**Senate Meeting Agenda**

Eight Meeting of the Eighteenth Senate – Tuesday October 29th, 2019

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Officer Reports

President – Will Harris

Executive Vice President – Garrett Edmonds

Administrative Vice President – Kenan Mujkanovic

Chief of Staff – Aubrey Kelley

Director of Public Relations – Ashlynn Evans

Director of Academic and Student Affairs – Abbey Norvell

Director of Information Technology – Paul Brosky

Speaker of the Senate – Nathan Terrell

Secretary of the Senate – Brenna Matthews

1. Committee Reports

Academic and Student Affairs –

Campus Improvements – Matt Barr

Legislative Research – Josh Zaczek

Public Relations – Brigid Stakelum

Diversity and Inclusion –

Sustainability – Jillian Kenney

SAVES – Hope Wells

1. Special Orders

University Committee Reports

Judicial Council Report

Guest/Student Speakers



1. Unfinished Business

Resolution 4-19-F Veto

1. New Business
2. Announcements and Adjournment

A close up of a logo

Description automatically generated

To the authors of Resolution 4-19-F and voting members of Senate,

The Executive branch, in a 0-4 vote with 2 abstentions, has issued a veto of resolution 4-19-F. The veto was issued solely on a line item clause. Due to the inability to make a line item veto, resolution 4-19-F has been vetoed in its entirety.

The second whereas clause states the organization violated the non-discrimination clause. The clause used to justify the means for this was outlined in the bylaws pertaining to section 6.3. In section 1.1 of the bylaws; it is stated that the bylaws are subordinate to the constitution.

SGA would like to make this cognoscible in regards that SGA abides by the non-discrimination clause. However, there was no claim brought forth to the organization through the Office of Student Conduct, stating that an organization was discriminatory, or one which explicitly violated any of the following: the WKU Student Code of Conduct, Title IX, Title VI, nor Section 504, or any other section outlined in 1.5.1 of the constitution.

According to the bylaws, a whereas clause is defined as “is/are statement(s) as to why the policy needs to be changed, and end with a.” This resolution did not do so and the proper placement for this would be in the therefore clause, but this was not done. The resolution is not legally valid within the organization as the proper structure and formatting was not followed. In order for the resolution to be legal, the second whereas clause would need to be removed completely, along with others as they serve no purpose in why a policy needs to be changed and are not proper whereas clauses. This resolution is illegitimate and not legal from a legislative standpoint because of this. These changes are quintessential in authoring legislation that is deemed necessary by authors to take action. However, the time and effort were not put into the writing of the resolution to do so, voiding the resolution in its entirety.

Furthermore, the vote of the bill was not discussed completely. Discussion was focused on the initial resolution purpose clause and did not dive into the issue of funding for the organization. To objectify this organization for years to come is not the place of SGA and is not the stance we as an organization should take. If there would have been a timeframe on the bill, then it would be considered, but because there was no timeframe, nor was there a claim brought to the attention of leadership within SGA regarding an official claim from the Office of Student conduct, the resolution has been vetoed. It is not the SGA’s place to withhold University funds to an organization that is eligible to apply. This whereas clause is the reason for the veto. SGA cannot and should not ever hinder the ability for an organization to apply for funding. This sets a dangerous precedent, exhibits an environment of malfeasance, and is not the stance of the executive branch. Prima facie, there are no true grounds to justify any action to be taken on any basis.

When the bill is brought to the floor, the executive team encourages more questions to be asked.

\*What research has been done that has been cleared by the Institutional Review Board to constitute such punishment? At the last senate meeting the authors of the resolution claimed that research backing their stance would be presented; however, there was no research presented due to the fact that the study was not conducted through the Institutional Review Board as it is federally mandated.  As the SGA, we represent the Student Body. A resolution sent up with support from SGA is representative of the Student Body at WKU. One cannot say that they have spoken to several students and give no context on the information, it must be quantitative in nature to be the official stance of the student body. The information presented was not sufficient to make an educated decision, especially with the new information presented.

Who have the authors spoken to in the administration? Find out what administrators have said. Comments from one administrator is not a holistic view and is not enough information to come to a complete conclusion, or even know if this resolution will accomplish the goal the authors brought forth the resolution for. A resolution is a statement piece but has the ability to truly make change if the proper resources are used and the proper channels are taken. In this instance, the authors did not do so. Rather the resolution was fueled with vague stories of previous instances and backed with no statistical data to certify the claims, thus indicating a lack of diligence and research. \*

If this resolution is passed, it sets a precedent for the SGA withholding funding from organizations. Ask questions to better understand the resolution as a whole, thoroughly examine and research the previous incidents reported in the resolution, as well as speeches given in debate. Then, come to your own individual conclusion on if those incidents were the same and justify this punishment from an organization that represents all students. If this is passed, then SGA is effectively saying an organization consisting of over 140 students, is not allowed to receive funding from an organization that is supposed to be representative and inclusive. Without working with administration, there will be no opening of an already closed investigation nor will there be any progress. Rather, it would continue the discussion and debate and not work with bringing individuals together.

The following was the vote count:

Yes

None

No

Garrett Edmonds

Kenan Mujkanovic

Ashlynn Evans

Paul Brosky

Abstain

Will Harris

Abbey Norvell

Not Present

Aubrey Kelley

Sincerely,

The Western Kentucky University Student Government Association Executive Cabinet