

4/23/2020

Began at 7:05

First business is the consideration of the constitution.

Stewart said they distributed the new constitution with all of the edits made last night. We fixed the line in section two, we took out post doctoral students as discussed. Article one, the legislative branch

Fain asked why we took out post doctoral students.

Kamryn said it was discussed last night and was determined that they are different than most other students.

Bilal yielded time to Michael.

Michael said senator Lo said post-doctoral students are not students and do not pay the SGA fee. We are going off grad student feedback.

Fain said he wasn't in attendance last night, so he respects the conversations we had, and just wanted to ask for clarification.

Stewart said article one is generally about the legislative branch. One thing we talked about last night is the new name "senate chair". And Senate vice chair for senate coordinator. Article two is about the executive branch.

Hawse asked for clarification on the wording "an active member of sga for a year", does that mean it has to be the year prior to running for office or any year.

Kamryn said any year.

Alex Cochran asked if he can change the wording to "term" because freshman senators technically do not serve a year.

Bilal said this is not the time, but he can after the motion is called.

Stewart said nothing was changed in article three, which is about the judicial branch. Article four is about the constitutional review process. There will be a committee, they will meet every four years and evaluate the constitution.

Farmer asked if the constitutional review committee would still go through the same process as mentioned in article 5.

Kamryn said yes.
Bilal yielded time to Michael.

Michael said the way the language reads. In a review year, suggestions and amendments can come straight from the committee. But the full senate would still need to vote on it and O&E would have to discuss it.

Lo asked if there are any specifications or is it just assumed that the findings of the committee have to be concluded by the end of the academic year.

Kamryn said they left it vague with the assumption of the end of the academic year. If you think something should be added, definitely bring it up later in debate.

Fain asked why the former article 6, relating to elections, was not included in this constitution. There is nothing in this that refers to elections and how those are supposed to be administered.

Michael said when they were going through this there were references to it in each branch section. They took any clarifying language that was different and embedded in the individual branch sections. It was never a full coherent section on its own.

Kamryn said section one is where they added those. The last article outlines how amendments are made. They can come from the constitutional review committee or O&E. They have to go to the full senate no matter what. They have to be read twice before the senate.

Farmer yielded time to Michael.

Michael said the $\frac{2}{3}$ vote in the senate strictly approves it to be placed as a referenda item on the ballot in the election. This will prevent the document from being littered.

Kamryn moved for the adoption of the UK SGA Constitution.

Bilal seconded.

Farmer asked if it would be best to go through it section by section? Or as a whole?

Stewart said article by article would be best.

There was no discussion on the preamble.

Fain said he wanted to go back to the preamble. He offered a friendly amendment to add post-doctoral students back into membership. His senate special project benefited the society of postdoctoral scholars. They are considered students. Does not see a good enough reason to remove them especially when we've offered funding to them.

Arianna said to move it as a normal amendment and not a friendly amendment.

Gammon moved to amend it.

Zac seconded it.

Elias said someone yesterday said they took it out because we do not have a postdoctoral representative. Do you have to have a senator representing them if we include them in the representation?

Lo said that is part of the rationale he brought up yesterday. Gammon brings up a good point that we have funded them. He is just concerned about the lack of their representation. They also fall into a grey area where they are not really students. They are not going towards a degree; they are employed somewhere.

Boyd said he wanted to reiterate what Lo is saying. They are normally known as researchers, not students. They also have vastly different needs than other students.

Fain said the university's governing regulation says postdoctoral students can view their classification as both students and salaried academic staff. The university refers to postdoctoral as both students and staff.

Boyd said the fact that they are also staff is why Lo was saying there is a grey area.

Fain said to be fair there are also students in this body serving as students/staff. He doesn't see why they should be excluded from student government.

Farmer yielded his time to Michael.

Michael said since postdoctoral students are identified as students in regulations, we are legally obligated to represent them if governing operations deem them as students. He feels very strongly if it is listed in the governing operations to include them.

Lo said he agrees, but he wants to make sure that they are represented in the right way. He knows they fall into a grey area, but if we include them, there should be a relevant seat created for a doctoral scholar.

Fain said postdoctoral scholars are currently represented by the graduate professional senators at large. He represented them with his senate special project this year.

Farmer asked if it would be possible to include them in a way that in the future, they would get representation in the senate so both Fain and Lo's concerns would be addressed?

Boyd said that it's great that Fain advocated that group. He is a graduate student not a postdoctoral seat. We should give them a seat. It's nice that we're talking about representing them, but this is the only place they come up in the codes and constitution. If this is something we want to do, we should do it in a more active way. We shouldn't say something in the preamble and then never say anything about them again.

Elias yielded time to Michael.

Michael said this is a great conversation. He feels like if a postdoctoral student wanted to run for a seat, they could run for a graduate professional senator at large. We may need to broaden that definition and inform them that they can run. Also depending what college they are classified in, they would be eligible to run for the college seat. He does agree if we need to add more specific language or generalize the language in the preamble and then further address it in the codes.

Fain said if this motion passes, he would also propose an article to amend article one to make sure post-doctoral scholars are represented.

Stewart said she agrees with Michael. We can also amend it to say the UK SGA represents all students at UK.

Richardson called for a vote.

Elias seconded.

13 yes, 5 no, 4 abstain. Motion passed.

Farmer asked do we need to add postdoctoral students anywhere else in section one. Or is that something we will talk about when we talk about the codes.

Kamryn said what Michael said earlier is true, they can run for the professional graduate seats.

Lo said since we have made this amendment, it would only make sense to follow it and define it as graduate, professional, and postdocs.

Woodson asked since we have two seats for the college of arts and sciences, do they both get a vote?

Bilal asked if she was referring to the university senate.

Woodson said yes.

Bilal said no, only one would represent at university senate

Bilal allotted Michael time.

Michaels said a lot of times we get caught up with the name for graduate professional students at large. We could change it to graduate senators at large. It is just a suggestion if we think it will satisfy some of these concerns.

Blackstone agrees if we are going to add postdocs in the beginning, we should add them in the senators at large. Like Gammon said, he had to go to them to get funding for them.

Losey said he moved to amend article 1, section 1, subsection F to read that the graduate and professional senators at large shall be elected solely by the graduate, postdoctoral and professional membership during the general election.

Kamryn seconded.

Losey said he'd like to move to call to question.

Kelly seconded.

Losey withdrew that motion and called for unanimous consent to end debate.

23 yes, the amendment passes.

Lo would like to make the point that if we are now including postdocs, it's important to know that graduate, professional, and postdocs are at very different stages of life and are different types of students. These seats need to be defined.

Farmer yielded his time to Michael.

Michael said they were intentional to not include those numbers here due to possible changes that could happen in the future. We can change the numbers through the governing codes.

Blackstone said if we are going to put postdocs, she would like to amend article 1, section 1, subsection a, clause 4, to read "these shall be undergraduate, graduate, professional, and postdoctoral seats" by unanimous consent.

Boyd seconded.

No objections. Amendment added.

Fain said he would like to make a motion to amend article 2 section 2 subsection a, to strike clause four. He doesn't agree for it to be a requirement that someone running for SGA president to have been a member of SGA for one active year.

Losey seconded.

Richardson said he would like to speak in favor of this. He doesn't think being a member of SGA for a year qualifies the person to represent the student body. He thinks a lot of members represent greek life and it is currently over represented. No offense to anyone, he thinks it's great. Having this clause in the constitution will allow for a "good ol' boys club" to have the same ideas every year. He wants everyone to think about the validity of that requirement. Strongly urges everyone to vote in favor of this amendment.

Farmer would like to speak in favor of this amendment. The point of SGA is to speak for the students. We have an election every year to allow students to say what they want. We should not put a limit on who they can elect. Previous elections have shown they often do want SGA members to represent them, but people who are not a part of it should not be barred.

Hicks said Richardson summed up the same concerns him and other members in O&E had. The greek life population on this campus is 26%, the population in student government is past that. This will turn into a popularity contest. It is his full belief that anyone who receives a majority of votes on this campus, should not be prohibited.

Kelly said he is also opposed to this being in the constitution. When he thinks of SGA he thinks of it as mirroring the actual US government. There is no clause like this in the US constitution that requires people running to be a part of the government before running. If there is a year to come where students do not want a student of SGA to be president, they should have that right. Taking this clause out of the constitution is not a drastic change. Adding it would be a drastic change.

Bilal also spoke in favor of this amendment. We would be remiss if the office of student body president carries a lot of leverage to enact change and work with the administration and the board of trustees. This

clause does not address the issue we are trying to solve. The president does a lot of work that is very different to the rest of the work of student government. The experience of working in another part of SGA does not necessarily qualify them more than another student.

Boyd said for A and B, the president and VP have the same qualifications besides the fourth clause. Can we amend the motion to remove four and move A and A together?

Fain respectfully declines this amendment.

Blackstone spoke to keep the clause. With all due respect to everyone who has spoken, the reason it is in place is because we are trying to prevent people from taking office as a joke or running on radical ideas. They are trying to garner a win off of feelings. Additionally, there is a thing in our government similar to this, which is the electoral college. She does not think this excludes anyone, there are many ways to be involved in SGA. Additionally, this is the highest position we have. We do not elect internally. We let our VP not be an active member, it is fair to hold our president to a higher standard than that.

Woodson said she is in support of this amendment. This clause is not only elitist, but the message this sends to the student population is that the SGA population does not want an outside voice. Everything is a learning curve. She didn't know anything about being a senator until she was one. She does not see the correlation and does not believe that this is important.

Fain moved to call the amendment based on unanimous consent.

Boyd seconded.

17 yes, 6 no. The amendment passed and the clause was struck.

Farmer said if possible, he would like to discuss article 2, section 2, subsection a and b both clause 2. He knows there was some discussion about the GPA in O&E. He thinks it's worth having a discussion about if it should be a qualification for serving in the presidential and vice-presidential office.

Hawse said last night we talked about how to be in good academic standing the requirement is a 3.0. It is most important for the people in charge of the student body. SGA would be doing a disservice to anybody we have represent us if we were not worrying about their grades. We are all here to get degrees. Holding people to what the university sees as good academic standing at the university believes is satisfactory. He allotted time to Michael

Michael said he doesn't know where the 3.0 is coming from. It's usually a lower number. Regardless, a higher GPA requirement is important. From experience, this is a very busy and loaded job. The distractions and workload definitely take away from time spent doing academics. It would be doing them a disservice to set them up for failure. It is important to be academically strong.

Blackstone said the reason 3.0 is what was settled on is that 2.0 is a C average, it actually considered average. When they were looking at what would be reasonable, but still holding them to a higher standard 3.0 seemed like the magic number. 4.0 would be too high of an expectation and not fair.

Farmer said based on the research he has done this past week, looking at UK's other standards. The highest standard he could find was in athletics where they require 2.75. With that in mind, it may make sense to change it to 2.75 to make sure we are consistent with other university guidelines. Offered an

amendment article 2, section 2, subsections and b clause 2 to change the 3.0 cumulative GPA to a 2.75 cumulative GPA.

Lo seconded.

Woodson seconded that. 3.0 may be excessive. To be president is a higher calling you have within yourself to become a leader. Expecting a student to have a 3.0 is excessive.

Blackstone said like Dean said it is the bare minimum for most programs for people to stay in. The president takes on a lot of responsibilities. It is good that we include this cushion that someone already has a 3.0 cumulative. If someone falls below a 2.75 and they are a risk for their colleges, they would have already been protected by this cushion.

Farmer apologized if he misspoke. 2.75 is the absolute highest standard he could find. The vast majority of standards are a 2.0. That is the minimum you have to do to pass. Our most stringent programs require a 2.75. At the same time, he thinks GPA, even though it is important to remain a high academic standard, we all have to recognize that certain pervading factors may limit a student such as personal, familial, mental health emergencies.

Torres said she understands what Farmer just said, but she thinks the GPA standards he spoke about are the minimum, but the student body president represents all students. She doesn't think a 3.0 is that unattainable for most students. She thinks it is important to consider the spot of presidency and that we are here specifically for our degrees, it is important to show your time management skills. She is not sure if students going through a current, big struggle should be taking on that responsibility.

Stewart said Torres said everything she was going to say. If you are in that role you should be held to a higher standard.

Bilal echoes what Kamryn said. It is important to note that Farmer mentioned that the highest standard was a 2.75. It is fair that the president's standard should be the highest. The president is the highest-ranking student. While GPA is not an indicator of intellectual ability, it is an indicator of the work ethic and determination that a student puts forward.

Hawse wanted to reiterate what Bilal, Gabby and Kamryn said. They have to have a 3.0 at the time of their swearing in. He has never been a part of an organization where they did not have a minimum GPA. It is important to start them to a higher standard. This is a full-time job and you may have to choose between school and it. This is important not only for intellectually competent, but to have a good work ethic. We are doing a disservice by saying we don't care what their GPA is. We are here to get degrees.

Fain said he wanted to note that under our previous constitution that it was a 2.5. He is not sure in the history of SGA if we've elected a president that was not competent to perform the duties of the job. Fundamentally we should not be screening who can run for this. The democratic process will take care of this. Ultimately what we have to say is that not our choice to make that is the student body's decision. He thinks 2.5 has worked for so long, there's no reason to change it to a 3.0

Farmer said he appreciates what Fain mentioned. He felt that the 2.75 GPA is a reasonable compromise between what we previously had and what is being stated now. Academic probation for nearly all institutions is a 2.0. He has not had much trouble maintaining a 3.0 GPA, but he comes from a place of privilege. He doesn't think we should restrict somebody because they don't come from a place of privilege.

Losey said Farmer said most of what he wanted. In addition, he would like to point out that a GPA is an extremely unreliable measurement of someone's capability. He doesn't think that it is a good indicator of how good a president will be. If someone is capable of running a successful campaign, it is up to the voters.

Blackstone motioned to call previous question on unanimous consent

Hawse seconded.

9 yes, 15 no. Amendment failed.

Fain moved to amend article 3, section 1, subsection c to read “must be enrolled in the University of Kentucky Rozenberg College of Law” by unanimous consent.

Blackstone seconded

No Objection, it is added

Farmer said he is curious as to why there are no qualifications for the members of our supreme court, particularly because this is the one branch that is not democratically elected.

Hicks said this is modeled almost exactly after the US Supreme court. They are elected by the president. This is why checks and balances exist.

Stewart said she would agree with what Hicks said. Every nomination goes through O&E to put checks and balances in place.

Lo said those are fine points to put up, this if for consistency states, if they are going to model it after the way the U.S. government is set up, then likewise, there is no GPA requirement for the president. If you are trying to ensure that there is a quality governance here and that students are also able to meet the academic requirements, he thinks it's only right to have a GPA for the supreme court.

Hicks said to counter that, there are additional requirements for running for president and senator. Those requirements serve as substitutions for the federal rules.

Bilal would like to make an amendment to change article 3, section 1, subsection E, to change “one term” to “one year”. Motion to pass by unanimous consent.

Stewart seconded

No objection. Motion passes.

Bilal would like to also amend article 3, section 1, subsection f to eliminate “go” for grammatical purposes. By unanimous consent.

Stewart seconded.

No objection. Amendment is put into place.

Hicks allotted time to Michaela.

Michaela asked if the codes say anything about anyone on the judicial branch not being able to campaign for elections? If not, it needs to be put here.

Stewart asked for clarification.

Michaela clarified she is asking whether or not it explicitly says a member of the supreme court cannot be involved in election campaigning

Stewart said at a brief glance she does not think that is in there, but the place for that should be the codes.

Farmer allotted time to Michael.

Michael said he is not sure if it is explicitly mentioned. It should be in there though. We can put a clause. Another question he has for the group of consideration is section one, e, that requirement is that it is important. If E cannot be satisfied, if there is no person on the supreme court who has served for at least one year, it may be smart to add language that says how to satisfy it.

Boyd said there are still a few instances where numbers should have brackets to provide clarity.

Kamryn asked if that was the only one he saw.

Boyd said no, in article five after that there shall be 2 readings. Senator Losey may be able to inform that better.

Stewart said motion to vote by unanimous consent to amend article 4, section 1, subsection a to add the number 6 in parentheses after the word six.

Richardson seconded.

No objection. Amendment was added.

Stewart said going back to article 3, section 1, subsection e, Michaels point was important. Motion to add at the end “in the event that this qualification may not be met any associative justice may be eligible to serve as chief justice”.

Kelly seconded.

18 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain. Motion passes.

Fain said this is a question to senator Stewart. What was the thought process for including the elections process in the codes but not the constitution?

Stewart allotted time to Michaela.

Michaela said her first year they had issues with the elections where there would be information in the constitution that was different than what was in the elections app. The process changes year to year due to

the way our exec team is run, things we see happening in the previous election. If it is put in the code rather than the constitution, they are easier to be changed.

Bilal allotted time to Michael.

Michael put the core fundamentals of the elections in each of the branches they included. Before, there were so many convoluted pieces even within the constitution. We left that as a more generic piece in the constitution. We kept the main concepts, but we deferred to the elections section of the codes.

Stewart says she agrees with everything Michael said, she would like to add that they did take part of that elections section that was in the original draft of this constitution and moved it up, so part of it is still included. This senate passed the elections procedures and rules in the fall. They took everything from that and put it in the codes.

Fain said his primary concerns are what Michaela said, that the codes are more easily changed. But if they think what they have added, the only thing he thinks that may need to be added is when the election is to be held. But he will not offer an amendment if they think the way they created this takes care of it.

Farmer allotted time to Michael.

Michael said they outline in the elections code a time frame. The general election should be held two weeks before spring break.

Stewart said just for reference, it is in section 602 in the codes. The timeline is outlined. They don't think it would be great to put it in the constitution in case of certain situations

Lo said he had a concern about the lack of a specified conclusion to the constitutional review committee. He would suggest making at least some specifications that it ends in that same academic year. He would like to propose to make an amendment to say that it convenes and concludes in the fourth academic year after the 2019-2020 academic year.

Kamryn said it may be best to say it at the end.

Lo accepted her friendly amendment.

Richardson seconded.

20 yes, 0 no, the motion passes.

Boyd said when they discussed this in meeting it is crucial that when this gets passed our codes are no longer effective. What is the plan for the codes?

Michael said yes, we were planning to go through the codes tonight.

Farmer asked if we could pass this for the first time now.

Stewart said yes, that is the plan.

Richardson asked if the codes have to be voted on once or twice.

Stewart said once.

Losey called for unanimous consent to call to pass the first reading to the constitution.

Richardson seconded.

23 yes 0 no, motion passes.

Stewart said the codes were also distributed and are 54 pages long. We do need to get feedback from everyone.

Fain asked what the reasoning was to include in chapter 300 each cabinet position, to require presidents to fill certain cabinet positions? He knows of an act he wrote that opposed this and is wondering why it's being added in.

Stewart said the committee felt like these positions needed to be outlined in detail.

Bilal allotted time to Michaela.

Michaela said in the elections codes she knows what she submitted she required signatures to be removed. O&E voted to have them kept. After research, she believes signature requirements should be removed. We are one of the last SEC schools to have senators get signatures. She still thinks presidential and vice-presidential candidates should have to get signatures. One, it would allow us to move all applications online. Two, they don't verify all 200 signatures. One, because they need staff to help them validate the signature requirements and there are only two SOA staff members. She would like signature requirements removed for senators. She thinks it makes the elections more equitable.

Stewart said the sections Michaela is talking about starts in 603.3 and for future reference, if you are referencing the codes say the section number. She allotted time to Michael Hamilton.

Michael says signatures are verified through random sampling. The current elections codes give the elections board power to verify the signatures through random sampling. That process is not for nothing and those signatures are verified.

Woodson said in the absence for not taking signatures, would there be any replacements? Allotted time to Michaela.

Michaela said the verification process would still be the same (for GPA, college, and program). But as of now there would not be any other.

Fain asked about section 300.4 again. Why did we choose to describe those positions?

Boyd said in the previous version of the document the only thing outlined was the inclusion and equity. Talking as a group, they decided between getting rid of the only position talked about or include some they thought should be included in every year. Michael was a key member of this conversation. They thought there should at least be a few that are there every year.

Michael said he included a clause that says we have to have a director or official to address inclusion and equity issues, both within student government and our campus abroad. He thinks it is a crucial part as our role and the committee thought the wording took away from what the other directors did. They decided to provide clarification for other positions.

Fain said the language that it reads right now he doesn't think it accurately or sufficiently provides the president and VP with the amount of UA, as the previous constitution intended. In article 2, section 3 we say that the president is granted the full authority to administer the executive branch and appoint members to the executive branch by nature of being elected president and VP you should have the ability to set a cabinet that you think will enact the policy that you campaigned on. He agrees if you read it closely, the president can work around this. 300.4 specifically says "These appointed members will be referred to as cabinet officers. Cabinet officers and their duties are as followed:". He knows that each year these things have looked a little different. Last year the director of student health and wellness position was created. Previous administrations have said that campus safety should not be on our cabinet. He feels that by including this in the document we are taking away some of the autonomy that comes with this position.

Bilal said immediately before the sentence he read it also says "the executive team leadership and any additional officers that the president deems necessary" directly gives the president the autonomy he is talking about. He would also like to point out that the codes are a lot more malleable. From personal experience the charge that the transition team has when assembling an executive team is very broad. Putting together descriptions for each position. He thinks it is important to keep consistency. Are changes allowed to be made to what their responsibilities are? Yes. Outlining their responsibilities is something we should be intentional in and have a code to refer back to. Allotted time to Michael.

Michael wants to make sure these codes read that the president has full autonomy to create their own cabinet. These were included to make sure that these crucial positions do not leave. The wildcat wardrobe has grown exponentially and has become way more substantial in the past few years. It does need its own director to remain sustainable. Certain things need directors to continue to thrive and grow. A new administration would be doing a disservice if they didn't at least consider, because all of these positions are crucial to current government services. Whether a president decides to add or take away, this language gives them the option to do either.

Fain said he appreciates that perspective and to Bilal, it does allow a president to add, but it is more difficult to take it away. The perspective we have now is that this is the way this has been done. While continuity is important, a new administration would have the opportunity to take away the Wildcat Wardrobe for example. We have to trust that the democratic process would take care of this. Even though we have done a good job this year, he does not feel right locking things in. He thinks this could potentially take away the ability for someone to run a campaign that has substance. If the program is set up, what is someone going to run on? We need to give presidents and vice presidents as much autonomy as possible, because that enables us to have conversations on campus and help students meet their needs. To him this seems like codifying the way we have done things. He offers these comments for consideration, next week he will make an amendment.

Farmer said Olivia Morris Bush has been working hard on a handbook to lay out the method by which current SGA administrations have done things and to help future administrations. He is curious to hear about that ongoing process and wouldn't want to take from that. Allotted time to Michael.

Michael said Olivia has done a great job for creating that guidebook and will help in transitions. One point to make here is that if a, if this senate decides to include this, they are saying these positions are

important for our organization. In the future if an administration no longer thinks these are important or is no longer a need, they can bring it to the senate.

Losey yielded time to Michaela.

Michaela said currently as the process stands, we have the application process and it is all on paper. A candidate would file it. One of the benefits of not having the signatures allows us to put it all online. It would give better access to students. Signatures have become a bit of a barrier. Some graduate students only have 20 people in their program. We do a randomized signature verification.

Woodson doesn't seem to see the benefit of getting rid of signatures. Collecting the signatures is one of the best ways to campaign. It also gets the word out about elections and shows that you have some type of background for being a qualified official. Doesn't think having it all online would be the best way to go about it. Does see the point made about the graduate senators.

Michaela said thank you for the feedback and if we do want to keep signatures, she thinks we should decrease them. She knows some senators have said the signature requirements are quite high.

Lo said the other considerations are when birthdays are collected, he has had people deny putting their birthday because everyone after can see it. It can be a personal piece of privacy. It can be awkward to give out for older students. Have there been any alternatives considered for verifying students other than the birth dates.

Michaela said it would either have to be birthdays or student ID numbers.

Losey asked about the signature verification randomization process. How many signatures actually get verified? It lets him know how many are feasible. Yielded time for Michaela.

Michaela said it is 3 out of the 25 per page.

Boyd wants to address the postdoc thing we talked about. The only places that will need to be added to are 200.3, 605.6. Since we have added that language in the constitution about graduate, professional, and postdocs, he thinks it's important to add.

Losey would like a clarification on if we are going to vote on amendments tonight. Yielded time to Michael.

Michael said we don't need to make formal amendments tonight because it has not been currently moved.

Kamryn said if you catch any grammatical things please reach out to her.

Richardson asked if senator Stewart is open to it, if someone knows they are proposing an amendment would it be possible to send them to senator Stewart before the meeting to help move things along.

Stewart says she doesn't know the rules.

Arianna said it was most likely possible.

Richardson allotted time to Michael.

Michael said to make sure when you're reviewing the doc make sure you have the most updated one. It was reordered recently.

Stewart said to clarify that the only thing that's been brought up that isn't really a debate thing is adding the post docs. If there's anything else, please bring it up now.

Lo noticed that starting on page 24 we discuss the availability of public records, but the most recent records on uksga.org/records have had an inconsistent availability of those records. O&E has 2018 records, no 2019 records, and then they are updated again in 2020. Is there any room to specify that this is done in a timely manner for not just BBNvolved but also uksga.org/records?

Stewart said yeah that honestly Michael could speak more to this. Working with the director of technology, there were a lot of issues with the technology. She thinks it's being put on UK's domain. The records should be able to go up much easier than before.

Michael said last year the website was under reconstruction. It was a nightmare. We have set up a process for UK to host our website. Hopefully in the future we will have a way to post those in a scheduled way. Your concern is important so maybe put up a timeline on when minutes need to be uploaded or a time limit. That's a great suggestion.

Meeting adjourned at 9:49.