



University of California, San Diego
Graduate Student Association

Special Council Meeting
December 05, 2016
6:00 pm, Price Center Forum

- 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 l's

IX. Adjourn

A. Motion to adjourn meeting

- 1. Second
- 2. No objection, passes, meeting adjourned