

UC Gen
10/23/16

Community Time: Matt Estes (Election Commission Chair)

- Candidacy declaration form - opens tonight. Then name added to online google doc
- Have to get 150 signatures to make it on the ballot.
- Can people sign for multiple tickets? Yes
- Why is it against the rule to message on sandwich boards? Long-standing tradition
- Mandatory election meeting on November 4th
- Campaigning starts November 9th, 12:01 am. Voting opens the 14th, a Monday, and closes on the 17th, Thursday

Referenda: see Cam's document

Caucus Presentations

- Black Caucus: Meet on a regular basis; purpose: institutional link to the UC; also link to the administration. Want to expand the ways they discuss issues of importance within the black community - bring to Dean Khurana
- Latinx Caucus: "Unity creates strength" - unite different entities in order to create progress. April 15th, 2016 - the creation. Plan is to meet with leaders of Latinx community but also the general population; attending meetings, town halls, etc.
- Queer Caucus: Same vision - institutionalization. Clearing up communication. For the Queer Caucus specifically, continuous issuing of statements/presence on issues on campus/nationally

Questions

- What would be the gain from institutionalization? Important question - high rate of turnover, etc. More legitimacy, more structured.
- 3 person minimum? Can't have a caucus of just one person, practically speaking. Pressure on to make sure there is representation
- What about Latina women and black women? Publicize/encourage over email lists. Personal outreach.

Updates

- Financial accessibility task force!
- Freshman debate watch party went really well! Going to create a bi-weekly newsletter with news and also freshman hacks
- HY Club 1636 Thursday night
- Requiring reps to hold office hours?

Fall Grants Pack 5

- Spent less money than we normally do - 25% fewer grant applications. No budgetary alarm
- People love new application

Passed by unanimous consent

Bylaws Amendment: Caucuses

- Financial need for caucuses? Is something that we would want included in the future? Right now, don't need funds going toward them - want to distinguish caucuses and committees
- What is the great gain of institutionalizing a caucus - losing ability to have fewer than 3 people on the caucus? Doesn't prevent unofficial caucuses from forming
- Would this discourage students who see there *isn't* a caucus for their community on the UC? Hopefully will only encourage them to join the UC- represent their community
- Con: Allyship? How does that fit in? How it'll affect inter-Council relations - shouldn't be divisive but could be; how would this help communication?
- Pro: SRC could work well with the caucuses - make sure we are doing outreach. Caucuses reporting to SRC - disseminate to UC. People can also do individual outreach by themselves.
- Con: What concern is legitimate in terms of unrepresented voices? These are very personal conversations. People could feel very rejected if caucus is denied; could also accept so many caucuses because these are such personal conversations - Council will splinter.
- Pro: SRC holds authority - will act in good faith. Has to have $\frac{2}{3}$ of SRC's support and Council's support. Will be very judicious.

Amendment: *"Should there not be three elected members of the caucus' stated community of interest, at the behest and application of a student organization in that community, a group of allies numbering at least three can be appointed to liaise to that community in a form of a caucus."*

- Uncomfortable situation - not a member of that community and they're trying to represent it?
- Allies will be appointed by whom? How? The UC - should this mechanism be explained in the amendment

Friendly amendment: *The student group representing that community that is applying shall nominate an ally from the UC*

- What about a split? Some groups want allies, some don't.
- Con: Stretches boundaries of what allyship is. Dilutes purpose of proposed legislation.
- Pro: Nothing has to happen unless the students group want it to happen.
- Con: Caucus not the best way for this allyship to happen.
- Pro: Issue that's broader: just because students run doesn't mean they're going to get elected. Then all of a sudden this vehicle doesn't exist anymore, that's not fair.
- Con: No requirement/stipulation for the organization that nominates these allies - should continue to work with the UC. Also allies shouldn't pretend to be representing the interests of a certain group if they can't relate as well as others. Adds a lot of complexity to this legislation. Introducing a lot of other mechanisms.

- Pro: If it's up to the group whether or not they're going to appoint an ally - why are we interfering with this decision?

Amendment to Amendment: *Other groups from this same community will have two weeks to object to potentially nominated allies - not considered by voice vote*

- Con: We took action based on what Damon told us - this speech could not have been matched in terms of passion, etc. by three allies
- Pro: Make process of organizations coming to talk to the UC about issues easier

Amendment fails by hand vote

- Con: Two-tiered system - certain underrepresented groups will have an official caucus and certain won't
- Pro: We need to make sure we hear every voice on campus; don't just rely on caucuses
- Con: Don't confuse true advocacy of caucuses with institutionalization. Adds entire process - de-legitimizes caucuses. Arrogant of us to think we are immune to our own biases. Issues never become dormant, but caucuses would be.
- Pro: When we're unofficial, the rest of the UC has no idea what people are doing. Also incentivizes people to run for the UC.

Fails by roll call vote 26-16-3