

Executive Minutes 10-20

President's Report:

-SGA represents the student body and disagreements should be had with the interest of the students in mind.

Executive Recommendation:

Peebles: Addressed the President because it felt natural and the precedent was set by previous SGA bodies. It was necessary to include President Feaver because he should know about the issue as part of his job. It is also important to keep open communication between SGA and the administration.

Brooks: The disagreement is the result of miscommunication. It wasn't clear to everyone that the board would send it to the president.

Melendez: The recommendation should've been sent to Nancy and Monica. Going to the President was an overreaction.

Monica: Part of what's so great about SGA is that differences in opinion can yield the best outcome. Won't speak as to whether sending the recommendation was right or wrong. Has full confidence and trust in President Feaver and trusts that he will handle legislation properly. Was caught off guard by the addressing of the president but the decision to do so is ultimately respected.

Melendez: Feels that President Peebles went over the heads of the executive board by addressing the president.

Brooks: Doesn't feel that that was the intent of President Peebles but there should be more communication and transparency in the future.

Alexander: The board trusts Nancy and Monica to handle the issue but also trusts President Feaver to be aware of the issue without overstepping his boundaries with Nancy and Monica.

O'zee: There's no real harm in sending to the president because he would've known anyways. There are also some benefits to sending it to the counselor because there would be more urgency to improve. Doesn't put any blame on any one person on the board for the lack of communication. This can be a lesson learned.

Peebles: Opinion is that the board should include the president in future Executive Recommendations and use this as a precedent.

Melendez: Doesn't support the method by which the executive recommendation was sent.

Monica: In the future, the board should CC the president rather than address it directly.

Making the Recommendation Public:

Peebles: The board has to make the recommendation public by law. Also open to censoring identifying information in the document before publishing. Even if the recommendation doesn't fall under the Open Meetings Act, it should still be published with redactions.

Brooks: Part of what contributed to the lack of communication was the speed at which we acted.

Peebles: Acted quickly because the responses of students led to the belief that lives were at risk which gave more urgency to the issue.

Monica: One thing the board needs to do is change the language to clarify that the submissions are allegations rather than established fact.

The recommendation needs to be sent to Mike Compinetti. Then the board needs to then make revisions and redactions for the publishing. The Final draft without redactions will be sent alongside a copy of the recommendation with the board's omissions.

Melendez: Feels as if it will be a waste of time to censor before sending the recommendation to Mike.

Board of Regents Meeting:

Peebles: was asked Monday what would be on his report. He would like to summarize the current actions of the SGA in a paragraph to the Board of Regents.

Monica: Are other student organizations doing things that should be brought to the Regents?

Peebles: (to Melendez) Isn't there something the UHC is doing of importance?

Melendez: The UHC is establishing a scholarship for immigrant students.

Casey: The student leadership conference could be mentioned.