

Senate University Affairs Committee Agenda

Associated Students, Minutes Taken By Clara Perez

October 28, 2014 - 7:30 PM, Chumash Room

CALL TO ORDER by Cassandra Mancini at 7:36 pm

**A. MEETING BUSINESS**

A-1. Roll Call

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Note**: absent (excused / not excused) arrived late (time) departed early (time) proxy (full name) | **Name** | **Note**: absent (excused / not excused) arrived late (time) departed early (time) proxy (full name) |
| Jenna Anderson | Late excused 8PM | Jennifer Liem | Late excused 8:45pm |
| Hiro Bower (Vice Chair) | Proxy (Emani Oakley) | Cassandra Mancini (Chair) | Present |
| Niki Elyasi | Present | Monica Quintanilla | Unexcused  |
| Kevin Koo | Present | Jonathan Rothschild | Present |
| Nikka Kurland  | Proxy (Hector Contreras) | Liam Stanton | Present |

 A-2. Excused Absences

 Nikka Kurland: until 8:30 PM \*\*

 Jenna Anderson: until 8:30 PM \*\*

 Jennifer Liem: until 8:30 PM every other week \*\*

 Hiro Bower

 \*\* means for the entire quarter

*MOTION/SECOND: Stanton/ Koo*

*Motion language: Motion to excuse Hiro Bower*

*ACTION: Vote: consent*

 A-3. Proxies

 Emani Oakley for Hiro Bower

*MOTION/SECOND: Koo/ Rothschild*

*Motion language: Motion to accept Emani Oakley as a proxy for Hiro Bower*

*ACTION: Vote: consent*

 **B. EXTERNAL REPORTS**

 **C. PUBLIC FORUM**

* **Hector on behalf of Bailey Loverin**
	+ The bill does not overstep executive authority because it still allows for Executive Officers to hire and fire their own staffs but provides a way to keep those privileges from being abused – that being of course, the majority senate vote.

	Ali’s fears about “bad blood” in the office are not a substantial reason to let this bill fail. First, what is bad blood? Is it differences caused by party lines? Or just plain dislike for another person? Is it caused by diverse opinions on controversial issues? I think those are very petty reasons to excuse firing someone from a job they’ve held for five months. As the bill states “Good cause for removal includes a failure to perform duties as listed in Associated Students Legal Code or an offense deemed worthy of removal.” If this so called “bad blood” becomes such an issue that the staff member does not perform their appointed duties, the executive officer is within their rights to fire that staff member. If there is a serious offense as determined by the executive officer and senate – think theft, assault, etc. – the executive officer is within their rights to fire that staff member. Also notice that the language in the bill is intentionally broad which allows for senate and the executive officer to interpret the bill as to their best judgments.

	I also am personally highly wary of any person in a position of power who strongly opposes a checks and balance system. Where there is an excess of power there is an opportunity for that power to be abused. While it would be lovely to think that no one would ever abuse power entrusted to them by other students, it’s also a bit naïve. I encourage you to be cynical and question such authority.

	This bill is not a new idea. I’d like to remind you all that the office of the EVPSA currently has the same restriction that this bill proposes. According to Legal Code the EVPSA has the power to appoint and remove staff members with a majority senate vote. It’s an unnecessary concern to worry that you are stepping on Exec’s toes or restricting their authority when one of the five offices is already adhering to an identical principle as the one being discussed today. Furthermore, the bill being considered today is less stringent than the one used by the EVPSA because it only applies to the first 20 weeks of the execs term. After the 20 weeks (approx. 5 months), the exec no longer has to seek senate approval. This time period stops frivolous firings early on. After 20 weeks it would be highly detrimental to fire an office staff and rehire one so late in the year and it can be assumed that all firings have a reasonable justification.

	Staff has earned their jobs and the right to keep them as long as they continue to meet the standards set by the executive officer they serve.

	Once again this is a slippery slope. We don’t know when we’ll face this again and it might just be the president next time. AS President appoints the ASOP staff members and also appoints “the chair people of all associated students boards and commissions, senate ad-hoc committees, and asucsb units, as well as all representatives to university administration, faculty, staff, or other advisory boards.” If you don’t protect staff from unreasonable removal now, half of AS could be replaced in the future for a reason as arbitrary as say… bad blood?

*MOTION/SECOND: Stanton/ Elyasi*

*Motion language: Motion to suspend normal protocol during public forum and allow anyone present to speak*

*ACTION: consent*

* **Hector on behalf of Saiba Singh**
	+ I would like to seriously preface the dedication both the EVPLA and OSA staffs have shown in this unusual time. Both staffs have been entirely immersed in work and have exceeded expectations and job descriptions. It is very worrisome to me that an executive with no experience in either of these offices could wipe out those who have experience and essentially are the reason there is an office for them to run in the first place. We are not asking for our jobs. We have already earned our jobs and demonstrated our capability in performing the duties of the office without an executive. An executive that comes into office will still have the opportunity to hire new staff members. We are not limiting staffs to the amount of people already hired. Executives will still have the power to hire other people for the office. We are simply asking that we be granted the right to keep the jobs we have rightfully and fairly earned. Just as an executive has the right to choose staff members they will work well with, we have a right to the positions we were trained in and that we have proven to do efficiently and effectively. Specific to the OSA staff, forcibly removing the appointed staff and having them re-interview (if they choose to do so) would prevent OSA from helping students, which is the fundamental reason OSA even exists. In the time period that interviews are taking place, no caseworkers will be present to help students that come into conflict with university regulations. This would reflect terribly on OSA and AS as a whole. AS exists to help students on a general level, and this bill is the only way to ensure that this continues. AS and everyone who is in AS needs to remember that the students come before personal interest, and an executive that comes in and undermines the work the appointed staff has done and all the people the staff has helped is a poor reflection of executive duties. This bill would also not take any power away from an executive because if certain staff members are not performing their duties, they can be fired; however, they cannot be fired without a reason, which is exactly what would happen should new executives come into office. In today’s SAG forum, Sukayna stated she would have the entire OSA staff re-interview should she take office. This would drag the office even further behind and would be personally offensive to each staff member that has put in extra time and effort to sustaining the office. And to re-train an entire new staff in both casework and outreach would be completely absurd because it would mean being an entire quarter behind in her own personal goals as well as set office goals. Most importantly, it would mean putting off student needs, which is completely unfair to them as well as the staff who is entirely willing and trained to help them in their situations. Also, for clients already in contact with current staff, it would mean passing their information on to someone else who they may not feel comfortable with and to someone who doesn’t know his or her situation in its entirety. Again, this bill would simply give us the right to the positions we have already earned, while still allowing the executive who comes into office to hire new staff members. At the very least, this bill will allow us to prove to the new executive that we are capable; we have already proven this to the student body and to senate, so this bill should not even be a question. If you were to put yourself in our shoes and have your abilities questioned, you yourselves would want this bill passed. We are best suited for our positions, and we have hard evidence of that.

**Ali Guthy – AS President**

* In response to Bailey Loverin's letter
* Ali’s comment about bad blood in the exec report was not her only reasoning behind her objection
* Ali’s intention was not to make bad blood about party lines
* SAG is unpartisan, so it's not applicable
* Concerns: authority of exec officers ability to select their staff, something should be in place to insure there is a system upon resignation of exec office staff, must monitor arbitrary releasing of staff
* Currently senate must approve all resignations and could still choose not approve them without this bill
* Innate duty of exec to select staff depending on their projects to complete
* Staff may not have interest or skill set in the program to implement it so would not work for the executive's plans.
* President is only exec position that has clear line of succession as IVP is next in line
* Liam: How do you feel about equalizing the offices processes
* Ali: If EVPSA has a different process it should be uniform but Senate must still approve or deny resignations
* Ali on the CONTROLLER BILL
	+ Agreed on structure of office with Amir
	+ One Problem with the Project leads portion
	+ Originally submitted with 10 positions, in his office. This is excessive, more than other execs
	+ As a New office, should start small and add on if necessary
	+ Suggestion that project leads is struck out
	+ Their duties already reflect those as a member in the f AS fellowship
	+ Repetitive of the fellowship, not necessary
	+ These 4 positions would earn honoraria
	+ Recommend to eliminate project lead and allow fellows to do that job
* **Angela Lau**
	+ **How senate should approach bills and video resolution**
	+ **Look at bills in a more Macro terms**
		- **Affecting people 10 years from now**
		- **When reading a bill, step out of the now (all the drama) how it this going to affect the Association**
		- **Think of AS as a whole**
		- **AS- is all UCSB forever**
		- **There have been a lot of place emotions, don’t want to be reacting**
		- **Reacting shouldn’t be writing a bill that will be in legal code forever**
		- **Different bills that will come in during the year, but have to consider the bigger picture**
	+ **Video taping resolution**
		- **Talked about for many years**
		- **Edited or live stream**
		- **Who’s going to edit, judgement, money, jurisdictions of what they cut something out that others want in**
		- **Live streaming- happening now, reality TV, whatever happens**
		- **Responsible for whatever you say in that moment because everyone is going to be watching it**
		- **Privacy – some people don’t want to be recorder**
			* **Going to have to have waiver or something**
		- **But think this is a good progress**
		- **Help people know what Senate and AS is**
		- **Paola- CMOs, started last year because there was an issue people with live streaming – 185 people saw the video**
	+ **Amir’s video**
	+ **Controller – written in LC in combo of chair of Business Service Committee and financial matters**

 **D. ASUCSB Officer Reports**

 D-1. Administrative Committees Reports

 D-2. Boards and Commissions Reports

 D-3. Units Reports

 D-4. Advisors’ Reports

* Marisela
	+ Reviewing the video tape
	+ It’s important to try and talk about these matters in between meetings
		- About what might come forward in the meetings

 D-5. Executive Officers’ Reports

 D-6. Ex-Officio Members’ Reports

* Hector Contreras– Attorney General
	+ Fine violations in legal code and persecute anyone who does
	+ Address Bailey’s comment on the bill
	+ Please be conscious when you are writing a bill on someone’s behalf
	+ Line of succession
		- If IVP were to step down, then temporary until election
		- Would not replace current system to elect someone else
	+ Restructuring SAG office
		- Against the constitution
		- Positions and office structure can only be changed by the SAG

 **E. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA**

*MOTION/SECOND: Stanton/ Anderson*

*Motion language: Motion to add a bill to add AS Legal Code Art. 7 section 3 , 8-10*

*ACTION: consent*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

**F. MINUTES AND ALLOCATIONS**

F-1. Minutes:

 **G. ACTION ITEMS**

G-1. New Business

1. 102214-23: A Bill to Create Legal Code for the Community Financial Fund

*MOTION/SECOND: Anderson/ Stanton*

*Motion language: Motion to send this bill to consent calendar with the amendments*

*ACTION: consent*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

2. 102214-24: A Bill to Amend Article XII, Section 6, 8, & 9 of Legal Code

*MOTION/SECOND: Anderson/ Rothschild*

*Motion language: Motion to send this bill to the consent calendar with the amendments*

*ACTION: consent*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

3. 102214-26: A Bill to Update Standing Policy 2: Senate Minutes and Agenda

*MOTION/SECOND: Koo/Oakley*

*Motion language: Motion to send this bill to the consent calendar with the amendments*

*ACTION: consent*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

4. 102214-27: A Bill for Improving the Attorney and Solicitor General

*MOTION/SECOND: Koo/Stanton*

*Motion language: Motion to send this bill to the consent calendar with the stipulation that the word “plaintiff” should be removed*

*ACTION: consent*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

5. 102214-33: A Resolution to Begin Videotaping Senate Meetings

*MOTION/SECOND: Stanton/ Koo*

*Motion language: Motion to table to this bill indefinitely*

*ACTION: consent*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

6. 102214-34: A Bill to Update A.S. Legal Code Article VII Sections 3, 8-10

*MOTION/SECOND: Stanton/ Anderson*

*Motion language: Motion to send this bill to the consent calendar*

*ACTION: 4-3-1 motion fails*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

*MOTION/SECOND: Rothschild/ Anderson*

*Motion language: Motion to table this bill*

*ACTION: Vote: 6-2 motion passes*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

 G-2. Old Business

 1. 101514-22: A Bill to Update the A.S. Office of the Controller

*MOTION/SECOND: Stanton/ Koo*

*Motion language: motion to send the latest version of the bill to the consent calendar with the stipulation that the Project lead portion is deleted*

*ACTION: consent*

*Advisor/Staff Instruction/Request: n/a*

*Responsible for Follow-through: N/A*

*Additional approval required: NO*

 **H. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

 **I. INTERNAL REPORTS**

I-1. Representative Reports

* Paul Austin – Poli Sci major from Lakewood
* Cassie- meetings next quarter 4pm on Mondays, will think about it
	+ New policy no laptops or phone during public forum

I-2. Administrative Assistant Report

 **J. REMARKS**

* **Angela and Ali can talk without being in public forum**
* **Ali – if you have any questions on the contentious bills come talk to her**
* **Emani – Qcomm has finalized their calendar next wed at 6:30pm**
	+ **Queer town hall**
	+ **Housing in the sweeps – over-packed**
		- **Access to the hall with a designated wristband**

 **K. ADJOURNMENT**

*MOTION/SECOND: Rothschild/ Contreras*

*Motion language: Motion to adjourn the meeting*

*ACTION: consent*

*Time Taken: 9:01pm*