

HARTWICK COLLEGE STUDENT SENATE
Minutes: April 15, 2008

Senators Present: Arnold, Blea, Fiteni, Gaines, Harrington, Jones, Kazaks, Kelsey, Lillie, Negrich, Madzar, Ramos, Rubio, Shipman, Simmonds, Woskoff

Senators Absent: Green, Kopstein, Parker, Pringle,

Senators Late (15 min. +):

Passage of Minutes:

- **Motion to pass the minutes**
 - **Seconded**
 - **Motion Passes**

Committee/E-Board Reports:

- *VP of Campus Affairs, Whetsel:*

-Dean Zalatan needs someone to paint the wall. I volunteered my committee to paint the wall.

- *VP of Finance, Utterback/Kendall:*

- There are 3 SMRs tonight

- *VP of Judicial Affairs, Rudy:*

- Nothing to report

- *VP of Senate Affairs, Post:*

- If you are in a club, let them know I'll be sending out an e-mail for the senate awards on the 15th in Stack. We're going to make it a big deal this year

- *Secretary, Roods:*

- Nothing to report

- *Chairperson, Riviello:*

- I want to say thank you for everyone understanding my absences. I am in charge of club officer training. It will be held on May 3 and May 4. I need to meet with my committee after senate.

- *Vice President, Forst:*

- Nothing to report

President's Report:

- Gardner: first I would like to congratulate the newly elected E-Board. President Elect Forst, Vice President Elect Rudy, Treasurer Elect Utterback, and Secretary Elect Secretary. The elections were very heated; it led to the highest voter turnouts. Congrats to all candidates who ran, we hope to see you next year... unless you're a senior.
- Gardner: the Union Split proposal. Everyone should have gotten a proposal of that in their e-mails yesterday. This is something we would like to resolve tonight. Also, we have members of the Union E-board, current and future; if you have questions for them you can direct it towards them.

- Lillie: my only concern is that this time there wasn't a lot of advertising for things from Union. What are you going to do about that?
 - Well, we've put it into our different committees within Union to be in charge of their own fundraising. We're going to have a training session for our members in making the campus aware—like how to do a good poster.
 - Simmonds: I'm concerned that—I'm in favor of the split and amount going towards Union—however, has there been consideration from both parties about what would happen if the student activity fee doesn't get raised and there is a 25% amount of the Student activity fee and how that would effect clubs?
 - Gardner: of course, the topic of percent was a huge factor in our meetings. In fact, the first time the e-board met it was an hours worth of discussion, the second time it was much less time. If the student activity fee is increased, Union gets a large amount of money—if it's not, then it translates into roughly 70,000 for their budget, which is still grossly inadequate compared to our benchmark institutions. This would be an increase in their current budget. Union is the primary programming board on campus. Their programs are designed for every student which is not the case for every club. Their programming will be held next year at a certain standard by I believe the director of student involvement who will oversee union as a part of their job. The other thing to consider is that the debt is no longer an issue, and hopefully will never be a concern again. While there is a possibility that—I just don't know. I hope that answers that.
 - Forst: in response, the financial changes we've made—the vans, the readership, yearbook—we've made ample rooms for this increase. Club budgets will not suffer for Union to have its needs. Kendall and Utterback can respond. Senate at this time can support that, with or without the student activity fee.
 - Fiteni: I agree they need more funding—clubs will be cut short as is, clubs will be looking for more money, therefore we shouldn't be doing this—this isn't the time. You'll have 110,000 off the top, 110,000 is whipped off the top. 10 or 20 other things for senate that you include, it cuts you down already to 130,000 already—if you're lucky, not counting SMR and gas pool. We've already approved a pre-gas SMR. Unless the activity fee gets cut short. I can agree to 20 but not 25... it won't work, you can't live on this. The earliest I've heard from Treasurer Kendall is that it might not get approved next year. Approve the percentage—you're going to bankrupt us and kill us.
 - Utterback: the likelihood of it changing is pretty high. Also, we are out of debt. There was 30,000 that is back in. It's still a higher amount of money than would be the total budget for Union next year. So the money you'll be working with clubs will be more.

- Kendall: in response, you have to remember we didn't budget for yearbooks. They will be taking some of that money, we didn't pay anything for readership this year—these are costs that are increasing. We did the math—it will be 1,500 per club. U
- Utterback: when we ran the numbers yesterday, that was for the smaller clubs and average—we had already subtracted the big Wick SAA and other clubs.
- Blea: say it does happen and we don't have enough money. Union has had a problem with membership—it would be interesting if we could promote club cooperation with Union. Even if clubs have a little less, they can work with Union.
- Fiteni: didn't we just use a lot of that money to pay off the student Senate account debts? Where is all that little extra cushion providing for senate going to be provided for? You're trying to do 5 things at once but we don't have the money. This isn't going to work—you're going to run yourself into a hole.
- Harrington: do you think we have money to do this? Do we have to decide this now?
- Gardner: to respond to your question—where the money came from is from unallocated and unspent money of rollover. However, continuing on with this topic, there is disagreement between the two finance officers, but the rest of the e-board does believe that this is reasonable. Union is the top priority for programming. There is no club that can match or should match Union in programming. Union is charged to program for the entire campus. It's not a question of whether we can or cannot do this—we can. It's whether or not we think Union should have the money to do the stuff they need to do or give it to clubs for things they want to do—for more self serving program. Clubs are important, however, most clubs—all clubs—other than the ones mentioned, don't program for the whole campus. They are open, but they are constitutionally open. They do not expect the whole campus to show up, which is different from what Union has to do.
- Jones: where are we with increasing the student activity fee? That would help, if you're going to be doing the budgets according to the current student activity fee.
 - Gardner: we'll get more on that later. If all goes to plan, the earliest that the student activity fee can be increased is for next spring—that is assuming that it does get increased.
- Simmonds: on the proposal, under procedures: union can decide how big of a cut they get?
 - Gardner: what "B" means is that they control their own budget, that we can't itemize and

change anything. We don't stipulate. They don't get to choose their percentage cut.

- Harrington: I agree with you, Pres. Gardner. I heard that the amount that the incoming freshman are paying is a lot more than last year, a couple thousand more. Because of the activity fee?
 - No, the activity fee hasn't gone up yet, so it wasn't that.
- Harrington: I think the campus is a little confused about that.
- Ramos: the increase in funds in coming years for Student Union—what do you guys want to do with the extra money and provide for campus. What exactly would you like to do with this money?
 - I was treasurer the year before last—this budget is about the size we had at that point, that was the year everything went downhill, but we did have a good year—hopefully that level of programming.
 - We would like to provide more and better quality programs. This semester we have say 8 programs. We haven't brought any bands to campus because bands are expensive—if you want a band people will go to it will cost a little more money. You might need 1 or 2000 for a band. We could get more people to go. Comedians: we can't bring top of the line comedians—we still won't be able to bring like Dane Cook. So if you were going to say “hey, would you like to see Vermont Harris?” but if you get a bigger name, it would be good. The hope is to improve quality.
 - It's also our responsibility to find out the wants of the campus community. When we send out surveys its student's responsibilities to respond.
- Ramos: last week we approved to pay off the debt of the fundraising costs of several clubs—I was in favor of that—but what mechanisms would you have in place to prevent overspending?
 - Gardner: those mechanisms apply to all organizations on campus—their splitting from us doesn't mean Student Life doesn't oversee them. This just means they don't answer to us like other clubs do—they would be relative equals rather than subordinates. They would have to go through Allie Spears for petty cash and get things signed off. Those checks are institutional and were encouraged by many different offices.
 - Harrington: I want to remind Senate that we've given money to a lot of sound equipment and

have bands—we've been spending money so we can have more things on campus. I think it's worth spending. It seems like we've been trying to get more events all year. I think we should probably get money into all of those things. We should just do it.

- Fiteni: I beg of Senate—please don't do this—we'll be in debt again. It will take two or three to get out of it. You're going to put us in debt.
 - Gardner: there is no feasible way that giving them a percent simply means that we have 75% of the budget. That means that it's Senate's responsibility to allocate that money. Doing this simply means that we're giving 25% of this to Union.
 - Utterback: I'm going to do comparative stuff right now.
 - Ramos: I think what Fiteni is trying to say is that we won't have enough money to allocate to clubs and OH Fest. But my question is, you both have two different accounts of what will happen—can we run down what you're allocating?
- Woskoff: right now, the two things you had most recently—with the magicians—how much do those normally cost you?
 - I think like 3000 or 4000. I think that was our most expensive event. Typically the comedian we'll spend 2-3000, a band 1-2000 depending.
 - Our budget was 44,000 this year.
 - Fiteni: My main concern here is that I agree—we do need to give them more money. My major fear is that it won't allow clubs to do what they want with the budget they get. Clubs have worked hard so they can have the things they like and in addition to have Student Union. I think you can do this for a lower percentage this year—wait till student activity fee gets passed, then add the fee when it gets passed. I'm not sure what percentage wise it would be if we lowered it. We can do this in a gradual step process. Then there won't be issues with clubs, give them a little more money.
 - Whetsel: I agree with you that without an increase in the fee clubs will take a hit. I don't feel that's going to take a hit—it will instead force clubs to hold events that matter—events that the campus will show up to. When you service two people, it wastes money.
 - Blea: co-sponsoring events, what I mentioned earlier. What do you feel about that?
 - Union always tries to be approachable as possible—our meetings are entirely open. We considered moving Union meetings to a more

campus central location so it's more open and anyone can come in. Student Union works best when the involvement is the whole campus. We're also open to clubs coming to us saying "we want to put on this event, we need more financial stability and were wondering if you'd like to co-sponsor". We have several clubs who have approached us for next year planning to co-sponsor events.

- Forst: this would not take away from clubs but definitely motivate them. This is something I want to bring to Senate next year. It won't take away from clubs so that they lose money. If that's what happened—there were 30,000 unspent money from next semester. If clubs wanted to program more, why is 30,000 coming back into senate? If they see Union programming, it empowers them. It allows us to support our constituencies.
- Rudy: I guess its just reiterating points that have been made, but the difference between Union is that you have college dems—we have a budget and serve less than 10 people. Student Union, however, serves the entire campus—including people who aren't in clubs. During this whole campaign period and went to clubs and asked what you wanted to see next year—every answer was "we want to see more programming, concerns". How does this happen? We can't give tons of money to college dems. I motion to pass the proposal.
 - Kelsey: I want to clarify something—this 25%, it gets re-evaluated every year?
 - The entire proposal.
 - Kelsey: so if it does appear that we're going into debt again, we can lower it?
 - Gardner: no, in this proposal the 25% is the minimum.
 - Ramos: I think that if clubs spend the money wisely, prioritize, etc. I think that we're kind of in crisis mode—clubs want to spend the money. I think they should be at 20% and I'd like to motion to make the minimum 20% instead of 25%. That being the only caveat. Motion to pass the proposal with the minimum of 20% rather than 25%
 - Utterback: I want to point out, I just ran numbers—all club budgets with Union subtracted out. The total amount is 94,000 roughly. I divided that among clubs, which was an average budget. So there will be a 70 dollar cut, considering there was 56 clubs.

- Simmonds: on top of this concern. How many clubs may go inactive this semester—that’s hard to guess.
 - Whetsel: I second the motion to pass VP Rudy’s motion to pass the proposal as is.
 - Gardner: move to call the vote
 - Thomas: if you don’t get this money, will you fundraise?
 - The purpose of Union is to spend money on programming. We have no fundraised—we do not have plans to fundraise. And I guess my question would be, who would we ask for money when it’s the entire campus that we’re programming for?
 - Fundraisers don’t take in the scale of money we need to budget.
 - The other thing is—this proposal isn’t about what we want—this is about what we think student union needs to fulfill its charge by the campus—student Union isn’t some club that’s going to dissolve. It’s mandated by the college and has to do as much as it can.
 - Utterback: I just wanted to note that the 5000 taken out per semester—I think of that, only 1000 was actually spent—that gives you another 4000 that can go to clubs. There’s no way clubs will go over.
 - **Motion Passes**
- Gardner: I have a quick thing that requires just a quick vote, if anything. Tara Loewenguth is on the committee for the academic day on May 9th. I was wondering if Senate would be interested in donating one of its vans for use during that day. They need to be able to bring people from Anderson up to Johnstone. For people who are disabled. They were wondering—normally they’d have to pay 50 dollars because they aren’t a senate organization.
 - Roods: motion to give them the vans without the fee
 - Harrington: seconded
 - **Motion Passes**
- Gardner: everyone should know that last Thursday the e-board met with cabinet. We discussed the raising of the Senate Fee. I was impressed with the discussion of the E-board with the cabinet. Basically, it falls like such:
 - We were asked to do the following: make a proposal on the increase which will increase what we want, why we want it, include benchmark numbers
 - Construct a process—we have done that—a referendum and require 2/3 of those who vote to pass.
 - Then we will take the proposal to the Board of Trustees who would vote yes or no on that. We have a timeline—made it immediately after the e-board meeting. The proposal is to be distributed by Friday, the 18th. Then we will have three open forums for the student body to address their concerns to us—20th at 4, 21st at 1220 and 23 at 6. Then the 24th, voting will begin, close 4pm

the 1st of May. 7pm the 1st of May, E-Board will discuss that with the cabinet and submit that with them.

- Gardner: what I need from you is a number
- Forst: with all the research we've done—it's a flat out 200 dollar increase that would double the student activity fee. It won't force kids to transfer, it would potentially double budgets on average—if not more. WE wouldn't have to allocate for yearbook twice over or OH Fest twice over. I propose 200 dollars. I motion to make it a 400 dollar increase.
 - Post: seconded
 - Simmonds: does the E-Board have an overall recommendation?
 - Gardner; that's basically our recommendation.
 - Riviello: in talking with the cabinet and Pres. Miller—they said increase it so we don't have to do it again.
 - Forst: in addition, Pres. Miller says if you are going to increase it, are you getting your bang for the buck? Will we incur huge cushions if we raise it by 300 or 400 dollars?
 - Fiteni: just quick questions—did President Miller talk to President-Elect Drugovich.
 - Gardner: we've brought the issue up and she would be hands off about it.
 - Harrington: does the student body have to vote on this?
 - Yes, for a week.
 - Harrington: if the students ask us—we should say it's not too much, not too little. And say "we'll be giving money to Union"
 - Gardner: everything would be given a boost.
 - Kelsey: do you think this has a high probability of being passed? My concern is that people have that 50 dollar number floating around due to that inaccurate article in hilltops. I feel like it will be enough incentive to vote it down.
 - Gardner: we happen to have two hilltop staff here. They may be interested in doing their own article on it?
 - Thomas: after that article was published, I asked people if they would increase it more as long as they know it would mean more programming. If they see 200 300 dollars they aren't going to transfer. Clubs will get what they need. Personally, I'm more than Okay with at least 300 dollars. I wouldn't mind having an increase of 300 to have more money in the bank. If we do spend all the money we have, we can also spend what we've increased it by.
 - Meyering: also, we can convince student senate, looking at benchmark institutions that they have an activity fee of this much—I think that would convince them also—"they get this budget and get these things". Students aren't concerned with the increase but whether the increase will do any good.
 - Utterback: from an admissions standpoint—I can't count how many tours I've given and students who have applied say "this school has this, this has this" and we don't. I agree you don't want to do more than doubling right away because then clubs will have vast overspending and not being overly responsible. We can always raise it on—we've set up this proposal. If in a

couple years down the road it's not enough, you can change that.

- Kendall: we've been discussing the increase of the activity fee in the E-Board. People I've talked to are shocked that it hasn't been raised already.
- Woskoff: if we do this already, can we build in a percent so we don't have to address it? Are we just going to do a flat.
- Gardner: we could but I see a potential—I don't want to scare people away with a bunch of numbers—the most important thing to me is getting an increase—it would be a good idea to maybe have a percentage increase built in so you won't have to keep readdressing it.
- Forst: one of the things President Miller brought up is that it would put us on par with other schools. At this point, it puts us where we need to be. Mirroring what Utterback said, making sure that we're responsible first. As we saw, when there's a huge cushion built up, overspending happens—we don't want to overtax the student body.
- Fiteni: I just wanted to give you a number run—it would be 560,000 if we double it, 760,000 if we add 300 dollars. I think the E-Board has it right on with this. I want to make you guys aware that this needs to happen now, I have hints and tips—just please bring this call to vote.
- Jones: when is this going to take effect?
- Gardner: spring next year and then fall of 09.
- Jones: what will we do with the money?
- Gardner: we'd have an extra-huge SMR pool.
 - Motion Passes
- Blea: you talked about promoting this with Forums. We need to make as big a deal of this as possible.
- Gardner: Dan drafted an article in the next hilltops. VP Rudy is going to make a ticker on the Hartwick channel. We can get WRHO to broadcast this. They have to do PSAs every now and then. I and Sec. Roods have the ability to ZHD... we will be spamming people's inboxes constantly.
- Kendall: also, finance budget hearings—we're going to plug it.
- Simmonds: VP Forst, has there been more work to tag on the Pine Lake fee increase along with this proposal?
 - Forst: this wasn't brought up as it is a separate fee. This year's e-board's focus is to have this passed. We were told to use caution. It's something I'm still committed too. I look forward to having a procedure drafted.
 - Fiteni: I think also, with the increase—if this gets approved by the board of Trustees—there will be extra money sitting in the spring if Pine Lake needs money. I think that President-Elect Forst will hand over certain amounts.
 - Giokas: personally, in terms of promoting this—you would have Unions support, too.

- Gardner: I would like to preface this presentation—this is a functionality of the E-Board situation. I propose that positions be eliminated off the E-Board. The positions to be eliminated would be Senate Affairs, Campus Affairs, and Chairperson. Campus Affairs' duties would be not absorbed. There are two problems that I see with this—Senate is not in the business of programming including, unfortunately, charitable work. Circle K receives a budget from us to do this, Beyond Boundaries gets a budget from the college. The other thing is that Union is the programming board. So, that would be why I'd eliminate that.
 - o Chairperson—all business that's conducted in Senate Meetings—all of that, including vehicle maintenance. The reason for eliminating this is that in the bylaws the chairperson isn't defined as doing anything other than scheduling the vehicles which Dan doesn't do anymore and running the meetings. Basically, instead of having Dan here, we would have seen Nick conduct the meetings—which he had done. As bad as that may be, it gives the VP something additional to do rather than sit there and look pretty. The tie-breaking vote that chairperson holds—what we discussed with the four elected positions for next year—they like to eliminate the president's vote and giving that president the tiebreaking vote. They seemed very receptive to that change. Nick was willing to lose his vote again.
 - Forst: if you look at the way votes are called, unless it's already a tie, that vote doesn't really change anything by the time it gets around to the president. When I'm the chairperson, I abstained from most votes because it's not my place to decide on those issues for one or more reasons. Losing that vote isn't fundamentally changing how senate votes on issues.
 - Harrington: I don't know how I feel about this. How many of there are you right now? 9? I kind of need all 9 of you all 9 of you to tell me what you're thinking. Maybe when we get things about community service, I like hearing opinions on it because you know what's going on.
 - Gardner: it was a major concern, the number of opinions that you get in that meeting facilitate discussion. One of the main responses I would have to your specific question is that, while we're always more than willing to give you our opinions, it isn't our place to guide senate's actions and opinions. We're here to present the information to you, and you decide.
 - Utterback: going off of that, you should be making your own opinions. This is why the president losing his vote is a good thing. If you see the President voting one way, you may sway your opinion. As far as opinions go, these are appointed opinions. Josh could decide to hand-pick people who agree with him. If Josh were elected president and set on one particular goal, he could hand pick all the positions and have them in his pocket—constitutionally, if Senate is not active, the E-board can make votes. In theory, the E-Board could vote on important issues.
 - Gardner: regardless on who could vote, the fact that appointed positions outnumber the elected positions—they do hold sway.
 - Fiteni: in addition, if you're worried about volunteering services—you have the chance to expand senate. You sit there and say—why don't we have Beyond Boundaries. Then you wouldn't lose that representation—add in senators, not E-Board members.

- Gardner: SUNY Oneonta, they have four e-board members. 9 people is kind of unwieldy. Elmira had 11—but they had our equivalent of J-Board, Senate, and Union. That was there “SA” Board. Their senate e-board is two people.
- Thomas: would this go into effect in 08 09?
- Gardner: Senate Affairs, those duties would go to Secretary. So all external work pertaining to Senate would be in the Secretary—which makes sense because Sam distributes the minutes to the campus—he also does the bulletin board, running general PR.
- Fiteni: also, you can toss this onto secretary.
- Gardner: the committee will also still exist.
- Forst: one of the thing the secretary should do is be the conduit through which senate relates to the student body. In terms of internal things, judicial should be in charge of that.
- Jones: would this whole change reduce the number of committees or would they stay the same.
- Forst: it would just reorganize them, it would be under different positions.
- Gardner: you wouldn’t have a campus affairs, but they could be given the VP as a committee—a real committee.
- Gardner: why these changes? It evens out the workload. There are positions which—it isn’t the people, it’s the position as described—Nick’s duties are technically to wait until I die. He took on himself the Laura’s committee because he wanted to, not because he had to. It brings Senate into a governing board—what it was made to do. It would make more sense. Another added bonus is to reduce the unwieldiness.
- Gardner: name changes... we decided we would like to change the names. VP of Judicial Affairs—we decided on Coordinator of Senate Affairs. The reason is that it confuses us with J-Board. Under the new position, this position would be more involved in Senate types of things. Also, we’ll change VP of Finance into “Associate Treasurer”. This is because people get confused with these VPs and the actual VP of Senate. Any other questions on this?
- Fiteni: I love this idea—my question to you is, assuming we do this—how are we going to pass this in the bylaws in addition. We took all the elected positions and put them in the constitution. Does this mean we’ll have to add these responsibilities to the constitution.
- Gardner: what’s going to happen is right now I’m going to ask that we simply eliminate the three positions I asked to be eliminated. This will start May 25, 2008. And to change those names, and to put that one line under judicial affairs. All of those can be done in house, because bylaws are decided in Senate. For the duties under the elected positions—we would need to propose these changes to campus. To get it passed, we have gotten permission to table at breakfast of champions so we can Gardner a bunch of votes at one place. However, we are not bringing those constitutional changes tonight—we’ll bring them once we square away. I’m asking to eliminate those three positions, changes the names, and put that one line under judicial affairs.

- Forst: I feel that unless those two things—the constitutional changes and bylaw changes go hand in hand—it would be unfair to erase these positions. It presents somewhat of a problem. I'd rather table this until constitutional changes.
- Gardner: my only two concerns with that are I believe breakfast of champions is after Senate is done. The other thing is duties not defined in the bylaws—it's the president's abilities to put that wherever and put those on people. Also, Nick is constitutionally allowed to create any positions with Senate's approval. If that came up, he could create these positions with senate's approval.
- Jones: I agree with everything except maybe Chairperson—maybe it's just because I want Dan's job. I think it's important to have an unbiased person running meetings.
- Forst: I will attest that this went under considerable debate.
- Riviello: I really don't do anything—it is kind of stupid to have me around. The VP doesn't have any duties really. If she chose to be as lazy as me, she could have done that. Why not combine to lazy positions. I don't have any responsibility—I gave scheduling to Allison because Student Life. Chairperson really has no responsibility except to call on people and bang the gavel.
- Gardner: the issue of whether the person holding the gavel could have the vote came up. The basic argument we came to is that a. take vote away from president and b. the whole semester is that Nick ran the meetings, he has a vote, and nothing really came up because somebody with a vote was running the meeting. Personal biases will be there whether you have a vote or not.
- Fiteni: I can see Nick's point of view, the question is can VP Rudy—I'm assuming she'll be in charge. Can she have this done in the course of a week? In addition, does she want to take on this responsibility?
- Rudy: my committee just saw the 90% of the changes that would happen, my next project is the constitution.
- Gardner: we also have notes where it's written down where to put everything.
- Utterback: the issue with eliminating the chairperson is that the person with the gavel doesn't have a vote, you could also move it to Judicial.
- Ramos: I think by eliminating these positions you eliminate the wealth of experience student's can gain. A good example is that Kim would have not gotten the experience had she not been on e-board for this semester. I think those positions give senators and appointees experience on the Senate E-board. Is it possible to say have a couple senators somehow gain experience by meeting with e-board? Go to e-board meetings?
- Gardner: three possible responses: we might have chairs in committees—something that would be used, those would be senators. Another thing is whether there are 9 positions or not, there is no reason why a. a senator or b. upperclassmen would be appointed. I could appointed. Then we would all have graduated. The other thing is.

- Utterback: josh did a good job this past year of making sure there were underclassmen on E-Board. The years before, the entire e-board left because they were all juniors and seniors.
- Ramos: that's a good thing to have and continue. Josh did a good job, I think that's something we're starting—we've made a lot of progress, especially the last few meetings. I think that would help us in getting younger members.
- Harrington: I don't know if next year, we double the amount of senators—if we're having a lot more, I don't want less e-board. It makes more sense. I know other schools have less, that doesn't mean we have to. I think the secretary would be having a lot of work. The other thing is, you guys are doing finance things and everything, he's constantly typing, they're doing judicial stuff. Dan knows all the names the first day. I know secretary roods does when he's typing but I think it's good to have Dan there the first day. I did like it.
- Rudy: as far as the doubling of senate, that was something Kim and I were going after and something not set in stone. Since I am elected. It isn't something set in stone.
- Harrington: I think people want to be more involved in Senate. I don't want to see less e-board members.
- Forst: we are looking at increasing the size of senate, there is no particular way about doing it. We're hoping that this year's e-board and senate has drummed up enough good press that students will want to join senate, it is something that's important.
- Blea: I trust you guys, you've been the e-board and I'm supporting this because you guys know whether you'd be able to function with less members. Also, a lot of this can be brought to more committees—this will give more senators to talk to e-board.
- Fiteni: I think that general consensus is most people are afraid of losing chairperson. First, you have one of us going around the room—that person loses voting for this week. I've seen this done effectively. That way, everyone gets experience but they're just banging the gavel. I've seen this done effectively.
- Rudy: I know everybody is concerned about the chairperson, honestly—I'm still the one E-Board member that thinks. Maybe it would make sense to keep around Senate Affairs. Campus affairs has no purpose, Dan is vocal on senate so that may persuade you to do things on senate. What I'm trying to say is that I think you should take into consideration, if you want to cut down the numbers. Consider what positions.
- Forst: one of the things suggested to me is that the student Senate should be able to elect a member from themselves to elect the chairperson. It would be nominated, then voted on by the senate. I don't know how I feel about it at this time, its something you can consider.
- Gardner: yeah just to respond to some of the things I've heard. I understand the apprehension. It's been referred to as the cushiest job. Dan has done a phenomenal job this year—I don't know if you guys have seen really bad chairpeople. Last year, one of my closest friends was chairperson and he was terrible. There is no guarantee that chairperson will do a good job. Also, it's easier to higher people than

to fire people. It's epically true of senate, especially appointed positions. The president, with Senate's approval—so if there is too much workload. Also, experience isn't required to be on e-board. I didn't have e-board experience before Senate. E-Board experience isn't necessary as having leadership experience.

- Harrington: it would go towards Rudy—I would rather have my Vice President sitting here taking notes. I want my Vice President to pay attention. It would be easier on you guys. It might make things more organized. It is an easy job but I don't want Joanna to deal with that stuff—I want those people listening.
- Nico: what you said about having an unbiased opinion—I would unofficially second that, it's vitally important that we have someone who is unbiased towards side to an issue—with more voices you get a more diverse opinion. It's more representative the more voices you have.
- Jones: motion to pass the changes recommended by the E-Board with the stipulation that the chairperson stays.
 - Harrington: seconded
 - Roll Call Vote: Motion Fails
 - Lillie: motion to pass all changes recommended by E-Board in the original proposal.
 - Blea: seconded
 - Roll Call Vote: Motion Passes

-

SMRs

- WRHO SMR for \$96 for a new air conditioner.
 - We are SMRing for a brand new air conditioner because the current one we have died last week. It makes a horrible noise. We need a new one so we can make it through another Oneonta summer without frying our sound board.
 - Finance recommended the full amount
 - Ramos: motion to pass the full amount
 - Jones: seconded
 - Motion Passes
- SOSUBU SMR for 130 for a car wash for buckets and sponges.
 - Well we're SMRing for 130 to buy supplies for a car wash April 27th at Wal Mart. We need to buy stuff to wash cars with like towels and soap. I know I'm graduating but we want money in our agency and fundraise for next semester.
 - How much is the car was going to cost?
 - It's by donation—we thought if we put a limit like 5 or 8, more people would be apprehensive. If you put a donation you can put a limit—like our goal is 500 dollars. Maybe a parent will give more money so we can reach our donation.
 - Finance Committee recommended the full amount.
 - Ramos: motion to pass the full amount
 - Simmonds: seconded
 - Motion Passes
- APO SMRing for 565 dollars for an informal dinner.
 - The dinner we're SMRing for is an end of the year formal. It's every spring. We're SMRing for the full amount. We have 31 members. We're also SMRing for 100 for decorations so we can give a gift—a glass. As well as a senior gift to

our graduation members. We have a fundraising event planned for the 25th. This is an auction. We offer 4 hours of our service to the highest bidder. We also are going to pay 5 or 8 dollars out of pocket.

- Finance Committee recommended 360 dollars—10 dollars per person for the dinner and cut decorations in half.
 - Harrington: motion to approve the finance committee's recommendation
 - Seconded
 - Motion Passes

Old Business:

- Gardner:
-

New Business:

- Kendall: you should have gotten the Senate Finance Bylaws. You have the corrections that Joanna made on them.
 - Simmonds: regarding the OH Fest account—I have a question of clarification. Is it similar to an agency account or senate account? We'll give them money but how would it be used.
 - Kendall: agency account is fundraising money. OH Fest would be a Senate Account.
 - Utterback: the OH Fest account is not a new thing, it was that way this year.
 - Jones: motion to pass the changes, are we allowed pay for trains.
 - Kendall: the reason we mention these things is because these are senate vans, we can't pay for plane tickets for insurance reasons.
 - Kelsey: Seconded
 - Simmonds: under section 5, sub sub section 6—the associate treasure will send out a bursars office and there's a comment "the what?" next to it?
 - Fiteni: to VP Utterback, did we ever find the actual Pardez resolution written anywhere?
 - Kendall: well it's been dismantled. This Pardez that is mentioned is the amount given the clubs in their budgets. This stipulates that Senate Finance can do that amount.
 - Utterback: I have a question for Joanna—having the committee determine Pardez it gives complete authority to me as VP of Finance. Is there some cross? Is that a problem judicially?
 - Rudy: that is a problem potentially—and we can change it. That's what this is about; change. I think it should be under committee.
 - Motion Passes
- Jones: reinstating chairperson position? Is that possible?
 - Forst: this was an issue—in terms of Roberts's rules of order, you can recall a vote.
 - Jones: yeah, I think Dan already decided—it's his own position.
 - Harrington: if your position exists—is it you don't want to do it or you don't want the position there?
 - Riviello: no, I just don't think it's a necessary position. I don't see why two positions who don't have defined things to do can't be combined.

- Harrington: can I ask the Vice President if she thinks she can do it?
 - Rudy: right now I'm waiting for Nick to drop dead. The thing is, the only reason why Vice President has been effective this year is because Nick is such a motivated person and he does something of it. I do plan to do the same. By adding those duties. I guess I could have it be anywhere, to be honest—I don't think his position is necessary though, if someone should run the meetings it should be given to someone already on the e-board.
 - Utterback: to go off that, you see Dan, he's the most active person on E-Board at the meetings. In actual—when he goes to E-board meetings he's just there. The point is he isn't working on a committee. We're all here anyway, we see what's going on.
 - Gardner: the other thing to consider, I know this is true with Steph. When you go into an e-board meeting, this is true of past. You go into E-Board meeting. They're all talking about they're doing. Dan is just sitting there, waiting to give an opinion. Steph is just sitting there, waiting to say something. I know Steph feels really bad—she says “why am I hear”. It kind of destroys the person—seriously—their moral goes down. I'm talking about all the meetings I go to.

-

Announcements:

- Kendall: reminder, club budgets are due this Friday by 5pm. That includes signing up at 5pm.
- Roods: the Inauguration Committee for President-Elect Drugovich will be having its first meeting next week.
- Motion to Adjourn
 - Seconded
 - Meeting Adjourned