ASMSU Senate Minutes – April 11th, 2013
SUB 235

APPROVED – 4/18/2013

- Call Meeting to Order at 6:00 pm
- Roll Call
  - Howard - DC
- Review Previous Minutes
  - April 4th, 2013

McKay: Move to approve.

Vote: 16/0/0.

- Public Comment

Townshend: Signup sheet for public comment. Anything other than LI, go first.

Lashaway: Here to seek endorsement for funding relative to Romney Renovation Project. Transform Romney into academic centered building. Include student commons like first floor library, writing center, math center, possibly a student entrepreneurship center, center for faculty excellence, sandbox (imaginariaum center), student/academic focused uses. Discussion about third floor spaces. Rather than divide 3rd floor up into offices, project move toward renovating those for continued open use for multi purposes, including gym and dance floor. We would restore those for continued uses that support academics, movement/dance courses and current club uses. In order to accommodate this into next 100 years worth of use, many uses in building currently that cannot return, like ROTC field storage space, HHD spaces. Those uses can’t be terminated; viable academic uses for campus. 25,000 new square feet of spaces. $20 million proposed budget. Legislature has added a non-state funded component to virtually all building projects. MSU Northern has a building that is partially non-state, partially state funds. All other buildings are split as well. The legislature is expecting all universities to contribute in a non-state funded manner. Asking for endorsement to use existing academic R&R fund to use this for Romney. Some projects you’ve endorsed in the past: Wilson writing center, classroom upgrades (6 of them), compressor installation in Gaines, fire sprinklers in Linfield, plaques for campus artwork. Our request is to fund up to $5 million for replacement spaces for occupancies that will not be going back into Romney.

Lamm: Thank you for coming tonight, addressing issues about dance floors, education needs. How important study space is needed. First floor of library is well used, need community tables (6, 7 seats) more room for those areas. Ask for more of those kinds of things for our students.

Murdock: Anyone has further questions, comments, concerns, I sit on that committee so I can give you more details.

Bonnard: Heads up about event. A lot of you have noticed library doesn’t have a browsing collection. Time between classes, pick up a magazine, etc. We recognize this as a need, looking at it, we now have money to move ahead with a browsing collection, will be in place next fall. We want to make sure this is meeting the needs of students. We’d like suggestions from you of reading materials; great ideas, please send those our way. Recommendations from staff and students in those books. Do that on Facebook. Please become a Facebook fan of our page. Also created a list of popular journals and magazines and want to run that by you. I know this is a busy time of year for you. Tomorrow or Monday: email from me and Jan. Way for you to give us some feedback on that, really appreciate it, great addition to library.
Myers: Show of hands: how have you been affected by drunk driving? Drinking and driving epidemic here in Montana. Just past weekend, 23 convictions in Bozeman of drunk driving. Safe ride initiative. Vision: partner with streamline. Don’t want to compete with them, partner and take it further. Get people a ride home, help with congestion downtown. Done so far? Collected data, surveys downtown, rode the bus, met with key players, met with Matt Caires, looking at model down at Colorado State. Cut back on DUIs. Of data we collected of students, 21% voluntarily said they would drive home drunk. A lot are unaware of parking setup downtown, part of our vision as well to be able to park cars downtown. Lastly, want to benefit community. Effects individuals, families. Where you come in. Back in September with a finalized presentation and budget. Hope you’ll be able to support us, thank you for your time this evening.

Townshend: Maximum of three minutes per person.

Koby Bernard: Student associate for LI, former ASMSU senator. One thing bothers me. I’ve never seen Carmen so upset before. Incredibly generous, very smart, worked for MSU for a decade, knows her way around, knows things. Has a set way of doing things that works very well at the moment. Honor and respect opinion, not biased, capacity to bring in alternate opinions. Wouldn’t make recommendations without a lot of thought. Make sure we don’t inadvertently modify the culture of the LI and leadership fellows in a negative manner.

Ian Jones: Student associate, speaking on my own behalf. I became aware of the budget issue after it had gone through finance board. Never allowed chance to voice opinion before this. I want all senators to know I do not feel well-represented by decisions. I fully agree with lots of proposals being put forward. Definite need for more work put in; don’t need to switch things up that are working perfectly on such a special year coming up. Has already proven efficient. Very little amount of time to use budget this year to fully realize admin associate position; didn’t really come to fruition until a month before we lost that. Please take into account Carmen’s opinions and recommendations. She has guided the LI from a staff under 5 students to more than 10 students. Returned money to ASMSU, strongly advise you to reconsider changes in her plans.

Dhaval Bajaria: Representing LI. My views are based on what I have seen at the LI in 1.5 years there. I see director as a person who needs to have a vision, not micromanage tasks, not waste time on things like booking conference room for an event. Had Leanne for a few months, lost her. We had requested 55,000 for honorariums. 20% budget cut. Makes no sense. Cutting down speakers and workshops and events are really beneficial to us. Cutting down money and making way for .5FD for director does not make sense. Yesterday at a meeting, LI in past. We have not been finding enough mentorship opportunities. Views needs to be brought down to office. ASMSU is LI’s parent. Has to be complete transparency between student government and its programs. Keep .5FD for director, .5FD for admin assistant.

Josh Iverson: New student associate at LI. First semester here. In my short period of time here, I’ve learned vast amounts more professionally than I’ve learned in high school and first semester here as a college student. Love way things are going right now. Trust Carmen’s opinions professionally. Strongly urge everyone to consider rocs and opinions.

Ashton Solecki: I, too, am a newbie. Want to give you a perspective from a newbie. Like Josh said, thrown into LI, one of things that has made me excel. Improved my professional skills, academic skills. Learned a lot. Also: I’d like to address issue. Spoke to some of you. Concerns is that Carmen is so busy, runs around like crazy, concern she hasn’t had time for students, address staff ourselves. Started:
Leanne. When she was here, I had Carmen any time I needed, lost her to another job. Since then, because of that she hasn’t had as much time. Wanted to give you a fresh perspective from someone new.

Rishad Bharucha: Volunteer in this community. POV of a volunteer. LI has given me a number of opportunities, grateful for, part of General Wesley Clark, convocation with Condoleezza. Currently TA with Leadership Foundations class, couple of senators here have taken. Strongly believe LI is a cornerstone of leadership on campus, moving into Year of Engaged Leadership. Hypocritical to get rid of such an organization that has given you opportunity to step up into higher leadership roles.

- Presentations
  - Internationalization Laboratory – Dr. Peterson

Peterson: Good evening. Thanks for giving me time to talk. I don’t know if everyone has thought about it, everyone is going into international careers. University well aware of fact that that requires separate skills outside of your major. Look at strategic plan, language there. We want to create graduates who have had rich global, multicultural experiences. Skills to be world leaders, engage in global communities, solve world’s greatest problems. As far as thinking has gone right now. Process of doing serious thinking about international skills, experiences, you need while you’re here to be effective in international careers when you leave. Involved in a multi-year process to think about international side of MSU. What programs do you really need to get that experience? What experiences do you need to have while you’re here? Programs to get skills enable you to be effective in international arena. Doing this in cooperation with American Council on Education in DC. Seriously concerned about problem as well. Strategic planning process we are working with, internationalization laboratory. Process involves snapshot of where we are now, learning outcomes we need to make sure you have when you leave, with those two points in mind. Action plan to get from where we are now to where we need to be. All starting to come together, three outside experts at end of this month. Look at snapshot, look at proposed learning outcomes, look at action plan, help us improve that. Working on this process through the summer into the fall, very much like to have your engagement in it. All of you would be very welcome. Take time to be engaged with us at the site visit. First week of final examinations. Sorry to tell you that. In essence what we’re about.

Giusti: Good intro, cochairman of internationalization lab, we really want to engage you in this process, really touching your lives, not sure we know how to make this accessible to you, what can we do to make your voices heard? In addition to visit, send info to us. This is how you can reach students, voices heard. Include considerations and requests into report we’re creating. Interested in resources you think you need. We need to here what’s realistic and how we can reach you. I imagine you are interested. I should’ve started with that!

Peterson: Like to be able to walk away with you guys plugging in your precious time to spend an hour with us. Three discussion sessions going on. Three sheets with times and days. Please sign up and come to these meetings. Let those circulate through discussion, pick those up. One other thing. We have a draft that Ada’s been working very hard on, lists global learning outcomes, where we are now, need help to make that better, I’ll pass out in both directions. I know you have a lot to accomplish tonight.

Mains: Thank you for coming tonight, something we haven’t touched on a lot with. Global multicultural studies major. So important, lots of student interested, cannot wait to attend this session. Thank you for all of your efforts.
Lamm: On behalf of engineering, working on initiatives to go across national borders. Biggest thing is to have cross-credit. I can’t spend more than 5 years in school. Really fabulous, money is an issues, scholarships, grants, internships, etc. From CoFÉ, speak to that.

Giusti: This is so important. Funding for it is so important. Your voices will be heard. Continue conversation into fall.

Peterson: A University of Minnesota study found that students who study abroad graduate earlier than students who don’t on average.

Vanata: Echo senators, thank you. Thanks for including students in on these conversations.

Giusti: Learning outcomes, please know these are drafts, can be changed. We understand that you want to graduate in four or five years. Not additional set of requirements you have to meet, something we want to integrate within your curriculum. More opportunities rather than more credit load.

- MSU Alumni Foundation

Nordlund: Junior in College of Ag, student ambassador with alumni foundation.

Peterson: Senior. We represent alumni foundation ambassador team. It’s a referral program. We’d like to tell you about mission statement of our ambassador program. Professional internship. Want to stress that while alumni foundation and university work together, they are separate. Alumni foundation: increase relationships, bring in financial support for initiatives. Four parts of foundation: foundation (money raiser) and association-recently joined together. With campaigns and initiatives we have, why would be have them separate when we can use resources together to reap the most benefit? Bobcat Mentorship program, innovation campus. Great tool MSU can use for research and technology.

Nordlund: Foundation does a lot of money raising. 5 points of engagement. Join. To become members. Kept in contact with what is happening. Give. Donors, scholarships, etc. Serve: volunteers. Nonpaid people, help us out. Events hosted here on campus or off. Classify them within five points. Participate: fans at sports, etc. coming to campus, engaging alumni. Invest (partners) make difference in lives of students here at MSU.

Peterson: Involve alumni. Our program, as students, what we do. National and regional travel. We meet with alumni that have not been reached out to. Over spring break went to DC, contacted over 1200 alumni. Set up 50 meetings to meet with them face to face, gauge interest in university, want to come back and become involved. Join association, come back for an event. Last fall, went to Houston twice. Great opportunity to go outside of Montana, travel, meet alumni that are core of MSU.

Nordlund: Engagement is another focus. Want to know student perspective in clubs and organizations. Seeing needs of students and what we’re doing, how we can work together more. Hear about student body, ASMSU, what we’re up to. Year of Engaged Leadership. MSU alumni foundation. Going to work together.

Peterson: Student philanthropy programs. We want to work with ASMSU here. Want to start this; important donor dollars make on ability to receive quality education. We want to create our own programs. Couple examples. NC does tuition stop day. Stop signs all over campus. Date: school stop if they tried to fund our education if through tuition dollars. School would stop 1.5 months into year if we didn’t have donor dollars. Phil was here campaign. Yellow ribbons, activities touched by donor dollars.
Pretty amazing how much we don’t realize that was affected by alumni for students to receive best education. Come back for help, look forward to campaign we can create.

Nordlund: Ambassador and alumni foundation team meetings, two meetings a week. We get to hear every aspect of MSU alumni foundation. Learning all aspects about a great entity that benefits Montana State.

Peterson: Graduate ambassador support. As younger ambassadors, help them, reach out to thousands of alumni to set up meetings. 10% return. Help with that. Want to talk about impact of Alumni foundation on campus. 10,000 members in all 50 states, 12 countries. In past fiscal year, $32 million. $2mil for scholarships, $8mil to facilities. 2012: $13mil back to MSU. Shows that alumni foundation is growing. Alumni are starting to realize the importance of giving back to the university. Year of engaged leadership more momentum behind this.

Nordlund: Jabs College of business, end zone project, animal bioscience, scholarship funds—veterans, rodeo endowment (just reached $1mil mark, first in nation).

Peterson: President of MSU rodeo team, big things for us. Talked about 5 points of engagement, how do we do this? Bring alumni back, mentor students, can learn from what they did right, not do what they did wrong, sit on advisory boards, giving, reunions, tailgates, receptions.

Nordlund: Provide networking opportunities. 18,000 alums in valley, reach out to them. Join alumni foundation in professional capacity. Opportunity to travel, network with alumni, provide info about MT State. Understand impact on student education. Derrick Krueger here.

Goldstein: Thanks for coming out. Are you asking for something specific from us right now?

Peterson: No. Kiah asked us to come by. Clarify who we are, what we do. We want to let you know that what we mainly do, take student voice to alumni. Inform you on our program.

Abbey: Asked them to come by, lots of opportunities for creativity, especially since it’s a new program. Super excited about this program, talked about creative ways to get more students involved with alumni. How we can interact as student leaders with alumni. Really great people.

Murdock: Since they are essentially serving as voice and rep of students to alumni, we as student reps take job seriously, represent needs, bring them to student ambassadors. We want this, what we need. Dream big here! Take representation role here seriously.

○ Academic Integrity Capstone Group

Rooney: Hi, I’m Tia Rooney.

Anderson: I’m Corey Anderson. Studying academic misconduct. Doing research, disconnect between policy intention and implementation. Current student code of conduct, academic honesty doesn’t represent core. Academic integrity implemented into student code of conduct. Academic integrity can help solve disconnect between intention and what actually takes place.

Rooney: Want to propose changes to section 3-10 titled academic expectations. Add g: students will conduct themselves honestly and with integrity. No expectations for that currently. Be prompt and regular to class, etc. not specifically stating standard. Section 340: subsection. Academic honesty: integrity of academic process be credit given when credit is due. Not being embodied as MSU would desire. Fully define academic integrity. 340-10. High standard of moral ethical principles in scholarship.
Perform scholarship, high levels of truthfulness, and respect for one another’s work. Foster culture we feel is vital, students to embody core values. These are the students we want to be turning out at MSU, why it’s vital.

Anderson: Done extensive research. Easiest way to start moving to that culture. Lot of universities using this, including WSU, CSU, U of Minnesota, land-grant universities, most have academic integrity programs. University of Washington academic integrity violation occurs: not against rules, against values and school. Move to this will put focus more on student rather than institution. Want to have peers hold other peers accountable for academic misconduct.

Rooney: 194 cases brought to attention. Number probably isn’t accurate. Professors aren’t even able to address this right now. Definition isn’t going to change overnight. We need to move in this direction as other land-great institutions. Define this: step in right direction, less acts of academic misconduct, culture that embodies greater moral, ethical standards.

Goldstein: Thanks for coming. Any questions come to me or these ladies. I was wondering: speak more to why it’s important to take this burden off professors.

Rooney: Academic honesty holds Profs accountable, takes time away from teaching, grading papers, away from students. Students care, create culture where peers don’t do this anymore. I approach that if I see that happening. Take it upon myself not to create acts of misconduct. Create culture where peers hold each other more accountable.

Anderson: Hold themselves to a higher standard than it being faculty’s job to make this happen because they don’t have time for that. A lot don’t because it takes too much time. Move toward culture of academic integrity, proud to be an MSU student, proud of degree you have, cheating—not important. We just really think having it more student focus than faculty focus, good move for MSU.

French: In your 340.10. You mention high standard of moral and ethical principles. I’d venture to guess that we all have different principles. What are those? That’s awfully ambiguous to me.

Rooney: Entails direct responsibilities of student. Moral and ethical values make a student look within.

Anderson: MSU isn’t developing you as simply a scholarly person. You should leave here with character as well. Hold yourself to a higher standard.

- Budget Presentations
  Townshend: Pull up budget. Before we get started. I would appreciate. Anyone asking a question, yield time, recognize said person. Help me to see who is speaking next. Please remember to do that. Also, questions. Phrase as a question. Respond, please use direct response. Help us to know who is answering questions.

Reid: Talking limit because we have such a long meeting?

Townshend: Could make motion. Personally like to hold off right now. Will adhere to two talking points per person per motion. Previous question. You have right to do this. Lots of times when people still want to discuss. Be mindful of others’ time and information they hope to provide. Beneficial to talk as much as we need to but not talk too much. Request that you please limit side chatter because it’s hard for us to hear up here and it does degrade from discussion we could be having as a whole. Issues surrounding certain items. As far as it refers to budgets. Refer to Higgins, Jackson to clarify point made. Number wrong. They will step in, leave it to their discretion to correct that. Please do not make
comments personal. We are a professional body. Please be civil, respect nature of organization. Great discussion tonight, leave here bettering organization rather than detracting from it. Part of something bigger than ourselves. Please be conscious of how you may be affecting others.

Mains: This is a job but we are here to do this. It may take a while; limit talking points will limit discussion necessary to make these decisions. Mindful of making talking limits for certain issues.

Vanata: You want to limit us to two each per motion. I disagree with that idea. I’d be in favor of rounds.

Townshend: That’s how it is in Robert’s Rules. We could make motion to extend if it becomes applicable. I’ll alert you on second time. Motion would be limit or extend.

McKay: Move to take from table FY14 budget.

Townshend: Ask liaisons if they’d like to speak about anything.

Mulick: I’d like to recognize Carmen.

McSpadden: I wanted to thank you for all your work tonight. It’s a privilege to be the director of the LI. I take it seriously. I want you to know that the process has been challenging for us these last couple of weeks. I’m hoping at some point in the future that this will be an important conversation you have. We were alerted of the other proposal and we would’ve loved to have had a chance to have direct input on that proposal. I think you can see that the staff has lots of points of view as well. In the middle of a strategic plan, talked in great detail about continuing the wonderful success we have had. Working hard at those incremental steps; in process of determining everything around resources, funding, what we need to be doing to best serve students. I feel very much like a trust holder for the LI. Student body presidents, senators come and go. One person who really holds that organization in trust over time. It is my hope you will take consideration we put forward very seriously. With in mind not only the past ten years but what the next ten years could look like. We had a great year this year. Condoleezza Rice, killer reviews around that. Just finished with Charles Best. Dhaval handed around 10 letters from a classroom he had funded. Been a tremendous year, wouldn’t happen without students leading the way.

Philosophically, our role is to empower students and have students lead by doing. Every aspect: look at every piece and look at where students lead it rather than classified staff. Not about top down, direction of where we go, but about idea of if leadership is expanding and enhancing experience around students. That is a philosophical case that needs to be thought about and understood. We want as many people at the table as possible determining these questions as to what is needed and why. It becomes beyond us but senate should have a point of view as well. Let us bring you this work, let us tell you what we need FTE long term. Short term, right and on the mark for next year. We hope you’ll honor the work of what we’ve done and trust holder of this organization. Let us get you to next place, let us together as a we, as a group, make that decision. Option A: you all received. We support. I support it, staff supports it, idea of moving my position to 1.0FTE discussed and nothing brought forward, no consensus, no interest. In middle of process, haven’t quite completed it. That was January 16th. Heard that was of interest, went to next available admin meeting. Sat down with Michael, Kiah, Lindsay, Phyllis, everyone in room. The process is important. When these things occur, really want to not have silence, we had silence up until delivery of this to finance board. Become surprise, huge impact of morale of one of your most wonderful programs. Had conversations, dialogues, discussion. We’d like everyone to be in this conversation around something that could tremendously impact the future of this program. Option A really is what takes us to that next step. You know the power of incremental steps. Tested that last year. We
combined with student body president that half time admin assistant best possible step. Thought about it long and hard, tried that this fall. Leanne. Ashton was talking about. What happens when administrative pieces pulled off desk of Carmen? Opened up more student time, more thinking time. We’ve included that, the right incremental step to take us where we want to go. Also support for all students here. Second set of eyes for proofreading, making sure all those good things happened. Something wonderful about year round employee, historical knowledge over course of time. With Carmen, supporting ability of program to be indestructible. Do you understand that idea of that synergy that can occur? Other piece I want to say is keep eye on ball tonight. Question on table is concepts around FTE and budgeting. Proposal put forth based on proposal we received. Working off what we know. Doing this, communication is so important. Our proposal provides you an extra $10,000 to direct to other programming and adds another $10,000 to honorarium. Cutting programming is a 20% cut. Cut my job to .4FTE because it all goes together. Proposal has admin assistant, maintain current director level, increase honorarium to FY13 levels. Want to dispel rumors. I am busy, enjoy work I do, give you time I am paid for, honored to do that. No superwoman here, no one above and doing crazy things on your behalf. .5FTE appropriate, aligned, would feel like I was stealing from student fees by increasing it. Let’s put it all on the table. .5FTE for Carmen and another .5 for program coordinator, admin up to .75, another 5 more students in office actually leading by doing this work? Rather than top down, students being empowered to do work. Never anticipated having to come to a meeting like this. It’s been hard. I want you all to know how much I care about taking this forward to where you want to go. I am delighted to sit down with our incoming president and have her commit to our strategic plan in a way that will deliver what it is that is wanting to be delivered. We have put best plan together for FY14, honors students, makes us whole again, frees up funding so you can think about other programs that have been cut so drastically. Thank you sincerely for service, thinking seriously about most important decision on most important question.

Mulick: I think if their student associates are willing to come here and back this up. We should listen to what they have to say, they know what is best for their program. Doing great things. Feel so strongly about option A, seriously consider it.

Vanata: Carmen, thank you for your passion. Been an honor to see our students working so hard in LI. They work really hard as does Carmen. Honor to see that. First heard of option I was so excited about his opportunity. I think of growth, lots of opportunity. I was excited to jump on with LI when I came to senate. I want the LI to grow first and foremost. What’s best for student? I’ve been doing my homework over the last semester. Apologize for not bringing it to you sooner. Taking a few steps back. Really thinking about what do our students need? What do they want, what do we want in conjunction? Where do we want it to go? Work with strategic plan has been great, good people at the table, lots of good intentions. With that, I see that hopefully coming into effect quickly and as soon as possible. Establish ourselves, expand visibility. Come down not to just money and time but need to be put in direction. I’ve been torn personally. In a perfect world, we’d be at full time with Carmen’s exceptional work. We’re unsure if that’s something she’s interested in. Scares a lot of people, myself included. I think of her when I think LI, heavily invested. Success this year has been great. How is this going to impact students? How do we let LI impact students? Expand funding, resources, director position? Can they see all of this through in coming years with director half time? Urge body to think about students first and foremost, that’s our job. Politics in here, swayed back in forth, keep constituents in mind. You are here for them; that is your priority. Thank you all for being here, especially LI and LI staff. Carmen, you leave them well. Recognize Abbey if she wished to speak.
Abbey: I'd love to talk about admin proposal. I need to mirror Senator Vanata, vote for what is best for constituents. Move forward with 1.0 position. Few areas the LI director can improve upon. Many areas are not a consequence of Carmen’s actions but of organizational structure. We feel that the duties presently assigned to LI director are far greater than .5 appointment. Job description not reviewed since 2002, lots of growth in 11 years. That’s something that should be rewarded. Moving forward with 1.0 FTE, leverage small amount of space. No space in there to see more student staff. Increasing 1.0 FTE time to develop relationships across campus, alumni foundation for financial resources. Correct time and way to move forward for health of ASMSU and LI as a program of ASMSU. Questions, I’d love to answer them. Thank you.

Vanata: If you haven’t sat down with admin, lots of you have. Great. Makes me feel like less of a bad liaison. Glad you’re doing homework. Reiterate intentions behind all of this. Examine those across the board, best interest of students.

Lamm: I work for LI. Worked there for 2 years. Started out as Carmen’s intern, student associate. By her side during summer. This semester liaison to National Advisory Board. I have been incredibly benefitted by LI. I want to share that experience with all students on campus. I cannot tell you amount of times I’ve been blessed by people in the office and friends I’ve had. Carmen is like a second mom. Hard decision for me. I hope I do not seem heartless to LI friends. Because I want to impact more students, program needs to grow. One: More time both on student side and full time director. Students are capable of doing all things, however, more professional to have director be key line of contact between LI and other organizations on campus, continuous and organized. Very blessed to have Carmen in there, good at relationships. Need money. Because budgeting is so tight this semester, amount of money can’t really be supplied by us unless we increase student fee. That needs to come from endowment fund we have set up. To work with alumni association takes a lot of time, have that be healthy, takes time of a director. Students come and go constantly. Professionals keeping up with us is difficult. Space is a key thing, too. Students to come and say we need more space. That has validity. So much stronger if director leveraging constantly for hat. Also in support of student admin assistant. Great to talk about in job interviews, done things like that. Also feel comfortable with having student position not full year. Director can take over workload in summer. Filling Carmen’s shoes last summer, work half time, Carmen still working behind scenes, director transition to that well. I do feel strongly, thinking about it for over four months. Hard decision, hope you respect opinion.

French: I’ve done conversing, thinking. Few issues at hand. Issue of direction of LI and that can be approached from many perspectives. All of these issues are in a way tied together. From senate’s perspective, find the one that mostly pertains to us which is the budgeting. I’ve been trying to pare down and find the mass of the structure. I have a hard time seeing too much of a difference between this discussion and streamline discussion. Compensating director adequately for time putting in. No brainer for me. Compensate for work done. That is the approach we should be taking now. Conversations had about the direction of the LI. While this is ASMSU, need to have some say, at this point, we need to focus our opinions and discussions to whether or not topic at hand being addressed. Is the director position adequately compensated for time put in?

McSpadden: I absolutely am more than adequately compensated, part of bigger vision of where we take this in future. Timing right now is premature. Part of it is one small group deciding the future of the LI and not necessarily having input from all of us here in the room who do the job every single day. Want you to know we have the students and student body interests in mind with every decision we make. That we are not aligned with that to respect to budget is inconceivable. We’ll provide you with FTE when
that’s needed where and why. Help us with respect to where we were with last year’s plan. With all due
respect, Kate, open up additional things you’re interested in. Role of us in foundation is a whole nother
part of this organization.

French: Question I asked was answered. Is director’s position adequately compensated? I don’t want to
make personal. It can impair judgment. I need to be able to step back to make an appropriate and
fiscally responsible decision. Being adequately compensated for duties expected of her at this point.
Proposed revisions to job description. Those haven’t gone into effect yet. When they do, there would
have to be renegotiation of compensation for that. At this point, is it not true that we should budget for
current position, change that may take place but yet to go into effect? Conversation at finance board
pertaining to alternate recommendations. Slight modifications to original proposal. Minor things
removed like conference call topic. To me, that’s logical. Three companies available, don’t need to pay.
Closely mirrors what was originally requested, half time position half time admin. Move to amend
budget to accept the alternate recommendations to the LI. First change: move honorarium to $40,000
to $50,000. Kept conference calls out. Change to full time to half time position for director.

Higgins: Alternative recommendations. Half time director, half time classified assistant, only reduce
honorariums from additional $5,000 and move remaining to supplemental.

Townshend: Requires 2/3 vote.

Marshall: Thank you to Carmen, everyone coming, seeing you here. Great to see you are so passionate
about program. Not had much interaction with program. Didn’t have opportunity to interact with
Leanne. I do think this director’s position does need more time. I don’t know if it needs 1.0 FTE, option
of .75. Can be something done in future, can see hesitation. I have that concern if it doesn’t get done
now, when will it get done? Talk of strategic plan. Because I don’t have that in front of me right now, still
apprehensive. Program is great, lots of opportunity to grow. Most fiscally responsible is putting money
where it will benefit constituents.

Stevens: Problems presented to us. Need more time, lacking funding, etc. Great problems. Realize,
hasn’t been burden by admin to show that 1.0FTE has been assessed by needs. Fearful ASMSU is
overreaching on responsibilities. We’re not the experts. Carmen, student fellows know program, what’s
most healthy and prosperous. Realize that Year of Engaged Leadership is next year. Altering LI’s
operational structure when next year is so important, very irresponsible. ASMSU is constantly trying to
change and put our hands in programs where we don’t belong. Try to change, alter, not looking into
future, not allowing programs to be prosperous, get onto feet, gain momentum. Give it a few years
before we consider upping position to 1.0FTE. No link between problems and plan for position to so
solve these problems. Stay with budget recommended by LI.

Rowe: I am in full support of motion on table. LI fully aware of needs, what needs to be done. Budget
exemplifies everything that needs to be accomplished. Not our role to overstep our boundaries, make
rash decisions that will effect program in its entirety. Send them on a whole new path. Can’t support
that. Thinking toward next year, need to be in full support of honorariums they’ve been asking for,
through talented and gifted speaks they’ve been bringing in.

Mains: I’m involved in leadership foundations program, worked with LI, education at MSU been affected
by them. That being said, I’ve spoken to many constituents. Even I said this in meetings with LI. Heard
this was only half time, shocked. Amount of work that gets done there amazes me. Only positive
benefits half time to full time. Love to see what we can do with full time. I do understand the other side
of it and how it feels like we’re pushing to get somewhere when strategic plan in place. I do feel like as constituents agree, want this change LI grow into something bigger.

Goldstein: Thank you everyone for coming out. Divisive issue. French’s comments resonated with me in terms of paying someone for position they are doing right now. Lot to be said for adjusting according new requirements for position. A lot of people the LI can be doing more. Can be doing an incredible job at what they do. I would like to see more personal individual leadership cultivation across student postulation. Great success with small group of students, see it expand to broader section of population. Full time director for that to happen. Taken recommendations seriously. I’m also looking at things we want to see the LI accomplish in the future, don’t see that as possible with position remaining half time. Difficult, we need to keep our eye on the ball as Carmen said and look toward future, see where we want to be in a year, important time for cultivating leadership in community, having director would service that need. Main concern I that we risk Carmen not being interested in maintaining her position there. Done a great job, can’t base decision solely on that. Lot of qualified people out there, do a great job. We have several months to hire someone if Carmen does not want to take on responsibilities.

Bock: That is a personnel matter.

McSpadden: Would like to close meeting.

Meeting closed for executive session. (No public record kept of executive session)

Meeting opened for vote

Townshend: Vote on halftime director, halftime admin, add $10,000 into honorariums, move excess to $9338 into supplemental.

Vote: 11/6/0.

Townshend: Amendment fails.

Rowe: I’d like to make a different approach. Still in favor in option A, spend money better than supplemental. Adopt option A with $9338 split up. $5,000 to line item CE light and sound show. $3812 into large comedy show/plays. $526 into parking pass for legal services reserve r2-r6.

Thuringer: Object to consideration of motion.

Vote in favor to object: 11/6/0.

Townshend: We will consider the motion.

Rowe: Best way to spend money. Allow LI to accomplish everything they desire. Dismisses Year of Engaged Leadership decreases honorariums. Don’t want to remove them from agenda. Allow LI to fully accomplish what they desire and it’s fiscally responsible to use resources to increase campus entertainment.  Emancipator one of best events ASMSU hosted all year, due to light and sound show. Spoken with Michael Bonde. Where he wants to see money go. Can bring in another person as per initial request that was denied. Also added $526 into legal services parking pass, will always require a reserved parking spot. This decision goes beyond FY14 into new lawyer eventually and current lawyer. They have roles where they need to leave campus, don’t see it as right to take away parking ability on campus. 15 minute walk important. Spending money because she will always be most expensive classified employee, why waste dollars paying them to walk? Not viable, responsible. My justification. Money isn’t
just being thrown around. For items that have been taken out already. Parking pass is fully expected for the ASMSU attorney now and in the future.

Townshend: Carmen, if you want to move back into exec at any time let me know.

Reid: Already made decisions: LI, parking pass, waste of time. Insulting to think we have to redo decisions this body has already made. Move on and do other things we need to accomplish. Call previous question.

Vote: 12/5/0.

Vote on amendment to adopt option a with 5k lights, honorarium 50k. 3812 to CE large comedy, 526 legal service parking pass.

Vote: 9/8/0.

Marshall: Want to reiterate that this position doesn’t have to be 1.0 or .5, there is a middle ground. Talked with Office Manager Higgins today. We calculated numbers for .75 director, .5 summer, half time student assistant. That would allow us to put money back into honorariums, make changes to give CE money. Apologize in advance if puts us back in exec. Increase .75? Do you make decision where we lose you?

McSpadden: I’d like to close it again.

Meeting closed for Executive session. (No public record kept of executive session)

Meeting reopened

Thuringer: It will be an experiment regardless of when we do it. Great way of stepping into it. Doesn’t work, we can change it. Get through a year and decided it needs to go full time, we can do that. This leaves it open. Gives our director some flexibility in her own personal needs. Recommend put aside that comment that this wasn’t well researched, not entirely fair without asking Senator Marshall exactly what she did to research this. Lots of discussion with admin, director, etc.

Smith: I assume we all have made up minds. Call previous question.

Vote on previous question: 17/0/0.

Vote on amendment to director to .75 during academic year, .5 during summer, keep student assistant, add $10,000 into honorarium, move $7276 into supplemental.

Vote 16/1/0.

McKay: I would like to recognize Murdock.

Murdock: Put this out there. Throughout entire discussion, lots of calls to respect for classified staff. Here working for success for all of our students. In calling for that, call for same respect for our fellow senators. Saying when haven’t done research with specific amounts down to cent is incredibly disrespectful. Please respect fellow senators, all here for same reasons, care about constituents. Treat everyone with same respect.

McKay: Move to recess for ten minutes.
Vote: 17/0/0.

Townshend: Discussion on LI budget. Further discussion?

- CE

Marshall: I would like to move to amend CE. $5275 from supplemental to large comedy events, diving into line items to match first so there are two.

McKay: Where would that leave us?

Townshend: Original number from previous amendment slightly off, $120 extra or so added to supplemental, in regards to admin fee.

Higgins: $18,832.

McKay: The CE Budget is something I've talked to everyone involved from Colleen who's been there for 10 years, current director, past directors. CE has not been able to provide the quality entertainment that students expect because of overload. This takes a lot of attention from what we’re putting on our director’s plates. Current director is under impression this proposal would be just fine. I want to stress that the supplemental is also a very valuable piece to the budget. Before we start loading extra stuff on peoples’ plates, give them what they have this year, see how they handle it, feel like it’s appropriate and responsible, welcome to come to supplemental and use the funds there. Caution you to put money in places you think is appropriate when there needs to be more discussion. Need to be careful with depleting supplemental.

Marshall: I want to hear discussion on this, encourage you to get opinions out there. Not liaison, just talked to Michael. Might not be director next year, in past events put on haven’t been best because of overload, smaller event that impacts smaller number of students, easier to put on, less money, reaches out to different area of constituents. Student performers in front of an audience which is an incredible opportunity. Something we should encourage. Keep that in mind.

O’Donoghue: I would like to echo Senate VP McKay. Need to be cautious in pulling from supplemental, valuable resource to this body. Marshall—why is it pertinent to have two comedy events rather than one poignant one?

Marshall: Budget we have. Confirmation process. Money set. Play instead of comedy, have that money. Present to funding board, etc. Need to go through less trouble and then we have opportunity to put on two events.

O’Donoghue: I see where you’re coming from. One comedy event or one play could be a sufficient service to student body, maintain a healthy supplemental.

Lamm: Liaison. Discussing this with Michael. We came to consensus that wasn’t sure if we’d get money. If we were, he’d like to see larger concert events. Not responsible to pull whole $14,000. Perhaps $3,000 to large concert event. Creating more elbow room to get a bigger performer for that spring show. Echo McKay. Asking too much of CE, irresponsible to make him do two shows, especially when we have block party which provides entertainment for students during homecoming season. Wasn’t so concerned about large comedy shows as he was with large concert events. If I may, make amendment to amendment. Instead of $5275 to large comedy show, decrease to $3,000 and move it large concert events line item performers. Rest of money back to supplemental.
Townshend: This is moving away from original purpose of amendment. Like to see that occur from main discussion of CE budget. Back to discussion on original amendment.

Rowe: Something I tried to do earlier. CE best venue for accessing our students. Necessity for healthy supplemental, can maintain and still grant request.

French: I was part of finance board discussions. Is it prudent to have multiple large comedy events? Still complete support of one large concert event and one large comedy event. Split between semesters. Don’t see any amendment necessary to budget. Director wish to spend more money in large concert, can be from supplemental. Finance board and senate can discuss whether or not this is prudent. At this point, disapprove any modification to budget.

Mains: Agree with French. If we change, do what PD believes we should do. Wish he was here so I could ask him a question.

Goldstein: I believe we should defer to finance board’s rec in this matter. Budget is acceptable as it stands. As senator French pointed out, deem it necessary, can use supplemental.

Dove: Agree with Goldstein completely. Send money to comedy shows, concerts, both great uses. Fact that we’re considering two makes it worthwhile to yield to finance board’s rec and let new CE director submit requests for funding as he deems necessary in the future.

McKay: Let’s keep in mind. Going through hiring right now. Try to stay away from sticking with one individual’s views. I’d like to hear VP Murdock’s opinion on changes as supervisor to program.

Murdock: Reiterate blanket reminder. Do rehire all student programs every year, distinct possibility that it could be 100% turnover. Don’t move into budgeting with expectation that all directors will stay the same. Remember your position as a senator in setting budget to help move forward with what you believe this organization should be doing. In working with CE, there was a lot of turnover which hindered effectiveness a bit, impressed with ability to come back from that, ultimately stressful, balls get dropped on other events when we do these really big events. Don’t advise more than one a semester because it is so difficult. CE, advisor, student volunteers, SUB admin we work with, how it will impact players, return on investment for your constituents. Really think about trying to micromanage direction of those programs. Give them what’s fiscally responsible; let them do with it what they will.

Schaff: Issue of comedy/concert, know two or three artists that do both so it won’t necessarily be someone doing standup solely. Look at it that way, two media events each semester.

Goldstein: We’ve had some good discussion here. My minds’ made up. Previous question.

Vote 17/0/0.

Vote on amendment: 2/15/0.

Townshend: Suggest amendment to rules to do all incidental motions as voice votes from now on.

Goldstein: Move to suspend rules to allow voice votes for incidental motions.

Vote: 15/2/0.

o Productions
Townshend: Nusbaum been here the whole time, so thank you. Recognize folks from exponent next thank you for being here throughout this process.

French: I really appreciate the form this budget has taken. Discussion pertaining to vehicle. Finance board has since assured productions vehicle will come out of current year’s supplemental. Largest change. Complete approve as it stands.

Rowe: Nusbaum took me to look at van. It’s subpar and scary. I think it’s a necessity. Has to be approved, currently have will guesstimate will last two more weeks.

Thuringer: CE puts on a show. Productions receives revenue from that show? Never mind.

Lamm: We are trying to do some finagling from this year’s funds to give productions lighting and technical needs. Thinking about it.

Townshend: Give Higgins the go ahead to leave for vacation.

Higgins: I’ll stay if we’re closing budget tonight.

Townshend: Not going to happen. The only reason I say that is because once we’re done discussing each program, it is important to look at it holistically and make sure no further changes need to be made. I hope our work here has been enough but if that is the case, I want to make sure we have the opportunity to next week. Enjoy!

- Arts and Exhibits
  Thuringer: Hannah is director. This year she’s done a phenomenal job. Saved us money throughout year, very critical eye to Exit advertising campaign, amount they spend on catering. Decrease in her budget for this year. She has a lot of big dreams for Exit that we should support in the future. As this stands. In my opinion, nothing wrong. Most beautiful one I’ve ever seen.

- Films
  Schaff: Talking with Chantell. She’s for it. Haven’t heard anything else from her. Haven’t been able to contact senator Oak lately. A little upset about Sundance, understandable considering it was a one-shot thing; maybe look at it some other time.

  Dove: Talked to Chantell about this. Same thing. Not broken hearted, we can all agree maybe it was a little bit unnecessary, especially given experience that comes out of it. The way got their tickets ad set up the Sundance trip was less than ideal, done on such short notice. Noted that. Next year, suggestions laid out that there are better ways to do that trip, buy tickets. Might become more productive if they set it up better in the time. Set it up better, she’d look for a supplemental request.

  Vanata: Recognize Abbey.

  Abbey: Speaking to PD development, future action. Prudent in the future for films to encourage director to look into things other than Sundance, more fruitful around Sundance. Meaningful, just didn’t hit the mark.

- PR
  Rowe: Isaac has done a wonderful job. Budget coming in lower than last year. No complications.

  Mains: He’s doing a lot of work with senate, more than in the past, still lower budget, awesome.
Elections
Marshall: Elections Eric has done a phenomenal job. Floored to have such a great PD. Only things we decreased were food. It’s a good way to pull people in, lots went unused. Printing we can do in the office.

State Leg
Goldstein: Talking to Mark Bond who’s in charge of program, he is really confident this is best way to move with it in the future especially with positional changes and name change. Restructuring, good way to go about how this functions. Budget for next year where there is not a lobbyist. To maintain program as is. He outlines positions there.

Senate Discretionary
Townshend: I presented on briefly a few weeks ago. This was thinking about 50 per senator to allow for each senator to put on an event to help out with PR within college.

Vanata: Apologize for not speaking with right people before I informed this opinion. Not sure if it’s necessary, utilized. I don’t foresee senators take it upon themselves to use this in a way that is effective. Outreach. Start there. Don’t see that here. I don’t see this as necessary.

Mains: Question/thought. For senators who will rerun, could this easily be abused? Say I rerun, say I want to buy everyone who’s voting for me cookies.

McKay: The way this has been formed. Michael and I have discussed it extensively. Have to go through approval from senate president. Will be very clearly communicated to successor of this position, very well planned out event, dates, times, locations, details, like supplemental to the president. Well thought out venture.

Mains: Can you combine within college?

McKay: Yes. Idea. To do that individually or join together as a group to hold a larger something.

Thuringer: Last semester, Eric threw a meet your senator in fishbowl which was really successful. In Cheever. I was able to meet students I never would have met. Held office hours there. Hard to step out of school because academic buildings so separate. Great way to reach out to students, get some PR. Something big coming up, great way to pull in some interest, get perspectives so essential to decision making.

McKay: Echo Thuringer. Henry Lawson and I did this when college of business building coming around. 3rd floor Reid for 2 days, bought cookies, great outreach. Really cool opportunity to grow culture within senate. How you meet constituents. Really easy for us to get caught up in what we’re doing, sometimes don’t take time to do these things, outreach. Attitude around these funds will be formed by incoming senators, etc. In favor of idea, after doing something like this with my own funds. Student who emailed me, met there, wouldn’t have met elsewhere.

Reid: Speak to Vanata. Not a lot of negative to this. Don’t want to use it, nothing is lost. Lots of good can come out of it. In favor of it. Good idea.

Vanata: I hate to discount them. Haven’t seen or heard that part from Thuringer. Looking for grounds to say this is worth it. And McKay. Want to clarify that.

Townshend: Recommend motion to postpone till next week.
McKay: Move to approve.

Thuringer: Voice center has spearheaded. Really just our way of saying this is something we support as a body: idea that sexual assault of any variety is not acceptable on our campus, won’t allow students to feel that they can do and not receive frowns everywhere for it.

Marshall: Support this. I’m an advocate with Voice Center, near and dear to me. Really important to support that this is not okay, need to educate constituents, safe environment. Form relationships, bonds, school in general.

Townshend: Please put computers under table.

O’Donoghue: Thank you for bringing this to Senate body. Set precedent it’s okay to talk about these things. Talk to constituents that we support this, them and their rights. Incredible way to show leadership in this body.

Vote: 17/0/0.

Vanata: Move to table document until next week.

French: It hasn’t brought up so do we need to do anything?

Townshend: No. The motion to table is defunct because we weren’t in discussion. To be honest, I have no idea if that’s how you’re supposed to do that.

Goldstein: I see why we’re tabling this. Questions, come talk to me about it. Culmination of a lot of work. Move into bylaws.

Abbey: What if we move bylaws to next week because we don’t have a lot of budgets to next week?
Townshend: No reason we have to spend a lot of time on bylaws tonight. Like to show you thoughts brought up in past week. It could be a long meeting next week to if we wait to do all of it then. Highlight changes. Applicable to enter discussion, we can make that motion. Brought to my attention to say senate president/senate VP rather than senate leadership. Uphold integrity, professional values. May want to define this.

Mains: Are we going to discuss that code of ethics?

McKay: I move to take from the table the bylaws.

McKay: Move to accept changes proposed in section 2-1 and line 2.

Townshend: For all smaller changes that are more grammar and logistics, we can move to accept as a whole. Discussion surrounding previous service of senator to be eligible for senate leadership position. Should be limit on number of terms senate president/senate VP?

McKay: Set limit, taking away power of future bodies to make decisions. Been there for a while, liberty to put person in that position again.

Lamm: Agree. The more freedom in this sense where they can become senate leadership without previously being on senate. Let other senators be responsible for their own actions, make own decisions.

Vanata: Echo echo.

Dove: Echo. I think we can’t have one of these but not the other. Discussion on whether or not you should be able to run for senate leadership. Put restriction on them, same token as letting them run multiple times.

Thuringer: I submitted should be limit comment, devil’s advocate comment. On other point, disagree. Senate leadership is much more effective when they know what they’re doing, what's going on. Always things that carry over from year before, good for senate leadership to know what’s going on. Have some idea of how it can be approved. Told this wasn’t so great, maybe we’ll try this. I do see point of that limiting future bodies. Star first time senator makes sense for position. Quite a phenomenal person for me to be supportive of that.

McKay: I came into this being one proposed term before. I’ve thought a lot talked to people, constituents. Starting to step on future toes with our past feet. I have been working hard to have more faith in people elected to these positions. Select whoever they feel fit and capable of these positions. Weighs heavily on ASMSU experience, I do think there might come a time where someone could come through and do a phenomenal job without having previously served as a senator. Another position within ASMSU, another school. Move to strike line 4.

Vanata: I believe McKay is right. Toward changing elections, senate leadership most likely be elected in spring, lack of experience, have summer to get bearings under them.

Rowe: Echo McKay and Vanata. We should not limit them to having been a previous senator, will be exception to rule. Job of senate to nominate whomever is most qualified. We had options, picked Michael due to his experience. Senate will continue to make right decisions.

French: Amend motion to also strike line 3.
McKay: I think line 3 points a valid point we need to be making. If we shouldn’t be setting up limits, that’s necessary to clarify. Opposed because it’s important to say that we don’t have a limit set on these positions.

Marshall: I read about the ASMSU president, VP, have a limit on their term, important to have that in there that there is no limit on that.

Vanata: Little redundant. Senate president, VP, re-nominated. Senators will see value in them returning if they did a good job. No restrictions, clarify everything in bylaws, it would be super large which we previously did. We can assume it’s not limited.

Mains: Agree McKay, Marshall. Could come up in future, should be in there.

Dove: At the risk of sounding like some kind of republican or something, this is necessary. Why put rules in there just to put rules in there? That being said, move to previous question.

Townshend: Amendment to amendment is to strike line 3.

Vote: 7/10/0. Amendment to amendment fails.

Reid: We’ve spoken to this point previous question.

Vote: All in favor.

Townshend: Line four was stricken. Amendment passes.

Townshend: Added wording regarding stipend review committee regarding composition of committee.

Abbey: Language is unclear.

Townshend: I will set it up like finance board where it is bulleted out so it is more clear.

Stevens: Recognize VP Murdock.

Murdock: Don’t think VP voting member on that body. Conflict of interest. Their position is beneficial to provide testament to hours of employees overseeing. Didn’t vote because I didn’t think it was appropriate. Retiring, double conflict of interest.

Stevens: I totally agree with VP Murdock.

McKay: Move to amend by putting the ASMSU VP and ASMSU BM as non-voting members. To speak to my amendment, 3 voting members is fine. Still doesn’t allow for a tie, 3 members appointed by senate, faith in senate to appoint capable individuals. All of stipend review goes back to finance board and you guys in budget reviews so nothing is going unchecked.

Vanata: I am interested to hear whether or not we eliminated VP because it’s a stipend position, should be on review committee?

McKay: Not only is ASMSU VP, BM is stipend, OM is classified, Senate employee is stipend. Hard to get around that because in forms of leadership, all positions are stipend. Trust as non-voting members serve appropriately, senators vote in own discretion, check by finance board and senate.

Vanata: Didn’t’ think about that.
Stevens: I understand we’re reviewing this during budgeting. I’d like to see a more direct path from their decision to senate. Prelim decisions, 2/3 to overrule them. More responsible for efficient budgeting. Question mark.

McKay: Definitely a way we can set up way for stipend review committee. Reflected in budget. Admin agree with positions. There could be a 2/3 vote involved in that. Looks more like stipend review committee is reporting’s to senate, change stipends. Not reflected in admin or finance board budget, senate has discretion.

Townshend: As reminder, discussion on amendment.

French: Recognize Murdock.

Murdock: Constantly in office, I can pretty much see when directors are and aren’t coming in and out and have idea of their actually hours. Input also beneficial for student review committee. Provide that feedback to senators.

Amendment passes.

Stevens: Reiterate concerns I don’t know what they are like to see them after make decisions come to senate. Don’t think they need to go to admin.

Townshend: Submit to exec prior to budgeting.

Stevens: Streamline budgeting; allow senate to be more educated on what’s going on. Motion to amend to have stipend review submit stipend rec to senate before budgeting process.

Thuringer: Don’t know how necessary this is. Didn’t have questions regarding stipends specifically this cycle, did one last year because we didn’t have stipend review. I think if a question were to come up, voting members are senators, already here, question addressed at that time. Questions will be answered regardless of whether or not we have members report to senate. Important: goes to exec council, which we already have. See this reverted back.

Marshall: We did have a really good discussion about stipends Pres, VP last week. Long week. Senators on stipend review, still a lovely discussion with a lot of thoughtful research done and opinions. Recognize Abbey.

Abbey: Currently, all of programs submit budgets. Stipend review is separate. Then they submit budget. Admin merges all together by getting to a zero budget. Submit to finance board to check us. That’s going to get checked. Goes to finance board. And finance board checks it. Senate’s job to do research, check in with review. Waste of time for stipends to come here multiple times. Might as well just come here with budget. Inefficient from my perspective. Conversations should be here but makes sense to go through process. With that, return floor to Marshall.

Townshend: Brings up issue of it happening every odd year. Stipends supposed to exist for two years and not be changed. Made it every year, original way makes more sense. Happening every other year, changes it a little bit.

Stevens: This is only going to save time. Problem, don’t want to hash it out during budgeting. Save time, arguments, make budgeting more fluid. Another check. Lots of committees aren’t checking right now, having a fallback on that committee is a good thing.
Thuringer: Still think it’s a waste of time. Wanted to check every committee, would be a nightmare. Look at program within full context of budget. Hard to know without events planning, programming for following year. Easier to see numbers for coming year after review for admin and finance board.

Vanata: Previous question.

Amendment: 4/12/1. Abstention: Mulick.

Vanata: I heard people call for yes vote before division, didn’t vote yes. Unclear at any point, have right to ask for clarification. Don’t ever be embarrassed. I saw five say yes, three votes when we did placards. Ask for clarification if you need it.

McKay: Might I recommend pressing save after every change that is made that is voted upon? Really don’t want this to go bye-bye.

Townshend: Streamline advisory committee. Streamline board. Language that echoed KGLT, LI has as far as advisory committees. Two senate liaisons, etc.

McKay: Move to accept.

Lamm: Can you clarify what this would do for streamline?

Townshend: Currently a board.

Lamm: So just putting it in bylaws?

Townshend: Reflect what KGLT has. Streamline advisory committee, 2 liaisons on committee.

Abbey: Why are we calling it advisory committee if it’s a board?

Townshend: Language that clarifies that.

Dove: Two seats on streamline. To my knowledge, difficult to fill consistently. Now create board that advises two people?

Townshend: Saying that board is the advisory board so we know there is an advisory board for one of our programs.

Thuringer: That would make it a requirement by two senate liaisons to go to those meetings.

Vanata: Repercussions for senators not attending meetings?

Townshend: I am of opinion that it should count as unexcused absence. Huge burden placed on senate pres to keep track of that. Yes, probably should be. It's unrealistic to monitor that.

Vanata: See it as pretty simple. Require one paragraph report of what happened, return to president. I guess when we’re calling them required. Putting it in there, throughout rest of bylaws, any real teeth to that.

Reid: Of opinion it shouldn’t be required, we’re students, if you can’t make it because you have a class or test the next day, shouldn’t be required. I think putting a requirement on it is too much to ask.
O’Donoghue: Similar sentiments. A body of students who are motivated to do what we can to be involved in student body, putting a requirement is belittling to that. Something they feel passionate about, carry over into meetings.

Thuringer: Like this in there, students who work for streamline, point of contact that may not be their boss, represent students. Would count was 2 meetings per month required with PD. Also think it should be required that KGLT, LI, legal services, daycare, etc. Making that consistent. Don’t think these should be required for one; make that consistent for the rest of them. Important: chose programs who liaise to unless you come in appointed. Incredibly important, make sure senate keeping voice on these boards. Problem getting senators to those meetings, they need to be there.

French: I can’t point to where it is. I was of understanding that you can only miss one or two unexcused senate meetings a semester, two committee meetings counted for one of your absences on senate. Type of language should encompass this document. Next semester if I can’t make committee meetings, step down from that. I’ve had issues with that, trying to make Romney committees. Nothing you can do about it.

Townshend: Clarify to add this into it. Applicable conversation about repercussions and level of what happens if you’re not doing these things. We’re in discussion here. Finish this up, have that conversation afterward.

Lamm: Move to previous question.

Amendment passes. Adopt that.

Lamm: Move to table bylaws until next week.

Vanata: I would like to have you skim through and explain further changes, proper preparation for next and last meeting.

Lamm: Can we close and still skim?

Townshend: Yes.

Vanata: Can we ask for clarification?

Townshend: Yes, just no amendments.

Mains: I feel like we’re here now, push through a bit more. We’re going to have a lot to do next week too do a bit more call it quits. We can do a bit more.

Marshall: Echo Mains. We’re only at section 4, 9 total. Push through this a little bit, make more headway.

Lamm: Move to previous question.

Postpone: 7/9/0.

Townshend: Discussion on bylaws. Has anyone here been to outdoor rec advisory committee?

McKay: Just had conversation with Ryan about this Monday. It’s not active currently, looking to open that up, make up new membership, suggest we consult with director on this matter, he knows what he wants. Invite him into conversation.
Reid: Really interested in opening it up to two liaisons, two other senators, just 2 liaisons, 2 students at large, fresh blood.

Macy: Clarify that Ryan is following Blake’s edits of bylaws as of now.

Townshend: We’ll discuss this outside of this body. Question. Senate liaisons serving as co-chairs makes sense, hopefully part of conversation with Ryan, please bring info back to us. Rec sports and fitness?

Stevens: Attend every month.

Townshend: Work out with senators being co-chairs?

Stevens: Yes. I believe Steve likes it that way, haven’t had discourse.

Townshend: Judicial council. No murmurings in the week, talk more about this. Don’t want to enter discussion on it right now. Too big of a thing. Discussion on proxy. More discussion wanted?

Marshall: Like to revisit this. Good discussion over past week, interesting ideas. Option of senator Skyping in (say at conference) had option, still wanted to be a part of that. Dani Skyped a presentation. Constituents concern with this. If not part of discussion.

Vanata: I think as far as a Skype thing, you need to be present to be in discussion. Proxy on paper is a great idea, if a senator is to put in a vote for something, paper as a proxy they’ve heard of previously, wrong to assume that anyone on this body would chose to vote even though they may not be knowledgeable, don’t understand. In order for me to represent constituents, need to be able to put in my vote on their behalf. Some cases this year, senators have family emergencies, doesn’t mean they are not knowledgeable. Conference, inexcusable. Those should not be in there. Emergencies senators should carry that vote, circumstances outside of their control.

Mains: I’m all for Skyping in. It’s 2013 why not? With that, pressure on president. In charge of making sure Skyping in, can’t raise placard. All ideas. A Skype system in place, person physically controlling Skype to wave placard to make things more efficient in the room. Thinks proxy is a great idea, been swayed so many times this week, love to hear some great arguments about this. Thank you.

Stevens: Personally feel Skype proposal is distracting. Not very applicable. Slow down legislature process. Able to Skype, probably could be here. Agree with Vanata. Keep proxies. Like to see an amendment to read “intent of proxy vote only applicable if intent of main motion remains the same” vote only cast if intent of main motion is the same. No alteration. Amendment that changes intent, vote is thrown out. That’s kind of dotting i’s, crossing t’s. And proxy is going to be spelled with a p. That’s my amendment. Pretty self-explanatory. Limit problems could arise from proxy, don’t see anything negative, up to senate president’s discretion if intent is changed. Only grey area.

Vanata: I agree it should be based on intent, not just a grammatical thing. Grey area of intent. Some uncertainty, that proxy would be held and vote wouldn’t be concluded until senator was reached. Senate president calls after meeting. Senator would then allow for vote. Either would or would not be valid. Abstention.

Stevens: Within bylaws, votes have to be a time after they’ve been tallied up that they can be changed?
Townshend: Proxy votes aren’t allowed in Robert’s Rules. This is something brought to attention consider for this body. In certain assemblies, yes that is the case. It would have to be adopted as a statement in the bylaws.

Stevens: Is it a question of vote?

Townshend: I don’t want to say senate president shouldn’t do work required of them but this is just getting into a really difficult area. It would be hard to manage all of that. That’s my personal opinion. Would be a lot of work.

McKay: Surprise! Erica’s against proxy voting. Because conversations we have around this table, everyone seen it, especially tonight, change your opinions. Opinions changed all over the place tonight. Intent stayed same. Such a grey area. Look at conversation we’re having. Do we want this to happen every time someone calls in a proxy Your physical presence here and ability to engage in conversation, most important role as a senator. Vote accordingly. You can’t even make argument that conversation here does not change opinions, had it 6 or 7 times tonight. Happened on public record. Why I’m against idea of proxy voting. So passionate, you dang well can do research and homework and lobbying before meeting. Easy to talk to senate friends at office hours, school, after meetings, before, etc. See it tonight, previously. Adds so much to votes, how they turn out. Lt decision made by one vote tonight. I’m sorry but some in favor or opposed changed opinions in conversation. Can’t tell me not being here and voting is responsible.

Townshend: I’d recommend discussion. Concrete amendment proposals within next week to consider next week.

Vanata: Concerned with the lack of value put into proxy votes. As a senator, responsible to vote on behalf of constituents. Assume that every senator can be swayed coming into this is ridiculous. If a senator believes they can be swayed, shouldn’t be voting, that’s on them. Can be swayed at all, shouldn’t be voting. I think if you believe you can put a vote in on behalf of constituents, put a proxy vote in for it. I think we are not servicing ours students if we’re not allowed to do that. Not in all circumstances. Can’t be here, hot topics. You should be able to still vote. Discredit or discount if you can be swayed. Senators come in here, do homework, very certain. Can have discussion. I lobby to people all the time. They’re super resistant to me. Not necessarily effective. Still need to be able to represent my constituents. Stiles, myself, Dove, College of Engineering all gone, we need those proxy votes here in special circumstances. Key word. Family emergencies. Test, etc. super important to have for those circumstances.

Goldstein: Not for concept of proxy. Bad idea, goes against Robert’s Rules. Wasn’t here, wouldn’t be able to voice that opinion. That is important. Expectation that you are here. Discussion outside of senate. Not appropriate time for this. Midnight, class tomorrow. Move to move pass this. Call to previous question.

Townshend: Surround language: original intent hasn’t changed.

Vote for amendment: 8/7/3. Abstentions: Goldstein, Smith, Mains.

Townshend: You are all out of order right now. Please don’t’ discuss proxies anymore.

Charles: Move to postpone until next week.

Vote: 14/4.
Townshend: We will postpone until next week. Not necessary to obstruct process, please maintain order, allows for us to actually have a discussion. Please remember that. Different ways to report, regularly should be discretionary. Could define more if people desire that. Fiscal policy: cap on president’s discretionary. Currently 1% of activity fee revenues, about $11,000. End up getting 1.5 million, it would be $15,000. Should there be a cap, 1% or this much? Use of excess funds. Currently excess funds placed in reserve fund at end of fiscal year (end of June) all remaining funds transferred to incoming president. April 18-June 30, new incoming president have use of remaining funds from previous year’s discretion. It’s a bit confusing, need an accountant’s perspective. Go to reserve, what it’s used for, total up to get 40. Continue with changes, just no discussion. Will take two more minutes. Excess funds in operation fund. Earmark for themselves. Throw it all into reserve fund at end of fiscal year or allow them to earmark. Allocation of supplemental. Traditionally not used to cover program budget deficits. Please think about that.

French: Is it not true that there is some sort of finance board policy that would be more suited to cover that rather than bylaws themselves?

Townshend: We can cite that policy. As last week, code of ethics to think about. Additions made up to this point. I hope you all spend time on this, now that we’re mostly done with budgeting so we can tackle this problem next week. I’m getting tired and a little bit cranky I apologize. Concludes old business.

• New Business
  o 2013-Funding-15 ASMSU Lobbyist April Stipend
    ▪ State Leg
  McKay: This is Dani’s pay for April so she can pay her rent. Thought it would end at end of March, turns out it doesn’t, unforeseen issue with logistics. Nothing wrong with state leg, Dani, anybody, unforeseen expense.

Move to approve by French.

17/0/0.

o 2013-Funding-16 Outdoor Rec Operating Equipment
  McKay: Ryan’s supplemental. Came through finance board, never made it to you guys. Hoping to host this on server within university, pricing wasn’t working out, have more conversation, move forward with that. Software purchases for rent master, make program more efficient. Most controversial piece was PC. Requested a Mac. Maybe a PC is considered because Macs are more expensive, ran familiar with programs on Mac to do what he needs, have a longer life. Ultimately, approved unanimously.

Reid: Move to approve.

Reid: Good points. Taking that out into field. Want to be able to get on that at end of day, check in, everything back in shop done correctly, sand, dirt, snow, etc. Mac a lot more durable in those conditions, really interested in running Photoshop, etc. Difference between Mac and PC is pretty substantial, professional stuff to boost program for marketing getting it up or above par, Mac key to that.

Vanata: Thanks for clarification. Excited for improvements. Always wondered why we couldn’t use debit or credit cards. I think that will make a big difference. Thanks.
Thuringer: Speak to Macs. My Mac had a gallon of milk spilled on it this morning and it's fine. Elements: could be a good call. Programs, final cut pro, etc. They'll run on Windows and they will kill it. Will kill a Mac over time. Extreme drain over time. Invest in a Mac, return on that. Windows comparable. Make right choices given price 15-inch retina. Good call coming from personal experience. Same computer I use, beautiful, can handle that stuff for five years.

Lamm: BM Jackson: Supplemental sit if we approve?

Townshend: This is a reserve request.

Lamm: I'm very sorry I missed that.

Townshend: I didn’t mention that, either.

Rowe: Move to previous question.

Vote: 17/0/0.

- 2013-Resolution-16
Townshend: Addition to new business. I apologize I got this to you last minute. Resolution is takeaway from Bob Lashaway’s discussion on Romney project. Dependent on legislature’s vote on long range voting plan legislation, currently HB5 but it’s been changing. Allow for new construction to take place to house occupants in Romney currently that will be displaced if this project happens. 20 million, authorization of 5mil more for non-state funds, which would be academic R&R, mainly academic building fee. Allowing for new construction to be built for occupants outside out this room.

First reading of 2013-R-16.

Dove: We do not know yet where this will be?

Townshend: Thoughts—over behind facilities, south east corner of campus between AGR and current building there near old faculty houses that are now mostly research labs. It’s also proposed that will turn into academic space, facilities will move elsewhere to allow central spot to be used to more academic uses.

Dove: I talked with them and ROTC doesn’t want to move that far away.

- Admin Reports
  - President – Kiah Abbey
  Abbey: It’s unrealistic to think that anyone is paying attention so I will put my admin reports on my window.

  - Vice-President – Lindsay Murdock
  Murdock: Email those, don’t want you to forget. Keep eye out for that. T-shirts exchange, Romney stuff. Quote: “If you set out to be liked, you will be prepared to compromise on anything at any time and you will achieve nothing.”

  - Business Manager – Lauren Jackson
  Jackson: Going to go over what budget looks like. Can’t get into computer, have a good weekend.

  - Senate President – Michael Townshend
Townshend: Doing a good job. Almost 12:30. 6.5 hours a lot. I’m getting cranky like I said, I apologize. I will try to remember the fun aspects of what we do here. I’ve been kidding myself that it’s not every fun. I do enjoy working with you all.

- Senate Vice President – Erica McKay

McKay: Tomorrow 12-2 on corner of 6th and Grant. Take glass, take it and recycle it into countertops and backsplashes for college of business building. Piece of you. Not RSVPed for banquet. ANGRY eyes. If you have not done it those are my angry eyes. Still a response. Come talk to me afterward. Lot of calls to action today in public comment, need to actively act on those as a body. Ask for our input, give it to them. It’s your job to give those to them. Recs for library stuff, compile email and send it off as ASMSU body. Everybody was talking about how great directors are tonight. Tell them. I need two people for each date for VP of student success candidates. Student senators to pass mic around. April 15: 8:45am. Monday. I think they’re one hour. Kiah will save your butts. April 26 1:15 Friday thank you Ethan. Send email out. May 1st Wednesday 8:45am finals week. Thank you Cara. Way to be on budget. Super proud of you all. I get like this when I’m tired not cranky so yeah good job.

Townshend: I didn't forget this. Want to make sure everyone had a chance to fill this out. Anyone? Send it out to everyone.

French: I would like their emails.

Townshend: I will get that for you.

- Senate Reports

Lamm: This is really important. Surveys. Everyone’s help. 5 of them. Talk to five students about dead week, finals week, stress levels, presentations, etc. We need this data by Tuesday. We need to put it into a PowerPoint to give to faculty senate to get legislative action going. Ton of complaints about finals week, dead week, etc. questions? Grab me after meeting. Copy machine, copy more! All people you know have them. Vanata working with me on this.

Vanata: Thank you. Hand them out to five people, constituents real quick.

Lamm: Present to you next week about exact presentation for faculty senate. Want hard data. Please feel free to fill out your own.

Rowe: IT council. All MSU campuses, any points, get them to me. Actively pursue a safe drive program.

Vanata: UAC debacle. They’ve called a meeting for that to touch on a couple of other things, May 1st 1pm. Interested in attending, provide input. In athletics department.

- Senate Announcements

Rowe: Take time to go to Pow Wow tomorrow. Great event ASMSU sponsors.

Thuringer: Email 3 weeks ago about Story Mill. Still only one response from business manger Jackson. Reach out to community. Begging me for input, can’t give them input. Take ten minutes, look at website, map, what do you want? Do it this weekend, won’t be angry anymore.

Townshend: Please resend email.

Thuringer: Get at me with feedback.
Vanata: Sorority AOPi Strut Out Arthritis. 15 or 20 per person. Fashion show, appetizers. Sponsor two senators. Really cool event, cool peeps, two senators I’ll sponsor you. 7pm. Jen and Charles. Appreciate you listening to ambassador program. Process behind that. Jump in a bit. $33 million. Let you know what process is, interested about process. I’d love if we could have educational transfer to incoming senators. End of year report. Talk about committee, what happened there, issue that came up, any advice to future senators in future college. Interest in that? YES.

Schaff: Greek week, going well. Lots of things. Messy Twister, disappointed I missed that, finished tomorrow with food drive. Food at home, please give it to sorority or fraternity, prefer AGR, chariot races Saturday.

Move to adjourn by Mains.

• Meeting Adjourned at 12:36am.