SGA Minutes
September 21, 2014

I. Attendance

All members present.

II. Acceptance of Minutes

Senator Jahan: Motion to accept minutes.
Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.
All aye.
Minutes accepted.

III. Announcements

a. Meeting decorum and parliamentary procedure

Speaker Brady: Before I turn it over to President Custer for announcements, I just want to briefly go over parliamentary procedure for the new Senators and everyone else who isn’t in the Senate. In order for you to speak, time has to be yielded to you by a Senator. If you want to speak, let your Senator know.

President Custer: Welcome to all of those of you who are not in the Senate. Thank you for coming. I know most of you are here to talk about tailgating. There are a few housekeeping things we have to get through first, but we will move the tailgating discussion up in the agenda.

b. Ratification of First Year Senator candidacies

President Custer: Motion to ratify the First Year Senator candidacies
Senator Judy: Seconded.
All aye.
Motion passes.

c. Seat and welcome First Year Senators

President Custer: Welcome, First Year Senators!

President Custer: Motion to move up the Resolution on Changes to the Tailgating Policy
Co-Chair Bogin: Seconded.
All aye.
Motion passes.

IV. New Business

a. Resolution in Response to Tailgating Policy Changes (F2014-SB4)
Chief of Staff Zhang: There is a secretary who is taking minutes and she is going to be writing down the names of everyone who speaks tonight. If you aren’t in the Senate, please tell us your name before you speak.

President Custer: First of all, welcome to Erin Quinn and Katy Smith-Abbott. In speaking with them about this meeting, we agreed that it would be good to hear student ideas first. We will give Senators a chance to speak first and discuss issues that their constituents have already talked to them about. Then, we will bring everyone else into the discussion. Like Speaker Brady said, a Senator has to yield their time to you, but it doesn’t have to be your Senator—any Senator can yield their time to you.

Speaker Brady: Do any of the Senators have initial thoughts or points of interest?

President Custer: I’ll start. I want to begin by noting that there are two separate issues here. One is the process issue: how the decision was made, the lack of student input, and how the decision was communicated to the student body. The process issue is what I find more troubling and what I want us to talk about. The student body should be involved in changes to policy. A lot of the time we are, but we were not in this particular case. For those of you who aren’t familiar with how a Resolution works, it contains “Whereas” clauses, which are the facts, and then a “Be it resolved…” section, which is where we put our opinions. Basically, the Whereas clauses in this bill say that the change happened, the SGA was not told, Community Council discussed it briefly but not in detail, and it was not something the student body knew was going to happen. The Resolve section says that we want the administration to inform the SGA President and the Co-Chair of Community Council (SCOCC) of all policy changes before they happen so that we can notify the student body. Of course, there are a lot of policy changes that are mandated by law, but there are also some that students should be able to give their opinion on.

Senator Fisher: President Custer is right when he says that this issue has two sides. There’s the procedural side and the substantive side. This bill doesn’t speak to that and I think that’s right. I don’t want us to get caught up in conversation about the substantive side. The problem we are dealing with—and I’ve heard this from my constituents—is procedural negligence. The administration neglected to do what they ought to have done. They should have had a conversation with the Community Council. No one in the SGA had any idea. That’s the underlying issue here and that’s what the bill says. Talking about the substantive issue is not relevant because the policy is already in place. We should have already had the conversation about this and we need to have conversations about these things. The student reaction shows that this is important.

Speaker Brady: I agree with that. I have two questions for Mr. Quinn. You talk about how this has been in conversation for a while, so why weren’t students given a warning or told to clean up their act at tailgates? Also, have you noticed a pattern where students today are acting worse than they have in the past? Has it gotten that out of hand?

Erin Quinn: Thank you for the opportunity to be here. I appreciate the over-arching theme and philosophy that students and the administration should be in conversation. On this particular
issue, the strategy has been communication on site with the people who are impacted by it. The people at tailgates are students, faculty, staff, visitors, community members, and alumni. The number of students impacted by tailgating policies is pretty small. There are a relatively small number of students at any given tailgate, so we haven’t viewed this a student-wide issue. I see it as an Event Management issue, not a student issue, so that’s why there was no broad communication. Once there was a possibility of a more drastic policy, Community Council wanted to meet with us and I made sure that we talked about tailgating even though it wasn’t on the agenda. It happened at the very end of the meeting and I said that if anyone wanted to follow up to please reach out to me. The problems with tailgating and the possibility of prohibiting alcohol were definitely laid out at that meeting. As to your second question…once students started to see the tailgate as a party area, we saw a creep of people getting there earlier and drinking longer. And this isn’t just students, but it is alumni and parents too. There were also certain policies that were not new, like limiting the time that you could be in the tailgate area and making people leave the tailgate area when the game started. It’s not that students are worse than they were, but it was the creep. That’s why it’s different now than it was before.

Senator Vaughan: My response doesn’t really speak to that, but independent of the discussion on the tailgate, what I have talked to people about is the ambiguity regarding the process. It says here in the proposal, that SGA is the “vehicle through which students can participate in the formulation of institutional policy affecting academic and student affairs and collectively express their views on matters of general interest to the student body,” but that vehicle isn’t clearly defined. We added some more definition now, with the President and SCOCC needing to know about these policy changes, but we need to have concrete procedures in place. There needs to be a mutual understanding between the administration and students. I don’t know if now is the time for us to talk about what we should put in place. The President and the SCOCC are the filters to see if it should be addressed by the larger student body, so it is up to their discretion to decide if it is impactful enough to be taken to a forum of students. That should maybe be a week before a policy is enacted or two weeks or even a month. It is these details that we should discuss. Just a note about your comment, Mr. Quinn, about the number of students not being a large enough portion of the student body: that is a discussion that is hard to have because even though something might only impact a few students, it might be very important to those students. I think we need to look at quality, like how much it’s affecting them, and not just the quantity of students affected.

Erin Quinn: I don’t intend to say that if there are only a certain number of students involved that we shouldn’t discuss it with the SGA and Community Council. In retrospect, I wish we had communicated more broadly. The people at the tailgates knew that the changes were coming and they were aware that we were trying and were unable to enforce the rules.

President Custer: I agree with what you said, Senator Vaughan. And thank you, Mr. Quinn, for your comments. The issue is who gets to decide whether or not the students care about an issue. That is why, going back to the Resolution, that the SGA President and SCOCC should be informed about proposed policy changes before they actually happen. Since the student body elects us, students know us and talk to us and therefore we have a better idea of what students want and care about and we can bring it up in Senate. Although I doubt this would happen, there could be more important issues, like sexual assault, which is very clearly important to a lot of
students, where new controversial policy could be enacted without our input. There needs to be involvement on the part of the students. We might not get a vote, because the administration is within their purview to do things for safety reasons, but we should have a chance to voice our concerns and ask, “Can we have a provisional period?” At that point, the administration can say “yes” or “no” and give us the reasoning behind it.

Senator Sanders: I agree with what President Custer said. I think that this Resolution is a good start. A lot of Senators have been approached about this and it has brought a lot of student interest. From my understating, Community Council would have benefited from being a part of this process. I have heard a lot of suggestions of alternative models and policy changes that students would have like to see and it’s clear that they wanted to participate in the making of this decision. I think this is a great start, and the SGA should voice this opinion, but this is just the beginning. There is the second part of the issue, like Senator Fisher said, and that needs to be part of this discussion as well.

Senator Fisher: Mr. Quinn, you said you went to Community Council with several issues, discussed tailgating, but didn’t think that you had a full discussion?

Erin Quinn: Correct.

Senator Fisher: Then I think the next thing to do is to go talk to Community Council about this thoroughly and fully.

Speaker Brady: I would like to hear what your responses would be to this bill if it passed? If this were passed, how would it change or not change how you wish you had handled this?

Katy Smith-Abbott: Do you mean about the first two pieces and going forward? I am really interested and I recognize the spirit in which this was written. I think that it would be meaningful to sit down with the SGA President and SCOC and talk about what this would look like in reality. The number of policy changes is really large and some of them we don’t have any control over. I don’t want it to be disingenuous in having a broader student discussion if it wouldn’t change what would happen. You need to trust us when we say we are going to do something. We can have a conversation, but in some cases we can’t adjust policy based on those conversations.

President Custer: Students need to realize that there are some things that we wont get a vote on, but I still think we should be consulted on these things. I don’t think that we should have gotten a veto on the tailgating policy, but students should have had a chance to express their concerns before the policy change, even if it is going to happen regardless. Students should be given a chance to say, “Can we have a provisional period? Maybe there could only be drinking allowed at Homecoming and then see where to go from there.” At that point, the administration can say “no,” but students need the opportunity to ask and to hear the reasons why they are being told “no.” I think that the student body will be realistic and realize that there are some things we will not get a vote on, but we would appreciate a say and a chance to get our questions answered so that we feel like we are respected members of the community. That is what this issue was about.
Senator Toy: I agree. It would have been nice to have a more in-depth explanation. The second email that you sent was better, Mr. Quinn, because it gave some more logic and reasoning about why this happened. If that had been in the initial email, I think students might have been more understanding. However, I can think of many reasons why this makes Middlebury an unsafe environment. Students are going to be drinking way more before football games.

Erin Quinn: The logic is that we have a lot of events in Athletics in all three seasons in a lot of venues. These are some of the biggest and most charged events on this campus. The venue, including the tailgating area, has become increasingly difficult to manage. At some schools, the parking area is away from the stadium so it doesn’t have a big impact on the venue itself. Our tailgating area is very big for us. It is a gorgeous setting, a great party area, and right next door to the athletic venue. Over time, though, it has become more dangerous to spectators and parents, and the behavior has become such where we can no longer allow it to exist. In discussions about it, it is the only athletic venue where we allow alcohol. I included the NESCAC statement in the policy announcement. Some might interpret it as a crutch, but we should think of it as the context for what we say that we do. We say we provide a safe and hospitable environment and that we ban alcohol from these venues. We agreed to that many years ago. By allowing alcohol in that venue, we have not provided a safe and hospitable environment because of how it affects the venue next to it. There is inconsistency in what we say we are doing because we are banning it from all other venues. In the bigger national scheme, you could argue that football is different, but maybe that is a problem. It comes down to that we haven’t been providing a safe environment even though we say we do.

Speaker Brady: I think what a lot of students are struggling with is that we weren’t given any real hard facts about the bad behavior. The Trinity game was mentioned, but do you have any hard facts? Was there a big increase in property damage, hospital visits, or complaints from community members? It would be great to see statistics.

Erin Quinn: We have had to provide more force throughout the years, but there is a lot of documentation that is missing, including about the Trinity game. We as Middlebury College and the Athletic Department don’t want to have people getting arrested. It becomes an issue of how much Public Safety can handle. They are trying to contain it as opposed to stopping and citing individuals for transgressions. We just want to keep it safe and contain it. While there might be many violations of underage drinking or public intoxication, we were not trying to cite people for these violations. Maybe 5 or 6 years ago, the liquor inspector showed up and went through the tailgate area citing people and the numbers from that were not great. He showed up unannounced and so we had a discussion about how much the Middlebury Police Department can and should come onto our campus. We said that we would handle it ourselves because we don’t want people to be getting arrested on our campus. I know this might not be satisfactory, but we don’t have any hard data.

Senator Sanders: I have two questions. Was there a thought to having a provisional period like maybe a semester long or other thoughts on how to improve the tailgating experience without the ban? My other question is that given the huge student response, if this happened again, would you have approached this the same way?
Erin Quinn: A wide range of options were discussed and incremental changes have been happening over time. One of the issues that crept up over time was that students were getting there earlier and earlier. Two years ago, things were not good for Public Safety, so we did mandate that you could only get into the tailgate area an hour and a half before a game. We did also consult with other schools and some of them only let people in an hour before the game. That seemed like a really tight period of time, especially if you are really tailgating and setting up a grill, so we chose an hour and a half. We also wanted to try and force people out of the tailgate area when the game started and there were some years of trying to enforce that. When Public Safety tried to enforce that, they were met with hundreds of students saying “‘F’ you and ‘f’ football. We aren’t here to watch football. We’re here to party.” So the response from the students to our incremental changes was that they were not going to follow the rules. These sort of changes were on the agenda at NESCAC conference meetings and the overall sense is that nobody is extremely comfortable with what is going on (having alcohol at tailgates). It was a range of those who are extremely uncomfortable to those who try just ignore the tailgates. Our tailgate area is uniquely special because it encourages a big party scene how tailgates at other schools do not. One other school had gone as far to say that no students or alumni can drink, but parents can drink while in “pens.” There was a pen for the parents of the home team and a pen for the parents of the visiting team and these pens were set up so that they couldn’t see the game. It gave the choice to parents whether to stay in their pen and drink or to go and watch the game and the hope was that they would all want to watch their kids play. That’s essentially what we are doing but we didn’t want to adopt that policy. They didn’t have a big outcry when they put that policy in place. We explored all of the different options but none of the other schools were confident that what they were doing was working or was healthy.

Katy Smith-Abbott: About your second question, there are some things that we would do differently. We always learn from students. I think that a version of what is embodied in this resolution is something that I think would be meaningful to discuss and see if it could be practical in real terms. I don’t want this to be an excuse, but there were realities of the schedule that made us postpone this policy change. There was a plan to have this underway earlier, but there were some major campus events this summer that got in the way and if we hadn’t gotten distracted by those, maybe this would have happened in a different way. I don’t want to be disingenuous and have a student forum if the student opinion isn’t going to change anything and I can say that I don’t think we would have ended at a different decision about this. I think it would be disrespectful to engage you in conversation if there isn’t room for change.

Senator Judy: It has come up a lot that this is mostly about safety. I was wondering about your thoughts on what would happen in the wake of this policy, with students getting drunk before the game. Obviously, people are still going to drink either at or before the tailgate and might be driving after drinking. What was the discussion about what students would be doing instead of drinking at the tailgate? I know that people in my dorm were already drinking at 9:00am because they knew that they couldn’t drink at the game.

Erin Quinn: All of those concerns were already happening, just in the opposite direction. People were already drinking at 9:00am and had the same opportunities to do so even if they hadn’t planned for a designated driver. Where we are located, there is a silly rule that the bathrooms are located inside of the stadium so that we don’t have students dashing across the street to use the
bathroom and making cars screech to a halt. The concerns are the same in either direction. This was already happening and I cannot control what students are doing. I am not afraid to send a message. I will not judge those who are drinking at any time of the day, but I would request that, if you are coming to a sporting event, that you not drink excessively. It does not mix well with athletics or anything. really. If people want to start drinking at 9:00am for a 1:00pm game, I would prefer that they don’t come to the game. The biggest problem is that we can’t handle it when all these drunk people show up. Most people don’t show up drunk to other sporting events. This weekend was awesome though: there were a lot of athletic events happening but there were very few people who were really drunk, at least as far as I saw. My answer to this is very focused on our athletic facility, because I don’t have control over what goes on outside of that.

President Custer: It is a Sunday night, so we don’t want to keep you here all night. I would like to open it up again to students if anyone wants to speak.

Colleen Sullivan: My question goes along with the theme of lack of communication. There are all of these references to the Trinity tailgate. I was abroad during that but I was wondering if there was an email that was sent out saying that this behavior was not okay or if we had been given a warning. I go to the tailgates so this is an issue that is near and dear to me. The only warnings that I saw were citations, but you can receive a citation anywhere on campus. It doesn’t matter whether or not I receive my citation at the tailgate or at Atwater…it doesn’t seem like a serious enough warning. My question is: was there an announcement or email that I missed that said the policy change was coming?

Erin Quinn: Thanks Colleen. There was not an email. As we discussed, we might have had a different communication strategy. Our strategy before that was more about the site and for the people who were there. They knew the rules and they were clearly stated. Public Safety had conversations with those who were at the event. That was maybe not a great strategy when you are trying to contain the tailgate and everybody is drunk, but that is where most of the communication happened. It wasn’t just students who had bad behavior and it never felt right to send out a message to faculty, staff, students, alumni, parents, and parents of other NESCAC teams and say that there is a problem, when it is only impacting 300 of these 5000 people. I never thought that would have been effective. The idea was to target it where it was happening.

Emily Banks: Given all of the negative feedback that has been pouring out about this—the petition, alumni complaining and threatening not to donate, that it’s all you can hear people talking about in Proctor—are you at all reconsidering the policy change?

Katy Smith-Abbott: No. The communication and process can be discussed, but not the policy.

Erin Quinn: My concerns were about consistency in what we are doing. Conversations exist at NESCAC meetings, but there is no conversation about rolling back the statement. The conversations are just about how to abide by the policy. Everybody had a sense that the students who were at the athletic events this weekend had a really great time. Nobody drinks at the Field Hockey tailgate, they’re just there enjoying themselves and watching the football game. This is the culture we would like to have at all of our venues.
Caroline Walters: I spoke to someone who worked with Green Mountain Security at the Trinity game. He said the issue was mostly to do with alumni. Should all students have to suffer because of the actions of the alumni?

Erin Quinn: That is one person’s perspective. We couldn’t just ban alumni from the tailgate area. Our communication strategy was off. This definitely is not just about students. There has not been a great record of alcohol at athletic events, here and elsewhere. I think that parents and alumni can be just as much a part of the problem.

Leah Fessler: I work for Middbeatt and we have received over 100 responses from alumni and parents about this. The main concern that has been expressed is that there is a lot value put on students and praising them for their time abroad, their academic ventures, what societies they belong to, projects they work on, etc., but this level of praise and respect does not carry over into social life. As students, we are put on pedestals and we work so hard that we literally kill ourselves ever week. It doesn’t make sense that there is such a big difference between the level of responsibility that we are given as students and the lack of trust we are given outside of that—especially for those of us who are 21 and just want to have a beer before the football game. What I am trying to say is that there is a divide between the amount of respect we receive as academics and the amount of respect we receive as social beings.

Katy Smith-Abbott: I can speak with absolute conviction and say that if the scene had been exclusively 21-year-olds drinking a beer and acting responsibility and respectfully, this would not have been an issue. That was not the scene. We haven’t really gotten into the issue of everyone being of age, but even if they were and they were behaving in the way that they have been at tailgates, it is very different from what you are saying. You are stating the ideal, but time and consistent adjustment to policy showed us that those adjustments did not result in the ideal.

Erin Quinn: I said this in my open letter, but upon becoming Athletic Director, I found it to be inconsistent that we had alcohol at our football tailgates. I conceded on that because I didn’t want to make a big change right after taking the position. It was easier to ignore the inconsistency. I would have kept going on like that, but parents and community members were coming to me and asking me why we had alcohol at our football tailgates. This raised the question of whether or not we should be allowing this inconsistency.

Will Schwartz: My concern is not just about tailgating, but about the administration and Public Safety cracking down on all party venues. That’s a concern that I’ve been hearing.

Katy Smith-Abbott: We know that perception is afoot in the student body. This isn’t the time or place to talk about that, but I would be happy to have that conversation with any of you.

Stuart Warren: I want to bring us back to what Senator Fisher says. This discussion should be about procedural negligence. That is the main problem. But since I have the chance to say something and people are listening to me, I think that we should do something if there is a policy that we don’t agree with and lots of other people don’t agree with. Maybe we should get a big group together and just drink where we want to drink and if there are enough of us, Public Safety won’t be able to stop us.
President Custer: The reason this whole policy came into being was bad behavior at tailgates. Being difficult at future tailgates is not going to be an effective strategy. I would not recommend that.

Leslie Panella: It seems like a lot of the issues, like running across the street to the woods, could be solved easily. We could have installed port-a-potties so people wouldn’t have to run across the street. This is one of our only traditions at Middlebury, so we just wanted more of a warning so we could show that we are worthy of having this tradition. It would have been so nice to be able to have a beer with my mom at a tailgate. There were other steps that could have been taken—like moving the tailgate further away from the venue—and students have ideas about those steps.

Senator Vaughan: Regarding what I said about procedure earlier…I am hesitant to say that we can discuss this at a later time because I think if we want this to be effective, the Senate needs to be included because we have equal purview. Going forward, we should be a part of the discussion, not just a smaller segment of the SGA.

Senator Sanders: I think this fits in with what Leslie was saying. I am afraid that the student body is feeling repercussions of just a few people. Moving forward, the information and communication is important, but I also want to look at the relationship between students and Public Safety. A lot of damage and disrespect has been done to that relationship and it is not representative of the whole student body. Senators, please talk to me if you’re interested in this.

Erin Quinn: Getting back to the comment about civil disobedience…I know there was a lot of anger and frustration and this idea was thrown out in several venues as an option to protest the policy changes, but I would like to commend the student body for their behavior this weekend. There were a lot of people down there, but it was a really positive atmosphere. I know people had talked about doing things, but it didn’t happen. It was a really great weekend, so thank you for that.

Senator Fisher: I think that this conversation illustrates that when we actually have these conversations, it can be great. Finally, we do have a bill that we are going to be voting on. Would you (Katy Smith-Abbott and Erin Quinn) agree with the final two clauses?

Senator Gerstenschlager: I just want to quickly thank Emily, Leah, and Jack for coming to us and working through different mediums—We the Midd Kids, Middbeat, and The Campus—to spread this message. We appreciate it and would like to see more of that.

Erin Quinn: Responding to Senator Fisher, there are parts of it that I agree with and I am really supportive of the spirit of the resolution. This will be an interesting conversation and I don’t really know the answer to it. I did participate in a discussion with Community Council. I brought up the issue but there wasn’t a lot of time to talk about it. Officer Chris Thompson described the issue and he mentioned some of the steps that might be taken, including banning alcohol. I said that I would be interested in coming back to Community Council if they wanted me to and that I was available to talk about this more, but I didn’t hear from anyone. Therefore, I don’t think you
can say that I failed to properly communicate with Community Council. I also don’t know that it is in fact disrespectful if the intent is not disrespect. I think we should be really clear that we should have communicated better and this was a great experience so that we can do so in the future, but disrespect was not the intent.

Katy Smith-Abbott: There is no policy that already says that the SGA is consulted on all policy, so I can’t say that we failed to do that. I hesitate to offer this, but to Senator Vaughan’s point, I don’t know if you would want me to come in, but we should have a discussion about what you want to hear about from me: major policy, student life policy, or maybe just policy involving alcohol?

President Custer: I would like to make a Friendly Amendment that would change the language to say that the failure to consult was “inconsistent” instead of “disrespectful.” In terms of the second point about which policy changes should come before us, I worded this so that all of the changes come before the SGA President and the SCOCC so they have the discretion about what should be discussed in the Senate or with the wider student body. It holds us accountable and puts pressure on us to hedge on the side of bringing things forward to the senate. That will assure that all of the policy changes are looked at. We can vote on this tonight.

Senator Chang: I like the spirit of this bill. It’s much wider than just policy to do with sports and it will affect many parts of our lives if the SGA President and SCOCC are informed of policy changes. However, I think this is vague and not practical and to be more effective, I would like to see the SGA President and SCOCC meet with the administration further and find out what we would concretely be able to talk about and then we could vote on this bill next week.

President Custer: We’ve had Professor Smith-Abbott and Mr. Quinn here for a while, and I don’t want to keep them any longer. Thank you both for coming.

Erin Quinn: Please come see me if you have any issues. Just shoot me an email and we can set up a time to meet.

President Custer: Speaking to your point, Senator Chang, we can still pass something that is clear. The spirit of the bill is that we will know everything and we can work this week on the rest. We can pass things later on that will stipulate what Co-Chair Bogin and I have to tell you about. This is general and vague, but we have an opportunity to get something done now and I don’t want us to miss this opportunity.

Senator Jahan: I have a question about the We the Midd Kids petition. You only need a Middlebury email address to sign the petition, right? Alumni have access to their email addresses for up to a year so that could be reflected in the petition and I think we should try and fix that.

Chief of Staff Zhang: You’re right and unfortunately, there isn’t a way for us to look and see how many of them were alumni versus current students.

Senator Fisher: I stand with my President in that he wants to get this done tonight. I think the spirit of this bill is great and it’s okay that it doesn’t outline specific things because we can add
those later. One thing I want to say is, and I don’t want to fight my President on this, but I think there are a lot of students that felt disrespected by the administration. I think we should give the administration the benefit of the doubt and keep the language of the Friendly Amendment, but I want it recorded in the minutes that there are students that felt disrespected by this and we need to acknowledge that disrespect.

Senator de Toledo: I think we should vote on this tonight. Even if there were alumni, we haven’t had this much enthusiasm on this campus over an issue in a long time. I think it will be great to just get something done and show the student body that the SGA can actually do things! It’s not that we can’t, but given the apathy we are facing, I think this could lead to more activism on this campus. I also agree that the students were disrespected but that it would be detrimental to our cause to include that in the bill because of our already fragile relationship with the administration.

    Senator Toy: Motion to end discussion on F2014-SB4 and vote.
    Senator Sanders: Seconded.
    Ayes: Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Vaughan, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
    Nays: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang
    Abstain: Senator Gerstenschlager
    9-7-1
    Motion passes.

Senator Chang: I want this to pass quickly tonight. However, it looks like they might not do what we are asking them to do, so we should have some more conversation about this.

    Ayes: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
    Nays: None.
    Abstain: Senator Hussein, Senator Chang
    15-0-2
    Resolution passed.

V. Committee Reports

a. Elections Committee

Director of Elections Nick Warren: The Elections Council had elections, not a surprise. It went great. Thank you to those of you on Elections Council—great work!

    President Custer: Motion to ratify committees.
    Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded
All aye.
Motion passes.

VI. Old Business

a. Constituency Outreach and Student Engagement Act (F2014-SB1)

President Custer: I know that it’s late and we all have other things to do, so please bear with me while I try and convince you that we should pass this tonight. It becomes a lengthy process to get this person to do anything if we wait any longer because we have to send out a committee application. At this point, it will be 2 weeks before they can do anything. I would like to make a Friendly Amendment and change the name to Director of Publicity, because there was some confusion about the flow of information. If we want students to know about something we go to the Director of Publicity and tell them to use their committee to tell the whole student body about this. The Director of Publicity doesn’t interact with the student body, that’s our job. I made the mistake of putting the incorrect name on this position—all they are doing is publicizing the message of the SGA.

Co-Chair Bogin: I still want to discuss the section about office hours, but out of respect for everyone’s time, I think we should split the bill. I would like Section 7 to be a new section—the office hours bit.

Co-Chair Bogin: Motion to split F2014-SB1 into two sections.
Senator Medina: Seconded.
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: None.
Abstain: Senator de Toledo
16-0-1
The motion passes.

Chief of Staff Zhang: Let’s just focus on the first part of the F2014-SB1, which discusses the Director of Publicity position.

Senator de Toledo: Motion to close debate and vote on first section of F2014-SB1
Senator Medina: Seconded.
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: Senator Toy
Abstain: Senator Jahan
15-1-1
Motion passes.
Vote on first section of F2014-SB1
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: None.
Abstain: Senator Jahan
16-0-1
First section of F2014-SB1 passes.

Senator Fisher: Motion to table the second section of F2014-SB1
Senator Sanders: Seconded.
9-5-3
Motion passes.

Senator Vaughan: Are we going to send out an application for this position?

President Custer: I get to appoint this person, so there is no application process. I am going to be appointing Robin Loewald. She was a Co-Chair of Ross Commons Council and she did their advertising. I ask that you trust my discretion.

President Custer: Motion to nominate Robin Loewald as Director of Publicity.
Senator Fisher: Seconded
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Toy, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: Senator Jahan
Abstain: Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Medina
14-1-2
Motion passes.

b. Improving Cabinet Efficiency (ICE) Act (F2014-SB2)

President Custer: We went over this without discussion last week. It gets rid of the Alumni Relations position and gives it to the Director of External Affairs. Doesn’t really change anything, I don’t get more power from this. There just hasn’t been enough for the Alumni Relations position to do in the past.

President Custer: Motion to end discussion and vote on F2014-SB2
Senator Toy: Seconded
All aye.
Motion passes.

Vote on F2014-SB2
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Sanders, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: None.
Abstain: Senator Chang
16-0-1
F2014-SB2 passes.

c. Competitive Elections Clarification Act (F2014-SB3)

President Custer: This just repeals what was passed last year and replaces the language so that it is consistent with our Bylaws. There are no substantive changes.

President Custer: Motion to end debate and vote on F2014-SB3
Speaker Brady: Seconded.
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: None.
Abstain: Senator Sanders
16-0-1
Motion passes.

Vote on F2014-SB3
Ayes: President Custer, Senator Jahan, Senator Gerstenschlager, Senator Gogineni, Senator Toy, Senator Medina, Senator Judy, Senator Sohn, Senator Brook, Senator Vaughan, Senator Hussein, Senator Chang, Senator Fisher, Senator de Toledo, Co-Chair Bogin, Speaker Brady
Nays: None.
Abstain: Senator Sanders
16-0-1
F2014-SB3 passes.

VII. Adjournment

Senator Jahan: Motion to adjourn.
Senator Gerstenschlager: Seconded.
All aye.
Meeting adjourned.