

1. President Tanja Aho calls the meeting to order at 6:50pm

2. Approval of Minutes

- Motion to approve the minutes from the October 5, 2016 Senate Meeting
  - Motion: Social Work
  - Second: Community Health & Health Behavior
  - Oppose: 0; Abstain: 0; In favor: 71

3. Announcements

- The GSA Programming Coordination, Diana Moore, explains that GSA events for November and December include:
  - November 4<sup>th</sup>- Java Junction, 11:00am – 1:00pm in 310 Student Union
    - Free Tim Horton's coffee and doughnuts for graduate students
  - November 7<sup>th</sup>- Discount AMC Movie Tickets Available
    - Tickets will be on sale at the SBI Ticket Offices for \$6 each. 1 per UB ID.
  - November 11<sup>th</sup>- *An American in Paris*, 8:00pm at Shea's Performing Arts Center
    - Tickets on sale now at the SBI Ticket Offices for \$25 each. 2 per UB ID.
  - November 18<sup>th</sup>- South Campus Siesta, 4:00 – 6:00pm in 105 Harriman Hall
    - Free food and beverages for graduate students at South Campus
  - November 27<sup>th</sup>- Buffalo Bills Football Game vs. Jacksonville Jaguars, 1:00pm at New Era Field
    - Tickets are sold out!
  - December 2<sup>nd</sup>- Java Junction, 11:00am – 1:00pm in 310 Student Union
  - December 9<sup>th</sup>- Jingle Jangle Jam, 7:00 – 11:00pm at Templeton Landing (2 Templeton Terrace Buffalo, NY 14202)
    - Open bar, dinner buffet, music and prizes!
    - Tickets on sale November 7<sup>th</sup> at the SBI Ticket Offices for \$20 each (\$25 at the door if still available). 2 per UB ID.
- Tanja announces that the Social Work GSA is doing a winter clothing drive from Nov 1<sup>st</sup> – Dec 1<sup>st</sup> for the Matt Urban Hope Center. You can donate gently used winter clothing, as well as personal hygiene items and anything else that would be of good use (such as children's clothes and adult clothes) at the GSA office (310 Student Union), or in the Social Work Lounge (631 Baldy Hall), Greiner Hall (near Au Bon Pain), or Diefendorf Hall (near the Health Sciences entrance). Details can be found on the GSA website.
  - Students who donate to the Winter Clothing Drive will be entered for a chance to win a Distinguished Speaker Series VIP front row seat ticket, or awesome GSA swag!
  - Hilary Vandenburg from Transnational Studies GSA points out that women's hygiene products are especially hard to come by and are very important for homeless folks. She encourages everybody to purchase those, as well as underwear and socks, specifically, since they have to be donated new and wrapped.

4. Report of the President

- Trick or Eat Food Drive Winners
  - Tanja announces that winners chosen from the pool of students that donated to the Food Drive for the WNY Food Bank were Addison Marino, Seth Cosimini, and Natalia Pamula.
- Parenting Graduate Students Updates
  - Tanja is still seeking testimonials from any parenting graduate students that can be used to help generate services provided by the University. Any input would be greatly appreciated.
- Need Volunteers for CIRTl's Advisory Board
  - CIRTl, the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning is an NSD-funded organization that brings together people in academia interested in teaching in STEM fields. CIRTl was started at UB about a year ago, and the university would like to see some STEM graduate students serving on the advisory board. Tanja calls for volunteers and asks all STEM-identified club officers to reach out to their constituents to generate interest in this position. Anybody interested in serving on the Advisory Board should email [gsa-president@buffalo.edu](mailto:gsa-president@buffalo.edu) within the next two weeks.

5. Report of the Treasurer

- We need a new Finance Committee Alternate Member
  - Call for Volunteers
    - Tanvi Jain ([tanvijai@buffalo.edu](mailto:tanvijai@buffalo.edu)) from Finance volunteers
  - Motion to approve new Finance Committee Alternate Member
    - Motion: Community Health & Health Behavior
    - Second: Library & Information Studies
    - Oppose: 0; Abstain: 0; Passes by consent
- GSA received an SBI Programming Grant to start a Statistics Lab for graduate students
  - We need volunteers with statistical experience and expertise to help implement this new venture. Any interested students should email [gsa-treasurer@buffalo.edu](mailto:gsa-treasurer@buffalo.edu).

- Funding Account Balances:
  - Special Activity: \$25,000 to start, \$2,230.00 allocated this month, \$20,370.00 remaining
  - Interdepartmental Activity: \$3,600.00, \$309.00 allocated this month, \$3,291.00 remaining
  - Symposia: \$18,600 to start, \$0.00 allocated this month, \$15,800.00 remaining
  - Scholarly Publication: \$11,800 to start, \$4,200.00 allocated this month, \$7,600.00 remaining
  - Community Outreach: \$2,000 to start, \$0.00 allocated this month, \$1,250.00 remaining
  - Conferences:
    - November: 78 requests for \$24,978.54, 76 applications approved for \$23,878.54
    - Beginning Balance: \$140,000.00; Remaining Balance \$79,943.45

#### 6. Report of Vice President

- Make-Up Mandatory Officer Training Meeting for any club Presidents or Treasurers that have not yet completed this requirement will be held on Monday, November 7<sup>th</sup> at 12:00pm in 330 Student Union.
- GSA Office Winter Break Schedule:
  - Office open through Monday, December 19<sup>th</sup>
  - Office closed Tuesday, December 20<sup>th</sup> – Wednesday, January 11<sup>th</sup>
  - Office on Summer Hours Wednesday, January 11<sup>th</sup> – Friday, January 27<sup>th</sup>
    - Open Monday – Thursday 8:30am – 4:00pm, Closed on Fridays
  - Office closed Monday, January 16<sup>th</sup> for Martin Luther King Jr. Day (University Closed)
  - Regular Business Hours resume Monday, January 30<sup>th</sup>
- Paperwork Deadline: Monday, December 12<sup>th</sup>
  - Anything that needs to be paid before shutdown must be in by this date. Otherwise, please notify vendors that they will not receive payment until late January.
  - Stephanie announces that this is very important because we had a lot of complaints from vendors last year who were not made aware of this schedule in advance and now will no longer direct bill GSA for club events due to the delayed payments.

#### 7. Old Business

- Review of MDRF Committee Recommendations and GSA Responses
  - Tanja explains that at the last meeting we reviewed the final report and recommendations made by the MDRF Committee. Tonight we are going to go over the GSA's responses to those recommendations based on our institutional experience, the new Directors' perspectives and the work they are already doing, and based on the Finance Committee's input, seeing as how they are the ones that shape GSA financial policies. We also held a Town Hall meeting on October 20<sup>th</sup> to further discuss these recommendations, however that meeting was under-utilized. We will go through each recommendation one at a time. We are then going to discuss and debate the issues to hear everyone's opinions. We want everyone to have a chance to go back to their departments and constituents to discuss these issues, so she is proposing that we vote on the final recommendations at the next Senate meeting, however that decision will be up to the Senate. All of the recommendations were handed out to the Senate and are also posted on the GSA website.
- 1. Create MDRF Statement of Mission and Purpose
  - GSA is in support of this idea
- 2. Create a Services Committee
  - GSA is in support of the committee, but not as a dispersing agent for MDRF funds.
    - Reasoning:
      - ❖ The Review Council volunteers are the ones who read all of the applications and should be making funding decisions
      - ❖ Checks and balances are handled through GSA E-board oversight
    - We will still be creating this committee to address other issues and to get more students actively involved in GSA as part of Constitution revisions that will take place in February
- 3. Create an MDRF Assistant Stipend Position
  - GSA has already created this position
    - All of the tasks suggested by the committee that the Assistant would be responsible for are also already being done
- 4. Adjust funding and review paradigm by:
  - a. Raising MDRF lifetime funding cap to \$4,500, and set program-based caps to: \$3,000 for PhD, \$1,500 for Master's, \$2,000 for MFA
    - GSA supports raising the lifetime funding cap to \$4,000, but does not support the \$500 increase to the PhD level (as per the GSA Finance Committee's recommendation)

- Reasoning:
  - ❖ We have already made multiple changes to MDRF, which have led to increased allocations. We need to see how those changes impact the fund before we decide to increase maximums.
  - ❖ \$500 increases were just made 2 years ago to all levels.
  - ❖ We may consider increases in the near future if reserves remain high, but we would want to increase funding at all levels, and not just for PhDs.
- b. Creating a one hundred (100) point system with penalty scheme to remain as Review Council mechanism with four (4) tiers of funding: [1] 100 – 90 point score receive 100% [2] 80 – 89 point score receive 90% [3] 70 – 79 point score receive 80% [4] 69 point score and below are encouraged to resubmit with revisions necessary
  - GSA/MDRF already have this scoring system in place
- c. Lifting requirement that funding be restricted to “final projects”, but “final projects” as indicated by applicant and confirmed by advisor will be awarded a two (2) point bonus not to exceed one hundred (100) points
  - GSA does not support this idea
    - Reasoning:
      - ❖ Departments will use this as justification to reduce funding for pre-final projects
      - ❖ We will clarify that any stage of the final project (including pilot studies) may be funded
- d. Allowing former grant recipients to submit further grant funding within the same degree program so long as their former grant has been closed out and they have not yet reached the program-based or lifetime funding cap
  - GSA does not support this idea
    - Reasoning:
      - ❖ We want to give preference to those for whom this is the first learning experience (since the grant is primarily a learning grant)
- e. Retaining current grammar penalty of two (2) points in review process as deemed appropriate by Committee and results of past applicant survey
  - GSA does not support this idea
    - Reasoning:
      - ❖ There currently is no penalty for grammar, but there are points for clarity of the application. Therefore, there is no need to penalize an applicant twice for the same thing.
      - ❖ Discriminates against English as a Second Language (ESL) students
- o Discussion
  - Representative from History states that she discussed these recommendations with her constituents and none of them feel that these recommendations actually address any actual issues with the Mark Diamond Research Fund. They feel MDRF penalizes lower income bracket students because you don’t actually receive the funds until after you have completed the research, and some of them do not have the money for that. Further, they had complaints about the way that the actual application process works in that they had been rejected for not properly justifying travel dates and/or expenses. They thought that it would be easier to just lie on your application about your research and take the money for a vacation. She states that her constituents asked her to state these complaints.
  - Student states that if this is supposed to be a learning grant, or a training opportunity for students then why wouldn’t applicants receive a penalty for grammar? Not just ESL students, but students who just choose not to proof read their papers. She states that other grants will judge an application or give a penalty for grammar, so it would not seem to benefit the students’ learning process to not be judged on that criteria.
    - Amy responds that the learning part takes place as part of the resubmission process. The student has the opportunity to correct any mistakes in their application and then resubmit in order to receive funding.
    - Student responds that he knows people in his department who were rejected for funding, but then cleaned up their application based on the Review Council’s comments and were then awarded funding on their second submission.
  - Tanja states that there were a number of changes also implemented by the new Directors that will help students as well. Applicants now get more detailed feedback in their award or resubmit letters, we are doing more outreach to promote the grant, MDRF is offering more and better workshops on the application, in the next application cycle the submission process will be fully digital, which should make submitting the

application easier. We are already seeing better applications submitted and more money being awarded than before.

- Jen Schechter, the new MDRF Director, clarifies that applicants will still need to submit one full, original paper copy of the application so that we have original signatures on file.
- Representative from Transnational Studies responds to History's concerns and states that it should be on departments to help students who cannot afford to pay research costs up front. Most professional grants only provide funds by reimbursement. Very rarely do they ever provide funding up front for research expenses, so the MDRF procedures are not at all uncommon.
  - Stephanie responds that GSA and MDRF do have methods for ordering supplies or paying for items on behalf of grant recipients through the University's purchasing office. We can order supplies, equipment, chemicals, animals, or any other commodities directly as long as the vendor will accept a Purchase Order (PO) and invoice directly, often at discounted prices. However, we have no method to pay for student travel up front, or to pay for items that students choose to order from vendors that will not accept direct billing.
  - Tanja mentions as a side note that this is a topic that she has brought up to the Graduate School in the past. The idea of an emergency fund for graduate students who are in financial trouble, who need help paying for tuition, or who need help paying for research expenses up front would go a long way towards recruiting and retaining graduate students. She states that this is something they are currently looking into, however there are structural issues that prevent us or the Graduate School from being able to provide those services.
- Student asks what other clubs and organizations are going to be voting for or against these changes, and who has a stake in these changes, or who will they benefit.
  - Tanja responds that MDRF is part of GSA and that only GSA members can apply for these funds. Graduate students make the decisions because it is their money, so the stakeholders are us, which is why she is trying to generate a discussion.
- Student asks how many applications we typically fund and for how much money.
  - Jen responds that in this last grant cycle we had 36 applications for funding and 13 of them were rejected. The Review Council funded about 64% of the applications for approximately \$47,000.
  - Stephanie responds that historically we have given out approximately \$35,000 per grant cycle, so in this past cycle alone the Review Council awarded an additional \$12,000 above average.
- Student asks if these grants are for individuals, or if they can be used for a group research project.
  - Jen responds that currently the grants are only for individuals, but that they are discussing the possibility of expanding to group projects.
- Student asks if, based on 4.c., the Advisor will have to determine whether or not a grant application is for a final project.
  - Tanja responds that the Review Committee's recommendation is to give a two point bonus for final projects, as verified by the Advisor, but that the GSA is not in support of that idea and would recommend continuing to limit applications to only final projects, which also have to be verified by the Advisor.
- Representative from Social Work states that in his department they are starting to experiment with multi-paper final projects and asks whether any or all of those papers would qualify as a final project.
  - Anastasia asks if all of the papers are related.
  - The student responds that they are all within the same field of research, but not necessarily on the same topic.
- Student states that it would be like applying for multiple final projects until you have hit your cap.
  - Tanja responds that the GSA's recommendation is that you only be able to apply for funding once per degree.
- Student asks what the rationale is behind only being allowed to submit once. She states that while we say we want to give preference to first time applicants, why can't preference be given while also allowing the committee to consider funding for continuing research.

- Amy responds that we need predictability in the amounts that we will be awarding in order to sustain the MDRF budget. By adding too many variables into the equation when considering awards, we will not be able to effectively manage the budget. She states that we saw this a few years ago when we increased MDRF funding and spent down the reserves too quickly. She states that she doesn't personally feel that the MDRF reserves are as high as the Committee seems to think, and believes that the structural changes we have already made will be enough to deplete the available funds. She states that if we start considering increasing cap amounts and funding additional research projects then we will not be able to sustain our current level of funding at an average of \$35,000 per cycle.
- Representative from GISA asks how we are paying for the new stipend staff member.
  - Tanja responds that the funds are coming out of the MDRF account line.
  - Student asks how much we are paying those individuals.
  - Tanja responds that the Director receives a \$12,000 stipend per year and the Assistant receives an \$8,000 stipend per year.
  - Student asks how significantly that impacts the MDRF fund.
  - Stephanie responds that it is an additional \$8,000 per year coming out of the MDRF account, plus the amount needed to cover taxes.
  - Tanja states that the E-board felt that the second position was necessary due to the amount of work it takes to manage the program, and was justified by the fact that they are now able to offer more workshops, more feedback to students, expand the number of one on one meetings available, and allow for more outreach and promotion of the fund.
- Student asks how the vote on these recommendations is going to take place. He asks if the Senate is going to have to vote on all of the recommendations at once, or if they will be able to vote on items one by one.
  - Tanja responds that the Senate will be able to decide how they want the vote to take place, but that she would suggest that the Senate vote on each item one by one, just like we reviewed the topics tonight.
  - The student then asks what will happen if the Senate votes on a recommendation that the GSA has not supported.
  - Tanja responds that the Senate will have to decide on how to handle the voting procedures. She states that the Review Committee was tasked with making these recommendations, so we will consider each of them, but that there are some suggestions that have already been implemented. The Senate would still have the power to vote these suggestions down and we would have to figure out how to handle those situations.
  - Amy responds that if something goes wrong, we will be able to identify which recommendation has problems and which recommendation was not supported by GSA.
- Student asks why and how the assistant position was created.
  - Tanja responds that the new MDRF Director and Assistant have already started implementing a number of the recommendations the Review Committee had suggested because they saw the need for similar changes even before the MDRF Review Committee's final report had come out.
  - Amy responds that she was an E-board member last year and that she implemented the Assistant position for a number of reasons. She states that it was partially based on the internal structure of MDRF and the need for additional people in the position in order to better manage the fund and the applications. Also, it would help with continuity in order to pass along information from year to year.
  - Tanja adds that the point system was implemented last year as part of prior MDRF revisions.
- Student asks where the money for the Assistant position is coming from.
  - Tanja responds that the money is coming from the MDRF account, which is money allocated to that account annually. She states that while it does roughly equal out to the cost of funding four grant applications per year, the E-board felt that it was the most productive way of using some of the excess funds in order to better promote and manage the fund and to disperse more money to graduate students.
  - Anastasia states that we have reserve money that the E-board decided to use in this way, but that later on, once MDRF is restructured and is working the way we want it to, we can revisit the decision

to have an Assistant position. She states that for right now, because we have the money, they are not worried about funding the Assistant position.

- Michael Cimasi, Chair of the MDRF Review Committee, asks to clarify a few points. 1) With the Services Committee serving two functions, first as a fact finding body and second as a dispersing agent for MDRF, he states that the committee debated this point over the summer and felt that part of the problem in the past came from the fact that there was not a good working relationship between the MDRF Director and the E-board. They thought that by separating out the dispersal of the funds to a committee that had greater stakeholder involvement in the process and included Senate members, it would help to avoid any issues stemming from internal politics or conflicts. He states that this policy-based oversight is already being provided by the officers, so it is not actually adding additional controls, just mandating Senatorial engagement in the process that also includes the elected officers. The committee was more interested in the fact that external parties should have a say in determining policies, which was the main reason for proposing this new committee, more so than having them be in charge of the dispersal of funds. He states that the committee was trying to address the issue of the accrual of additional funds in the MDRF account, but they are not assigning blame to any one party. 2) The increase to \$4,500 was something suggested by the committee in order to start dispersing some of the accrued funds. 3) For the final projects issue, he states that there was considerable support for this idea based on the results of the survey, so the committee felt it was important to bring it to the Senate's attention. 4) Finally, he states the grammar penalty came back 97 to 51, so almost 2 to 1 support from the survey results. It was one thing that people felt was a clarifying point that did not have to do with the nature of the project. The committee struggled to come up with ways to warrant judgement of projects that was not based on the merit of the research, and because it was only 2 points and was fully supported by the survey they decided to maintain that penalty.
- Amy states that in regards to the Services Committee, the oversight and dispersal of the MDRF funds should remain with the Review Councils alone. She states that they are an objective body that is specifically tasked with the review of the applications and management of the MDRF funds. To have a second committee that is not held to the same MDRF budgetary constraints making decisions about funding does not seem like a sound financial or accounting decision. She states that if the Senate wants to create a committee to oversee GSA as a whole that she feels it is actually a good idea, but that because this is a recommendation coming from the MDRF Review Committee, the recommendation would be created specifically for oversight of MDRF and could potentially become a conflict of interest. She states that she feels it would be better to create a Services Committee that is outside of this MDRF discussion, which is what GSA is suggesting.
  - Michael Cimasi states that is not what the Committee's recommendation implies.
  - Amy responds that this is just her personal opinion and interpretation of the Committee's recommendation based on their tasked purpose.
  - Tanja explains that currently the MDRF Review Councils review all of the applications, make their decisions on funding, check to see how much funding is available and if sufficient funds are in the account then all of the grants are awarded as suggested.
  - Amy responds that if another committee was to make an obligation to a grant recipient then GSA would be required to honor that financial commitment regardless of whether or not funding was available.
- Student states that with regards to the final projects it would seem counterintuitive that the nature of MDRF is to get people ready to write real grants, but now you are now limiting that experience to only apply for final projects.
  - Anastasia responds that the issue was brought up about taking the burden off of the Departments to help fund student research, but she states that she doesn't feel that it prevents people from using MDRF as a learning experience because it can be a stepping stone to your next grant. She states that we will be clarifying that funds can be used for any stage of your final project. Therefore, as long as your Advisor states that the research is somehow related to your final project, then it will be an acceptable project. It can be early on in the research, or even a pilot project. She states that students usually would not be applying for a larger grant for a pilot study. Between those two issues,

this was the compromise that GSA would propose, making clear that any stage of the final project is acceptable.

- Tanja states that we have plenty of resubmissions and people to help you with your grant application to try and avoid problems or delays in funding.
- Student asks if there is any evidence to support the idea that Departments will cut funding.
  - Stephanie responds that we had a very similar issue with our conference funding. As soon as GSA increased the amounts for students to attend conferences we started seeing departments deny student requests for funds until they had depleted all of their available GSA funding. She states that there are a number of departments that require letters from GSA stating that a student has used all of their GSA money before they will even consider funding a student's travel. GSA's funding was intended to be a supplement to Departmental funding, but has become a replacement funding source in many instances.
  - Student responds that this is the policy in his own department, and another student also confirms the same for his department.
  - Student asks if that is coming from Civil Engineering.
  - Stephanie responds that, generally, the Engineering Departments have plenty of funding available for students. Typically these requests come from Departments in the Humanities.
- Anastasia reiterates the reasoning for not wanting to reinstitute the grammar penalty is to avoid discriminating against non-native speakers, or ESL students who did not go through American school systems. She states that there is often debate about what constitutes a grammar mistake, and different people have different opinions on these issues. She gives the example of ending a sentence with a preposition. These types of problems can lead to long and unnecessary debates in Review Council meetings over minor differences of opinion. She states that the issue should be as long as there is clarity in the application, there should not be a second penalty for grammar. If the sentence structure is so bad that you cannot make sense of an application then it is a clarity problem and would be penalized as such.
  - Student asks about clear and egregious errors, such as "studying relationships to baboons"
  - Anastasia responds that those would be considered typos, and people who make typos still get grants as long as one can make sense of an application. It would be unfairly discriminatory to international students and would be punishing someone twice for the same thing, grammar and clarity at the same time.
  - Student asks if spelling discrepancies such as spelling color with a "u" would constitute a penalty.
  - Anastasia responds that it could if the grammar penalty was in place.
  - Tanja states that she thinks we all understand the implications around this issue.
- Tanja calls for final comments, questions, or clarifications.
- Jen asks to make a final wrap up of the discussion. She states that she is new this year into the position and has implemented a lot of changes to the way things are done. She is working very hard to try and increase the number of applications we receive by improving outreach efforts. She states that she wants to fund more applications, which is why she is in favor of keeping the amounts at their current levels. She worries that by raising the amounts we would end up lowering the amount of funding available for students who submit stellar applications, or lowering the number of grants that would be able to be funded overall. As to the grammar point, she states that when Review Councils read the applications there are about 40 points that they go through during discussion, and clarity is one of them. If the applicant clearly states the project and the purposes of their research so that it is understood by the reviewers, then the committee is not going to judge based on the grammatical structure of the sentences. Whether or not a sentence ends in a preposition is not relevant. They just want to know if they can understand the research project based on the abstract. Penalizing for grammar would be redundant and she doesn't feel it would be fair to double punish students for simple typo issues. Jen states that she fully supports the idea of a Services Committee. She thinks it would be beneficial to have a body in place to look at policies rather than have to ask students every year to sit on ad hoc committees whenever issues arise. However, she feels it should be a GSA-wide committee and cover all policies, not just MDRF. Lastly, she wants people to know that she is spending as much money as possible. She was told there was an overage and she has been working to fund as many applications as she can. She is

going to do that by changing the application system to an electronic version, sending out emails after each grant cycle to advertise who was awarded grants, she is better advertising the grant deadlines and workshop dates to make people more aware of the funding that is available, and she is increasing the number of workshops offered before each grant deadline from two to four. She wants people to know that she personally reads every application and is willing to meet with any student one on one before the deadline to review and make suggestions on their grant application. She wants to spend all of the overage money and wants to give it to as many students as possible. She states that she is thankful for the opportunity to have the Senate see her, hear her opinions and the things she is already doing to improve MDRF, and to better understand the GSA's reasoning behind the suggestions proposed tonight.

- Stephanie asks Jen to elaborate on the electronic application system.
- Jen replies that in the last cycle the Review Councils rejected 13 applications and half of those were simply because they were not complete applications. The major point with a teaching grant is that you have to follow the instructions, and if you follow the instructions then you will be funded. Therefore, by switching to an electronic submission process students will not have the ability to submit an incomplete application, which also will in turn lead to additional funding being awarded. She states that this system should also help alleviate a lot of the inconveniences we have heard about in relation to the submission of the grant applications themselves.
- Motion to close the discussion and table the vote until the December Senate meeting
  - Motion: Transnational Studies
  - Second: Library and Information Studies
  - Oppose: 0; Abstain: 0; Passes by consent
- Tanja asks everyone to think about all of the information presented tonight and to go back and present the information to all of the members of your clubs, then come back next month prepared to take the final vote on all of these recommendations.
- Student asks if they will be able to re-open the discussion at the December Senate meeting.
  - Tanja responds that the Senate can vote to re-open discussion if they so choose.

#### 8. New Business

- Club Recognition
  - No clubs to recognize this month
  - The final deadline for new clubs to apply for recognition is Wednesday, November 30<sup>th</sup>.
- Funding Requests
  - Representatives from each of the clubs are asked to give a brief description of their event and answer questions from the Senate. Questions include inquiries about the dates of events, details about event expenses and co-sponsors, and the frequency of publication.

#### Special Activity

- Tango Workshops- Argentine Tango Club
  - Requested/Recommended: \$1,050.00
- Diwali Celebration- GISA
  - Requested/Recommended: \$1,180.00

#### Interdepartmental Activity

- Lasertron Event- Microbiology and Biochemistry
  - Requested/Recommended: \$309.00

#### Scholarly Publication

- Art Graduate Catalogue- Art
  - Requested/Recommended: \$1,500.00
- Chronika- IEMA
  - Requested/Recommended: \$1,300.00
- ABD Journal- Anthropology
  - Requested/Recommended: \$1,400.00
- Motion to approve all funding requests as a block at the recommended amounts
  - Motion: History
  - Second: Community Health & Health Behavior
  - Oppose: 0; Abstain: 0; Passes by consent



- Approval of Election Code
  - Review of Election Code
    - The Election Code was emailed out to all Senators and Alternates before the meeting. The document is reviewed in full with the Senate by Alexandra Agostinelli, the Election Committee Chair, and Connor Walters, Election Committee Member. All changes made to the document are noted for the Senate, specifically 1) Officers must be physically available to serve their entire term, 2) The committee has increased the maximum number of signatures allowed on candidate petitions from any individual department from 8 to 10, 3) The Senate appeals process has been detailed and made more clear, and 4) All of the deadlines and dates were updated accordingly.
  - Review of Code of Conduct
    - The Code of Conduct was emailed out to all Senators and Alternates before the meeting as well. The document is reviewed in full with the Senate.
    - Question is asked about the vagueness of the document and the Election Committee explains that they wanted to keep this document vague in order to keep things subjective and give them the power to judge cases on an individual basis.
    - Question is asked whether or not this Code of Conduct could later be used as a cause for action against a sitting officer and the Election Committee states that this document is just being created to enforce regulations on behavior during campaigning and elections.
  - Motion to approve the Election Code and the Code of Conduct
    - Motion: Library & Information Studies
    - Second: Economics
    - Oppose: 0; Abstain: 1; Passes by consent
  - We need a new Election Committee Member
    - Call for volunteers
    - No volunteers from the Senate, so we will call for volunteers via the listserv and approve new member(s) at the next Senate meeting.

#### 9. Roll Call and Adjournment

- Motion to Adjourn at 8:15pm
  - Motion: Graduate Indian Student Association
  - Second: Mathematics
  - Oppose: 0; Abstain: 0; Passes by consent