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1. **Call to Order and Introductions**

Meeting called to order by Chiao-Wen Lan at 5:32 PM.

Quorum was present.

1. **Approval of Meeting Agenda**

Tracy Teel (Education) moves to add an education item to the agenda after the public comments

* MPSC seconds the motion
* 11 – 0, the motion carries
1. **Approval of Minutes from last Forum Meeting on January 20th, 2016**

No corrections were made and the meetings minutes from last Forum Meeting on January 20th, 2016 were approved.

1. **Officer Reports** 5:33 PM.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **GSA President Milan Chatterjee**
 | Milan Chatterjee is not here tonight.  |
| 1. **Joel Lanzaga, Vice President of Academic Affairs**
 | - Seeing a lot of talk about the UC retirement system- Cannot disclose details right now- UCLA Roosevelt library launched accelerator for those interested in entrepreneurship. We’re trying to get multidisciplinary teams to form for start-ups. - Chiao-Wen and I are in talks with another grad student to build a cross-disciplinary program in the UC system that facilitates the joining of UC as well as Haiti University - Looking to cross-program with Haiti University to collaborate and build long term projects especially in the medical field- Also working with Innovation Health, I’ll provide additional details soon - USAC is looking to foster undergraduate/graduate collaboration through a mentorship program  |
| 1. **Chiao-Wen Lan, Vice President of Internal Affairs**
 | - Thank you for the councils that have sent meeting minutes in; they will be posted on the GSA website- We are working with the alumni association for future collaboration- I am also in communication with the fellowship of finance office at the grad division to find out about the recent decision of the total amount of conference funding that students can receive from grad division is limited to $1000 over the course of their entire time in UCLA. Thank you education council for taking the lead on this and we hope to have a discussion on this at the next forum. - The GRIT peer to peer coaching program is currently seeking graduate coaches  |
| 1. **Sabine Jean, Director of Elections**
 | The elections board needs to consist of one rep from each council. Email me the name and email of that person by next week Wednesday, February 17. The email is elections@gsa.asucla.ucla.edu. I plan on tentatively having the first meeting the week of February 22, so I need to get the representative names as soon as possible. If you have any questions or comments email me at this email.  |
| 1. **Other**
 | Ian Coley (MPSC) – So one thing about the sexual harassment training. Currently, when you take it, the link to the sexual harassment policy that’s in there redirects to the wrong policy, the temporary policy that was effective until the end of last year. So someone should tell someone that. Chiao-Wen Lan – the director of communications will be notified of that. Ian Coley (MPSC) – I had another question about something in the cabinet minutes from the January meeting. So there was a dispersal of money for the grad games and for the event at the Hammer Museum by the cabinet at the January cabinet meeting. Where did that money come from? Out of what budget? Chiao-Wen Lan – It came from the cabinet discretionary.  |

1. **Bruin Shelter 5:43 PM**
	1. *eGSA*
	2. Motion to move this agenda item to before the surplus discussion
		1. MPSC motions to move the agenda
		2. Biological seconds
		3. **Motion carries, agenda item will be moved**
2. **Public Comments 5:44 PM**
* Mohannad Ghawanmeh – On November 30th I stepped down as director of Melnitz Movies because Milan Chatterjee has enacted a neutrality clause duplicitously and conducted GSA affairs at his whim and in his own service. I am here to tell you that Milan Chatterjee recently has CCed me on emails to the GSA cabinet and administration in which he intimidates me and conveys retaliation against me. On January 19th, Chatterjee sent an email titled “unapproved film festival expense, violation of GSA code” relating to a festival past expense that Chatterjee had approved on July 6. Why has Chatterjee pursued this investigation so long after the fact? He claims “the only reason why this expenditure came up is because I recently received an email about passing the GSA surplus and this expenditure was referred to in that email.” So Chatterjee has been broached by an unnamed person about exhausting the GSA surplus that the student union director projected in the tens of thousands of dollars. Chatterjee fails to disclose in a thread he CCs me on though I am no longer a member of the GSA. The intimidation in Chatterjee’s emails is evident. He seems to be retaliating against me. It is time for GSA forum to relieve him of his duties and the rest of us of his lousy leadership.
* Dani Smith – The GSA code of ethics states that officers should conduct themselves in a professional manner, avoid undue harm to others’ mental wellbeing, honor responsibilities by not allowing personal beliefs to interfere with their representation, and act as responsible stewards of GSA resources that are the collective property of all graduate students at UCLA. This does not appear to be what is happening and this campus cannot be considered a safe space for any student, regardless of religion, race, political ideology, or any other aspect of personal identity or belief, if a leader of student government is able to personally attack one of their constituents without repercussions.
* Ivy Onyeador – I wanted to express my disappointment in the way that this has unraveled and been handled. To hear that the diversity caucus, which is an excellent event, had these concerns about divest from Israel or something like that is just very sort of odd. I am disheartened. Students are being harassed by the GSA and that is uncalled for. The GSA president last year did not want to take any stand about this issue but there were no funding decisions based on that
* Ariana Bell – As an Israeli American and Jewish person I just wanted to clarify that I think it’s alarming that the word anti-Semitism has been thrown about so casually. This issue is about the restriction of free speech and the lack of diversity.
* Nikki Kathuria – GradGames is happening from March 28th to March 31st. We are looking to have at least 400 participants this year, if not more. We’ll be sending out more info but please let your constituents know
* Rahim Kurwa – We’re very grateful to see ASUCLA’s proposed code amendment banning viewpoint discrimination. We’ve also come back with a more full resolution and so we would be very happy to take our resolution and replace the amendment with the ASUCLA language and compromise that way. I also want to second the other people who have talked about inappropriate behavior coming from the GSA President.
* Yacoub Kureh– I am passing out a resolution that I would like somebody to motion to consider at the next forum if possible. GSA President Milan Chatterjee shared an article on Facebook that accuses me, a Palestinian person, of constantly harassing and targeting Jewish students on campus. It called the organization that I as a Palestinian feel at home in an anti-Semitic hate organization. This is a registered student organization and the GSA president, because we’re trying to fight for our right to talk on this campus, is attacking us in this way. We’re being called a hate group. If you disagree with Milan Chatterjee, he’s going to come after you, and I just want that to be clear to everybody. This is the kind of retaliation that our GSA president has been issuing.
1. **Council Discussions 5:55 PM**

Biological Sciences motions to add an item to the agenda following Education council discussion

* MPSC seconds the motion
* Motion carries; Bio Sciences will add an item after education council
1. **Education Council Discussion**
* Tracy Teel (Education) – As a delegate of the education council I would like to bring forward some concerns that I have been hearing from students about GSA President Milan Chatterjee. We feel that our student’s concerns are valid enough that we would like to bring them forward for democratic consideration. We would like to have the forum consider convening a subcommittee of council members with the goal of composing a list of evidence to be presented regarding Milan Chatterjee in advance of the next meeting as required by the constitution to expeditiously deliberate the evidence and come to a consensus of moral judgment about his capacity to serve as a representative leader of all students and to deliver findings and a list of suggested consequences at the next forum meeting. The things that have been brought forward to us about his performance thus far include the following:
* Non-performance of stated duties and responsibilities of the president’s office including, but not an exhaustive list, failure to take records of official GSA business, failure to deliver a timely budget, including reports of council allocations, failure to ensure and uphold constitutional procedural guarantees by not writing business rules according to Robert’s Rules of Order.
* Questionable ethical comportment and judgment appropriate to the office. Making the unilateral decision to selectively silence the voices of some students, particularly those concerned with the BDS movement. Publicly distributing internal business correspondence when it was not requested by the investigation. Publicly denouncing fellow student leaders. Publicly shifting responsibility for his actions to campus advisors. Usurping authority belonging to the forum and the cabinet by acting the VPI’s assigned role by running forum meetings throughout fall quarter. Usurping the responsibility of the forum to exercise its constitutionally granted budget authority for everything outside that necessary for daily operating of the GSA
* Unilaterally making, applying, and attempting to enforce GSA policy outside the authority of his office without the input of the forum
* Our motion is to convene a subcommittee, launch this investigation, and bring forward suggestions by the next forum. We would like to do this in a democratic fashion.
* Ian Coley (MPSC) – Would you limit the scope of the subcommittee to actions by the president or to cabinet members more broadly?
* Tracy Teel (Education) – Someone could amend the motion to broaden it
* Tracy Teel (Education) motions to form the subcommittee to initiate a review of the past performance of the office of the president and the cabinet and to determine the fitness of Chatterjee’s leadership of the GSA
	+ Ian Coley (MPSC) seconds the motion.
	+ 10 for, 1 opposed, the motion carries and the subcommittee will be formed.
1. **Biological Sciences Council Discussion**
* Katherine Myers (Bio Sciences) - We want to state publicly that bio sciences feels that the GSA President’s emails are grossly offensive and inappropriate and do not represent us as a GSA or as bio sciences. That is unprofessional and out of bounds and he has attacked others that have a different viewpoint. We feel that his fake sarcastic apology to the diversity caucus in no way represents the GSA forum. He has used his position to promote these disgusting points. We feel that some of the members here have been attacked unfairly and we feel that in no way does this represent us as a council or the GSA. We also would like to request formally that Milan discontinue his use of the listserv until a review of his performance can be conducted
	+ Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – I feel that the president abused his power and sent his side of what was happening to the listserv and that that was very inappropriate
	+ Michael Skiles (WHRA) – Are you asking that he be barred form his email?
	+ Katherine Myers (Bio Sciences) – That he be barred from using the listserv
	+ Michael Skiles (WHRA) – I believe that contradicts with article 7 of the constitution, which prohibits the dishing out of any disciplinary actions of forum without seven days notice beforehand. You’re effectively taking away one of the tools that he has and that it sounds a lot like punishment to me.
	+ Katherine Myers (Bio Sciences) – I would be happy to say that we will give him seven days notice. The only emails that I’ve received from him have been extremely disturbing, inappropriate, and I think an abuse of power
	+ Tracy Teel (Education) – I suggest issuing a strong rebuke and suggestion to him on behalf of the forum until the investigation has been carried out so that we are not overstepping our bounds
	+ Ian Coley (MPSC) – the president is also responsible for running the day-to-day operations of the GSA. I don’t know if he needs to email all of the delegates of the GSA Forum to carry out these duties. I feel that if something drastic comes up he could run it through the GSA VPI
	+ Katherine Myers (Bio Sciences) – My motion would be to strongly encourage him to not use the email until the conclusion of a panel on the quality of his performance
		- MPSC seconds
		- 19 for, none oppose, the motion carries
1. **GSA Code and Constitutional Amendment 6:07 PM**
	1. **Amendment 7.5.4.4, GSA Cabinet**
		1. Roy Champawat – Even absent additional campus legal guidance, this amendment finds its language in UCOP legal policies.The guidance from UCLA legal affairs, which is going around, is a more extensive quotation of the UCOP policies affecting campus activities and so you’ll see this language that is embedded in this proposed code change really derives from these policies**.**
		2. Motion to discuss the amendment passes.
		3. Katherine Myers (Bio Sciences) – Is this guidance in response to what has been happening or is this previously published?
		4. Roy Champawat – primarily the guidance is quoting existing UCOP policy, but it is a response to the current issue
		5. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – Was this advice given to avoid future liability or did it in anyway claim that past actions were illegal?
		6. Roy Champawat – It’s not functioning as a court. To really make that kind of determination, you need to determine the facts. Legal was not attempting to adjudicate but rather initiated a review of the existing documentation and guidance. GSA codes did not directly speak to the issue of criteria for funding requests.
		7. Ian Coley (MPSC) – I would like to speak against this bill. This amendment would add in this reasonable policy, but this is not the right place to talk about viewpoint neutrality in their codes. It would only affect money coming out from the GSA discretionary fund. I don’t know that the language of registered campus organizations is appropriate for the GSA, because funding requests don’t always come from registered campus organizations. I don’t know where it should be, but I would like to see the language tweaked and a good place found for it.
		8. Michael Skiles (WHRA) motions to table this discussion until next forum
			1. Seconded
			2. Two in favor, 8 oppose
			3. We will vote on this amendment at this meeting
		9. Roy Champawat – putting this into your codes just reiterates an existing rule that exists. You’re required to do this, we might easily find another place to put it, but the wording I think covers the things that you need to do
		10. Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – if this is already in the constitution why are we having this legal issue?
		11. Roy Champawat – It’s not; it’s in UCOP policy, which applies to all mandatory student fees and that’s what these funds are. The merit of this is that it brings it into your local governing documents where one might easily find it. It may not strike many people to look at University of California policies to get guidance. It addresses some of the community concerns
		12. Katherine Myers (Bio Sciences) – It’s already a policy but it may not be like very readily known and putting it in the GSA code of conduct makes it more accessible
		13. Tracy Teel (Education) motions to vote on what’s on the table
			1. Ian Coley (MPSC) seconds
			2. 16 for, none against. The motion carries
		14. Passing the amendment as written: 11 for, 4 against. The motion carries, the amendment is passed
	2. **Amendment 7.10.2 and Resolution, *Rahim Kurwa & Yacoub Kureh* 6:23 PM**
		1. Talking about the GSA funding resolution, not amendment 7.10.2.
		2. Rahim Kurwa – We want to make sure everyone is on the same page regards to the events that have been mentioned here. (Accompanying PowerPoint). Emails from GSA President continue to reiterate that if you have any connection to the pro-Divestment side you cannot get funding. The key takeaways are that this was directed at the “pro-Divestment” side and that these people were electronically harassed into enforcing this non-engagement policy. Jerry Kang never responded to the Diversity Caucus’s emails regarding this subject. Viewpoint neutrality means not discriminating based on the message advocated. It is not permissible under the Constitution, UCLA, or UCOP policies. These emails represent a clear example of viewpoint discrimination. This has caused serious damage. Many students have been questioning what their rights are at this point, particularly in terms of funding from the GSA. Students right now don’t understand what their rights are because they have seen that they might not be able to get funding based on their viewpoint. We want the GSA to rescind and correct the policy of viewpoint discrimination, which is what you’ve done in a way now by passing that ASUCLA code amendment. We want you to enact a clear policy forbidding viewpoint discrimination in all funding decisions, unequivocally state that the GSA values open discussion about important social and political issues and consequently firmly commits to providing funding to a variety of student organizations on a viewpoint neutral basis. We also want you to unequivocally state that campus members cannot be penalized for their viewpoints. ASUCLA’s amendment essentially brings the GSA in line with the UCLA Code of Conduct and is essentially the same set of rules that USAC has. That leads us to the resolution that is printed out here for you. We propose that our specific let it be resolved clause be dropped and replaced with the one that you have already passed from ASUCLA. The one you’ve already passed has encompassed what we have been asking for.
		3. Ian Coley (MPSC) – moves to strike the code amendment from this resolution
			1. Nursing Council seconds
			2. 10 for, 0 oppose; the motion carries
		4. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – Does that leave anything other than an apology?
		5. Rahim Kurwa – What is left acknowledges many of the issues and facts applicable here and reiterates a commitment to free speech.
		6. Education council member – the education council stands in solidarity with the issues that you have brought forward. To choose to be selectively silent is not the same as being neutral.
		7. Andres Schneider – Regarding the last two ‘let it further be resolved’s, what type of actions would you like to see from GSA? This is not very specific. What type of apology do you mean?
		8. Rahim – That is up for the GSA forum to figure out. When it comes to the last let it be resolved, I would feel better with an apology and I know that several other students have paid a much higher price. It’s a decent thing to do.
		9. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – I’m concerned about issuing an apology now because we just voted to have an investigation into whether conduct was wrong. I feel like it prejudices an investigation by declaring that something wrong was done. It would seem to open GSA up to liability because it would seem to admit guilt on the behalf of GSA as a whole.
		10. Tracy Teel (Education) – When we make apologies for hurt that has happened, I don’t think that’s the same as GSA accepting responsibility or pre-judging Milan. The fact is that these people were hurt and I don’t think there’s any harm in GSA extending an acknowledgment
		11. Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – I don’t think it’s out of line for GSA to apologize
		12. Katherine Myers (Bio Sciences) – Milan Chatterjee is not the GSA. He is a representative, but if we choose to do something it does not speak for him personally
		13. Andres Schneider – Would you like to have a general apology from the forum? Given that there are these nuances between the president, the cabinet, the forum, in your imagination, which type of action should we take?
		14. Rahim Kurwa – we’re not asking for an apology from the cabinet or from Milan. The GSA Forum is the democratic body that speaks for the GSA because ultimately you are the ones who are responsible.
		15. Katherine Myers (Bio Sciences) – if we do decide to pass this, we should discuss as a body how we want to go about doing this
		16. Roy Champawat – UCLA legal has not seen this language or any variation of it. They have seen the amendment that we struck
		17. Andrea Hadjikyriacou (MPSC) – this is a resolution so we’re not doing any code changes. The GSA can take a stance on this
		18. Tracy Teel (Education) – We’re not explicitly taking responsibility for these actions in a technical sense. We’re apologizing to students.
		19. Rahim Kurwa – We want closure from this. If people do have hang-ups, we’d rather you just strike things and pass something, although we think you should pass the whole thing.
		20. Ian Coley (MPSC) motions to move to a vote
			1. Medicine seconds
			2. Motion carries, move to a vote
			3. Vote: 15 for, 0 against. The motion carries and the resolution is passed
	3. **GSA Code of Ethics 1.2.2, Michael Skiles (WHRA) 6:47 PM**
		1. Michael Skiles (WHRA) - In keeping with the counsel from Vice Chancellor Blum, in order to be viewpoint neutral, we also should pass an amendment to be content neutral. When you make decisions based on viewpoint neutrality, it is hard to defend that in court, as it is very hard to prove that your motive is neutrality. The safest thing is not to fund anyone at all ever. Short of that, Blum recommends that we establish a funding regime that is completely objective and doesn’t look to the content at all. She says that students who are offended by certain events are eligible for a refund of some of their mandatory fees that were used to program the offensive event.
		2. Chiao-Wen Lan – you are talking about 1.2.2 right now, the discretionary funding amendment discussion will have to be reopened with a two-thirds forum vote
		3. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – (Reads the code of ethics aloud). I submitted this for review and Blum took issue only with a few words, ‘shall not adopt any positions’ and ‘political viewpoint.’ That’s her advice to us, to make this a general non-discrimination bill. I move to strike ‘shall not adopt any positions or’ and then also the words ‘political viewpoint’ form the amendment
			1. Motion is seconded
			2. 9 for, 3 oppose. The motion carries and the words are removed.
		4. Ian Coley (MPSC) – With these removals, it seems that this has lost the teeth that it needed to enforce what is at hand.
		5. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – I would absolutely like both of those parts to still be in it, but we received very strong guidance from Blum. The UCOP amendment that we passed at the beginning of this guarantees that the GSA cannot discriminate on the basis of political viewpoint. This particular bill doesn’t offer a remedy against discrimination.
		6. Roy Champawat – The concern had to do with ‘shall not adopt any positions’ which predetermines some things. You want to start out not having bound your hand. Discrimination usually takes the form of taking actions, the concern is that it’s a very complicated legal area when you get into the realm of ideas.
		7. Ian Coley (MPSC) – as we are bound by UCOP policy, we needn’t put something into our code. We should redirect people to the UCOP policies rather than try to write it ourselves because it is legally very difficult.
		8. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – All that remains of this language does come directly from language of the UC regents, this is effectively pointing people to UC policy.
		9. Education council – Even though having this language here is redundant, if this had been here in the first place we probably wouldn’t be in the mess we’re in now.
		10. Michael Skiles (WHRA) moves to vote
			1. Education seconds
			2. 8 for, 0 oppose. The motion carries and the code amendment is passed
	4. **Discretionary Funding Amendment**
* Motion to reintroduce 7.5.4.1 to forum by Michael Skiles (WHRA)
* Social Sciences seconds
* 3 for, 5 oppose. Motion does not carry and we will not discuss at this forum meeting.
1. **Bruin Shelter Discussion 7:04 PM**
* Luke Shaw – Louis Tse cannot be here tonight. For those who don’t know, we have an exciting project starting at UCLA this fall. It’s the nation’s second student-founded and student-run homeless shelter. This will be the first youth shelter on the west side. We’re a registered 501c3 non-profit. We will be able to host eight homeless UCLA students to start in the fall. We would like to seek funding from the large surplus left over from last year. This money, to the tune of about $20,000, will set up this project correctly and provide opportunities for volunteering and professional development to graduate students. It will benefit the students who will be housed as well as training existing graduate students. We’re finalizing our budget right now. If you have any questions or concerns email me at bruinshelter@gmail.com. We’re going to finalize the budget this weekend and at the next forum we would like to apply for funding.
* Andres Schneider – Why don’t we promote a fundraising activity and use money from the surplus to create more money? We should build a fundraising activity.
* Luke Shaw – I would like to consult with Louis on that, but that sounds like a fantastic idea. We would love GSA’s help in any idea that we can get it.
* Hannah Brosnan (Public Health) – I think that’s a great idea but I think it’s also important to get them their funding up front and not slow them down
* Tracy Teel (Education) - Next time, when you come back, you should talk about how you’re going to sustain your project over time. Start-up fees are great, but it would be great to know how you’re going to keep this going.
* Luke Shaw – We will definitely address that next time.
1. **Council Allocation and GSA Surplus Fund 7:09 PM**
	1. ***Roy Champawat, Director UCLA Student Union***
	2. ***Debra Simmons, Accounting Manager ASUCLA Student Government Accounting***
	3. Ian Coley (MPSC)moves to amend that the $11,189 currently being added to cabinet discretionary be rolled back proportionately to the councils. Additionally, the $43,268 going to the graduate students events discretionary fund I would move to put in the forum discretionary fund
		1. No second for the motion to pass
		2. MPSC motions and seconds to discuss
		3. Motion to discuss passes
	4. James Molyneux (MPSC) – it is our view in MPSC that the council represents the direct way that such a large surplus can benefit the students. This comes out to roughly $1 to students. We feel that moving this money to councils will help these funds directly benefit the students. Regarding the second half of the amendment, giving these funds to the forum would give us the benefit of taking this money and giving the forum the opportunity to do some really great things. For example, we could fund the Bruin Shelter with money from this surplus. That was our thinking on the reallocation
	5. Roy Champawat – The graduate events discretionary, this is the funding that the director has for what we call graduate events. That’s your choice, but there’s a director who identifies programs like the GradGames and funds them. The diversity caucus funding came out of this cabinet discretionary. There are certain things that we have been obliged to pay the bill for, there does need to be some money in there for those monetary obligations. I think we need to put some money in for the elections budget, because there’s no money for elections.
	6. Michael Skiles (WHRA) – I don’t think people here appreciate the value of what the events director does, in part because a budget has not been passed yet so he hasn’t been able to put on any events. Half the year is going by and we still haven’t been able to figure out what events for grads we’re going to be able to plan. Grad bar—like at orientation—is supposed to be happening the whole year. This is a problem with the budget taking forever. I don’t think it’s fair to completely and utterly castrate the cabinet discretionary. As it is, everything is seeing way more money than it ever has.
	7. Ian Coley (MPSC) – Is the director of events here?
	8. Chiao-Wen Lan – He is not here today
	9. Ian Coley (MPSC) – The additional budget being $3,000 is ridiculous when what is actually being spent is about $30,000. If he wants to come in and petition for the budget he wants at forum, that’s great. GSA Cabinet’s January meeting spending approvals represent a gross over expenditure of the actual funding they have in their account. They approved spending to the tune of around $10,000, when they only have $3,000 in their budget. If people need money, they should come to the forum and petition to receive funding from the forum.
	10. Roy Champawat – One of the problems that you have in your original budget is that is it based on the funds that are identified based on fee rate times projected enrollment. When you see the previous year’s expenditure--that was because significant surplus was put into those accounts in those years as well. That’s gone on for a number of years. It’s not a reliable way to pay for graduate events because surplus is variable year to year. The expenditures you see from the past are the result of a lot of surplus allocation into those accounts. You are making reference to coming to forum as maybe a good mechanism for event funding, but this body doesn’t meet very often and generally has a very full agenda. It’s for you to decide. You have two events directors.
	11. James Molyneux (MPSC) – moving the funds to forum also accomplishes that --- a lot of events, we don’t necessarily hear about. For example, the one at the Hammer, we did not hear about.
	12. Ian Coley (MPSC) – we did hear about it, but by the time we did the event had been capped
	13. James Molyneux (MPSC) – this also serves the purpose of telling all representatives about the events as they are funded so they can go back to their constituents. Forum meets every three or four weeks, so unless there is a special circumstance where the need for funding comes up almost immediately, I don’t think it’s too big of a burden on event planners to come to forum and request money
	14. Motion to move to a vote
		1. Motion passes with none opposing
		2. Vote: 2 for, 7 against. The motion does not carry
	15. Ian Coley (MPSC) moves to add $5000 from the events discretionary fund to the elections line item
		1. Motion passes with none opposing, $5000 will be moved into the election budget
2. **Approval of the Enrollment and GSA Surplus**
	1. Law (SBA) moves to approve the GSA surplus
		1. Social sciences seconds the motion
		2. 14 to 2, the motion to approve the surplus allocation passes
	2. Roy – We have met with the councils and the Bio Sciences budget needs to be adjusted a bit. Debbie and I would like to initiate kind of an adjusted mechanism for next year to try to get together and frame some clearer guidance. We intend to bring to first forum the discipline alignments as we understand them so that you can take them back to your councils so that at the next forum you could vote your approval that those are in fact the correct alignments. We then could have a much more expeditious route to final voting of the council allocations. These are the numbers and if we vote these we will post the balance of the allocations that have not yet been posted. Those will be the final column to the right.
	3. Motion to approve the council allocation
		1. 17 for, none oppose.
		2. Motion carries and council allocation is approved
3. **Approval of Appointment – Melnitz Movies Director 7:34 PM**

David Robert – I’m really happy to be a part of Melnitz Movies as a director. I welcome you all wholeheartedly

* MPSC motions to approve the appointment
* All approve
* Motion passes, appointment is approved
1. **Adjournment**
* Engineering motions to adjourn the meeting
* Motion carries

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 PM

**Respectfully submitted: Secretary**

 **Signature Date**