Minutes for Wednesday,
November 4, 2009

I. Call to Order/ Pledge of Allegiance
   a. President Hanson called the meeting to order at 7:05pm

II. Roll Call
   a. Excused Absent- Freya Carmen Moran, Emily Radson, Mindy Saxton

III. Approval of Agenda
   a. So Approved

IV. Approval of Minutes
   a. So Approved

V. Recognition of Visitors

VI. Officer Reports (usgeboard-l@mtu.edu)
   a. President (emhanson@mtu.edu)
   b. Vice President (alvanslo@mtu.edu)
      i. Retreat Discussion
         1. Going to Camp Manitou in Wisconsin- please see the surveys to pick a date.
         2. If need to be back by Sunday, we will have Tech vans to take a group back Sat. night instead.
   c. Treasurer (amsheal@mtu.edu)
      i. See the Financial Standings Report.
   d. Secretary (smandert@mtu.edu)
      i. No Report

VII. Advisor Report (jaredmj@mtu.edu) (lpcook@mtu.edu)

VIII. Old Business
   a. SAF Fee Change
      i. A. Van Slooten moves to accept the proposed Student Activity Fee Change Document
      ii. Kevin Endsley- SEB
         1. SEB does need to provide food to the entertainment that happens at the Rosza Center. SBG’s have long standing traditions that need to be carried over every year. Student Activities would be around longer and withstand the turnover every year. (There is a reason for the things that they do and might be complicated too).
         2. As a student- concerned about student representation on this issue.
            a. Student Affairs approving a budget request- concerned with students having a strong voice regarding their budget.
               i. This will include a group of faculty and a few students as well.
      iii. The amount that Student Activities receives is subject to change to due enrollment figures.
      iv. Motion to accept the first page (BOC policy). MOTION PASSES. One Abstention.
      v. GSG Liaison, Collin- Concerned about the ambiguity of the appeal process. Concerned with the student representation on this committee. (I GSG, I USG and the rest are staff)
      vi. Fuller makes a friendly amendment to this document to word as appointed by USG and GSG. (This can be added to the USG by-laws upon their revision)
      vii. Cottrill suggests 2 USG and 2 GSG representatives. (Faculty member would likely be someone from the Business Department as they work with budgets on a regular basis).
viii. Randy Harrison (GSG President) GSG is involved with this process because they expressed concern about this previously. USG will “lose power”
   1. There is a whole budget process, not appropriate at this time.
   2. Graduate Students also pay a SAF as well. How much is connected to the Grad Student Population?
      a. USG does not have control over the fee amounts (this is a Board of Control issue), do however have control over how the money is authorized.

ix. Baldwin- does USG need to approve these with OSA?
   1. Beth Wagner with OSA- Working together on this document, however will bring it back to USG if there are some discrepancies.
   2. In the Spring of every year, USG has to still vote on the final amount of money that OSA will receive to allocate.

x. Previous mention of Appointment by president has been removed- this will be covered in each group’s respective by-laws.

xi. Baldwin- adding the Assistant VP of Student life to both appeals and budget process. These people should also be the same?

xii. Beth Wagner- Appeal process- totally separate from the originally group, different group so they are impartial, can look at said items with “fresh eyes”.
   1. Should this be mentioned in the document that these should be different groups of people?
   2. Appeals process committee would meet ONLY ONCE.

xiii. Fuller- This appeals will not be brought to the USG body.
   1. Are appeals going to be communicated to the USG body? There will be reports from that group., there will NOT be however a new vote.

xiv. Moorehead- Remove Student Org Secretary from Appeals process.

xv. Remove Director of Student Activities (this is the USG advisor)

xvi. Fuller- The assistant VP of Student life is a voting member.

xvii. Appeals Group- Should there just be 1 GSG and USG member instead? This would make the group smaller.
   1. GSG Liaison- The Presidents of GSG and USG should be the committee members on the appeals process. (This brings it to the highest person on each respective body).
   2. Wainoe- Should be a smaller group, but should still have a student majority.
   3. About half of the groups typically appeal (of SBGs)

xviii. Fuller- it would be unethical to have someone who is a president of that SBGs on either committee.

xix. Fuller- friendly amendment for the Appeals committee to include: Assistant VP student life, USG rep and GSG rep.
   1. Baldwin- removed a faculty member who might also have some input.
   2. Fuller- by the time get to appeals process, there is time to have discussed as well.
   3. Concern is that loose the expertise from the original hearing as groups have time to revise their budget.

xx. Starnes- change to read: within 10 days from business days. (They have time to meet with their group and discuss as needed).

xxi. Waineo- would like to have an advisory member (no voting rights) to advise the committee.

xxii. Moorehead calls to question. (USG has not approved previous revisions).


xxiv. MUB Board- amount of split (currently 50%), would SBGs have discussion on how to split this?
1. This would just depend on enrollment, first time USG body would speak about this and vote on it.
2. Separating USG from allocating its own budget? What will end up happening is a large amount of people who work with USG on a regular basis. (Carol works with USG regularly, Jared is USG Advisor)
   a. Moorehead- this is much better than what USG would be doing now.
   b. USG Advisor is supposed to be unbiased while on this committee.
   c. Suggested to add an at-large student by MUB Board
      i. How would this be picked?
         1. Open Nomination process, could even be run out of the OSA. They would make the decision
         2. Then they are involved too…
         3. MUB Board- Just so that ppl affected by USG are not a large chunk of the board.
         4. Nicole White- Suggested IRHC member, they are not affected by this.
         5. Cogan- Would this remove hearing committee to 1 USG rep, 1 GSG rep and a student at large.
         6. Beth Wagner- want someone who is unbiased. There should be some nomination/ election process.
         7. Valencia- Election is not the best way to go, have had problems in the past, and then the responsibility goes to USG to fill the position.
         8. Waineo- Only need to have an at-large member to vote on USG budget. They should abstain from this vote, and would eliminate the need for the at-large member.
            a. L. Van Slooten- USG reps are elected to their respective positions by the student body. Not trying to be in more favor of itself.
         9. Dionne- At large member would not know what is going on prior to the USG discussion on budgets.
         10. Mattson- at-large member should be someone who is familiar with the SAF.
         11. Thornton- what if it was a small scholarship run through OSA to have this position?
            a. Randy Harrison(GSG) want someone who is understanding of what is going on. Might be over thinking this.
            b. Mendenhall- this could fall under something that shouldn’t be funded.
         12. Cogan- Can it just be made mandatory that USG reps abstain about the USG budget?
            d. Starnes suggests #5 to SAF can fund: Lodging for members for conferences/symposiums or for lodging for members hosting campus events.
            e. USG votes on SAF and GSG does not
f. Fuller- Change to SAF can fund- #1 Alcohol/ food/ lodging can be funded except where contracts should apply

g. Mendenhall- concerned about the food and giveaways- this is okay as long as it is publicized.
   i. USG E-board gets a stipend pending good performance..
   ii. Is this open to interpretation??

h. Honorariums for speakers are funded. Plaques? Considered under awards.

i. Mendenhall- does this remove stipends?
   i. Moorehead- other universities pay reps and eboard from their equivalent of the SAF. (from the Student Association of Michigan)
   ii. Hanson- not aware if other groups do stipends as well.

j. Thompson- does GSG have a budget? They allocate their own funds.

k. GSG President- Should be able to fund awards/plagues. It is pretty standard practice when a speaker comes.
   i. Beth Wagner- SAF purpose is to fund items open to all student body. Budget is has line item and can see these requests.
   ii. Fuller- this leaves room for the group to purchase items for above and beyond through fundraising.

l. Anderton calls to question.
   i. Roll Call Vote pertaining to document with said changes. MOTION PASSES unanimously.

3. RSO document

   i. Drake- Must be an RSO to receive funds from the Parent’s Fund
   ii. Must be an RSO to Reserve Space.

b. Jiang- wondering why active and 10 members?
   i. To become an RSO, must have at least 10 members- usually paying dues. (active- always going to meetings)
      1. Active- enrolled- according to Beth Wagner.

   c. Valencia- Advisor must be approved by OSA, correct?
   d. Drake- moves to accept this document.

   e. Baldwin- not RSO must not be able to recruit new members?
      i. Beth Wagner- Applies to all groups but especially to Fraternities, Sororities.
      ii. OSA does not recognize any new members that might be added.

f. Mendenhall- what if groups do not check their mailbox? How enforced?
   i. Somehow enforced through Student Org Secretary?

g. Starnes- not able to recruit on Tech’s campus.
   i. GSG President- If not RSO and only have 6 members, how supposed to become an RSO? All previous benefits are gone, double jeopardy.
   ii. Starnes- allowable information sessions?

h. Mattson- Friendly amendment- not RSO unless the cause is because below 10 members.
i. Drake- why does this statement need to be here at all?  
   Beth Wagner- this could be struck.

i. Mendenhall- Can it be see to it that they are able to reserve a 
   room?
   i. Fuller- These standards are in place to “weed” out weak 
      orgs.

j. Drake- makes friendly amendment to remove statement about 
   recruitment.
   i. Starnes- If an org cannot take the time to register their 
      org, they should not receive those benefits.

k. Talisha Sutton with SIS- 10 members and not being able to 
   recruit would hinder small groups.
   i. Fuller- could we change it to 5 members.
   ii. Hanson- this document vote can be tabled.

I. Mendenhall moves to table this Document vote TABLED to 
   next week. Motion passes.

IX. New Business
   a. WAM (usgwam-l@mtu.edu)
      i. Reimbursements
         1. Audio Engineering Society
            a. $980.97 for Equipment. Motion Passes.
         2. Men’s Soccer Club
         3. $345.30 for hotel costs. Motion Passes.
      ii. Advance Reimbursements
         1. HARC
            a. Advanced Reimbursement for $509.97 for 3 transceivers. 
               Motion Passes.
         2. Canterbury House
            a. Advanced Reimbursement for $1000 for Audio Books from 
               Amazon.
      iii. Opportunities Fund- to be voted on next week
         1. Opportunity Fund for $505 for Safety Equipment and tournament 
            fees
      iv. Daily Bull Reimbursement
         1. $93.34 from their 09-10 allocation for printer repairs.
         2. The group needs to adjust accordingly. MOTION PASSES.

X. Committee Reports
   i. Personnel (usgpersonnel-l@mtu.edu)
      1. Evals due ASAP!
   ii. Service (usgservice-l@mtu.edu)
      1. No Report
   iii. Judiciary (usgjudicial-l@mtu.edu)
      1. Both dates suggested in email about Judiciary social will happen. Please 
         see the email from Marc Starnes soon.
   iv. Elections (usgelect-l@mtu.edu)
      1. Trying to figure out if CollegiateLink doesn’t arrive in time for spring 
         elections.
   v. Public Relations (usgpr-l@mtu.edu)
      1. Newsletter items to usgpr-l@mtu.edu
   vi. Student Issues (usgissues-l@mtu.edu)
      1. Meeting with Parking Task Force next Wednesday.
vii. External Affairs (usgea-l@mtu.edu)
   1. No Report.

viii. Civil Rights Committee
   1. Still actively looking for other groups to work with.

XI. USG Liaisons
    a. Liaison Coordinator (amsheral@mtu.edu)
    b. Liaisons
       i. GSG
          1. No Report
       ii. Provost Search Committee
          1. Interviews this coming weekend and a few weekends. Will keep USG posted when the campus forums will be held.
       iii. Staff Council
          1. Funding has been declining, however MTU planned well for it and is doing well.
          2. MTU is trying to reach a goal of 10% from state funding and eventually 0%.
             a. Where other income is from- Tuition increases and/or Research funds.

XII. OPEN FLOOR
    a. Talisha Sutton looking to become an associate member. Doesn’t have time to become a full voting USG member at this time. So recommended by President Hanson.
       i. Motion Passes. 2 abstentions.
    b. Recommendation of First Year Representative- Kate Little
       i. So appointed. Congratulations Kate!

XIII. Announcements

XIV. "Remarks for the Good"

XV. Adjournment
    a. President Hanson adjourned the meeting at 9:17pm