

MUSG Senate 2014-15

Marquette University Student Government

Monday, December 1st, 2014
7:30 PM – Sensenbrenner Hall

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Dear MKE**
4. **Reflection**
 - A. *MUSG Senate*
5. **Presentations**
 - A. *Dr. Jon Su, Director of the Core of Common Studies & Chair, Provost Search Committee*
 1. Provost Search
 1. Next official update this week
 2. Thanks to President Whelton for his service on the committee
 3. Strongly endorses student involvement on search committees
 2. Common Core
 1. Academic program review started this year
 2. Unless there are complications, changes will start next semester
 3. Three primary areas of attention
 1. Better assessment
 2. Better integration of courses
 1. How are 'gen-eds' different from other institutions?
 2. Curricular basis for the Jesuit education, i.e. how do core classes help one better understand classes specifically for their disciplines?
 3. Process for revision
 1. Must come from senior leadership due to complexity of our institution, i.e. what are the basic parameters for discussion of the core?
 3. Questions:
 1. LVP Wallace: how was feedback from student session incorporated into committee? Yes, e.g. transfer and study abroad issues
 2. Senator O'Rourke: A&S requirements will be aligned more with the university? Discussion from dean of removing college curriculum but outside purview of committee, but not direct change of the core
 3. Senator Elizondo: more service learning? Marquette has highest rate of service, more than 400,000 hr/year of service, makes enormous sense to include it in the core, please emphasize it as an organization if it is important
6. **Forum for Concerned Students**

- A. Mardi Gras
 1. Concern over funding period
 1. Three large trips, will not overlap well with periods
 2. Any response to this issue? Still same amount of money, just different periods, will not likely be any bias based on this, allocation will not be affected.
 3. We would like the periods to align with the semesters
 1. President Whelton That is the plan, will align with first day of the semester
 1. Senator Kouhel: Where is this stipulated? It is not, FVP will do this
 4. We would like a time for review from students, point out issues to the organizations
 1. President Whelton: student training will incorporate this, will gather feedback as well, SOF system will be continuously improved and fine-tuned, 5-year continuous improvement plan will be written as well which will also be open to student feedback
- B. Marquette Rowing Club
 1. Club is the biggest it has ever been, growing organization, increasing relationships
 2. Funding has become more of an issue as the organization grows
 1. E.g. unable to fund an event in Indianapolis
 3. Boats cost \$20,000, oars are expensive as well, travel costs
 4. Concern over spot funding, how will this change what is allocated to us from the beginning?
 1. President Whelton: Spot funding is on top of other periods, at least \$5000 set aside, largest demand on SOF from club sports in recent year, SOF typically denies national competitions since it is not sure if the club will make it to that point
 5. How will we fund for events that do not require qualifiers and in the summer? We will have to discuss this with the FVP, historically MUSG has not funded anything past last day of classes, budget priorities must be put into place
 6. Approval of changes regarding capital goods
 7. Questions:
 1. Senator Kouhel: did you request money for trip to Indianapolis? Money allocated to other things could not be used for travelling
 2. Senator Kouhel: (to President Whelton) why do we not fund summer events? Nothing that explicitly bans it, mostly a question of funding events to which all students have access

7. Officer Reports

President

Kyle Whelton

- Mayor's holiday drive, collection containers in the AMU, helping out veterans, we need ziplock bags

- Ozzi use at over 16,000, might move one machine to Mashuda, composting will be back in January as well
- Mission Week in February
 - RHA End Hunger event
- Thanks and good luck on final exams

Executive Vice President

Natalie Pinkney

- 9 applicants for Diversity Coordinator position

Communications Vice President

Sarah McClanahan

- Last day for Emily, thanks!
- Prepare for post-break video for B&A

Program Vice President

Ryan Twaddle

- Finals Week programming
 - 12-1:30 Pet Therapy
 - Monday, desserts from 2-4
 - Tuesday noon-3 free massages
 - Wednesday, late night breakfast

Financial Vice President

Nick Ciccone

- Total of \$117,00 request, \$47,000 approved

Parliamentarian

Olivia Slusarek

- 30 seat and 30 present, SOF requires 16, FVP and PVP require 20, amendments require 20

Legislative Vice President

Zack Wallace

- Feedback sheet
- Mayor's Holiday Drive, mayor was very impressed with MUSG and wants to continue our partnership
- Last meeting for Senator Quill
- Student Life survey closed tonight, will be reopened next semester
 - Questions
 - Senator Murrar: why will it be reopened? We did not get very many response, will be able to build off of more data

Advisor

Jennifer Reid

- Winter clothing drive through the Provost office
- Student Affairs is revising student leadership awards, more to come next semester

8. Committee Reports

President Pro Tempore

Aliya Manjee

- WCLL meeting went well, will likely start some time next semester

Business and Administration

Courtney Guc

- No Report

Student Life

Estefania Elizondo

- Safety and lighting plans to go into effect next semester

Academics

Ricky Krajewski

- Went over goals for next semester, work with career services

Student Organizations

Amanda Stolz

- Approved 5 new organizations, denied 3 organizations

9. Outreach, Council, and All-University Committee Reports

- A. President Whelton: another meeting, narrowed down to an official candidate pool, 44% women, 50% from a diverse background, all are sitting provosts or deans at other schools, interviews coming soon
- B. Senator Schick: committee on academic technology, discussion of clickers in the classroom, one type of clicker used in the university, exploring other kinds of clicking technology
- C. President Whelton: invited to a special meeting on campus safety on Friday

10. Approval of Minutes

- A. Approval of Minutes from 11/17/2014
 - 1. Senator O'Rourke: change to section 9
 - 2. Approved

11. Old Business

12. New Business

- A. SOF Club Sports Period 2 Allocations
 - 1. Senator Dearden moves to consider, Senator Haines seconds
 - 2. Presentation:
 - 1. Baseball: spring training and conference fees, games open to all on campus
 - 2. Water Ski and Wake Boarding: travel fees and lodging
 - 3. Hockey: spring rental fees for an ice rink, travel expenses, larger crowds and a growing fan base, games are free and open to all
 - 4. Ultimate Frisbee Club: registration and travel expenses, open to entire community, unique way to get involved in a club sport
 - 3. Questions:
 - 1. Senator Bowman: Period 1 allocation? \$37,000
 - 4. Debate
 - 1. Senator Bowman calls the question
 - 1. Voice vote > carries
- B. MUSG Financial Vice President Approval
 - 1. PPT Manjee moves to consider, Senator Vrana seconds
 - 2. Presentation (includes FVP and PVP candidates)
 - 1. Ted Eberly
 - 1. Incredibly smart and dedicated
 - 2. Continuously sought opportunities for leadership and service
 - 2. Sara Beattie
 - 1. Love for programming, program assistant for Late Night and involved in Cobeen as an RA
 - 2. Numerous accolades for well-attended events at Cobeen
 - 3. Candidate:
 - 1. Involvement in finance office is enjoyable, a lot to learn every day, prepared for future challenges

4. Questions:
 1. Senator Bear: what is biggest weakness with the budget currently? Not a lot of exposure to the budget, not on SOF committee, we need to shoot under the budget
 2. Senator Guc: what is your learning style and teaching style? Both by example
 3. Senator O'Rourke: any negatives to proposed SOF changes? Need to focus more on students and organizations themselves
5. Debate:
 1. Senator Kouhel: very professional, looking forward to working with him
 2. Senator Bowman calls the question, Senator Quill seconds
 1. Voice vote > carries
6. Voice vote > carries
- c. MUSG Program Vice President Approval
 1. PPT Manjee moves to consider, Senator Stolz seconds
 2. Candidate:
 1. Passion for communication, programming, advertising, etc.
 2. Excited to see what can become of the position in the future
 3. Questions:
 1. Senator Guc: familiarity with budgeting and programming, e.g. fighting for your programming money? Important to know how things fit
 2. Senator Elizondo: example of most challenging programming experience? Halloween at the AMU this year, difficulty overseeing all entities involved in the event, e.g. catering
 3. PPT Manjee: familiar with SOF process? Will familiarize with SOF if approved, translate way I learned over to others
 4. Senator Kouhel: did you apply to this position last year? Yes. Tell more about this? Supervisor told me about this opportunity, brought to attention the following year, chance to grow as a programmer? Why did you not get involved in other ways? Involved in Late Night, question of timing. Knowledge of new SOF process? Four paid coordinators, each will take on programs together rather than as separate entities, good opportunity for collaborative brain storming. What do you want to change? Does not want to make any suggestions until I know the inner workings better.
 5. Senator O'Rourke: programming reductions? We can find a way to make events work and also cut down on the budget
 6. Senator Vrana: what is virtue of continuing programming funding at its current rate? MUSG is attuned to what organizations want and need, should focus on the university as a whole
 7. Senator Biagi: balance between RA, PA, PVP, and student? Less Late Night programming next semester, on 12-15 credits as well.

8. Senator Maglio: how do you plan to get male students involved on campus? Working on wider spectrum of events, open to different ideas and listening to what other groups of people want
 9. Senator Barelli: most successful program? Secret Santa/Christmas event last year, very high attendance, very heart warming
 10. Senator DiVittorio:
 11. PPT Manjee: thoughts on over-programming? There should be variety on campus. Coordination over the summer? Readily connected to email and phone
 12. Senator O'Rourke: what qualities did she possess that others did not? Passion for programming, defining why it is important, desire to put in the work and get the programming done, very competitive pool of candidates. Any faults of concern regarding the candidate? Last-minute thinker in terms of ideas
 13. Senator Bowman: why is programming important? Social and education programming, opportunities to go out and do things that are different, caring for the entire person and the world around us
 14. Senator Bowman calls the question, Senator Dearden seconds
 1. Voice vote > fails
 15. Senator Quill: how do you plan on working with diversity committee? Strong understanding of how to make programs work, help ideas of the committee come alive
 16. Senator Schick: How does PA position work? Each get a program or option to mix and match between programs.
4. Debate:
1. Senator Kouhel (negative): disappointed with lack of experience in terms of large-scale events
 2. Senator McNerney (affirmative): any issues identified are teachable, positive traits she has are not teachable, reliable and accountable
 3. Senator O'Rourke (negative): concern over lack of availability over the summer, reservations regarding magnitude of the position
 4. Senator Elizondo (affirmative): good leader with great interpersonal skills, can grow and recruit coordinators with experience
 5. Senator Barelli (negative): lacking a big event on campus even though we do a good job on smaller events, requires more aggressiveness, may be difficult to accomplish given her commitments
 6. Senator Elizondo (Affirmative): she might seem soft and respectful but she is more tenacious than she seems, large events require a good team that is cohesive, requires people skills which she possesses

7. Senator McInerney (affirmative): other candidate had more time commitments, she can get things done so long as she has a deadline
 8. Senator Maglio (negative)
 9. Senator Kouhel (negative): concern over lack of involvement after first attempt at position
 10. Senator Bear calls the question, Senator O'Rourke seconds
 1. Senator Bowman moves to table item, Senator Elizondo seconds
 1. Voice vote > fails
 11. Vote
 1. **Roll call > no approval**
- D. Amendment #3 – Updating Financial Policy Definitions Pertaining to SOF
1. Senator Schmidt moves to consider, Senator Wogernessee seconds
 2. Presentation
 1. Conference now has a definition, codifying not providing funding to events that are not free to students, recognized student organization request from OSD
 3. Questions
 1. Senator Bowman: recognized vs approved organizations, discrepancy in bylaws? Outdated, should be flipped
 4. Debate
 1. Senator Guc (affirmative): love defining conferences
 5. Vote
 1. Voice vote > carries
 2. 29-0-0
- E. Amendment #4 – Clarifying what is eligible for SOF
1. Senator Bowman moves to consider, Senator O'Rourke seconds
 1. Presentation
 1. Internal review provided a lot of definitions
 2. Questions
 1. Senator Bowman: national and regional membership dues? E.g. engineering organizations, dues required to remain members of certain organizations. Definition of capital good, precise, e.g. over \$100? Typo, will be corrected. Changes related to Students for Life, i.e. conference travel? In the past this was not funded, new mechanisms to redefine travel. Consideration to opening up funding to travelling to conferences? Brought up but it would be a greater financial burden for the SOF committee, other schools do not allow or limit. Strict language with 'will vs 'may'? Deadline has been made strict, proactive approach.
 3. Debate
 4. Vote
 1. Voice vote > carries

2. 29-0-0

F. Amendment #5 – Required Training for SOF Applicants

1. Senator Vrana moves to consider, Senator DiVittorio seconds
2. Presentation
 1. Present at other schools, help eliminate issues with applications
3. Question
 1. Senator Elizondo: quality training for organizations? Supervision from the executive board, want to make sure training is genuinely worthwhile
 2. Senator Vrana: nothing stipulating additional training for an organizational change, e.g. mid-semester election? Whoever is active will need to undergo training, there will be no penalization if a change occurs
 1. Senator O'Rourke: OSD steps in to talk with new student organization leaders
 2. Senator Vrana: proposed change in wording
 1. Senator O'Rourke: in spirit of legislation? Yes
4. Debate
 1. Senator O'Rourke (affirmative): sometimes funding is denied, training will enable better applications
 2. Senator Guc moves to amendment first "Therefore" clause, Senator Elizondo seconds
 1. Questions
 1. Senator Murrar: if there is a change, they would not have been able to attend the meeting? If there is a resignation, SOF will not deny them
 2. Debate
 1. Senator O'Rourke (negative): redundancy, further wording will constrain organizations
 2. Senator Elizondo (affirmative)
 3. Senator Touhy (affirmative): e.g. would have helped with club water polo team
 3. Vote
 1. Voice vote > carries
5. Vote
 1. Voice vote > carries
 2. 29-0-0

G. Amendment #6 – Publishing Criteria

1. Presentation
 1. Requiring transparency on the SOF committee, allows applications to be tailored to SOF
2. Questions
 1. Senator Bowman: criteria are public? Yes. Further conversation about number of criteria? Overarching attributes for each field, appendix is not a comprehensive list. Is the process subjective

right now? There are objective criteria but sometimes have subjective qualities, e.g. is it 'good for the community?', using attributes as guidelines in order to speak to why an event would or would not be beneficial, intentionally vague to allow decisions by the committee. (Senator Krajewski) Attributes will be reevaluated? Yes, every year.

2. Senator Elizondo: set of attributes for each year? Yes, and reevaluated each Spring, will not change if SOF committee changes
3. Senator O'Rourke: good idea to just have SOF committee or Senate at large? Just SOF, they come from the Senate, MUSG has a lot of other business to consider as well
4. Senator Quill: consideration of one set of criteria then reassess each year? We need to make sure to update with changes in culture of campus
5. Senator Krajewski: Will organizations create applications that are more rhetorical if they are aware of criteria? Numbers will still be a basis of evaluation
6. Senator Bear moves to go to debate, Senator Bowman seconds
 1. Voice vote > carries

3. Debate

1. Senator Bear (affirmative): as best as it will be, should have addressed any issues before
2. Senator Schick (affirmative): important to clarify criteria
3. Senator Stolz (affirmative): SOF committee, these will be great
4. Senator Bowman (negative): does not support in this current form, concern over suggested criteria
5. Senator Krajewski (negative): too vague, not ready for student organizations
6. Senator O'Rourke (negative): ambiguous
7. Senator Elizondo (affirmative): criteria is useful particular for justification, there is vagueness but Senate trusts members of SOF to make ambiguous decisions
8. Senator Bowman (negative): reiteration, objective guideline already exists

4. Vote

1. Senator Bowman moves to amendment to add deadline for criteria approval, Senator Dearden seconds
2. Senator Bear calls the question, Senator Bowman seconds
 1. Voice vote > carries
 1. Voice vote (on amendment to amendment) > carries
 3. **Voice vote > carries**
 4. **20-5-4**

H. Amendment #7 – SOF Secretary and Committee Training

1. Senator Haines moves to consider, Senator Vrana seconds

2. Presentation
 1. Legislative Clerk functions as secretary of SOF, public notes open to discussion
3. Senator Elizondo moves to debate, PPT Manjee seconds
 1. Voice vote > division (hand vote) > carries
4. Debate
 1. Senator Kouhel (negative): last clause is not responsible, information should not be hidden from senators
 2. Senator O'Rourke moves to amendment to make minutes public to university at large, Senator Kouhel seconds
 1. Questions
 1. Senator Elizondo: rationale again? Benefit university at large, if information is private it can be cleaned up through a private session
 2. Senator Murrar: when is it made public? After decision is approved, i.e. after Senate meeting
 3. Senator Schick: what are we allowed to release? Legal gray area, most conversations not disclosed to Senate
 4. Senator Murrar: if over \$2500 and goes to approval, might not be good to be fully public? Does not specific when they need to be published
 2. Debate
 1. Senator Bowman (affirmative): not bad practice, should make a public process
 2. Senator Elizondo (affirmative): we need clarifications regarding transparency
 3. Senator Kouhel (affirmative): important that student body understands what is happening with other student organizations
 4. Senator Quill (negative): pointless to publish notes when most information will have to be made private anyway
 5. Senator Guc moves to limit debate to 5 minutes
 6. Senator Elizondo (affirmative) not all SOF information is private
 7. Senator Schick (negative): providing minutes is a slippery slope, can be taken out of context
 3. Vote
 1. Hand vote > fails
3. Senator Guc moves to limit debate to 5 minutes, Senator Schick seconds
4. Senator Kouhel (negative): not enough clarity
5. Senator O'Rourke moves to table, Senator Kouhel seconds
 1. Voice vote > fails

6. Senator Elizondo (affirmative): minutes necessary for efficiency
5. Vote
 1. Hand vote > carries
 2. 25-3-1
- I. Amendment #8 – Relocating the Charitable Donations Clause
 1. Senator Bowman calls the question, Senator Vrana seconds
 1. Voice vote > carries
 2. 29-0-0
- J. Amendment #9 – SOF Appeals
 1. Presentation
 1. Codifies criteria for grounds for appeals
 2. Questions
 3. Debate
 4. Vote
 1. Voice vote > carries
 2. 29-0-0
- K. Amendment #10 – SOF Reimbursements and Payments
 1. Senator Schmidt moves to consider, Senator Thiry seconds
 2. Presentation
 1. Eliminates financial burden of university and allows buying up front rather than reimbursement
 3. Questions
 1. Senator Bowman: is it not an established practice? Not established
 2. Senator O'Rourke: will this change current practices regarding reimbursement rates? No but will give us opportunity to help clubs pay upfront.
 3. Senator Kouhel: should we put in university policies discussed? No, will be iterated in training
 1. Senator O'Rourke: is this something organizations may have issues with? They will need certain goods to function as an organization
 4. Debate
 1. Senator O'Rourke (negative): we would see more cases of university having to take action
 2. n on students being unable to pay
 3. Senator Kouhel (affirmative)
 5. Vote
 1. Voice vote > carries
 2. 28-0-1
- L. Amendment #11 – SOF Non-Club Sports Period Restructuring and Addition of Spot Funding
 1. Senator Biagi moves to considers, Senator Stolz seconds
 2. Presentation
 1. Big proposal, incentivizes forward planning, there will be a transition but it will be beneficial

3. Questions
 1. Senator Bear: why are there no specific dates for the periods and why are there limits for events over winter break? No specific dates other than club deadlines, clubs prefer having winter break allocation in the fall
 2. Senator Kouhel moves to table, Senator Krajewski seconds
 1. Voice vote > fails
 3. Senator O'Rourke: do any other model universities have spot funding for the summer? Not sure, not sure from when funds for summer funding would be taken, question of fiscal year
 4. Senator McInerney: why are events not funding over summer? Main concern over fiscal year
4. Debate
5. Vote
 1. Voice vote > carries
 2. 29-0-0

13. Announcements

14. Adjournment

- A. Senator Bowman moves, Senator Biagi seconds
 1. Voice vote > carries