Senate Minutes
Student Government Association
Northeastern University
{10/15/2012}

Present: 36
Absent: 5
Excused: 1
Quorum: was met.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm.

There are no minutes from last full body they will be ready for the next full body in two weeks.
The minutes from last Senate have multiple corrections due to bad acoustics.
We will deal with both minutes at a later date.

Executive Vice President, Nick Naraghi:
- There is no guest speaker to try to be as efficient as possible
- The process for legislation is
  - 5 minutes to present if presenting legislation
  - 5 minutes for questioning to ask the presenter
  - 10 minutes for debate
    - Any amount of time can be extended by a motion at any time

President, Pete Petrin:
- Thanks to everybody who participated in all the homecoming events and senator retreat.
  - All the effort has been greatly appreciated and we’ve had a great presence on campus.
- The registration deadline is approaching, Wednesday October 17th in Massachusetts.
  - This is our last push for NU votes.
- We are going to have a mock election, campus wide.
  - We need volunteers for that from 5-7pm on Tuesday.
- There is going to be an Ides of March screening sponsored by CUP in afterhours at 7pm on Tuesday.
- There will also be a presidential debate watch.
- We will be registering voters at all events.
- Last Wednesday there was a meeting with President Aoun, where he laid out the blueprint of where the university is and where it will be going moving forward/our priorities.
  - If interested, the video is posted on the SGA facebook page.

Comptroller, Maya Quijada:
- Yields

Vice President for Academic Affairs, Kristina Lopez:
- Thanks everybody for coming to all the town hall meetings that have been happening.
  - We have a few more coming up and she appreciates everybody that has come already.
- If you haven’t been to a town hall yet but would like to, CSSH is going to have one next Tuesday at 5pm
- If you know somebody in the college of computer sciences, we are looking for representation for that college for college education.
- There is a lot going on at the library and if you’re interested in helping out let me know.

Vice President for Student Affairs, Nicole Daly:
- My committee won’t meet today due to the full body senate.
  - Will have it next week.
Vice President for Student Involvement, Kate Chandley:
- Thanked everybody who helped out over the past few days.
  - Special thanks to senator Yao and Matt Crimmins for helping with preparation.
- There is a presidents meeting this Wednesday at 8pm.
- I’ve been meeting with various people dealing with a bunch of various things and campus activities.

Vice President for Student Services, Terry MacCormack:
- We had a few productive board meetings and university wide committee meetings.
  - First we had the student advisory board where we got together with a few groups and talked about dining concerns
  - AVP Corrado attended the meeting about sustainability where they discussed a number of initiatives. Including one of our own projects which will hopefully start up soon.
  - We went over the housing application and a couple logistical items for the coming year.
    - Went really well, will be talking about gender neutral housing next week.
- Been getting mobile ticketing issues
  - We are aware of the issue.
  - Will be in touch to get this fixed.
- Senator LePage met with NUPD to relay several concerns. Got ideas for collaboration.
- Installation of printers in Curry and Snell is going to be delayed until November.
  - Waiting on the new cabinets to come.

Chief of Staff, Noah Carville:
- Thanked everybody who came to the new senator retreat
- In order to have voting rights, you had to be a Senator on or before September 17th.
- If you were late and didn’t make roll call, please come see him.

Executive Director of Communication, Caitlin Rogers:
- Thanked everybody who helped out with Red and Black day.
- There will be no committee on Wednesday night.
  - I will be in the office Tuesday if you want to come help count surveys.

The Senate moved into Special Addresses.

Parliamentarian, Olivia D’Angelo:
- Yields

Elections Committee Chair, Julia Patten:
- We edited stuff in the manual this week.
- Everybody has voting rights in her committee now.
- Next Monday after senate we are holding an open forum on slating on the third floor.
- Anybody who is interested in participating in elections committee or thinking about running in the spring, she highly recommends that you attend the forum
  - It’s basically going to be talking about details regarding on running and how elections work.

The Senate moved into Question Time.
The Senate moved into New Business.
President Petrin to present Senator of the Month for September

- We wanted to recognize a senator who has been extremely active on many committees
  - He has been helping with class calendars for husky accounts.
  - He’s been active on college expectations and academics
  - He has helped with surveys on conditions during welcome week.
  - Basically does everything for everyone at all times
- Recognized Senator Shaw

First thing on the list is RG-FA-12-101 – Clarifying Role of Parliamentarian
Motion by Senator Pett to postpone the amendment until the next full body senate.
Second by VP Daly.
With no objections the motion passes.

RG-FA-12-102 – Clarifying AVP Rights

VP MacCormack will present

- Will get 10 minutes, because he will explain the structure of legislation.
- For those of you who are new or don’t know how legislation works I will go through it quickly
  - The entire resolution that senate would be adopting if passed, is one sentence.
  - The first part up top is the preamble.
    - Basically a bunch of clauses that start with “where as”
    - At the end it says “therefore” and then the statement of what happens.
  - Technically the only part you’ll be voting on is the “Be at resolve” section
    - The in acting clause, it’s what is actually getting changed.
- This resolution is here to help clarify the rights of the Assistant Vice President
  - Currently it is written very vaguely about what the AVP’s relationship with Senate actually is.
  - We are just trying to formalize the language.
- Currently its worded saying the AVP has the responsibility to maintain the rights and privileges afforded to a Senator.
- The way it has generally been vaguely interpreted in the past is that there is no relationship between being a AVP and Senator. So if you are a Senator, and you become a AVP, then you can continue to become a Senator. If you are not a Senator, and you become a AVP, there is no obligation to become a Senator.
- Article 7, Section B 1.C proposing strikes is a bit vague. It effectively keeps the constitution the same way we have been interpreting it.
- Questions for VP MacCormack:
  - Question from Senator Shaw: This is a constitution which is only formally signed once a year, so when would this amendment go into effect?
  - VP MacCormack: What happens is you have several full body Senates, and you have the option to change the amendments in anyone of the Senates, and you have the right to sign or not sign the constitution. If you want to sign 4-5 times a year, this would simply go to the waitlist. And at the end of the year, you are required to write a letter to the Vice President saying this the way the Senate has decided to amend the constitution: the section and the reasons. Take 3-6 weeks to get into it.
  - Senate Yao: Which part of the existing Constitution are you striking?
  - VP MacCormack: The way that it is written right now is the article 7 Section B Subsection 1, there’s ABC, or point letters that are under subsection 1, and ‘moving to strike’ point 2.

Motion from VP Daly to adopt by unanimous consent.
Second by Senator Yau
Objections from Senator Corrado

Moving on to role call vote

Vote:
22 Yay
4 Nay
1 Abstain
Vote passes

RG-FA-12-103: Approval for Circulation of Petitions
President Petrin will present
   • As mentioned before, each year constitution goes through approval by Office of Campus Activities and the Office of Student Affairs, and it’s an agreement between us and the university
   • One concern that is highlighted was the Article 5.5 which states, “The Senate has the power and responsibility to… approve or reject outside individuals or organizations to circulate petitions or referenda among the students” was that the policy which is the Office of Student Affairs has the approval of outside activities or outside orientation looking to do that. And absence of getting the approval from those offices but getting it from a Senate first can be considered as a violation of the university’s solicitation policy and even trespassing.
   • The concern with that was a future scenario where an organization is approved by the student government but they might not be aware they need university approval and could get in trouble.
     o This will clarify where the approval authority lies so they know what to do.
   • This proposes the removal of article 5a5 from the constitution, which is that the senate has the power to approve or reject outside individuals or organizations to circulate referenda’s among the students.

Professor Herman
   • The university is worried about this organization (SGA)’s liability concerning this matter.
     o Since they can potentially approve something that the university won’t approve.
     o Trying to avoid the SGA taking on the liability with the university.
   • Questions for President Petrin:
     o Question from Senator Bhadra: Can you clarify what a petition or referenda – what kind of examples they are going to be?
     o President Petrin: An outside non-profit organization has some kind of political cause they are passionate about, and they are trying to get signatures on campus locations from students, which is something that requires approval from the university.
     o Question from Senator Shaw: Does the approval has to go through us first, or straight to the university.
     o President Petrin: If passed, it would mean it would go straight to the Office of Student Activities and the Office of Student Affairs. SGA, like other organizations, has sponsored outside groups, or recommended sponsorships. This clause was a default, and it has been here forever, but no one has ever enforced it. And it says any outside organization cannot find anybody else, then SGA power to approve- but it has the same power as the other student organizations to approve the organizations to come on campus to undertake the activity.
     o Senator Yao: So we don’t have anything to do with approval or rejections of individuals, and it will just go straight to the university.
Professor Herman: Correct, because student groups do not have any authority to approve or reject groups coming to campus.

Question from Senator Pett: Why did it take so many years to address the question.

President Petrin: A theoretical answer to that is since we have a new VP and Student Affairs this past year, we have only been reviewing the constitution for the first time, and which hasn’t been previously noticed. The university council realized there are liability issues involved.

Senator Pett: Technically speaking, isn’t the VP of Student Affairs’s opinion irrelevant because she is not the signatory authority?

President Petrin: She is not the signatory authority, but our governing documents are still vetted through that route.

VP Daly: Concerned about the validity of the referendum process. Is that defined any other place?

President Petrin: Yes, that’s defined elsewhere within our governing document. This only pertains to outside individuals or organizations, which does not impact our referendum process at all.

Question from Senator Kisby: What kind of student office will be in charge if this legislation is passed.

President Petrin: If this was passed, this will solely be within the Office of Student Affairs and Campus Activities that will give you approval, which they already have that. And we also have the secondary provoke authority.

Senator Pett: Are there any cases where we know the SGA got into trouble for approving outside organization without going through the department of administration channel?

Professor Herman: Fortunately no, but we close several times. But President Petrin said exactly right, the Office of Student Affairs has to go through administration by the student vice president who read it, and thinks it is a problem, he will send it to the Legal Council, and so they send it back. We got this year’s constitution signed, so the Senate this year will take a review at this.

Question Time expired

Motion from VP MacCormack to extend question time to 2 minutes
Second from VP Daly
No objections
Motion passed.

Question from Senator Corrado: How does it work right now if a group or individual from outside wants to come to campus, we are the default recommender or sponsor?

Professor Herman: If they cannot find a sponsor in any other student organization, we will reach out. If they still come to the SGA and ask for our support, so SGA will be the direct recommender or authority, but we never have the power to actually approve it; we only have power to recommend it to the Office of Student Affairs. To my knowledge, this is not a clause that the university has been very much aware of in the process. I believe most often most organizations require with the campus activities about coming to campus has generally gone directly to Student Affairs.

Question from Senator Corrado: As the constitution is written right now, we have the power to say: we don’t want to we don’t have to?

Professor Herman: Yes, but that does not supersede university policy, if that makes sense.

Question from Senator Yu: Does that mean if we deny them the rights to come to campus, but the university grants them, they can still come anyways?

President Petrin: My interpretation will be no.
Professor Herman: The answer is yes but it has actually never happened. The Student Affairs will generally look from support from some student organization. Typically it ends when the SGA says no, but a group can get a sponsor to change that decision.

Question from Senator Lothrop: If the university takes the liability the way it stands, hypothetically speaking what can we vote no to? It sounds like the conditions now state that according the approval of the previous year we had to take this under review, but it makes it sound like we have to pass it no matter what. Why are we even bothering to vote on this?

President Petrin: I can see that as an issue, but the way in which it is worded now says we have to review and address any controversy with university policies, not necessarily that we should strike it down. So we can know if we need to take any action in order to retract it.

Question Time expired
Motion from VP Lopez to extend question time to the end of the speakers list
Second from Senator Yao
Objection from Senator Corrado
Second by Senator Yao
Motion by Senator Corrado to extend question time by 5 minutes
Second by Senator Kisby
Question time extended by 5 minutes

Question from Senator Pett: Would a theoretical amendment happen later during the debate to the clause for article 585 reading “you can recommend approval over objection of outside individuals or organizations” would that alleviate the concerns from student affairs?

President Petrin: I cannot speak on behalf of their perspective, but I believe it would satisfy the expectation we address.

Question from Senator Corrado: If the student affairs office gets the inquiry and says well if no one wants to then SGA can, shouldn’t they know the rule already? I don’t understand the legal counsel thinking this is an issue based on the rules of the university.

Professor Herman: The problem is its contradictory regulation so somebody coming from the outside would have trouble reading it and understanding it.

Question from Senator Yu: Is there any way that we could keep our authority to say no but at the same time make it clear organizations that they have to get approvals from student activities as well as SGA?

Professor Herman: It’s unnecessary, every student group has the right to recommend or not recommend. So, all this does is make the SGA equal to every other student group.

Question from Senator Yao: Do you know the original reason why they chose to word it that way when the constitution was made?

EVP Naraghi: You can’t ask about the original reasoning behind rules. Legislation has to interpret it the way it exists.

Question from Senator Shaw: So who becomes the default if no outside organization can get a recommendation? Does it come to us?

President Petrin: My interpretation is it would stay with the office of student affairs.
Parliamentarian D’Angelo: In the last resolution some people voted no but there wasn’t much discussion, so if you do feel uncomfortable please object so it can go into debate and be discussed further.

Move into debate

Motion from Senator Pett to amend article 585 to say “The senate has the power and responsibility to recommend approval or rejection of outside individuals or organizations to circulate petitions for referenda among the students.” It’s basically just concerning recommends approval or rejection. This will be in place of approve or reject.

Professor Herman said to remember that, in the past, this has always been at the fault of us, so we really want to make sure we encourage outside groups to find appropriate organizations on campus and not bring every request to SGA or seek support from other groups.

President Petrin doesn’t deem this friendly.

Second from VP MacCormack

Objection from Senator Kisby

Move into debate on this particular amendment of this legislation

Point of information from Senator Shaw: Does the constitution state who within SGA has that power, is it the whole senate, just e-board etc?

Point for debate by Senator Pett: I feel like I wasn’t the only one in the room during question time who felt uncomfortable with removing the clause entirely, even if they want us to. I think this does a good job of protection ourselves from a liability standpoint while still keeping some power in senate.

Point for debate by Senator Trowbridge: I feel like it doesn’t really matter taking in account to what has happened in the past. Let’s just save ourselves and get rid of the liability issues.

Point of information from Chief of Staff Carville: If this isn’t in our constitution would we still have the power to recommend groups?

Professor Herman: You would still have the power just like any other student group does to recommend to the administration. It does make a difference because every group can make that recommendation but only the administration can approve it.

Point for debate by Senator Pett: I completely disagree with that because once it’s out of the constitution you may still retain that power like other student groups, but once it’s not really needed I don’t feel like the administration will take it as seriously.

Debate expired

Motion to extend debate by VP MacCormack to extend by 5 minutes

Second by Senator Yao

No objection

Point of debate by Senator Kisby: He agrees with Senator Pett because I feel like we should be a body that is regarded slightly higher than all the other student groups.

Point of information by Senator Donati: Does anybody know how often in the past couple years this has actually come to senate to approve this?

Professor Herman: The answer is yes, it does happen, just not recently. It’s typically with very contentious groups regarding important issues that many groups don’t want to touch one way or the other. My memory is most instances get voted no.

Move into a placard vote
A vote on whether to replace the amendment with this new wording
A vote yes changes the wording while a vote no would keep it the same

Vote:
18 Yay
9 Nay
1 Abstain
Vote passes

Back into debate about the legislation with the amendment approved.

- Point for debate by VP MacCormack: I do think that it is protecting us from liability by not expressly getting an approval by us and making us just an approval body. I think this will protect us while still keeping some power and allow us to bring in outside groups.

Move into roll call vote

Vote:
25 Yay
0 Nay
2 Abstain
Point of order or information by Chief of Staff Carville: Is it in order to add senators to say they are here and give them voting rights if they were late. Can we interrupt the vote to add those people?

- Parliamentarian D’Angelo: It could have been done before the results were announced; now it is too late.
- Parliamentarian D’Angelo: You can request it before the next vote though

Vote passes

This ends the constitutional portion of the amendments.
Professor Herman suggests now if somebody wants to propose the executive board to have editorial authority to make the changes to the language prior to the submission to the EVP it would require a motion now.

Motion from Senator Trowbridge to do what Professor Herman said
Second from Senator Yao
Motion Passes

Are there any senators that came in late and want to be added to the vote?
There are no senators that want to be added.

Move into IR-FA-12-101: Executive Board Expenditure Approval
Professor Herman stated that an Internal Resolution is a resolution presented to the full body senate that doesn’t need an official approval by individuals afterwards.
Presented by VP MacCormack
There are two internal resolutions that are going to be presented in a row. They were both presented last year and passed. I think it would be in the best interest of senate to get them to pass again and then be continuous.

This IR states that all purchases exceeding $100 are subject to approval by the majority of the executive board.

The association has two accounts, the budget account and the cash account
- The budget account is budgeted
- The cash account is primarily fundraised

The budget account exists on a yearly basis mainly for the good of the student body.

The cash account is typically used as a supplement and more internal things.

The two people that have authority over those two accounts are the Chief of Staff and the President.

The resolution that passed last year session has already ended. Thus, currently there is no authority over the Chief of Staff or President to keep that in check.

This is amending to say that any expense exceeding $100 must be approved by a simple authority of the executive board.

The change from last year’s statement is adding “this will be continuous and apply to all future fiscal years unless deemed unacceptable in the future”

From being Chief of Staff last year he can vouch and say that this was good. We never ran into an issue with people abusing the way it stood prior, however, it is good to get in the mindset of thinking about instituting things like this to prevent things in the future.

This allows the executive board to state any objections and get more of a perspective.

Move into question time

Question from Senator Yao: Either the President or Chief of Staff can just spend all the money?

VP MacCormack: Well, no. There are some checks currently and does have to run through SABO. Thus, nothing catastrophic can happen, but otherwise the approval authority isn’t checked.

Professor Herman: This is a noble sentiment. However, I don’t believe that last sentence making it continuous can be enforced. The problem with internal resolutions is they only apply to a particular senate. Thus, this can’t be imposed on future senates. You can recommend, just can’t enforce.

Point of information by President Petrin: Don’t the bylaws state that is the case with internal resolutions unless it is specifically stated otherwise?

Professor Herman: The bylaws may state that, but it’s not legal.

EVP Naraghi: Wouldn’t the bylaws supersede Roberts Rules though?

Professor Herman: It’s not a question of Roberts Rules, it’s a question of senates power to try to sway a future senate. Even if it’s in the bylaws it can’t be done. The only way of making it happen is if what VP MacCormack is suggesting is specifically stated in the bylaws, thus making it a bylaw. What we are doing here is creating a subordinate set of rules that nobody is going to remember that isn’t in the bylaws that people are expected to follow. What you are doing is hoping the next senate will continue what you suggest.

Parliamentarian D’Angelo states in the bylaws(Article 5 legislation A section 3) says this is possible, which can be problematic.

Point of information by Senator Harris: Are the stipends associated with the budget account?
o **VP MacCormack**: Yes, as it is budgeted now it comes from the budget account, but that’s a weekly payment. It’s safe to assume the executive board will approve that.

o **Question from Parliamentarian D’Angelo**: Will this include election expenditures?

o **VP MacCormack**: Yes.

o **Question from Senator Yao**: As it reads now, anything that the President or Chief of Staff signs off on, it still have to get approved by a greater authority correct?

o **VP MacCormack**: Yeah, basically they process the forms, but don’t go into it to see the legitimacy of what it is unless it’s very obvious its fraud or something like that.

o **Question from President Petrin**: Does the student government advisor get to play a role in this?

o **VP MacCormack**: Yes, we have a budget advisor as well that signs off on any purchase upon SABO’s request.

o **Professor Herman**: Actually either advisor can sign off. My signature can also be accepted.

**Question Time Expired**

Motion by Senator Corrado to extend question time to the end of the speakers list. This means that the speakers will all speak and then it will go into question time after.

Second by VP Lopez

No objections, thus question time will be moved after going through the speakers list.

o **Senator Trowbridge**: Would it be against regulation to move the internal resolution to the bi-laws that way it continues from senate to senate.

  o **EVP Naraghi**: You wouldn’t be able to do it with this legislation since it’s an IR, but you could suggest a future legislation that was an RT that amended a bi-law. Keep in mind, there is another full body meeting in two weeks that has deadlines for suggestions coming up, if you’d like to suggest that feel free to do so.

o **Senator Kisby**: Yields

o **President Petrin**: Can you seek for approval by the association of the budget account beforehand?

  o **VP MacCormack**: Yeah, there is a budget proposal that says the responsibility of the Chief of Staff and President is to formulate and present to the senate sometime at the beginning of the spring that can go towards the finance board which then reviews the budget for next year. It is either approved or denied by the finance board then. Whatever is budgeted then goes to the next fiscal year.

o **Senator Corrado**: If the stipends are already approved and allocated, does the e-board have to approve it on a weekly basis and can they say no?

  o **VP MacCormack**: That didn’t come up last year. My initial guess is because it is one line item it only has to be approved once it just gets allocated week to week.

  o **Professor Herman**: I believe VP MacCormack is correct with that statement.

**Question Time Expired**

Moves to points for debate

Motion by Senator Shaw to strike the last line out of the resolution

Amendment is accepted as friendly by VP MacCormack

o **Point for debate by President Petrin**: The spirit of this IR is based on transparency. My concern is with the budget account. It goes through an approval process in the Spring and all allocations afterwards go through a bunch of checks and I think it has very thorough oversight as is. I feel like if things are already allocated and that the executive board should be responsive to that.
VP MacCormack: I do think any extra oversight wouldn’t be a bad thing and this doesn’t tamper with the President or Chief of Staff’s ability to move an expenditure through. It’s not hard to get the e-board together and it wasn’t an issue speaking from experience.

Senator Pett: Based on how this IR worked last year, it doesn’t prevent things that have already been allocated from last year. It just affects new ideas and new expenses to get a check.

VP Daly: There have been issues in the past where the executive board hasn’t been notified…

Chief of Staff Carville: To agree with the previous speaker and as the current Chief of Staff, even though specifically there was an issue two weeks ago we were under a strict deadline. However, we still would have had time to go through this budgetary process. I can’t see any situation where this would be unacceptable.

Motion from VP Daly to approve
Second from Senator Yao
No objections
IR is approved
Move into IR-FA-12-102: Stipend Approval
Presented by VP MacCormack

In years past it has been a practice that executive board stipends are funded partially through budget and cash accounts. There has been a point in years past where the executive board has decided to have an influx from the cash account that supplements stipends.

Given what was just passed, the only authority on whether that passes would be from the executive board, not anybody else.

Basically, that would mean the e-board could raise their own stipends without any outside approval.

This will make it so the senate has to approve any stipend change regarding the e-board with a majority vote by senate. The line regarding making it continuous year to year will be taken out.

Basically, this states that the E-board must go to senate for further approval for stipends coming out of the budget or cash account.

In years prior this has only applied to the cash account.

Any changes that come to association budget process this doesn’t address. This is dealing with the situation now.

Move to Question time

Question from Senator Yao: In previous years stipends could be approved by the E-board alone, but this states that now it has to go to senate as well?

VP MacCormack: Yes.

Question from Senator Corrado: Previously the whole budget is presented to senate, correct? Now this would be subsequent stipends to the already approved budget?

VP MacCormack: The budget is approved around March, this would be dealing with after the appeal process has ended. This could potentially deal with two different senates, but yes its separate approval processes.

Senator Lothrop: Can any additional student associations approve stipends from the cash accounts?

VP MacCormack: Not that I am aware of.

Professor Herman: Very few student organizations even have stipends. It’s the nature of the executive officers here that have created the stipends in the first place. Currently the SGA is the only
on campus organization that gets stipends from the student activity fee. Regarding the cash account I believe that also applies.

- Question from Senator Shaw: So the senate can increase the stipend for the E-board, does this mean Senate only votes on an increase and not a decrease?
- VP MacCormack: Anybody can propose something to senate about a change in stipend and it can’t decrease below the allocated stipend decided in March.
- Point of information by Senator Kisby: In terms of the constitution, what deems the simple majority?
- VP MacCormack: 50% +1.

Move into Debate

- Senator Shaw: Is striking the last line permanent?
  - VP MacCormack: Yes, the last line has been taken out.
- Senator Corrado: The original budget is approved at a different point, so this is in addition to the already approved amount from March.
  - VP MacCormack: Yes.
- Senator Trowbridge: Doesn’t this go against that we can’t put rules on what other senates do since it technically affects a different senate than the original budget was approved by?
  - Professor Herman: Yes, but at any point this year the president can come in and say the stipends are inadequate given by last year’s senate and would have the authority to change that. This would fix that issue.
- President Petrin: I have a concern about the timing of this resolution. It makes a lot of sense and I agree. Just a few weeks ago the senate turned down the Ad-Hoc committee with a budget review that specifically deals with our situation with stipends. I worry that any legislation that gets in the way of that review shouldn’t be done until it’s complete. I feel as if this would be more appropriate after the Ad-Hoc committee is done.
- Point of information by Senator Pett: Questions what the charge of the Ad-Hoc committee is.
- EVP Naraghi: I believe that it is charged with looking at the ways that we can change the stipend process using the new student affairs VP. Inherently the Ad-Hoc review doesn’t affect this year, only the years moving forward.
- Point of information from VP Daly: So this is only dealing with subsequent years?
- EVP Naraghi: Yes, this is only dealing with subsequent years.
- Point of Information by Senator Shaw: If we were to approve a raise would it come out of the cash account?
  - EVP Naraghi: Yes, this is dealing directly with the cash account fundraised money.
  - VP MacCormack: The language currently has the budget account and cash account approval coming out of either. So the Senate has authority over both, but it will almost be out of the cash account.
- Senator Corrado: If we wanted additional money for the budget account would we have to go through the finance board?
  - Yes
  - Comptroller Quijada: I think it’s important for everybody to understand that as it stands the E-board can vote to approve it, yet with this it would be the Senate. It’s a huge step.
Motion by Senator Yao to pass the legislation
Second from Comptroller Quijada
Objection from Senator Pett
Roll Call Vote Taken

Vote:
26 Yay
1 Nay
1 Abstain
Vote passes

Move to Open Discussion
- Parliamentarian D’Angelo: In terms of motioning for a unanimous consent, I’d like to suggest not getting in the habit of using that for more important things like resolutions.
- Senator Lothrop: Is there any timeline on when that Ad-Hoc committee will be presenting their suggestions.
  - President Petrin: 2 weeks left in the charge, so we will get together a presentation by that time.
- Senator Corrado: Can you explain NU Votes a little more and why it relates to senate?
  - President Petrin: NU Votes is essentially designed to increase student participation in the election. I think this is something that goes incredibly undervalued and unnoticed is the impact we can make. The message is to make sure local politicians and decision makers can take all the important steps. I feel like it is important to demonstrate that we are active members in our community. I believe that we speak on behalf of the student body and by doing NU votes it shows that we have a stronger student voice in our community and the community issues. It allows us to be active in not only internal matters but matters that affect our surroundings. We can demonstrate students have an impactful voice in our community.
- Senator Corrado: I’m just curious about the website. Why does it look the way it does?
  - EVP Naraghi: I’ve been working with Senator Tyler and a new work-study to get the website up. Unfortunately our created website was inadequate for IS. We are looking to get more support from IS to protect our website and then we will pass it on to E-board and communications committee to be an easy to update website. It should be up within the next few weeks.
- How should we direct students who are curious about us?
  - EVP Naraghi: Right now the current SGA website has the content, it’s not beautiful, but it’s there. Manuals will get updated soon.
- Senator Moreno: Would SGA be interested in sponsoring a Husky Hunt team?
  - EVP Naraghi: I don’t think SGA would sponsor one, but you can organize one.
- VP Daly: Come talk to me after this meeting to set up a second Husky Hunt team.

Senate adjourned at 8:39pm.
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