The Student Senate met in Regular Session on February 1, 2006 at 6:30 in the Ohio Union, Grey Suite K. Speaker of the Senate Nick Benson presided.

Present: 34  Absent: 14  Alternates: 1

Anderson  Brin  Bullard  Capone
Bhatt (A)  Cropcho  Denning  Dodovich  Evangelista  Fogt
Fuquen  Hoque  Howell  Hornsby  Innes
King  Klempay  Knoepfler  Lawson  Leland
Lockshin  Luby  Marconi
Noon  Nystrom  Pineiro  Pittman  Reed
Samuels  Seger  Singla  Sprinkle  Steele
Surovjak  Valentine  Wallace  Wireko  Wiseman
Yeh  Gates  Barylak  Rothacker  Smith
Allie  Byerly  Martin  Webb

OPEN FORUM FOR THE PUBLIC
-DR. ALLISON SNOW, Director of the Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR): The new Office of Undergraduate Research has just opened and USG was at the opening. The USG Website has an article about the OUR on the website. The idea behind this office is that Ohio State is a huge research institution but it’s not easy for undergraduates to always get involved in research. The OUR then is a central place for people to come to know how to get involved, get funding, and get a mentor. They have an office in Page Hall and a website. Right now, it is just her, working part time, and a graduate assistant who is also half time. Her first goal is to get more workers for the office. She will also be going around colleges and departments and talking to Deans and Department Chairs to work on getting more undergraduates involved in research. Over time, she is hopeful that the OUR will grow. She is also optimistic that donors will give funds to the office so that it will grow. The office is geared towards everyone, not just students in Honors & Scholars Students. They are hoping for a lot more grants for undergraduates to get involved. She feels that faculty are always so busy getting grants and teaching, so the OUR will be working on creating more time where faculty can take on undergraduates for research. Right now, she is spending her first few months listening to comments from students and from colleges and departments about the topic of undergraduate research. She is dedicated to making the OUR useful to students. We have a lot of potential to grow. Dr. Snow will be the Director of the OUR for the first four years. Right now, she is putting together a Student Steering Committee and a Faculty Steering Committee. She has also been speaking with Mr. Samuels about ways that USG can get involved. It is not just sciences and Honors, it is much broader than that. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

-Mr. Marconi: Exactly what would we be researching? Usually it’s a project that you are already engaged with and that is already going on in your college or department. However, if you would like to start a completely new project, then
that is possible as well. She would like to make research and the Denman Forum more accessible to students across the university. You can research just about anything.

-Mr. Noon: Are there any plans for clinics for undergrads? That is an exceptional point. As soon as the OUR finishes with its website, they are going to work immediately on putting together workshops and clinics all-year long for all students.

-Mr. Knoepfler: What role do you see USG playing in getting the OUR off the ground? She’s not too sure about what we are capable of. She is considering working with the Executive Members to get us involved. Mr. Samuels discusses the idea of having academic senators look on their college website and see if there are links to undergraduate research on it. If there are not, then we should let Dr. Snow know. Mr. Samuels is also getting a Student Steering Committee together.

EXECUTIVE REPORT, PRESIDENT SCHARER

-On Tuesday night, the Greek Director and President Scharer participated in a Greek panel to new members of the Greek Community. There was also a lot of USG information about it.

-Furthermore, tonight is the start of African American History Month.

-Buckeyethon is this Friday night. If you would not like to dance, then there are a ton of volunteer activities.

-President Scharer is working with CGS and IPC about a Safety Task Force that will launch in the next week.

-OMA put on a wonderful event last night called “The Faces of Us.” It was a great program.

-We’re also starting a Greek Recycling Program.

-We’re also starting a Greek Recycling Program.

-Yellowcard will be the entertainment offered for Rock the Block during spring quarter.

-THINK OHIO launched its efforts today. Stay tuned about it.

CONSTITUENCY/COMMITTEE REPORTS

-Mr. Luby: B&F met on Monday and considered 38-B-17. They reduced the amount asked for and then passed.

-Mr. Dodovich: P&G met last week and considered all the resolutions concerning EGB Bylaws. The P&G Committee endorses all the resolutions concerning EGB.

-Ms. Lockshin: Last Sunday, she went to a Humanities Alumni Hockey Event where she was able to cement alumni relations with Humanities alumni.

OLD BUSINESS

38-R-46: A Resolution to Amend Section III.A.9 of the Elections Governance Board Bylaws, MR. DODOVICH

MR. DODOVICH: Okay, this was tabled last week and the suggestions have been taken into account.

WE MOVE INTO A HAND VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES
SPEAKER BENSON: This would make those initiatives that are passed in the spring binding according to our bylaws. He feels that it is implied in the bylaws that they should be binding but it is not explicit in the bylaws. DISCUSSION:

-Mr. Noon: He’s confused about the idea of an initiative being considered unconstitutional but then being implemented by the approval of the Judicial Panel.
-President Scharer: Can a non-student put forth an initiative? That is not possible.
-Mr. Knoepfler: He has a problem with this piece of legislation. He feels that any legal question would have to go to a court. It puts the burden of proof on the student and he feels that that is excessive. It seems like there is no burden of proof on the initiative supporter to show that it does not violate any laws or university policies. Furthermore, if this applies to those initiatives that were passed last year concerning taking away free tuition for the President and Vice President. If that were to pass again, then there could be no possibility of a President or Vice President who have a poor financial situation.
-Mr. Marconi: So what if a person submitted an initiative to disband USG and it passes? The answer is that it would have to pass.
-Mr. Brin: He doesn’t feel that the Judicial Panel should be able to overturn those initiatives that are considered unconstitutional or against university policy.
-Vice President Kreiner: Does it make sense to vote on a resolution that is in relation to a future resolution? According to Mr. Reed, 38-R-47 does not have to be approved in tandem with 38-R-63.
-Ms. Lockshin: Has there been a case of a ballot initiative that was practical and possible to carry out but was not enforced? Last year, Issue 1 that dealt with free tuition scholarships for the President and Vice President, was passed but it was not implemented.
-Mr. Capone: So would this mean that all previous initiatives that have been passed would now become legal? No it would not be retroactive.
-Mr. Brin: What was wrong with Issue 1 was that it could not mandate the President and Vice President to relinquish their free tuition.
-Mr. Reed: Would the initiatives that are passed only be binding for one year? That is what is felt.
-President Scharer: Where in the Constitution or Bylaws does it say that resolutions are only binding for one year? According to Mr. Reed, it is not explicitly stated but there has been a ruling on that issue based upon past precedent and other university policies. According to his interpretation, bylaws are only to be enforced until they are revoked. It was made explicit that when the term is up,
-Mr. Pittman: He’s concerned that students don’t really take the ballot initiatives too seriously and don’t really know what the implementation of initiatives would entail. Concerning disbanding USG, Speaker Benson does not believe that this would be possible through an initiative
-Ms. Lockshin: She is worried that a representative government is supposed to rely upon an informed constituency but the will of the people is not always right. It can sometimes be outlandish and be dangerous for us to bind ourselves to the
people’s initiatives. We do have a system where there is democratic decision-making.

-Ms. Innes: She feels that it is unfair to believe that students who vote on a ballot initiative are uninformed. She calls for question and it is seconded.

WE GO INTO A HAND VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION FAILS

38-R-48: A Resolution to Clarify the Duties of the Judicial Panel, SPEAKER BENSON

-This resolution would make a bylaws change concerning the duties of the Judicial Panel. It would revise several things:

-There has been a precedent of the JP to make rulings based upon the “spirit of the bylaws.” If it’s not explicitly in the bylaws, then the JP can still make it against the rules based upon the “spirit of the bylaws.”

-It will allow for some due process rights (you’re innocent until proven guilty for example).

-The burden of proof of guilt will be on the claimant’s shoulders.

-It will allow you the right to remain silent and not answer questions that could endanger yourself.

DISCUSSION:

-Mr. Capone: He feels that by making these bylaws, we are not all lawyers. It’s very hard for us to try to create a loophole-free system.

-Ms. Innes: She agrees with Mr. Capone but also feels that we are learning as we go and shouldn’t allow the JP to make up the rules.

-Mr. Marconi: He feels that this resolution is a very good idea.

-Mr. Knoepfler: We have separate EGB Bylaws from our bylaws. Therefore, would it be for all JP hearings. No, it would only for JP hearings concerning elections.

-President Scharer: She supports some of it but is concerned that if we just go by the book and don’t let them rule by the “spirit of the law,” then candidate teams would just become more fraudulent and find more loopholes.

-Mr. Reed: What is the EGB Director’s opinion about this? Speaker Benson has not asked her to take a position on it.

-Mr. Baker: In a real judicial hearing, you cannot force a judge to only strictly interpret the constitution.

-Ms. Innes: She disagrees. If judges were to look at only what is not there instead of what is there, then there would be so much gray area.

-Mr. Reed: Our constitution and bylaws leave a lot of room for interpretation but he at least uses what is there and then interprets what it means. It is not about what the original intent was, but how the resolution should be interpreted.

-Mr. Steele: Calls to question.

WE GO INTO A HAND VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES 15-10-5.

38-B-17: A Bill to Support the American Sign Language Club, SPEAKER BENSON:

-This bill is for the American Sign Language Club. They are taking a trip to Washington D.C. to visit the only hearing impaired university. They want to use the experience to gain more contacts and networks with the hearing impaired community and see how the
We go into a hand vote and the bill passes 25-6.

Mr. Dodovich: He motions to suspend the rules to allow for Ms. Liz Ghandakly to introduce and answer questions concerning all resolutions pertaining to EGB Bylaws. It is approved with unanimous consent.

38-R-54: A Resolution to Remove Requirements of Polling Stations, Ms. Ghandakly

-Last year, there was something put in the bylaws about having polling stations around campus. However, they were very ineffectual and did not even work. It is a wasted expense on behalf of EGB. She is asking that we strike the section of the bylaws pertaining to polling stations. DISCUSSION:
  -Mr. Noon: Would it prohibit future EGBs from having polling stations? It is not commensurate for next year. Future EGBs can put the idea of polling stations back in the bylaws.
  -Mr. Dodovich: Calls to question.

We approve the resolution unanimously.
38-R-55: A Resolution to Create Voting Clarity
-Last year, there were some problems with the ballot. It was not clear for people that they could only vote for One Living Area. It will be a two-step ballot that will allow people to choose which living area to vote in and which college that they are enrolled in that they can vote for. Furthermore, it’ll ask that the online ballots of names will be randomized. DISCUSSION:
  -Mr. Reed: He knows for a fact that there were people last year who had tried to vote for him but had actually voted for another Living Area Senator.
  -Ms. Seger: She agrees and it happened to her last year. She feels that it is a very good idea.
  -Mr. Knoepfler: Is it actually possible to randomize the names on the ballot? It is definitely possible.
  -Ms. Innes: She really likes the idea of randomizing the names on the ballot as her last name falls in the middle. She moves to call to question. It is seconded.
WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND IT PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

38-R-56: A Resolution for EGB to Provide Substantive and Successful Candidate Events, MS. GHANDAKLY
-This resolution is to fix some problems that EGB has had in the past in trying to get students to meet the candidates. In the past, Meet the Candidate sessions have been only for candidates to meet each other. So, it’ll be gotten rid of. However, EGB will try to put on two events to introduce students to candidates. EGB will also encourage candidates to have their own specialized Meet the Candidate sessions.
  -Mr. Marconi: He feels that this is a very good idea.
  -Mr. Noon: He agrees with Mr. Marconi.
  -Mr. Samuels: Is EGB going to have the manpower to help set up all these Meet the Candidate sessions? EGB will not give manpower like in staffing debates, but it’ll be more like tangential suggestions and help in planning the events.
  -Mr. Dodovich: Moves to call to question. It is seconded.
WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND IT PASSES.

38-R-57: A Resolution to Clarify Pre-Campaigning Solicitations of Support, MS. GHANDAKLY
-There is a lack of clarity about what people can do before pre-campaigning begins and what people can do before campaigning can begin. To clarify this, it’ll say that
  -General solicitations of support can begin at any time but cannot solicit for organized endorsements or votes until campaigning begins.
DISCUSSION:
  -President Scharer: Is campaign season defined in the definition of bylaws? Yes it is and can be more defined in the future.
WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND IT PASSES

38-R-58: A Resolution to Decrease Senate Candidates’ Spending Limits, MS. GHANDAKLY
-Currently, senate candidates can only spend $500; however, she would like to limit it to $250. She feels that this is more feasible and that each candidate can do it for $250.
Mr. Marconi: He calls to question and it is seconded.

WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES

\textbf{38-R-59: A Resolution to Amend the Number of Signatures Required for Senate Candidates, MS. GHANDAKLY}

- EGB would like to amend the amount of signatures required for senate candidates from 50 to 100. DISCUSSION:
  - Mr. Reed: Will you have the manpower to verify that all the 100 signatures are valid? They will, though it will be difficult.
  - Mr. Noon: He’s concerned that by raising the amount of signatures, it’s limiting the number of possible candidates because those who are not as prepared to run may not have the time to get 100 signatures.
  - Mr. Brin: He definitely does not believe that it is hard to get 100 signatures.
  - President Scharer: Can signatures come from anyone? Yes they can.
  - Ms. Innes: She believes that this will create a better, more coordinated senator. She calls to question and it is seconded.

WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES WITH SIX IN OPPOSITION

\textbf{38-R-60: A Resolution to Amend Section III.D.2 of the Election Governance Board Bylaws, MS. GHANDAKLY}

- It is in our bylaws that everyone needs to include their platform. However, instead, EGB would like to just have questions on it that will pertain to platform issues. Furthermore, EGB will also have links to websites.
  - Mr. Samuels: What if a candidate has platform issues that are not a part of the candidate questions? There will be a “Say Anything” section of each candidate’s bio.

WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES

\textbf{38-R-61: A Resolution to Clarify Write-In Candidacy in the EGB Bylaws, MS. GHANDAKLY}

- Currently, the section on write-in candidacies is vague and bad. Right now, it says that write-in candidates must sign a declaration of intent and either get at least 30 votes or be approved by Senate. Instead, they are going to require write-in candidates to abide by the EGB Bylaws. If it is found that they did not follow the bylaws, then they will be dealt with at a later time. Furthermore, write-in candidates who have won their seats must then be approved by the new senate. DISCUSSION:
  - Mr. Baker: What if write-in candidates are the only person running for a seat? What’s the point then? Why should the new senate have to approve them? Sometimes it happens that people who win write-in candidacies do not actually take Senate seriously. This could possibly help that.
  - Ms. Innes: Is it currently in there that senate must approve write-in candidates? It is in there if they have not received thirty votes.
  - Mr. Luby: He likes the resolution except for the last clause. He doesn’t feel that we should go over the students’ voice.
Ms. Hoque: She calls to question and feels that it is okay since senate has to already approve candidates for senate vacancies.

WE GO INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES

Mr. Dodovich motions for a 5-minute recess. It is seconded and we go into a break.

38-R-62: A Resolution to Provide Guidelines for Slates in the EGB Bylaws, MS. GHANDAKLY

-This is a big resolution. Currently, there is nothing in the EGB Bylaws concerning slates and she feels that this is an egregious error. The wording is important. Slates will be defined as any coalition of candidates who endorse each other and use their funds together. Slates shall also have a Director. Each member of a slate is responsible for one member’s actions. Furthermore, slates only have to turn in one monetary fund. Slates without a presidential/vice presidential association can only spend $2500. However, slates with a presidential/vice presidential association can spend $3,000. DISCUSSION:
- Mr. Noon: Does all a candidate’s funds go towards the slate? It does not have to be all for the slate. For example, a candidate can give half of their funds to the slate and then use half of the slate for their own use.
- Mr. Steele: So a senate candidate could then possibly spend over $250? The slate could spend up to $2500 to promote for a slate of candidates in the name of the slate.
- Speaker Benson: If you were to contribute $50 towards a slate, would that then take away from the $250 that is allowed to be spent? You are limited to as much you can contribute on your Monetary Profile. Each individual cannot spend more than $250 on a slate.
- Mr. Samuels: So are you saying that you could donate $250 on the slate and then spend $250 on your campaign. THIS IS ABSOLUTELY NOT TRUE.
- Mr. Fogt: You can give your funds to the slate but then are you allowed to print your own resources? This is possible.
- Speaker Benson: So if one were contribute $250 to a slate, then that slate can only spend $250 on that candidate.
- Mr. Reed: So then a slate with a presidential/vice presidential team can really then only spend $1,000 on the senatorial slate if they decide to use their $2,000 limit? Yes that would be true.
- Speaker Benson: If a presidential campaign has a slate but decides to use none of their money on the slate, is there a requirement that $1,000 must be spent on the slate? No it does not require this.
- President Scharer: She feels that this needs to be revised a little bit. There is nothing specific that says that each candidate is capped at their $250 amount.
- Mr. Steele: He feels that the passage of this resolution could cause even more confusion.
- Speaker Benson: He feels that this should be opposed. There were a few senate slates last year and there were no regulations on them. He is very concerned that presidential campaigns could just have a senate slate to be able to use an additional $1,000.
-President Scharer: Is there anything that we can do by midnight tonight to pass part of this? It could be failed right now and then a person could submit an additional clause for the resolution.

-Mr. Brin: He does not agree with the idea of putting a funding cap on slates. He feels that it is a disincentive for people to join slates because it would place a personal limit on their campaign expenditures.

-Mr. Dodovich: If we bring a new resolution on the floor, at that time, we can discuss changes and amendments. He calls to question and it is seconded.

WE MOVE INTO A HAND VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION FAILS

**38-R-63: A Resolution to Increase the Feasibility of Ballot Initiatives, MS. GHANDAKLY**

-She has spoken with CSA about ballot initiatives to prevent non-students from submitting initiatives. Initiatives must be submitted to the EGB Director so that EGB can review them concerning the topics of feasibility and implementation. It will then be given back to the initiator of the resolution who will then go get votes for it. It will then be much easier to implement the initiative because implementation has already been discussed.

-Mr. Sprinkle: He is concerned that with the timeline of submission to the EGB Director by the end of the sixth week, then those students who are not in USG will not have enough time to put together an initiative. The EGB Website is going up this Friday and if the word goes out, then that is enough time.

-Mr. Dodovich: He feels that a week is enough time to get the initiative written, though they don’t need the signatures at that time.

-Mr. Brin: The purpose of this is not to prohibit initiatives, but just to evaluate them based upon feasibility.

-Mr. Noon: Is there any process to ensure that people are not collecting signatures before EGB has reviewed the initiative. The petitions for the signatures will not be provided until all initiatives have been reviewed.

WE GO INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES

**38-R-64: A Resolution to Amend Section III.C. of Election Governance Board Bylaws, MS. GHANDAKLY**

-This is so that contracts must be received and reviewed by EGB before using contracted windows, services, and other such contracted items. DISCUSSION:

-President Scharer: What will the timeline be? If the receipt is given, then campaigns should assume that the contract is fine. Also, how will EGB ensure that contracts are at fair market value? Ms. Ghandakly believes that this is more for the jurisdiction of the Judicial Panel to interpret.

-Mr. King: Calls to question and it is seconded.

WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES

**38-R-65: A Resolution to Strengthen Violations, MS. GHANDAKLY**

-Violations are always a big deal in elections. This year, they are going to keep a close watch on the rules and will deal out harsh violations. The first part will fine entire slates for a slate member’s violation. Furthermore, fines will increase from $100-$200. Lastly,
if you spend even one penny over the amount that is set, then candidates will be disqualified.

-Mr. Brin: Will this be like what happened last year when fines did not actually mean that people had to pay fines but they will have fewer funds to work with? This resolution will not address nor change that issue.

-Mr. Noon: If I were to receive a fine that puts a person over the limit, would that then disqualify him or anyone candidate? No it would not.

-President Scharer: In the past, candidates have not paid fines because USG cannot accept it. So will fines just reduce the possible funds for their campaigns? Yes they will.

-Ms. Hoque: She calls to end discussion. It is seconded.

WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE MOTION PASSES

38-R-66: A Resolution to Tighten Accounting Requirements in Campaigns, MS. GHANDAKLY

-EGB will be really diligent this year about getting receipts. Every purchase or donation must be accompanied by a receipt. If items or services are donated, a receipt signed by the donor with a monetary value is required. This monetary value is subject to review of EGB with regards to its feasibility. EGB is also striking the requirement that campaigns over $1,000 have an account at National City Bank.

-Mr. Reed: So we’re requiring every campaign to update their expenses every day by 5pm? Yes this resolution will. It is felt that updates should be made when a purchase is made.

-Mr. Brin: Is updating necessary if you’ve stayed at zero? No this process will not be necessary. Also, will there be a link provided to the monetary profiles? Yes, EGB is working on improving the website to allow for all of this information.

WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES

38-R-67: A Resolution to Tighten Definitions within the EGB Bylaws, MS. GHANDAKLY

-The definitions are not appropriate right now.

VIOLATION will mean an infringement upon EGB Bylaws
CAMPAIGN VALUE REPORT will mean fines and agreed upon monetary values of donations

WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES

NEW BUSINESS

-Please read new resolutions

Mr. Dodovich would like to bring a resolution to the floor. It is very similar to 38-R-62 with only a few differences. HA now says “the first day of spring.” HC was changed to $3500. It was also amended to say that only $2000 can be used to campaign for the presidential/vice presidential candidates. This is designated as the NEW 38-R-62.

WE HAVE A VOICE VOTE TO BRING IT TO THE FLOOR AND IT IS APPROVED
DISCUSSION:

-Mr. Dodovich: When you work together and jointly campaign, a lot of costs are shared together. Therefore, he does believe that a cap should be in place.

-Ms. Innes: They raised the cap to $3500 for a slate that joins with a presidential/vice presidential campaign.

-Ms. Ghandakly: The idea of having a maximum amount of donations is to stop those who would possibly spend a lot of money.

-Mr. Brin: But wasn’t there a clause to still limit presidential campaigns? Furthermore, if there was a flyer printed with 100 names on it and it costs 5 cents, would it be deducted for 5 cents for every member of the slate? It would only be taken away from the slate if the flyer includes everyone on the slate.

-Mr. Knoepfler: If you do chalking and put your name down, would it be deducted from the slate or from the individual candidate? It would be taken away from the slate.

-Mr. Fogt: If a member of a slate is disqualified, would that mean that every member of the slate is disqualified? Yes they would be.

-Speaker Benson: He would like to make an amendment to cap the slate’s funds to $2,000. He moves to strike $3500 to $2000. It is seconded.

-Ms. Innes: She feels that if it is raised to $3500, then it could benefit more senate candidates.

-Speaker Benson: He feels that this is important because he does not feel that there is anyway to distinguish between the presidential/vice presidential campaigns and the slate’s campaign. Slates in the past have only been a support for the presidential campaigns, not as a second entity of them.

-President Scharer: If it’s down to $2,000 for the president and vice president, then she does not feel that anyone will really want to join a slate associated with a president/vice president campaign. Even raising it to $3500 would only allow for the maximum amount of funds from six senate candidates.

-Mr. Noon: He does not feel that it is in the realm to reduce the spending. He feels that it is up to the EGB Director to determine whether a presidential/vice presidential campaign are abusing this extra money from the addition of a slate.

-Mr. Marconi: He ran his campaign without spending any money.

-Mr. Steele: He motions to call to question. It is seconded.

WE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT AND THEN IT IS CALLED FOR A DIVISION. IN A HAND VOTE, THE AMENDMENT FAILS

-Speaker Benson: He would like to amend by saying that any expenditures over the $2,000 must not have the names of the presidential/vice presidential campaigns or link to their candidate website. THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE:

“Any expenditures for a senate slate under a presidential/vice presidential team that go above $2000 may not include the name of presidential/vice presidential candidates or websites of the said campaigns.”

The amendment is seconded. DISCUSSION:
Ms. Innes: She likes the idea behind it but does not feel that we should have to exclude websites.

Mr. Capone: Are there two different websites, one for the slate and the other for the presidential/vice presidential team?

Ms. Lockshin: What if you have two different monetary profiles and could donate to the pool for the slate?

Ms. Innes: She moves to amend the amendment to strike “or websites of the said campaign” from the amendment. It is seconded. DISCUSSION:

Mr. Dodovich: He calls to question. It is seconded.

WE VOTE AND THE AMENDMENT PASSES 14-7-2.

Speaker Benson: He moves to amend by adding to the end of the amendment that the name of any website for a senate slate may maintain the name of the presidential/vice presidential campaign. It is seconded. DISCUSSION:

Speaker Benson: His concern is not that you end up on a presidential/vice presidential campaign but that the presidential/vice presidential candidates not be in the URL address.

Ms. Innes: She agrees with the amendment and calls to question. It is seconded.

THE AMENDMENT LANGUAGE TO BE TACKED ON WOULD BE:

“No website address promoting a senate slate shall contain the names of the presidential/vice presidential candidates or the two in tandem.”

President Scharer: Doesn’t the bylaws say that you must have a website for material?

No, that point of order is not correct.

WE MOVE INTO A HAND VOTE AND THE AMENDMENT PASSES

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Fogt: Calls to question on the amendment. It is seconded.

WE MOVE INTO A HAND VOTE AND THE AMENDMENT PASSES

OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE AMENDMENT (Lower Case “E”)

“Any expenditure for a senate slate under a presidential/vice presidential team that goes above $2000 may not include the name of presidential/vice presidential candidates. No website address promoting a senate slate shall contain the names of the presidential/vice presidential candidates or the two in tandem.”

DISCUSSION OF 38-R-62:

Mr. Brin: He would like to amend to strike the maximum amount of $2500 and $3,000 for senate slates with a presidential/vice presidential candidates. He would also like to amend so that the sum totals. The amendment is seconded. DISCUSSION:

Speaker Benson: He opposes the amendment.

Mr. Marconi: He calls to question and it is seconded.

WE MOVE INTO A VOICE VOTE AND THE AMENDMENT FAILS

DISCUSSION OF 38-R-62:

Mr. Dodovich: He calls to question and it is seconded. It is not accepted however.
Mr. Fogt: POINT OF ORDER. Would I be allowed to be more than one slate? He does not feel that we have defined the concept of a “slate” well enough.

Ms. Ghandakly: You are limited to the amount of slates that you can be involved in because the definition of “endorsements” only calls for one endorsement.

Mr. Marconi: Calls to question. It is seconded.

WE VOTE ON 38-R-62 AND THE RESOLUTION PASSES

ANNOUNCEMENTS/REMINDERS

-Mr. Dodovich: He will be sending out the resolution concerning religious tolerance.

-Ms. Gent: If you’ve sent anything to Ms. McGrath, please send her what committee it is and where you would like for it to go.

-Mr. Knapp: The Policy Group is working on a project with the Registrar’s Office. They do, however, need a senator to help out.

-Mr. Brin: Student Affairs has received its second resolution of the year so please come to the meeting on Monday.

-Ms. Ghandakly: Thanks for all your hard work. The EGB Website shall be up by Friday night.

-Mr. Knoepfler: There will be a University Senate meeting next Thursday from 3:30-5:30 in Drinko Hall.

-Mr. Noon: When you’re speaking to the press in an unofficial role, please don’t use your official USG title.

-Mr. King: The South Campus Senators are discussing campus safety on Friday. If interested, let Mr. King know.

-Mr. Marconi: The University Senate Committee will be meeting Monday at 5:30 in the USG Office.

-President Scharer: Leadership applications are out and she encourages us to apply.

-Mr. Samuels: Expect to fill some senate vacancies next week and who would like to go to the senate social activity on Saturday night. About a dozen say that they would like to attend.

-Speaker Benson: Thank you to those who stuck it out until the end. Committees are extremely important and that is where these amendments and discussions should go.

SENATOR OF THE WEEK IS MR. JESSE CAPONE

Meeting Adjourned at 9:16pm
Meeting Minutes Submitted by Eric A. Samuels, Diversity-at large Senator