

### **MINUTES**

**Location:** Wolverine Room (Michigan Union, 3rd Floor) Zoom

- 1. Call to Order & Convening Matters
  - a. Mario Thaqi calls the meeting to order at 7:35 PM
  - b. Eric Veal calls the opening roll  $\rightarrow$  Quorum is met
  - c. Mario Thaqi reads the land acknowledgement
  - d. Swearing in New Members
    - i. Riley Kina, LSA
    - ii. Daniel Pacious, LSA
    - iii. Amina Safiedine, LSA
- 2. Recalls
  - a. Mario Thaqi: There are no recalls
- 3. Elections
  - a. Mario Thaqi: There are no elections
- 4. Community Concerns
  - a. David Reeves
    - i. David Reeves: I am a rep of the undergrad student government at Michigan Technological University. I'm reaching out to CSG to discuss a topic that's important to us. Recently, our orientation program, which was a full week before the school semester started, has been changed by the administration. As reps of the undergrad student university, we highly value shared governance and want to have a voice in these opinions and write insight to the administration when these opinions do not reflect the student interests in the best way. We don't believe this change was done in the best way. It was changed to a model that's going to have a summer in person orientation which for geography is 8 to 10 hours away from UofM which is a hardship for parents and students or anyone who wants to participate in this program. We're reaching out to student governments across the country to garner support for shared governance and gain insights to current orientation programs. Our team reached out the UofM sg on stats on the orientation and any insights that will assist us on this investigation and increased steps for shared governance.
    - ii. Margaret Peterman: What does support look like for you from CSG? Is it endorsing this? Have you received those statistics on our orientation program we run here?



- iii. David Reeves: We would like any endorsement of any recommendations our committee puts forward. We put our meeting minutes publicly and will reach out to all universities we contacted on our final decision. In trying to keep shared governance at all universities, that is what we're looking for for endorsements. We have not received the data yet but we understand that this is a large ask.
- iv. Margaret Peterman: Who did you reach out to?
- v. David Reeves: We just reached out to the CSG.contact.edu email.
- vi. Erin Neely: We support any mission of shared governance. We are looking to get data collection ourselves for an issue that's important to UofM and students, namely unfair grading in introductory math classes. Based on your experience with data collecting, do you have any suggestions for us?
- vii. David Reeves: A lot of the context is that we are a much smaller university so a lot of our advertisements are posters and mass surveys. They're received a lot more locally so some students take higher values in certain issues SG presents. We focused on taking involved students who had personal issues with the orientation process and that can be transferred over to other committees related to this, and that's a great starting point for us and I think that's a great starting point for any initiative going forward.
- viii. Amr Brown: Part of my work is working with UM Dearborn and Flint. Do you see this as a one time thing collaborating with CSG or extend this to a larger partnership.
- ix. David Reeves: I think there's a huge opportunity with these initiatives. I have reached out to Dearborn and Flint, but I think this is an issue we can put forward. This issue has been admitted to other universities as well, so having some sort of student collaboration can bring about a consistency of how these ideas are enacted.
- x. Tiya Berry: Does it have any implications for UofM students or looking to lobby it back to your campus?
- xi. David Reeves: I do believe, while this doesn't have any direct influence on UofM, I think it does have potential issues that could occur along the lines of undergrad students coming into the university. But in this specific instance, it's about supporting the initiatives we put forward for shared governance.
- 5. Reports
  - a. Rules



i. Stefan Nielsen: Two of the resolutions we discussed still have significant hurdles to jump over. We figured it was a better decision to let the assembly deal with certain topics we were discussing. Everything was passed and approved.

### b. Finance

 Joanna Hua: We talked about AR14-45. We still need clarification on where the money is sent to and things like that. There were a couple amendments passed and that's about it.

### c. Communications

i. Jack Brummer: We didn't have any resolutions for release or return. Go vote early. Tyler discussed the disability advocacy bill and how it's being discussed in rules but later in comms as well. It will be in the campus wide ballot in November.

### d. Resolutions

i. Margaret Peterman: We had 5 resolutions to discuss. We talked about a resolution condemning DPSS actions on the protest of November 7. We also had one come forward about the raid on the encampment and holding associated bodies accountable. We also considered 3 resolutions. We postponed 2 because sponsors weren't here. We released a resolution rep Engstrom worked on to make our university protect gender diverse students.

### e. SOC

- i. Hayden Jackson: Nothing to add.
- ii. Mairo Thaqi: Check out the report because it is the first one about the budget.

#### f. Elections

i. Hayley Bedell: If you are a candidate, if you could sign in at the sheet of paper on the back table, or chat with me, or send in photos if on zoom. We hit 100 applications for candidates. We had 3 withdraw last week, one is not eligible, one is considering eligibility. Applications close tomorrow night. So if you are an appointed member of the assembly, you have to reapply. Linked to my report is the elections information sheet about our candidates. There's a quick breakdown about the fall election on 20th and 21st. We're going to send out a volunteer help form sign up. We have linked the fall election budget. It doesn't have to be approved by the assembly, but please look at it so you know what we're doing with our money.

#### g. Shoutouts



i. Shawn Kelly/ Tyler Hart: Shoutout to the interns. To Amr, for helping lead and organizing the first Arab pre-law org at Umich. For Margaret Peterman, for being a great organizer, you have a bright future ahead of you. To Riley Kina, welcome back to assembly. To Dan, welcome to assembly, we're eager to see what you achieve. To Haylet Bedell and her team, thank you for breaking candidate numbers. For Jessie Rehberg, for writing your first resolution. To Hayden Jackson, to all the unrecognized words. To Maya Akiva, for her research that will be shared. To Eric, we saw you working hard. To Emily, for being a great chair and giving great reports each meeting. To Debby, for taking an exam and coming straight to the meeting. To me, for doing an 8:30 am coffee breakfast on a Friday. To our justices, thank you for joining us. To the elections team, for doing a great job. Another Eric, for being the best crowd control. For Demi, you're the best. To Mark and Jack, love you guys. To Hayley, for a great report. For Margaret, shoutout is always making me laugh. For Margaret, for being the best Harris supporter. For the interns, for learning to make links and posts. For Amr, for being dedicated to student leadership. To Aiden, congrats on your first official report. To Stephfan, for doing a great job sharing meetings no matter how hairy they get. To Emlily Ryan, asking me to write her insta post. To Tyler Watt, being Tyler Watt. To Mena Clark, giving a last minute finance report. To Eric, your tireless work in efforts are not unseen. To Andrea, her first meeting as a rules intern. For Eric, for being a strong campus leader and elevating student voices in the process. For Mario, for making the best banana bread.

### h. Executive

- i. Margaret Peterman: I'm curious about the president and vice president about their promise to reach out to members of the assembly.
- ii. Mario Thaqi: I have no knowledge.
- iii. Margaret Petermna: Will the exec report of last week contain events that happened at the meeting of October 8.
- iv. Maori thaqi: I have no knowledge.
- v. Margaret Peterman: Are we able to use the CSG instagram to promote things now?
- vi. Mario Thaqi: Yes.
- vii. Angelica Previero: I heard there was the president'c council happening this morning and I know VP Atkinson is a part of th council. Did he attend the council?
- viii. Mario Thaqi: He was not presnet.
- ix. Angelica Previero: Do you know if he has plans attending in the future?



x. Mario Thaqi: I have no knowledge.

### i. Speaker

i. Mario Thaqi: We have 3 vacancies right now, one in LSA, dentistry, and SMTD. We're working on filling those. 3 vacancies were filled from the school of LSA. Other than that, please fill out the excused absence form as always. You have 8 excused absences per semester. Office of the speaker had its first meeting on the 25th with the chairs and vice chairs. It's a good group so I'm hoping the assembly will confirm the cominees. The SG speaker met with the civil rights office in relation to the meeting on the 8th and we're trying to defuse the hostile situation and make sure it doesn't happen again. I will be meeting with Dean Jones about the post budget transition on Wednesday so I will keep you posted. I also attended the President's Council this morning. There was a great presentation on health this morning. I tried to get him to come. Also, next week, our meeting will be on Monday the 4th Anderson Room. We have a lot of resolutions so be cognizant of others' time.

#### 6. Nominations

a. Mario Thagi: No nominations

#### 7. Introductions

- a. CA 14-003: Veto Process Amendment
  - i. Mario Thaqi: Sponsors are not here. Mr. Watt, would you like to speak?
  - ii. Tyler Watt: It would simplify the language in the Constitution so the president has 5 days to veto a resolution. If the president doesn't veto it for 5 days, it automatically becomes enacted. This will be voted on next week.
  - iii. Mario Thaqi: This resolution will be referred to the resolutions committee for second reads.
- b. AR 14-045: MATH 115 Data Collection Act
  - i. Jessie Rehberg: This resolution is one of two I'm planning to write. The first is asking to conduct a survey. We have questions we're thinking of looking at student input. From that data, the LSA school is hoping to compare it with data they have. For the second resolution, I'm hoping to look at how we can make changes based on that data.
  - ii. Mario Thaqi: This resolution will be referred to the finance committee for second reads.
- c. AR 14-046: Authorized Signer Flexibility Act
  - i. Tyler Watt: It would modify the language so that any official can be made an authorized signer because with the emergence of the task forces and



the limited officers we have, it's difficult to conduct business. This would allow flexibility for the assembly in the weeks to come.

- ii. Mario Thaqi: We're trying to approve more authorized signers so we can get them operating. It would make it easier to get purchases approved.
- iii. Erin Neely: Point of information. Do you believe the assembly needs to move into business or should it wait another week?
- iv. Tyler Watt: It's okay.
- v. Mario Thaqi: This resolution will be referred to the rules committee for second reads.
- d. AR 14-047: Protect Our Students Act
  - i. Amr Brown: Me and the other sponsors got together to get it out. It's about the response of DPSS to the walk out on October 7th. It condemns police brutality and DPSS response to student activism. The goal is to get it out there and that we condemn it and reject anything limiting student first amendment rights. This is to get a larger change to DPSS and how they react to student activism.
  - ii. Mark Farag: There were no cameras shown, there was no answer. It's important to support the people. They are the students and we should have freedom of speech. I feel the school needs to do extra work to do that.
  - iii. Amr Brown: Motion to discharge and place this resolution under business.
  - iv. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, this resolution is placed under business.

### 8. Business

- a. Minutes from the 15th Meeting of the 14th Assembly on October 22nd, 2024
- b. CA 14-001: Petition Review Act
  - i. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object to the passage of this resolution with unanimous consent? Seeing an objection we will enter debate?
  - ii. Tyler Watt: Partially unchanged since rules, this would reaffirm CSJ rules in the petition review process. It would also reaffirm the court's ability to offer advisory opinions. THe changes on here would rephrase the ballot language. This is a campus vote, so if we pass it the student body would vote on it.
  - iii. Margaret Peterman: Motion to accept all amendments as made.
  - iv. Hayden Jackson: Could you explain what you feel is the purpose or need in CSJ reviewing petitions at all? I'm wondering why they have a role in this at all. There's no real parallel to this.



- v. Tyler Watt: There are not many real world equivalents of this. I would say that we're unique with our process in petitions. Anything that 1000 students sign on can become legislation. I stand by this because if this body can come up with a detached opinion whether something is constitutional or not, I would trust a court doing that. I think it's a lot of stress to place on one position when it comes to deciding if something is constitutional, and the court would help with easing that.
- vi. Hayden Jackson: Why do you feel that an adversarial process isn't necessary?
- vii. Tyler Watt: This process occurs early enough that petitions lifespans would not string people along. For adversarialism, CSJ has done a good job of taking a weird system and making it adversarial. It can resemble something adversarial.
- viii. Margaret Peterman: Does this have anything to do with how this is being brought forward by the students and not the assembly?
- ix. Tyler Watt: Yes, this judicial process could resemble how a committee reviews legislation. It's hard to put in words, but the petition process is hardcoded in our constitution and compiled code that if a petition is put forward the assembly it can't be amended, so we couldn't pass it through our typical assembly ways unless we change the rules. There's different ways we could skin this cat, so I opt for this approach to include CSJ because that's how we did it in the past.
- x. Erin Neely: I do not see any reason why the CSG system needs to be put more towards the adversarial model. Regarding the adversarial model of court cases, I know that at least one country that if enough legislatures claim a proposed statute is unconstitutional, they can force the supreme court to consider it. I believe that on at least one ballot question, opponents sued overloaded questions on the ballot.
- xi. Hayden Jackson: Why not have CSJ review the eligibility of candidates in this election?
- xii. Tyler Watt: Because it's a lot more of a cut and dry question. If something is controversial and unconstitutional, they would be the ones catching slack as opposed to a singular person at the front.
- xiii. Vincent Pinti: I think there's important context here. I would like the sponsors to talk about the precedent for this change.
- xiv. Tyler Watt: In the fall of 2023 we had our first petition that was signed by more than 1000 students that was introduced to CSJ but they found it constitutional. However, that was later revised and found constitutional last fall. In the most recent round, CSJ elected to not issue an opinion



whether they were constitutional or not, they did not exercise their authority to do so, so we had long meetings about budget debates. CSJ electing to not provide a yes or no on whether those petitions were constitutional or not ended badly. This solution, though imperfect, would give us some clarity as to why the core electors didn't make a decision.

- xv. Tiya Berry: I wanted to ask if there are efficiency implications instead of going through the whole process?
- xvi. Tyler Watt: There could be. It could waste many people's time.
- xvii. Margaret Peterman: Motion to accept all amendments with unanimous consent.
- xviii. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, the amendments are made. Does anyone else wish to make a motion? Motion to previous question. Does anyone object to ending the debate? Seeing and hearing none, we will end the debate and will move to the previous question. Does anyone object to the passage of this resolution? Seeing an objection we will enter a roll call vote.
  - 1. Vote -> Pass with 2/3s majority

a. For: 25

b. Against: 2

c. Abstain: 1

2. Delegation Vote -> Pass to re referred to all campus vote

a. For: 9

b. Against: 0

c. Abstain: 9

- c. CA 14-002: Disability Ex-Officio Act of 2024
  - i. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object to the passage of this resolution? Seeing an objection we will enter debate.
  - ii. Margaret Peterman: I wanted to confirm, I do know that Erin did put this in the GC that at rules, they discussed the ex-officio act that it needs more input from disability students. I don't believe there was a point of communication with that community, so if anyone has comments please share.
  - iii. Erin Neely: Since I sent that message, no one has contacted me. It's in the rules committee report, the core dispute is about the language in the amendment itself and ballot question whether the disability ex-officio should have a disability and if so, how do we determine who qualifies. Tyler Watt and his associates that for legal reasons, we can't require the ex-officio rep be disabled themselves, but it is just not right that we would have an abled student speaking over disabled students in this



- seat. I would propose a compromise for the language to say that this position represents students with disabilities which doesn't explicitly require students to have disability so it should stave off legal challenges but is implicit the rep has some ties to the disability community.
- iv. Angelica Previero: Just to be mindful that one voice truly represents all voices. I'm not sure it's the language that we would be mindful of.
- v. Margaret Petermna: I would agree with rep Previero on that. There is a misconception of what a disability is. I think it would be a disservice to say that one person can speak for a whole community. No one on this body should claim to represent every experience. I would personally advocate for Tyler's amendment to not disqualify anyone for that position. The advocacy part is most important, so there should not be someone who doesn't understand that position. But I have faith in the nominations committee. I don't think we have a problem with the wording instead of saying representatives with disabilities.
- vi. Vincent Pinti: As a law student and person with a disability, I understand a lot of the sentiments said, but I do appreciate what SGC and what rep Peterman mentioned. As long as we have a nominating executive process that allows for ensuring the student elected for this role is advocating for the community, I think it's going to be known that this person has done advocating work. I think that's what would happen. Including language the SGC proposed is appropriate because it answers questions we should be acting. There's a wide breadth of people that can do this but there are ways we can bump up diversity without coming across legal challenges.
- vii. Tiya Berry: My first internship was at Detroit Pavillion Power and I'm glad to have learned from them. I learned how visible and invisible disabilities can be but I also learned about drawing that line of what counts as a disability. Given that, I think the wording Mr. Watt was fine given the work I did with them. Someone who is in that position is naturally going to select themselves to what this position entails and what they can achieve. If it's not reflective of what the community wants, then they won't get elected.
- viii. Margaret Peterman: I think we should caution against wordings that include SSD because they're not the best at what they do right now. They haven't been as accommodating. I think that if you visit their website, they don't have a great definition of what a disability is so deferring to their definition would be very confusing and is not representative.



- ix. Tyler Watt: I spoke with the university general campus office in terms of what we can do. We cannot have a seat that is only for students with disabilities. The language I have would pass their legal muster. I would propose that rep Neely's proposal would also pass. Non-members can yield to their advice.
- x. Tyler Fioritto: In terms of this language, I did speak with someone with a disability culture at UofM. In terms of language, disability advocates are fine with them and one thing we forgot to mention is that in terms of an appointment process, that would have to be a different date. In terms of this, getting that position to exist is the priority here.
- xi. Reyhaneh Najafikoupaei: I'm not against using the word advocacy, but I want to ask is it possible this language can be interpreted so that students without disabilities could apply?
- xii. Margaret Peterman: There is always that possibility but it's unique because they have that qualifier of them, but we would be hard pressed to find someone who would advocate for them and answer questions regarding the disability communities. I think it would be a disservice to exclude people who have loved ones who have disabilities and people who know the difficulties. I think it leaves that option open.
- xiii. As an individual with an invisible disability I find the language including SSD to be not the best. It can be difficult to get insurance to get diagnosed. I think it's exclusionary to have that language.
- xiv. Margaret Peterman: Motion to accept Tyler Watt's amendment with unanimous consent.
- xv. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object to the amendment? There is an objection. We will enter a hand vote.
  - 1. Vote -> That motion is made
- xvi. Margaret Peterman: Motion to accept all amendments except for the last amendment with unanimous consent.
- xvii. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object to those amendments? Seeing and hearing none, those amendments are made. Motion to previous question. Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, we will motion to the previous question. Does anyone object to the passage of this change? Seeing and hearing none, CA14-002 passes.
- d. AR 14-036: Transparency in Policing Act
  - i. Mario Thagi: Does anyone object to the passage of this resolution?
  - ii. Erin Neely: Motion to accept amendments on the document.
  - iii. Mairo Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, that amendment is made. Motion to the previous question. Are there any



objections? Seeing and hearing none, we will move to the previous question. Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, the resolution passes.

- e. AR 14-039: Election Code Staffing, Compensation, and Misc. Amendments
  - i. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Objection noted, we will enter debate.
  - ii. Tyler Watt: There are two small amendments.
  - iii. Margaret Peterman: Motion to accept amendments with unanimous consent.
  - iv. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, those amendments are made.
  - v. Erin Neely: Motion to accept clerical amendments.
  - vi. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing, those amendments are made. Motion to previous question. Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none we will consider the resolution. Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, the resolution passes.
- f. AR 14-040: Trans Umbrella Student Protection Act
  - i. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing an objection we will enter debate.
  - ii. I believe we just needed some more time to work on this. Motion to refer it to the resolution committee.
  - iii. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, the resolution is referred to as resolutions for third considerations.
- g. AR 14-047: Protect Our Students Act
  - i. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing an objection we will enter debate.
  - ii. Amr Brown: Motion to accept all amendments.
  - iii. Mario Thaqi: Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, those amendments are made. Motion to previous question. Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, we will move to the previous question. Does anyone object? Seeing and hearing none, the resolution passes.
- 9. Reconsiderations
  - a. Mario Thagi: There are no reconsiderations
- 10. Matters Arising and Announcements
  - a. Margaret Peterman: Thank you for listening. I wanted to say that we accepted almost all of our eligible interns so make yourself known to them. They will be having coffee chats with members. Please respond to emails quickly. I will be working on two resolutions. One is the microgrant resolution. Secondly, a high school leadership initiative to invite high schools to learn what advocacy looks like on a college level.



- b. Vincent Pinit: I didn't hear the challenges to SSD, but I work very closely with them so if there are please reach out to me.
- c. Erin Neely: I'm sorry for the ways I've let you down. Since rep Engstrom isn't here, please vote in the elections if you haven't done so already. Also, the blood battle is happening. I also have a couple projects I'd like to work on with affinity advocacy and the transportation act. Congrats to the football team for beating MSU.
- d. Mario Thaqi: As long as we're respecting each other it's all good.
- e. Tyler Watt: Be sure to file for candidacy. Shoutout to Elizabeth, our intern.
- f. Eric Veal Jr.: There's an initiative going around the state to figure out how to keep books cheap and affordable. We're one of the last schools to join that, but feel free to join that. Interns, you can introduce yourself. We are trying to get one of our mandatory training for next week for MASA. Make sure to advocate for your constituents.
- g. Mario Thaqi: Next week be in person for our guest if you can to Anderson on Monday. Eric and I met with Jones about Wolverine Wellness and he is looking for CSG people who are passionate about mental health. They have an advisory council and steering council. If you want to be a part of either of them, reach out to me, I'll give you more information. Steering committee is tomorrow. If you pass resolutions, now what? If you don't know what to do, reach out to me. I will get you connected with the right people.

### 11. Closing and Adjournment

- a. Eric Veal calls closing role → Quorum is met
- b. Mario Thaqi closes the meeting at 10:17pm