I. Call To Order: 6:07 pm

II. Approval of Agenda
   A. Motion to approve
   B. Move to strike time limit on DCR
      1. Second
      2. Objection
         a) Cory- instead of constantly…
         b) Mel- want time limit
         c) Sophia- wasting time debating about it
      3. Move to extend to 40 mins
         a) Second
         b) No objection- DCR#4 approved for 40 minutes
   C. Move to approve agenda
      1. Second
      2. No objection- passes

III. Unfinished Business
    A. DCR#3- VP EDI Martin
       1. What we worked on last council meeting, new information from UCOP, because of that discussion
          a) Move to postpone indefinitely
             (1) Second
             (2) Objection
                (a) Debate
                (b) DCR#4 is to replace DCR#3
                (c) Objection withdraw
             (3) Passes- postponed indefinitely, killed

IV. Election for Election Committee
    A. Move to approve
       1. Second
       2. No objections- passes
V. Appointments
   A. Move to approve appointments as a slate
      1. Second
      2. No objections- passes
   B. Move to approve slate
      1. Second
      2. No objections- passes

VI. Call for Agenda Items for CM #6
   A. Budget Audit
   B. Update for International Center

VII. Presentation and Vote on DCR#4
   A. Martin- yield time to Katie Simpson of DAC
   B. Katie- similar resolution to DCR#3, but includes new information and incorporated feedback from DCR#3
   C. Sophia- what do we hope to get with this?
      1. Martin- want UCSD specific administration response, asking for resources, ICE recruiters
      2. Katie- legal resources, UCSD shares immigration lawyer with UC Riverside, 53 cases since July at just UCSD, legal services are understaffed
   D. Rob- Explanation for removal of sanctuary language?
      1. Sara- Included in reference to UCOP statement
      2. Sara- This also would apply to faculty and staff
   E. Sophia- How enforceable is this resolution?
      1. Cory- We can ask for anything and it’s up to the University to decide what they are willing and able to do, they can say no
      2. Kim- We can and should ask for whatever we want
   F. Valerie- Why language specific about Raza Resource Centro stricken?
      1. Chair- Will go over that in debate
   G. Adam- Why aren’t we asking for UCSD to not allow ICE from coming to campus?
      1. Mark- UCSD cannot do that, it’s part of the UCOP statement
   H. Sophia- yield
   I. Emma- Is “ample” intentionally vague?
      1. Martin- Yes, will figure out specific meaning at the meeting
   J. Chair: Move to debate, 1 minute time limit to comments
   K. Sophia- need to have explicit examples, what if the internet is down?
   L. Kim- GSA should stand for something and push when we need to, don’t underestimate our power
M. Raul- BIR#4, amend this to be more clear, ask for whatever, implementation of warning system of ongoing investigations
   1. Cory- motion to approve grammatical changes WA#1-6, BIR#1-4
   2. Sophia- second on grammatical only
      a) No objections- approves grammatical changes

N. Tanner- echo Kim, this is an important issue, can offer rides to people who need a ride home if this runs late

O. Seth- echo Kim, history of social protest, ask for more radical demands to get more moderate demands met

P. Nate- awesome points being made, we should be pushing for more things, look at the language, we need to get out ahead of this, calling for response by next Council Meeting
   1. Rob- agree with Nate, happy to be apart of community that found the middle ground, behind the effort behind DRC#4

Q. Sara- some of this intentionally left vague so we don’t box ourselves in

R. Rep.- what are the chances that we will get a response by the next meeting?
   1. Nate- This is on everyone’s mind

S. Kim- include best practices, we should do the ground work

T. Sophia- VC EDI language, gender not pushed, propose Parent’s address not be released/ documented

U. Rob- Resolution to the point and ask for what they need

V. Nate- sharing information covered in UCOP statement

W. Sophia- move to WA#7 language changes
   1. Second
   2. No objections- amendment approved

X. Raul- move BIR#4, language
   1. Second
   2. Objection: Rep- aren’t they bound to do that?
      a) Mark- point of information, the UCOP statement applies to police, this was meant to include faculty and staff
      b) Sophia- this didn’t change policy?
         (1) Mark- this is now the UC system wide policy
      c) Christina- “participation” is vague and changes the meaning, object to motion
      d) Raul- they should be protected, but also participate in this
      e) Christina- want this policy to cover or they have to follow in?
      f) Raul- change to participate in implementation
      g) Cory- wording was designed to make sure the policy applied
to faculty and staff, not just police, agree with Christina, need new language

h) Nate- support for original, new language weakens
i) Valerie- support for current, but should change it later
j) David- say "this" is bound by "this"?

3. Raul- Move to change to new language
   a) David- second new language
   b) Objection
      (1) Sara- objection, can approve this, but should include language that says that faculty and staff must follow the same policy as police
      (2) Cory- someone can call the question
   c) Sophia- call the question on language changes to BIR#4
      (1) Second
      (2) No objections- now voting on BIR#4
   d) Vote on language changes to BIR#4- passes with yea’s

Y. Nate- read UCOP statement regarding privacy of information

Z. Sophia- move to BIR#5 language
   1. Second
   2. Objections
      a) Rep- why marked vehicles?
         (1) Sophia- marked or unmarked
         (2) Nate- they have to get here somehow, this is for recruiters
         (3) Rep- aren’t they supposed to be traveling in only marked vehicles?
         (4) Martin- we can ask for whatever, it’s up to the University to decide
      b) Kim- would like to add language
         (1) End of time
         (2) Motion to extend by 20 minutes
            (a) Second
            (b) No Objections- passes
         (3) Kim- call for moratorium on ICE coming to campus
            (a) Cory- cannot make a motion for any new language
            (b) Sara- call the question
               (i) Vote- approve language to BIR#5
                  (a) Passes with the yea’s
c) Kim- GSA wants moratorium on ICE, BIR#5 new language
   (1) Nate- we should keep the original language, even if we add the new stuff
   (2) Jacob- we aren’t condemning these federal organizations
   (3) Rep- by adding this we are limiting employment opportunities for students
      (a) Davide- this is not going to limit students
   (4) Cory- don’t personally think a blanket moratorium is something to advocate for, the tone is very different
   (5) Rob- no reason to deprive students on campus from opportunities
   (6) Seth- don’t see any value, economic argument of job offers not a good one
   (7) Sophia- classroom intimidation occurs, some people would love to join deportation forces, call the question
      (a) Second
      (b) Vote on calling the question- 27 for, 12 against, 1 abstain
   (8) Vote on new language BIR#5- 14 for, 23 against, 2 abstain

d) Adam- move add moratorium language to new BIR#, with revisions to include specific to UCSD and only applies to ICE
   (1) Rep- is it just ICE?
      (a) Answer- yes
      (b) Second
      (c) Objections- yes
         (i) John- this is a federal agents, including just not enforcement, this opens doors and we shouldn’t restrict students
         (ii) Adam- does ICE even recruit here? Yield to Martin
         (iii) Martin- agree this should be passed, the jobs are still there and students can get there, we just won’t allow it here
         (iv) Mai- this is an unfair statement
         (v) Out of time
            (a) Motion to extend by 20 mins
            (b) Second
(c) No objections- passes

e) Mai- we don’t know who is interested, barring people isn’t fair
f) Jacob- nakedly political, we are trying to prevent students to be harassed, students can harass other students regardless of ICE recruitment
g) Vlad- glad to take out DHS, for ICE the issue is that ICE doesn’t just do deportations, we just don’t want people to be harassed
h) Sophia- trying to protect vulnerable population, these people are triggers
   (1) Rep- agree with Sophia, having them here at all is harassment, which is unfair
i) Kim- backpedaling, this is solidarity, not charity
j) Davide- students getting a job with ICE is not the point of this
k) Mark- similar in spirit to the previous motion, call the question
   (1) Second
   (2) Question has been called- passes
l) Vote on language on moratorium- 25 for, 11 against, 3 abstain

AA. Rep- WA#5, language, include specific language
   1. Tabled until language ready
   2. BIR#5
   3. Davide- proxy my vote to Seth, Sociology
   4. Raul- agree with shooting for the moon, BIR#5
      a) BIR#5 already included
   5. Valerie- language change
   6. Quint- specific language, remove ICE from BIR#5
      a) Second
      b) Objection
         (1) Mai- should include ICE in case they disapprove BIR#5
         (2) Quint- contradictory language, yield to Nate
         (3) Nate- I think it’s fine
         (4) Adam- is it redundant or contradictory
            (a) Chris- I have language when we get back to what we tabled
         (5) Sophia- what are the issues with having both?
(a) Quint- including ICE allows them to come
(6) Vlad- language of if you come, this is what we expect, call the question
(a) Second, passes unanimously
c) Vote on language to remove ICE- 13 for, 23 against, 3 abstain
d) Betty- move to extend by 30 minutes
   (1) Second
   (2) No objections, time extended by 30 minutes
e) Chris- move to new language in WA#5
   (1) Second
   (2) Objections- Cory
      (a) Cory- wanted to keep the document short, encompassing of events outside of those specific events, this doesn’t add anything
      (b) Chris- negative views, what does that mean?, we need specifics
      (c) Sara- get rid of the details, but include language about harassing language instead of negative views to be specific
         (i) Sophia- agree, we should footnote things, call the language racist, etc
      (d) Rep- this shows the immediacy
      (e) Mel- call the question
         (i) Call the question, passes
   (3) Vote on language- 27 for, 5 against, 9 abstain

BB. James proxy to Brian, Philosophy
CC. Sara- there is another item on the agenda after this, there is more pizza
DD. Mel- call the question on DCR#4
   1. Call the question vote: 20 for, 17 against, 0 abstain
      a) Passes
EE. Kim- time check? 17 minutes
FF. Rep- WA#5, add language about international students
   1. Second
   2. Objection- none, passes
GG. Adam- BIR#4, new language, table until specific language
HH. Betty proxy to Mel
II. Quint- BIR#7, new language
1. Second
2. No objections, approved

JJ. Raul- friendly language?
KK. Vlad- what other edits are there?
LL. Sophia- circular statements, where is BIR#6
MM. Mark- anything in Black is in current document
NN. Nate- yield
OO. Adam- new language for BIR#4

1. Quint- question, what is included in UCOP statement
   a) Mark- link in document
      (1) Second
      (2) No objections, passes unanimously
   b) Nate- call the question
      (1) Calling the question vote: 14 for, - against, - abstain, does not pass
      (2) The references have not been approved

PP. Sophia- BIR#6, we say they can't be included and then we include ICE in recruitment

1. Martin- we already had that discussion, move to approve and fix all the references and links
   a) Second
   b) Objections- none, pass
   c) Adam- call the question
      (1) Second
      (2) Calling the question vote: 33 for, 4 against, 2 abstain, passes
   d) Vote on DCR#4- 36 for, 1 against, 3 abstain, passes

VIII. Presentation and Vote on ?
A. Mark- presentation, motion to sign this

1. Second
2. Objection- Kim
   a) Kim- few things to say before vote, yield to Katie
   b) Katie- point out that it’s ironic that this is directed to Congress about Trump and this is being considered un-political and fine
   c) Sara- Can we change the language?
   d) Mark- no, but this will be grammatically correct
   e) Sophia- this is saying science is important?
   f) Mark- it’s making these three points numbered 1 through 3
g) Rob- what other GSA's have signed?
   (1) Mark- UC Davis student wrote it and their GSA approved it already
h) Mai- does this need to be circulated?
   (1) Mark- No, it does not
i) Kim- Don't the incoming people have these conflicts already?
   (1) Mark- This is about what we want to see approved, not about specific people?
j) Kim- Doesn't Congress have a conflict of interest? Isn't it problematic to say this?
   (1) Mark- There isn't time or structure to have everyone write their own resolution
k) Martin- This is similar to petition.
l) Sophia- When does Congress meet?
   (1) Mark- Congress cannot appoint new appointments. Authors are trying to fix by first week of Jan, which is before we meet again
m) Vlad- call the question
   (1) Second
   (2) Call the question- passes
   3. Vote to sign document- pass with I's

IX. Adjourn
   A. Motion to adjourn meeting
      1. Second
      2. No objection, passes, meeting adjourned