

Senate 2/5/08

- I. Call to order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Introduction of Guests
 - a. Laura Seplaki
 - b. Anthony Barron – proxy for RG
- IV. President's Report
 - a. DL – As was discussed last week with colors, Katie is still investigating but we haven't gotten a response yet. General Assembly was very well attended and productive. We had our pizza Superbowl party after the GA meeting.
- V. Speaker of the Senate Report
 - a. CO – I had a few people approach me and ask that we as the Senate or the Executive take this under consideration. There is a growing concern about the unprofessional attitude of Carren Klenke towards the students. Many people have expressed negative feelings and they were hoping the SGA might be able to do something about it.
 - b. LS – Anytime you are talking about a staff member on campus you are addressing a delicate issue, broaching this subject needs to be handled delicately. However this is not the first time I've encountered something like this and I have spoken to her supervisor so he is aware of the problem.
 - c. CO – Well that's why I was asking whether or not this was something I should talk to Jim about as the speaker of the senate, or whether or not it should come from the Executive Board.
 - d. LS – Specific instances are needed, also please think of how you would like to be addressed in a situation like this. With everyone's permission I'll have another conversation and tell Jim what occurred this evening and let him know what the concerns are.
 - e. SM – I don't know how comfortable I am with the SGA dealing with this; it seems wrong for the SGA to be dealing with an administrative issue. As long as it is not approached as if we are coming to Jim with as a unified front against Carren. Because it seems like a personality issue, I've not had any trouble dealing with Carren. When it comes down to results she does a very good job organizing things.
 - f. EW – So Laura – you will be approaching Jim on behalf of specific issues.
- VI. Vice President's Report
 - a. EW – Dealing with approving the minute; I'll email them to you at the end of each meeting and then you'll have a week to review

them. At this time Katie will read Dean Annis's response to Bristol Chapel.

- i. Dear Ed,
Thank you for forwarding to me the Senate Resolution regarding the current seating in Bristol Chapel.

I am also concerned about the state of the pews in Bristol for many of the same reasons you state, especially their basic condition and the "creaking" that occurs during performances. The pews and refinishing the floor of Bristol Chapel are on our list of Westminster physical plant needs.

Currently, we are in the stage of finalizing plans to build an additional rehearsal/recital space on the Westminster campus. This project relates directly to the seating in Bristol, since having a third large space on campus will allow us to look closely at the future use of Bristol Chapel, the Playhouse, and the new space. In addition complete renovation of the entire Bristol Chapel building is under consideration.

It is my hope that by this summer we will finalize our planning and set a timeline for action. This will certainly include the Bristol Chapel pews. As our planning continues, I will keep the Student Government Association informed.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Annis

VII. Old Business

a. Lauridsen Resolution

- i. EW – What feedback did you get from your constituents?
- ii. SM – The few constituents that replied to me did not express much interest because of the small groups that Lauridsen would work with. They agree that it would be a valuable residency but they would hope to see a splitting of the cost with Choral Activities.
- iii. AnBr – My constituents would like to see this happen.
- iv. CO – My constituents feel that this would be a waste of our time and money.
- v. MF – My constituents say a resounding yes, they feel it would be a great use of our money.
- vi. DG – The majority of my constituents said yes.
- vii. Anthony Barron (RG) – her constituents were overwhelmingly in favor of this resolution.
- viii. EW – Can you speak a little more of your concern?
- ix. RG (AntBar) – There seems to be a large part of the student body that would be excluded from interaction with him.
- x. DG – Generally the idea of the residency would be more of a three-day thing working with lectures and other students.

- xi. AB – The idea is for him to be visibly on campus with all our students. My constituents are very much in favor of such a project.
- xii. EW – As some of you know not all of our students are represented by senators so I act as the liaison; to that regard I've gotten yes and know from the other students, they are also expressing concerns over the cost.
- xiii. CO – Point of information, I spoke to Erin Knapp and discussed that if a resolution is approved in Senate it does not mandate that it be approved by the SFB.
- xiv. JW – My concerns were mainly what Katie sent out via email, the SFB controls the SAF.
- xv. PM – Motion to close discussion and close the vote – CO second. Passed with one abstention.
- xvi. CO – I move that we table this pending the SFB decision. PM seconds. Opposed.
- xvii. AB – The box on the application confuse is still confusing.
- xviii. EW – Dionne would you like to comment on that box?
- xix. DL – It is purely a case-by-case basis; obviously having the backing of the Senate is a good idea but it does not dictate the discussions of the SFB.
- xx. EW – My only thing right now is that the money issue; if we tabled this and re-evaluated the cost...
- xxi. AB – Motion to approve the resolution. AnBr seconds. Passed.

b. "Make it Happen Day" Progress

- i. EW – Please look at the issues that we discussed earlier and think about how we can make those into resolutions.
 1. More bike racks
 2. Double sided copy machines
 3. Improving library hours
 4. Smoking on this campus
 5. Benches
 6. Extending dining common hours.

VIII. New Business

a. Legislation Proposals

- i. CO – The reason I wrote this resolution was because of the amount of legislation that has come through this body; which can be seen as a good thing or a bad thing. We are supposed to represent our students and too many times legislation is brought without consulting our constituents. This is why I'm presenting this to this body. Also, I've randomly polled about 100 students and only approximately 33 have been contacted by their senators.

- ii. PM – I was with Chris when he contacted the students and the response was “do graduate students have senator”.
- iii. SM – An example of this was when I asked a few freshmen about the Lauridsen proposal and none of them had been contacted. This is just an example of how we need to do our job and how we represent our students.
- iv. CO – I have a catchall – it is set up that the faculty or staff advisor can override this bill in the event that the Senate deems to make a quick decision. The bill cannot be overridden by the chair or the speaker, only the advisor.
- v. EW – Just a few comments, Joe is still the advisor and Laura is visiting for today.
- vi. AB – I’m concerned about who is actually being represented by this senate. There are also senators who have left and to my knowledge their constituents have not been reassigned. I’ve been in email contact with Chris hoping that we might add more people to the constituents list. For instance John hasn’t ever gotten a list of constituents to represent.
- vii. EW – Who has a problem adding more constituents to the list? After I send you the minutes from last weeks meeting I’ll send you additional constituents as well.
- viii. AZ – As you are adding more are you also going to be updating the list because I know that our student has changed.
- ix. EW – We’ll move constituent representation to for the good of the order.
- x. AB – I think that the 48 hours is an excellent idea, however I’m concerned that the 48 hours notice not the issue rather than students not being represented in the first place.
- xi. JW – I have a few concerns/questions. In section 3/subset C - I would give a time frame for execution.
- xii. CO – That’s why section B is in place.
- xiii. JW – Yes, but that’s not saying that the legislation cannot be voted on within the 48 hours. Also section D/subset 1, I agree that the senator should vote based upon his/her own view, however the wording is too subjective.
- xiv. SM – The issue with that is that each senator is represented by another senator in the room so that our opinions do not cloud voting – that we can accurately represent our constituency.
- xv. CO – Tonight I can explain why I voted the way I did on the Lauridsen resolution; because of the response of my constituents – regardless of my personal feelings.

- xvi. JW – I understand but remember you are voted to represent the students.
- xvii. CO – Discussion of representation of students not our own personal believes.
- xviii. JW – I feel like this would be a standing order rather than a by-law amendment; also this should be something that could be enacted next year.
- xix. AB – As senators are elected, are you required by constitutional law to vote in the favor of your constituents? Or after you are elected on good faith. Is it a wise idea then for my fellow senators to bind yourselves to consulting your constituents on every thing we do?
- xx. DL – I think that in considering the bill, I think it would be wise to consider that by being voted in a Senators the student body is trusting you to represent their ideas there is a trust factor they know that you won't need to contact them for every little thing. There also may be times that a vote is needed that your constituents may not know or need to understand. Bear in mind you are trusted by the student body just by being voted in as a senator.
- xxi. EW – Chris I'd like to know based upon the comments where you would like to move.
- xxii. CO – Change wording in line 34.
- xxiii. AB – Could we commend to the chair that in your construction of the agenda of not accepting a resolution without consulting our constituents.
- xxiv. Co – It says that it needs to be in the chair's hands 48 hours before the meeting however it does not need to go to the senate.
- xxv. AB – What I might suggest is that consider it a standing order that would require notification before the meeting.
- xxvi. EW – I've always loved to send resolution to meeting but a lot of resolutions I receive are just prior to the meeting.
- xxvii. JW – You could say that anything under new business could not be voted on. That would be guaranteed that you couldn't vote on it that week.
- xxviii. CO – That would mean that we would have to table this again until next week because we are not using Roberts Rules.
- xxix. MF – I motion to table this resolution till next week pending changes to the language. AB – seconds. Passed.
- xxx. SM – Point of clarification, this is a slightly different from a resolution.

- xxxi. CO – If you want changes to you need to state those questions.
 - xxxii. JW – I can comment saying that you can table the resolution with discussed changes, and it would be up to the 3 authors of the bill to take what they heard tonight and rework the bill.
- b. Adoption of Roberts Rules of Order
- i. PM – We discussed most of this last week in for the good of the order saying that a couple of the senators were confused where the discussion was leading at that time. It became clearly evident that RRO would have cleared that up. I wrote this as a resolution for this semester so that we can get RRO into play all the time and adopt the bylaws. As Chris brought up earlier, technically we cannot vote on this under RRO but I'm asking that we suspend RRO for the duration of this section of the meeting so that we can enact this. We need a parliamentarian to enforce RRO, and that person would also be responsible for training on RRO.
 - ii. SM – The only thing on here I'm not sure about is page 2 – line 1, when it discusses lines 3-5 does that apply to the parliamentarian's training or the training of the senate within two weeks.
 - iii. PM – We can amend that to both the parliamentarian and the senators would be trained within two weeks.
 - iv. CO – I'm fully in favor however since you co-author the last piece of legislation would you consider tabling this to next week?
 - v. PM – Yes.
 - vi. AB – I've had this for a few days I don't know about everyone else.
 - vii. MF – I think this resolution is well intended, however I think in the long run it might create more a problem than it is trying to resolve. I feel like we got a lot accomplished last semester and I'd like to see that continue this semester and don't want something to get in the way of that.
 - viii. JW – Clarify the 1st line on the 2nd page. Also Roberts is possessive so it should have a (^).
 - ix. SM – In reply to Mr. Fili's comments, the fact that we've had so much discussion of things that have or have not been accomplished last semester. I think that is all the more for RRO to be included. RRO is meant to streamline the process rather than hindering the process.

- x. PM – RRO has more to do with how we accomplish what we do, if we can take a 25 min. discussion and cut it down to pros & cons I think we can get a lot more accomplished.
- xi. DG – Can we define the term parliamentarian? In the House of Representatives the parliamentarian is not part of the voting body.
- xii. PM – In RRO the parliamentarian is there to hold order to the meeting.
- xiii. AB – So we would need to find someone that is not in this meeting right now to come and fill that role?
- xiv. DG – The speaker of the house that appoints the parliamentarian who is not part of the voting membership.
- xv. AB – It is not up to voting but rather up to the chair to appoint someone.
- xvi. PM – We are not the US government.
- xvii. DG – I think it should be clear in the legislation.
- xviii. RG (proxy) – I think this proves Mike's point; this could turn into a lesson in RRO rather than getting things done in Senate.
- xix. AZ – That's the point of the training.
- xx. AnBr – Does this person need to be an expert?
- xxi. PM – Doesn't need to be an expert because it doesn't always apply to us. We'd only be trained on specific sections.
- xxii. DG – I believe that this only presents more of a reason that this person should not be part of this governing body, it should be more clear in the senate and I would endorse something that said it would be apart from the governing body.
- xxiii. AB – The parliamentarians I've met before have doctorates in law, and no one who is going to really have definitively studies this; but as it stands now I have reservations.
- xxiv. JW – The good thing about RRO is that it can be suspended if it needs to be and not all parts can apply.
- xxv. PM – You've also got to remember we've got eh system of check and balances, you can also call the parliamentarian out of order.
- xxvi. LS – Something to think about, it might be beneficial to have a training to see if you want to even do this.
- xxvii. AnBr – I motion to table this resolution until Senate receives training in RRO. AB seconds – passed with one abstention.

IX. For the Good of The Order

- a. MF – I spoke with Walt Johnson, and he said that technologically he would be happy to change the screens in the computer labs,

however he cannot make that decision it has to come from administration.

- b. JW – Point of clarification.
- c. MF – Explanation of legislation.
- d. PM – I will see what I can do about getting someone in here for next week to go over some RRO, I know someone who has made a fun game and it covers all the points that we would use here.
- e. DG – I feel like we should try to do this during a different time.
- f. AZ – How long would that take? Because getting us all in the room twice a week might be difficult.
- g. AnBr – Perhaps we could extend the meeting a half an hour?
- h. EW – The constitution committee is not in favor of that idea.
- i. PM – We can always say that for one week we'll meet afterwards.
- j. SM – If we could fit this training into one meeting would it be that unreasonable to say that one meeting is specifically set or RRO
- k. DG – Could the SGA provide us with copies of RRO? And for all purposes could we say that the constitution committee is sponsoring this.
- l. SM - Think it would be a reasonable request to have the books. provided ahead of time, and Erin could probably approve it herself.
- m. PM – We could actually invite our RSO's to come in and see if they want to adopt it to their meetings as well.
- n. EW – Before this takes place I think that this resolution needs to be passed by senate first.
- o. AZ – Didn't we say that we couldn't pass the resolution until training.
- p. JW – He's saying that we shouldn't by the materials until we've been trained.
- q. AnBr – If we getting a basic RRO training then we don't necessarily need to have the books.
- r. EW – The reason I'm brining this up is because there is nothing saying that senator has to be at the training.
- s. PM – It would be a very quick crash course.
- t. MF – I was approached coming in here, one of my constituents asked if there was any way of gaining use of the Princeton University Gym.
- u. EW – It wouldn't hurt approaching Princeton University.
- v. SM – I'll fill you in afterwards Mike.
- w. MF – Could we bring this up as a resolution point next week?
- x. EW – Earlier there was talk about having a senate town meeting either weekly or monthly, basically he town meetings would be a way to discuss their concerns.
- y. MF – I think it's a good idea.
- z. DG – I agree.

- aa. EW – We'll work on finding a time and discussing format etc.
- bb. AZ – Has Shane spoken to Steve about the washers and dryers?
- cc. SM – There has been a lot of talk, and they have been looking into things. I'm also going to talk to Erin about consolidating those ideas and then taking them again to Steve.
- dd. DG – Its really an emergency.
- ee. LS – I was told last week by facilities that there should have been attention to them by now. I'll follow up.
- ff. SM – I think the concern is that they are only 5 years old.
- gg. LS – Inform us of specifics so we can help you out.
- hh. EW – I know I've expressed a lot of passion and vision toward legacies and this meeting seems to be based upon how senate needs to be run; you just need to let me know where you want me to guide you – something for you to think about.
- ii. AZ – I motion to extend the meeting, PM seconds – passed.
- jj. AZ – Discussion of constituency.
- kk. DG – When students vote in senators they don't think about specifically who will represent them but who will represent the whole campus well. The things we decide in here may not always represent exactly what they want but it's for their own good.
- ll. SM – I understand that the election process that its how its done but as a elected body we are responsible for getting feedback and representing those constituents, its important to have that communication.

X. Adjournment 8:06pm