

Student Government Association:

# March Senate Minutes

---

Minutes from the following meetings of the Senate are included in this document:

[March 6, 2017](#)

[no March 13 meeting — Spring Break]

[March 20, 2017](#)

[March 27, 2017](#)

# Senate | MINUTES

DATE: 3/6/2017 | TIME: 3:30PM | LOCATION: Hearthstone

Meeting called by:	Maggie Bean	Attendance: Dustin, Aaron, Dan, Tyler, Michael-Paul, Erin,
Type of Meeting:	Senate	Charlie, Haley, Maggie, Caitlin, Jeff, Logan, Michelle,
Facilitator:	Maggie Bean	Chuck, Dan, Dave, Morandah
Note Taker:	Caitlin Ludke	
Timekeeper:	Caitlin Ludke	Proxies: Charlie for Kendall, Erin for Hannah

Guests: Michael

- I. **Call to order** at 3:30 pm
- II. **Approval of Minutes** from 2.27.2017  
no additions, deletions, or changes to last meeting's minutes  
Aaron makes a motion to approve; Tyler seconds.  
Approved: All  
Opposed: --  
Abstained: Haley
- III. **Guests Speaking on Grants**
  - A. Michael - Ski Cross Grant
    1. Representing himself - ski cross athlete (4 skiers compete with each other on the same course) - currently ranked 2nd in the pro division, racing against world class skiers and high-class athletes
    2. With such a big event there's a lot of fees - nationals April 9th (budget in Grant)
    3. Don't expect SGA to fund all of it, but seeking additional funding/sponsorships, but he put the whole breakdown to provide all the information regarding the costs of something like this
    4. Questions: how will you be representing Champlain?
      - a) Champlain is a very diverse community, lots of different interests, we aren't as well represented in the athletic division as we should be - lots of competitive athletes, if I could attend this event I could be a face for Champlain College that a lot of people don't get exposed to
      - b) Ted Whitaker - Jeff will be in touch
  - B. Caitlin's Capstone Grant
    1. Doing a survey about Canvas usage in the classroom from a student perspective - giving a voice
    2. Asking for gift cards to give out as raffle prizes to students - want to give people an incentive to take the survey but also a reward for participating
    3. Asking for \$50 for 5 \$10 gift cards
- IV. **Traveling Office Hours**
  - A. Charlie - came up during his actual office hour: question that was on one of our meeting notes regarding classroom bill of rights - curious about what that really was and how it would be implemented and effect the classroom

1. See Say Do has the different boards, Diversity and Inclusion board is writing a letter to staff and faculty (Jared is helping them edit) - not a bill of rights but more of "this is what we want" (Student expectations) - we did not proceed with anything further
  2. Concern of the student was that it would censor conversations which is probably not the intention
  3. Michael-Paul: part of See Say Do - not that we can't talk about it, but teachers having some boundaries with students
  4. Dan: is that healthy for the students?
  5. Maggie: this is what we expect from teachers letter - part of it involves accommodation and part of it involves a healthy classroom environment
- B. Dave - Dan and Dave were in the round table - freedom of expression in the classroom was brought up - when we were trying to address the bill of rights, it doesn't really say anything and someone could be scared about the bill of rights - main concerns it'll restrict conversation and certain ideas and if this is going to inhibit that then it needs to be talked about
1. Less discussion of bill of rights - the point is how broadly it was described in the notes and it is a problem area
- C. Tyler - went to Vermont Smash 4 weekly club - didn't know anyone, was nervous about going but once I got there the club members were super friendly and talked to him about how the club works - if you're signing up for traveling office hours and you're nervous about going to something you know nothing about be fearless because people are excited to share their passions with you, don't be concerned that you know nothing about it because I was pleasantly surprised
- D. Michael-Paul - two events: the weekend was completely empty - weren't many people - probably because spring break is coming up, and a handful of people at least in my hall are home-sick so they're going home and then they'll go home next week too (and too cold)
- E. Morandah - went to women of color affinity group - just inviting anyone to come - both women of color and women of non-ethnic background - Logan went - a bunch of venting individuals and know each other as a group, bashed about teachers and nonsense - nice casual get together, nothing specifically structured, just nice and fluid - Jenga questions
- F. Logan - SLACK Committee had a meeting last week and we're working on trying to get more feedback from students - exploring where we might be able to do that so keep your eyes open for that - turns out they have a suggestion box

## V. *Legislative Acts*

### A. Bill Clarifying Bylaws Ambiguity- Maintain

#### 1. Discussion:

- a) Background - someone has contested our Bylaws as being ambiguous
- b) Debate guidelines - we are NOT discussing whether our GPA requirement should be a 2.5 - if this comes up I will redirect you - discussion is whether or not the word maintain and hold are ambiguous within the stating of the Bylaws
- c) Why we're not discussing the GPA: because in order to discuss this we would have to be discussing a Bylaws change which we already talked about during Bylaws committee in order to make a change it has to go out to students for 30 days and then we can make a change
- d) **Robert's Rules** has a section for what to do when there is an ambiguity in your Bylaws - "If a Bylaw is ambiguous it must be interpreted if possible in harmony with the other bylaws. The interpretation should be in accordance with the intention of the society at the time the bylaw was adopted, as far as this can be determined"
- e) Maggie has presented a bill that says when we use the word "maintain" or "hold" we mean \_\_\_\_\_.
- f) This bill says "this is what our Bylaws is."

Maggie motions to approve Bill Clarifying Bylaws Ambiguity - Maintain; Aaron seconds.  
Approve: Everyone else

Opposed:  
Abstained: Dave, Dan

**Amendment:** Aaron makes a motion to amend the bill to say date of application and henceforth through entire term of office from date of application through the entirety of the office; Dustin Seconds

- Discussion:
  - Dustin: makes sense
  - Chuck: all this means is that this is our understanding of what this means

Approve: Everyone else  
Opposed:  
Abstained: Dave, Dan

Bill Clarifying Bylaws Ambiguity- Maintain has been approved.

**B. Bill Clarifying Bylaws Ambiguity- Hold**

1. Discussion

- a) Aaron: I think the bill is pretty much explaining it succinctly enough that it clears up any ambiguity
- b) Chuck: Michelle and Chuck worked on other wording - neither of us have standing to amend anything - can you as chair amend anything? - basic point: the Bylaws are here to guide how the organization works and making a general set of rules that treat everyone equally. In law it ends up being about how Person A and Person B interprets that sentence -- well what did we think this means?
  - (1) Michelle and Chuck reasoned that if you go to the language "in order to hold" that it really means "in order to apply to hold..."
  - (2) Because everything happens in the same semester there is no place for that to change (spring election)
  - (3) Both argue that the implicit understanding we were all working with was that when you apply to office you have a GPA of 2.5 and Michelle verifies that and then you get to run or don't get to run
- c) Tyler - if we change this to say apply then it's almost voided that you have to maintain disciplinary standing
- d) Dustin - to Chuck: there is something about this in the sanctions area - about SGA reps/officers needing to maintain a standard of some sort
- e) Maggie: never made a motion before - just saying what we're meaning and NOT Changing the Bylaws
- f) Chuck: Basic problem is ambiguity - "when I applied I had this GPA and now I don't" - when we come to maintain we've solved that by saying date of application all the way through office

motions to approve Bill Clarifying Bylaws Ambiguity - Hold; seconds.

Approve: Everyone else  
Opposed:  
Abstained: Dave, Tyler

Aaron amends the motion to approve to change it to what Michelle said; Erin seconds

Approve: Everyone else  
Opposed:  
Abstained: Dave

Aaron amends the motion to approve to change it to what Michelle said; Erin seconds

Bill Clarifying Bylaws Ambiguity- Hold has been approved.

C. NECCDC Grant

1. Discussion:

- a) Tyler: We've funded this in the past for \$1500 - it goes to a good cause and it's a good opportunity to show off Champlain's expertise in the field - money well spent, \$1500 is good in supporting it
- b) ~\$10,400 left in budget
- c) Dustin: can bring the knowledge back to school; okay if it goes to only the students
- d) Aaron: seeking alternative funding, not asking for what the trip actually costs, good for networking - lets do it!
- e) Jeff: would fund in full, good for the college to be there, beneficial to the students, sending 9 students and we're only paying \$1500 - good for the college - even better that they're going to a faculty member

Aaron motions to approve NECCDC Grant; Tyler seconds.

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Dave

NECCDC Grant has been approved.

D. Ski Cross Grant

1. Discussion:

- a) Dustin: conflicting feelings about this grant because it's good that we have a student who is going out and doing these things and representing the college, but...
  - (1) 1 student for \$1800 which is the equivalent of 36 students activity fees
  - (2) Don't see how this will help the students when he comes back - how does it benefit the community?
- b) Jeff: the Senate gave \$2300 to a student for a film
- c) Erin: the reason we approved the \$2300 grant was his chance to go big and represent Champlain in a way that they'd look up to that person, if people look up to him they would see Champlain represented - Hannah and Erin think we should only fund fees
- d) Dave: only fund fees - something like the \$2300 film...it is impossible to not look at that with the inclusion of many other students (a leader and a team) whereas this is literally just one student but we fund a lot of things that are arts and class related, but a big part of the community skis and snowboards, so helping him out in any way is good, not funding it in full but funding the fees
  - (1) Is the funding that he's going after you keep what you make or if you don't hit the milestone you don't get to keep the money?
- e) Aaron: very much in the same vain that Erin and Dave are on - it is one student but we fund so many different interests in other things - it's important to understand that there are other people who are athletically inclined (continued issue of the college and not funding athletics) I think we should fund the race registration fees and licenses he needs - it is a student interest and it is something a lot of people on campus do but it does not warrant funding the entire thing for one person

- f) Logan: with each year you're putting about \$3,000 of your own money into it for helmets, gear, traveling fees - he's funded every single race up to this point on his own, also reaching out to other options
- g) Jeff: he's asking for \$1800 and his USASA team has raised \$1200
- h) Tyler: what if we compensate up to the \$550 - Jeff - \$600 would match him to the goal
- i) Campaign ends in 3 weeks
- j) Caution wording so he is not restricted if sponsors want to pay for certain things
- k) Dustin: we will fund you for \$600 for this project and in our logic it's that we'll fund the fees/licenses
- l)

Charlie motions to approve Ski Cross Grant; Erin seconds.

Approve: None

Opposed: Everyone else

Abstained: Charlie, Kendall, Hannah

Aaron makes an amendment that we fund this for \$600; Dave seconds

**Discussion:** this is what he hasn't fundraised yet - if he gets more than we'll get more back

- Morandah - we should wait - sounds more like a hobby - not something if you think about Champlain then you don't think they have a really great ski club or team, but with other programs you have funded you wait until they've had funding and then you tell them to wait until they have funding
- Aaron: Can we word it in such a way that if we fund up to this - once your fundraising is done - then if you come up for \$200 short here's 200 and you don't need the full
- Maggie: We can tell him to come back after the fundraising is done but that's in 3 weeks, every dollar we don't spend will go somewhere
- Jeff: it's going to be through reimbursement anyway
- Tyler: encourage him to come back

Approve: no one

Opposed: All

Abstained:

Ski Cross Grant has been denied.

\*\*Can we make sure to tell him that he spoke great and worried that he won't come back - come back we'll most likely give you money - denying it for the current date

**E. Caitlin Capstone Grant - see Jeff's notes**

1. Discussion:

a)

motions to approve Caitlin's Capstone Grant; seconds.

Approve:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Caitlin's Capstone Grant has been approved.

**F. University of Lethbridge Conference Grant**

1. Discussion:

a) Maggie: first of what I assume will be a good amount of this CURI project

- (1) What makes me nervous is that when we talked to Erik it seemed like everyone was going to come to SGA - their only source of funding is SGA - that makes me VERY NERVOUS if we're going to be getting almost \$2000 grant every single week
- (2) We might want to have a discussion on how we handle these grants now rather than funding some now and none later
- b) Dustin:
  - (1) Good for reaching out to other campuses and gaining international exposure
  - (2) One student but a good conference and they can probably bring something back
  - (3) Good to see students going out and presenting things like this - we did fund a student to go down to a writing conference last year
- c) Charlie - from Kendall - paying for flight and registration fee but nothing else
- d) Erin - agree with Kendall's statement - just do flights and registrations across the board
- e) Dave: agree with flight/registration - different conversation that Josh and I tried to start last year - for BIG grants (500-600+) - if students want to do a successful project it brings up the conversation of having a separate fund for projects/trips like this
- f) Jeff: we will give you X to work with that you can present expenses for - would reiterate that we can't fund this forever, they need to figure out how they're going to fund it next year, we don't want to fund this forever - allocating a block is good but it could tie up to anywhere from 3-4,000\$ but then they can allocate that however they want to or we could say you need to take all the students who are going to go and have them come to us and present on what they're doing - take all the grants
- g) Jared: a handful of people who have been selected by Erik right now who can apply to go to conferences but Erik looks for conferences that are worthy of undergraduate research conversations - the differences between one to the next is different enough and that's hard to do because they're going to be different from time to time and it's about time and deadlines, etc. - as for just comment of we don't want to pay for this in future years, I would question why we worry about not contributing this in the future - other departments can contribute some - a system of how do we work with Core division and provost's office but we shouldn't ignore this - MIGHT be the last one this year because we don't know
- h) Aaron: have funded large grants for one student before but those aren't something that happen regularly, this is going to be another part of the college and if we were to keep funding this in full it would put a strain on what we can fund in other areas that are multi-students
- i) Chuck: going back to what Jeff said - give the money to Erik but he said no to that, at this time he is not prepared logistically to organize that but he hopes in the future they can, second scenario: same position that Erik is in, third alternative: in response to Maggie's thought of more are coming, you could set precedent that we're only paying for flight/registration and we'll do this for grants that seem relevant until money runs out, or internally allocate X amount of money - but there's no way to predict how many more will come

Tyler motions to approve University of Lethbridge Conference Grant; Dustin seconds.

Approve:

Opposed:

Abstained:

**Amendment:** Aaron makes an amendment for 740. Dave seconds

Discussion:

- Dustin: the only thing we can see to be flexible on this going forward - while I'd like to see us be able to fund more of this I don't see it being sustainable
- Tyler: not enough bang for your buck and coming from the grant fund I don't see what the student body gets from this - the Core division and Provost office really need to step in

Approve: Everyone else

Opposed:

Abstained: Hannah

University of Lethbridge Conference Grant has been approved for \$740.

## VI. Updates from Cabinet and Senate

### A. Senate Updates

1. Michael-Paul: we moved the dates for the applications
2. Morandah - women's history month - event here march 30th - understanding Islam especially with the current events going on - black lives matter flag is being hung during the break - there will be a spiel going on right after break, Logan, Maggie, Lisa will be doing a reveal - flag is going to be right in the atrium

### B. Cabinet Updates

1. Jared: elections are continuing through, Cabinet applications are going out on the 20th - another Bylaws forum tomorrow night at 6:00 PM - if anyone asks they did receive an email - after we go through that conversation we'll make any last questions it will decide whether we put out a position for a Director of Diversity and Engagement, study abroad piece, and class reps. - if you are free between 6:00 - 7:00 PM please be in Hearthstone
2. Caitlin:
3. **Jeff: there will be a budget surplus - Cabinet has been discussing some of the things we'd like to present - you can be anticipating what those will be in the coming weeks**

- C. Dan Update: we're bringing Cindy Pierce to campus - hookup culture, consent, etc. and that will kick off sexual assault awareness month (thursday March 30th) - speaker all day so there'll be "pop-up" events, wants to meet with certain student groups

1. Cindy was a comedian and has done some local events, written some books, etc.
2. Mens group want to sponsor an event every month

Meeting adjourned at 4:56 pm

# Senate | MINUTES

DATE: 3/20/2017 | TIME: 3:30PM | LOCATION: Hearthstone

Meeting called by: Maggie Bean      Attendance: Tyler, Michael-Paul, Dustin, Dave, Aaron,  
Type of Meeting: Senate      Maggie, Erin, Caitlin, Michelle, Chuck, Dan, Morandah,  
Facilitator: Maggie Bean      Hannah, Haley  
Note Taker: Caitlin Ludke  
Timekeeper: Caitlin Ludke      Proxies: Dustin for Charlie, Erin for Kendall

Guests: Matthew Rohr

- I. **Call to order** at 3:30 pm
- II. **Approval of Minutes** from 3.6.2017  
no additions, deletions, or changes to last meeting's minutes  
Aaron makes a motion to approve; Dave seconds.  
Approved: All  
Opposed: --  
Abstained: Haley
- III. **New Business**
  - A. Upcoming Elections Events:
    1. Voting Kickoff Sign-Up:  
[https://docs.google.com/a/champlain.edu/spreadsheets/d/14Gh\\_xFsNwCr83Y0vtmcRs9UR384ij-cWgnsTcQizoeE/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/a/champlain.edu/spreadsheets/d/14Gh_xFsNwCr83Y0vtmcRs9UR384ij-cWgnsTcQizoeE/edit?usp=sharing)
    2. Raffles: those who voted should be entered into the raffle - talked about either gathering ID numbers, emails or names to then have in a google sheets and you can use Command F to find the person's name
    3. Pinata reveal at the Elections Party
    4. Tell Jared to write in the raffle process in the voting email
- IV. **Current Business**
  - A. Travelling Office Hours:
    1. Dustin: week before break I was in the Google Hangout for Admissions; there might be another global partner with a place in Scotland for Game majors and others (heard through the grapevine) - ears open mouth closed
    2. Maggie: Went to W&GC party for National Women's Day
    3. Tyler: Cyberthreat conference - talked about the "bill of rights" in the classroom and how girls aren't treated equally in the classroom in this field - not sure how widespread it is but it seems like a campus climate issue
    4. Aaron: Cyberthreat conference - put on by the Department of Justice and college about cybersecurity, good for Champlain to put itself out there within the small business area
    - 5.

## V. *Legislative Acts*

### A. Triwizard Tournament Grant

1. Word of Jeff: we have \$7,600 - should reach out to Ted but he is out of the office until the 27th - supports them all in general; supports the Quidditch one in full
2. Sam: really great thing, in past years they've tried to do similar things and it'd be great to get other colleges here, as far as prices they're not asking for a lot and if we don't fund this but fund other very expensive things then it looks kinda iffy, it's building the program if we get other colleges here, and they're very good about getting paperwork in, etc., they don't ask for a lot from SGA
3. Aaron: keep it in the back of everyone's mind that the little grants do add up and a bunch of little grants add up to one big grant, Quidditch has a good participation rate and they are visibly active on campus, good to support something like this
4. Charlie: Where is it going to be held, how many attendees do they expect, etc.

Dustin motions to approve Triwizard Tournament Grant in full; Michael-Paul seconds.

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained:

Triwizard Tournament Grant has been approved in full.

### B. AIGA NY Trip Grant

1. Hannah:
  - a) Planning another trip - recently had gone to Boston now we want to go to NYC - good opportunities to tour buildings (Vice Media) - have a connection there and Hannah Campbell has a connection, as well as other buildings, networking and alumni who they will be having dinner with - asking for transportation, hotel costs, fees, and food - want to hold an hour long session to meet with people who weren't able to go on the trip and recap what happened and talk about what opportunities we obtained from the trip, staying at a hostel (but affordable)
  - b) Questions:
    - (1) Do you expect to fill all spots?: there was a lot of demand in 2014 so we think we'll be able to fill it easily - no more than 40 though
    - (2) Transportation: is it for the whole bus or per ticket?: whole bus
    - (3) Are faculty going?: Suzanne is going, Koby (professor) in addition to Hannah Campbell
      - (a) They are part of the 40 count but are paying their own way
    - (4) Minimum number you need to go on the trip?: Not sure
2. Discussion:
  - a) Jeff: thinks we should fund it in part → look at asking Career Collaborative or the division to help pay, participants need to sign a waiver that Ted sent us
  - b) Dave: awesome that we can potentially fund something that is career oriented and post-college related, do they have a significant budget for putting together trips like this? - Probably not, if we fund this I hope we see more things like this
  - c) Charlie: we fund conference trips a lot and it's never for a trip this large, lots of planning and funds, we should consider denying it and telling them to consider coming back with a max of 10 students
  - d) Dustin: seeing a lot of students go is good but how are they going to get there funding?, per person: ~86, if we were do to 20 students including transportation it would be \$3,730
  - e) Dan: fixing the amount of people and fix the food
  - f) Aaron: we can give them a lump sum of money and they decide what to use it
  - g) Morandah: we should fund portions and definitely student admission and food, but they should definitely be fundraising

- h) Maggie: 40 is a lot of students, don't know if we can fund all grants in full, could just pay for the bus, could pay for some students and the bus, could pay for the students and NOT the bus
- i) Erin: if we don't want to have the only paying for 20 students we could pay for fees and transportation - ~2,280
- j) Chuck: consider that AIGA has been told to apply for separate things for funding from their budget, it may be one of the oldest most successful academic clubs on campus
- k) Sam: one of the older clubs and they are very organized, rarely has it been this size but now they have the coach bus on there, encourage the use of coach buses (have discussed with Jeff) but it's also a much higher cost and adding in hotels is quite a number for what we have left - funding partially is a good idea and then do fundraising
- l) Michelle: given the time frame of the grant and amount of time it will take for them to orchestrate it all - recommend that if you fund it partially then do it now rather than making them come back again
- m) Dan O'Hara: getting a coach bus for 2,000 that will have 40 people on the bus no problem, think about that - the transportation is the bulk of the grant - they'll pay 2,000 whether they bring 40 people or 20 people
- n) Tyler: would it be fair to stipulate that people pay \$40 to go on this trip - Sam: people have done it, rugby does it and they have to pitch in for insurance

Dave motions to approve for AIGA NY Trip in full ; Erin seconds.

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Charlie, Kendall

Amendment: Erin motions to amend the AIGA NY TRIP for transportation and tickets (\$2,280) ; Dave seconds

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Charlie and Kendall

Discussion:

- Easy number to come to
- ~80\$/student

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Charlie, Kendall

AIGA NY Trip Grant has been approved for \$2,280.

### C. Homecoming Dance Grant

#### 1. Levi:

- a) Looking for money to help facilitate some of the decorations and strange events at Homecoming - strange interactive art project based on high school dances, this Saturday, expecting at least 100 students or more (last event was 200+ students), making it feel like a homecoming dance - NO LONGER NEED a software budget
- b) Questions:
  - (1) animal masks - what do you need? Maggie has 3 camel masks already
  - (2) Have you talked to student activities? Yes, they have helped as much as possible
  - (3) Now asking for \$252 (minus animal masks)

#### 2. Discussion:

- a) Tyler: seems like a pretty successful event, seems cool and a huge turnout, bringing Champlain students together in a dance environment is a cool thing to be able to include a lot of people for not a lot of money, \$252 seems reasonable
- b) Aaron: cutting out animal masks so it's \$192

Tyler motions to approve Homecoming Grant for \$252 ; Aaron seconds.

Approve:  
 Opposed:  
 Abstained:

Amendment: Aaron makes a motion to amend the grant for \$192. Dustin seconds.

Discussion:

- Dave: there might be other things we can cut,
- Dustin: do we have cloaks in storage?, looks fine at \$192 - we'll get the strobe lights and disco ball back and those can be re-used
- Tyler: where does all this stuff go? - In Durick Hall

Approve: All  
 Opposed:  
 Abstained: Charlie and Kendall

Approve: All  
 Opposed:  
 Abstained: Kendall

Homecoming Dance Grant has been approved for \$192.

#### D. ISOM Conference Grant

##### 1. Discussion:

- a) Karly Struble: invisible nipples - Instagram prohibitions of the female form and presenting at a gender conference
- b) Dustin: numbers don't match up, \$440 for the flight, \$115 for the night in a hotel, two shuttles @ 160, Thu. Fri. Sat. food @ 30/day, total = 805, inconsistencies with meal amounts
- c) Aaron:
- d) Maggie: CURI grant second week in a row!!; what did we pay for the last one? Flight and conference fee - if we want to be consistent on items we can do that, or be consistent on cost

Aaron motions to approve for ISOM grant in full; Dan seconds.

Approve: No  
 Opposed: All  
 Abstained: Charlie and Kendall

Amendment: Erin makes a motion to amend the ISOM Conference Grant and just pay for the flight (440); Aaron seconds

Approve:  
 Opposed:  
 Abstained:

Discussion:

- Morandah: we should do the flight, and the shuttle and the hotel and food
- Funding flight and transportation?

- Erin: don't think we should fund the shuttles - when someone has a more expensive flight in the future and then they ask for shuttle money
- Aaron: stick with the precedence that we made with flights and conference fees
- Michelle: fees are higher now

Amendment is denied.

**2nd Amendment:** Tyler would like to make an amendment for \$600 which will cover plane and shuttles; Aaron seconds

Discussion:

- Just because of what Michelle said you can't really get to Oxford from Memphis

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Charlie and Kendall

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Charlie and Kendall

ISOM Conference Grant has been approved for \$600.

#### E. Bylaws Changes Round Two

##### 1. Discussion:

##### a) Director of Diversity and Engagement:

- (1) Tyler: Compensation be the same? - Paid the same as other Director events but different from VP/P
- (2) Maggie: Jeff doesn't seem concerned for adding positions, gave him a structure of the proposed new structure
- (3) Dan: meeting with organizations all over campus might be more appropriate rather than just those with a diverse identity
- (4) Jared: because there is engagement in the name we should have an awareness that it's important to engage with everyone - we can encourage the individual to meet with all the groups
- (5) Logan: important to keep it focused; additionally traveling office hours is that you're reaching out to groups you're not typically involved with and we're also looking at other positions being added in SGA
- (6) Michelle: educate and engage with clubs who don't have a lot of diversity, value in having an individual go to lots of clubs

##### b) Article IV Section I

##### c) Article IV Section 2b

- (1) Jared: House of Reps. makes it sound more connected to the students - we're representing the students and it reminds us constantly that we are here to serve the students
- (2) Senate = House of Representatives

##### d) Article IV Section 3, 6A

##### e) Article IV Section G

##### f) Section 2 - Be free from record of disciplinary probation

- (1) Talked to Donna - if you did something in the past but are clear of sanctions, technically you can run - for small misdemeanor stuff it's okay but probation is the highest you can get before you are expelled - very hard to reach probation, unlikely this would happen

- g) Aaron: all of this stuff clarifies a lot of things and the changes include/add things that we've talked about

motions to approve for ; seconds.

Approve:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Withdrawn Amendment: Aaron makes a motion to amend Article II, Section 1 to say "at least two (2) but not limited to advisors"

Amendment: Aaron makes a motion to amend Article II, Section 1 to say "two (2) or more advisors."; Michael-Paul seconds

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Charlie & Kendall

ALL BYLAWS CHANGES

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Kendall

Bylaws Changes Round Two has been approved.

#### F. Bill for Appendix G Date Enforcement

##### 1. Discussion:

- a) Sam: one of the things we wanted to do this semester - make sure that it's sanctioned, this bill will set the 5% deduction for the future, due date that we usually use is the first day of classes of the semester, the paperwork to establish them as a club must be in on time or their budget will be cut due to the fact that paperwork is late
- b) Dan: is that a severe enough penalty?, no form should be handed in late
  - (1) We have the contingency fund and club heads might try to get money from there
- c) Maggie: how many clubs had their appendix G form in on time? ~20 out of 36-37 and some of the ones that were late were big clubs
- d) Dustin: only thing I'm worried about is the comments that we got from the survey about how it can be difficult to find out club information, so this just needs to be thought through about how to get this information to clubs - if we do this everyone needs to know about it
- e) Erin: if someone submits a certain amount of money and it's outlandish and then you want to cut it a bunch, where's the line of what you cut?
  - (1) After you vote on the recommendation the 5% comes out AFTER the voting happens
- f) Needs to be reworded slightly so it's clearer
- g)

Aaron motions to approve this bill; Erin seconds.

Amendment: Tyler makes a motion to amend the bill for club registration to say at the end "changed from requested budget after approval" to approved budget; Erin seconds.

Approve: Aaron, Erin, Dustin, Michael-Paul, Tyler

Opposed:

Abstained: Charlie, Dan, Dave, Kendall

Approve: Michael-Paul, Dustin, Charlie, Kendall

Oppose:

Abstained: Erin, Dan, Dave, Tyler

Bill for Appendix G Date Enforcement has been approved.

**VI. Updates from Cabinet and Senate**

A. Senate Updates

1. Morandah: we moved the LGBTQ flag along with the Black Lives Matter flag, doing a launch on Thursday at 12:15 outside the dining hall - sneak in and grab a drink, Maggie, Logan and I will be speaking

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 *pm*

# Senate | MINUTES

DATE: 3/27/2017 | TIME: 3:30PM | LOCATION: Hearthstone

Meeting called by: Maggie Bean  
Type of Meeting: Senate  
Facilitator: Maggie Bean  
Note Taker: Caitlin Ludke  
Timekeeper: Caitlin Ludke

Attendance: Dan, Dave, Erin, Morandah, Michael-Paul, Dustin, Tyler, Caitlin, Logan, Jared, Logan S., Chuck, Michelle, Haley, Kendall

Proxies: Tyler for Charlie, Dustin for Aaron, Logan R. for Hannah

Guests: Mike, Michael Keever, Olivia, Nicole, Yanira

- I. **Call to order** at 3:32 pm
- II. **Approval of Minutes** from 3.20.2017  
no additions, deletions, or changes to last meeting's minutes  
Tyler makes a motion to approve; Dustin seconds.  
Approved: All  
Opposed: --  
Abstained: Hannah
- III. **Guests Speaking on Grants**
  - A. Mike (DFA Grant): pretty expensive venture, DFA is looking at hosting an individual who is on Air Force base performing Threat Analysis - need to pay him an honorarium and noteworthy guest speaker, our budget is not sufficient enough, historical speaking fees a reasonable honorarium is for the speaker, work history and experience, not a complicated endeavor (pay for lodging), give a presentation with questions, then he'll be leaving
    1. Dustin: **have you talked to the ITS department about funding?** - Yes, Scott Stevens suggested that I try going through a different fund - actually looked like it was pretty reasonable but it didn't work out - still think it would be valuable and want him to come up independently; **The honorarium is just a thing donating to the speaker because it's something that we usually do?** - he's done some stuff that you've definitely seen in headlines, he'll have to put his whole presentation through the declassification process, but regardless of what is presented to students it'll be cool
    2. Tyler: **if the club wasn't able to raise the money, is it likely that he wouldn't be able to come and speak to the students?** - hate to be in a position to tell him that he isn't getting the money, I'd use the DFA's budget to supplement the amount if we ended up slashing it down, if we got \$2,000 then I'd use the DFA budget - out of respect for what he's done it's reasonable
    3. Michelle: **have you made an offer that's been accepted?** - No
    4. Maggie: **have you asked him what he wants to be paid?** - No
  - B. Michael (Ski Cross): Ski Cross athlete, qualified to go to Nationals in CO next week, very expensive and have been fundraising around the VT community, raised \$1400 by himself to cover other fees, still about \$575 short on the goal to get out there, covering hotel fees and transportation, asked to send an updated budget and I have done that

- C. Olivia (ISOM): was selected to go to Women's & Gender Studies Conference at University of Mississippi - picked because we did embodiment papers and projects, have decided that we can talk on a discussion panel, made up a proposal for travel fare - Karly and I both put them in and they came at different prices but plane tickets have jumped, proposal was about \$900 and the exact number for flight is \$737.39 and the shuttle to get there and back is \$135 - total = \$875.39 - preferred seats because I couldn't get any other seats
1. Jared: price for shuttle for yourself and Karly together or just you? - just Olivia, it's \$135/person
  2. Maggie: can you take the same shuttle? - yes, but they charge the same amount per person
- D. Yanira (ODI): six girls are participating in a fashion show (Karibu fashion show), found it through Morandah, CVOEO to help low-income people reach citizenship, etc. - these girls are going to wear clothing from their families countries, all the money being collected is going through all their programming because they're non-profit, asking for \$1250 because they want to cover 50 tickets, this will be an event where people can learn about different countries, representing culture and things we care for, all the girls are first generation, \$250 is going to bus (location is at Higher Grounds)
1. Dustin: when is this event? - April 13th at 7:00 PM
  2. Jared: is there any funding coming from ODI or CVOEO or Shades of Me, etc.? - this is where I've come first for funding
  3. Tyler: are you confident that you can get 50 people to commit? - Yes
  4. Maggie: will they all be Champlain students? - yes
  5. Morandah: two students that are at Champlain students have been helped by CVOEO because they got the funding, housing, and other things paid for through this program
- E. Nicole (DREAM Six Flags): leading a culminating event, a big end of year event for the kids and it's something we try to do to show them how proud of them they are, haven't been able to do it a lot, struggling to get back to the level we were at (lost a lot of senior mentors), would like to take the kids to Six Flags, have done a lot of fundraising on our own (\$300), kids raised \$180 and very into it and wanted to work hard for it, estimated that it'll cost \$3,233
1. Maggie: **what is the amount you're asking?** - \$1,500
  2. Dustin: is DREAM supporting the trip? - yes, asking for \$500 alumni grant and looking into a fund that was created by mentors a few years ago and might try to get some money from that
  3. Tyler: **have you looked into other transportation options like Champlain vans?** - one mentor who has offered to use their own cars, buses were too expensive

#### IV. ***New Business***

##### A. Election Party:

1. EVERYONE MUST be at the Elections Party. We will need help setting up starting at 7:45 PM, scanning people into IDX, running the raffle table, and just general odds and ends tasks that come up
2. YOU MUST tell Caitlin if you are coming at a specific time other than 7:45 PM because I will expect you there at 7:45 PM otherwise
3. The reveal will be at 9:45 PM in the dining hall
4. Raffles will be drawn at 10:45 PM - winners do not need to be present to accept the raffle
5. Raffles for SGA members - we will be drawing raffles at the event - because it looks bad if a SGA members' name is drawn, I suggest that you put a friend's name and

differentiate your tickets from theirs (with a symbol of some sort); that way you can still participate but it doesn't look as "shady" or "rigged" as some might say

6. I will need people to help me clean up so anyone who can stay after 11:00 pm is appreciated - recognize that it's late but it's only one night
7. See task list for details:  
<https://docs.google.com/a/champlain.edu/spreadsheets/d/10cqTNZMf-boNXNiuTK3kD6F6QRz4yxdQK1aMwC1uFhI/edit?usp=sharing>

**V. Current Business**

- A. Traveling Office Hours:
  - 1.

**VI. Legislative Acts**

- A. Bill Clarifying Standing Rules Ambiguity
  1. Maggie: There has been a situation that has brought up ambiguity - only evaluating the Endorsement section - a situation that has proved ambiguity in the Standing Rules and how they are interpreted. Like the Bill with GPA, we are ONLY discussing the ambiguity and not the situation around the ambiguity - this is basically what we're talking about at the moment, if you stray off topic I will stop you and if you continue to go off topic you will be expelled from the meeting
  2. Opening Statements:
    - a) Chuck: Like the discussion of the grade requirement, you are being asked to determine what your understanding of specific language in the Standing Rules is, in determining that you should consider: insofar as you can know it, what was the intent of the folks who wrote the rules, how do the words that have potential interpretation relate to other words in Standing Rules and Bylaws, and how have you understood the rules so far? At this point it makes sense to read the specifics. --
    - b) Maggie: read the Bill (Whereas, the Standing Rule have been contested as being ambiguous regarding the word endorsement;Whereas, in the context of the heading Elections and Campaigns, Campaign Procedures, 6D "Endorsements by any current SGA officers, cabinet members, senators or clubs. Joint campaigning is not considered an endorsement.";Whereas, the definition of Endorsement is "an act of giving one's public approval or support to someone or something.",Resolved, that "Endorsements" be interpreted to mean, per the definition, that declarations of support only count as endorsements if they are given in a public manner, which does not include one's private social media accounts.)
      - (1) Questions:
      - (2) Chuck: Are endorsements only public not private recommendations - what is meant by the Standing Rules in respect to this - consider: intent of those who wrote the rule, what is your understanding of the rule, is there elsewhere in the document you can look to provide clarification - historical piece: it is our understanding that the intent of those who wrote the rule that sitting SGA officers should not be recommending candidates, PERSONALLY think that was a bad choice, HOWEVER, that is my understanding of the rule
        - (a) VOTED: All - Abstain (hannah and Aaron)
  3. Discussion:
    - a) Dustin: going off Chuck, from being here last year is that SGA members/officers/anyone in the SGA is not supposed to give any endorsement

- personally without further context which means no publicized you should vote for “x,y,z” but if someone were to ask for my opinion I’d give them my personal opinion and it’s not out on social media
- b) Maggie: do you consider one’s personal social media account public or private and it’s a very grey area that everyone is struggling with
  - c) Dave: personally when I read that bill and I hear private the thing that comes to mind is Twitter (locked to a certain amount of people and privacy switch), Snapchat, but then there’s Facebook there are certain people who can’t see things, private in the word itself opens up a huge discussion - what is private social media? If I said who I vote for on Facebook then it can be public
  - d) Kendall: private is not a good word to use because it’s different for everyone
  - e) Maggie: some people have public facebook accounts, but then there are personal private accounts
  - f) Dustin: take on social media is unless it’s one-on-one it’s public, there is no way to determine what outside body can see it
  - g) Jared: VOTED - Approve: Tyler, Dan, Erin, Kendall, Michael-Paul, Abstain: Dave, Dustin - Get the concern of private as a debatable term, there could be a line where it’s private to some and not to all, each of us is a student as well as a member of SGA and we hold this role most of the time, if Maggie chooses to post on social media but makes it private to certain members it is still public to her friends but her friends are still private and she is speaking as a student and SGA member on her personal opinion which is not connected to the campaign, lots of different levels, you can talk to more than one person at once but still you are speaking to a closed group of people that you have accepted to make privy to this information as to who to vote for in this election
  - h) Erin: a lot of the social media that has large friend pools would be public because private to me is one-on-one so if you say something that goes to hundreds of friends and can be seen across potentially a whole student body is public - any type of social media can’t be private because you’re opening your opinion up to a large group of people
  - i) Dave: Does this boil down to intent? I see this easily becoming an issue but it would come down to the intent the person had with this post - if I posted something on Snapchat that is public and private but I could see different ways of wording what I said - intent is important
  - j) Maggie: you can’t make policy about intent but I understand the conversation
  - k) Sam: VOTED: Approved: Everyone else // Abstain: Dave, Dustin - Standing Rules when we reviewed them and the interpretation was in the past was the focus of the Presidential candidates, you get a majority of the student body to vote for you and any endorsements would mean a lot and could be greatly influenced by an endorsement, main focus is that there could be a mix of information with positions (Cabinet is influential) AND public vs. private: Facebook being a different social media because we put our titles on there, I think it’s inappropriate to post about someone in elections because I have lists of people who can see that
  - l) Kendall: bread and butter of communication, we’re citizens of Champlain College and we can have an opinion, looking at the greater US politics and comparing it and I personally think it’s ok as long as you’re not using business accounts to endorse - think it’s okay to say it as long as it’s your personal account
  - m) Tyler: the main things we’re defining: public, private, and endorsement: private is a one-on-one interaction and anything more is public, and it’s hard to discuss that but I’m recently incited by Kendall - maybe instead of rephrasing we should remove it
  - n) Kendall: a lot of ambiguity in private and personal might make it better

- o) Jared: VOTED: Approved: Michael-Paul, Kendall // Opposed: Dave // Abstain: Dan, Tyler, Dustin -- 3 levels: 1) agree with Kendall whole-heartedly but it's not how we feel about it and it's not relevant to this bill 2) public v. private: sitting in the dining hall and talking about elections and I would call it private because I deemed them worthy of having that information 3) if we're looking at endorsement it is approval or support to someone or something - the wording is where I hit a wall - it comes back to intent and I think there needs to be clarification on the word endorsement
- p) Chuck: VOTED: Approved: All -- really impressed with quality of deliberations and it's not easy to decide, think the essence of the discussion should maybe focus on what you think the intent of the rule was and what it is, if we disagree with intent we can change it later, Dustin & Sam were saying this - the intent was to prevent SGA members on exerting influence on the election
  - (1) Maggie: if we voted on this Bill now, can we change the wording later - if it's denied can we change the bill and approve that? - NO, you'd have to write another bill
  - (2) Chuck: can do a straw vote and see where people are, and then amend the bill
  - (3) Maggie: going to do a straw pull - This is an unofficial vote
    - (a) Approve: Aaron, Hannah, Kendall
    - (b) Oppose: Tyler, Erin, Dustin
    - (c) Abstain: Dan, Dave
  - (4) Discussion:
    - (a) Kendall: Says SGA members are prohibited
    - (b) Chuck: you are voting for the "Resolved" section
- q) Dustin: Standing Rules are meant to be a gauge - there is no way for an outside force to look at Social Media and determine who can and cannot see it, gives my perspective that any social media is public (there are loopholes) but for a rule across more than one social media I think everything is public
- r) Tyler: the internet is public - once it's on the internet it's out there, it doesn't matter if it's behind private accounts, you can see it
- s) Dave: what about iMessage?
- t) Maggie: there is a difference - there is a moderate approach, it's somewhere in the middle, there's some private interactions online and there are some public interactions online even if it's iMessage
- u) Logan: VOTED: Approve: Kendall ,Dustin, Oppose: 3, Abstain:
- v) Sam: VOTED: Kendall, Michael,
- w) Dave: we all have an issue with the social media, deliberating about the wording of how social media gets wrapped up into this, not the idea of whether or not SGA should be able to endorse people, but if we were to say this is not worded correctly and re-word it in a way that allows us to endorse people - there is an error here that we could endorse other people
- x) Maggie: this is a change in ambiguity not a change in bylaws or standing rules - what does this mean rather than lets change this
- y) Michael-Paul: sharing or posting is an expression of supporting, is liking or retweeting a part of it?
- z) Maggie: I know that we have members on all of SGA that have liked certain candidate pages, where is the line?
- aa) Dustin: our conversation is supposed to be intent of what Standing Rules should be and we should not endorse
- bb) Maggie: Don't see this budging
- cc) Chuck: VOTED: Approve: All // Oppose: Erin
  - (1) Looking at this and how you vote - what is your understanding of the issue? Is your understanding of the issue that someone who made a

post is in violation of it or not? Do you think this is an endorsement or not?

dd) Michelle: VOTED: Approve: All // Abstain: Dave

(1) Don't be a chicken and abstain - VOTE

ee) Erin: if we approve this is there any way we can change the wording? What constitutes as social media, endorsement is any type of thing - posting, talking, etc., so if we change the ambiguity that it includes talking to someone, posting on social media, etc.

ff) Haley: is there a clause somewhere that if someone were to post something inappropriate on Facebook, what is the wording for that? Anything about bullying on social media, private or public etc.

gg) Sam: VOTED: -- stated in Standard of Conduct and it gets more clear in Standing Rules

hh) Tyler: no Standard of Conduct in Standing Rules

Dustin motions to approve Bill Clarifying Standing Rules Ambiguity; Michael-Paul seconds.

Approve: Aaron, Michael-Paul, Kendall, Hannah,

Opposed: Tyler, Dan, Dave, Erin, Haley, Dustin

Abstained: Charlie

Billy Clarifying Standing Rules has been denied.

Erin makes a motion to amend it to say including private social media accounts; Dave seconds

Discussion:

- Dave: Better wording is saying "all social media"

Dave makes a motion to amend it to say "all social media accounts"; Dan seconds

Discussion:

-help make things more clear

-SGA MEMBERS ENDORSING THINGS

Approve: Dan, Tyler, Dave, Erin, Michael-Paul, Dustin, Haley

Opposed: Kendall

Abstained: Aaron, Hannah

Dustin makes a motion to request that the Standing Rules committee next year review SGA members something endorsements; Dave seconds

Approve: All

Oppose:

Abstain: Hannah, Charlie, Aaron

## B. Bill Clarifying Standing Rules Ambiguity

### 1. Discussion:

a)

motions to approve Bill Clarifying Standing Rules Ambiguity; seconds.

Approve:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Bill for Clarifying Standing Rules has been approved.

## C. ISOM Conference Grant - Revised

### 1. Discussion:

- a) Is it weird for Karly and Olivia to talk about one getting more money?

Tyler motions to not approve the ask for more money for the ISOM Conference Grant; Erin seconds.

Approve: All  
Opposed:  
Abstained: Proxies

ISOM Conference Grant for \$103 has been denied.

D. DFA Guest Speaker Grant

1. Discussion:

- a) Aaron: wants to support the ITS event, concerned with what happens if they don't get the money
- b) Charlie: what is an honorarium, is that just the amount of money to cover this guy, look into whether or not he can stay in the cottage behind Perry Hall, too much money for a speaker who may or may not get a big turnout
- c) Hannah: seems like a great opportunity, shooting for 50-100 might be a bit lofty, more open to funding half of the request
- d) Jeff: we have \$2,900 to allocate BUT he is willing to put another \$5,000 in the grant fund (surplus in capital - we never spend all the money so where does it go?), DFA we should partner with but not fully fund
- e) Maggie: he hasn't asked this guy how much he'd do it for, also he is presenting to three clubs
- f) Dan: not sure if I got it right, btu did he even ask him how much it should be - giving him \$3,000 without asking - would like Mike to ask before we give him any money - not comfortable with moving forward
- g) Dustin: agree to support event
- h) Tyler: there needs to be an offer made first - it's a respectable thing to do in a business interaction
- i) Logan: did state that it is not including their budget that they could do \$1,000 out of their own budget
- j) Sam: right along the lines of what DFA does with their events, they do speakers and it's a good thing to do but he should have had a price point on it

Dustin motions to approve DFA Guest Speaker Grant in full; Dan seconds.

Approve:  
Opposed: All  
Abstained: Aaron

DFA Guest Speaker Grant has been denied .

E. Ski Cross Update Grant

1. Discussion:

- a) Dan: he brought his cost down significantly and he did a lot of work behind the scenes, we did talk about a \$600 cap on his cost and he is a little bit below that - he worked hard with that
- b) Charlie: he agrees with Dan's statement

Dan motions to approve Ski Cross Grant; Tyler seconds.

Approve: All  
Opposed:

Abstained:  
Ski Cross Grant has been approved in full.

F. ISOM Conference - Olivia Grant

1. Discussion:

- a) Tyler: she added a revised number - \$737.39 + transportation - 872.39
- b) Dustin: ok with that
- c) Tyler: they keep coming in
- d) Hannah: that is a very expensive flight yikes, I would push for just funding the ticket and have her do the transportation
- e) Kendall: just the flight and makes it less weird with the other one
- f) Maggie: think it's a little weird because she got her grant in 1 week after, she didn't book her flight until Wednesday March 22, so it's kinda her fault that it's so expensive
  - (1) Tyler: they were approved to speak at this conference at the same time, we should fund them equally
  - (2) Michelle: you have the option to fund this one for \$700 and the other one for \$700
  - (3) Tyler: it's on them for buying the ticket after the grant is funded
  - (4) Dustin: you come with a grant and that's what you're given, if you don't get it done early then that's your own fault - \$600

Tyler motions to approve ISOM Conference - Olivia Grant for 872.39; Michael-Paul seconds.

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Charlie, Hannah

Amendment: Dustin makes a motion to amend this grant to \$600; Dan seconds

Approve: All

Opposed:

Abstained: Hannah

ISOM Conference - Olivia Grant has been approved for \$600.

G. ODI Community Engagement Grant

1. Discussion:

- a) Jeff says we should fund ODI in full and spend the rest of the Diversity fund
- b) Dustin: hesitant because 50 seems ambitious but they're confident so let's go for it
- c) Kendall: we're giving money to a good cause whether people go or not - it does come back to Champlain
- d) Hannah: think \$20 isn't a lot to ask for students to pay for
- e) Charlie: sees where they're coming from, doesn't feel comfortable paying for students to go see a concert or anything - didn't get Morandah's point or Yanira's speech
- f) Dan O'Hara: do a lot of stuff with reserving buses, did she get a quote from the bus company on what that rental would look like - think it's a great event, but I think where she thinks it's going to be enough to fund 50 people the bus might cut into that a little bit, I've done full day rentals and it costs like 600-700\$ and it might go up because the bus has to wait at the event - something to think about
- g) Michelle: not specific in the event
- h) Logan: you can take public transportation for free

- i) Logan Smith: 50 people are going to get tickets - how many people have their own cars and are going to drive their on their own

Amendment: Erin makes an amendment only to pay \$1,000 from Diversity Fund; Dustin seconds

Approve: All

Opposed: Charlie

Abstained: Hannah

Erin motions to approve ODI Community Engagement Grant in full from the Diversity fund; Dave seconds.

Approve: Dustin, Aaron, Dan, Tyler, Kendall, erin, Dave, Michael-Paul

Opposed:

Abstained: Hannah, Charlie

ODI Community Engagement Grant has been approved for \$1,000 from the Diversity Fund.

#### H. Dream Six Flags Grant

##### 1. Discussion:

###### a)

motions to approve Dream Six Flags Grant; seconds.

Approve:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Dream Six Flags Grant has been approved.

#### **VII. Updates from Cabinet and Senate**

##### A. Senate Updates

##### B. Cabinet Updates

#### **VIII. Any Questions? Comments? Other Ideas/Worries?**

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm