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STUDENT GOVERNMENT
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT SENATE

SPRING 2018 REGULAR SESSION
APRIL 11, 2018
ELEVENTH LEGISLATIVE WEEK

CALL TO ORDER
MOMENT OF SILENCE
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
PUBLIC INPUT

NEW BUSINESS

SGFB No. 10 By Sen. Shrestha – A Finance Bill to Allocate a Maximum of Six Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($6,000.00) from the Student Government Initiatives Account to Fund Exterior and Interior Building Signs That Demarcate Life Sciences Building (LSB) from Life Sciences Annex (LSA)

SGFB No. 11 By Sen. Burris – A Finance Bill to Allocate a Maximum of $10,000.00 to Fund the Clean Hands Initiative to Purchase Stands for Hand Sanitizer Stations, and Assist Facility Services in Replenishing Stations for a Period of Up to 5 Years

SGR No. 21 By Sen. Warren – A Resolution to Urge and Request the LSU Student Health Center (SHC) to Change the Name of the LSU Women’s Clinic to the LSU Gynecology Clinic

**Motion by Sen. Riley to Insert SGB No. 8 A Bill to Amend the Student Government College Council Constitution Regarding the Ogden Honors College Council
> Seconded

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS W/ Sen. Stirling – Heard SGR No. 19, Passed 7-0-1. Shrestha spoke on her legislation coming next week. Great semester!

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS W/ Sen. Riley – Heard 2 finance bills, both passed 10-0-1. Minutes can be found on the OneDrive. No major amendments, only technical. On slide is updated account balances. BA meeting for next week with finance bills will probably be moved to Monday.

CAMPUS AFFAIRS AND SUSTAINABILITY W/ Sen. Green – Heard 1 piece of legislation, passed unanimously. Resolution with parking and transportation, altering hours and improving communication. Only technical amendments made. Probably no meeting next week. REMEMBER – Spring greening coming up on the 19th and it is an SO Point. Sign up with group and your group gets money.

STUDENT AUXILIARIES AND SERVICES W/ Sen. El-Rachidi – Had 4 pieces of legislation, all passed unanimously. Highly suggest consulting the minutes, there was a lot of discussion.

STUDENT LIFE, DIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH W/ Sen. Perkins – SLDO didn’t meet this week, had to cancel. SO points officially due next week, but deadline can be extended, as long as you show proof of registration and of attendance. Last night fundraiser for the Period Project went very well, raise $400, and project is still in the works!

RULES W/ SPT Hunt – Heard 2 bills, SGBs 6 and 7, both passed 6-0-1. SGB 6 had some minor amendments, but not major changes
**STUDENT FEE VALUE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE** w/ Sen. Green – met last Thurs., have 2 pieces of legislation tonight. SGRs dealing with Performing Arts Fee and Student Media Associated Fees. Both passed 9-0-1. Minor amendments made; we’ll meet again tomorrow to hear final piece of semester regarding Campus Life.

**Executive Officer Reports**

**Judicial Officer Reports**

**Unfinished Business**

**SGR No. 17** By Sen. Allmon – A Concurrent Resolution to Approve Adam Norris to a Two Year Term as an Associate Justice for the University Court

- Opening: Adam came through last night, can’t be here tonight. Lived off-campus for 2 years, now trying to get more involved on-campus. He wants to go to law school and thought jbranch would be good experience. Not much debate, except that he seemed like a good fit for the position. Passed unanimously.
- No questions; no debate
- Closing: urge favorable passage

**SGR No. 17 passes by Unanimous Consent**

**PPP** – Sen. Au. Grashoff present; another Sen. present

**Motion by Warren to suspend rules and immediately hear SGR No. 18**

**SGR No. 18** By Sen. Warren – A Resolution to Urge and Request the LSU Athletic Department to Distribute the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) Survey to Student Athletes.

- Opening: Warren yield to Leah (President of SAAC): purpose is to be liaison between student athletes; do lots of outreach, volunteering. Want to administer survey to our fellow student athletes, about their experiences. But we are being the right to send it out by administration.
- Questions:
  - Q-Green: Reason denied?
    - A-Warren: My understanding is Admin. afraid of outside sources getting the info. Because if athletes have adverse experiences, they wouldn’t want that known
  - Q-Daniel: That official, or thought?
    - A-Warren: It was expressed by Admin
    - A-Guest: We’re only allowed to send their official survey, can’t do our own. So then we can’t truly grasp +/- of student athlete life, so can’t do much to help improve
    - A-Warren: Also, seniors fill it out on their way out of undergrad, not during their time
  - Q-Stirling: What power does athletics have to prevent you from sending survey?
    - A: Many student athletes on scholarship; academic, athletic; afraid of having these taken away. Also, spoke to other schools, they’re struggling in same way, want to be the school for change
  - Q-Cheatwood: Any rules preventing athletes from taking a survey?
    - A-Warren: Not directly
  - Q-Cheatwood: Could an org like SG issue survey to athletes on behalf of SAAC?
    - A-Warren: Yes, but may not reach the necessary people
  - Q-Oliver: You’d like for admin to help administer survey, then allow you access to results?
    - A: Yes

**Debate:**

- Unbiased: passed unanimously, many similar questions as on floor. Good debate regarding student athletes. Biased: am fully in favor. SA’s are students. They give
BACK TO OUR SCHOOL, AND RELATIONSHIP DOESN’T SEEM LIKE MUTUAL EXPERIENCE RIGHT NOW. FEEDBACK SHOULD BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY
   ○ ALLMON: DON’T ALWAYS THINK OF SA’S AS STUDENTS LIKE US, THEY DEP. ARE. ABILITY TO
     VOICE THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS IS SO IMPORTANT AS NON-ATHLETE STUDENTS CAN, I THINK
     ALLOWING STUDENT ATHLETES HAVING THIS VOICE IS INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT AS WELL
   ○ LANDRY: COLLEGE ATHLETICS—TROUBLE IN PARADISE. OTHER SCHOOLS HAD ISSUES WITH
     MONEY AND OTHER THINGS. ADMIN WORRIED ABOUT BASHLASH, BUT NOT THINKING HOW
     HELPFUL THIS COULD BE FROM PREVENTING SOMETHING BIG FROM HAPPENING LATER. IMAGINE
     IF THIS WERE TO HAPPEN IN PROS; THEY’D FORM UNIONS, GO ON STRIKE. I’M NOT SAYING WE DO
     THAT (YET) BUT LET’S GET DATA WE NEED AND LET’S DO WHAT WE CAN FOR STUDENTS. I URGE
     FAVORABLE PASSAGE
   ➢ CLOSING: WE AND PREV. SPEAKERS HAVE SAID, OUR DUTY TO REP SA’S, PROMOTE DISTRIBUTION OF THIS
     SURVEY TO HEAR THEIR VOICES. URGE FAVORABLE PASSAGE.

**AU. GRASHOFF MOVES TO PASS BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT; SECONDED; NO OBJECTIONS**
   ➢ SGR NO. 18 PASSES WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT

**PPP Sen. Porche Present**

SGFB No. 8 BY Sen. Stirling & Oliver - A Finance Bill to Allocate a Maximum of Two Hundred Fifty-Nine Dollars and Eighty Cents ($259.80) from the Student Government Initiltives Account to Fund Rentable Chargers for the LSU Student Union Information Desk
   ➢ OPENING: INFO DESK HAS/HAD CHARGERS, NO LONGER WORK, NOT UPDATED, NO LONGER HAVE WHAT
     THEY NEED. CAME TO MY ATTENTION, THOUGHT WE SHOULD PROVIDE MORE
   ➢ QUESTIONS:
   ○ Q-ELLIS: WHAT HAPPENED TO CHARGING PEOPLE FEE FOR REPLACING THEM?
     ▪ A-Oliver: USED TO WORK THERE, THEY DIDN’T HAVE GREAT SYSTEM. NOW THEY HAVE
       BETTER SYSTEM W/TIGER CARDS. MISTAKES MAY HAVE HAPPENED WITH USER ERROR
       OR GETTING OLD. ONES WE GOT PREVIOUSLY WERE WORTH MORE THAN A TIGER CARD,
       SO MAY HAVE BEEN STOLEN. NOW CHARGERS OFF-BRAND, WORTH LESS MONEY, SHOULD
       BE LESS OF ISSUE
   ➢ DEBATE:
   ○ RILEY: PASSED COMMITTEE 10-0-1. MOST QUESTIONS WERE ABOUT TYPE OF CHARGERS;
     ANDROID/APPLE, OFF-BRAND SHOULD HELP PREVENT THEFT. IN FALL 2015, WE FUNDED
     CHARGERS, MANY HAVE BEEN LOST/STOLEN/BROKEN. USUAL WEAR AND TEAR
   ○ AU. GRASHOFF: MARGOT CARROL HAD ASKED ME ABOUT THESE A WHILE AGO, THEN STOPPED
     ASKING, SO I THOUGHT SHE HAD REPLACED THEM. SINCE THIS IS STILL ISSUE, GLAD THEY’RE
     REPLACING THEM. I’VE FOUND MYSELF W/O A CHARGER A FEW TIMES, THIS WILL BE GREAT.

**PPP Sen. Ryan Present**
   ➢ CLOSING: (stirling) LIKE A PREVIOUS SEN SAID, DEFINITELY NEED THESE. (OLIVER) FOUND NEED
     THROUGH FRIEND PAUL, I THOUGHT WE’D HELP AND THEY’D BE GREAT. FROM WHEN I WORKED THERE, I
     KNOW LOTS OF USAGE. (STIRLING) LET’S MAKE PAUL HAPPY. I URGE FAVORABLE PASSAGE.
   ➢ MOVE INTO VOTE-UP VOTE
   ➢ SGFB NO. 8 PASSES WITH 100% IN FAVOR

**PPI Sen. El-Rachidi - moving SGFB No. 9 to end of Unfinished Business – exec SAS not yet present**

SGR No. 14 by Sen. d’Espalungue - A Resolution to Urge and Request LSU Parking and Transportation to Modify the LSU Tiger Trail Night Ops. Operations and the LSU Campus Transit System webpage and operational hours
   ➢ OPENING: THIS IS FOLLOWING MEETING W/JEFF CAMPBELL. AFTER, HE AGREED TO MOST REQUESTS: TO
     CHANGE NIGHT A BUS ROUTE, BECAUSE 2 BUSES ON ROUTE, BOTH RUN SAME DIRECTION, WANT ONE TO
     GO THE OPPOSITE DICTION; SECOND, WAS TO CHANGE HOURS OF TRANSIT, EXTEND FROM MIDNIGHT TO
     1AM. ALSO TRANSLOC APP, LACK CAPABILITIES FOR ANDROID USERS; ONLY IPHONE USERS.
   ➢ DEBATE:
   ○ GREEN/(UNBIASED): PASSED COMMITTEE UNANIMOUSLY, ONLY POSITIVE DEBATE, A FEW
     TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS. (BIASED) LAST YEAR LIVED ON-CAMPUS, TRANSIT WENT TO 3AM, AND
     IT WAS VERY HELPFUL. THIS WAS WELL THOUGHT-THROUGH, MET WITH CAMPBELL ALREADY,
     THIS BASICALLY BINDING DOCUMENT TO HELP HIM STICK WITH IT.
➢ Closing: feedback today from Campbell; said he’d address each issue, confirmed currently working to implement changes. If not able to make now, then go into effect Fall 2018, have to deal w/ external contractor, but changes in the works. Urge favorable passage.

**Sen. Trepagnier moves to pass by unanimous consent; Second by Ellis; No objection

➢ SGR No. 14 passes with unanimous consent

SGR No. 15 By Sen. d’Espalungue - A Resolution to urge and request the LSU Student Health Center to consider providing a package for common sexually transmitted disease (STD) Laboratory Tests at a fair price

➢ Opening: this started by a few students asking me why they needed to pay more than $100 to get these tests done. I thought it did sound very costly. Idea of this resolution is to encourage them to provide a ‘package’ to reduce costs for students. I didn’t want to put exact cost, because that’s constraining, I didn’t want to put pressure, but strongly urge them to consider the idea.

➢ No Questions

➢ Debate:
  o Au Grashoff: changing it from demanding something to more considering, as you can see in preamble. Not telling them they need to do something but showing awareness of an issue, and asking they do something if they can. This passed committee unanimously
    ▪ Q-Stirling: if you get this done at health center, goes on fee bill?
      • A: it can, but not always. You can pay in person if you’d like but often times people aren’t aware initially. It costs this much and don’t have the money readily available
  o Bell: I am in favor of this legislation. Many students may not get this done as frequently as they should or would want to, because they can’t afford it. Students shouldn’t compromise their health care because of costs. Also, shows up on fee bill, having to explain may be hard. I urge favorable passage

➢ Closing: thank you, I think everything has been said. I urge favorable passage.

** Sen. Cheatwood moves to pass by unanimous consent; seconded by An. Grashoff; no objection

➢ SGR No. 15 passes with unanimous consent

SGR No. 16 By Sen. Allmon - A Resolution to urge and request the LSU Student Health Center to make a sexual health tab on their online patient portal.

➢ Opening: improving sexual health resources on campus I think is very important. The main thing I’d like for there to be is a tab regarding the info. There are mental health tabs, wellness tabs, but nothing for this. Very hard to find if tests can be done, let alone what tests. There’s something in there regarding a birth control class, but that’s really it. Sexual health resources also sometimes get muddled with sexual assault resources. While that is incredibly important, should also be a different area. Alabama has amazing resources regarding this information, could grow to be great sec exchange initiative

➢ No Questions

➢ Debate:
  o Au Grashoff: (unbiased) Lots of questions, author answered all of them. A few technical amendments, some positive debate. (biased), I think this is incredibly important. Sexual health is health, we need good health all around, and this is part of it. I know their recovering from instances (the fire) and this is something we should bring to their attention. They are open to improving student experience and resources
  o Perkins: very much in support. Think this is quick easy fix for making resources accessible, I think this is a great time for this.

➢ Closing: I think this is great; if you saw reveille last week, it shared that students felt she was lacking, this will help with it. Step in right direction, sexual health is important. Urge favorable passage.

**Cheatwood moves to pass by unanimous consent; seconded; No objection

➢ SGR No. 16 passes with unanimous consent

SGR No. 19 By Sen. Warren - A Resolution to urge and request the College of Humanities and Social Sciences to recognize and offer American Sign Language (ASL) as a language course
**Opening:** I’ve been taking an ASL class, and it has grown near and dear to my heart. It is considered the 4th most used language in US. It is not however considered a spoken language, so it isn’t taken into consideration very much. It is not considered an ‘actual’ language, which is disappointing. We have one course, in Comm D, but for students to improve more or get certification, must search off campus programs and classes. Could be great for non-deaf students.

**Questions:**
- Q-B Landry: do you know how these classes are structured?
  - A-Warren: not just ASL. In ASL learn about deaf people, deaf culture. Could be written portion; teacher could sign in front of class, and class could write what was being signed, signing exams could also be given, too.
- Q-D’Esp: how many students have/would ask for this course on campus?
  - A-Warren: I am not sure an exact level. Where I take classes, we have LSU students on every level. About 30 students, in Comm D, because this is a required skill for them.
- Q-Perkins: could this replace language class or just elective?
  - A-Warren: I’d like for it to also be able to replace language class.
- Q-Oliver: have you spoken w/ department?
  - A-Warren: haven’t sat with Dean Haynie yet, but have been emailing back and forth and has no objections so far.
- Q-Martin: so this isn’t even offered as elective yet?
  - A-Warren: there is some phys comm class, but not even all ASL.
- Q-Phillips: when could we see this as a class? Like for language option?
  - A-Warren: this is something I’d like to have implemented eventually.
- Q-McKinney: have you spoken with anyone who knows ASL who could teach this?
  - A-Warren: I have identified 2 people who have PhD in ASL, not at LSU right now, but BR is their home town, looking to coming back. But right now no place in BR for them to teach.

**Debate:**
- Stirling: (unbiased) heard in AA on Monday, questions about feasibility, she’s been talking to Dean Haynie, and she’s great and would like to see it happen. (Biased) I learned a lot about deaf culture, linguistics and culture very interesting, prevalence interesting. I think it’d be great addition.
- Bécourt: I live with 2 ComD grad students, and yesterday they were saying they wish we had ASL at LSU because they really need it to communicate with patients, but harder to take if off campus.
- Chaisson: my GF is ComD, she’s was upset they didn’t offer ASL. I mean we offer Cajun French, which is a dead language, so I definitely think we could benefit from offering ASL, a very useful language.
- Perkins: When I initially read, I wasn’t sure how it’d go with foreign language requirement. But this legislation just proposes to offer the course. Then logistics could be discussed later on. I’m taking a 4HR online Italian class, because I needed lang. I would’ve much preferred this, feel it’s more useful. Think it’d be great to offer.
- Mullaney: just wanted to say I went to much smaller school for undergrad, and we had ASL. It was very popular class, and I think it would be too. In Law, we are allowed to audit classes, and I think this would be popular. It would be a great skill to have for anyone of any major.
- J Landry: think we heard of practical need for ASL. Want to point out something in PPS. The word Deaf is capitalized; not a typo. Refers to culture, conventions; how to properly and respectfully communicate to people w/in culture, when you’re outside of culture. When thinking of Deaf culture, think less of dealing with disability, but with diff culture, diff way of life. If look at history of deaf culture, see how it developed. Our colleague called Cajun French a nearly dead language – back in those days, sign language was strongly discouraged, but now it has become strong thing. Reason we have languages at LSU other than English, and that we have topics – like ComD- that deal with trying to communicate. If we can pass this, great first step.
Closing: I think you all heard and said everything. Think incredibly important, also for helping welcome deaf and hard of hearing students and faculty to our school. Urge favorable passage.

**Vaughn moves to pass by unanimous consent; seconded; no objection**

SGR No. 19 passes with unanimous consent

SGR No. 20 By Sen. Warren - A Resolution to urge and request the LSU Student Health Center (SHC) to offer the documentation of physical triggers on the SHC patient portal.

Opening: I work at women’s center, I work with lots of different groups on campus and in community. Brought to my attention that many students afraid of going to SHC because not their normal practitioner, not someone familiar with, and would like to know resources are available and known about these.

Debate:
- Au. Grashoff: (unbiased)Committee responded well to this, asked about wording, how it’d appear on website. Passed with unanimous (biased). I am happy about this, I think it’d be a great thing. I am in full support and think you should be too.

Closing: I think important, and that helpful to many students on campus. Urge favorable passage.

**An. Grashoff moves to pass by unanimous consent; seconded; no objection**

SGR No. 20 passes with unanimous consent

SGCR No. 15 By Sen. Green - A Concurrent Resolution to place a referendum before the Louisiana State University Student Body in the fall 2018 elections to urge and request the LSU Board of Supervisors to reconsider, restructure, and reduce the student media associated fees.

Opening: to get started I have a few minor technical amendments that I’m doing at beginning of debate. So this draft is something we’ve been working on for a while. Sat down looked at fees we felt we had questions about. Reached out to departments and received more detailed reports. Reviewed these details, came up with questions, met with rep for about 2 hours. Then met later, came up with majority opinion. As you see in this report. Opinion section: 1st decision, the $8 gumbo fee should be cut entirely; based on people who get gumbo, and how much they make from revenue and ad sales. Felt improper use of student fees. 2nd change, to consolidate all fees into one fee; right now one fee for KLSU, one for Tiger TV, etc. However, right now feel money from rev is restricted; in past, used money from gumbo fee to reveille; technically not allowed. This would allow more flexibility; want areas that need the money to be able to have it. Also, recommending legacy be discontinued. Most students we spoke with outside of mass comm, they didn’t know what it was. When we asked how many people read or pick them up, they had no numbers. They put them out in boxes but don’t check numbers. We’d like to reallocate that money to other media outlets. Want also, to add part time fee. Nothing stopping anyone from using student media, so requesting part time students pay $2 per credit hour. Also, this whole thing is non-binding. But this is SGCR because it will go into referendum. I think this about covers it. If any questions, I’d love to answer.

Questions:
- Q-Riley: How much did you speak with student media after you made these decisions?
  - A-Green: Asked questions about how they’d feel about cuts, attachment to gumbo – didn’t seem to attached to gumbo. Haven’t come back to them asking how they’d feel about the cuts. Not currently aware of exactly what we’re asking of them, but we’ll be in touch. This would go on ref during Fall 2018, so it’d be a while before we get this to student body.
- Q-Cheatwood: Wasn’t one of them operating in huge surplus? Like gumbo or legacy?
  - A-Green: Most of the time don’t operate on surplus; do have some money right now because of the change in director. Transition was odd. I think you may be thinking of a diff fee we’ll talk about later.
- Q-Phillips: Have you spoke with board of supervisors?
  - A-Green: They knew about committee, did send stuff their way, and they said they’d ask questions if they have them.

Debate:
GREEN: amendments to wording for how committee felt, tech amend, passed in favor, with me abstaining.

ALLMON: I’m in favor of the fee reduction completely. Also I’m our counterpart on student media board. While I like things that manship does for students, while lots good, I do feel that legacy and gumbo do seem to be the least popular. Even people who are on those departments aren’t manship students; in student media board meeting when I brought up this fee, the only people who were concerned were faculty—so I think it’s more their project than students. I feel students don’t care so much for it. When I asked pick up rate for Legacy, the lack of clear answer was bothersome. And it’s like $39 a year. Students seem like they’d rather pay for other things (like guy who came in during public input about music).

MARTIN: so when I found out we had to pay a fee—first I didn’t know gumbo existed. Like we have to pay fees for it, then we have to like actually buy it if we want it. If people wanted it they could buy it without us paying fees. Very glad committee was created and they’re doing things about it. Urge favorable passage.

RILEY: I was in meeting w/ director of student media when SFVAC met. Also, if anyone having reservations—company we pair with to order gumbo requires 600 copies to be ordered. We only have about 300 students who want them. So like 300 unclaimed copies, that student fees bought. Also, hope this legislation makes student media want to improve their usage tracking—like with legacy; also, couldn’t tell us for KLSU, and for Tiger TV, just go off of number of views on YouTube. I hope they improve their data collection, and that it encourages other departments to do the same.

Q-BELL: do you know how much it would cost to track readership or people listening?
- Yield to Green: TTV track by YouTube, KLSU could purchase (who contracted out to) set of data for $700, which is a small fraction of the money they get. They did it many years ago, and haven’t even considered doing it in a while
- A-RILEY: even if not track constantly, some months, so we could get some kind of idea.

BELL: **proposing amendment—want to thank Green and SFVAC for their work. Amendment I’m proposing we strike to remove funding for Legacy. I’d like to lower it, or something I think completely removing may be a mistake. I think we encourage them to change the way Legacy is run. I think Legacy is great experience for people to write and work on it, and gumbo. But do know people who work on Legacy. As manship, I think my constituents would like for this to continue.

Q-D’ESP: do you know how Legacy writers are selected?
- A-BELL: I am not sure
- **PC ALLMON: can apply for editing position, vote in student media board. 2.0 GPA, paid position

Q-STIRLING: can you expand on diff between rev and leg?
- A-BELL: I used to write for rev. Limited number of positions, a lot of opinions, some news, magazine is different.

Q-WARREN: do you think print is the best option? That posting online isn’t viable or sustainable?
- A-BELL: not sure
- **PC ALLMON: if could do online, students not sure how they could do that.

Q-WARREN: well do you think it could be published online?
- A-BELL: I think it could, if we reduce fee. But if we strike fee entirely, then couldn’t even have that option

Q-CHEATWOOD: clarify amendment?
- A-BELL: I’d like to remove the support of cutting legacy mag

Q-McKINNEY: would you agree that this continuing resolution is to reallocate the fees, not necessarily decide action of student media board? Especially something that only manship student benefit from?
• **A-Bell:** Oh yes, I do understand. But I do think a lot of non-manship can benefit from it. However, I feel that if as a body we were agreeing to the whole document, then I think it should be struck.

• **Q-Phillips:** Would you agree that recommending discontinuing the Leg is a strong way of recommending they better allocate student fees? Rather than forcing students to pay diff fees?

• **A-Bell:** Right, well, instead of us saying we want to do away with the Legacy, we say that we want you money in a pool, then you can use it however you want. But maybe we just don't include our opinion on the Legacy.

• **Amendment deemed hostile**

• **Debate on Amendment:**

  • **Allmon:** So I'm against the amendment. Part of being in the field I'm in - media field - is hammering effectiveness, measuring outreach. The fact that Director was unable to tell us ANY numbers or data was very irresponsible. Also, job opportunities and experience - manship sends out email with those every week for students to use. Many available on or near campus
    1. **Q-Cheatwood:** Have you been on student media, think they enjoy and get experience?
    2. **A-Allmon:** No, but have close friends. Yes, think they enjoy, but don't think they're pulled together enough. Even people on say irresponsible, don't have social media people, and don't carry out how they should.

  • **Oliver:** Glad Bell brought up amendment. Was upset to see this getting cut. I have close friend on Leg, and it helped her land internship with Vogue. Yes doesn't benefit all students but does greatly benefit some students we rep. Think we can recommend pool, but also think we shouldn't tell them how to do use their money.
    1. **Q-Green**
      1. **A-Oliver:** Think if we think discontinue Leg, think just rec to pool.
    2. **Q-Green:** Well, same argument, what about gumbo?
      1. **A-Oliver:** Don't think we should suggest cutting that. But financial gap between gumbo and Leg is much different.
    3. **Q-Riley:** Do you think that we should leave that open, seeing as they've spent money thus far?
      1. **A-Oliver:** No, but I think this will open eyes.

  • **D'Esp:** Regarding amendment. I worked with student media last semester. Think student media does offer great experience. I think the way they select students to work for them, actually, is unfair, and biased. Not actually open to have just anyone come work for them. They have an unspoken criteria.

  • **Cheatwood:** I'm in favor of amendment. Love legislation and what it does, but do think that the Leg and gumbo are assets to student media and LSU as a whole. Could just say it doesn't rep all 500 constituents I should be against. But if just one or two do benefit, then I should speak on it.
    1. **Q-Black:** Are you aware nature; strong language; posed to student body; and potential of being cut?
      1. **A-Cheatwood**
    2. **Q-Green:** Don't you feel that if we see Leg money not being used properly, we should cut it's money?
      1. **A-Cheatwood:** No I think we should agree to cut student media funding, not to cut Legacy funding specifically.
• B Landry: Right now, saying let’s cut Legacy, put toward student media, maybe revile. We’re saying that if we strike this, suggestion of removal of leg money, they how to make that up in rev? Any other increase, to bring rev back into black, doesn’t seem possible. My colleague wants to talk about experiences — we heard that many other outlets for it. Heck with that money, could do long form journalism. With leg, the mag seems something better suited for alum association or some other admin to take care of.
  o Q: Riley: (maybe not to you but to anyone) — part of ref is part time students, do part time students get to vote in elections?
  o *A-Mickler: I do believe so

• Perkins: I wasn’t that invested in SFVAC at first, until now we all are. With Legacy, from what I’ve seen at LSU, people do notice it. Not a TON of people benefit from it, but the people that I have known to be involved in it — featured, photographers, writers, editors — it does serve underrepresented communities on campus. Yes, it is a lot of money, and it is student fees — but does represent people on campus. Think we could decrease, but don’t think we should cut

• Stirling: I feel strongly for cutting the legacy. I’m most in favor for keeping legislation as it is written. I do see value in magazine, as it has been brought up. I don’t think though that every student should have to pay it. I think student media could choose to keep it with their new pool of money, but if they really truly believe their mag is viable, they’ll find other avenues to make it happen besides have every student pay for it on their fee bill. I am against amendment.

• Riley: I am not in favor of amendment. Like, I’m student worker in Bursar and I’m accounting, and it is great experience, but it is something all students use. Most students utilize the resource, and paid from diff way. Even if 30–40% students used Leg, I think it’d be good to see this kept and encouraged to grow, but not even that amount. Someone said we shouldn’t direct people for how they should spend their money, but that’s exactly what I think we should be doing.
  o Q: Oliver: Well, then you disagree that we should give them lump sum?
    * A–Riley: No, I agree wit
  o Q: Cheatham: Yes, lacking logistics. Do you know viewership of TTV?
    * A–Riley: On their TTV channel.
    * Mickler: Less than 100 typically

  o Cheatham: so, TTV reaching even lower % of people, probably, and we say that it successful. Why is that any less successful than leg?
    * A–Riley: Legacy doesn’t reach large number and trying to. TTV could. Also, Legacy seems that it only benefits the 14 students working on Legacy
  o *PC Green: Legacy prints 6500 each time
  o *PC Mickler: Legacy distributed same way as reveille, in boxes
  o *PC Porche: TTV some videos only a few hundred, yesterday one has 16 thousand, and one a while ago, 7 thousand
  o *PC Burris: Top 12 have over thousands of views; they do get a lot of views.

• Amend closing, Bell: Thank you all, I have an idea for the suggestion. There is a place for us to suggest to the people on the top how to spend their money. But as manship senator I think they benefit from. I’m sure I pay fees that others benefit from, and then
WE WANT EVERYONE TO BENEFIT. I THINK WE SHOULD LIFT EACH OTHER UP – THINK SHOULD LEAVE A LEGACY

- Close, Green: still against amendment; student worker jobs available, don’t think we should pay for 14 of them. If we wanted to cut legacy and money, we would’ve cut the money, too. But we’re still giving them the money from it. We feel other things do benefit students more – so than the legacy (however, they still could fund legacy if they’d like)

  - IN LIEU OF VOICE VOTE, STANDING VOTE
  - AMENDMENT FAILS
    - (BACK INTO DEBATE)
    - Vaughn: incredibly for this legislation, for what SFVAC does and stands for. I want to make clear too how non-binding our opinion is, it just puts it up to a vote for the student body. I’m very much in favor of the legislation, think everyone should read it

  - CLOSING: this is so important. Thank you all for participating in this; it is the first time students have ever reviewed fees on our own and made suggestions on them, so we are really making strides here. Think you heard all you need to hear. I urge favorable passage.

  - VOTE-UP VOTE
  - SGR No. 15 passes with 93% in favor

SGCR No. 16 By Sen. Green - A Concurrent Resolution to place a referendum before the Louisiana State University Student Body in the Fall 2018 elections to urge and request the LSU Board of Supervisors to reconsider the Performing Arts Fee

- Opening: This is very similar to previous legislation; opinion crafted by the committee, after our meetings with people from MDA, performing arts fee. I will read purpose of fee and original creation of this fee. Also, note black box fee, not associated with this fee, and we feel this fee is being well used, nothing should be done with it, noted in legislation. This fee, though, performing arts, no longer used for original intent. Intention to be used by union …, which no longer exists. At some point, fee got transferred to MDA. Very interesting that student came here early, wanting to create fee that would allow programming to be free to students. No programs free to students, offered at reduced price, but not free. Also, if you look, attendance, very low participation. We feel that with those in mind, fee doesn’t serve student body. Now serves as subsidy education for students in College of MDA. While it does help those students, not beneficial to all students and shouldn’t be paid by all. Also, we feel advertising efforts done are not very good, barely exist. But don’t need to because subsidized so well. Also, have two funds, from fees and from revenues – revenues nearly double of fee. Think don’t need to have fee – doesn’t offer as much benefit as it is costing.

- Questions:
  - Q-McKinney: would you be willing to work w the guy who was here earlier?
    - A-Green: yes I spoke with him. He wants fee for students of school of music, only, to make events free for them

- Debate:
  - Green: (unbiased, committee report) basically same thing as last one. Went through it, made tech amend, changed some wording, no intent changed. I have series of tech amend. Passed all in favor, me abstain as chair
  - **Mickler: this legislation with tech amend, now on OneDrive
  - J Landry: with all SFVAC stuff; looking to see what getting for stuff were paying, and also that the fee is being used for its intent. First, idea of student oversight. When fee created, had view of students and diff people involved then are now. We don’t know how, when and why, want to find out though, to help prevent this from happening again. Also, discovered some interesting things as we talked with our reps – blow by blow in minutes – but pro tip, if conversation goes to talking about the ‘other’ sheet and the ‘other, other’ sheet, which were not made available, not painting self in glory. This needs the attention of the board of supervisors, pronto.
  - Black: I was able to attend meeting with the reps from performing arts. Willing to work with and answer questions, however, as previous speaker brought up an
“OTHER” SHEET AND AN “OTHER OTHER” SHEET, WE REALIZED WE DIDN’T HAVE ALL INFO. THEY WERE THEN WILLING TO PROVIDE THAT INFO. THOUGH WE LIKE PROMOTING PERFORMING ARTS

- **Closing:** Similar to last legislation; we in no way want this experience to go away for students. We just feel that the way the fee is used, how it is distributed, vs how it was intended it be distributed, that our review of the fee was helpful and necessary. We do think it is great to have these opportunities open to students, but not quite by means of this fee. I urge favorable passage

- **Vote-up vote**
- **SGR No. 16 passes with 100% in favor**

**SGB No. 6 By Sen. Riley – A Bill To Amend The Student Government Bylaws**

- **Opening:** Being co-authored by Porche and Cupp. Also, changing preamble a little bit. We’ll each go over section. (See the legislation)
- **Riley and Porche discuss changes**
- **Questions:**
  - Q-McKinney: No friendly amendments, just means has to be discussed and debated?
    - A-Riley: Yes
  - *PC Mickler: yes; In Robert’s rules, actually no such thing as friendly amendment, that’s just something we have
  - Q-Oliver: Orgs would have to pay it back? Or just wouldn’t be awarded? Something would catch that before double funding was allocated, correct?
    - A-Riley: Yield to Michelle – we’ve never had issue; typically case by case. If get both, first one is revoked. Wouldn’t be eligible to apply to second if first one began spending
  - Q-McKinney: could we just say that they have to deny funding from first to even go to second?
    - A-Riley: I had that originally, that it had to be denied before pursuing more.
  - Q-Black: Do you think it kind of acts as ‘safety net’ to allow for more funding to be pursued?
    - A-Riley: Yes, so that in the case they deny first funding in hopes of getting more, then are denied by Senate, they are not left without any money.
  - **Now discussion moves to Legislative Branch Rules of Order**
  - Q-Stirling
    - A-Riley: I did originally have ‘under discretion of speaker of Senate’ but technically everything is, so it was a bit redundant
  - Q-Black: Does it list who the counterpart[ ] is for each Senate committee?
    - A-Riley: Yes, and it also expresses ‘or equivalent position’ in the case that titles change for positions, our documents don’t need to change
  - Q-McKinney: The recusal; that’s not binding, right? More of a suggestion?
    - A-Riley: Right. We are not taking away any student’s right to vote, but it is saying that the individual may, or the chair or Speaker may recommend that they recuse themselves

- **Debate:**
  - Cupp (Author): This is really great, the whole legislation is mostly clarifications, adding recusal. Very straightforward, think we cleared some things up
  - Porche (Author): Think it better represents how our Senate runs, kind of anyway, so yeah.
  - Hunt: (unbiased) Amendment that passed, we went through each change, and it passed 6-0-1
  - Green: I made the amendment, wanted to explain it. How it read was that if you received some funding form PSIF or ORF, they’d have to deny it to pursue funding from Senate. Say they do that, then Senate turns them down, too. I’m not comfortable with that – I think that leaving people with no money who went through all necessary modes to received it, is kind of wrong. I think it’s better to allow people to have some funds. I think this group has done a wonderful job of going through to make these more accurately rep how we use funds today
• Q-RILEY: SHOULD’VE DONE THIS DURING OPENING COMMENTS, BUT COULD YOU EXPLAIN TO PEOPLE WHAT PSIF AND ORF ARE?
  • A-GREEN:
  • YIELD TO RILEY: EXPLANATION OF PSIF, ORF
  • *McKinney: (AMENDMENT) WOULD LIKE TO STRIKE LINES REGARDING RECUSALE.
  • OPENING (ON AMENDMENT)
    • McKinney (Amend): NOW IT BASICALLY STATES THAT PEOPLE SHOULD RECUSE THEMSELVES IF THEY HAVE CONFLICT OF INTEREST. I THINK IF YOU’RE INVESTED YOU SHOULDS ALWAYS HAVE CONFLICT OF INTEREST. UNLESS YOU’RE TRYING TO BE UNBIASED CHAIR, I THINK EVERYONE SHOULD EXPRESS THEIR VIEW AND VOTE ON THAT
  • *Deemed Hostile
    • Riley (Author): I THINK VERY IMPORTANT. ALSO I’D LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT THIS IS ONLY APPLICABLE TO COMMITTEE — NOT FOR VOTE ON SENATE FLOOR. ESPECIALLY FOR FINANCE BILLS, SINCE IT COULD ESSENTIALLY BE SEEN AS AWARDING FUNDS TO YOURSELF. WE GOT A LOT OF INSPIRATION FOR OUR WORDING FROM Robert’S RULES OF ORDER, WHICH EXPRESS YOU SHOULD RECUSE YOURSELF. ALSO, IF WE DON’T HAVE RULE, WE REFER TO Robert’S, SO THIS JUST BRINGS IT FORWARD SO MORE PEOPLE THINK TO CONSIDER IT.
    • Porche (Author): I THINK PEOPLE CAN DECIDE HOW THEY FEEL ABOUT THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THIS IS JUST SUGGESTION, PEOPLE MAY OPT OUT OF VOTE IF THEY FEEL THEY’RE ONLY VOTING A CERTAIN WAY BECAUSE OF CONFLICT. JUST SAYS SHOULD RECUSE SELF, NOT HAVE TO.
      • Q-Mullaney: CONFLICT OF INTEREST, TO CLARIFY, THIS IS MORE FOR INVOLVEMENT IN ORGANIZATIONS, NOT BECAUSE OF STRONG OPINION?
        • A-Riley: correct. DEEP INVOLVEMENT IN ORG, OR CLOSE RELATIONSHIP WITH PERSON FOR POSITION, ANYTHING OF THAT NATURE, THAT WOULD SWAY A PERSON’S OPINION OR VOTE DUE TO OUTSIDE INFLUENCE FROM THE ISSUE OR TOPIC BEING VOTED ON
  • Debate on Amendment:
    • J Landry: (Quotes Robert’s rules, relating to conflict of interest). I think my colleagues language is consistent with Robert’s rules; helps with what people should or should not recuse self with, and I am against the amendment
    • Au. Grashoff: he said was I was going to say, but more fancy. So I’ll say it more casually. Say, I’m a member of an organization; I could debate for person I know, since I can maybe their character. But say we want to award my org money, it wouldn’t be right really for me to vote on it, since id essentially be awarding myself money. we take an oath when we join, to not use position for personal gain; best to recuse self if you feel breaking that oath, or behaving in immoral manner.
  • Closing on Amendment:
    • McKinney (Amend): I still don’t think that should be in there. It’s just suggestion, not requirement, so what’s the point. Also I think you rep 500 students, every time you don’t vote you’re not using that vote.
    • Riley (Author): I agree with author of amendment that you shouldn’t abstain when unnecessary to, and you should always voice for your students. I’d agree more though if this was for the floor, not for committee. The line is there for reminder. Technically we follow this as part of Robert’s rule anyhow, so I think it’s good to have it there as a reminder
    • Cupp (Author): conflict of interest, too, would mean you rep you more than your constituents. If you vote for money for an org you’re in, then you’re already not voting for 500 constituents, you’re voting for yourself. So I disagree with amendment
    • Porche (Author): having this just shows our rules better reflect Robert’s rules
  • *Amendment Fails
CLOSING: [Porche] think changes we made better represent us, and that adding the recusing better reflects Robert’s rules. [Riley] I think these changes are beneficial, and need to be made. I urge favorable passage.

VOTE-UP VOTE

SGB No. 6 passes with vote of 96% in favor

SGB No. 7 by Sen. Riley & Au. Grashoff - A Bill to Amend the PSIF Bylaws

Opening: [Au Grashoff] Riley and I sit on PSIF Committee. We brought forward to committee at our last meeting, some recommendations for changes. They also brought some to us, as well. Then as committee, we voted on it all, as is required to make changes to this. We were very careful with our changes — if we are to make any alterations, need to bring it back to the committee. If you have any questions though, please ask.

Questions:
- Q-J Landry: striking...?
  - A-AU. Grashoff: NIPF right now, really no point in having that right now. Also having that marketing cap is kind of unclear
  - A-Riley: also, marketing and advertising we don’t want to limit because think it is important, because we want as many students to know about and benefit from these as possible

Debate:
- Hunt: [Unbiased] Bill passed 6-0-1, it’s solid, it’s good. That’s it
- Closing: [Au Grashoff] worked hard on it. We discussed for a long time in committee. Think they’ll hold for years to come. Now some of what we practice that hasn’t been in rules is in there now. Think we made good changes. Urge favorable passage

VOTE-UP VOTE

SGB No. 7 passes with 100% in favor

SGFB No. 9 by Sen. El-Rachidi - A Finance Bill to Allocate A Maximum of Five Hundred Twenty-Nine Dollars and Twenty Cents ($529.20) from the Student Government Legislative Contingency to Fund Security for the Student Union from 11PM to 3AM from April 29th to May 3rd

Opening: sorry Emily Jones couldn’t make it, she got caught up in a meeting. But this is important it is to fund security guards for finals week union study space. We have funded this before, this is last time it will be finance bill, hoping to work it into the budget. The original quote was a bit less, but this is correct amount. We shifted the days for this, it is different than past — cut the days that had fewer than 50 people, and just doing it during finals week

Questions:
- Q-VAUGH: how many times has this been a finance bill?
- A-EL-RACHIDI: 4th semester it’s a finance bill

Debate:
- Riley: [Unbiased] Passed 10-0-1. Questions regarding funding, how long this has been finance bill. This is intended to be in budget this year, so shouldn’t see it as finance bill again.
- Au. Grashoff: I know my biggest concern with this every year, that it has been finance bill. But also, as sas, I feel it is a great contribution for us. I think I would much much rather see this in the budget. We’ve been working on this with exec, which is cool, with Emily Jones, and pass Sas chair, Clarissa Bruns. Think important that we have this space, very much utilized by students, less stressful, more comfortable environment. Has free snacks available.
- D’ESP: I think great idea, library gets packed, feels stressful, more relaxed, I think it would be great place. It is cheaper than last year, which is good. And also, I am late night person, I think a lot of college students are, I urge favorable passage

Closing: Great idea, last time as finance bill, looking forward to seeing it in the budget — I urge favorable passage

VOTE-UP VOTE

SGB No. 9 passes with 100% in favor

LO No. 13 by Speaker Mickler - A Legislative Order to Appoint the Standing Committees of the Forty-Seventh LSU Student Senate
➢ **OPENING:** right now you can’t join BA and you can’t leave SLDCO. Anyone want to change committees? Seeing none.

➢ **QUESTIONS:**
  o Q-Ellis: change committees, back to SLDCO?
    ▪ A-Mickler: No.

➢ **CLOSING:** I like the suggestions this week. Enjoy your last committee meeting.

**Ellis moves to pass by unanimous consent; seconded by Cheatwood; no objections**

➢ **LO NO. 13 PASSES WITH UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

**Legislative Officer Reports**
**Advisor Reports**
**Petitions, Memorials, and other Communications**
**Adjournment**