally, but the grassroots movement the other people that are involved in other schools and places I think are.

Senator Caster: I would really be interested in forming a dialogue as I said consistently representing student opinion and advocacy on upholding this university to socially responsible investment. I was curious if you would push for divestment from a company like Raytheon who though may be invested in Israeli technology are invested in a myriad of other forms of human

rights abuses and violations and to advocate from a company that may be involved in Israel and the human rights violations, but would also being consistent with our message and saying we are divesting from this company because of their involvement in Israel and divesting from this company because they are selling munitions in Libya. I was just curious if that would be, if we made this comprehensive if you could find a way to support it even in the context of the occupation.

Hailey: If there are clear human rights violations with materials from that company then I don't see why not, but if it is just a company that is being used in the occupation, like, I don't know in Motorola. I was looking this up and there was an article in the *Free Press* and they said there weren't even any stocks in Motorola and I don't remember what it was but it was in a *Free Press* article if you want me to send that to you but I think if human rights violations if there is a consistent record of human rights violations in companies that we are invested in no matter what country they are in, including Israel, I think possibly but if the occupation is the only reason that we want to divest then I don't think that's plausible.

Senator Burns: You mentioned that Students for Justice in Palestine might have ulterior motives because they are only talking about Israel. First of all do you think Students for Palestine being in their name that this is what they're pushing for because they think it's the best way to do this. Do you think they should they not push this forward because you can't divest from one place in world without divesting from all in the world?

Hailey: Ok, their divestment proposal states human rights violations as the reason along with the illegal occupation, but you can't say it's human rights, can't say both. In the proposal it says human rights violations and an illegal occupation. If it just said illegal occupation they could put that through and I would say a million more things about why that's wrong. If you say human rights violations then why are you only singling out Israel? Because it says human rights violations that's why I think that's wrong.

President Mensah: Point of Clarification: Exactly which proposal are you talking about?

Hailey: I'm talking about the proposal to the SRI right now. The resolution was just to recommend [inaudible] proposal.

Senator Burns: I was more speaking to, since Students for Justice Palestine are directly targeting justice in Palestine, do you think there would be a better way for them getting justice in Palestine considering all these countries with human rights violations because from where I stand they're just trying to get justice in Palestine, not target Israel. It just happens that Israel happens to be in Palestine and they are the ones that... their whole goals is for justice in Palestine [inaudible].

Hailey: I kind of have the same answer I guess that's what they want but it really just makes the point not really if they are only saying human rights. I don't really know. There's a lot of human rights violations and if they say that and I know that's what they want. I'm not really sure how to answer that.

Senator Bennington: I know that you did not call any of these students anti-Semitic. I'm definitely a little sad that had to come up because I really believe in all of us that we can do things without being influenced by hatred and bigotry and I know that people in Vermont Students for Palestine are not bigoted and they really do believe in justice and human rights. How, as a

senator, should I reconcile that a lot of students I've spoken to that are Jewish said we should divest?

Hailey: I just think not this proposal. I'm not really sure. I think that the fact that Israel whether or not, I know plenty of Jewish students that think there should be a divestment as well. I think there is a deeper meaning as to why this conflict is so big when there are so many other conflicts going on in the world. I'm sorry I had to bring it up but there has to be a deeper reason as to why we are talking about Israel and Palestine right now and not a different affects. I don't know that's part of the reason why because historically, not within the past 20 years, there has been a lot of oppression against the Jewish people and other races and ethnic groups as well and that's part of the reason why. Historically they were extremely oppressed and that was the main reason why they have been in their homeland.

Chair Adams: Point of Information: Vermont Students for Justice in Palestine in their constitution are obviously promoting Justice in Palestine but also are supporting BDS as an organizations. Since you brought that up earlier I was wondering why you think BDS is anti-Semitic?

Hailey: Because they are only pointing out Israel. Because there are so many other human rights violations across the world and Israel, the only Jewish state. What about the human rights violations in other states in the world and surrounding Arab countries where women can't drive. Women can't drive in Saudi Arabia. Is that not a human rights violation? I'm pretty sure it is. It's only against Israel. Did you know that Syria has been occupying Lebanon for over 50 years? Why is that not coming up right now. That is why I think, it's just something going on in my head right now. Why else? I don't know why else.

Senator Lovell: I was just wondering if you were aware of the fact that a few years back STAND motioned for us to divest from Sudan due to the Darfur crisis. They chose to target one issue that was a single issue, it was contained, they could deal with ending our investment there as a good first step. If that was a good first step wouldn't a second step, even if it is in Israel be a good one, possibly. Along the lines of divestment in one area is good...

Senator M. White: A couple years back we made a resolution about gay rights here at UVM. In Uganda there is a huge problem with gay rights and we haven't stepped in there yet, that doesn't mean we're not going to, we only have so much time, so what's wrong with attacking human rights violations in a piece by piece manner?

Hailey: I just don't think that if you are voting to, if there is a specific thing going on which here I just don't know if that's the right idea. I don't know. I just think there's a lot. This divestment in other divestment proposals I think there is a clear problem. There is a very clear problem with gay rights. Here, this is a really hard issue. You can argue the human rights violations, you really can, and it's going from both sides. This specifically, it's not like there's a lot of oppression, there is a lot of oppression but a lot of it is economic oppression, there's a lot of different steps. Everyone can agree that gay rights, like everyone deserves equality. With South Africa you can agree that Apartheid is wrong but this is a really deep issue and a lot of the facts are false a lot of the facts brought up in this proposal are false. I believe that this is not a battle. I believe that's valid. Because everybody can agree that gays deserve rights, not everyone can agree, but if we're looking for equality then yeah. This is a very deep problem that has a lot of different sides and opinions so I don't know that this should be passed because there's a lot of different aspects. This is not necessarily something, it's more complex than other issues being brought up for divestment.

Greg: Can you speak a little bit about the BDS movement also supports the right of return that President Obama has said would be a possible end of to the conflict in Israel if you know about that?

Hailey: I don't know how much I can say about it other than there has been a lot of other peace agreements brought to the Palestinian people in past and with the right of return, that basically means that Israel will not have their own country. There's a lot of confusion with the Israeli Palestinian conflict and I'm not that well versed on it, I do know what it is and anyone can Google it. If we just gave up I don't really know how I can answer that. If the right of return, it's really complicated and I can't answer that.

Stephanie: I was wondering if you could talk about and maybe clarify why it's important, I thought you made some good points, maybe talk about the difference between divesting from somewhere like Uganda was mentioned where they're talking about gay rights versus like you said a very blatant human rights violations versus when people are comparing that and comparing South Africa to Israel which is the only democracy in the Middle East. Can you just explain more about that?

Hailey: I want to be clear that the divestment is not to divest from Israel but it is to divest from American companies that are benefiting from the occupation. Israel is the only country that has equality. It is the only Middle Eastern democracy, it has equal rights for everyone. Gays can serve in the military. Did you know that a few weeks ago there was a gay couple, one was Palestinian and one was Israeli. The Palestinian lived in the West Bank and they granted him citizenship, not citizenship but the ability to move to Israel because he was being treated badly in a Palestinian area where homosexuality is illegal and people that are homosexual are treated not equal. I just don't think that this is human rights, this is about human rights so if you're just bringing up human rights, like Apartheid South Africa and like Uganda there are just a lot of different violations that are wrong. The divestment from an occupation we can't decide whether or not that's wrong because there is so much complexity from that issue that I don't think it's the university's place to decide to divest from that issue.

Senator Goodnow: Thank you for coming in. We're starting to speak in circles and this is one of the reason why I think sponsoring a forum, as a senator I feel like that's the best move. I have to just bring the question, do you feel that a respectful debate forum can occur? Once the term anti-Semitism gets thrown out there, I really start to cringe and it kills the conversation. I heard from another side that is supportive of that, do you honestly feel like that's something we can sponsor or is this too entrenched that an open, respectful honest conversation can occur outside of this body?

Hailey: If we're just talking about the conflict. A forum about the divestment, I don't know if feelings will come out. I can't say. I brought it up right now because I believe that there's a deeper meaning but if there is just a dialogue about the conflict I think it could be ok.

Nolan: I just want to get a point of clarification because I'm a little bit confused. You talked about Uganda and the actions taken against Uganda or the human rights abuses taken against homosexuals. There were human rights abuses against homosexuals going on in other areas of world and yet you said you still supported that action against Uganda. I just want a point on what your train of thought is going through, I don't know why you would support action against Uganda with gay rights even though there's lots of other assaults on gay rights but you're so adamantly against divestment from Israel on the grounds that there are other human rights abuses.

Hailey: Because what's going on in Israel there's a lot of complexity. The proposal had two different things, it's about human rights and the occupation. If you're just talking about human rights I think that's ok but because this is about the occupation I don't think it's ok. If you're going to point out if there's a group that is only against gay rights violations in a certain place we can only agree that's wrong for the most part. I don't think that's possible when you're just talking about Israel.

Old Business (1:04.18)

Motion to Censure President Mensah

Senator Caster: I guess with this censure like I said last time and I will say it this time. I know a lot of people have said if you don't like the idea of a censure we should try to get rid of it in the constitution but the inability to apply it consistently raises a lot of concerns and worries and I'm going to vote against it because I don't think it has been applied consistently. I understand completely where the individuals who proposed the censure are coming from and it is legitimate, but that's not the problem.

Chair Herman: I just would like to echo what Senator Caster just said. I think it's not just for President Mensah to be censured for second time when there have been several occasions where we could have censured several people for patterns of not following the constitution. I could have censured Speaker Chevrier for not sending out legislation a day late or this past week 2.5 hours late but that would be ridiculous. The Constitution Committee would be obligated to approve it because technically she was in the wrong. That makes no sense. I think the Constitution Committee should have some type of discretion about what merits a censure and what doesn't. I think there needs to be some type of discretion given to the constitution committee so they don't look silly, in my opinion, because this censure holds slightly more weight than the last one but the last censure was ridiculous so I'm going to vote against it.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: I personally would like to preface this speaking to the validity of the censure, I'm not trying to sway anyone's view on way or another but I am trying to speak towards my personal involvement with it. You all were here when I brought up the resolution in opposition to the Pence Amendment which was extremely time sensitive. Prior to the meeting we had hours of conversation and debates about whether or not it should fall under emergency business. All of this was invalidated and made a moot point by the inability to distribute the legislation once it had been passed by the body. I personally felt like the work that myself and the easily dozen senators who sent me friendly amendments was really hung out to dry and left unattended and disrespected and disrespected by the fact that what we debated for easily about an hour had been left unattended and unable to do what it was intended to do. Additionally Jill, I can never pronounce her name, the lovely woman who came from Planned Parenthood is the head of PR for all of New England. She essentially drove 2 hours to be here on very short notice that night. It was passed and have kept up conversation and she was really disheartened that we were supposed to be setting a precedent to send to other universities who would receive legislation that was signed and passed and we weren't able to do that and Planned Parenthood who had been all set and geared up to do that felt taken advantage of in that they sent an important person to speak on their behalf only to not do what the legislation had hoped to do. I personally voted against the last censure I felt that it was unrealistic. I personally think I will vote for this one because there was time sensitive legislation involved and it was 3 weeks in row and Speaker Chevrier made such an open and persistent attempt to get in contact with President Mensah. I didn't support the last censure I feel obligated to support this one on my own behalf as well as the fact that it put

other clubs like Demonyms who couldn't get started because it wasn't signed and a club that got \$12,000 in supplemental funding where if something had gone wrong would have been left, they were given funds even though it was not signed. If something happened while they were away they would have owed SGA \$12,000 which I feel is too much to let slide by because we don't like censures.

Senator Mason: Like I have voiced to other senators on this body, it does have merit, that's not what we're discussing with most of the people who disagree with this censure. It does have merit. People are saying oh well President Mensah hasn't signed legislation in the past, well, why wait so long to censure him? You should have nipped this in the bud from the beginning. If he didn't sign it the first week or the first month not 3 weeks before we're about to leave this body to try set some example out of nowhere. Other people in this body have not done their duties on time with due diligence and nobody brought up the censure. To say these censures, this thing is more important than someone didn't do is a cop out. It's frustrating. You don't even see the difference of why censure this person with your personal opinion well this thing is not as important. We had a whole presentation that many people about due diligence saying everything is being fair but we're not doing that. Why do it for one person and not the other no matter how big you think this mistake is compared with another mistake. Late is late, if it's a minute, if it's a second, if it's an hour, if it's 5 days, if it's 3 months. Late is late, period. If that was that important then and it's important now it should have already been brought up in previous discussion and other censures should have been going out. It just mind boggles me why one person is being pointed out more than others. Is it a personal bias? Is it some kind of personal attack? Is it some kind of prejudice? It offends me personally in that aspect to think that it even could be because of that just because I identify with him more. I am going to abstain from even voting on that because I'm disgusted by that. It is the same things and the issues that people come up to us on this body as people of color that other organizations come up to ask us when these things that are in *The Cynic* in the front page that have talked about and quoted on and they bring it up to us why this is being brought up when other things aren't brought up. This is the reason why can't encourage these people to come out and sign a packet to join this body. I'm disgusted by this whole thing.

Senator Benner: I'd like to voice my opinion on this censure after if I can yield the floor to you Speaker Chevrier to explain the circumstances under which you can vote yea, nay, or abstain.

Speaker Chevrier: Sure so it's a motion so like any other motion you are allowed to vote in favor or against it and there are two reasons why you can abstain. One if it's a conflict of interest or two if you feel as though you are not knowledgeable on the subject and feel like you can't make an educated vote.

Senator Benner: I was looking for the idea apparently if you vote no it means that you disagree with the fact that President Mensah broke the rule or if you abstain you are disgusted with the whole thing, so to speak.

Speaker Chevrier: I think if you decided you had a conflict of interest because you were disgusted I think it's fine to abstain. I'm not sure quite what your question is but I'm going to try to scramble around here to answer it. The idea of an abstention is it is a lack of vote. It needs 50% to pass. There are 42 senators, let's assume we are all present, it needs 21 to pass. If one person abstains or two people abstain to make the math easier for me then it would be out of 40 and it will need 20 to pass, not 21.

Senator Benner: I very much dislike the idea of a censure as a whole. I think it is a last resort method body and it sends a message from our body to the student body that we can't solve issues

through discussions. I think instead of a censure it's proper to say, ok, we are disappointed with you, we think you screwed up, and we're going to talk about it. I think we've done that. President Mensah has been extraordinarily receptive to it. He took it with a lot more humility than he did the first one. When he sent the email out for PR to edit he sent it out 48 earlier than he ever had. It seems like he's really taken this to heart and he has taken this well, he knows what need to do and we could use staying away from the bad press of a censure especially in a time during which we are looking for a lot of people to run for this body, that we like to take out our leaders every time they do something small.

Senator Yeager: I just want to preface this, this is my mindset as to why this is a deserving censure. I don't think we're doing this to set an example. I feel like we're doing this because this is more of a last resort. I'll tell you why for a few reasons. First of all, this has been an ongoing thing, unfortunately, and I know you say tit for tat, but the thing is if there's been 3 weeks which he hasn't signed the legislation and that is a huge deal. A tit for tat would be getting someone who didn't sign once to censure him as well. This is my reasoning behind this because we've looked the other way multiple times for Kofi and others. It's not like every single time President Mensah hasn't signed the legislation that we've censured him. It's the long span of time where he hasn't signed the legislation. I know he said one of those weeks he was sick and we wasn't able to get out of bed and I totally understand that except he collected his stipend so I feel like he totally should have signed the legislation and I don't really think that's an excuse. I think the reason why there's been more censures for President Mensah is simply because the president has more responsibility than all of us, therefore he has more chance to mess up and this was a mess up and it was in the constitution and we looked the other way long enough. I applaud the fact that he has taken this to heart but I still feel it's warranted.

Chair Adams: I just want to speak to a couple of different things. I spoke to President Mensah the first week he didn't sign legislation pointing out that he called us all out and how could you be the first one to not do it on time and several of you were in the room when I did that. Then the next week he didn't sign legislation on time and then the next week. It's not like it's out of the blue let me look up President Mensah's first screw up and nail him. It wasn't my intention to do that, it is a pattern. Second of all, it's a pattern that has affected students. It has affected our ability to enact emergency legislation that was passed. It's also affecting clubs which I've been very honest about, they are my constituents. On behalf of Demonyms and Crew I felt I had to censure President Mensah. I think that's unfortunate. In terms of hypocrisy, President Mensah didn't sign 15 pieces of legislation in the past 3 weeks on time. Technically if I wanted to call everyone out for trivial things, I would censure him 15 times. That is silly, that is being ridiculous. Everybody has a bad week, people mess up from time to time and we should be forgiven, but it is a pattern and we need to address a pattern. A lot of people have brought up the unfortunate timing of this and the timing of this has prompted me to think about last year and elections and particularly President Mensah's platform which he asked us to buy into when we became members of this body. He ran on a platform of accountability, visibility, and legacy. By not signing legislation, he has affected our legacy. I have talked to him hold him accountable, I am censuring him to hold him accountable, and visibility also means transparency so I think by his own standards for this body we have to pass this censure.

Senator M. White: Amanda's got a hell of a point. One, I don't think standards we hold President Mensah to are unfair and he's the president, he signed up for the job of head honcho. Number two, you collected your stipend which means you did your job. Three weeks in a row you didn't do it.

President Mensah: Greg and Senator White you bring up good points with the stipend. I would like before anyone else brings up the stipend I collected for the 3 weeks that I didn't sign the legislation, signing 3 or 4 pieces of legislation is only about 5-10% of my job. I still did if not all of my job before that, I was still in constant email communication with everyone I was supposed to be and I was still scheduling meetings and rescheduling meetings for the week that I wasn't able to get out of bed. I know you're bringing up the stipend part, but it was just like a 5-10% of my job that I was going to do for the one week. Do you understand?

Senator M. White: I would like to echo something the wisest man on Senate Jordan Lovell said earlier this year that if he only did 5-10% of his job he wouldn't get paid. A couple more small things, Dominique brought up the idea that some of this is put forth through racism which is something I dealt with last time with the censure. Please be careful when you are throwing these terms around. They are conversation enders and I think they really hurt people's credibility and it fucking sucks when you're not a racist to be called a racist so please be careful. Last thing, I'd like to address Benner's point of abstaining.

Senator Mason: Point of Information: I said prejudice.

Senator M. White: Sorry, my bad. I'm getting caught up in things that happened last time. Abstention, I think that if you are voting yea or nay on this you are voting yes he violated the constitution which is not 3 or 4 times or no he did not. If you think this censure is a bad idea because it looks bad on the body you should abstain because that's a conflict of interest. You can no longer vote yes or no if you think that people's idea of SGA come into conflict with whether or not he violated the constitution which is how I'm going to vote. That's how I'm going to vote, I'm going to abstain.

Speaker Chevrier: I thought that I would take time to address this as one of the authors of the bill I was one of the people most affected by late signing. I wanted to respond to what Senator Benner said about how this was brought up and how President Mensah has now followed all of the rules. I kind of want to respond to my own hypocrisy because earlier in the year I said it would be crazy to censure someone for not signing legislation, that's silly. The fact that this has happened 3 weeks in row cause me to change my mind. I walked all the way up from the library to the office with my bad knee and it's not signed and he said I'm sorry, I'm sick. I said, that's fine, just let me know next time if you're not going to sign it so I didn't waste my time. Then the next week he didn't sign it again so he said oh yeah I will. It was the third week when even though I had 2 tests the Thursday before Spring Break I will come in early and print them out before the tests, make sure you sign them. I would have said it's ridiculous, but I can't vote hypothetically. I would have voted or probably abstained from a censure if someone brought it up the first time he missed it out of this set of three. I would have said that's ridiculous, the second time I would have said that's ridiculous but I think using this as a last resort the third time has gotten us where we wanted because he signed them early last week. Even though it's frustrating that censure has changed the action, I do think that's at the root of this.

Senator Rifken: Two quick things. First off and maybe I just don't know enough information about what's been going on in exec but I feel like it should be the job of the executive committee to monitor these things and then it doesn't need to be thrust on to senate to do it. I guess I'm disappointed there that this couldn't be handled by exec. My second part is a question for the speaker about the constitution committee. Are they deciding the validity of the censure and then we as a body vote on the censure?

Speaker Chevrier: The Constitution Committee's job is to see if the Constitution has been directly violated. For instance, one of my jobs as speaker is to send the voting records to Jess. It takes hours and it's a pain in the butt but there is no timeline in the Constitution that says when I have to get it in by. Sometimes it's a week, sometimes it's 11 days but I always get it in. If someone were to censure me for sending the voting records too late then the Constitution Committee would come to the conclusion that voting records time line is not in the Constitution. With this we were able to look at legislation that wasn't signed and say yes, it was more than 72 hours.

Senator Rifken: I guess my second part in there would be if we need to re look at that because we're having this problem where I always thought it was the Constitution Committee that decided if it's valid or fair. I need to kind of think about that then and who is deciding that. I always thought it was the Constitution Committee that was deciding it.

Speaker Chevrier: Because censures are a motion, if it were posed in some other form that would make it possible to give the sole authority to the Constitution Committee and then senate votes on it when it comes to the Senate floor. The Constitution currently outlines that the Constitution Committee bring to the senate whether or not it's valid so if I said, no it's not valid, there's nothing about timelines in the Constitution then you guys wouldn't be able to vote on it because it would be an inappropriate motion. That's currently how the constitution is laid out.

Vote on Motion to Censure President Mensah - passes

Emergency Business (1:27.09)

n/a

New Business (1:27.14)

n/a

Executive Reports (1:27.18)

Speaker Chevrier: Hi friends. First thing I want to thank everybody who came out to the debates yesterday. I really liked them, hopefully you did too. If you have any suggestions as to ways that things could have made them better I will be happy to pass them on to whoever takes my job next year. Also, please get your friends to vote. The Presidential election starts tomorrow at 8am and it goes until 4pm the following next day. It's on the Lynx. Uvm.edu/clubs. We had a huge voter turnout last year and it would really suck if it goes down afterwards. What will it say for our legacy if 3 people vote. Please get your friends to vote. As far as senatorial elections are concerned, I took a tally of people who have signed out packets, these are the people that are not on the ballot but of people who signed out packets. We have 15 current senators, 2 past senators, and 13 newbies. The problem is only 8 of them are off-campus. Only 8 which means we will have huge openings because we decided to vote against popular vote last week. I have tried to put it out on every single listserv I am a part of, every historically underrepresented colleges, all of off campus students just received an email from me. LGBT, ALANA, every listserv I'm on, the IRA listserv, hall council listserv. If you are on any listserv and haven't received an email from me begging you to join senate please send one. I have gotten 6 people who have emailed me saying they got my email and will take out packets. If you could get 12 more that would be great. Last meeting was very long and a lot of chairs stood up and said they would send out their report and the reason why every chair gives a report is because that's supposed to explain what you did that

week and that changed from originally having to write down what you did to deserve your stipend. Some of you didn't after you said that you would send it out so technically you should be censured as well, or you could just send it out. That's it, please vote send out, please fill out packets.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:30.22)

Chair Adams: Are laptops now allowable during public forum because both you and President Mensah used yours.

Speaker Chevrier: No they are not allowed during public forum. I tried to use mine as a point of information but now that you've called me out I will never do it again. I have asked president Mensah not to and he says he has bad handwriting and would like to keep it up.

Chair Adams: Can you read the questions that you didn't ask the presidential candidates?

Speaker Chevrier: Some of them were screened which is why instead of switching it up and giving you the mike you had to listen to me. I will say one of them was who do you think the hottest senator is so I screened that. How prepared do you feel for the presidential position? Have you actually had this I can't even read this. If someone wrote the yellow one please tell me or else I won't send that out.

President Mensah: How prepared do you feel for the presidential position? Have you actually had conversations with this president or contacted presidents from past years?

Speaker Chevrier: What do you feel has been this year's, this one is good, as president, how will you separate personal agenda versus what is imperative for students?

Senator Bennington: Is there any way that either we could, the Constitution Committee would be interested in opening up the constitution again because it seems like now some of us would change our votes and agree that not changing the 50/50 on campus off campus is already causing us a problem. Also, is there any way we can extend senatorial elections to have a couple more days to get more people interested?

Speaker Chevrier: Unfortunately while I would love to say yes to both of those, both are a nay. Firstly, as far as reopening the constitution it takes 2 weeks. Which plays into your second question what it says in the current constitution is that we would have to happen within a certain timeline that we are abiding by and pushing it back two weeks would go against the constitution which means we would all get censured.

Senator Burns: What happens if 21 people aren't running for off-campus positions?

Speaker Chevrier: The 8 people that run get on and then you start off with a really huge body and go right to appointments in the fall.

Chair Adams: Is the constitution going to look in to the censuring process since so many senators are uncomfortable with it?

Speaker Chevrier: I am not going to look into anything until you guys bring it up with me so we will have a Constitution meeting in the next 4 weeks.

Senator Vitagliano: I have a question that if there is such a huge opening for next year I believe we agreed there would be an election 2 weeks before the start of the semester so I guess there can't be an election during the summer.

Speaker Chevrier: The Constitution was changed for midterm elections it's easier so there is less of a threshold for midterm elections but there is nothing in there for elections at the beginning of the year. 5 senators will be appointed at the beginning of year because there will be 5 first years.

Senator M. White: Because we had this amendment about the 21-21 split on the table before is there any way we can revisit it or is that cheating? It is going to be a big problem if we only have 8 and then we have to appoint 13 people next year right off the bat.

Speaker Chevrier: Two things, it was 8 people this morning and 6 people have emailed me since. The problem is I'm going to say no and that's me saying it's my job to interpret the Constitution, not because I don't think it would be helpful, I think it would be great, but bills are not allowed to be reintroduced in the same form. If I brought up the Claire is the coolest and you all unanimously voted it down, I wouldn't be able to bring it up every week because that would be unhelpful and disrespectful to the body that originally said no. While we don't have to use the constitutional amendment changes in the same way we do bills, I think it would be really bad for the body if we were able to make that and switch it up just because we would like to take back our votes and switch it. If anyone disagrees with me talk to me about it and I may be persuaded but I doubt it.

Senator Caster: We have 8 people who are living off campus right now who are taking out packets or we have 8 people who will be living off campus next semester or will live off campus or are living off campus.

Speaker Chevrier: The way we do that is for the calendar year. Even though senators are sworn in in April it is for the next year you will be living off campus. We have 8 people currently right now that will be running for off campus spots. You raises a good question that I had never thought of, on the sheet that you have to sign when you take out a packet it says circle on or off campus so maybe it's possible that people are confused so I will tell Jess to have them circle what they will be next year.

Senator Ravech: When I signed mine out Jess told me to do what I'll be living next year.

Speaker Chevrier: I'll make sure she always does that.

Vice President Maciewicz (1:37.09): I'll try to keep it snappy because it is already 9:40. Hope some of you have noticed some of the office renovations, they're almost all done except for some of the painting. All the new signs are up. There's a new sign in the hallway, it's metal and green. I think it looks pretty nice. We just need to finish some last minute painting and hand some pictures and the TV back up. I think it's looking a little bit nicer. Looking at the storage remodel that I've been talking about. We evicted or are evicting clubs that don't need their space or didn't respond to my email. We will be reassigning them to new clubs. I also have a work-study student who is helping me organize the junk from the back. We are going to donate it to charity and get some more organization in there. Student life is vacating all their space downstairs so we can have more storage for clubs in the cage. Next week we will be voting on the 3 SGA end of the year awards. There is the Diversity Award, the Service Award, and the Gormley Award, all of those are available to any Senator, including Speaker Chevrier, except the Gormley award must be for a

senior. Kofi Liz and I are not eligible for any of them. We will be voting for them next week by secret ballot. There is no debate on it, it will happen during my report. Start thinking about who you would like to vote for, I sent out the descriptions last week. End of the year banquet April 5 and April 12. Both 5:30-7:00. The first is hosted by President Fogel and his wife. The last meeting will be hosted by me and both will have free food and mine will include a gift which you should all be excited about. Last The last thing I am working on is the Davis Center ethos report. I serve along with Pat Brown and Alan Josie, the 3 Davis Center advisors and we are doing a report of how the Davis Center can be improved with the fee we all paid. I had a team of 4 people and I made them sit on the first floor of the Davis Center for a couple hours and observe and make recommendations on how it could be better sigs, color, scheme, anything. I will send that out to you when I send it to the Davis Center Advisory Committee. If you have any ideas about floor 1 you can send to me. Have a good week, please remember to vote, it's very important.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:39.41)

Speaker Chevrier: I was wondering if you could have the names of people that are graduating seniors because I remember voting for someone that then wasn't eligible and I have no idea who is graduating. I know that not least year but the year before when it was Provost Hughes and not Provost Knodell that he invited us into home and he invited not only every single senator but every single senator could bring a guest that meant the most to them on campus. So it was a big honor for somebody to be invited and so it was a big honor for them to be invited. There was good food and it was at the Provost's House that the university pays for but is not actually not lived in. I was wondering if there were any conversations with Provost Knodell about why she's not doing that.

Vice President Maciewicz: I will certainly send out list of graduating seniors. For those of you who are seniors who I don't know as well and you're not graduating and taking a 5th year, I will double check with all of you. I think I know who's graduating but I will send out a list of seniors. I don't know, I do know the Provost used to host a dinner at their house. I have not heard anything from Provost Knodell. I can ask her but I gaurentee it's too late to do it now but for next year I will ask her or tell her it was a good tradition and she should start doing it again.

President Mensah (1:41.14): To quickly speak to your question Speaker Chevrier, Provost Knodell no longer lives at that house and her house is far away. I agree, it was an amazing experience being able to walk down to South Prospect. Maybe if her house was closer we would be able to do it. I get what you mean. A few things, as mentioned last week David and I will be having a meeting tomorrow with some senior administration so there was a week available for you all to send me any questions. If you have any questions that you all feel would be important for me to ask, actually Provost Knodell will be there. She wasn't able to be at the last one. This is our final meeting with them as the next time a meeting is scheduled we will no longer be in office. There is the first Naked Bike Ride meeting this Friday and I think I will let Jesse speak to that more as he gets to his report. The decision was made to go ahead and fund BlirpIt for next year. As I mentioned a few meetings ago they are requesting \$6,000 from us, \$6,000 from IRA and some money from other sources but the final decision will be

Chair Mallea: Point of Information: We have agreed to write legislation on it. The Senate still has to pass it.

President Mensah: As Chair Mallea just mentioned the final decision will rest on you. We felt it was the best way to bring it to the senate floor and have you all vote on it. David mentioned most of this when the floor was yielded to him. The conversation we had was really interesting but I

think it was mostly a debate that was going on between the two different groups and I really don't think that is the intent of public forum to have groups to come and debate, rather it is a time for us to ask them questions and raise awareness to the issue. I feel like for the past 2 weeks that wasn't done to the extent that it could have been. Last week Thursday during exec I created an ad hoc committee that is going to address the FDA requirement that the Red Cross Association bans men who sleep with men from giving blood. I'm really excited for that. There was a lot of good things and last week's exec meeting was really productive and this was one of the things that came from it. Senator of the week actually was nominated by one of the chairs and it goes to Chris Juare. I would like to formally give my applause to all of the Finance Committee because I feel like over the past few weeks they have been working really hard to get the budgets allocated out to student organizations in a timely manner and they've set a process for appeal and pushed forward in trying to get us to understand the budget process as best as possible but still working diligently to get next year's FY 12 budget out to all the clubs. I am going to preface what I'm going to say next by saying that it's going to be a bit long winded. It deals with the censure and first I am going to say how disappointed I was in *The Cynic* this past week for making this whole censure issue front page news. To me, I'm not that important nor is the censure that important that it should have taken away from next year's elections. Students this week are going to be voting on 2 of the most important positions for student representatives on campus. That was pushed to page 10 while, in my opinion, the senseless censure was pushed to page 1. I was disappointed with that. As Senator Mason mentioned a few moments ago which I think some of you might interpret wrong since Senator White stood up and misquoted what Senator Mason said. I think you need to understand a bit of the history that has been told to me from Pat and different sources about this organization and how different minority groups perceive this student body. Bear with me, this it going to be long winded. In terms of people questioning the motives and the true intentions of people, not just this year but in past years on senate, back in the 80s when the first male student of color was president he got impeached halfway through his term for committing some kind of infraction that as Pat has told me was done by other presidents before him. The question was why was everyone focusing on him so much and wanted to impeach him when whatever he committed was done in previous years before but no one brought up any motion? That was back in the 80s. A few years ago, 5 or 6 years ago, this senatorial body that looks very different from when Alex and I joined in 2007, there were about 5 or 6 students of color that sat on this body. Halfway through their term they felt so unsupported, they felt that why am I still on a body that thinks the ALANA student center that is the support center on campus for students of color is a club? Yet this is supposed to be the representative body for 10,000+ students on this campus yet they think one of these minority groups is a club. My first year, senators that had been on this campus for 3 or 4 years still thought this was a club. A lot of people that I know that wanted to run were put off by the idea that these are people that are supposed to be making educated decisions on my beliefs and issues but I don't feel they can fully support why I'm here. In one swift motion they all got up and resigned because they felt unsupported. The only person that stayed that was a person of color was DaVaughn Vincent-Bryant who was the Vice Preident my first year because he felt he should be there and he should be an example to show people of other minority groups whether or not it was LGBTQ or students of color can actually participate in this organization and make a difference. When Senator Mason mentioned that other people, not just students but faculty members, that last week the *Water Tower* mentioned that Professor Kornbluh who is the head of the Women and Gender Studies department and I actually had a class with her last semester, she sent another email this afternoon after reading the censure saying Kofi, what's going on. When I have professors and students that are walking in the hall and they are going Kofi they are really just trying to impeach you, they're just trying to kick you out of office. I have to take a step back and defend this whole organization just as I've been doing since spring semester of last year. That's what I've been doing. Even if we're doing this one censure because I failed to sign 14 pieces of legislation not 15 in the past three weeks, one of the weeks I was sick and I do

apologize. I could have emailed Claire so she didn't have to walk up from the Dana Medical Library studying, that was completely on me. The past two weeks I do admit to it, I made a complete flop, sometimes my memory is not the best. The week before spring break I was running out trying to catch a flight. I came into the office with every intention of signing it but I had to meet with a student group and I had completely forgot by the time Jess knocked on my door because she was driving me to the airport. Students are mentioning these things it's not necessarily because they are calling your racist or discriminatory. They are questioning the motives behind why you feel the need to pick out one person in the organization when you've had multiple reasons, multiple instances to censure someone else. I do understand what you are saying Senator Yeager that I am the president and my position is more polarized than others and I think it's because it's out there so much that people are looking at this and saying what is going on. It really does suck. Even one of the speakers from one of the Jewish groups said she believes that there is Anti-Semitic reasons behind that. Can we be sure of that? No. Is she feeling that way because she is Jewish? Potentially. To me, this censure in essence, I don't want to say you all voted on something senseless, means nothing to me in the fact that what you wanted done from this censure has already happened or the reasons for doing this censure have already been recognized by me. I spoke to Speaker Chevrier and I said it makes me feel bad that you have to remind me because that makes me feel like I'm not doing my job. In those 2 weeks aside from the facts that I was sick, I felt terrible. As soon as I read that email when I was at the TFA I was like shit. It's my job and I want to be holding myself to a higher accountability and I did slip up for 2 weeks. 3 weeks in total because I was sick one of them. That's just a little bit of history I wanted to put out there in terms of how different groups on campus are interpreting the actions by this body that have been happening for the past year and also for multiple years. When I came on this body the only two students of color were myself and Senator Mallea and I was like, wait, what's going on? This is supposed to be representative of this organization as possible. Then talking to different student groups some of them have felt ostracized in years past and that's one of the things, I tried to bridge those connections earlier this year. I had a workshop with as many of the student groups of color to try to reopen that connection they felt as if had fallen off in years past with this organization to make us more of an inclusive body and make us more representative of different student groups. I just wanted to give a little bit more explanation of what Senator Mason and Senator Caster were saying of the implications of these past two censures. People are seeing is as they have had the opportunity to do it in the past but they haven't and now because this person is doing it they are going to. They are not seeing in the lens you are because you feel as if you are censuring someone because they are the president they might see it that you are censuring someone because they are an LGBTQ student or a student of color. No one is actually pointing the finger at you, they are more so looking at the history of this organization and how they have interacted with different groups in the past.

Open the Floor for Questions (1:54.18)

Chair Filstein: Thank you for that. That was really helpful and definitely some meaningful words. My question is on behalf of former Senator Lober, I wanted to ask you what you are planning to discuss tomorrow, specifically?

President Mensah: I've received a few emails and talked to a few people about priority registration in terms of the 50% and what they are trying to gauge by that. If years from now they are going to start creating some statistical information to see if it is reducing the amount of students that can't get into classes. Maybe they completely get rid of that 50% so everyone is put into in class priority registration or not. I'm not going to, of course not, forget about course evaluations because that really is important. It's one of the important things we did this year so I

want to make sure we don't lose that. I also want to touch on the R5, where the information for the new gymnasium is headed.

Senator Bennington: Thank you for that, that was beautiful and it's really important that we have those conversations even if they are uncomfortable and difficult. Tomorrow, administration, is Richard Cate going to be there?

President Mensah: No, unfortunately Richard Cate is not one of the people that we meet on a regular basis. It is going to be Gustafson, Lucier, Derr, and Knodell. Those are the usual suspects.

Senator Bennington: You could probably ask this question to Knodell, I already asked this question to Richard Cate. There is \$600,000-\$1 million in other considerations of the budget proposal and one of those things is the TRI. If you could be what's up, where is that possible money going to come from if it's going to the TRI? Hopefully not from our tuition.

President Mensah: Could you email me that because I'm going to forget and I don't want to not bring it up tomorrow.

Chair Adams: I was wondering if you could give us a Lynx update.

President Mensah: Where the Lynx is headed per conversation that I had with Pat Brown last week. So as some of you might know, we wanted to gauge whether or not the lynx is the best tool to be reaching student clubs on campus and whether it is doing what it's supposed to do. The Lynx working group met once to discuss that and after we left the meeting it was to try to find different programs. We were coming around to the Spring break time but more importantly our advisor Pat Brown was hopping around to different conferences. As he's returned, pretty much what he's told me is that 3 years ago when Jay Taylor, he was president 2 years ago, he was looking through different systems and essentially there were 2 big companies out there that provided these services which were Orx inc. and Collegiate inc. That hasn't changed and right now we are under the collegiate lynx system on our campus. What that is going to mean for the conversations with the Lynx discussion group is maybe it's going to be too hasty to try to completely get rid of the Lynx right now. If we don't have any other stable group that works on different campuses. One of the only things that is coming to mind is square crop but this is their first year running. I don't want to pay \$20,000-\$30,000 to hop on to this and then it might not be exactly what we want. We're going to look up ways to make sure the product is actually working better and how to get more students involved with that. I guess that turnover for next year's administration coming up quickly it might be hard for us to do that so Pat and I are looking to Leon, our club sports coordinator, to focus a good chunk of his summer time doing that.

Senator Rifken: Thank you so much for the history you went on because I think it's really important we as a senate know our history. When we don't it's not always as informed as what we want to be. This is a suggestion for next year when we do the transition, maybe have some sort of diversity, prejudice workshop that goes over this history. I just went to the discrimination and bias conference and it was awesome. Something for senate, because it's really hard and creates a really tense atmosphere having to deal with hefty subjects like this. I definitely think it's something that needs to be addressed not in Senate but in a conversational setting.

President Mensah: I would be more than in favor of having Senator Vitagliano because I know he's going to be Vice President next year doing something like that because. I can tell you that sometimes it's yay to the max and sometimes it's not going to be the easiest. I can attest to fact my first year on senate when Vice President Bryant tried to do a diversity seminar for the retreat

so many people said they wouldn't want to come and the attention span of people was spaced out because we had touched on it in the fall retreat and he wanted to go more in depth and it was appalling that people didn't want to pay attention to it. I hope next year's senate does want to pay more attention to it.

Senator Caster: I think that's a great idea. As far as the Lynx goes, this may be bizzare, but is there any way we can coordinate with facebook and calling facebook and say hey, upload our information and we'll give you \$20,000.

President Mensah: I don't think we need to imbezzle funds to get to facebook. Nick and the Public Relations committee have been working diligently with Jess to get our SGA facebook page and our clubs facebook page really spiffy looking. If you look at Brown's facebook page what they have is their main Student Government page and right next to it they literally list a link to every club and their facebook page online. Since millions of people use facebook we feel like that's another positive way to reach students.

Chair Adams: Point of Information: The Lynx will already take comments and status updates posed and crosslist it with facebook and twitter, just very few choose to use that option.

Senator Mason: Going off what Senator Rifken said about it, just because I was at meeting with Pat last year in beginning, so if we are we going to do something like that, because I know that the leaving from exec were at that meeting as well as different heads of organizations. If you're going to head that up and ask certain people to come or someone else.

President Mensah: To clarify what Senator Mason was talking about, in lieu of some of the things that happened at the end of last year, a lot of different student groups felt negatively affected by that so Pat Brown set up a working group with some of the folks that were involved in the elections decision making process in senate and the different groups that felt negatively affected, almost what I am hoping with happen with the *Water Tower* and senate. We had a lot of good conversation and Pat Brown did give us more background about what's going on. I would be interested in looking to see what conversations we can have with this body next year and looking to to make sure we don't keep seeing repetition of things in the past and this organization stops getting a bad name because I really do love this organization. When I came to UVM Fall 2007, one of the first things I decided to be a part of was SGA because I had been part of SGA and I felt like as a senator I could really make an impact. Coming back to my residence hall at 11pm and saying oh my god, I just came out of a 3 hour senate meeting we were just talking about the Red Cross ban. When I feel as if I have to act as a defendant all of the time, which I feel like I have been doing for a good amount of time this past year. With some of the actions passed going back from the stipends the first week to this now. I personally have to consistently defend people's actions. It hurts sometimes because people are calling me naïve, they're calling stupid and people say I don't want to look at it in the face for what it is and no, this is more of a reason and this is what's going on. I would hope that next year's president doesn't receive notes from the LGBTQA center and that ALANA student center saying we're here for you and we support you because as if something more drastic is really going on. I think those conversations are really important.

Senator M. White: I would hope that you would defend our actions especially those of us who vehemently supported you for such a long time.

Treasurer Salsgiver (2:06.09): The Treasurer Application is out which went to club signers. It's

due April 4 if there is anyone you know who is interested in it forward that email to them or give me their name and I'll forward the application to them directly. It came out with a letter listing. Last year when I came to the position I didn't know a lot about it. I didn't know when my responsibilities started and I didn't know what went into being the Treasurer. I drew up a letter which hopefully you read through which lists some of the responsibilities and links to the constitution and hopefully will be helpful for anyone applying. This week I also talked with Pat and Blank about how much money we have to play with for the budget, how much we have for appeals and supplementals. Blanka met with Finance today to go over those numbers. I also went through all of the budgets with Blanka over the past 48 hours. Kind of rushed but I think we did a good job. I met with the Finance Committee today to sort through all the glitches. I think that everything is coming together really well. We all worked really hard on it and they are doing a good job. P.O.s as regular and that's it.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:07.33)

Senator Vitagliano: How many people have taken out an application that you know of?

Treasurer Salsgiver: Well you don't take out an application, it's just one that you fill out. I have been talked to by 4 people and 3 of them are already getting recommendation letters and they are all really qualified.

Senator O'Brien: Thank you so much for hard work. I was curious if you can fill us in on the status of the professional development fund for next year if it will be the same amount as this year and explain this fund because I know some students don't know about it.

Treasurer Salsgiver: What Whitney is referring to is the Student Professional Development Fund. It's going to be the same for next year, it's going to get \$12,000 for the beginning of the year and it's a fund that any individual can apply to. It's not for a club, it's for an individual. You don't have to be in any sort of club and you can apply to help fund any kind of conference and event that could help you in your professional career. A lot of science come looking for funding for conferences and a few senators have used it looking for pre medical or environmental type conference or something for sustainability. It's anything that has to do with your major that could further your career down the road. That will still be there.

Committee Reports (2:09.03):

Finance:

Chair Mallea: Liz summed up budgets. We've been really busy, Finance Committee has worked really hard and we apologize for being absent for most of the debates and I would also like to apologize for being on my laptop. I would also like to sleep tonight. This was a pretty light week for supplemental requests. We had 3 requests and 12 gas requests, all under \$2,000. If anyone has any questions about budgets before we present the budget just email me, come find me.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:09.55)

Senator Yeager: I know budgets are winding down and that you put the stipend characteristics of what you need in order to earn your stipend over the summer on the back burner. I was wondering if you were picking that up again.

Chair Mallea: That's a great question. We've been looking at a lot of different things in the operational documents. Within budgets stuff has come up on how much money can we allocate

for food and stuff like that. After appeals are done by the end of this weekend and hopefully we'll have some time to sit down as a committee and go over that.

Student Activities (2:10.42):

Chair Adams: Hi friends. A little follow up with The *Water Tower*, Molly has been meeting with everyone who has requested a meeting with her. I just wanted to throw that out there as something they are doing to address the issue. There is a bit of concern on how the message is being relayed back to the rest of the organization. I am working out with her for someone, either myself or somebody else that is better qualified to talk to the concerns people have. Potentially Dustin from Student Life could do the same thing. From that end, we met with some concerned students. Senator Clader, Senator Cesario, and Senator Tepper and I all sat down with Mo Sykes from last week and Avery is still hoping to be involved. Really awesome people so we're hoping to move that forward in a really constructive action oriented way. Hopefully you guys will be seeing a resolution on that this year but I'll let CODEEE elaborate. The club awards banquet is April 7, which is 2 weeks away. We're hoping to do an ice cream social or other similar dessert which will be cheaper which will allow us to keep it open with food as a first come first serve kind of thing. We're hoping to turn it into a PowerPoint of club successes and open it up to presidents to shout out to their members. We're thinking in the form of an ongoing slideshow. Senators Mason and Moise are sort of heading that up. If you see a flash drive on the SAC/Finance desk, that is what it is there for so please don't take it. Also in terms of SAC and Finance desk, please don't leave your gallon of milk on there for a day or so. We are not pristine but we are clean. I really appreciate respect on that front as would the Finance Committee for sure. We're still compiling club events. We're encouraging clubs to promote more on board. Hopefully we will have a tangent for that for the rest of the year going into next year. Next year's committee can evaluate and improve. Some club recognitions that may be coming up before we go away. ALANA Gear. They are typically house out of the Outing Club. They specifically focus on trips for ALANA Students so they will hopefully be coming up. Amnesty International started by former Senator ? will hopefully be up. Students for Justice in Palestine, clearly an active group will hopefully be coming up. Campus Progressives, fun fact, they emailed me the day after they were derecognized saying so we want to start a club up again. Literally the next day. At the beginning of the year and they didn't follow up on anything. Basically the things they have to do to be re-recognized is the same thing they have to do to be reactive. All it's preventing is using the privileges of SGA clubs until they are again meeting. They don't have a president, they are debating who should be president, however both people are graduating by next winter. It's kind of an interesting continuation question there. Should out to Senator Calder who has really been taking up this *Water Tower* issue and also has been meeting with Conscious, another literary magazine, to get them up and met with Demonyms. She's been really on the ball and catching up on policies.

COLA (2:15.09):

Chair Morgan: Hey all. COLA's police luncheon was today and I thought it was really cool. I had a lot of fun, Senator Alleger was at my table and you left. When the talked moved on to chickens Filstein literally left the table. I thought it was kind of ironic. It was great I was happy that students were willing to talk and that police officers were willing to talk. My contact at BPD was acting the same way as I was, I was like students, separate yourselves and talk and she was like, police officers, mingle and talk, that's why we're here. I dragged your asses here so we could do this. It was cool, they talked to me afterwards and said they might want to meet twice a semester and have a luncheon here and a luncheon there at BPD. They would like to see more club leaders or more people that they would have interactions with off campus. That came out differently than I wanted. It was more like, I'm sorry, that came off really poorly. It was more of a conducive conversations with student leaders was the term they said. Sorry for inferring

fraternities. Student Neighborhood Initiative Grant, we had two applications that were actually good. We're starting up the grant process with everyone involved so it will be Joe Speidel, Alicia and Gail from OSCR and Jenny Davis from CEDO in Burlington. We're going to meet on Thursday and decide how we're going to give out the grant money because we really like the applications we've gotten in so far, it's very exciting. Community Coalition is on Friday the 25th from 2:00-4:00 at Pearl House. There's a few things on the agenda. Our Party Registration czar Senator Fitzgerald is giving a presentation on her in depth findings on Party Registration. She's done some really awesome in-depth work contacting people at University of Colorado and Colorado State, the Police in Boulder from meeting with Danny Gonzales to Gail and Alicia and the police and talking to everybody. I'm really excited to see right what the presentation is going to be because hopefully we can have the right conversation with police and decide how we're going to implement Party Registration and so if you want to go to Community Coalition, feel free. If not, we'll update you on our findings and what not. Also, in our agenda for Community Coalition, we are finalizing letters to parents of first years and parents of Sophomore who intend to move off campus and finalizing those. Does everyone remember Alcohol edu? We're talking about a comparable system for students moving off campus so it's more of a community, I'll try to articulate this best I can. It's an online system with an online tutorial that's a couple hours long that focuses on what it means to be a good member of the Burlington community so that's on the agenda. Have a heart, does anyone not know what have a heart is? Cool. We're going to have 2 have a hearts coming up on April 1 and April 8. Have a heart is when OSCR gets chocolates from Lake Champlain and they have flyers that were drawn by little kids that have drawn these things saying I hate waking up to loud music at night. So we go out on campus to dining halls and say, hey if you head out tonight be respectful and quiet downtown. It's cool to go downtown, just be respectful of everyone in the neighborhood, we're all in the same community together. That's what we're going to do April 1 and April 8. OSCR we do spring clean ups, trash clean ups. We did 1 or 2 in November before winter came. I will have more dates for you, that is steadily approaching. It's a fun way to get senators and anyone else involved in cleaning up our community.

Senator Fitzgerald: I just figured since he's been mentioning party registration I would give a brief description of what it is. I will try to make this really brief. The reason why I am looking into Party Registration is because at other universities they have a program in which students get a warning from the police department if the police department has received a complaint about noise at a party. What this would do is give students a 20 minute warning to empty their house and the party in order to avoid the \$500+ noise violation. It's a really bad situation for students because it's super expensive and also it would help improve community relations and make police officers jobs a lot easier on Friday and Saturday nights because officers have a million things going on and it takes forever to get the parties cleared out and people hate it. That's what I'm attempting to do. There are a lot of people to talk to. We are talking about having a class for students to attend and after they attend that hour long class they would be able to register their parties. We got a go for that, the biggest go is to try to get the police department on board. That's where we're at with that.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:22.06)

Chair Filstein: I just wanted to say Chair Morgan, your presence was missed at City Council last night. Also, ironically, the conversation also centered around chickens.

Chair Adams: Did you know the Have a Heart Flyers were actually drawn by Professor Luis Vivanco's child Isabella?

CODEEE (2:22.35)

Chair Herman: Hello everyone. To touch on the blood ban initiative, I know people bring it up a lot but I'm not sure if all senators are aware of what it is. It has been in the works since last year. Vice President Maciewicz pretty much wanted us to touch on it again so it resurfaced. Initially myself and Senator Vitagliano reached out to various people in the American Red Cross office and we weren't getting a reply so Senator Vitagliano had a great idea to make a video showing gay men getting denied the right to donate blood. That's pretty much the idea we're running with. One of the main concerns was we didn't want the video to come off as bashing the Red Cross for all of the great things they do so to combat that we've come up with the idea of saying this is in no way trying to affect or deter people from donating blood but this is actually trying to get rid of the awful federal law that denies gay men from donating blood. That's pretty much in a quick way what the video is going to be about. It's a great issue that's really a collaborative effort with Student Action. Many of you know I met with BSU on Wednesday. From that meeting I actually got two members of BSU to sign out packets for Senate, which is great. Some issue that they, yesterday I met with the board from BSU, from Alianza Latina and AASU. This was the community that I've been discussing. The E-Board members felt it was necessary to meet ahead of time before the community meeting. The community meeting hasn't occurred yet. This meeting was just to discuss agenda items that they wanted to discuss at the community meeting. So I met with the various student unions. It was a great meeting. Some things to come up were that we discussed during the meeting was the ALANA terminology. Some students don't mind the term, pretty much the acronym ALANA, some students don't mind it, others have an issue with it. We thought it would be valid to bring up during the community meeting to have a discussion among the community members about the terminology and we're going to have some staff members come to speak on it as well. Another thing that came up was the liaison program and some didn't know who their liaison was. That shows how difficult it is to juggle all those clubs amongst one person, which is why I think new way if it is taken seriously and actually followed through next year is awesome. I would love to interact with these clubs and those similar to BSU in a CODEEE umbrella to interact with different clubs at least 3 times a semester. That would have been great. I think that's definitely something that should be passed on because that's something that each of the E-board members expressed that they wish would be better for them in the future. The Exploring Discrimination and Bias Conference was awesome. I heard about it pretty much last minute and I think a conference like that would be great for CODEEE to work with students to program next year. Hopefully that will be something that occurs. I'm not sure if any members, pretty much most of our members are seniors or running for Vice President, so whoever is left next year I would hope that would happen.

Chair Mallea: Point of Information: I think you might have been gone that week but SGA also sponsored it. We allocated them \$400 to put on the conference.

Chair Herman: That's great, I would just love, I saw some senators at the conferences but on the planning side I would love more involvement on that side from this body.

Senator Cesario: A couple of updates. The Environmental Forum this week was a Jesse Simmons special. It was a lot about bike transportation on campus and we talked about BUG. It was only an hour so not a ton else, but one of the things I thought was interesting was Richard Cate approved a list of projects for the Clean Energy Fund so I recommend going on their website and checking it out. Some things I give thumbs up and some things my thumb is wobbling around about. Some Earth Week planning updates, they are trying to get, the people who are doing the marketing want more students to provide Earth Week tabling and that type of thing at the Farmer's Market which is going to be in Davis Center during earth week. If you have any type of organization or anything if you make hats and want to sell them during Earth Week at the

farmer's market I can give you the email address of the guy that is running the event. Just to give you some updates from our meeting with Mo. April is sexual violence awareness month and the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference is April 12 so we want to start a discussion around the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference, in general you should register for it because apparently they are already close to capping registration and also we are trying to figure out pairing with the Women's Center to do some conferences and workshops they might be doing.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:29.46)

Chair Adams: I just want to ask would you be willing, so the restructuring of the liaison program is basically what Senator Lederer-Plaskett said during the debates. She did a very good job of explaining it. Would you be willing to toss that idea out to them and see what they say?

Chair Herman: I pretty much already discussed that and gave them that option for the remainder of my terms I told them I am more than willing to be resource for them. In the future that's definitely a conversation that we're having and being aware.

Student Action (2:30.33):

Chair Simmons: Hey kids. I will try to be really quick. Bottled water, we talked to the VSTEP kids, they are putting out a new petition thing. They are putting out a resolution modeled after the one that we passed a couple years ago. More information on that coming. I tried to emphasize working together and not have two different petitions collecting signatures on essentially the same thing. That's a waste of time. Burns is working on getting some community service in exchange for punishments dished out on-campus rather than writing a paper. Unfortunately Senator Fifield somehow knows that like the back of her hand so she's going to be helping him out through that whole process and kappa sigma for life.

Senator M. White: Going off of what Chair Herman just said what I would like to effectively refer to as GBBAH because it's the worst acronym ever, the Gay Blood Ban Ad Hoc will be starting off on Friday. I will send out a doodle of the times. The magnificent 7 so far as Steph Cesario, Claire, Ian, Will, Will, Gavin and myself. If anyone else would like to join send me an email. I'm super excited and I hope you are too.

Public Relations (2:32.15):

Chair Monteforte: Boungiorno! Hello. Many things going on, elections like Claire said. Vote, please vote. We're not doing a formal poll thing, can everyone just raise their hand if they are free on Thursday around 11-2? Anyone? Two people. We're just seeing if people could sit at a table with a laptop and get people to vote, talk to them about it, get a good presence out there. I will book table and get that out there so please check your email tomorrow. Please vote that's all that's going on right now. We do have some other cool projects but I'm not going to waste your time right now.

Senator O'Brien: Hi guys, so remember from last year our big poster talking about the net increased in attendance and we put forward the student budget referendum. That's coming back up we just decided that today. That's really exciting because it's all about face to face interactions because it's all about students and their hardships and sometimes excitement about tuition increase. Basically we worked out a rough timeline and this Friday all of us but one PR member will be in the SGA office to make a big poster and you're all invited because it's a group effort.

Academic Affairs (2:33.52):

Chair Filstein: Hello. Things are going pretty well in AA. We're getting really close, we essentially every night have been having slumber parties and pillow fights and pot lucks at each person's house. In terms of stuff relevant to SGA, things are really starting to move and shake. Senator Caster and myself had a meeting with the Student Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate in which they essentially passed the questions we had submitted that we would have on publishable course evaluations. Barring some minor tweaks, there clearly were some English professors who clearly had problems with the syntax and diction. Hopefully by the end of the semester we're hoping to have the whole concept of publishable course evaluations get passed by the Faculty Senate and from there the hard work begins since it's going to be a paper version for the foreseeable future, how much work is AA going to do in going out and facilitating this whole thing. The real victory, the near victory is in the realm of enhanced course descriptions. Senator Todd Alleger is going to give you all a presentation about it right now.

Senator Alleger: Alright, expanded course descriptions! This has been a lot of fun. So, Fireworks make me think of history. This is what happened last April, we passed a resolution, passed the AA groups that need more information and don't know nothing. In November, I went to Curricular Affairs and they told me about it and it went really well. Then December came around and that did a lot guys. That was awesome. They were like boots shaking. Now January came and we put together CSC subcommittees to talk about this. It's happened, it was really genuine, everyone was really nice to each other. You might have some questions. These are some things that we're working on. These are the information that we want. How much? We want it all, we want to know everything and anything that could be on a syllabus. You all know how mucky that got but it's good news. We want to know about the content, what the course is going to be, objectives, where are you going to go? Expectations, what are you going to do? Evaluations, how are we going to be graded? Reading, how much work are you going to do? Pretty straightforward, stuff you get on any syllabus, stuff you get on the first day of class. So, on that note, I am going to dive into MyUVM. Now. Does anybody want to give me the MyUVM. Uvm.edu. Way to go. You look at classes. Da de da de da. Here I am, look up classes. What's going on? Fall 2011, that's the next one. Plant and Soil Science. No this isn't where I want to be, I want to be in Plant Biology. Plant Biology, Plant Systematics, that's a good class. Cathy Paris, she is the coolest. So you go in, section description available. I like the looks of that. Wait a minute I'm going to have to collect 25 plants throughout the semester? I don't know about that. This is it, this is what it looks like.

Chair Filstein: Todd, what's that blue thing?

Senator Alleger: This blue thing is a syllabus. Some professors, my next point which brings me back to there. So what we do, that's the first thing we do is we go on there and we see what it looks like and what works and what doesn't work. A lot of the links are not working for us. I'm meeting with them on Thursday. What can you guys do? Scope it out, check it out, get online. There has just been an email sent out to all Faculty members telling them this is what they should be doing. In a couple days they should be putting information up there. Check it out, poke around, see what the information is like. On that note, I'm going to let everyone know about this because everyone should be using it and that's how it's going to be effective and that's how it's going to happen. We'll get in everybody. Start talking about it. Thirdly make sure professors are doing this right, so ask them wha' gwan? I went up to one and said, hey we're trying to do this enhanced course descriptions and hey, what do you know, he said he was going to put it up there. So say hey, I am going to take your class next semesters. I want to know a little bit more online. Put it up there, this is all very exciting and it's cool.

Open the Floor for Questions (2:41.38)

Senator Calder: If we talk to our professors and they want to put it up there, who do they contact or how do they get their syllabus up?

Senator Alleger: That's a great question. Every professor has gotten an email about how to do it. If they want some in depth information they can contact Jennifer Dickinson who is the head of that subcommittee that put this whole thing together. She's an Anthro professor and she did some really awesome work get this happening within a month, which was really cool. They can access this through their MyUVM and this is something that was already built into the banner system. The place where they go to write the 25 word description that they used to do is the same place they would go to find this enhanced description. It's all right there.

Chair Morgan: Is this totally optional for professors? They're not like you have to do this or is it like one in every ten of them is going to do this? What's the response?

Senator Alleger: That's where it all gets a little grey. On one hand you've got professors that are all about it, on the other hand you've got professors that say well, ok, I'll just put a 26 word description. Then when you get this slight edict that was brought down from the administration saying that for next semester every professor is required to put an enhanced course description or syllabus online. So there's that going for us and there's also us keeping them, borderline McCarthyism, keeping them in line.

Senatorial Forum (2:43.37):

Senator Tepper: This is a 3 part announcement. Part 1, if we're going to censure someone let's censure them, get over it, and move on to positive and constructive things. Part 2, Chair Filstein and I were representing the SGA at the Nuts and Bolts Organizing conference last Sunday, it was a great time. We weren't but we attended and it was fun. People should check out events like that. Thirdly, encourage your off campus friends to vote so I have some competition because I like a challenge.

Senator Rifken: I want to agree with what Chair Herman said about the Bias and Discrimination Conference and it was awesome. In the future it would be really cool to see more senators there. I really want to say something about budget at hoc committee because we have been diligently working. We have a great group mostly comprised of people who are not senators which is really interesting and in a way I would love to see more senators there because I feel like we should be the ones that are informed about what is going on at our university. Our next meeting is tomorrow at 7:00 and we're going to be going over some of our topics. We're actually working on putting together some sort of document and working on creating a more transparent easy to understand thing for students. I know that someone before mentioned the packets I have been giving out and put together. More stuff like that. Thursday from 3:30-4:30 in the Silver or Sugar Maple, Richard Cate is going to be coming in and we've compiled some questions and areas of concern that we've found a lack of information and things like that. If anyone has any comments about that or has any more questions or wants to get more involved I would love to see more senators. Hopefully we'll be having some results in the near future.

Senator Mason: My first thing that I wanted to say was a shout out to the Finance Committee with all the budgeting and everything, I know it's crazy, I know how many clubs there are so we completely understand, especially from a student activities position, I would hate to look at all

those numbers. Academic Affairs, I loved the presentation, I love the PowerPoint. That was really good. Public Forum today, I have to bring it up, I'm sorry. I agree with David on this. Are we talking about the resolution or anything that is going to be passed or are we talking about people's personal biases or political views or stances because honestly I do care about the student opinion, that's why we sat here and talked to Claire about not limiting people's time. We want to hear what people think about what we are going to be able to pass. We really want to hear that kind feedback not like tangents on rights and other places that do inhumane things because that's not what we're passing. We're not passing anything on that, we're voting on a certain situation. I sort of wish I voted against time limits today off of that because people were going on tangents. Even senators were going on tangents on things that I don't know why they were being discussed in a sense. And a shout out to, Claire thank you for the whole thing about people asking questions and not saying comments. It's a waste of our time.

Chair Adams: Somebody wrote me this note reassuring me not to be in a bad mood. I'm not, honestly I think the whole thing around censures is unfortunate but I have no problem with what President Mensah said. I think it's important that we know our history. My way of addressing that was to be as explicit with my intentions and the reasons why I brought this censure forward. Until it is not written in the Constitution if anyone violates the constitution and then I talk to you about it and then you proceed to do it 2 more times, I will censure you. I will tell you that right now. That is my policy on that, especially if it affects clubs and students.

Senator DeVivo: So Sleep Out for the Soldiers went sort of well. We raised \$4,400 for the Fisher House Foundation and it was a good kickoff to the month of service. Where I'm going with this, as some of you might have heard it's a 24 hour event that we run for sleep out and around 2:00 our event was shut down by Burlington Police while there was a party that was going on two houses away that was allowed to continue until 3:30. As someone who put in over 150 hours into this event I was obviously beyond belief to the point that I called Lucas at god knows what hour and this was the 6th time they had come. I felt really discriminated against as a student, as a member of Greek life. I didn't feel like I was allowed to exact my rights as student if those rights are even there anymore. The reason we got shut down is because there is a bed and breakfast next to our fraternity, we're a victim of circumstance. Every single Thursday through Saturday night there is drunk people who walk by our house just because we're on the way to downtown on Main St. and I really feel like this bed and breakfast is using us to target and take some of their anger for their place of business out on us when we were trying to do a good thing for our community. This is not the first time this has happened and it's not the last time this has happened. I talked to Gail from OSCR and I don't know where to go at this point as a member of a fraternity who in more than one way has been discriminated against and as a student who has been in more than one way discriminated against. It's just the way I was talked to. Senator s Juaire and Senator Lederer-Plaskett were there can vouch for this, the way I was talked to by police officers that night, the way I was talked to by people from the Lang House and the way they think they can treat students as lesser people is not ok. Some students may drink and make noise and do all that stuff, but I'm not one of those students. For any of them to assume that I am felt really bad. I talked to Lucas a couple times, if anyone has suggestions on how we can fix this because I know I'm not the only student who goes through this, please let's do something about this. I know other fraternities and sororities have dealt with this, not just with the Lang House but with other neighbors. I think that a lot of people look at us as targets for living in college town because we are a convenient target. The event got shut down for 6 hours and we proceeded to come back out at 7:00 am which is outside of quiet hours and proceeded to raise \$2,600 more dollars. I think we could have done a lot better for a lot of reasons. It really kind of put a damper on the event and it was unbelievable to me that they were spending so much time enforcing

shutting down a philanthropy event when two or three houses away there was a full blown party going on that kept going through the night.

Speaker Chevrier: A few things, to comment on Public Forum we abide by the same open meeting policy as everyone else so technically, we had Kornbread come in and rap to us about Crack last year and we had to let him because he wanted to. Anybody is allowed to come here and now they are allowed to do it as long as they want. Also, the ever beautiful and brilliant Senator Mike White has realized that technically if we wanted to we could open up the constitution two weeks from today which would be the day before elections. Jess will want to kill all of you because it means we will have to set up two different elections but she can do it. I'm going to motion... just raise your hand if you would now vote for a popular vote. I'm going to restate everything. Last week we voted to get rid of on and off campus separation. Currently we have a whole lot of people who have signed out packets for on-campus and 8 who have signed out packets for off-campus. This means it's going to be a heavily contested race for on-campus and everyone will get it from off-campus including many write ins for off-campus. Now people have been telling me that they wish they could change their vote. Senator White suggested that instead of vote to strike the same thing, we could add into the constitution something about making it a popular vote which means the same thing but makes it different enough for me to not feel guilty about kind of breaking the rules for legislation. Raise your hand if you would now vote in favor of getting rid of on and off campus separation and doing a popular vote? Raise your hand high. Raise your hand if you are going to abstain.

Senator Rifken: Wouldn't that be a conflict of interest for everyone who signed out packets?

Speaker Chevrier: Two things to say about that, one, this same point was raised when we were voting on it and I said what I'm going to say now which is technically everything we vote on is a conflict of interest, but the difference between doing it then and now is that it would make it so more of you are from on campus right now. All of the people from on campus would be making it more difficult for themselves. Most of the people that would be making it more difficult from themselves raised their hands. I guess my worry would be smoothed out. I wanted to quickly remind everyone that Senatorial Forum is to discuss senatorial things. A lot of the comments that have been done on Senatorial Forum have been walking the line between comments and announcements so if you went to a really cool program or something really terrible happened to you downtown, please save it for during comments and announcements.

Senator Ravech: Don't we have to open the Constitution tonight if it has to be open 2 weeks before?

Speaker Chevrier: So the Constitution doesn't have to be opened, the amendments have to be brought on to the table and they have to be publicized so I'm going to type them up and send them to all of you so they are on the table and then I'm going to send them to Jess which means they will have been open two weeks which will be the day before elections. It will make me look like a total jerk to all the people who received an off campus email today saying it's not contested race, but I'm ok with that.

Chair Filstein: Point of Inquiry: Did we just have an informal poll so that the amendment is not officially on the table yet?

Speaker Chevrier: The way that it works is it doesn't say in the Constitution that amendments have to be brought up during Senate, it just says they have to be on the table and publicized two weeks beforehand. I am going to do that by sending it out to all of you tonight.

Senator O'Brien: With regards to the senate listserv and certain people talking about really important student issues such as the Israeli Palestinian one, I would really appreciate if these discussions that are important to all of us be sent to all of us, just in the next few weeks while we're all serving a term together. Also, just bringing up what I brought up during the PR report, basically getting student feedback as the next SGA President will be addressing the Board of Trustees in May and they do have a great impact on the tuition increase decision and it came up in our discussion today as we were deciding whether or not to include a question on the VSOP and we decided [inaudible] more face to face contact, so that's something we decided to do which is really exciting so when the next SGA president goes in there they can talk about some of the interactions we've had and some of the survey.

Chair Simmons: I forgot to mention in my report, I think Bennington and I are going to contact some folks and get some people talking outside of this this body because I think it's just better this way. If you want to be in on this conversation tell me. I know a lot of people don't want to hear about it anymore.

Chair Adams: So I opened up President Mensah's email this week and I was really excited to see a video in it and I watched the video and it was 'Don't Say No to Panda' and it was this really weird angry panda running around destroying things. So, given that so many of our clubs have so many cool videos and PR has this really cool camera, I really hope that in the future they choose things that are relevant to UVM and SGA. I would particularly recommend if you caught it on video Senator Alleger's presentation, I think that was one of the most animated moments on Senate this year. We can continue to publicize Course Evaluations that way. Excited there's a video, a little disappointed it had nothing to do with UVM.

Chair Monteforte: Point of Information: The video was put in there to be a test to see if people would actually look at video. 20.8% actually opens Kofi's email and 121 students actually opened the video so that was a good amount on the video. We're also going to put clubs in there so it was just a test. You also might be getting a cool video from Kofi Mensah tomorrow morning.

Senator Bennington: To touch real quick on Public Forum, I think I made a strong voice last week that we don't have time limits and we don't debate people. I want to apologize because I kind of stepped into the realm of debate today a little bit. Last week I think we unfairly debated with Nolan. Also, a lot of that debate was coming from yielding the floor to speakers from the audience, I don't know what the rules are but I am wondering if senators can choose to say I'm not going to yield the floor to you if it's clearly getting to the point of where we're just clearly supporting this horrible debate that's not going to go anywhere. A quote, even though most of you probably don't want to hear it. It's from David Orr. "Students hear about global responsibility while being educated in institutions that often invest their financial weight in the most irresponsible things. The lessons being taught are those of hypocrisy and ultimately despair."

Senatorial Comments/Announcements (3:02.02)

Senator Moise: So I want to start by saying thank you President Mensah for what you said earlier. I think it's something we all needed to hear as a whole and appreciate you voicing that opinion. I also wanted to say I intern for Planned Parenthood and they wanted to send their thanks for the resolution that you did with the Pence Amendment. They were very happy so even though it was late they still found it to be very effective. Lastly I sent out an email over the listserv about a fundraiser that the step team is doing. If anyone is interested we are still taking orders.

Senator Juaire: I would just like to congratulate Kyle and Kappa Sigma for doing an awesome job. I find myself in a unique position on how Kyle was treated as I am a student, I'm in a fraternity, I work for two Burlington businesses and I'm working for the police department this summer so that ties into all these things and I think it's inappropriate that college students are judged as a whole especially as we bring a whole lot of money and good things to Burlington. If anyone wants to work with me, I'm going to try to drag my employers into this because we get a lot of reservations from the Lang House which is the one that was against Kyle and I'm one of their best employees and I'm in a fraternity so that kind of puts them in a fun situation. I was hoping COLA would like to work with Kyle and I in dealing with improving the relationship between Burlington students and businesses and authorities in the Burlington area.

Senator Rifken: 2 events this weekend. Both of them involving music. This Friday benefit for Medlife. Top cats and my group Zest will be singing. 8pm in the Grand Maple Ballroom. It's going to be really cool. Saturday March 26 in Ira Allen a benefit for Oxfam which is a poverty injustice benefit concert and I think all 4 a capella groups are going to be there so it's going to be really cool too should you should all consider coming.

Senator Sadek: April 1, 2, 3 the Lawrence International Debate Team is hosting the U.S. National Championships right here on campus. There's over 200 teams coming from not only across the country but internationally. We have teams from Slovenia, Cameroon, England. It's a big deal. It's over 500 people that are going to be here for this weekend. If you want to check out some awesome debates the excellent argumentation, there is going to be a debate beforehand on Thursday there is going to be a public debate. More importantly, we need volunteers. We need people to run ballots, we will give you a free t-shirt, food, pretty much anything you want. If you are interested come talk to me. It's going to be a lot of fun and Vermont has a chance to win this tournament. It's a lot of good stuff some come check it out.

Senator L. White: As some of you may or may not know I'm a member of Delta Delta Delta along with Senator Fitzgerald and Senator Ravech. This Saturday we're holding an event called Delta Desserts, I'm sure you've seen our flyer in the atrium. It's an all you can eat dessert buffet \$5 at our house on 143 South Willard St. on the corner of Main and South Willard St. It will be delicious and I hope to see you there.

Senator Yeager: On Friday after you go to the Zest concert you can come down to my place slash Jordan's place for a nice little shindig on behalf of my birthday. You are all welcome. The theme is to be determined.

Senator Lovell: Point of Information: He needs to be bullied into making a decision about his theme.

Chair Simmons: I wanted to leave this off of forum because it's totally my opinion but after the thing today with the thing with Israel and Palestine I've come sort of back full circle from where I had progressed to about having this forum and shit and I've really come to hold a strong personal conviction that divestment is the way to go. I really don't appreciate the why are we singling out Israel coming from a university in a country that donates billions of dollars to Israel each year. Saying that economics doesn't have anything to do with human rights is outrageous. I'd be happy to tell you why but I don't think I need to. I think that money is a major factor on why Israel is the way it is today and while I'm down with both populations having states one does right. I want to continue with the forum and I'm going to do my best to keep my personal beliefs out of it because I feel that every student at this university should have a say in what we do as a body but I

would still like to bring some sort of resolution back in front of this body before I'm dead and gone. Totally changing gears, Bike User's Group's Bike Share is hoping to kick off on Monday. It's crazy. Basically all you need to do to use the bikes is fill out a waiver that it is an assumption of risk, not a consumption of risk as *The Cynic* wrote. Either way publicity is wonderful. I really appreciate if you could spread your listservs and send out a link to our waiver, it's online on the Lynx. They are going like hotcakes. I have 3 right here. If you see me get it from me later. If not, sign it now and get it back to me. Bikes are available at Simpson, McCauley and the Davis Center. I would just love your help in publicizing it and getting people to sign the waiver.

Senator M. White: 3 things, first of all GBBAH and I would love to meet with you all after for just a second. I know it's late but I need to see you all. Second of all, month of service, awesomely kicked off by Kyle. So sorry of my own attendance. We are chugging right along, you heard about all those events. Lastly, I wanted to do a shout out to Tom Campbell running for senate next year also organized the show on Friday.

Senator Lederer-Plaskett: To echo what Senator Juare and Senator DeVivo said, I was present that night and what progressed from a really nice warning stage at 10:00 proceeded to really rude and inaccurate legal statements being made about the fraternity, claiming they need a permit to hold an event on their own property which anyone with a basic legal understanding knows is not the case. Basically, a lot went wrong that night and a lot should be done to better our communications, not just with the city itself. I believe if this had been done not with another service organization had been doing this, it wouldn't have the same stigma attached to it as if it were Greek life. I think it was pretty clear there was other set of associations a social means with it being a fraternity hosting it. I would really love if SGA would work towards bettering our relationship towards Greek Life. Even though it's not an SGA recognized society I would really love to see our relationship with them improved because frankly what happened that night was really appalling and a poor display and a disconnect as a member of our community that raises a lot of money for really great causes. Additionally, the feminist group is putting on Rock for Choice on April 7. Senator Bennington's band is playing. It's going to be awesome with a full line up of local bands. It's going to be a lot of fun. It's for a really great cause even if you disagree you can get information anyway. I think it will be a really fun event. Also, if anyone knows someone who would like to adopt a guinea pig, our landlord found out we had one and we're in trouble. I would really love it if you take it off our hands.

Senator L. White: Delta Deserts is this Saturday from 1-5 at the Tri Delta house and all of the money goes to St. Jude's Children's Hospital.

Senator Bennington: First of all, I don't think my band is playing but thank you for the invitation. Also, about the police and student discrimination. That sucks that that happened to you. Also, for living in a really progressive city we have a pretty discriminatory police force. In the beginning of the fall I was assaulted, I was punched in the face by a woman because I was wearing a dress downtown at night. I was called a faggot and a lot of other slanderous words. The police asked me if I thought it was a serious threat when they were talking to me. They asked 'were you really offended?' and I was like, this woman just punched me in the face and called me a faggot and I'm wearing a dress and fishnets right now. Hell yeah I took it seriously. They never followed up with it. The city tried to pass a sitting ban on Church Street to keep vagrants and homeless people, and musicians off the street because they were blocking traffic even though vendors quite frequently have sales on the sidewalk which blocks traffic and they put signs out. Also, people mobilized against that and it didn't happen yet. The point is, if you're going to start talking with the police about this stuff it's really important to keep in mind that it's not just students and I'm not attacking Burlington police officers, I think they're usually good people, it's

the institution of the police that sometimes runs askew and keeping in mind it's not just students that are discriminated against in this city, it's a lot of people.

Chair Herman: April 2 Alianza Latina is having their event they have every spring semester, Comida Para la Gente which is an event with Spanish food, music and dance from 8-11 in the Davis Center on the 4th floor. They are also looking for cooks so if anyone can cook any Spanish dishes definitely reach out to them.

Chair Adams: There's another birthday this Saturday is our lovely dedicated minute taker slash my roommate's birthday. Second of all, I don't want to dwell too much on this Lang House issue for too long but I was the work-study at OSCR for three years and there were multiple meetings between Greek Life and the Lang House and there have been multiple offenses on both sides. I think the issue is more complicated.

Roll Call (3:15.00):

Finance: Senator Tran, excused

Student Action: All Present

COLA: All Present

CODEEE: All Present

Student Action: All Present

Public Relations: Senator Yuan, excused

Academic Affairs: All Present

Adjournment:

End Time: 11:16 pm