March 6, 2013

Present: President Bergenn, Vice President Braun, Treasurer Alaimo, Senators Anderson, Baldassario, Berriault, Choplick, Fallanca, Fellows, Fernandez, Fox, Fung, Germaine, Gomez, Hubbard, Khan, Kirk, Kitchener, Lee, Lopez, Manento, Marcelli, Mgushi, Mills, Narcisse, Ott, Pancak, Radden, Rodriguez, Sejdiraj, Sonet, Szabo, Testa, Towler Truex, Zohlman

Meeting called to order at 3:13 p.m. by President Bergenn.

Motion to approve minutes from February 27, 2013 (Germaine, Ott)

Kitchener: I’d like it reflected in the minutes that last week Shelby Dattilo wasn’t voting, someone was using her clicker

Baldassario: does it show who was using it

Bergenn: her name appears but it’s reflected that Sen. Fernandez was using it

Passes Unanimously

Student Affairs Report: Dr. Tordenti

1. The new dining hall is preceding even id the new residence hall is put on hold. We’ve talked to dining hall consultants and are soliciting feedback from memorial hall and IRC. It will be built up the hill though the exact location is still undecided

2. There are some concerns with the upgrades to Vance. It was the plan once the new residence hall is built one by one all of the old halls will be refurbished, but right now in the short term the Vance basement will be renovated and some of the individual rooms as well. Some have already been done and weighed in on. We cant afford to do a whole building right now this summer. The option was do what we could or do nothing at all. Some people may be disappointed but we just can’t do it. we must be realistic with the financial restrained

Fallanca: so it will be renovated over the summer?
Bachoo: as many rooms as we can, possibly a floor but all renovations must go through the state. We want to be the least disruptive that we can to student lives but we can’t do a full building.

Sonet: when was ResLife updated on the fall through of the Vance Renovations?

Bachoo: Vance wasn’t slated to be renovated for a few years, Carroll was in fact the first dorm for planned renovations but we decided not to do anything until the new dorm building is up though we’re still going through with the air conditioning. When Vance does go down it will be down for two years, but three halls were always before Vance

Sonet: was the administration aware that the students believed a full renovation was going to take place over the summer

Tordenti: it was only ever just one floor so something somewhere got lost in translation. This is the first time I’m hearing of those thoughts

Bachoo: we’d have to move everyone to do a complete take down, that’s a major state project close to 25 million dollars

Tordenti: they could have been caught up in the enthusiasm but I will be happy to talk to the Vance students

Truex: how long is the new hall on hold for?

Bachoo: we’re hoping it will be back online for the fall. Keep in mind this wasn’t a university decision

Truex: so now that it’s on hold can the clubs still use north field

Bachoo: yes there’s no relocation

Ian Mangione: you tired a more open policy of requesting singles, is that something you plan to use to sweeten the deal to stay on campus

Tordenti: it may be but we have to think of revenue as well. Vance is ideal to offer singles with or without the renovation in the spring semester

Fallanca: I had heard the Vance basement renovation was going to be done over winter break

Tordenti: it was scheduled too, but the renovations will be more sophisticated now

Bachoo: we began the process but it requires state approval

Tordenti: some decisions took longer than expected

Ott: did it already start

Bachoo: yes
Public Hearing: None

Treasurer’s Report

1. Finance committee requests will be under committee reports
2. Thank you for all the help with the base budget emails
3. Thank you to Jenny and Conner for all their help with the info sessions. The next one is Monday at 6p in the SGA Office
4. All clubs should have started their drafts and been in contact with their liaison and SALD advisor by this time
5. March 20 at 5p is a firm deadline with no extensions
6. We still have some outstanding recommendations for Monday
7. I will not be here Wednesday so all questions can be directed to Sen. Truex
8. We are under budget for contingency requests

Baldassario: if they’re all passed how much will we have left

Alaimo: about $6000

Vice President Report

1. Emails are due by midnight Wednesday, no extensions
2. A checklist was passed around for base budgets similar to what your clubs got. They’re going to come to you to sign off on packets, you must check off everything on this list before you sign off. More copies will be available to you online and in the office

President’s Report

1. The e-board allocated $130 for the panel discussion
2. I signed off on every motion, it’s rare that I don’t but I don’t think it’s good for the long run for the senate to be able to overturn decisions by the e-board with a majority vote based on how we operate. If you’d like to talk about it more please come to me
3. I got an update from Colleen Powers- 2,900 tickets for the spring concert was sold, which is selling out. $54,715 was put back into our reserve accounts
4. The banner is up
5. I got an email from Conrad Meurice he wants help with a community service project so if you’re interested please sign up on the sheet going around
6. I approached the Recorder’s Editorial staff about hosting a debate for the e-board elections. A tentative date for that would be next Wednesday at 7p. if you have any ideas talk to the EIC Kassondra Granata

Committee Reports

Finance Committee: Alaimo:

Pride came in and cleared up some confusion and their line item was passed. We had a long discussion about design club and ultimately decided to deny the contingency request. We approved $400 for Deuces Wild, we approved money for MSA to travel to North Carolina for a
conference, we gave money to TGFI to join the rest of the A Cappella Society at a competition in Boston, we thought Neuroscience presented a straightforward base budget, we denied Accounting because it’s similar to what they asked for last year and we approved $5000 for Biology for a conference

Braun: do you have the Design Base Budget

Alaimo: we can get it

**Move to accept Finance Committee recommendations FC13-076, 079, 080 and 081 (Alaimo)**

**Move to amend to strike FC13-080 from the motion (Baldassario, Marcelli)**

For: Baldassario: I think it deserves a separate discussion

Vote: 26Y 6N 1A

Amendment Passes

Original Motion: **Move to accept Finance Committee recommendations FC13-076, 079 and 081**

Vote: 33Y (Braun, Anderson, Baldassario, Berriault, Choplick, Fallanca, Fellows, Fernandez, Fox, Fung, Germaine, Gomez, Hubbard, Khan, Kirk, Kitchener, Lee, Lopez, Manento, Marcelli, Mgushi, Mills, Narcisse, Ott, Pancak, Radden, Rodriguez, Sejdiraj, Sonet, Szabo, Towler Truex, Zohlman) 0N 0A

**Motion Passes** SG13-119

**Move to approve Finance Committee recommendation FC13-078 (Truex)**

For: Truex: finance looked at this again and we recommended that it should be approved

Against: Marcelli: I understand why you would want to because they need this to operate but we turned down less money for them last week. They should be under the media board, it’s not our fault media board isn’t operating right now. It’s not appropriate for us to fund this

For: Mills: the recommendation suggests they become part of media board next academic year. This failed last week because senators were uncomfortable with the printing exceptions being made

Vote: 23Y(Braun, Alaimo, Anderson, Berriault, Choplick, Fallanca, Fellows, Fox, Fung, Hubbard, Lee, Lopez, Manento, Mgushi, Mills, Narcisse, Radden, Rodriguez, Sejdiraj, Sonet, Szabo, Towler Truex, Zohlman) 5N (Baldassario, Germaine, Kitchener, Marcelli, Pancak) 5A (Fernandez, Gomez, Khan, Kirk, Ott)

**Motion Passes** SG13-120

**Move to approve Finance Committee recommendation FC13-080**
POI Berriault: were they just presenting on TGFI or for all the A Cappella Society to go

Alaimo: they are a subsection and the others are already going, when the base budgets were presented they didn’t know TGFI wanted to go

Move to amend to strike out “$1730 to TGFI, the subsection of the A Cappellas with $830 going to tickets for access passes and $900 to hotels” and replace it with “TGFI a subsection of the A Cappella Society $830 going toward ticket access passes” (Baldassario, Hubbard)

For: Baldassario: I am there liaison and from what I’ve been told this original allocation would be more than the other subsections got combined. The others are paying their own way; this change will make it equal

Against: Berriault: we should vote this down. Three days in Boston is expensive and if they other groups want them to go with them then they should be able to go. They’d only have two weeks to raise the rest of the money that’s not a lot of time. We are under budget and have the money so we should give it to them

For: Mills: I originally loved this motion but hearing what Baldassario says changes everything. This should pass so everything is fair. If the other sections are paying their own way then they should too. In base budgets we pay either travel or registration and we should hold to that

Vote: 28Y (Braun, Alaimo, Anderson, Baldassario, Choplick, Fallanca, Fellows, Fernandez, Fox, Germaine, Khan, Kirk, Kitchener, Lee, Lopez, Manento, Marcelli, Mills, Narcisse, Ott, Pancak, Radden, Rodriguez, Sonet, Szabo, Towler Truex, Zohlman) 3N (Berriault, Gomez, Mgushi) 3A (Fung, Hubbard, Sejdiraj)

Amendment Passes

Original Motion: Move to allocate TGFI a subsection of the A Cappella Society $830 going toward ticket access passes from account SG9016

Move to amend and add “and $300 to hotels from account SG9016” (Berriault, Gomez)

For: Berriault: 12 people going at $50 a person that’s $600. They’d only then need $300 more to get to the original $900. They don’t have a lot of time to fundraise so we should at least give them this. No sense in giving them tickets with no place to stay

Against: Baldassario: the original $900 took into account them paying $50 each because the hotel supposedly cost around $1500. So even with this amendment they’d have to come up with another $600

POI Mills to Hubbard: what is the price the others are paying?

Hubbard: they’re raising money and paying about $50-70 a person

POI Braun to Hubbard: so they’re fundraising and paying out of pocket
Hubbard: if fundraising doesn’t go well then $70 but they’re looking to fundraise to cut cost to $20 a person

For: Berriault: what good is it to give them money for tickets but nowhere to stay? This $300 is at least a starting point

POI Sonet: TGFI is a subsection so were they looking at this unforeseen as a whole or as the subsection

Bergenn: they separate cost but applied for a base budget together but didn’t ask for this part of the society to go

Against: Baldassario: keep in mind this is only Boston, it is possible for them to commute if they really needed to. Just because this is all last minute doesn’t mean you’re going to always get what you’re asking for

POI Berriault to Alaimo: how much do we have in the contingency account?

Alaimo: $23,000

For: Narcisse: it’s drastic to make them commute

Against: Mills: we have this much money because we’ve been fiscally responsible. We shouldn’t give the money away just because we have it

Vote: 8Y (Berriault, Gomez, Khan, Mgushi, Narcisse, Ott, Szabo, Towler) 23N (Braun, Alaimo, Anderson, Baldassario, Choplick, Fallanca, Fellows, Fox, Germaine, Hubbard, Kirk, Lee, Lopez, Manento, Marcelli, Mills, Pancak, Radden, Rodriguez, Sejdiraj, Sonet, Truex, Zohlman) 2A (Fernandez, Fung)

Amendment Fails

Original Motion:

Vote: 25Y (Braun, Alaimo, Anderson, Berriault, Choplick, Fallanca, Fellows, Fernandez, Germaine, Gomez, Kitchener, Lopez, Manento, Marcelli, Mgushi, Mills, Narcisse, Ott, Pancak, Radden, Sonet, Szabo, Towler, Truex, Zohlman) 2N (Fox, Kirk) 3A (Baldassario, Khan, Lee)

Motion Passes

Move to approve Finance Committee recommendation FC13-082 (Alaimo)

For: Mills: this was more like a base budget request, asking for things like an ice cream social. We thought it wasn’t appropriate and something similar was denied last semester

Vote: 16Y (Anderson, Choplick, Fallanca, Fellows, Fernandez, Germaine, Kitchener, Manento, Marcelli, Mills, Pancak, Radden, Sonet, Towler, Truex, Zohlman) 2N (Fox, Ott) 7A (Braun, Alaimo, Berriault, Kirk, Lee, Narcisse, Rodriguez)
Move approve Finance Committee recommendation FC13-083 (Alaimo)

POI Marcelli to Alaimo: how did you come to this recommendation?

Alaimo: we received the paper work

POI Marcelli to Alaimo: why did the committee think it was appropriate to pass this

Alaimo: you can read through the minutes

For: Mills: this is a lot of money but last year they got money for this conference but since then the price has gone up drastically. They have more student participation and hotel costs went up because of the economy. They’re using grants and students are contributing. This is a true contingency and remembers we spend more for less for COSGA

Vote: 25Y (Braun, Alaimo, Anderson, Choplick, Fallanca, Fellows, Fernandez, Fox, Germaine, Kitchener, Kirk, Lee, Lopez, Manento, Marcelli, Mills, Narcisse, Ott, Pancak, Rodriguez, Sonet, Towler, Truex, Zohlman) 0N 1A (Radden)

Move to pass Finance Recommendation FC13-077 (Alaimo)

Against: Braun: there are two main reasons to deny a contingency, it wasn’t unforeseen and it was denied in the base budget. There was nothing denied in the Design base budget and we don’t know if this was foreseen because in the original base budget nothing was mentioned so we’re just speculating. What makes this different then their October 15 contingency? This is one of the best annual events on campus appealing to a large number so we should give them the money. Maybe not $1000 but we can decide later so vote down the motion

For: Truex: Liz said it, it’s an annual event. Contingency is unforeseen and I’d like to point last semester I also voted against this. It’s a question of doing what’s fair or doing what is correct. This isn’t a true contingency whether it is a big event or not

Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: Berriault: can we yield time for people in the gallery to speak

Bergenn: not during a motion’s debate

Against: Mills: I made this motion twice, once to pass the contingency and when that failed a motion to deny it and I wish I hadn’t. This is a great event on campus and as our job to represent the student body we should do this for them

Move to postpone until the end of the agenda (Berriault, Ott)

Bergenn: you have to do a different date or table

Move to table (Berriault, Ott)
Vote: 1Y 21N 0A

Motion fails

Original Motion:

For: Rodriguez: yes this is a great event but they requested something similar last semester. They could have gotten money in other ways. It’s annual and just because we like it doesn’t mean it’s contingency. A lot of other events we also liked didn’t get money. They knew about this when requesting the base budget, it’s not contingency

Against: Berriault: assume, presume…those are some words that scare me. We have people from the design club in the gallery right now. I’d rather wait and speak to them. The current e-board wasn’t around last year and I don’t think we should penalize them for that. I want to know the facts I don’t want to guess on them

Move to suspend the rules and allow members of the gallery to speak (Marcelli, Fernandez)

Vote: 17Y 5N 1A (Truex)

Rules are suspended

Rodriguez to Design: were either of you on e-board last semester.

Design: I was, we’re technically a new club. Last semester’s e-board I was a secretary so I didn’t know how to do a base budget. We didn’t know if we were going to have a spring show because we didn’t know if we were even going to have a fall show. We were as prepared as we could have been.

Hi, I’m LJ, President of Design. We didn’t know what contingency was until we spoke to our advisor

Berriault to Design: were either of you around last spring.

Design: No

LJ: I transferred here this semester from WesConn

Berriault: so the previous e-board didn’t put money in for the show

Design: when we came to ask for a new base budget we asked for this crazy amount and were told we can only get up to $500

Pancak to Design: do you have a full e-board now

Design: yes as of Monday
Vote: 5Y (Fernandez, Lopez, Marcelli, Rodriguez, Truex) 16N (Alaimo, Anderson, Berriault, Choplick, Fellows, Fox, Germaine, Kitchener, Kirk, Manento, Mills, Narcisse, Ott, Pancak, Sonet, Zohlman) 2A (Alaimo, Fallanca)

**Motion Fails**

Alaimo: in the future I suggest coming to a finance meeting to hash things like this out arguing for 45 minutes is ridiculous and we should allow everyone the same rules

**Public Affairs:**

Pancak: SGA is hosting Devils Den next Thursday for elections with an American theme so if you are free please come

**Academic Affairs:** the joint resolution has been signed by Western, we’re still writing for Southern and Eastern.

**Internal Affairs:** Braun:

Move to approve Internal Affairs recommendation IA13-004 (Braun)

For: Braun: after last week we heard your concerns and any questions can be directed to Sen. Choplick because he chaired the meeting. We’ve included Bobby’s amendment about the VP providing guidelines for Business Casual. We took out the penalties so it’s more of a By-Law rule with no penalties. This should pass. We need to make a good impression especially when we have a photo in the paper each week. We also have administrators here and we should look professional and respectable

POI Rodriguez: so the rule is to dress up but there are no repercussions if we don’t

Bergenn: we can point it out and say you’re in violation of the by-laws, which is bigger than saying “Oh way to dress up”

POI Narcisse: is this included with the change of excusals

Bergenn: no

Against: Truex: not against this im against that there’s no penalty. There’s nothing to stop people from not following the rule. There should be some sort of ramification

Bergenn: to clear up things you could call a point of order and they’d have to leave unless they can prove they are in order

For: Berriault: we are elected by the student body and we have visitors it’s right and fair to be dressed at least in business casual. We need to represent the student body well

Against: Rodriguez: this should be an option. A lot of people are uncomfortable dressing up. I was voted in because of my ideas not the way I dress. This violates the right to expression and some people may not be able to afford new clothes or want to sit in class all day dressed up
For: Choplick: not all by-laws have repercussions, they are just procedures we follow. We tried having repercussions and people were against it. we were elected and employed by the student body, we should dress to impress. Congress has a dress code and they were elected in for their ideas

Against: Lee: we work hard to gain credibility and I think it is embarrassing to have to insert a rule about having to dress nicely

For: Berriault: in the real world you have to dress business casually. We were elected and it isn’t uncommon to look nice or to have to make an effort. This is our job to represent the students so we should dress to impress. Dressing like slobs is not doing our job well

Against: Simms: idea that someone can call point of order three times for you to have to leave and miss those meetings and eventually kicked off is inappropriate.

For: Kitchener: im not a huge fan of this but this is a compromise. I hope people wouldn’t call point of order but they compromised and you got the best of both sides

Against: Alaimo: we are debating about clothes. Im not saying we should or shouldn’t pass this but this is crazy we should just vote. You should dress nice if you yourself want to impress and if not then don’t

For: Choplick: the first step of letting people know who SGA is to be taken seriously. I agree this is embarrassing that we have to do this but it’s because this is something that normally doesn’t happen. You can leave the polo in the office so if someone calls point of order you can run up and get it. We need to be reputable for the voters

Call to previous question (Truex, Fernandez)

Vote: 21Y 3N 0A

Debate is ended

Original Motion

Vote: 16Y 7N 0A

Motion is passed

Move to accept Internal Affairs recommendation 1A13-005 (Braun)

For: Braun: this is a two-art easy change. It’s to take sections 1-2, 103, 1-4 and put it under one section labeled attendance, which makes it easier to understand. The second is taking the standing rule that was passed last week and included it in the section. It was already passed as a standing rule so I hope it will be passed as a by-law as well

Yield my time for questions

Narcisse: if a Senator had a summer job in a different state can they be excused
Braun: it works in the say way it does now

Narcisse: what if they have a conference for their major

Braun: you can asked to be excused for anything…even a ski trip

Sonet: is the 3:20 correct

Braun: yes so is the 4:20 leave time, it was changed from 3:25

Move to amend the motion to strike out in 1-2-f’under attendance “and be removed from senate” (Fernandez, Choplick)

For: Fernandez: I don’t think it should be in the By-Laws that this can cause someone to be kicked off senate. We were democratically voted in

Against: Choplick: this wasn’t originally included, but there were two vastly different ideas so if you’re against the whole thing vote against this

For: Marcelli: I agree with amendment. Vote down the amendment if you don’t want to pass the whole thing vote yes if you want to pass it all

Vote: 21Y 0N 0A

Amendment passes

Original Motion:

22Y 1N 0A

Motion Passes SG13-125

Braun: come to our meetings at 3p on Fridays

Unfinished Business: None

Bergenn: if it’s okay with everyone we’ll push the COSGA presentations to next week

New Business:

Move to disassociate the Student Government Associates with the Students of Connecticut Universities for Democracy (Alaimo, Pancak)

For: Alaimo: this means logos will be immediately removed and SCUD (or SUD) should have no further presence at joint events or meetings. We should not be affiliated with SUD. Their leader, Danny Ravizza is also linked to the Connecticut Citizens Action Group (CCAG) as well as SUD. I don’t think he separates the two enough. SUD has no meeting times, no agendas, no minutes. Ravizza is a registered lobbyist and a UConn grad student trying to represent the ConnSCU schools as well as the community colleges. Yes I understand he started SUD when he
was an undergrad at Western but he should have stepped down and given the role to someone else in the system. He’s lobbying everywhere. We shouldn’t have a lobbyist and nonmember of the system. His group’s symbol is on the banner, we paid for it. did he contribute anything? It’s not appropriate. He wanted a banner with his group’s name on it and we’re paying for it. We never voted to be in affiliation with him. Im not against the flyers as long as we’re not affiliated. SUD is not an actual group, they’re just a Facebook group that we’re giving free ad space to. It’s obnoxious. We have other systems that can help us with the work, we shouldn’t be affiliated with a lobbyist. In multiple articles the groups he is paid by and the group he organizes is linked. We should be disaffiliated. He can be at meetings, attend the rally but the names should not be affiliated.

POI Bergenn: anywhere in these pages do either ones reference each other

Alaimo: no, but articles have

Chair is passed

Against: Bergenn: the closest association we have is the banner and that is because someone from the organization is putting in hours because of what we told him to do. In the picture from the Recorder that was provided he is writing down a timeline of what other people are saying. There’s definitely a political affiliation with SUD but think about it, we’re also a political action group. Nowhere in here have the different groups recognized each other. Ravizza works for one and organizes the other, but all of these are really weak links. It’s like saying that our treasurer who is going to a Conservative conference next week now means we are linked to that group. We’re not and I have no problem with him going to that because that’s where his interests lay. He works as a lobbyist, but not with SUD. If I could have someone come in here willing to lobby based on our beliefs I would, that would be awesome, but no one would do that for free. SUD doesn’t want to be our voice. SUD and CCAG have no affiliation other than the one common person. Being a registered lobbyist just points out who he works for. We’re not hosting or putting on a façade. This has all been very transparent and everything provided is easy enough to find, we’re not hiding it. he is not the sole operator of SUD I also help. It’s an open Facebook group anyone can join. There are students from all over the system. We can’t disassociate with something we’re not associated with to begin. I only have someone who is willing to help and do what we ask for no money. Who is affiliated with doesn’t matter; he’s helping us with our own initiatives. He gets no gain from helping us he is just a proud Western alum. The name of the group is on there to get people talking. Nothing is hidden. Yes CCAG is super left and I don’t agree with their message.

Move to postpone until next meeting (truex, Sonet)

For: Truex: it’s almost 6p and we barely have quorum. It’s not fair to vote on such a hot topic issue with less than half the senate here

Against: Alaimo: the rally is on Monday we shouldn’t postpone this

I withdraw my motion (Truex)
For: Berriault: I don’t like what Ravizza is doing. When senates won’t pass the joint resolution because he is accompanying members of our senate to their meetings then it impairs our ability to do our job. I think it’s too late to remove the name from the banner but from here on out we shouldn’t be affiliated with them

Against: Marcelli: this is absurd. I don’t think any point made for this made any sense. We’re getting into politics, I know some of you aren’t okay with that but I personally love it. I don’t want to be a politician but I want to get as close as I possibly can and I think that’s a goal for most of us but doing this is making us into politicians, saying we won’t work with someone because their opinions or affiliations are different makes us politicians. I personally don’t like Danny Ravizza, but I’m working with him because we are on the same side in this matter

Point of order this isn’t germane: Berriault

Not well taken

Marcelli: there is 36 of us on Senate with multiple affiliations because that’s how leaders are, they are involved but that doesn’t mean their different affiliations are all linked. We don’t always agree with different clubs and organizations but one minute we’ll be collaborating with them and the next we’ll be arguing to not give them money, it’s what we do. We’re not politicians so please don’t turn into those types of guys right now.

For: Rodriguez: I don’t agree with when we were told we would be working with him. If there’s nothing to hide why didn’t we learn about him? Everyone is against tuition hikes but not every club is on the banner.

Against: Anderson: no one has all the facts, this packet we were given only highlights one side. We’ve had a bunch of things referencing him and what we were doing so it was well known

For: Alaimo: I’m not against anyone specifically and I don’t mean to call anyone out or blame anyone. Im just saying we shouldn’t be affiliated with him, it’s not politically correct. Everyone knows im a republican. I’ve known vice chairmen who also acted as lobbyists and stepped down because of the two different constituencies and that is what he should have done. What if down the road new information comes out, I don’t want us linked to that, im concerned. Eric should not and cannot represent the student body if he is friends with Ravizza. Not to be disrespectful but it’s not okay. I love the school and I don’t want anything to happen. I tell people who I am when I first meet him. Did he ever introduce himself? No. that’s deceitful. He gets paid by the CCAG to go to different schools. Yes he can believe in the cause but three different articles have linked the two organizations. Just rethink what is going on. A lobbyist has to perform 2000 hours to be recognized, he wasn’t a lobbyist by accident, and it’s intentional. My hope is to just break away ties

POI Rodriguez: I have to leave and I want to make sure I’m not breaking quorum

Braun: no you’re fine

Against: Berriault: I don’t think this is the time or place to discuss this and I think this debate has gotten out of hand
Move to postpone (Bergenn, Fernandez)

For: Bergenn: this is what some call stacking the cards, not having all the information from both sides to make it look one way. This packet only shows one side, but there are two sides. I won't turn around and attack our treasurer, I know he doesn’t hate liberals because I am working with him to host a republican/democratic debate. However, I am the President of the Student Body. I am the SGA. I’m the SGA all the time, when I’m in the office, out and even when I’m sleeping. My job doesn’t stop. If you claim otherwise then I consider that a personal attack. You don’t tell me when I am or when I am not doing my job. This is stacking the deck. The groups are not cross referenced or cross affiliated. I care about CCSU too, I don’t need personal attacks and I don’t need to dissociate with an organization we’re not associated with. There is no logic to this; it’s just a straw man’s argument. Making people aware and stacking facts are two separate things. When I worked with Bobby on the resolution I mentioned the Governor’s budget proposal and only his proposal, not his party or other affiliations because to do so would have been wrong and irresponsible.

Braun: we’re overbooking the space and have lost quorum just so you know

Bergenn: I’ll halt the argument out of respect then but in one statement to go against my character is telling me I am not doing my job as President.

Vice President Braun adjourns the meeting

Meeting is adjourned at 6:30pm

Respectfully submitted by SGA University Assistant Brittany Burke.