

LSA SG Regular Meeting (Hybrid)

1427 Mason Hall / [Zoom Link](#)

Meeting ID: 940 6091 3035

Nov 3, 2021

8:00 PM

1. Call to Order
2. Opening Roll Call () - Present, E - Excused, A - Absent

i.	Watt, Tyler		xxvii.	Vidhya-Ponraj, Mithun	
ii.	Farah, Zackariah		xxviii.	Gadola, Noah	
iii.	Rifkin, Cameron		xxix.	De Martínez, Brandon	A
iv.	Cohen, Jacob	E	xxx.	Bernstein, Dylan	E
v.	Theuerkauf, Caroline		xxxi.	Vordonis, Emanuel	
vi.	Rich, Sophia		xxxii.	Watson, Lauren	
vii.	Salino, Sarah		xxxiii.	Ervin, Gabriel	
viii.	Goodsell, Alli	E	xxxiv.	Berglund, Mollie	
ix.	Hamamy, Salma	E	xxxv.	Wojtara, Magda	E
x.	McLean, Claudia		xxxvi.	Manzoor, Aleezah	E
xi.	Rothstein, Kayla		xxxvii.	Moon, Austin	E
xii.	Williams, Erik		xxxviii.	Wilson, Michael	
xiii.	Dai, Carol		xxxix.	Colvin, Anna	
xiv.	Fioritto, Tyler		xl.	Orleans, Louis	
xv.	Jonaitis, Cody		xli.	List, Riley	
xvi.	Stoneman, Max		xlii.	Altimemy, Zahraa	A
xvii.	Slack, Caroline		xliii.	Crespo, Maleny	E
xviii.	Gunasekaran, Gaurie	E	xliv.	Juliao, Jordan	
xix.	Zhao, Suki	E	xlv.	Crews, Tiffany	A
xx.	Kado, Lydia	E	xlvi.	Bromberg, Luke	
xxi.	Nelson, Erica	A	xlvii.	Kelley, Makayla	
xxii.	Tam, Peter		xlviii.	Nighswonger, Abigail	
xxiii.	Chakraborti, Aditya		xlix.	Rich, Noah	E
xxiv.	Addison, William				
xxv.	Tedrick, Vincenzo (Vince)				
xxvi.	Neff, Ethan				

3. Announcements
 - a. Election Day Polling Places! (Watt)
 - i. Sign up to help [here!](#)
 - b. Ballot Question fun facts!
 - i. Write-in answers can be enabled for ballot questions
 - ii. There does not seem to be an impactful option limit for ballot questions
4. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Motion: Juliao
 - i. Second: Colvin
 1. Approved by consent
5. Approval of [Previous Minutes](#)
 - a. Motion: Salino
 - i. Second: tam
 1. Approved by consent
6. Constituents' Time
 - a. Abby Ochs: Freshman in LSA, planned to major in Polisci. Excited to potentially join LSA SG!
 - b. Maria: Freshman majoring in Intl Studies
 - c. Bilal Irfan: Freshman majoring in Intl Studies, he/him
 - d. Christina: Freshman majoring in polisci
7. Guest Speaker(s)
 - a. Riley List, Sophie Cronk, Nicolas Gutierrez Riera, Student Sustainability Coalition (SSC)
 - i. [Presentation](#)
8. Appointments, Elections, and Nominations
9. Executive Officer Reports
 - a. [President](#) - Tyler Watt (trwatt@umich.edu)
 - b. [Vice President](#) - Zackariah Farah (zfarah@umich.edu)
 - i. Please contact me if you would like to attend the overnight campout outside President Schlissel's house and require a tent!

- c. [Treasurer](#) - Cameron Rifkin (crifkin@umich.edu)
 - d. Counsel - Jacob Cohen (jaccohen@umich.edu)
 - e. [Academic Relations Officer](#) - Caroline Theuerkauf (theuerkc@umich.edu)
 - i. *Announcement*
 - ii. Watt: Tell us about the resource guide!
 - 1. AAC sent out the office hours resource guide today to all LSA students. It'll be great!
 - f. [External Relations Officer](#) - Sophia Rich (sserich@umich.edu)
 - g. [Student Life Relations Officer](#) - Sarah Salino (smsalino@umich.edu)
 - i. Announcement: Tomorrow, we will table. Sign up is in my report. You can meet constituents and tell people about what the government is doing.
 - h. [Secretary](#) - Alli Goodsell (goodsela@umich.edu)
10. Committee Reports (in alphabetical order)
- a. Budget Allocations Committee - Louis Orleans (lorleans@umich.edu)
 - i. No report
 - b. [Committee Advocating for Transfer, Nontraditional, and International Students](#) - Jordan Juliao (jjuliao@umich.edu)
 - i. Announcement: CATNIS Field Trip! Trip to Detroit; a signup sheet will be sent out soon. We need people who have cars. Be sure to look out for it, and look
 - 1. Salino: Need you be in a CATNIS community to attend?
 - a. Juliao: No! It is open to all, but especially advertise it to your friends in those communities.
 - 2. Watt: Field trip date?
 - a. Juliao: Ya know, that is a great question, our loving president! The date will be released once Friendsgiving's date is announced. That info will be posted in GroupMes.
 - c. Diversity Affairs Committee - Gaurie Gunasekaran (gaurie@umich.edu)
 - d. Health Committee - Gaurie Gunasekaran (gaurie@umich.edu)
11. Task Force and Subcommittee Reports
- a. [Appointments Subcommittee](#) - Claudia McLean (mclaudia@umich.edu)

- i. Announcement: These links will give us an idea about participation in the potluck event! Fill it out either way!
 - ii. <https://forms.gle/uBbv6a9EJ7ztSB6b8>
 - iii. <https://forms.gle/uBbv6a9EJ7ztSB6b8>
 - b. [Judiciary Establishment and Election Code Amendment Task Force](#) - Max Stoneman (maxstone@umich.edu)
 - i. Watt: Is there an intention to renew jeecat
 1. Stoneman: We have been discussing this. At this point, we recognise the need for it. As we work our way through the election code, it will be useful to have a body that oversees the judiciary as it gets started. Hopefully a new, cool acronym can be formed.
 - c. LSA Annual Scholarship Task Force - Vince Tedrick (vtedrick@umich.edu)
 - i. Did not meet this Sunday, just working on an email to send out to Alumni.
 - d. [Subcommittee on Technology, Advising, and Academic Resources](#) - Jordan Juliao (jjuliao@umich.edu)
 - i. Announcement: Michigan Online online classes: if you have used this platform, reach out to me or Abigail Nighswonger. CAI is trying to get data on how people like this platform, how it is going, its accessibility, etc. Second, STAAR is contemplating doing a mini backpacking season in the days before 11/18 (when registration opens). Keep an eye out for these training series!
 - e. [Taking Responsibility for the Earth and Environment Subcommittee](#) - Erik Williams (werik@umich.edu)
12. Individual Representative Reports
 - a. Max W. Stoneman (maxstone@umich.edu)
 - i. Hello everybody. I am Max Stoneman, he/him, an Elected Rep. I came into this role many moons ago, and it has been quite the journey since. I came in as an Apptd Rep, and then things got crazy. I was a wide-eyed young buck, but I have grown into a full blown rep at this point, Some notable things include being ECRAFTF vice chair, an unopposed role I learned to love. We (Jacob and I) worked together to make the EC easy to read and follow as well as we could. I

think it is important that it is easy and fair and purposeful to join LSA SG. The experience got wilder once it became JEECAT Force and we took on the judiciary project. The end is near. Once all the pieces fall, we will have a new branch of the government. I have had a lot of help from you all - big shoutout! I am also IRC Vice Chair because **I LOVE JACOB COHEN WITH ALL OF MY HEART** (let the minutes reflect that). Through this I have been involved with a lot of the representatives in the government, as I help them navigate the tricky documents. If I can help you learn anything, email me.

13. Budget Allocations Committee Recommendations

a. ~~none~~

14. Old Business (YES-NO-ABSTAIN)

a. [B.F2021.30 An Amendment to the Seventeenth Chapter of the Bylaws Addressing Appointees](#)

- i. Tam: This was introduced on 10/13; edits were needed. This is now in a final version form. First, we have kept the section re: LSA appointees (appointed reps) not being applicable in this section. Second, we have struck the part about mandates. Third, we have removed the recall process and now call it removal. The person who appointed someone has the first ability to remove them. Intention is to vote on it today.
- ii. Stoneman: Vote by acclamation
 1. Second: Salino
 - a. App by consent
 - i. Ayes win, bylaw amendment is adopted

b. [C.F2021.02 An Amendment to Article IV and Article VIII of the Constitution to Clarify the Duties of the Counsel and Role of the LSA Student Judiciary](#)

- i. Stoneman: This tweak impacts the judiciary that we might as well use! It broadens the Counsel's role in representing the government before all judiciaries, not just CSJ. It also makes LSA SJ a body capable of hearing LSA SG election disputes. Nothing too controversial! Intent is to vote today on it.
 1. Watt: Enumerated vote okay?
 - a. Stoneman: You bet kiddo.
 2. Juliao: Vote by placard
 - a. Stoneman: Second
 - i. App by consent
 - ii. Placard vote: 24-0-0

1. Ayes have it, amendment is internally approved and will be placed on the ballot
- c. R F2021.12 A Resolution to Propose to the LSA Student Body a Binding Ballot Question Regarding the Renaming of Angell Hall
 - i. Tam: This will poll the student body about whether Angell Hall should be renamed. My hope is to pass it this week.
 1. Rothstein: Do you want to explain more about what a binding ballot question is?
 - a. Tam: This will allow the student government to be guided by the position of the student body on this issue, as they will vote on it during our election.
 2. Tam: Motion to open speakers lasting ten minutes, with speaking time of two minutes, each person may speak once
 - a. Second: Farah
 - i. Approved by consent
 3. Tam: Motion to extend time to 18 mins
 - a. Second: Juliao
 - i. Approved w/o consent
 4. Tam (FOR): As a student government, we are not taking any stance on this issue As a sponsor, I am open to any amendments. It is inarguable that Angell took part in the Angell Treaty. I will not disagree with the fact that Angell disagreed with the wholesale exclusion of Chinese laborers. But his actions opened the floodgates for later actions. We need to ensure that there is accountability for future use of the Angell name.
 5. Tedrick (AGAINST): Angell was progressive for his time, it is a false dichotomy to say that Angell Treaty lead to the Chinese WExclusion Act. Two years before he was even ambassador, a similar act was passed by Congress. Angell's treaty did not allow prohibiting immoigration from China, it just allowed for regulation. There were benefits in his treaty for China, as it gave China trade benefits. The benefits for China were repealed by the Chinese exclusion act. He had a progressive mind in an unprogressive time. Placing the question on the ballot causes a bias that he must have done something bad if this is being considered.
 6. Farah (FOR): I am speaking in favor. I do have concerns that Angell's policies as ambassador did have an impact on the CEA. I am not a historian nor is anyone else here. I am in favor of postponing this for one week, as we have a week to consider this. I propose we contact Dr. Shin who is doing a teach in on this matter. To me, his legacy is confusing. This will advise on whether to act on this resolution. Beyond renaming

the hall, there are proposals to somehow right the wrongs of the CEA through a scholarship.

7. Ervin (AGAINST): After reading about Angell, I have found that he is a complicated figure. He was considered so radically progressive for his time as a result of supporting Thaddeus Stevens and William Steward. He was a staunch abolitionist and Unionist as a publisher; the only to continue to support the war to free the slaves. He was more progressive than Lincoln on this. We could highlight this, or look at the murky situation to highlight him as a bad person. The Angell treaty treated China as equals and hindered the trade of opium. The CEA was based on racist premises; the Angell treaty did not. It is a false dichotomy to compare the two. I would also like to say that if we mention the CEA before the election, that is what people will remember and vote based on.
8. Stoneman (FOR): The point I want to make is that, based on the mixed opinions and complicated history, we should gauge what the student body is thinking about, as that is the point of a ballot question. We should look at the campus and act on those things. Regarding the format of the question, we can amend things. I think it is strange that we are making up minds on Angell while disregarding student feedback. There is a lot going on about this issue at the moment. I would hate to see us close ourselves off here.
9. Addison (AGAINST): I support what a previous speaker said earlier. I researched Angell and he was a progressive man who stood for a lot of things. He was also the longest serving president at U of M, and saw many new colleges develop. There are pros and cons. Merely asking this question invokes the suggestion effect; we cause action by asking it. People will not educate themselves about the entirety of the purpose. We should entirely rephrase this. If this idea does not staunchly stand out to our constituents, then they should not say yes or no immediately.
10. Vidhya-Ponray (FOR): I mirror some of the suggestions of those who spoke FOR before me. It is important to gauge student feedback and not create decisions for ourselves. In doing so, I think we should educate ourselves on the topic and gauge how the students are engaging with the topic. If they are engaged, then we could reword the question in a way that highlights informed and uninformed perspectives to avoid the suggestive effect.
11. Juliao (AGAINST): If you look at the document, I am an endorser. What I want to say is that I think it is important to ask the students questions about this. People could be genuinely hurt by this. This is coming on the

heels of a conversation on the renaming of Weiser Hall. I believe the question of “should we rename?” provokes many thoughts and encourages me to research. Many people will not have the ability to research this. If we could reword it, then it would be beneficial. The topic of renaming, however, is biased in itself, that is where my main issue is.

12. Crespo (AGAINST): I didn't know much about this question or the proposal until last week. Initially, I thought of course! I want to support students impacted by the CEA, etc. However, I agree with the former speaker who stated it was reductionist for people to do their own research, noting confirmation bias as well. I believe the proposal is biased. Reading the history of Angell suggests that people of the same opinion wrote this and put this out there. This is much different than the advocacy in 2016 re: CC Little, where there was obvious outcry. There is a lot of nuance for this. This sets a precedent re: questions that are biased where people may be uninformed on. I am very hesitant to propose this ballot question, as I see it as unfair to students. We will then see data that is not accurate
13. Tyler Watt (AGAINST): As the many people, I want to know the many concerns in suggestion bias because of proposing let's discuss further and rephrase i appreciate civil debate we are great i yield
 - a. Motion to amend speaking time to add a minute (Tam)
 - i. Seconded by Salino
 1. Approved by consent
14. Nighswonger (FOR): To quote from the treaty, “ the United States... the embarrassments upon such immigration”... “The Chinese Laborers.. Threatens the nation”. This language is xenophobic and white supremacist. This language is unacceptable today.
15. De Martinez (FOR): I am in favor because there have been alot of discussions about this. I understand this and I appreciate your perspectives. As a Latinx/POC person, it is dubious to ignore the implications of not removing this. Some would argue that history has nothing to do with it; I understand this point. We are in 2021, almost 2022, and our society is developing. This will reflect badly on us. We will appear racist, ignorant. If we do not consider renaming it, that could affect other POC. As one of the few POC in this room, I ask others to see this in a new perspective and try to understand why people would want to change the name.
16. Vordonis (AGAINST): I was not here last week but I appreciate hearing all the info. After hearing the arguments, as someone coming in with a

fresh pair of eyes, I feel that the AGAINST side has a better audience. We all want to do good and do better in this world; the impulse to do better makes us impulsive to act on something that represents a lack of judgment. If we propose this in its current wording, there will be inherent bias that people want to be against the errors of the past. Instead of setting the precedent of renaming things, we set the precedent that all need to be perfect. Angell is not perfect, but the treaty and its impact, as well as his legacy and the abolitionist movement, his legacy should not be tarnished. We should find other ways to deal with this.

17. Tam: Motion to amend original motion to extend time by one minute, striking out the one and replacing with 8

- a. Seconded
 - i. Consented

18. Julia: Motion to table for one week

- a. Seconded
 - i. Objection: Addison, for amendments
 - ii. Objection: De Martinez, when will it come to an end?
 - 1. Rothstein: Because this is a binding ballot question, it would have to be voted on next week.

b. Motion to table for one week consented

19. Tam: Point of Info to VP; when is the teach-in?

- a. Farah: Next Wednesday; more info on CSG's Instagram page. I will send a message in the GroupMe when I get more info.

a. [B F2021.32 An Amendment to the Sixth Chapter of the Bylaws Regarding Individual Representative Reports](#)

- i. Tam: A minor change with big consequences. Currently, all reps have to deliver a report. We will make this optional.
 - 1. Stoneman: Asking Tam, will there be another system to replace this system in the near future?
 - a. Tam: Yes; the President may have a role in this new system.
 - 2. Addison: Why change this?
 - a. Tam: The Counsel raise concerns that individual rep reports only served to extend the time of meetings and failed to hold members accountable in any way.
 - 3. Farah: Could you elaborate on what the other system may be?
 - a. Stoneman: we don't have anything concrete yet, as we want to engage with as many parties as possible, including president and VP. We thought about having reps engage with President and VP

in a similar way, as they represent the student body. Having personal conversations may help guide them in their projects. The system is not part of this amendment as it is not fully developed.

4. Juliao: How will this affect reps who have not given a report?
 - a. Tam: It would just be optional for them.
5. Addison: Would you be amenable to fleshing out this other system? I enjoy the personal touch of the rep report, as it introduces one and their ideas to the government.
 - a. Tam: That would be interesting to see it tabled and brought to IRC; the IRC Vice could elucidate on this.
 - b. Stoneman: It was the impression of several authors that this change does not yet require the additional component, we thought that making this change now could change the way our meetings work and make them more effective. There are other ways SG members can introduce themselves. We did not feel it necessary to combine everything here.
- ii. Stoneman: Table for one week
 1. Seconded by Tam
 - a. Consented; tabled for one week
- b. [B F2021.33 An Amendment to the Second Chapter of the Election Code Enumerating Ballot Question Response Limits](#)
 1. Stoneman: I am happy to introduce! Another flash to the election code. Speaking as someone who played a role in amending this area in the past, you may see there is a 2000 character limit. That is the max the platform allows; we want it to be in the doc so we can refer back to it. I believe the author is attempting something similar here. The author was informed that you can have up to five multiple choice options on ballot questions; we also gained info on short answer questions. This is just an area of the election code where changes are not being made, but the limits are being described.
 2. Watt: You can do more than five options; tabling okay?
 - a. Stoneman: Yes
 3. Stoneman; Table for one week
 - a. Seconded by Tam
 - i. Consented; tabled for one week

15. New Business

- a. [B F2021.34 An Amendment to the Eighteenth Chapter of the Bylaws Clarifying the Record Keeping Process](#)

- i. Tam: This is an obscure amendment as few are privy to how this system works. I realized that our policies and the Bentley's don't add up. Currently, they require the President (of LSA SG)'s permission to access docs. There are some minor changes, but it is quite complicated considering how obscure this is.
 1. Stoneman: I know it is a weird question, but do you know how long this may take to get into its final form?
 - a. Tam: In a week!
 2. Addison: Is it true that Tyler has to sign off on access?
 - a. Tam: That is the Bentley's policy that we will look into.
 - ii. Tam: Table for one week
 1. Seconded: Stoneman
 - a. Consented, tabled for one week
- b. [R F2021.13 A Resolution to Propose to the LSA Student Body a Binding Ballot Question Regarding the Minimum Wage](#)
- i. Crespo: I would like this to be voted on tonight; review the link in the agenda.
 - ii. Tam: This came about as we were hoping to increase the minimum wage. The current wage is \$9.87 is not livable in Ann Arbor. \$15 would be. This would target jobs given by the University to students.
 1. Salino: The best time to go about writing ballot questions is to make an action place. Beyond sending this to people, what are the other action steps?
 - a. Tam: R14, which is on hold, would advocate particular changes more directly.
 - b. Crespo: It may be best to see where our constituents stand, as it may be good for us to take action steps based on this data. This is a good first step to move forward in this process.
 2. Addison: We may have misleading wording in the question here. I think we could rephrase it about living costs in Ann Arbor. We could have an open response instead of multiple-choice.
 - a. Tam: The question does not seem to be fitting for a binding ballot question, as we cannot take decisive action based on those responses.
 - b. Addison: Is it possible to consider this as a non-binding ballot question?
 - c. Tam: No, too late.
 3. Crespo: Was the previous question regarding concussion about the \$15 figure? I sent an email to the student employment office, they said the average wage is \$13. Mostly transfer, 1G students make less than what the average is in my experience. This is a first step, as more info would

inform us about the specific \$15 figure. This provides an opportunity for them to give feedback.

4. Juliao: Would the authors and endorsers be open to adding a fourth multiple choice that states if people feel the current wages are acceptable, or otherwise don't agree with it being raised to \$15? The question as worded fails to give data on why people do not want it upped.
 - a. Tam: I think that we could change the question entirely to remove the dollar figure. The choices should also be changed.
- iii. Tam: Motion to table for a week
 1. Stoneman: seconded
 - a. Consented, tabled for one week
- c. [R F2021.14 A Resolution Condemning the Actions of Dr. Robert Anderson and the University of Michigan](#)
 - i. Slack: This is a res similar to what CSG passed last night, which condemned Anderson and those who covered up or failed to act after what happened. I would like to get this passed tonight, to continue the momentum for the camp-out event.
 - ii. Farah: To give more context, the Anderson sexual abuse case has caused more allegations against a single person in the history of the United States. It is a monstrosity, truly a shameful thing. This is insane. And yet, we don't see the news coverage of it, or things happening on campus. There has been a coverup on this. The administration has been able to present their side of the story and suppress negative stories about this case. Though this happened for 37 years and people spoke up, there is no national news coverage like we saw for Larry Nasser. You can talk to the survivors in front of Schlissel's house. It is just now attracting attention, like from HBO. U-M needs to try their best to analyze how this was allowed to occur on campus. They need to fire several individuals, like the assistant athletic director, knew it was going on, and is still employed at this university. That is absurd. It is uncomfortable to take such a harsh stance against the administration. There is a list of recommendations that we would call for if this should be passed. I encourage you all to read through this, as we could invite the survivors next week to hear their stories. It was moving and distressing to hear their stories. I am hoping it can be passed at that time. There is a campout this Friday; if you are interested in going, contact me.
 - iii. Slack: Totally agree with Zack, I want to continue on his point. Read through it, and note the resources being discussed. This includes creating a supportive center for victims like MSU's. This also includes creating a long term program for counseling of survivors. We also call upon making more resources survivor-focused; survivors have been ignored. We cannot just sit and watch this happen

- iv. Neff: The claims against Anderson are true, factual, definitive and appropriately addressed here. There are some things that trouble me, including the sections regarding Bo Schembechler. There are some clauses that talk about him in a definitive manner, “actively covered up” etc. It is okay to bring up the allegations, and in general, the allegations against him are contentious or shakier than what the resolution suggests. The main point is true, but there are some things regarding Bo that I think can be worded much better. I think the part in the end is just thrown in there. While there are points of information that suggest Bo was involved, there are some that suggest he was not. I am happy to share these sources, just contact me. I am happy to see those parts changed, but if they are not, I am unsure if I can support this res.
 - 1. Farah: Bo Schembechler is probably the most famous U-M football coach. There are weighty accusations against Schembechler, including against his son-in-law who was a victim. Bo did not report allegations made by his son-in-law, saying that he didn’t want to hear that. The survivors say that Bo knew, and everyone on the team knew. Anderson could not have done what he did had others not been there to cover it up.
- v. Tedrick: Are you willing to take on more help with this?
 - 1. Farah: Speaking for myself, I am open for suggestions.
 - 2. Slack: I am open for them, but I want people to be aware that this is a touchy subject and back up changes with thoughtfulness
- vi. De Martinez: Thank you Zack for not sugar coating this. I have only been here for a semester. I did not know alot about this University, but I did know this case. I transferred from Calvin College. People know about this in Grand Rapids in the west side of the state. I was following this case when it first started. The fact that we are even still doing this, is that we have a pedophile here. He did things with minors. This is something not to take lightly. At the end of the day, we have to realize we are dealing with something very serious. The fact that we have a little pedophile that is still working here (referring to the Asst Ath Director). I encourage you all to understand the gravity of this situation and not to ignore it. I do want to put emphasis on this; this is very, very serious.
- vii. Crespo: Thank you for taking the time to advocate for this. For those that want to discuss or more info on this, or resources in the community, I can provide space and time for that. DM me on GroupMe; I know others in SG would do the same. I also want to say that there are no promises on these things, but what is important is what they symbolize. Though it does not have the same attention as MSU, it is important that we act now. This is a resolution that is part of advocacy from the people who have been harmed. We have a duty to bring forward the voices of the people, the survivors. The fact that the President (Schlissel, not

Watt) is in his house ignoring these people is despicable. I hope that what we decide tonight will be beneficial to our community.

1. Farah: Thank you all for commenting on this. I want to see this tabled for a week so this can be discussed in depth. The words on the resolution are from the CSG resolution, so I want to thank the sponsors of that resolution as it was written in CSG. I encourage you to talk to the people in front of Schlissel’s house, it is enlightening to talk to them.

viii. Stoneman: Motion to table for one week

1. Bernstein: Second
 - a. Consented; tabled for one week

16. Snaps

17. Matters Arising

- a. Addison: We have a tabling event on the Diag tomorrow! We bring a table and info, and we talk to people about LSA SG in General. There is an SLC survey too! We need people to sign up to work there tomorrow!
- b. Stoneman: There are few pieces of business that were tabled. IRC is on Sunday, it is a great opportunity to discuss these things. You should come so that we can discuss and change things! It can get frustrating to have things reintroduced without anyone discussing them
- c. McLean: Sign up for the potluck! And if you are wearing Denim, stay!
- d. Tedrick: I know we did not all agree, but thank you all for keeping things civil. Stay great!
- e. Watt: Nov 10: Very auspicious day. Upsetting music starts playing aka its the edmund Fitzgerald-general lord help us all. Dress Nautical!

18. Closing Roll Call

- | | | | | | |
|-------|----------------------|---|--------|---------------------|---|
| i. | Watt, Tyler | | x. | McLean, Claudia | |
| ii. | Farah, Zackariah | | xi. | Rothstein, Kayla | |
| iii. | Rifkin, Cameron | | xii. | Williams, Erik | |
| iv. | Cohen, Jacob | E | xiii. | Dai, Carol | A |
| v. | Theuerkauf, Caroline | | xiv. | Fioritto, Tyler | A |
| vi. | Rich, Sophia | | xv. | Jonaitis, Cody | |
| vii. | Salino, Sarah | | xvi. | Stoneman, Max | |
| viii. | Goodsell, Alli | E | xvii. | Slack, Caroline | |
| ix. | Hamamy, Salma | E | xviii. | Gunasekaran, Gaurie | E |

xix.	Zhao, Suki	E	xxxv.	Wojtara, Magda	E
xx.	Kado, Lydia	E	xxxvi.	Manzoor, Aleezah	
xxi.	Nelson, Erica	A	xxxvii.	Moon, Austin	E
xxii.	Tam, Peter		xxxviii.	Wilson, Michael	
xxiii.	Chakraborti, Aditya	E	xxxix.	Colvin, Anna	
xxiv.	Addison, William		xl.	Orleans, Louis	
xxv.	Tedrick, Vincenzo (Vince)		xli.	List, Riley	
xxvi.	Neff, Ethan		xlii.	Altimemy, Zahraa	A
xxvii.	Vidhya-Ponraj, Mithun		xliii.	Crespo, Maleny	
xxviii.	Gadola, Noah		xliv.	Juliao, Jordan	
xxix.	De Martínez, Brandon		xlv.	Crews, Tiffany	A
xxx.	Bernstein, Dylan		xlvi.	Bromberg, Luke	
xxxi.	Vordonis, Emanuel		xlvii.	Kelley, Makayla	
xxxii.	Watson, Lauren		xlviii.	Nighswonger, Abigail	
xxxiii.	Ervin, Gabriel		xlix.	Rich, Noah	E
xxxiv.	Berglund, Mollie				

19. Adjournment

- a. Salino: Salino
 - i. Second: McLean
 1. Consented; meeting is adjourned