Student Government Association Minutes from April 16, 2014

April 16, 2014 Attendance:

President Choplick, Vice President Anderson, Treasurer Mills, Senators, Alsaqri, Berriault, Bosworth, Cahill, Cassidy, Christiano, DiBacco, Fallanca, Fernandez, Fox, Frey, Fung, Germaine, Gomez, Gregonis, Hubbard, Hudobenko, Khan, Kitchener, Lee, Measho, Moody, Moreno, Perry, Pietrycha, Rodriguez, Sonet, Swan, Testa

Meeting is called to order at 3:11p by President Choplick

Motion to accept meeting minutes from 4/9 (Cassidy, Alsaqri)

Motion passes unanimously

Public Hearing: None

Student Affairs Report: Scott Hazan

Please let your clubs know that we are wrapping up and getting ready for the end of the semester so no more events, especially with the last day being May 1. We are doing our best to stick to our policies. On the link we have a SALD survey so please take it and encourage your clubs to do the same.

Treasurer’s Report:

1. Thank you all for the well-wishes, I really appreciate it
2. Revenue Account: we spent $104,305 and have $241,000 left
3. For Use: spent $73,000 and have $23,000 left
4. Operational: spent $35,000 and have $71,000 left
5. Contingency: $36,000 spent and $11,320 left
6. New Base Budgets: spent $8720 and have $10,000 left
7. Fundraising: spent $3522 and have $22,000 left
8. Student Life spent around $6668
9. Public Affairs this far spent $33,907.33
10. Academic affairs will have spent $1000
11. Not including our clubs we spent about $262,600

Vice President’s Report
1. Please fill out and hand in the superlative awards
2. The Banquet is at 7:30p tonight
3. We did stipend review on Friday, 26 were granted, 8 denied, 5 were appealed and of those appeals 4 were granted

Kitchener: have the checks been printed yet

Anderson: I don't think so

Kitchener: can you stop them

Anderson: you’ll have to go to SALD

Hazan: I signed off on them this morning and while I don’t think you will be taxed on the stipend, if you want it stopped you have to go up ASAP

Perry: how do you know if you've gotten your stipend

Anderson: you should have gotten an email

**President's Report**

1. Sorry you’re all stuck with me another week, we will ratify election results next week
2. I decided to veto the decision made by the Senate on the stoles based on the public outcry of the decision made

Kitchener: did you poll the student body

Choplick: no my decision was made based on the students who contacted our Senators, but if you want to overturn my decision you can do so with a 2/3 vote

3. There is a motion under new business I suggest we move to Open Floor first to discuss it

Alsaqri: do we do that after we take care of the clubs

Choplick: yes

**Committee Reports**

Student Life: Sonet: It’s Not Easy Being Green is Tuesday 12-3p in the Student Center circle, we are passing around a volunteer sheet so please sign up//Vermin Supreme is here tomorrow in Torpe Theater from 5:30-8p he will be debating with me, Hubbard, Berriault and Rodriguez...the scholarship winners have been decided. Yields time for questions

Kitchener: will you email everyone who's applied regardless if they won a scholarship or not
Sonet: yes

Christiano: the sign up sheet for the event is going around, we mainly need help with setup and breakdown

Finance Committee: Mills: there was no finance committee this week but this year we spent $384,000 on clubs so congratulations on that. We have two line items to be decided on today, one is for the Student Veterans Organization for $95.75 for a new banner for an event they want to have coming up the second is for LASO moving money from conferences to the end of the year event

Kitchener: was anything in these requests denied in the base budgets

Mills: no, the SVO thing is new and the money for LASO was cut because of budgetary reasons

Khan: when is the LASO event

Mills: April 25

Alsaqri: can this still happen if it is past deadline

Mills: I do not have an answer for that

Choplick: is the SVO Banner for the club or the specific event

Mills: the email said for an event

Perry: what is the difference

Mills: if it is just for the club it can be reused

**Unfinished Business:** None

**New Business:**

Motion to approve the Student Veteran’s Organization Line Item Change with $95.75 going from speakers to supplies (Mills, Cassidy)

For: Mills: SVO would like to buy a banner for an event with excess money

POI Berriault to Mills: what is the purpose

Mills: promotion for an event

Vote: 27Y (Anderson, Mills, Alsaqri, Berriault, Bosworth, Cahill, Cassidy, Christiano, DiBacco, Fallanca, Fernandez, Fox, Frey, Fung, Germaine, Gregonis, Hubbard, Khan, Kitchener, Lee, Measho, Perry, Pietrycha, Rodriguez, Sonet, Swan, Testa) 0N 1A (Moreno)
Point of Order: Berriault: There was a senator who couldn’t cast a vote

Not well taken: that had to be brought up before I closed voting

Motion to approve the LASO line item request (Fallanca, Alsaqri)

For: Fallanca: the conference they had money for was not organized so they have extra money that they would like to use for this event

Against: Christiano: I don’t know if I feel comfortable just moving it to other

POI Fox to Mills: why did they wait so long to then need expedited shipping?

Mills: I can’t answer that as treasurer but I know this wasn’t just a last minute thing

For: Fallanca: they have all the quotes in the request so this is all the info we need

POI Lee: the lines don’t all add up

Choplick: it continues to the back

Vote: 25Y (Anderson, Alsaqri, Berriault, Bosworth, Cahill, Cassidy, Christiano, DiBacco, Fallanca, Fernandez, Fox, Frey, Fung, Gregonis, Hubbard, Khan, Measho, Moody, Moreno, Perry, Pietrycha, Sonet, Swan, Testa) 2N (Germaine, Kitchener) 5A (Mills, Gomez, Hudobenko, Lee, Rodriguez)

Motion to suspend the rules and move to open floor (Kitchener, Cassidy)

For: Kitchener: let’s move to open floor to talk about the by-law change

Vote: by voice

Passes

Open Floor

Kitchener: I pulled up the proposal from Dean since he is in VA. He suggested this just so there is a protocol if there is a tie and multiple seats need to be filled.

Proposed change:

D. In the event of a tie, a Special Election will be held on at least two consecutive days one week or less after the results of the previous election have been released. The Special Election will take place prior to the election results being ratified by Senate and therefore
before the commencement of the new Senate. The Special Election must be in accordance with Title 5.

E. In the event of a tie in the Special Election another Special Election will take place in accordance with Title 5 Section 5-2D until a winner or winners are decided.

Yields time

Germaine: what’s the difference between this one and the one on the agenda?

Kitchener: this addresses the issue if we need multi-winners

Measho: is this a separate motion

Kitchener: I’m not sure, so I can’t answer that

Fox: is this the same as he sent to us

Kitchener: yes

Rodriguez: so would this be like a special election voted on by students

Kitchener: it’s the same thing as a special election

Rodriguez: if there is a tie for time’s sake wouldn’t it be better for the senate to decide

Kitchener: absolutely not

Lee: point of order: noise

Well taken

Choplick: what happens if the eboard elections had tied? They would need to have a special election and that would have required one week and that would have come over spring break, did you have any conversations on that

Kitchener: no

Hudobenko: I know Dean has good intentions but I don’t think this needs to be so difficult. We can make it simple and clear without it being so long.

Testa: I don’t like that it’s two days I don’t think it’s necessary

Berriault: if this passes we should get rid of section E. I agree with Sen. Hudobenko, it doesn’t have to be so complicated. We should be as simple as possible. Sen. Ott says the same thing as the one on the agenda except it is wordier. We should put this into Section 5-2. There is no need to create a new By-Law section, it can be a subsection

Yields time
Kitchener: what about the 24 hour window for appeals

Berriault: that’s already in the by-laws

Kitchener: but how can you give enough time for those appeals and then have the senate ratified on the Wednesday

Berriault: it is under Title 5

Kitchener: how if they then have two days before getting sworn in

Berriault: are you talking about the proposal or By-Laws

Kitchener: both

Berriault: if this were to take into effect the new senate would be sworn in the following Wednesday we have a meeting, but nothing is set in stone, however it is in our By-Laws

Choplick: the current proposal just says two days, which can take place over a weekend. My suggestion would be for item A on the agenda to combine with elections

Hubbard: Point of Order: Noise

Well taken

Choplick: my suggestion for item b would be subsection 1

Hudobenko: I think the election should last at least two day to only be fair. There’s always time for the senators to be inducted

Sonet: because the ratification is only 203 weeks away from the end of the year and there is a possibility of multiple ties, what happens if it gets to May and a new senate isn’t ratified

Kitchener: that’s a great point, we can continue the election into the fall but that would be unfair

Fernandez: I think everything we're trying to accomplish with this is in Title 5-2 so it should just be a subsection. In reference to what Sen. Sonet said, there was a time when Senate refused to ratify election results and they went into the fall with half the seats not filled, there are ways to take care of that but I don’t think that will happen. I don’t think we should hold elections on the weekends, but what we have in front of us will take care of the problem for now, if something like what was brought up happens in the future there will be ways to go in and change it but right now it’s irrelevant

Kitchener: should we go back to the idea of a one-day election

Hubbard: usually I hate discretion but in this case a simpler method would be the best way. There are too many what ifs. You can’t standardize a tie, if we try to come up with one
answer we tie ourselves up. Special elections should be loosely constructed with the Public Affairs and Eboard coming up with the most practical solution because what happened this year may not be the case for next time

Berriault: I propose we move this to 5-2, and as much as I appreciate this conversation, a 2-day election is in our Constitution so we’d have to change that and right now we are talking about a by-law change and 5-2 also says a two-day election

Yields Time

Straw Poll:

Ott’s Proposal v Item A: Majority chose item A

Proposal as a second section v Combined with 5-2: majority likes combining it

POI Hudobenko: why did you recommend having its own section?

Choplick: just for the sake of clarity but there is no big difference as long as it’s covered

Motion to insert under Title 5-2 in the By-Laws “d: ) In the event of a tie, a run-off election will be held on two consecutive days prior to all candidates being sworn into office and in accordance with the rest of Title 5.” (Hudobenko, Pietrycha)

For: Hudobenko: the straw poll proves this is most favorable

Move to amend to strike “on two consecutive days” (Kitchener, Khan)

For: Kitchener: we talked about not holding it for two days and only having a one day special election

Against: Measho: I don’t like the idea of just one day, voters need to be alerted

For: Hubbard: if they just have one day it goes back to the idea of discretion, this as it stands has a time limit stipulation and the number of days should be up to the senate

POI Measho: if this does get strike out who’s discretion is it

Choplick: I would assume PA because they run elections but it’s not up to anyone specific

POI Testa: with the Constitution is this even a possibility

Choplick: if there is no day stipulation it would go to 5-2 which says two-consecutive days still

POI Perry: with special elections do they have a week to campaign

Choplick: no
POI Perry: so instead it’s two consecutive days

Pietycha: Point of Order: this is not a POI

Well Taken

Choplick: you’ve already asked one question

Against: Berriault: with regards to the motion and amendment, if you look at 5-2-c it says two consecutive days, if we’re to amend this as is it’s still two days regardless. Senate can amend to strike the two days and still be flexible and have more than two days, but anything less is a violation

Yields Time

Measho: C does that apply to anything

Berriault: if you take out what is listed it won’t change anything

Perry: do you agree or disagree with losing the times

Berriault: that’s a totally different issue

Kitchener: I withdraw my motion

**Amendment is withdrawn**

**Move to amend to strike “on two consecutive days” and insert “over a period of time decided on by the Public Affairs Committee” (Hubbard, Kitchener)**

For: Hubbard: I think this should be under 5-2 but it is specialized so it can be structured differently and if it decided by the PA committee that addresses the most concerns

Against: Lee: I’d like to think of something a little more specific and I like the two-days

POI Measho: does this count for every election

Choplick: this is for anything that is facilitated by the SGA

**Move to amend the amendment and insert after time, “lasting at least a minimum of 24 hours” (Anderson, Fernandez)**

For: Anderson: this covers all the problems we have with the amendment

POI Measho: if this is up to PA would it go against the By-Laws

Choplick: is this passes it would be up to public affairs to hold a special election of at least 24 hours
Vote: 19Y (Anderson, Alsaqri, Berriault, Bosworth, Cahill, Cassidy, DiBacco, Fallanca, Fernandez, Fox, Frey, Gomez, Hubbard, Hudobenko, Khan, Lee, Measho, Moody, Pietrycha, Testa) 3N (Germaine, Kitchener, Lee) 2A (Christiano, Sonet)

Amendment Passes

First Amendment:

POI Hudobenko: how do we include item B

Choplick: you can amend the original motion

Vote: 18Y (Anderson, Alsaqri, Berriault, Bosworth, Cahill, Cassidy, DiBacco, Fallanca, Fernandez, Frey, Gomez, Hubbard, Hudobenko, Khan, Kitchener, Moody, Pietrycha, Testa) 4N (Germaine, Fox, Lee, Measho) 3A (Mills, Christiano, Sonet)

Amendment Passes

Original Motion

Move to enter into a committee of the whole (Fernandez, Alsaqri)

Khan: point of privilege: it’s hot in here

Choplick: I have no control of that

Moving into the Committee of the whole is debatable

For: Fernandez: there are a lot of opinions and we should be able to speak freely

POI Hubbard: is this a discussion of the amendment or original motion

Choplick: the original motion

POI Berriault: can you read exactly what it says in Roberts Rules

Point of Order: Christiano

Not well taken

Choplick: this is rarely used when the motion should be openly conversed about the rest is all procedure

Against: Berriault: this is very outdated and never used and I don’t think you can use it when we are all assembled in senate

Choplick: this is so the assembly can enter into a committee as a whole and then recommend something back to senate
Sonet: so basically internal affairs

Choplick: you can look at it that way

Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: is this pass then we pass something does that just get referred back to senate

Choplick: yes

**Move to call to previous question (Fernandez, Alsaqri)**

Point of Order: Christiano: out of dress code

Well taken

Vote: 15Y 5N 2A (Mills, Sonet)

Vote: 7Y (Cahill, Christiano, Fernandez, Fox, Germaine, Gomez, Measho) 15N (Anderson, Mills, Alsaqri, Berriault, Bosworth, Cassidy, DiBacco, Hubbard, Hudobenko, Khan, Kitchener, Lee, Measho, Moody, Sonet, Testa) 2A (Fallanca, Frey)

**Moving to Committee as a whole Fails**

**Move to call the roll (Alsaqri, Khan)**

Attendance: (President Choplick, Vice President Anderson, Treasurer Mills, Senators, Alsaqri, Berriault, Bosworth, Cahill, Cassidy, Christiano, DiBacco, Fallanca, Fernandez, Fox, Frey, Germaine, Gomez, Hubbard, Hudobenko, Khan, Kitchener, Lee, Measho, Moody, Pierycha, Sonet, Testa)

Call to Previous Question (Berriault, Cassidy)

Vote: 9Y 9N 3A (Sonet, Mills, Fallanca)

Debate Continues

POI Sonet: if this never ends would this go to unfinished business

Choplick: yes

POI Measho: so next week the new senate will be inducted

Choplick: yes they will be ratified

Vote: 20Y (Anderson, Mills, Berriault, Bosworth, Cahill, Cassidy, Christiano, DiBacco, Fallanca, Fernandez, Frey, Gomez, Hubbard, Hudobenko, Khan, Kitchener, Measho, Moody, Pierycha, Testa) 3N (Fox, Germaine, Lee) 1A (Sonet)

**Motion Passes**
Move to call the roll (Khan, Fernandez)

Objection to the consideration of the motion (Lee, Pietrycha)

Vote: 11Y (Berriault, Cassidy, Christiano, Dibacco, Hubbard, Kitchener, Lee, Measho, Perry, Sonet, Testa) 8N (Mills, Bosworth, Fallanca, Fernandez Fox, Germaine, Hudobenko, Khan, Moody) 4A (Anderson, Cassidy, Frey, Gomez)

Fails

Attendance: (President Choplick, Vice President Anderson, Treasurer Mills, Senators, Berriault, Bosworth, Cahill, Christiano, DiBacco, Fallanca, Fernandez, Fox, Frey, Germaine, Gomez, Hudobenko, Khan, Kitchener, Lee, Measho, Moody, Pietrycha, Swan, Testa)

Back to Open Floor:

Choplick: if we’re going to keep going like this make sure there is no other pressing business

Testa: the PA committee is split on how the committee should work. Dean wants an ad hoc committee for elections that aren’t contributed to by the people running and I don’t think we need that so I want to get different opinions

Measho: is this how PA ran elections

Testa: we had problems this year, but do we let PA do their job or do we do an ad hoc committee

Christiano: how would this work with the by-laws

Testa: PA would pick a separate ad hoc committee

Christiano: would only graduating seniors be on it

Testa: only those not running

Measho: can anyone join

Testa: anyone who isn’t running

Khan: Public Affairs picks? Can anyone join?

Testa: Anyone who wants to join and is not running.

Dibacco: I don’t think that should be limited to graduating seniors.

Straw Poll: Majority chose ad hoc committee
Berriault: I think while this should be discussed, I don’t think it should be discussed really until the new senate is ratified. Public Affairs should discuss this during the retreat.

Motion to excuse myself from the 4/23 meeting. (Hudobenko, Pietrycha)

For Hudobenko: There is an Accounting Society meeting, they are usually at 7pm, but this one is at 3:30pm and they are doing e-board elections, and I want to run for a position.

Vote: Voice

Motion Passes SG14-178

Fernandez: It’s specific that PA have elections because there used to be an elections committee and we found that the more people involved the better. It all boils down to integrity, we shouldn’t have an ad hoc committee because that takes away from the committee as a whole.

Hazan: Way back when it was a really big deal to have running not be involved because it used to be paper votes, and we would have to have people sitting at the tables. Now there is very little advantage because everything goes through our office, and The Link.

Germaine: Yes, in the past it was easy, but now it is easy to hear the people at the polling station influencing. So we should have an ad hoc committee because it is still easy to manipulate voters.

POI Measho: Were there bios this year also available?

Testa: I don’t think you need an ad hoc committee for that, I am talking about the behind the scene stuff. You shouldn’t be sitting at the table if you are running, but you can still help with organization.

Berriault: We don’t need an ad hoc committee, the only con is if you are directly involved with coming up with the rules. There is no reason you cannot be on Public Affairs while you are running. If you want an ad hoc committee it can be part of Public Affairs, or a separate committee. We need to think outside the box and not doing something based on what was done this previous year.

Fernandez: It has been fun working with you guys. I want to keep these connections going.

Motion to Adjourn (Khan, Cassidy)

Point of Order (Measho): He wasn’t recognized.

Not well taken

Division (Germaine, Measho)

Vote: 12Y 5N
Meeting adjourned at 5:12pm.