Senate Minutes
Student Government Association
Northeastern University
{12/3/2012}

Present: 42
Absent: 2
Excused: 2
Quorum: was met.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

Approval of the Minutes

10 VP Daly moves to make a correction to President Petrin’s address.
   • In the ninth bullet point, the minutes should say, “The Executive Board will review those proposals before they come to the Senate floor, and will hopefully put them into consideration at the next Full Body meeting.”
   • President Petrin approves that this is what the minutes should say to reflect his address.

VP Daly moves to make a correction to her own address.
   • It should say, “Would like to thank Senator Pesaturo for attending the Carnivale meeting.”

VP Daly moves to make a correction to Parliamentarian D’Angelo’s address.
   • It should say, “Over the past few weeks, we have been starting to hear appeals.”
   • Parliamentarian D’Angelo verified this, saying that “We have started to hear Finance Board appeals.”

Minutes will be approved upon correction.

Executive Vice President, Nick Naraghi:
   • Welcome to the last Senate of the semester.
   • We are going to break at 8:45 pm so that people can get food before the dining area closes.
   • All Presentations will have five minutes to present, five minutes for Question Time, and then ten minutes for Debate. The exception to this will be slating, which will be presented first and will have ten minutes to present and twenty minutes for Debate.
   • We, as the Cabinet, would like to reorder the agenda to put Old Business after New Business if there are no objections to that.

Point of Information from VP Daly:
   • Shouldn’t a motion come from the floor to make a change like that?
   • EVP Naraghi says that it does not need a motion. It can be said by the chair.

   With no objections, the Old Business will be reordered until after New Business.

Executive Addresses

President, Pete Petrin:
   • Met with a number of administrators last week about the feasibility and content of the budget priorities survey. Expect this to go live tomorrow. The details will be provided in the December Newsletter. The Executive Board has set a target number of responses at 2500.
Met with a number of student leaders last week to discuss ongoing relief efforts for Hurricane Sandy victims. A group expressed interest in arranging periodic service trips to the region, and if you want to learn more about this, VP Daly and her committee will be the point of contact for that.

Will be presenting with several other student leaders about his experiences and student priorities to the Academic and Student Affairs committees of the Board of Trustees. This has been a goal of the Association for a long time.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of all these agenda items for tonight.

Comptroller, Maya Quijada:
Yields her time

Vice President for Academic Affairs, Kristina Lopez:

- Please pass out the finals study guide locations to your constituents – it can be found on the website.
- Last week, met with the Faculty Senate sub-committee to discuss Academic Integrity. Devised some changes to be presented to Faculty Senate in February, and if those changes are adopted, her committee will be implementing some really cool stuff with that.
- TRACE is open. Fill it out and tell your friends to fill it out. The feedback is very important to the university. There will be prizes.
- TRACE Night will be Thursday, December 6th at 6p.m. There will be giveaways, and Senator Manson will be Paws.
- Check out the TRACE thermometers on the windows of the ground floor of Curry for the intercollege competition. DMSB currently leads, and the university total is 19%.
- Committee will be meeting Wednesday at 6pm in the conference room.

Vice President for Student Affairs – Nicole Daly

- An email went out regarding the vandalism of the menorah. This Thursday, Student Affairs has organized a community vigil from 4-5 p.m. in Krentzman Quad.
- NUStarts has elected their executive board, one of which is Senator Galli. They will be organizing a welcome back event for NUin Students on January 3rd.
- Chris McGill, the director of Fraternity and Sorority Life and Leadership, has resigned. She was a huge asset to Northeastern University and especially SGA. Please join the Executive Board in thanking her during her last week.
- Good luck to everyone next semester.

Vice President for Student Involvement – Kate Chandley

- We have a survey going out on Student Voice about 240 Curry. Will be live starting on Thursday. Please publicize it. It will be open until January 3rd.
- Working on finalizing who will be cochairing the leadership councils. Working with Jason Foster on this.
- MEISA has changed their name; they are now the Live Music Association (LMA). It was out of necessity because the national organization has gotten rid of their college affiliation.

Vice President for Student Services – Terry MacCormack

- Had a productive committee meeting in which they discussed further recycling initiatives.
- Swipe Card Printing in Curry has been installed. If you want to utilize that, all you need to do is download the remote print driver, which is available on MyNEU.
- Had a Food Advisory Board meeting where they had a good conversation about Rebecca’s.
• Have a YMCA community meeting tomorrow. The YMCA residents are dealing with issues related to demolition in the area. Senator Donati and Student-at-Large Gaffney will be accompanying tomorrow.
• Thank you to Senators Donati, Napolitano, and Carroll for working on the NUPD survey. Will be sending that out next survey talking about different types of alerts that students get from NUPD.
• Will have last committee tomorrow and will go over some priorities before we head into the next semester.

Chief Of Staff – Noah Carville
• If you came in late, please come see me because absence will result in removal from the roster.
• The Holiday Party is on Wednesday. If you plan on going, please fill out the form on OrgSync. We will be leaving from here at 6:30.
• If you will not be here next semester, please email me and request to be on the inactive roster.
• The printer is broken again.

Executive Director of Communications – Caitlin Rogers
• The Newsletter is scheduled to go out tomorrow.
• We are shooting the NUin welcome video on Thursday.
• Because this is our last Senate, I want to recognize Senators Hwang and Desser because they will not be there next semester.

Senate moves to Special Addresses

Parliamentarian - Olivia D'Angelo
• The OAB met and we talked about making changes to our procedure for next semester. Will talk about that in more detail later.

Elections Committee Chair – Julia Patten

Yields her time.

Senate moves to Question Time
• VP Daly asks if anyone other than DMSB has ever won the TRACE competition.
  o VP Lopez says no.
• Senator Lothrop asks Chief of Staff Carville when the Holiday Party was first booked for Wednesday.
  o Chief of Staff Carville notes that he has been saying it in his executive address every week for the past three weeks.
  o Senator Lothrop notes that this adversely affects Finance Board because Finance Board meets on Wednesday nights.
  o Chief of Staff Carville says that this night was picked because it was the night before Reading Day. He announced it tentatively to get approval and encouraged anyone to come and see him if they had any objections.
Senate moves to New Business

Senator of the Month – November

Senator of the Month for November is presented by VP Chandley:

- This person is a wonderful member of the Student Involvement Board. Always willing to take on other organizations and new projects. Senator of the Month goes to Senator Eide.

Senator of the Semester – Fall 2012

Senator of the Semester is presented by EDOC Rogers.

- Very impressed with her willingness to take on projects and engage students in outreach. Excited to give Senator of the Semester to Senator Brown.

Presentation of the Direct Elections Manual

EVP Naraghi: We will be doing this section by section. Each section will be presented, then we will move into Question Time on that section, and then we will move into Debate on that section. After every section has been presented, we will vote on the Direct Elections Manual as a whole. The first section will be slating.

Elections Committee Chair Patten presents the manual.

- Wants to thank the six members of the Elections Committee.

Elections Committee Chair Patten and Senator Yao present Section 2 on Slating.

- This section needs to go first because all of the other changes to the manual depend on it. It is very important.

Before proceeding any further, Elections Committee Chair Patten moves to put the Direct Elections Manual on the floor. This is seconded by Senator Yao.

Elections Committee Chair Patten resumed Presentation of Slating.

- **Section 2** of the manual makes Slating mandatory. Edited Section 2.1 to say that candidates for president and vice-president must share a slate. Slating has never been mandatory before, but we did a lot of research into this and decided to implement slating.

- To continue on with Section 2.2, we edited this to say that voters must cast a ballot for exactly one slate or for no confidence. They may not vote for candidates from two or more different slates.

- Section 2.3 was edited to say that each slate must fill out a slate declaration form. We stuck with this because it is on the form. The slate declaration form will be approved by a simple majority vote of the elections committee. They must be approved at least one hour prior to the candidate’s briefing.

- Section 2.3.1 reads that “The slate declaration form may be rejected by a simple majority vote of the elections committee for the following reasons: 1. A slate name is deemed inappropriate. 2. Copyright infringement. 3. An individual on the slate declaration form is not a candidate. 4. A slate declaration form is incomplete.”

- Section 2.3.1.1 reads that “A slate declaration form can be rejected for any reason with a two-thirds vote of the elections committee.

Senate moves into Question Time on Section 2 of the Direct Elections Manual.
• Senator Pett asks what the intent was behind the timing of approving slate declaration forms relative to the candidate’s briefing
  o Elections Committee Chair Patten says we wanted it to be an hour before the candidate’s briefing. My committee will be available at that time, and if there is an issue, we will know ahead of time.
• Comptroller Quijada asks if you have concerns that a slate declaration form will be denied for illegitimate reasons? Do you think that the clause in Section 2.3.1.1 is a lot of power to give to the committee?
  o Senator Yao says that we do not believe it will be an issue, but the E-board made that change. It was not based on any rationale of our committee.
  o Elections Committee Chair Patten follows up, saying that what we originally had was “extenuating circumstances,” but E-board edited it to say “for any reasons approved by two-thirds of the elections committee.” The sentiment behind that is that two-thirds of the committee is not going to approve something for a ridiculous reason.

Senate moves into Debate on Section 2 of the Direct Elections Manual.

• EVP Naraghi: We will only have the opportunity to talk about this section specifically now because, at the end of the Presentation, we will be debating the Direct Elections Manual as a whole.
• Parliamentarian D’Angelo clarifies that it does not matter what the Direct Elections Manual used to say. It only matters what is on the floor now. It does not matter if there are editorial edits that the E-board made; we are only discussing what is on the floor now.
• Senator Pett states that it might be a good idea to clarify that, if a slate declaration form is rejected, candidates may resubmit before the deadline. That might be beneficial to candidates.
  o Senator Pett moves to amend the legislation. Section 2.3.2 is amended to say, “If a slate declaration form is rejected, the potential slate will have the opportunity to resubmit the form and be subject to the same deadline for submission.” VP Daly seconds this amendment.
  o The amendment is considered friendly, and is therefore adopted.
• Comptroller Quijada asks if the rationale for rejection required to be submitted to the candidates if their declaration form is rejected? I think this is very important if you are giving the committee such power over the candidates to reject their declaration form for any reason.
  o Senator Yao responds that all rationale should be conveyed to the candidates.
  o Elections Committee Chair Patten stated that her committee originally wanted to provide a report to the candidates with what was wrong with their declaration form. That is not technically reflected in the rules right now, but an amendment to that effect would be considered friendly.
    ▪ VP Daly moves to add to Section 2.1.3.4.1, after “slate declaration form may be rejected for any reason by a two-thirds vote by the elections committee,” “The elections committee will be required to submit their rationale in writing to the candidates.”
    ▪ Elections Committee Chair Patten says that this should fall in section 2.1.3.5 instead.
    ▪ VP Daly accepts this change.
• Senate Yu asks, based on section 2.3.2, if someone submits their slate declaration form ten minutes before the deadline, and then it is rejected, what happens to them? Are they allowed to apply?
• Point of Parliamentary Inquiry from Senator Pett: Are we in Question Time or Debate?
• EVP Naraghi: We are in Debate. But given that people are unfamiliar with slating, I have been lenient.
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• Elections Committee Chair Patten states that the goal is to be able to fix any problems by having the declaration forms due one hour before the candidate's briefing.

• Professor Herman corroborates this and states that there is always going to be a point beyond which submission is impossible. The earlier you submit, the earlier you get feedback.

• Comptroller Quijada states that she feels uncomfortable with the section that allows the elections committee to deny a declaration for any reason as long as they have a two-thirds majority. She thinks the language does not seem right unless there is a list of reasons.

• Point of information from Elections Committee Chair Patten: Am I allowed to yield to E-board because they are the ones that made that change? I am unsure of the rationale behind it.
  
  o Parliamentarian D'Angelo states that you are presenting the changes that are up here. It does not matter where they came from.
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• VP Chandley states that, in response to a previous speaker’s concern, in the Student Organization Approval and Revision Manual, the Student Involvement Board reserves the right to deny organizations for specific reasons, but it says, “including, but not limited to.” It does not say “for any reason,” but it leaves that idea. This is a similar situation. By leaving this open, the elections committee can reject something that was not expected. She thinks that they address it well by making it a two-thirds majority instead of a simple majority so that if something is controversial, you need to have support for it.

• Senator Corrado asks what the rationale is behind not making the slate declaration forms rejected by a two-thirds majority for the other, explicit reasons?
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• Elections Committee Chair Patten yields her time to President Petrin
  
  o President Petrin states that, in this instance, there is significant content that would override the candidacy of the entire slate.

• Senator Corrado asks if there is a reason that a two-thirds majority would severely hinder the elections committee in the outlined reasons, and therefore could we change the requirements so that all rejections need a two-thirds majority?

• Professor Herman states that the normal reason for making this kind of differentiation is that when you state reasons, you are giving all slates adequate notice that if they break the rules, they will be rejected. Therefore, you have a lower threshold.
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• VP MacCormack wants to bring up that requiring candidates to run on one slate limits the amount of Debate you can have about an individual’s position and how it differs from their running-mate’s. President versus Executive Vice President. An argument could be made that having them run separately could help those positions because they are very new. Wants to see if the Senate has opinions on that.

• Comptroller Quijada states that, to speak to a previous speaker, if you look through the requirements of EVP, I don’t think that constitutes a platform for a direct election. It is a lot of administrative things and being a neutral chair of Senate. While those are great qualities to recognize in an EVP, it makes it very hard for them to run by themselves without stepping into the territory of the grander ideas of what our president should be working on. I am not on the elections committee, but I think that is a huge part of the rationale behind having slates run together.
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• VP Daly states that, although I understand the sentiments of the elections committee and the research and thought they put into this decision, I do not believe in slates because I believe it creates a polarizing organization. In this organization, everyone has to work together to get things done. And in order to have two slates, that severely hinders our success in the following year. So I am against slating in general.
• Comptroller Quijada states that, no matter what, you will always have multiple candidates running against each other. That does not mean it has to be polarizing. It is just a matter of who the student body feels expresses their position.

• VP MacCormack states that the position of EVP has not been developed a lot, and a campaign waged on the separate set of issues facing the EVP could be helpful for the student body.

• Comptroller Quijada yields to Elections Committee Member Nelson.
  o Elections Committee Member Anastasia Nelson states that, in response to a previous speaker, the elections committee put a lot of thought into that point of solving the position of EVP. It is something we want to look into. We wanted to put it on a slate because we think that the EVP can stand on the slate. The President and EVP have to work very closely together, and we thought that this would be a good way for that relationship to develop.

• Senator Pesaturo’s comment is inaudible.

• Senator Moreno echoes the sentiments of the previous speaker.

Comptroller Quijada moves to extend Debate by five minutes. There is a second from VP Daly. With no objections, Debate is extended by five minutes.

• Senator Corrado asks a point of information: under Slates, in Section 2.1, what was the previous language about sharing a slate?
  o Elections Committee Chair Patten states that the manual used to say that candidates “may” share a slate. But no one wanted it to be that way anymore, so the sentiment was either to accept slating or take it away completely. So we did a lot of research, did debriefs, held an open forum. My committee felt that it was most advantageous to do slating. We felt it was a better option and that it was more consistent, so we decided to eliminate the option and make it mandatory.

• President Petrin states that he thinks it is interesting that the conversation has revolved around the concept of having these positions run independently providing more opportunity for the positions to develop. I would argue just the opposite. When candidates run together, you force them to have a conversation about what the relationship will be as President and EVP to make sure you are creating a more effective Association. So I think this better facilitates the formation of these positions than having candidates run independently.

• Comptroller Quijada yields to Elections Committee Member Rynowecer.
  o Elections Committee Member Rynowecer wants to echo what President Petrin said. Forcing people to get on a slate will ensure that people have already worked together and talked together. It will allow them to hit the ground running instead of having a long adjustment period.

• VP Daly states that, internal dynamics aside, having a slate does not put the best candidate for President and Executive Vice President up for that position.

• Comptroller Quijada yields to Elections Committee Member Rynowecer.
  o Elections Committee Member Rynowecer states that slating allows the association to start with its best foot forward because it encourages candidates to work together and get to work right off the bat.

• Senator Corrado would be interested to hear the opinions of anyone who may have held an elected position before slating was implemented.

• Point of Order from Elections Committee Chair Patten: Could you make sure that individual stories are not used as factual evidence.
  o EVP Naraghi: That is not a point of order.

• Point of Information from Senator Eide
Senator Eide asks the elections chair what methodology was used to determine that slating was the best method of selecting President and Executive Vice President.

Elections Committee Chair Patten states that I had a debrief this summer with candidates. I reached out to campaign workers and as many people as she could that were involved in campaigns last year. I compiled emails and responses. Reached out to President Petrin and EVP Naraghi, as well as past-President Sabo. I had an open forum on slating where we heard what people had to say. My committee has spent hours in committee analyzing the information that we had collected. We reviewed what happened in the open forum. We invited people to come into the committee meeting for open discussion. My committee unanimously decided to implement slating.

Senator Pett moves to extend Debate to the end of a speaker’s list. There is a second from VP Daly. With no objections, the speaker’s list is implemented.

- Senator Pett states: I was the last person to serve in the position of EVP before it became directly elected. Because I was not directly elected and President Sabo was, I did not know that he was going to be the Student Body President. However, I feel that we were able to work together very well, and I disagree with the point that the only way to have candidates work together is to have them run on a slate. I am not for or against slates – I just want it to be either/or. And I take some personal offense to the statement that the position of EVP has not been flushed out. You might think that if you just look at the constitution, but if you talked to myself or EVP Naraghi, you would find that is not the case. The position is much more complicated than just chairing Senate. It is a disservice to the people that served before us to say that.

- Comptroller Quijada yields to Elections Committee Member Rynowecer.

  - Elections Committee Member Rynowecer states: I just want to reiterate that what people need to think about here is that having slates will ensure that we will have competent leadership where relationships are already established. Think about that and how that will affect the student body going forward.

- Senator Moreno states: I second the previous speaker’s sentiments.

- Senator Strawbridge states: I think this is a unique opportunity to have slates. The best way to represent all students is to have the people running understanding what their constituents stand for. And when you have two people running on a slate, you have the opportunity to share your vision better than if you were just one person.

- Senator Harris states: I think making President and EVP run separately will help create a better connection between the two than just having you and your friend want to run. It gives you room for healthy argument between the two. By running separately, you help the positions.

Debate on Section 2 is now closed.

Elections Committee Chair Patten and Elections Committee Member Nelson will now present Section 1 of the Direct Elections Manual.

Elections Committee Member Nelson states:

- Only a few changes were made in this section. We changed section 1.1 to include “and slate declaration forms.”

- For section 1.2.1 we added a point saying that a nomination shall be considered void if the form is not submitted to and approved by the elections committee at least one hour prior to the candidate’s briefing.

Question Time for Section 1
There were no questions for Section 1.

Debate on Section 1

There were no points of Debate for Section 1.

Section 1 is closed.

Elections Committee Chair Patten and Elections Committee Vice-chair Conati

Section 3 of the Direct Elections Manual is presented by Elections Committee Vice-chair Donati.

- The only change is found in Section 3.2, which was made its own section in 3.5.

Question Time on Section 3

- VP MacCormack asks: Do you think that section 3.5 is enforceable?

- Elections Committee Chair Patten yields that question to VP MacCormack because E-board made the new section.

- Point of Order from Senator Shaw: You cannot redirect a question back to someone to have them answer it themselves.
  - EVP Naraghi: To clarify, you can yield to whomever you like, but they do not have to accept your yield.
  - Professor Herman: Technically, all questions are made to the chair, not to the presenter.

- Point of Information from VP MacCormack: The language that is the new section 3.5, was that not already in the manual and simply moved?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: Yes that is correct.

- VP MacCormack asks: Then I will ask my same question again. I am asking about the language in general, not necessarily about the placement of it. Do you think the language is enforceable?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: This should happen during the candidate’s briefing. I believe that it is enforceable if it is happening in the briefing since my entire committee will be here and they should be letting people know. For campaign workers that do not attend, it would just be stipulated to them that they must do it. If candidates have not done that, the candidates are still responsible for their own campaign workers.

- Senator Pett asks: Are campaign workers held responsible for the manual whether or not that provision is in place?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: Yes. That is correct. Part of the reason it was here before is that candidates must rely this information after the briefing. I cannot speak as to why it was pulled down. But originally, this was in place to reiterate that this is something that should be done at the beginning of the campaigning process.

- Senator Corrado asks: Are you going to make the candidates do some sort of oath, or are you just hoping that the candidates will tell their workers?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: One campaign worker from each campaign must attend, so they will be part of the candidate’s briefing. I yield to Parliamentarian D’Angelo.

- Parliamentarian D’Angelo notes: Speaking as a past elections chair, in the past, there has been a signature requirement, but it was decided that there was no way this could be considered binding. Therefore, the past elections committee did not find a use for it.

- VP MacCormack asks: Do you think that this language is just opening ourselves up to the filing of grievances?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: I think it is important to have it in here. No matter if the candidate relayed this information or not, all campaign workers are responsible to maintain
this manual. The candidate will be found responsible for the campaign workers. It is important to relay this in the candidate’s briefing because it is the kick-off to the start of the campaigning season. I think it is important to have it in here because it will lead to grievances if it is not in here.

- **Point of Information from Senator Shaw:** Does this necessarily make the candidate at fault even if the campaign worker worked against the wishes and instruction of the candidate?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: That comes up in a different section, campaign rules. We will get to it then. I will say that all of the campaign workers are responsible for adhering to these rules.

- Senator Corrado asks: Do you feel it explicitly necessary to have this sentence if you are not making it mandatory for all campaign workers to attend the candidate’s briefing?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: I think it is important to reiterate that candidates are responsible for telling their campaign workers.

- VP Chandley asks: Does it make sense, though, for it to be physically in this section, or rather somewhere else in the manual, considering it is not necessarily something that will happen in the candidate’s briefing.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: I think it is important to have it in this section. This is when the candidates are becoming familiar with the material, so I think it is important to reiterate the fact that all campaign workers are responsible for this information. All of them will be held responsible at the end of the day.

- Senator Corrado asks: Since it says that it is the candidate’s responsibility to tell all campaign workers, how would you feel about it being the chair’s responsibility to advise all workers?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: I don’t think that is even possible. We do not have a disclosed list of campaign workers anymore. Also, if a candidate wants to bring his or her entire campaign to the debrief, that is completely okay. I can then inform all of them right then.

Senator Corrado moves to extend Question Time on Section 3 to the end of a speaker’s list. Second from Senator Shaw. With no objections, the speaker’s list is implemented.

- Senator Corrado does not understand why section 5 is in the briefing section if the advising of all individuals will not go on at the briefing.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: From my understanding, it was there as an educative tool to educate the candidates. It is there to display the fact that it is not just the candidates that need to know and understand the manual; the campaign workers must do this as well. I cannot speak to why this was made its own section. I yield to President Petrin to explain the reasoning behind that.
    - President Petrin: That component was seen as a separate step of 3.2. 3.2 was about educating the candidates, and this is something different. This is about the candidates educating the people they work with.

- VP MacCormack: If the list of campaign workers is so free-flowing, do you think it makes sense to have this at the candidate’s briefing where not everyone will necessarily be there?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: I think it is important to keep this here because it is important for the candidates to know that their campaign workers are responsible for knowing the manual. I know it is not possible to get everyone here, and I cannot personally inform every campaign worker, but I would hate to have this taken out and have candidates think that they are not responsible for telling their campaign workers about this manual. This could open the door to a lot of misguided campaigning activities.
Senate Shaw: Is a worker from each candidate's campaign or each slate's campaign required to attend the candidate's briefing? Is a slate itself one single campaign?

Elections Committee Chair Patten: Slates will be sharing a campaign. Pete Petrin and Nick Naraghi ran on one platform and campaigned on one campaign. So each slate would have one worker – not each candidate.

Senator Pett: Isn't this clause just stating that the candidates must inform the campaign workers about the manual; that doesn't necessarily make it true?

Elections Committee Chair Patten: From my understanding, it is in this section because this is where the information is being given out. It is adding responsibility to the candidates, and I think it is important for the candidates to relay this information.

Senate moves into Debate.

VP MacCormack moves to strike Section 3.5 from the elections manual. Second from VP Chandley. This is not deemed as friendly by Elections Committee Chair Patten.

Senate moves into Debate on VP MacCormack's motion.

Point of Order from Parliamentarian D'Angelo: Make sure that the people making motions are senators.

With that in mind, there is an objection to this motion from Senator Galli.

VP MacCormack: I think that any extra language that is in the manual that is unenforceable opens the door to a grievance. It would be better to cut down on paperwork that is not enforceable. Furthermore, the language binding the campaign workers to follow the manual is already in the manual, in the sanctions section.

Senator Corrado: I agree with a few previous sentiments. I do not think this statement belongs in this section, but I do believe there is a place to say something like this, that there are rules about the campaign. If campaign workers are not going to be at the briefing, then it belongs elsewhere.

Senator Trowbridge: I believe this is the perfect place for this statement because candidates need to be told up front.Candidates need to hold their campaign workers and themselves to this manual, and I think the candidate's briefing is the ideal place for this to happen. I think it needs to be put in this section so that the candidates are told up front. I could even favor this being amended to say that candidates must sign something saying that they will inform their workers.

Senator Lothrop: It seems like so many of the previous speakers are trying to make this into a weaker manual than the one we have before us. The point of the manual is to educate the candidates and students who want to run with guidelines on how to do so, and also to give the committee checks that protect themselves in the event of a disagreement. The whole point of having something written is that it is explicitly enforceable. By taking this out, you cannot enforce this. With it on paper, it can be enforced.

Point of Information from Elections Committee Chair Patten: Can I be yielded to at this time?

Parliamentarian D'Angelo: Yes.

Senator Pett: Whether this provision is in the manual or not, candidates and campaign workers are still responsible for knowing and following the manual. I'm going to go out on a limb and guess that Elections Chair Patten will tell candidates that at the candidate's briefing regardless of what the manual says. This specific provision does not to tell campaign workers to follow the manual; it...
simply tells candidates to tell their campaign workers to follow the manual. If there is a grievance filed against a campaign worker, you can still hold it against them without this being in the manual.

- Senator Yao: This point was to remove the excuse of ignorance from the candidates so that candidates cannot say they did not know they were supposed to tell their workers the rules. That was made explicitly clear here.

Comptroller Quijada moves to extend Debate by five minutes. Second from Senator Donati. With no objection, Debate is extended by five minutes.

Comptroller Quijada yields to Elections Committee Chair Patten.

- Elections Committee Chair Patten: I do not think this should be its own point. I think it should have stayed where it was originally. Why it was moved to its own point, I cannot testify to. I was not given a reason as to why. And I don’t think it should stay as its own point.

- Senator Lothrop: Whether or not the point says that the campaign workers have to follow what the manual says, it protects the candidates who are running. Because by saying that the candidate has advised all the people working on his campaign, if someone chooses to go against that, then when it comes to an appeal, it can be said that the campaign worker went against what they were told, despite being advised by Elections Committee Chair Patten during the briefing and despite what the candidate told them.

Point of Information from VP MacCormack: What is the definition of a campaign worker?

- EVP Naraghi: A campaign worker is defined as a person who supplies work or dedicates energy with the goal of electing a particular candidate at the behest or knowledge of the candidate. A campaign worker cannot be a voting member of the elections committee.

- Senator Moreno: I think this is something that can be dealt with by the candidate simply telling the campaign workers to follow the rules.

Point of Parliamentary Inquiry from Senator Pett: Based on the definition of a campaign worker, once someone is working at the behest of a candidate, aren't all of their actions the responsibility of the candidate – even if each specific activity is not approved by the candidate?

- EVP Naraghi: Yes.

- President Petrin: I think the purpose of this point is meant to be educational, and I think on one side we are worried about campaign workers violating the manual and on the other side we are worried about eliminating superfluous redundancies. And I think that if we changed “required” to “encouraged” we would appease both sides.

Senate moves into a placard vote on VP MacCormack’s motion.

This motion fails.

President Petrin moves to amend Section 3.5 to state “Candidates are expected to advise all individuals assisting with their campaign to adhere to this manual.” This motion is deemed friendly by Elections Committee Chair Patten. Therefore, it is adopted.

Section 3 of the Direct Elections Manual is closed.
Elections Committee Chair Patten will now present Section 4 of the Direct Elections Manual.

- The first edit we made was to Section 4.1. We said, “The campaign period will commence at midnight following the candidate’s briefing.” We wanted to clarify when the campaign period would actually begin.
- The second change we made was an editorial change in Section 4.2. Originally worded, it was confusing. Before, it seemed like campaigns could distribute materials upon request, but we made it clear that it was just the candidates getting the materials ready for campaigning.
- Section 2, “including but not limited to digital media,” was struck because it was unnecessary. It was repetitive.

Senate moves into Quest Time on Section 4

- VP MacCormack: Just to clarify, are campaign-related materials defined in the glossary?
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten: Yes.

Senate moves into Debate on Section 4

- VP Daly: I really like the revisions that were made to this section. I know the candidates ran into trouble last year determining what was acceptable to say before and during the campaign period, and I think that was clarified here.

Section 4 of the Direct Elections Manual is now closed.

The Senate will now recess for 15 minutes to get food at 8:30 p.m. Senate will resume at 8:45 p.m.

EVP Naraghi called the meeting back to order at 8:50 p.m.

Point of Information from VP MacCormack, asking to clarify what Points of Information, Parliamentary Inquiry, and Order are.

The Senate moved into Presentation on Section 5 of the Direct Elections Manual, presented by Elections Committee Chair Patten and Elections Committee Member Rynowecer.

There are no new edits to present for this section.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Section 5 of the Direct Elections Manual.

- Senator Corrado asked where the money for Direct Elections comes from.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten yields to EVP Naraghi.
    - EVP Naraghi answered that Direct Election Fund was created by a one-time donation from President Curry. From conversations with Student Affairs, they are willing to fund direct elections since they were expanded to include the EVP, and that a change from $500 per candidate to $1000 per slate should not be a problem to them.
- Senator Corrado asked what changes to campaigns the Elections Committee would expect with the increase in money.
Elections Committee Member Rynowecer answered that campaigns should be able to purchase the same things from previous years, and the extra $500 will allow them to be more creative in reaching the student body with their promotions.

Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that since the 20% voter turnout minimum has not been easily reached in the past, the additional funds will allow for increased visibility and a better chance of reaching this minimum.

- Senator Harris: Could you give an example of something the $1000 might be spent on?
  - Elections Committee Member Rynowecer answered that the additional funds are designed to give the candidates a lot more leeway with campaign spending, since they have been restricted in the past and will now hopefully be able to come up with out-of-the-box methods of promotion.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that candidates do not need to spend all of the money given to them, and that the amount of money would be the same for two slates as four candidates running in the current system.

- Senator Shaw asked if "pending reports" in point 6 was actually supposed to be "spending reports" or if there was a difference.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that the committee believes it was a mistake and was fixing it editorially.

The Senate moved into Debate on Section 5 of the Direct Elections Manual: Campaign Finance.

- Senator Corrado: Whoever brings this change to Student Affairs should make sure to explain the reasoning behind it and that it isn't really an increase from previous years.

- Point of Parliamentary Inquiry from Elections Committee Chair Patten, asking what would happen if this change was not approved by Student Affairs.
  - EVP Naraghi answered that if the decision was not approved by Student Affairs, it would be returned to the Senate in the spring to vote on what to do.

- Point of Information from Elections Committee Chair Patten, asking if the money given to candidates can only be used for the candidates, and not anything else.
  - EVP Naraghi answered that money given to candidates can only be used by those candidates for the purposes of their campaign, and any money that is unused will be returned to Student Affairs or the Direct Elections Fund.

- Elections Committee Chair Patten said that the Elections Committee as a whole felt that the increase in finances will enable campaigns to reach a much larger portion of the student body and get a higher voter turnout overall.

- Senator Galli yields her time to Elections Committee Member Rynowecer.
  - Elections Committee Member Rynowecer said that it isn’t fair to say the current amount of money is adequate when we’ve missed the required number for the last few years.

- Senator Lothrop said that he doesn’t really see a downside, because the money is coming from Student Affairs, not directly from the student body. You could argue that giving candidates more money that they need is irresponsible, but in this situation it is not the Senate's responsibility to decide that.
• Point of Information from Elections Committee Chair Patten, asking what the original purpose of the money in the Direct Elections Fund was.
  o EVP Naraghi answered that the original donation was made to the Direct Elections Fund for the purpose of direct elections, and subsequent money will be given by Student Affairs to sustain direct elections.

680 • Point of Information from Senator Shaw, asking how much money is currently in the Direct Elections Fund.
  o EVP Naraghi answered that two years ago, there was less than a few thousand dollars left in the fund. Clarifying, less than ten thousand.

• Point of Information from Senator Trowbridge, asking about Campaign Fundraising.
  o EVP Naraghi answered that there is no way to raise funds, and that has been looked at by the Elections Committee. The issue is that it could possibly put in jeopardy the non-profit status of the University.

690 • Point of Information from Senator Eide, asking why Student Affairs was not consulted before increasing the amount from $500 to $1000.
  o President Petrin said that the Executive Cabinet wanted to discuss this change with Student Affairs, but did not get the chance to before this Senate meeting. It is something that will be address promptly after this meeting, regardless of the outcome.

• Comptroller Quijada said she would be interested to hear about a list of expenses from a previous candidate.

• VP MacCormack said he spent $250 on club cards, and also spent money on purchasing a domain name, web hosting, and chalk. Most of the money went towards club cards.

700 • Senator Pesaturo said that $1000 is a lot of money, and that elections have been run with less money in the past.

• Point of Information from Senator Kline, asking what a club card is.
  o EVP Naraghi answered that a club card is a 5"x7" card with information on both sides that can be passed out by candidates.

• Senator Strawbridge said that from previous experience on a campaign, being able to double the size of your budget can have a huge impact, allowing more information to be passed out and reaching more people.

710 • Senator Yu said that it is the goal of the EVP and President to act as a liaison to the student body, and therefore must be able to reach as many students as possible.

• Senator Brown said that it would be more responsible if we didn't increase directly from $500 to $1000, but instead increase half way or something similar, and then promoting the election as a whole more rather than a certain candidate.

Motion from Senator Donati to extend Debate by five minutes.
Second from Senator Trowbridge.
With no objections, the motion passes.

720 • Senator Trowbridge said he agrees, and thinks that it would be helpful if SGA promoted the election as a whole to the student body.
Senator Donati yields her time to Elections Committee Chair Patten.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten said that she the Elections Committee does promote the election the student body, and has a budget for doing so. Also, the move to $1000 is not a change in the amount of money, only a change to reflect the requirement of slates this year. Direct elections have been a struggle in the past, and many people who have been involved feel that the struggle is due to the monetary constraint.

Senator Corrado said she is concerned that there is not enough money in the Direct Elections Fund to fund $2000 for this upcoming election.

Point of Parliamentary Inquiry from Elections Committee Chair Patten, asking what would happen if there was not enough money to fund the election within the parameters of the Direct Elections Manual.
  - EVP Naraghi answered that there is no money that can come from nowhere, so in that situation, the decision would be returned to the Senate.

Senator Lothrop said that much of the money that has been spent in past years hasn't gotten the candidates enough promotion with the student body. Many constituents and friends have no idea who Pete and Nick are, even though they campaigned and spent lots of money last year. If we haven't hit the mark year after year, then clearly something is wrong and needs to change.

Point of Information from VP Daly, asking if there was any research done into elections budgets at other Universities.
  - EVP Naraghi answered that there was research done on the matter.

Motion from Comptroller Quijada to extend Debate by three minutes.
Second from Senator Shaw.
With no objections, the motion passes.

Motion from President Petrin to amend "$1000" to "$750".
Second from VP Chandley.
Objection from Senator Lothrop.
The Senate moved into Debate on the motion.

President Petrin said that to address the issue of raising the amount without vetting it with Student Affairs, $1500 was the combined amount allotted to candidates last year - four candidates, two individual candidates and one slate of two candidates. This year, if the same amount of candidates ran, it would be the same amount with this change, but would also allow for some additional flexibility. Last year, the slate outspent each of the individual candidates, so this is a compromise that doesn't change the current structure.

Senator Moreno said that he doesn't think the additional money would have that big of an effect on the student body, especially since it would be coming from student tuition money.

Senator Yao said that in order to be most effective, we must make the whole jump to $1000 instead of going only half way to $750. For example, if you only took half of your medication, you would still be sick. You have to take the whole thing, just like we have to increase the whole way to $1000.

Comptroller Quijada said that as long as candidates do not have enough money to achieve their potential in reaching out to the student body, we are wasting any money that we give them. If we give candidates $1000 and they are able to fully reach out to students, and maybe don't spend all the
money, that's great. But if we give them $750 and it still isn't enough, then it will have been a huge waste of money.

- Senator Trowbridge said that speakers are ignoring the fact that this is not a raise at all, it is only reflecting the change from individual candidates to two-person slates. Also, $1000 is $1000 whether is for two individual candidates or a slate of two candidates.

- Senator Trowbridge yields his time to Elections Committee Chair Patten.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten said that it is a raise because two candidates sharing one platform will now get $1000 dollars as opposed to those two candidates only get $500 dollars.

780
Motion from Senator Corrado to Call the Question.
Second from Senator Moreno.
Objection from Comptroller Quijada.
With a placard vote, the motion passes.

The Senate moved into a vote on the amendment.
With a placard vote, the motion fails.

Motion to from VP MacCormack to close Debate on Section 5.
Second from Chief of Staff Carville.
With no objection, the motion passes.

790
The Senate moved into Presentation of Section 6 of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Section 6 of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no questions for this section.

The Senate moved into Debate on Section 6 of the Direct Elections Manual.

800
There were no points of debate for this section.

The Senate moved into Presentation of Section 7 of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Section 7 of the Direct Elections Manual.

- Senator Shaw asked for clarification on the difference between private and public events and which candidates can speak at them.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that the Committee wanted candidates to be able to speak to student groups more freely, as this has been an issue in the past. The idea is to make sure candidates are able to talk to as many students as possible without worrying about other issues like candidates' schedules and so on.

810
- Senator Shaw asked if speaking engagements only include public Debates and private events.
  - Senator Yao answered that private events cover everything that the Elections Committee does not declare a public Debate.
820  • Senator Shaw asked if a private event has to be set up by a student group that is officially recognized by the University.
   o Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that the event does not necessarily need to be set up by a student group recognized by the University, it could just be a group of students.

830  • Point of Information from VP Daly, asking why the section says "officially recognized student groups".
   o Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that because of incidents last year, the purpose of the change was to clarify that those events are not public forums by default. Making it so officially recognized student groups were the only ones that could do it was not their intent, we just wanted to clarify that they have the ability to do it.

The Senate moved into Debate on Section 7 of the Direct Elections Manual.

840  • Motion from Senator Galli to amend Section 7.3.2 to read "student groups officially recognized by the Office of Campus Activities and/or students at large".
   o The motion was deemed friendly.

  • Senator Pett said the way Section 7.3.1.1 currently reads is that those are the only people that can declare a Debate public before the start of the event, but does not specify what can happen after that.

  • Motion from Senator Pett to amend Section 7.3.1.1 to read after the original sentence, "A public Debate can only be declared a public Debate prior to the start of the event."
   o The motion was deemed friendly.

  • Motion from VP Chandley to amend Section 7.3.2 to read "student organization".
   o The motion was deemed friendly.

The Senate moved into Presentation of Section 8 of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Section 8 of the Direct Elections Manual.

850  • Senator Shaw asked if it was stated in the Elections Manual that a candidate cannot be standing over the shoulder of a voter.
   o Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that it is specified in Section 6.6 that candidates may not directly facilitate voting.

860  • Senator Strawbridge asked for clarification on what facilitating voting meant.
   o Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that candidates cannot bring a laptop to voters to vote, or intimidate them into voting.

  • Senator Strawbridge asked if you can encourage voters to vote.
   o Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that you can hand out fliers to voters, but can't do anything that would prevent another candidate from having a fair chance to talk to that voter.

  • VP MacCormack asked if the glossary defines directly facilitating voting.
The Senate moved into Debate on the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no points of debate for this section.

The Senate moved into Presentation of Section 9 of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Section 9 of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no questions for this section.

The Senate moved into Debate on Section 9 of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Presentation of grievance form appendix of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on grievance form appendix of the Direct Elections Manual.

- Senator Nagy asked if filed grievances are public.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that grievance hearings are public and chaired by her, though deliberation occurs in Executive Session of the Elections Committee.

The Senate moved into Debate on grievance form appendix of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no points for debate.

The Senate moved into Presentation of Appendix A of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Appendix A of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no questions on this section.

The Senate moved into Debate on Appendix A of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no points of debate.

The Senate moved into Presentation of Section 10 of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Section 10 of the Direct Elections Manual.

- President Petrin asked if in a situation where a slate is found responsible for a grievance, is it required that sanctions are given to that slate.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that it has not been the case in the past, and will remain that way.

The Senate moved into Debate on Section 10 of the Direct Elections Manual.

- VP MacCormack said that Section 10.8 and its subsection were contradictory and should be changed.
• Motion from VP MacCormack to amend Section 10.8 to read "if multiple violations are brought forward in the same grievance, the Committee shall consider each violation separately."
  o The motion was deemed friendly.

• Point of Parliamentary Inquiry from Senator Eide, asking if it is permissible to have a section with only one subsection.
  o EVP Naraghi answered that it is permissible.

• Point of Information from Elections Committee Member Rynowecer, asking if this change means the elections committee has to consider two different grievances in the same meeting separately.
  o VP MacCormack answered that the change would mean that separate violations included in the same grievance would need to be considered separately.

• Point of Information from Elections Committee Chair Patten, asking what would happen with this change if a candidate had a grievance filed against them for the same violation twice.
  o VP MacCormack answered that it would be covered under the subsection.

• Point of Information from Senator Shaw, asking how it is handled when multiple grievances are filed for the same violation.
  o Elections Committee Chair Patten answered that it will be considered as one grievance, and in the past the information from the second grievance has been added to the first.
  o Parliamentarian D'Angelo answered that from her previous experience as Elections Committee Chair, multiple grievances have been filed for the same violation in the past, but they took the most flushed-out one for the hearing. Not every grievance needs to be found with merit by the Elections Committee Chair so they don't have to go before the Committee.

• Motion from VP Lopez to amend Section 10.2 to read "students, faculty, or staff".
  o The amendment was deemed friendly.

• Point of Information from Elections Committee Chair Patten, asking if it was possible for faculty and staff to file grievances in the past.
  o Parliamentarian D'Angelo answered that anyone was able to file grievances in the past, especially because there were anonymous grievances.

The Senate moved into Presentation of Section 11 of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Section 11 of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no questions on this section.

The Senate moved into Debate on Section 11 of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no points of debate.

The Senate moved into Presentation of Section 12 of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into Question Time on Section 12 of the Direct Elections Manual.
There were no questions on this section.

The Senate moved into **Debate** on Section 12 of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no points of debate.

The Senate moved into **Presentation** of Appendix B of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into **Question Time** on Appendix B of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no questions on this section.

The Senate moved into **Debate** on Appendix B of the Direct Elections Manual.

- VP **MacCormack** said the definition of Campaign Worker in this Appendix differs from the one in Section 6.
  - Motion from VP **MacCormack** to amend the definition of Campaign Worker to read: "at the behest or knowledge of the Candidate or his or her designee".
    - The motion was deemed friendly.
  - Point of Information from VP **Lopez**, asking if SGA can host a private event.
    - EVP **Naraghi** answered that the language reads, "This event is not sponsored by SGA," so the answer is no.
    - Elections Committee Chair **Patten** answered that SGA can host and declare public **Debates**, but cannot have an event with just one candidate.
  - Point of Information from VP **Chandley**, asking about SGA being included under "student organizations recognized by the Office of Campus Activities" and the differences between hosting and sponsoring, from a previous section.
    - EVP **Naraghi** answered that there will be an opportunity to debate the entire manual at the end of the presentation of individual sections, and this can be brought up then.

The Senate moved into **Presentation** of Appendix C of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into **Question Time** on Appendix C of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no questions on this section.

The Senate moved into **Debate** on Appendix C of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no points of debate on this question.
The Senate moved into **Presentation** of Appendix D of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into **Question Time** on Appendix D of the Direct Elections Manual.

1020

There were no questions on this section.

The Senate moved into **Debate** on Appendix D of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no points of debate on this section.

The Senate moved into **Presentation** of Appendix F of the Direct Elections Manual.

The Senate moved into **Question Time** on Appendix F of the Direct Elections Manual.

1030

There were no questions on this section.

The Senate moved into **Debate** on Appendix F of the Direct Elections Manual.

There were no points of debate on this section.

The Senate moved into **Debate** on the Direct Elections Manual as a whole.

- Motion from VP Chandlely to amend Section 7.3.1.2 to read "excluding SGA."
  - The motion was deemed friendly.

- Parliamentarian D'Angelo said that this debate is on the current manual with the changes that have been made on the floor, and if the manual is not passed, it will revert to the old manual used last year.
- Senator Pett said that the Elections Committee did a fantastic job on the proposed Direct Elections Manual, and that the changes address issues that came up in last years election.

The Senate moved into a roll call vote on the Direct Elections Manual.

1050 With a vote of 36 in the affirmative, 0 in the negative, and 6 abstentions, the **Direct Election Manual is approved.**

Motion from President Petrin to bring RG-FA-12-106 to the floor.
Second from Comptroller Quijada.
With no objections, the motion passes.

The Senate moved into **Presentation** of RG-FA-12-106: Enhancing Accountability of Association Officers.

The Senate moved into **Question Time** on RG-FA-12-106: Enhancing Accountability of Association Officers.

- Senator Nagy asked what accountability positions with no stipends have.
  - President Petrin answered that you could make the argument that there is not a reporting requirement for positions without stipends.
• Senator Eide asked for clarification on the terminology "equivalent of" a number of hours that an Executive Board member would perform.
  o President Petrin answered that this is clarified in the resolutions of the amendment, and that they are expectations, not requirements.

1070
• Senator Brown asked what the difference between having Executive Addresses in the minutes from weekly meetings on the website versus proposed weekly reports.
  o President Petrin answered that it is the function of association officers to type or write that report, which has been a precedent.

1080
• Senator Pett asked who approves the President's report if he or she chooses to receive a stipend.
  o President Petrin answered that this is potentially a gap in the amendment that would need to be addressed.

• Senator Corrado asked why nothing before "all positions" is being edited by the amendment.
  o President Petrin answered that he included the entirety of the article.

1090
• Senator Kline asked if all of the weekly reports are available on the website.
  o President Petrin answered that they are required by the Association by-laws, and are currently available by request. They will be uploaded now that the website is fixed.

• Senator Shaw asked if the weekly reports have to be approved by the Student Body President before they go on the website.
  o President Petrin answered that he wouldn't consider it a completed report if it wasn't approved.

1100
• Senator Hwang asked if the Student Body President is approving his own report.
  o President Petrin answered that this was answered in a previous question, and is currently the case.

• Senator Lothrop asked if this piece of legislation had anything to do with SGA taking a stance on stipends, as this has come up as an issue several times in the past few years.
  o President Petrin answered that it is something that will need to be addressed by Senators through talking to their constituents. This piece of legislation does not take a stance on the stipend issue, but provides more appropriate guidelines given that stipends do exist, creating a higher level of accountability.

1110
• Senator Corrado asked if weekly reports would be redundant with weekly meeting minutes, which also go on the website.
  o President Petrin answered that if implemented correctly, they could serve different purposes with Senate and your committee, or at different points in the week.

• Chief of Staff Carville asked if this means the Student Body President is approving his own report.
  o President Petrin answered yes.
- Senator Yao asked if this change is because the Student Body does not feel that they're getting enough accountability from their SGA officers.
  - President Petrin answered that that needs to be a conversation between Senators and their constituents, but during last years Direct Election, that was the sentiment from many of the students he talked to. Also, given the stipend appeal decision letter from Vice President for Student Affairs Wankel, the stipend ad-hoc committee was charged in looking at if stipends are merited by the amount of work that Association officers do.

1120 - Senator Eide asked how it will be communicated to the Student Body that the officers have each completed their expected number of hours per week.
  - President Petrin answered that the report should indicate how the officer completed the number of hours required of them.

- Senator LePage asked if the stipend ad-hoc committee ever met.
  - President Petrin answered that the committee met and did an extensive amount of research into the practices of other Universities for compensations of their association officers.

1130 - VP MacCormack asked if what qualifies a completed report is decided by the Student Body President.
  - President Petrin answered that it is a responsibility of the office of Student Body President.

- Chief of Staff Carville asked if this applies to stipends funded from the cash account as well as stipends funded from the SAF.
  - President Petrin answered yes, this applies to all stipends.

Motion from Senator Yao to extend Question Time by 3 minutes.
Second from Senator Kline.
With no objection, the motion passes.

1140 - Senator Yao asked if the amendment encompasses everyone who receives a stipend, or just Executive Board.
  - President Petrin answered that the legislation applies to all association officers or individuals receiving stipends.

- VP Lopez asked if association officers not receiving stipends do not have to file a report.
  - President Petrin answered that this language would not apply to individuals not receiving a stipend.

1150 - VP Lopez asked how those members are held accountable.
  - President Petrin answered that it is fair to say that is not addressed in this by-law.

- VP MacCormack asked if the wording is referring to the "office" receiving the stipend, rather than the individual.
  - Senator Pett answered that whether or not an individual is receiving a stipend, they are still expected to complete a certain number of hours per week.
  - President Petrin answered that yes, that is an expectation of each office, though it isn't a requirement.
Motion from VP Daly to extend **Question Time** by 5 minutes.
Second from Senator Brown.
With no objection, the motion passes.

- **VP Lopez** asked if it would be possible to have stipends allocated monthly to go along with monthly reports, rather than having weekly reports to go along with weekly stipend allocations.
  - President Petrin answered that it would have to be vetted through the Student Activities Business Office, but could be a possibility.

1170

- **Comptroller Quijada** asked for clarification on the amendment, if it was saying that the positions receiving stipends had to file weekly reports, and the rest of the positions had to file monthly reports.
  - President Petrin answered that positions receiving stipends would have to file weekly reports, but what positions not receiving stipends would have to do is unaddressed.

- **Comptroller Quijada** asked if there was any concern of violating any FERPA laws or invading anyone's privacy because although it is not explicitly stated that they receive a stipend, they would be required to file weekly reports that would be available to the public on the website.
  - President Petrin answered that he cannot provide an interpretation of the legal matters which have to be decided elsewhere, but it is up to you as Senators as to how your constituents would interpret that information.

1180

- **VP MacCormack** asked if we were still referring to positions for which individuals receive stipends, not the individuals in the position.
  - President Petrin answered yes.

- **Senator LePage** asked if he was Vice President for Student Services and he declined his stipend, if he would have to still file reports because although he is not receiving a stipend, the position that he is in receives a stipend.
  - President Petrin answered that that is not how it is currently interpreted, and that the individual would still be responsible for the work and hours of the position without a reporting mechanism.

1190

- **Senator Lothrop** yields his time to Elections Committee Chair Patten.
  - Elections Committee Chair Patten asked if this legislation includes the Elections Committee Chair and Parliamentarian, as they receive stipends but do not currently file monthly or weekly reports.
    - President Petrin answered that it is not referenced in the first section, therefore there is not necessarily an hour requirement associated with their positions.

1200

- Point of Parliamentary Inquiry from Senator Pett, asking if the current legislation reading "all positions for which individuals receive stipends" implies that if the budget with stipends is approved, the President is allocated a stipend, and regardless of whether or not President chooses to receive that stipend, they are serving in a position that receives a stipend.
  - EVP Naraghi answered that according to President Petrin who is presenting the legislation, that is not the case.
Point of Parliamentary Inquiry from Senator Pett, asking for an official interpretation of that rule.

- EVP Naraghi answered that individuals receiving a stipend are required to file a report, and anyone who is not receiving a stipend is not required, but is encouraged to file a report. That has been the practice up until this point.
- President Petrin answered that he would not execute it in that way. That's in the context of a budget that is but forth by an Executive Board the year before and then approved by a Senate or decision-making authority, it does not mean that was ever applicable to the person that next takes office.

Motion from Senator LePage to extend Question Time to the end of a speakers list.

Second from VP Daly.

With no objection, the motion passes.

- Senator Shaw asked how hours are currently tracked.
  - President Petrin answered that there is currently no method of tracking hours.

- VP Lopez asked how to hold officers not receiving stipends accountable, if this legislation is supposed to be enhancing accountability of association officers.
  - President Petrin answered that that is a gap that has been brought up, and hopes will be addressed in Debate.

- VP Lopez asked if this legislation will create a culture of mistrust among association officers.
  - President Petrin says that this works towards a culture of transparency rather than a culture of mistrust.

- VP Lopez asked if this could arbitrarily expand the powers of the presidency.
  - President Petrin says that this instills an accountability metric that cannot be found elsewhere in the institution. It allows the president to enforce his role that was delineated in our governing documents, to determine that the executive branch is held accountable.

- VP Lopez asked if the president will approve his own report.
  - President Petrin answered yes.

- Comptroller Quijada asked what President Petrin's intent was in drafting this legislation.
  - President Petrin said that the monthly report is the only accountability metric we have, and this does not reflect that stipends are given out weekly or that the constitution requires a certain number of weekly hours.

- Point of Information from Parliamentarian D'Angelo: Are you making requirements for the positions or for the individuals themselves? Because the requirements you are setting only come into play when individuals accept stipends.
  - President Petrin says that is correct.
  - Parliamentarian D'Angelo suggests that we do not put anything specific to people in our By-Laws. You should not put something about specific individuals in the By-Laws.
The Senate moves into Debate on RG-FA-12-106: Enhancing Accountability of Association Officers.

- Senator Trowbridge moves to amend the document to say that the weekly reports will be approved by the Executive Committee except for the member that submitted his or her respective report.
  - This motion is not deemed friendly. There is a second from Senator Yao. Objection from VP MacCormack.

The Senate moves into Debate on the proposed amendment.

- Chief of Staff Carville states that it is not defined anywhere that it is my responsibility to watch over VP Chandley just like it is not VP MacCormack's responsibility to watch over President Petrin. Giving that authority to each other is counterproductive.
- Senator Trowbridge says that this will ensure accountability without giving all power to the President.
- Senator Pett says that this amendment is out of order because you cannot take away the vote of someone on the Executive Board. If they have a vote, you cannot restrict them on exercising that vote.
- Point of Information from VP MacCormack: Could you clarify what Parliamentarian D'Angelo was saying about individuals versus positions?
  - EVP Naraghi answered that you cannot refer specifically to the person holding the position; you can only refer to the position itself.
- Senator Corrado states that making the monthly report will not increase accountability; we already give weekly report in Senate. Monthly reports are more comprehensive and understandable.
- Senator Shaw states that he agrees with the previous speaker. But adding a weekly report will not add substantially to the hourly requirement.
- VP MacCormack wants to agree with a previous speaker. Stipends are only allocated on a weekly basis because of convenience for the Student Activities Business Office. We could work out an agreement with SABO to dispense stipends on a monthly basis.
- VP Lopez yields her time to AVP Doulin
  - AVP Doulin states that she gets to hear weekly reports already in Senate and in committee. These reports would be redundant.
- Senator Shaw states that there should be a system of tracking hours, and this legislation does not necessarily do that.
- Parliamentarian D'Angelo states that this whole section of the By-Laws is out of order because it is referencing individuals rather than positions. I suggest someone makes a motion to remedy that.
- Point of Order from VP MacCormack: If it is out of order, should it be on the floor?
  - EVP Naraghi: It could be on the floor to correct being out of order.
- Senator Pett moves to strike “for which individuals receive stipends” from the legislation.
  - This motion is deemed friendly. It is adopted.
- Senator Nagy thinks that the Senate minutes already have what the Executive Board has done for the week, and those are posted online.
- Chief of Staff Carville states that there are certain details about weekly activities that are not voiced in his address to Senate because they are irrelevant to the interests or concerns of Senate, but those are the kinds of things that would go into a weekly report.
• VP MacCormack states that if we cannot amend the legislation to fix the President’s approval authority because that was deemed out of order, then we cannot salvage the rest of this legislation.

1310 • Point of Information from Senator LePage: When monthly reports have not been on the website, how many times have they been requested by students?
  o EVP Naraghi: To my knowledge, zero times.

Senator Shaw moves to extend debate by five minutes. Seconded by Senator Trowbridge. With no objection, debate is extended.

• Senator Pett thinks that the hourly requirement cannot be expected to be fulfilled every week – members of the Executive Board are not expected to be typing away on their laptops over Thanksgiving, for example. Also, we tried tracking hours in the past, but we eliminated that in the past because it was too hard to track.

1320 • Senator LePage stated that many things you do are quick fixes, and it is very difficult to track all of those responsibilities with an hour requirement.
• Senator Corrado states that we have two issues here. The initial language is out of order, and we have a problem with the President overseeing the other members of E-board. So I recommend to the Senate that we reconsider this in a different way.

• Chief of Staff Carville moves to amend that legislation so that the President’s weekly report will be submitted to the Executive Board.
  o This motion is not deemed friendly. Second from Senator Trowbridge. Objection from VP MacCormack.

The Senate moves into Debate on the proposed amendment.
• Chief of Staff Carville thinks that this is addressing the issue of checking Presidential power.
• President Petrin accepts this amendment; he just did not accept it as friendly because it was not in-keeping with the original spirit of the legislation.
• Senator Trowbridge agrees with the amendment.
• Senator Corrado thinks that this is not the way to enhance accountability for association officers.

The Senate moves into a Placard Vote on the proposed amendment. The amendment passes.

1340 The Senate moves back into Debate on RG-FA-12-106: Enhancing Accountability of Association Officers.

VP MacCormack moves to extend Debate by five minutes. Seconded by VP Daly. Objection from Senator Eide. After a placard vote, the motion passes and debate is extended.

• Senator Pett states that Senators should not vote for this legislation just to correct the out-of-order by-laws because that section of the by-laws will have to change anyway.
• Senator Corrado states that this legislation does not add accountability, especially because the weekly allocation of stipends is not philosophically tied to the implementation of stipends.

1350 • VP Chandley states that requiring a weekly report will detract from the time already committed to duties in the association.
• Comptroller Quijada says that it is President Petrin’s responsibility to hold members of the Executive board accountable to their positions. But it is not fair to single out individuals who receive stipends to complete weekly reports, and completing these reports will detract from overall ability to
do the work that the position requires. Also, the position of the comptroller requires doing the same thing over and over, and a weekly report would not add any accountability to that.

- EVP Naraghi clarifies that the legislation as amended would require all Executive Board members to write weekly reports – not just those receiving stipends.

- VP Daly states that the responsibilities of her position would not be easily reflected in a monthly report. Also, much of what she does is long-term and would not be represented in a weekly report.

- VP MacCormack states that the his projects are long-term as well, and those are reflected in monthly reports. Similarly, we already have weekly reports in Senate addresses and chair addresses in committee.

- Senator Yu states that the student body does not look at these reports anyway, so this legislation is unnecessary.

- Senator Shaw states that the hour requirement outlined in our by-laws is unenforceable and meaningless as is.

- Senator Trowbridge moves to amend the document to change the spirit of the document, and as such, it is ruled out of order.

- Chief of Staff Carville moves to amend the document to change the spirit of the document, and as such, it is ruled out of order.

Senate moves into a Roll Call Vote on RG-FA-12-106: Enhancing Accountability of Association Officers.

With a vote of 0 in the affirmative, 29 in the negative, and 11 abstentions, RG-FA-12-106 fails.

There is now a Quorum Call.
With 34 members present, quorum is still met.

President Petrin moves to postpone presentation of the remaining legislation until the next Full Body Senate. Second from Senator Yao. With no objection, the legislation is postponed.

Senate moves into Open Discussion.

- President Petrin states that if anyone has a manual that is not up to date on the website, please submit it to him or EVP Naraghi.
- EVP Naraghi thanks Senator Tyler for all of his help on the website.
- Senator Shaw thanks everyone for sticking through the entire Senate.
- VP Daly thinks that it is unfortunate that the only college to win TRACE is DMSB School of Business, so everyone should engage their classmates in the TRACE competition.
- Elections Committee Chair Patten thanks everyone for their patience, attention, and engagement.
- Senator Pett states that if anyone is worried about lack of publication of elections in the Spring, they should join elections committee.
- Chief of Staff Carville requests that any senator leaving next semester contacts him about joining the inactive roster.
- President Petrin hopes that everyone enjoyed this conversation. This was a great opportunity to reflect on why we do what we do. Thank you to everyone for all their work this semester.

Senate adjourned at 11:15pm.

Respectfully Submitted to the Senate by Noah Carville and Nicholas Naraghi.