Members in attendance: Kevin Schock (President of the Senate), Andrew Struthers, Megan Silvey, Adam Olfson (by proxy, Stephen Dulwick), Sara Varin, Dustin Cheney, Desiree Segura, Ashley Barnes, RJ Freidman (by proxy, Brian Tsai), Nolan Nichols, Brian Moran, and Matt Baumgartner.

I. Call to Order/Roll-Call/Quorum
The meeting began at 7:00pm. President of the Senate Kevin Schock introduced himself to the Senate and announced that he would be presiding over the meeting. Quorum was reached with 11 senators.

II. Swearing in of Senators
The proxies for Senators Olfson and Freidman were sworn in by oath.

III. Singing of the OSU Alma Mater
President Schock: There are no lyrics or music tonight, so we will vote on singing the alma mater.

A vote was taken by roll-call.
Vote: 9-1 fail.

IV. Approval of Minutes from Tuesday, October 6th, 2009
Senator Moran: I move to approve the meeting minutes from October 6th.
Senator Cheney: I second.
President Schock: Any discussion?

There was no discussion and a vote was taken by roll-call.
Vote: 10-0 pass.
V. Standing Committee Reports

President Schock: Are there any Standing Committee reports at this time?
Senator Struthers: Senator Barnes is not here, but the Oversight and Ethics Committee will be meeting Thursday at 12pm in Memorial Union room 110.
Senator Cheney: For the Standing Rules Committee we've made small changes [to the bylaws], but Senator Olfson has the specific changes with him and I don't have them with me. I will bring that information next time.
Senator Moran: Is there a specific layout for activities bylaws?
President Schock: Do you mean a charge? That's the committee's responsibility.
Senator Varin: Are previous committee reports on file?
President Schock: Yes, there are records of those. Would you like them sent to you?
Senator Varin: Yes.
Senator Silvey: This is my fault. I am the Chair of Student Academics and Activities and the guidelines are pretty broad. I've been looking for more guidance. I talked to Senator Barnes, she was on the committee last year and she's agreed to meet this week to give me a better idea, and Senator Struthers said he was going to get a packet from previous years' Chairs. I'm waiting for the packet and going to meet with Senator Barnes, but I'm not sure how to proceed. I am totally open if you'd like to offer input.
President Schock: I am open for input and my door is always open, unless I'm in class. Feel free to send me an email and I'll always find a time to meet with you.

VI. Special Committee Reports

President Schock: Are there any Special Committee reports?
Senator Struthers: That was the Standing Rules Committee and we already did that.

VII. Delegate Reports

Michael Miller: I am the delegate from the Student Athletics Advisory Committee. We're having our annual Fall Carnival on Halloween. It's going to be in Parker Plaza in front of Reser Stadium, 3 hours before the game. All the athletic teams are going to be there with booths for trick or treating, and any social groups that you might be involved with or know about are free to come help out. Please have groups contact me if you're interested, thank you.

VIII. Messages

President Schock: There is a brief message that I wanted to deliver related to last week and want to start a conversation. It was decided that the best course of action was to go into executive session for the SIFC Policies and Procedures. After talking to many students about this decision, I must deliver a sense of disappointment. You were elected to represent students in a manner that's transparent, not by removing the gallery and
others present. I would like to open the floor to senators for comments and justifications and I also open the motion to publicize the minutes from the executive session.  

Senator Struthers: If we give recommendations to SIFC it will be hard for them to understand what we're talking about if they don't know what happened. Releasing the minutes would help them understand our recommendations.  

Senator Segura: I would not have a problem releasing the minutes. There should be knowledge of what we were thinking and what's to come tonight. I didn't feel we had a chance to speak candidly. This was a matter that's been going on, not something that came this year. I wanted to sit down with the senators and think about our roles in student government and our relationship with other student bodies, that was my reason for calling us into executive session. We were not in an environment in which we could speak about concerns and problems and solutions.  

President Schock: Are there any other comments? I open the discussion to the gallery.  

ASOSU President Van Drimmelen: I'm commenting as a member of SIFC [not ASOSU]. I appreciate what you're saying and I want to put it to this body - I speak for SIFC when I say you should always feel comfortable speaking to and about us. We also represent the students. You're not going to hurt my feelings by talking to me, but it makes me feel worse when you feel like you can't talk about me in front of me. That goes for me as ASOSU President, too.  

President Schock: Are there any other questions?  

Mr. Miller: There are some issues that, when you have an open forum, everyone is going to have an opinion on and it's important just to get a guideline to know where the conversation is going. As long as the minutes are published, then you can move forward.  

Senator Struthers: I move to publish the executive session minutes.  

Senator Segura: I second.  

A vote was taken by roll-call.  

Vote: 9-0, 1 abstention; pass.  

IX. Special Orders  

Senator Struthers: I move to amend the agenda to take care of Judicial Council Confirmations before the SIFC business.  

Senator Segura: I second.  

A vote was taken by roll-call.  

Vote: 10-0 pass.
X. New Business

Judicial Council Confirmation

President Schock: President Van Drimmelen has issued another Judicial Council Confirmation. Ryan Ludlow has been appointed and I now ask the Congressional Parliamentarian to read the job description.

Congressional Parliamentarian Lite read the job description.

President Schock: Any opening comments from Mr. Ludlow?
Opening remarks were made by Mr. Ludlow.

President Schock: Any questions?

Senator Struthers: Do you have any past experience with Judicial Council or the judicial process?
Mr. Ludlow answers that he has experience.

Senator Segura: What’s your major and year?
Mr. Ludlow: I am a freshman in electrical and computer engineering.

President Schock: Are there any further comments?

There were no further comments and Mr. Ludlow was asked to leave the room.

Senator Moran: [President] Chris, what made you decide on him? Was he the only candidate or were there many candidates that you decided him over?
President Van Drimmelen: One, he is in the ASOSU Internship program and I am impressed with the quality of his questions. I decided to approach him about the position because, two, there is an expediency issue. We need a fourth councilor to meet quorum, but that is not the primary reason for appointing Ryan. These are 4-year terms and he's a freshman. He has the potential to serve all four years and it would be very beneficial for knowledge. He's a smart guy that could make a good contribution. Other people on the JC range from second year to post-baccalaureate. The traditional model for college is four years, but for some that's just not true. But that's the model that was conceived, and I believe I've found a first year student to serve a full four years and do it well.

Senator Struthers: I know the current Chair, Crystal Boyd, is talking about holding mock trials with students on campus and I think that will be a great contribution.

Senator Segura: I move to confirm Ryan Ludlow as a Judicial Councilor.

Senator Struthers: I second.
Mr. Ludlow was asked to return to the room.

**President Schock:** Welcome back. A motion was made and seconded to confirm you as a Judicial Councilor, now we will take a vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.
Vote: 10-0 pass.

**President Van Drimmelen:** Crystal Boyd, the Judicial Council Chair, will be administering the oath. As they have just reached quorum, she will take on this role and administer oaths as much as possible, a la the Supreme Court.

Judicial Council Chair Boyd administered the oath of confirmation for Mr. Ludlow.

### X. Old Business

**Student/Incidental Fees Committee Policies and Procedures**

**President Schock:** Mr. Pennington is back after last week. The floor is yours.

**Matt Pennington:** I was a bit rash before and will do a better introduction, especially since proxies are here. This is my second year on SIFC. Let me introduce Emily Loo (Member At-Large), Chris Van Drimmelen (ASOSU President), and Matt Vogt (Member At-Large). Kevin [Schock] is serving representing the Senate and Paul [Aljets] is serving representing the House. Also we have Ryan Mann (Member At-Large) who is also a second year. Kandice Kleiber (Member At-Large) is at a soccer game right now, but should be here later. Also, Jorge Michel is serving as the Memorial Union President. For the sake of ease of use, I will refer to the SIFC Policies and Procedures as the SIFC Bylaws, because that is what everyone keeps calling them and it gets confusing. So, SIFC is a committee that was formed in 1972 after incidental fees were started at University of Oregon, as delegated to the President of the University, who delegated to the students. Each university has a different system, sometimes very, very different systems. Because there were [ASOSU] constitutional changes, we re-did our bylaws. We revised last year and two years before. I'm not going to go through line-by-line, you've all seen the bylaws and if you have questions I can answer them, but in keeping with the recommendations, the committee did look at the proposal to add wording to 2P. That is what you recommended last week and we voted to add that to the bylaws.
President Van Drimmelen: We thought it was a requirement [to comply with summons from Congress], but the language makes it sound like it was just a suggestion, so we changed it.

Mr. Pennington: In relation to other recommendations, SIFC decided not to add the proposed changes to 6G in the bylaws. Are there any questions? Not just of me, we’re all here to answer questions.

Senator Struthers: Secretary, could you please give the executive session minutes to the SIFC members to look over?

Executive session minutes were handed out to SIFC members.

Senator Baumgartner: Who do I address?

Mr. Pennington: Any member.

Senator Baumgartner: Might I ask why you didn’t make the recommended change?

President Van Drimmelen: Can you summarize the recommended change?

Senator Baumgartner: I don’t know the exact wording.

Senator Segura: “An approved contingency allocation must be forwarded to the Houses of Congress as a recommendation for review. The ASOSU Senate will then vote to approve or deny contingency allocation recommendations according to established SIFC and ASOSU policies.”

President Van Drimmelen: This is just for contingency fund requests. Normal budgets go through the same process as before, from SIFC to Congress. With contingency funds, the process before was that the Senate Chair would say that it needs to be looked at and it would go to the Senate for approval. If the Senate Chair didn’t think it needed to be looked at, it wouldn’t go to Senate. We changed the process because there is no Senate Chair anymore, so now if a quarter of the Senate or House petitions to SIFC to review, that is, if 3 members of this body want Senate to review, then they petition SIFC to hear that. It’s heard here, then Congress can voice affirmation, or if we really disagree, we’ll send it back for reapproval or not. This system is better than just either Chair being able to refer to Congress. It doesn’t keep with the spirit of collaboration to say that all contingency fund requests must go through Congress. They are just contingency funds, not a regular, reoccurring thing, and the SIFC has been designated by President Ray to hear matters of student fees. We value the opinions of Congress,
but we don’t feel that all contingency funds need to go through Congress. They weren’t before, so I’m not sure why they should be now.

Senator Moran: The main question we had about that letter G was we thought 25% wasn’t really...well, SIFC wants to act as an autonomous body. We wanted to work with you more and the main point we had trouble with was that we can petition for you to bring things to us, but we can make all the recommendations we want and you can review them and ignore them completely.

President Van Drimmelen: I’m glad to hear the 25% wasn’t the issue because we thought members of the body coming forth rather than the Chair was more representative. There are a couple of things I want to address. The long and short of it is, SIFC was designated by President Ray to allocate money, I wish there was a nicer way to say that. That’s just the process. The Chancellor of Higher Education delegated to the Board of Education who delegated to President Ray to delegate to whomever, and that happens to be SIFC. We’re all elected to represent the interests of students, just as all of you, but we’re more specific in dealing with student fees. I highly value the opinion of the Senate and just because makes recommendations that are contrary, to think we would automatically disregard is upsetting. For example, we may not have all the information that the Senate does, and if something is kicked back to SIFC because of new information, there’s no reason why a contingency fund should be approved in light of the new information. This section was drafted as a replacement for the Senate Chair referral process. No one said, “Oh, ‘F’ Senate!” and then came up with this. I worked with Senate last year and it looks a little different, for instance, there aren’t 60 people here, but to think that SIFC doesn’t care what the Senate says...

President Schock: Robert’s Rules allow 10 minutes on a topic.

Senator Struthers: Another concern that came up was - how long will we have to give a petition? You could pass Wednesday and it could be to President Ray and we’d never know. So how long do we have to petition?

Mr. Pennington: I imagine until the money is spent. There are no provisions on length, just when it’s spent. The main purpose is for emergency repairs. To answer how long it takes to be allocated, a couple of weeks.
Senator Struthers: So you’re saying in 2 weeks we could have a petition and you could stop the process?

Mr. Pennington: Yes, that’s why we have two representatives from Congress, to bring that information to SIFC.

Senator Segura: I’m curious to know, where does it say that SIFC is the appointed group designated by the President of the University?

President Schock: Is it in the shared governance documents?

President Van Drimmelen and Senator Segura: No

Mr. Pennington: There is a case where ASOSU sued OSU. It’s referenced in there.

Senator Segura: I want to see that.

President Van Drimmelen: The State Board of Higher Education says something about it...talk to archives? I’ll email Ed Ray about that.

Mr. Pennington: Past versions of the ASOSU Constitution refer to it.

Senator Struthers: In the statutes, SIFC is recognized as an independent budgeting committee.

President Schock: Are there any questions for SIFC? I’m assuming you are all here seeking approval?

President Van Drimmelen: Correct.

Senator Moran: So we added the letter P part...

Mr. Pennington: Yes, that’s the only addition since last time. Oh, and I changed Student Leadership to Student Leadership and Involvement.

Senator Segura: Point of information - If I wanted to revise and make a further recommendation concerning the bylaws, when is an appropriate time to do that?

President Schock: I think now is the appropriate time as this discussion is around approval of the bylaws.

Senator Segura: But are we talking about approving the old or new bylaws?
Senator Struthers: New.

President Schock: You can approve, deny, deny with recommendations, or approve with recommendations.

President Van Drimmelen: There is a provision for approval originating from SIFC or Congress.

Senator Baumgartner: My main concern is what we talked about last time - checks and balances. It seems like all the SIFC is in the Executive branch, but I could be wrong.

President Schock: Point of information - It's not in the Executive branch.

Mr. Pennington: No, it is separate from ASOSU entirely.

Senator Baumgartner: And our representation is the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate...

Mr. Pennington: We were all elected at the same time as you.

President Van Drimmelen: We all answer to you in some way.

Senator Baumgartner: The problem is that it's not associated with ASOSU.

President Van Drimmelen: If I could address that - One, the fact that it's not associated with ASOSU is a good thing. We have to make decisions on the budgets of ASOSU and the Memorial Union and there would be an obvious conflict of interests. The University of Oregon makes it work somehow, who knows how. But we can't make SIFC part of ASOSU if we wanted to, that is a decision that would have to come from President Ray. We can't take it a perfect process tonight. If the legislative process was perfect, everyone would take part in all decisions, and we're trying to make this process as representative as possible.

Senator Segura: I want to address the Senate and SIFC about these bylaws. Understand that this is a long-winded discussion and taking a long time, but this is for a good purpose and reason, so we can be balanced. We all had problems with 6G for a good reason and I still have a problem with how they have it now, but I've been discussing with people who have been here longer who have dealt with budgets and SIFC about the compromises that have been made. I have a motion to bring up, whatever we decide to do with SIFC, today be the day that
we give our final recommendations and squash this so SIFC can progress and so we can get on with our business as well and not be stuck in this rut.

Mr. Pennington: This conversation came up about authority last year as well. Last year we talked about the position of SIFC and I’d like to reaffirm that this has been an ongoing conversation as long as I’ve been here. At least for the last 5 years.

President Schock: Are there any more questions?

Senator Baumgartner: One more concern I have. I know SIFC said money is likely to be spent in 2 weeks time frame, but I just worry...how does that work?

President Van Drimmelen: Just because the money is allocated, it doesn’t mean that it’s made immediately available. It’s not going to be spent the next day or even by the next meeting. Because of institutional process, that would be moving ludicrously fast if it was spent within a week of approval. I just don’t see how it would happen. For example, the last request we heard for a contingency fund was for repairs, which also doesn’t happen overnight because they have to actually sign a contract to get the work done and that can take forever. I would be open to a timeline surrounding this process. I can’t speak for everyone, but if you feel strongly about this, I personally don’t see a problem with that, as long as it’s not inhibitory.

Mr. Pennington: Technically, the way the money is spent is out of Mark McCambridge’s office. He is the Vice President of Finances and Administration. They spend the money out of that account and there are a couple of processes that have to happen before they can spend the money. For example, if at Dixon a pipe breaks and they don’t have the money to fix it, they can come to SIFC to request funds. That’s an extreme example, but emergency repairs is a key use of the funds.

Kandice Kleiber arrives at 8:00pm

Ms. Kleiber: Sorry I’m late. This may have already been addressed, as we discussed at SIFC, I understand concerns about enough time for inputs to make sure that the money is well spent. I’m not insulted, but it takes me aback that other people who have been elected don’t trust our judgment to allocate money. I trust you [Senate] and the House to make decisions and I would expect you to trust me to make decisions for the well-being of students. We [SIFC] aren’t
one thinking brain. We discuss amongst ourselves before deciding. I would hope that people would trust us to allocate money wisely and fairly.

President Van Drimmelen: And to listen.

Senator Varin: I understand about the trust thing, but my main concern is that you're asking us to leave this as a loophole.

Senator Struthers: To go off what Senator Baumgartner said earlier, as long as our representative from Senate is attending SIFC meetings, we could have a petition ready by the next meeting and then it could come for review the next week. I don't see that we'd have a problem getting a petition as long as our representative is attending meetings.

President Van Drimmelen: I don't understand what you mean by "leaving a loophole." You bring up the point that a petition could be made by the next meeting, but it could even be the next day if you hear from President Schock. If you don't like what he reports, email your fellow senators and it could be ready the next day. Once we get a petition, we can't get the money spent until Senate meets and lets us know why they don't like it. I don't see the loophole.

Senator Varin: Potentially, you could shoot something through without us knowing. I know it doesn't work that fast, but if someone wanted that to happen, it could.

President Van Drimmelen: Senate is not the only body with oversight. President Ray also provides oversight of SIFC. If we make recommendations and you approve, they go to the President for rubber-stamping. President Ray trusts the students to make good calls. If something was really fishy, though, there's nothing to say he couldn't step in.

Mr. Pennington: One thing I want to say is, you mentioned that all contingency funds are required to get approval of a major funding approval board. One of the twelve major funding boards has to approve first, so when we see it first, it's already gone through one step.

Senator Segura: I understand the need to be progressive and I understand why the provision was put in there, it makes sense. However, the petition process is pretentious and non-collaborative. There are better solutions. There are better ways or negotiations to have in place to make it more collaborative and fluid between the two organizations rather than petition because if we talk about petitioning, it's a jargon way to prolong the process.

President Van Drimmelen: I'm not sure what you meant by that last sentence. I feel that the time it takes to put together a petition is up to you; that's in your court. And that really sums up how I feel about the recommendation from
Senate, where all contingency funds must go through Senate. I didn't feel that was a compromise, that was an all-or-nothing where Senate tries to gain power they didn't previously have over contingency funds. I'm willing to listen if you have a compromise, but that really summed up how I felt.

Mr. Pennington: I wanted to say this earlier, but all SIFC meetings are open and public and it's well within the purview of any senator or student to come and listen to arguments. There will be a few days of lead time to hear about each meeting. Can I ask a question of you, Senator Segura? How would this increase efficiency by going through Senate?

Senator Segura: I don't have a problem with the whole petition process, I'm thinking of a compromise. The recommendation we made, if I can elaborate, is far to one side. I also felt the SIFC proposals were far to another side, for different reasons. I'm not saying that our recommendation was valid, but it was complete. It was a good starting place to come up with a compromise. We've had time to think now.

Mr. Vogt: On the issue of compromise, originally, over the summer, SIFC deleted this section entirely; that’s too far. I said we need to add it back in so they [Senate] still have that oversight. This was the compromise that we all made that, yes, you should have some kind of oversight, then we all got the alternate version of this back. We already tried to make this not one-sided. We may have not made it perfect, but this is along the right line and closer.

President Van Drimmelen: This wasn’t meant to be inhibitory. We had a discussion about the process being broken by not having a Senate Chair anymore and 25% people from either body of Congress, that’s three people from the Senate, didn’t feel that that was insurmountable; that’s not an enormous number. We’re trying to fix a process that was approved and worked in previous years, but was broken by the new constitution. We’re trying to stick with the spirit of the process and encourage any alternative solutions to come forward. If they are positively received here, that’s a majority of the voting members of SIFC, so tell us, please.

President Schock: I’m not entertaining any motions, but I’ll accept recommendations until the discussion is hashed out.

Senator Baumgartner: This was awhile ago [in the conversation], but Chris made a point about if we petition, they would red flag a contingency fund and stop the process. Not that I don’t trust that, but can we put it in writing? It should be in writing.
Ms. Kleiber: I’m agreeing with Chris, this is a compromise we came up with. Senator Baumgartner, this could be in writing. There are only 12 people in the Senate, so call 2 people and say you are concerned about something. There’s no harm in a petition just to have us review and it doesn’t take must time. That’s a good checks and balances right there. You may have a concern as a student or a senator. I don’t think 25% is hard to come by. This is an easy and fair compromise in the sense of coming to a right decision. I don’t want to pay more student fees, either. No one is out to hurt anybody or to take away money. It’s totally fair to have someone write something up [via email], you don’t have to wait until the next Senate meeting to discuss this, it’s a student concern.

Senator Segura: It’s not a matter of the 25% or the number of people, but the mere fact that our recommendations with not have any teeth with SIFC. The petition process is unnecessarily bureaucratic in congruence with SIFC, we are expected to petition a group that is only part of student fees.

President Van Drimmelen: What are your recommendations? Throw it at us.

Senator Segura: Ok, hold on. Change Section 6G to this – “The SIFC shall forward all contingency requests that are of 10% of the student group’s budget or $10,000, whichever is more, to the ASOSU Houses of Congress. An approved contingency allocation must be forwarded to the Houses of Congress as a recommendation for review. The ASOSU Senate will then vote to approve or deny contingency allocation recommendations according to established SIFC and ASOSU policies.” We can do what you want to that last section, the 10% or the $10,000 part.

Ms. Kleiber: Senator Segura, can you repeat that?

Senator Segura repeats the recommendation.

President Van Drimmelen: Point of clarification - if a contingency request comes to SIFC or is approved by SIFC it goes to Congress, or just if it’s 10% or $10,000, whichever is greater does that contingency request get forwarded to Senate for approval?

Senator Segura: It eliminates the petition process because not all contingency requests come to Congress.

President Van Drimmelen: So just not the small ones.

Senator Segura: No, not all, just the larger ones.

Ms. Kleiber: And then if the Senate denies, it will come back to us.
Senator Segura: There would be mediation. We can have the semantics say that. I just wanted a concrete number to present so we’re not hearing every single request. We maintain SIFC as the decision-making body, but if there are requests of notable amounts, then it will just come to us. That will foster collaboration.

Ms. Kleiber: If the Senate said no, then does it go to mediation or is it just that the contingency fund is denied?

Senator Segura: I’m saying we could put that in there to say that [that SIFC and Congress go to mediation].

Mr. Pennington: Point of information – I’m not sure everyone on Senate knows what mediation is.

President Van Drimmelen: It’s a process outlined in the SIFC Policies and Procedures and ASOSU statutes. If on a budget issues, SIFC and Congress disagree, there’s a mediation committee and it’s composed of SIFC and ASOSU members and they are locked in a room and whoever survives…No really, it’s a compromise committee.

Senator Segura: We can put that in there if you want.

President Van Drimmelen: Do it.

Ms. Kleiber passes on her turn on the Speaker’s list.

Mr. Pennington passes on his turn on the Speaker’s list.

Senator Struthers: Just to clarify on the process, the Senate doesn’t hear things first, the House does. If they don’t approve of the budget or contingency fund, it wouldn’t reach us because it has to go through the House first.

President Schock: The Speaker’s list is vacant. Is there any other discussion?

Senator Segura: I wanted to throw this out to the senators, holler, something that me along with others have thrown out there – this is a good way to compromise. It’s a good way to start and kick off the year on a good foot and set a good precedent. I want to hear what everyone has to say about personal changes or anything. I want to hear it.

Mr. Vogt: One question I have, if the House is the one who deals with fiscal issues, shouldn’t this discussion go to them?

Senator Struthers: Currently in the bylaws, it states the “Senate,” so it’s us that deals with your bylaws. Once we approve, then it will state, “Congress.” The contingency fund requests and the one-time packages would start in the House, and once approved, would come to the Senate. Am I answering your question?
Mr. Vogt: Yes.
President Van Drimmelen: Can we get a 5 minute recess so SIFC can talk about this?
President Schock: Is there a motion?
Senator Struthers: I move to take a 5 minute recess.
Senator Nichols: I second.

Recess commenced at 8:21pm.
Senator Barnes arrived at 8:30pm.
The meeting resumed at 8:31pm.

President Schock: We will proceed to use a Speaker’s list. Please raise your hands and I’ll put you on the list.
Senator Nichols: We were having recess and discussing Senator Segura’s idea about the 10% or $10,000 plan. Is that something that SIFC likes? What do you think?
President Schock: We’re going to keep going through the list, they will answer later.
Senator Moran: One thing I’m not liking is, if we send a petition on Wednesday with 25% and the House meets on the same day, so that’s a week. Then they approve, awesome, so we have to meet another week, so that’s two weeks. And you said before 2 weeks is when the money gets allocated and spent. That’s a horrible amount of time.
Mr. Pennington: What was implied in the compromise was that three of you could get together and if you signed a recommendation, then you don’t have to get together as a body. It just has to be three senators or 7.5 representatives. Does that clarify things?
Senator Moran: What we’re talking about is if we send a petition, then you come to Congress to discuss...I’m just thinking that two weeks is dragging it out and we’re trying to be more efficient. It there’s a mediation committee, then my concern is that it’s going to drag on.
Mr. Pennington: I understand, we don’t want it to be dragged on either. Along with Senator Segura’s proposal, as long as there’s a timeline when these petitions can be turned in (the process that’s in place is not implicitly in place), if there’s some committee put together...you know, I’m not sure how it would work, it’s undetermined.
Senator Moran: The way it’s set up now, it would drag out. We need to put something about a timeline in there.

Mr. Pennington: The way I would look at it, it would have to come to a conclusion – do we want a petition process or a set level? What’s the petition process if we go through with it, 2 components? It’s not perfect yet, but we’ll work through it.

Senator Segura: As far as the recommendation that was presented goes, I like it. We can change the numbers, we can hash that out; that’s fair. It’s the benefits of eliminating the petition process that outweighs the bad. Eliminating the bureaucratic process and feel, it’s more of a feel thing, it’s more pretentious for a group that’s only half of the process to have us petition them. That’s not fostering collaboration. As far as the efficiency matter, Mr. Pennington, you’re right about the two week waiting process. That still sits there regardless of the petition process. The benefit of having this recommendation is there is no extra waiting time if there are larger contingency requests.

Senator Segura: As far as the recommendation that was presented goes, I like it. We can change numbers and we can hash that out; that’s fair. It’s the benefits of eliminating the petition process, of eliminating the bureaucratic process and feel, it’s more of a feel thing. It’s more pretentious for a group that’s only half of the process to have us petition them. That’s not fostering collaboration. As far as the efficiency matter, Matt Pennington, you’re right about the two week waiting period, that still sits there regardless of the petition process. The benefit of having the recommendation is there is no extra waiting time if there are larger contingency requests, instead of us having to petition and then waiting. The greater thing is we’re only dealing with larger scale funds. Those that are large amounts of student fees we should be involved in. We’ll be ensured we’re involved and it’s not micromanaged. In the end, this fosters a better sense of collaboration, bypassing the unnecessary bureaucratic processes. It’s not becoming of people who are trying to help students. This recommendations, or something like it (should we change it?), is the better way to go.

Senator Struthers: I would like to express my affirmative on the recommendations that Senator Segura has brought forward. We can hash out the numbers later. The best way to approach this is, if the representative in the House, Paul Aljets, was at the SIFC meeting, he could put it on the agenda for Special Orders for that night, so that could happen. I’m not saying that’s how it’s going to work, but
that shortens the length of time. I wanted to hear from the SIFC how they feel about this recommendation.

President Schock: I will allow responses from SIFC members.

Ms. Kleiber: How much is in the contingency account?

Mr. Pennington: $1.7 million, approaching $2 million by the end of the year, but not all of it is available for use.

Ms. Kleiber: Does that include each group’s contingency fund?

Mr. Pennington: Point of clarification - each organization has fund balances. ASOSU has a $320,000 balance, Rec. Sports has $0 because they spend it all. Each group that has funds they are in charge of maintaining. SIFC has a contingency fund for $3 million that we can use for that and the goal is to have a 2 month working supply. The total budget is $20 million, whatever that works out to.

Ms. Kleiber: I know everyone is concerned with efficiency. It's important that if people have concerns about a budget or contingency fund, it's important to take the opportunity to think about it. So if someone has a concern, whether we're doing the petition or automatic forwarding, it's not a problem to have something take a week or two weeks. They should take the time to think about it. Second, we all have to realize that we're all trying to work together. Everyone has been elected because students believe we're going to make decision to reflect them. It's in our job assignment, what we were elected to do; what you're supposed to do is in your job assignment. This 10% or $10,000 plan, I find that to be micromanaging. We're been elected to do this, and you've been elected to do that. I agree there should be oversight, but petitioning or emailing is a good method of oversight. SIFC doesn't need to be managed, we've been elected.

Ms. Loo: Point of clarification - where did the 10% come from? Because it looks like micromanaging.

President Van Drimmelen: There are a few things I want to address. I don't know why efficiency became part of the conversation. Yes, we're about being efficient, but if something is a big deal to the Senate, the process should take as long as it takes. It's been said that the process drags out, but the ball is in the Senate court as to how long it takes. I am unclear as to the other issues, of it feeling bureaucratic, but I want it to go on the record that if the use of the word “petition” bothers you, we'll find something else to call it. It's used in other places in governing documents, it's just an indication of support. If three people feel it's an issue that needs to be looked at by the Senate, this shouldn't be a roadblock.
or a hurdle. In lieu of the Chair of a body [of Congress], we thought three heads would be better than one. I want to impress upon you that we're trying to show goodwill, not trying to throw stumbling blocks in front of you.

President Schock: Point of information - this room reservation goes until 9pm, at which point we will be kicked out. There are two people left on the Speaker's list, so we'll have to table this until next week or resolve it now.

Senator Moran: I respect the members of the SIFC, they were elected as much as we were. If we care enough about this situation, it's our duty to go to SIFC meetings, make petitions, and go from there. My only concern is having that petition finally come to us. As far as efficiency, we can keep the ball rolling and keep it as efficient as possible, but I want security that if I go to SIFC with two people from here and we petition, I want to look at it before it's spent. I do not need 10% or $10,000, I think you're doing a well enough job. There's, what, eleven? Seven to nine of you? I'm pretty sure you're not off to rule the world. If I care enough, I'm going to go petition and say, "Hey! I want to look at this!" That's that. I just need the assurance that it's going to come to us.

Mr. Pennington: That's the process. We all have open meetings. Not to point out President Schock, but that's in his job description, to attend the meetings, and he should be updating his body as much as he can.

Senator Segura: Why is SIFC still pushing for a petition, or a notion of a petition? I don't understand that point and it's getting focused on. The 10% comes from the size of budgeting boards. Most individual budgeting boards don't have large budgets...

Mr. Pennington: Yes, they do.

Senator Segura: Every single one?

Mr. Pennington: Even Our Little Village does.

Senator Segura: I meant contingency requests.

Mr. Pennington: Point of information - we did one last year for $1,100 for Jerred Taylor's salary and denied $1,100 for roof repairs for SSI.

Senator Segura: Yes, and most organizations don't get more than that, so we wouldn't even see most of the requests, which would leave most up to SIFC. That's the point, leaving you to your job description and us to ours. We don't want you to feel we need to have a say, but I feel that the recommendation without petitioning is a good compromise, that we only see budgets that will significantly impact student fees. If they are larger in scale to student fees as a whole, we need to see those.
Ms. Kleiber: I understand keeping the oversight. I like what you were saying about the 25% petitioning, Senator Moran. With contingency funds, any decision we make about that is money that's already there, it doesn't directly effect the amount students are paying. Whatever Senator Moran was saying about all bodies of House having a chance to look at it...I would have no problem writing that if SIFC receives an email from three members of Senate to put a hold on the request. I wouldn't have a problem with making sure the Senate and House has a chance to review. We aren't going to allow money to go out before everyone has looked at it. I don't think it should be open to the Senate to decide, you're only here for two years. This falls under the job description of SIFC, not the Senate, but the option is still available to petition.

Senator Segura: Point of clarification - contingency funds are student fees. I'm not concerned about them going up, but that's money we put in years ago. That's not the issue.

Senator Struthers: We keep mentioning the Senate, but we need to talk about Congress.

Mr. Pennington: I agree with Senator Moran regarding what we were talking about earlier. Process details can be worked out later if we agree. We've been talking about the size of contingency fund requests and open collaboration, but the petition process allows anyone to come and talk about any amount. Most contingency funds are very small, but the petition process increases collaboration. You're automatically cutting yourself out with the 10% plan.

Senator Cheney: Because of time, can I make a motion? I move to table approving SIFC till next week.

Senator Nichols: I second.

Senator Struthers: I don't feel we should table this. Can we move this to Snell? By pushing this off a week, this puts off business that they need to get done. Either we get this done tonight or next week if we have to.

Senator Baumgartner: Point of information - can anyone second?

Mr. Vogt: We do have other business to approve. We are willing to accept this and get it done, we need to operate now.

President Schock: I'm willing to stay in here until we are kicked out.

Senator Barnes: I can go check on the reservation.

Senator Barnes left to check on the room reservation.
Senator Segura: I am uncomfortable with tabling for the sake of getting things done. It's the semantics I'm uncomfortable with. I will not approve anything that doesn't have something we have all approved in their bylaws.

Senator Moran: I would like to move to approve with...?

President Schock: A conditional approval.

Senator Moran: Can I ask SIFC if they would want to add something into it? About how if we petition, it can't be allocated until we discuss?

President Schock: It would get confirmed with SIFC tonight, you may as well make that conditional.

Senator Nichols: Can I revoke my second?

President Schock: It is a motion in the affirmative, the motion is for tabling.

Senator Segura: Point of information - the original maker of the motion has to rescind.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Vote: 1-6, 3 abstentions; pass.

Senator Moran: Mr. Pennington or SIFC, would you guys be willing to but that into the Policies and Procedures?

Mr. Pennington: We don't have quorum, but I think we can work out the language now. I can't guarantee it, but I think it would pass. The language you were talking about was implied on our end, but writing it down is a smart idea. We can do electronic voting.

Senator Moran: Is that agreeable? I like this, I just want it reaffirmed.

Ms. Kleiber: That is a good idea, to work out the language.

President Schock: You can continue discussion, the floor is open.

Senator Schock: I don't know how to motion that.

Senator Struthers: Senator Barnes, what did the front desk say?

Senator Barnes: We have the room until 10:00

President Schock: Party on, Wayne. Is there any further discussion?

Senator Baumgartner: I motion...

President Schock: "MOVE!" Sorry, pet peeve.

Senator Baumgartner: I move to approve the SIFC Policies and Procedures...can we make the recommendation of putting that Senate will see things if we petition before the money is spent?
President Schock: A motion has been made to approve the SIFC Policies and Procedures with the condition that SIFC will hear any petition that ASOSU Congress presents.

Ms. Kleiber: This guy moves to approve the SIFC Policies and Procedures on the condition that section G adds that if a petition is filed with SIFC, a hold will be placed on the contingency amount.

President Schock: I have to call the motion. Senator Baum has motioned to approve the SIFC Policies and Procedures with the condition that section 6G adds that if a petition is filed with SIFC regarding a contingency fund, a hold will be placed and SIFC must meet with Congress before the release of the contingency fund amount.

Senator Moran: I second.

Senator Struthers: Point of clarification - what are we saying by "conditional?" Does this come back for discussion later?

President Schock: We are approving the bylaws on the assumption that they will approve. If they reject it, then it comes back to us, then goes back to SIFC. They can also say, "F' IT" and send it to Ed Ray or they can come back to us.

Senator Silvey: Point of clarification - they put a hold on the funds if we make a petition. I'm confused, our petition could or couldn't have a say?

Ms. Kleiber: It would go through Congress. Say, "I'm concerned about," whatever, and want Congress to look at this, and then House would look at it, and it would come to Senate, and the House might make recommendations. The idea is if we had approved contingency funds and someone had a concern, we'd put a hold on it and everyone could make a recommendation.

Senator Silvey: So it's something that's already been looked at and approved?

Ms. Kleiber: Yes, either approved or denied.

Mr. Pennington: The way I see it, it doesn't have to get into the nitty gritty of the process side, it's up to Congress to decide the petition process. You could have three weeks to get back to us some way, whether it's a letter a meeting, or a joint meeting. From our bylaws side, we leave it general. It's you guys coming back to us and working out that process.

Senator Moran: This is going to get put on hold, so if we have a strong opinion, you come to us and you'll hear our point of view. It's not whether or not they will come to us and do their own thing. We're having them come to us for consideration and input and that's going to have an effect.

Mr. Pennington: Can we make an amendment to the motion?
President Schock: No, you can’t make amendments.

Mr. Pennington: I was thinking of adding language about contingency request petitions to SIFC, if we see that as a bottleneck.

Senator Struthers and Ms. Kleiber pass on their turns on the speakers list.

President Schock: The speakers list is closed.

Senator Segura: No, you had me on the list. Is SIFC under the ASOSU constitution?

President Schock: No.

Mr. Pennington: Just the parts that overlap with the budgeting process. There is another overlap, with the Ways and Means Committee from the House of Representatives, which goes through SIFC to get budgets through.

Senator Segura: I’m confused because the constitution says the House is responsible for SIFC business handled through Congress.

Mr. Pennington: Point of clarification - that’s referring to joint sessions, so everyone would be in the same room, but yes, the House would vote first.

Senator Segura: Talking about matters of recommendations, any business we do from SIFC goes through the House, including rejecting SIFC recommendations and budget requests. My question is - I understand the petitioning idea and I don’t disagree with having numbers attached. My concern is...yes, we do have open meetings and SIFC has open meetings. That is a good place to offer contempt as an outside person or senator. I think that can be a space where issues of what we have against budgets or what SIFC is presenting or discrepancies. That would be a place to address concerns, that makes sense to me. But I’m still hung up on the petition piece and maintain that it’s unnecessary. I want to go over semantics.

President Schock: There is a motion on the floor, we have to approve.

Senator Segura: Ok, I wouldn’t agree with this motion.

President Schock: So you’re voting against.

Senator Segura: I can present.

President Schock: Is there any further discussion?

There was no further discussion and a vote was taken by roll-call.

Vote: 5-5, 1 abstention.
President Schock: For.

Vote: 6-5, 1 abstention; pass.

Mr. Pennington: We're going to vote tomorrow about the language. Megan Reeves and Ed Ray will let you know if there are changes before it's final.

XI. President's Announcements

State of the Students Address
President Schock: The State of the Students Address is tomorrow night. Are all aware of the time?
Senator Segura: What time is it?
President Schock: 7pm, this room, professional attire (take that as you will). Email me or Senator Struthers if you can't be there.

Office Hours
President Schock: Just a reminder - you need to be doing one office hour a week.
Senator Struthers: I have received hours from half. Please start putting in office hours and keep in mind that we should be doing those from now on.

XII. Senator Comments

Senator Barnes: I want to thank SIFC and the senators for all the time put into this.
Senator Cheney: As Mr. Pennington brought up, we've been putting heads since 1972. It would be beneficial to everybody if a document was found from the President for the powers he’s giving SIFC.
Mr. Pennington: The best I have now is the court case. I'll see if I can find something better.
President Schock: Find that in the next 20 hours and I'll present that to the Senate.
Senator Struthers: I would also like to say thank you. It's been a long process since the summer. Also, legislation - get some into the Senate. If there's a program with money attached, we can still start here and then send it to the House and get the ball rolling.

XIII. Gallery Comments

Mr. Pennington: I want to thank everyone for the comments on the process. I wish the health care debate could be so vigorous. I want to mention, for the next two SIFC meetings we're discussing budget guidelines, what we want them to present in the budget cycle. So if there are any pressing questions you want to know, like if you want to
know how many football tickets are picked up and how many go to Dixon, anything like that, come to me.

President Schock: State of the Students Address will be an hour and a half tops. There will even be clapping when Chris [Van Drimmelen] enters. It will be very formal; there will be a Sergeant in Arms even. Any other comments?

There were no more comments from the gallery.

XIV. Adjournment

President Schock: At this time, I would like to entertain a motion to adjourn.

Senator Struthers: I move to adjourn.

Senator Cheney: I second.

The meeting adjourned at 9:28pm.