**53rd Senate Meeting**

**March 19, 2021**

1. **Call to Order: 2:30pm**
   * Moment of Silence
   * Roll Call
     1. Absent
        1. Senator Lasnaund
        2. Senator Fridy
2. **Adoption of Agenda**
   * *VP Larkin:* Is there any adoption to that agenda? Any opposed? Any abstentions?
     1. Passes
3. **Approval of Minutes**
   * *VP Larkin:* You all receive the minutes from last week's senate, are there any amendments to the minutes? Any opposed? Any abstentions?
     1. Passes
4. **Administrative Address**
   * None
5. **Guest Speaker**
   * *Dr. Ellenberg*: President Gardner and I had met and talked about the spring break petition. I know everyone is tired after a year of pandemic, faculty, staff, and students. In the terms for the schedule for the semester we understood at the end of last semester that everyone was really tired after the turn to remote instruction. We consulted with various groups on campus, SGA was consulted about extending winter break, SGA concurred in that. We also discussed it at the senior administration level and decided that indeed a longer holiday break would be good for everyone. Because of that we extended the winter break and removed spring break. What we decided not to do was extend the semester beyond its normal date. We have about 2400 total different sections courses that are being offered each semester. We lost one day due to weather. I understand the sentiment of the petition and the desire for the students to have some sort of break. We all agreed at the beginning of the semester that this is how it would be so asking teachers now to restructure their classes would be a difficulty that we do not need to ask them to do. Are there any questions?
   * *Chair Johnson:* I know we as SGA kind of know how the university works internally and how the process of making these decisions can be difficult. I want to speak up on behalf of the student who started the petition, she does have well over 1000 signatures and I know this is not something we might not be able to do as a University, but I do you think they would appreciate if there was a way administration communicate this with them about how you are moving forward with this.
   * *Dr. Ellenberg:* I can ask SGA to figure out the best way to communicate that to students. I’m not surprised at this point in the semester that people want to break but I hope people understand that this is a complex organization. We are always open to suggestions and discussions. Part of it is that we are just so far into the semester now and to shift the calendar at this point would be very difficult.
   * *SPT Grant:* what was the reason why we didn’t move spring break into the end of the semester? What is the soon to work with housing considered in this decision?
   * *Dr. Ellenberg:* people were exhausted at the end of last semester and we had been fully online. Everyone was tired so that was the decision. We thought everyone needed a little bit longer of a break. Rather housing was concerned directly I’m not sure.
   * *VC Hoffman:* is this plan to be done in the future. If it were, would we find out at a decent time. I know some universes do a wellness week where they don’t necessarily give students a week off, but they don’t allow assignments to be assigned.
   * *Dr. Ellenberg:* I don’t recall that discussion but it’s a great idea. Years ago, we had something called dead week prior to exams. The board of trustees approves our calendar a couple years ahead.
   * *VP Larkin:* are there any further questions?
6. **Unfinished Business**
   * None
7. **New Business**
   * *VP Larkin:* we would like to call the author of resolution VII to floor
   * *VC Hoffman:* \*reads resolution VII\*
   * *VP Larkin:* are there any questions for the author of this resolution? Seeing as are no questions will now move into debate. The first point of debate goes to the author
   * *SPT Grant:* Vice chair Hoffman wanted to bring this to the floor and appreciate who had been the first in SGA. I am debating in favor of this resolution. It’s one of the many first that will happen at this university.
   * *VC Hoffman:* I wanted to do resolution because I feel strongly about diversity and to show that we had three very big first in SGA. This is to recognize the African-Americans students have done amazing things and I pushed our university further. So, I debate in favor of this resolution
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any further debate? Seeing as a no further debate will are now move to a vote
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *VP Larkin:* VC Hoffman motion for a second reading the resolution is their second
   * *SPT Grant:* Second
   * *VP Larkin;* is there any opposed? Any abstentions? Are there any questions for the author? Sing as there’s no further questions will now move into a debate. First point of debate goes to the author.
   * *VC Hoffman:* no debate
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any further debate? Seeing as there’s no further debate we are now moving to a vote.
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *VP Larkin:* we would like to call the author of Bill XV to the floor
   * *VC Clendennin:* \*reads Bill XV\*
   * *VP Larkin:* Are there any questions for the author?
   * *Chair Johnson:* why did you extend the week?
   * *VC Clendennin:* I extended the week because from my experience just having a few days seems short and I believe if we extend it, we will be able to entice more students to vote. If you’ve noticed in the past three elections there have been a decline in the number of people voting.
   * *Chair Johnson:* why lower the spending limit? And for 409.11you were saying you can't endorse another candidate or promote another candidate while running, it seems like you’re coming for campaign teams, and I was wondering why? Does election of a supervisor of elections make them a legislative member?
   * *VC Clendennin:* they will still be executive board member; They just wouldn’t answer directly to the student body president. I chose to reduce the spending limits because they are really high for a college student. $500 from my experience, is still a lot of money. I think If we changed the language to where candidates can’t campaign for other candidates. I think it will make it where you have to focus on yourself as running.
   * *President Gardner:* when saying people can’t back one another doesn’t that limit the student voices?
   * *VC Clendennin:* so, the election statues currently outline what counts as Active promotion of one’s Cadency. So, if this was instituted this line basically means you can’t do anything that lists active promotion for one's Cadency. I don’t think it limits the students' voice because you’re all candidates in the election.
   * *President Gardner:* in the statues it doesn’t clearly state anything about actively promoting.
   * *SPT Grant:* for the supervisor of elections, do you have it listed under their job description that they will have to actively promote voting. A potential issue that I see is that you can become very biased because the role of the supervisor of elections is for them to be unbiased. Why did you choose that to be part of the job description?
   * *VC Clendennin:* why do you Feel like it would be biased?
   * *SPT Grant:* because of them actively voting it could leave A fine line for who they are promoting.
   * *VC Clendennin:* it is their right as a fellow student vote in the election, this will make it more like in real life government. I don’t think it will create a bias, especially because they’re not actively promoting the candidate. They are just promoting the vote.
   * *SPT Grant:* when do they get to be student and when do they get to be supervisor of elections?
   * *VC Clendennin:* they are still restricted from actively promoting a candidate. They cannot go out in publicly state who they are going to vote for.
   * *SPT Grant:* so, in this case their job does not end.
   * *VC Clendennin:* basically. I believe that’s how the current statues work.
   * *SPT Grant:* you said in this update at the online ballot cannot be obstructed when access for mobile devices. Why did you put it in a statue well that is an Argopulse thing and not an SGA thing?
   * *VC Clendennin:* we are the one who makes the ballot so if Argopulse doesn’t meet the requirement for using the online ballot then it restricts us, and we can’t use Argopulse. Right now, our statues say that we do not have to use Argopulse, and we can use any platform we want.
   * *SPT Grant:* I just need a yes or no for this question. You are acknowledging that it is an Argopulse problem not an SGA problem.
   * *VC Clendennin:* yes
   * *VP Larkin:* are there any further questions?
   * *Director Lyons:*  Point of clarification. With the billing reference changed I think it was because student involvement changed contracts. I believe the intent of that bill was less to say that Argopulse was inefficient and more to say that student involvement as an office from year to year may use different software. We just use whatever student involvement provides us and I generally have been the standard.
   * *VP Larkin:* why take away part of someone’s responsibilities?
   * *VC Clendennin:* The way I thought about taking away from them was The supervisor of election was supposed to be this impartial person who oversees the entirety of the elections. Right now, the statues make it where someone could be impartial.
   * *VP Larkin:* Seeing as there’s no further questions we will now move into a debate. The first point of debate goes to the author.
   * *VC Clendennin:* I really want to see this bill passed. If anyone has any amendments or suggestions I am very open to them. The biggest reason why it’s named this, I believe this is a great way to lower that threshold into the entrance of SGA. Make it to where any fellow student can you get into the organization and feel like they have a great opportunity to get involved.
   * *Senator Buzbee:* I am debating against this bill. In the long run this bill will come across wrong and can restrict the candidate’s freedom to support other candidates.
   * *CoS Gaytan:* I know this was mentioned earlier because homecoming is a full week. Homecoming is a weeklong event that’s why voting is throughout that whole week. But SGA doesn’t really make sense to have it open for a full week.
   * *Chair Johnson:* I agree that we should strike 409.11 because it is very restrictive. I believe it will be much harder for people to get into SGA.
   * *Director Lamungkun:* I do have a few debates, the first one is against the supervisor of elections taking over for a director of communications. There is nothing in an SGA the semester besides selection purposes. The Director of communication works closely with the supervisor of elections and makes sure everything is there for that year‘s elections. So I don’t see the point in shifting their responsibilities, you’re pretty much taking away A job for the director of communications for that. Another debate is about changing the money I do debating in favor of it because it does help him out those who have less money. Another way that I have is against 409.11 well you can’t endorse another candidate. When reading it sounds a little bit threatening and sounds like we are not a team.
   * *VC Hoffman:* I understand where this bill is coming from and there are some parts that I do agree with. But there’s also a lot of points That I don’t agree with. With that being said I moved to strike 409.11 because it’s  not done in other universities.
   * *VP Larkin:* is there a second?
   * *Chair Johnson:* I second
   * *VP Larkin:* are there any opposed? Any abstentions?  Is there any debate?
   * *VC Hoffman:* my first point of debate is because I just don’t think the section is not really the spirit of the University.
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any further debate?
   * *Senator Hill:* I’m assuming this point comes from but at the same time it seems very Non-Inclusive for someone not to support someone else. So I am debating in favor of this.
   * *VC Clendennin:* I am debating against the strike. Big thing is that it brings this more into what I’ve seen in state statues.
   * *President Gardner*: I am debating in favor of the strike because I believe this right here is taking away the voice of the student population. We are not a state government, and nor do we work like they do.
   * *Senator Hill*: The way this is where there is no support of any other candidate even on an individual level.
   * *SPT Grant:* I am debating in favor of this motion because like everyone else has said. The way this reads is you are  completely removing the availability for any student running in the campaign to promote someone else in the campaign.
   * *Director Lyons:* did the goal of this line and the bill general. I like the idea of making elections more accessible, but I don’t think the language is the best way to achieve that. I would be in favor of the motion.
   * *Chair Johnson:* I agree with everyone else, and I will vote to strike this.
   * *VC Clendennin:* I am of course in favor of not moving forward with this motion. The main reason is because the language is very narrow with intention.
   * *Director Lyons:* I think your response of we can go fix this leader is not efficient. I would personally go forward with striking it instead putting something half done in the statutes.
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any further debate for this motion. Seeing as there is no further debate we are now moving to a vote
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any Further Debate for the bill?
   * *VC Hoffman:* I am moved to strike the change made in chapter 408 section D that deals with expenditures.
   * *VP Larkin:* is there a second?
   * *SPT Grant:* I second
   * *VP Larkin:* first point of debate goes to vice chair Hoffman
   * *VC Hoffman:* I debate in favor of this and my reason for striking is when I was doing my research, I saw that universities of similar size, we are already on the lower end. I believe that if candidates use resources from the same thing they should be up and divide it up.
   * *President Gardner:* I want to debate in favor of this motion. These campaigns cost a lot and by lowering it down you were limiting people‘s ideas.
   * *VC Clendennin:* I am debating against the motion. The main reason I lowered the total is because when you know how to make your dollars work you won’t even come close to $500 that I’m lowering it to.
   * *SPT Grant:* I'm debating against this motion because I want to make an amendment. So we can let this motion fail. I can make a motion to this amendment. I call to question.
   * *VC Clendennin:* I second
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *VP Larkin:* Will now vote on the motion
     1. Vote
        1. Fail
   * *SPT Grant:* I am proposing an amendment that it will read, instead of crossing out everything that has been added, take out the price changes but keep in the line that says the totals may not be divided among candidates.
   * *VP Larkin:* is there a second?
   * *VC Hoffman:* second
   * *VP Larkin:* are there any questions about the amendment? Seeing has no questions we will now move to the debate
   * *SPT Grant:* The reason I decided to make this amendment is because everything that has been brought to the floor, I agree that the total should not be split up among candidates on the team. I am voting in favor of this amendment
   * *VC Hoffman:*  I’m in favor this amendment, I think is a good compromise
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any other debate?
   * *VC Clendennin:* I do like the amendment. The biggest reasons I decided to move forward with lowering the spending limit, I was looking forward to making amendments for a publicly funded campaign.
   * *President Gardner:* I am debating against this motion because other universities allow their split.
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any other debate?
   * *CoS Gaytan:* this amendment makes sense, but I am hesitant on it
   * *VC Clendennin:* I’m totally for the amendment because as our statues fully read right now people can blow up those numbers.
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any other debate? Seeing as there’s no further debate we will now move into a vote.
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any further debate on the bill as a whole?
   * *President Gardner:* go entertain a motion to strike Thursday and Friday out of the spring election voting time?
   * *VC Hoffman:* I move
   * *SPT Grant:* second
   * *VP Larkin:* are there any questions? Seeing as there’s no questions real number into the debate
   * *President Gardner:*  The reason I want to strike this is because then digital days we did not see any trends or rise of voting.
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any further debate?
   * *VC Clendennin:* while I understand the point of other universities, we are not like other universities. I just think it makes more sense to do a full week.
   * *SPT Grant:* I am debating in favor of this motion. I would like to make a motion to limit to debate time to two minutes.
   * *VC Hoffman:* Second
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any debate on the motion? Seeing as there’s no debate will now move into a vote
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any for the debate on the motion on 403.01? Seeing as there’s no further debate will now move to a vote
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any further debate on the bill as a whole? Seeing as is further debate we will now be moving to a vote
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *Senator Arnold:* I would like to make a motion to suspend the rule and move senate addresses to right before treasurer Patterson’s bill.
   * *VP Larkin:* Is there any debate? Seeing as there are no further debate will now move into a vote
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *President Gardner:* I want Bill 15 to be submitted to the supreme court justice for review.
   * *Treasurer Patterson: \**reads sweeping bill\*
   * *VP Larkin:* are there any questions?
   * *VC Clendennin:* why are you rolling it into the president's special projects?
   * *Treasurer Patterson:* this is what we’ve done for approximately five years.
   * *VP Larkin:* are there any further questions? Seeing as there are no further questions we are now moving to debate
   * *Treasurer Patterson:* only point of debate is that it is a solid plan
   * *VP Larkin:* is there any further debate. Seeing as there is no further Debate we will now move to a vote
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
   * *President Gardner:* I move for a second reading
   * *VC Hoffman:* Second
     1. Vote
        1. Pass
8. **Appointments**
   * None
9. **Executive Addresses**
   * *President Gardner:* we finally wrapped up FSA. Senate bill 86 cuts back on bright futures. We will be fighting more against this.
   * *VP Larkin:* The theme for the banquet is all planned out. The campus cleanup event is done being put together.
   * *CoS Gaytan:* we are approaching the transition period. We will be transitioning April 2.
   * *Treasurer Patterson:* I have my last budget update of this semester. \*goes over the budget\*
10. **Cabinet Addresses**
    * *DoC Lamungkun:* The shirts just got in
    * *DoER Lyons:* I’m still planning my Covid event. And I’m also looking into remodeling the office
11. **Legislative Addresses**
    * *SPT Grant:* I’m working on my transition folder
12. **Adjournment**
    * Standing Committee Report
      1. None
    * Closing Announcements
      1. None
    * Public Statements
      1. None
    * Final Roll Call
      1. Absent
         1. Chair Hopper
         2. Chair Mckillion
         3. Senator Hill
         4. Senator Lasnaund
         5. Senator Lynchard
    * Adjournment: 5:53pm