

February 24

Attendance (7:31) – at quorum

Opening prayer

- Meeting end time – motion to end at 8:30
  - Passes, no abstentions or opposition
- Motion to approve minutes from Feb. 10<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - Passes, no abstentions or opposition
- Officer reports
  - President – material covered later
  - Treasurer – report on rebates and online students
    - See how much money total was misappropriated
    - \$9,700 misappropriated all-together
      - 1 semester for Metro, 1 semester for NCSST, and 3 semesters for nursing
    - Spreadsheet sent out, with the meeting reminder
      - Looking at the chart, with all department funds
    - We have the final enrollment numbers for this semester – 4,867 students paying the activity fee
      - Rebate total: \$68,970
    - Looking at the other chart – breakdown of numbers
  - Academic senator – senate met last week
    - Three proposals passed regarding faculty parental leave
      - Automatic tenure clock extension for candidates with new children
      - One year of paid leave for a new child if the parent is providing more than 50% of the care
      - Ability of tenure and tenure track faculty to go to part-time to care for child
    - These are things that the university does already informally, so it is good to make them formal
  - Secretary – no updates
  - Events
    - Happy hour tomorrow at Brookland Pint
    - Caps game – more info upcoming
  - Lectures – going well
  - Conferences – all the spring money promised away
  - Professional development – jobs conference in the planning stages
    - Email ideas for things you'd like discussed, or a panel presentation on, by March 20<sup>th</sup>
    - Technology and academic software – if you're familiar with it, email Amanda ([75banaki@cua.edu](mailto:75banaki@cua.edu))
    - Publishing panel – where/how to do it, tips and advice – another idea
    - In the past, panels have dealt with comps, jobs outside academia, women in academia, etc.
  - Parliamentarian
    - By-laws were edited on the 22<sup>nd</sup> – what was this?

- Non-substantive – had to do with the Prof. development chair, since that wasn't in the old by-laws
  - Also, adding the dissertation fund grant to the VP duties
  - Also, taking the PR chair off elections committee
- Elections
  - Anyone good with computes? We need to appoint someone to be in charge of elections, since Joe, the PR director, who is in charge of elections, is running for an office.
  - Taking nominations until March 7<sup>th</sup>
  - Sen. Vater volunteers to be the elections person.

#### Old business

- Rebate discussion – we can't really stop discussion, since we need to observe minority rights as well.
  - Sen. Vater – the philosophy senators would like to make a motion to ask the senators from those departments to return the money that was allocated inappropriately.
    - Not as punishment, since it was an honest mistake, but they have no just claim to that money
    - Would like the money to go to conferences
    - This would take into account the money voluntarily given back last meeting.
  - No further rebates that will be withheld, but future rebates will be correct
  - Sen. Przybylski
    - Did Emily ask Dean Jennings about online students paying activity fee?
      - Yes, but with the time it takes for the university to get things done, it might take a semester or two
      - But the nursing grad students should talk to their Dean
      - The nursing grad students pay for activities for the online students, so it makes sense to include them
    - She thinks that giving back almost \$5000 would jeopardize their ability to pay for what they do, which are activities for professional development
    - For next meeting – figure out why the nursing grad students are paying for things like lab simulations, etc., to see if it is something that the university should be paying for
  - Sen. Revollo – from MSPS – what exactly will they need to give up?
    - \$2120 – from previous years
  - Table until next week, so that we can figure out what is going on with nursing
  - The motion is to ask them, not to take it. So can we approve that?
    - If so, we'd send out an e-mail to those senators to ask them, and then could discuss at the next meeting.
  - Now we know the numbers, so now we know how much we're talking about.
  - The money is rebated allocated according to the constitution, so it assumes the money was properly allocated. But the constitution doesn't say that once the money is in the account, no one can touch it.
  - Sen. Brungardt – motion to ask for the money back, so that we can avoid some constitutional crisis
  - Sen. Revollo – different numbers for online students

- 114 students for Fall 2014, from their dean
    - Dominic – he’s run into this before (different numbers from different schools)
  - Physics senator – could they have some plan to give back the money in increments?
    - Can discuss this later, but first vote
  - A vote to ask the senators to give back the money
    - 12 in favor, 3 opposed
  - Do we want to e-mail them tonight? Or wait until next meeting?
    - Start with asking them to give back the money, and go into specifics later
      - Like the possibility of a payment plan
    - Ultimately, it is up to the senators from the schools to give back the money, and when they give it back
    - Motion to include in this email a request to see how the funds that we are asking these schools to give back to include some kind of plan of how they are using or are planning to use the money, so that if giving back the money truly is detrimental to the budget, then we can discuss it
      - Basically, just let us know your financial situation, because our goal isn’t to wreck anyone’s budget
      - Not to pry, but just to see if its being used for things GSA money should be used for
        - Only because the funds were allocated improperly in the first place – we assume in general that schools are using their money appropriately
- Consider whether dissertation scholarship winners should be eligible for conference funds
  - Sen. Powell – yes, it is a separate fund
  - Sen. Brungardt – they should be eligible, since there are separate funds

#### New business

- Future meetings
  - No March 9<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - Moving the next few meetings around:
    - Next meeting scheduled – March 23<sup>rd</sup>. Can we move this meeting to the 16<sup>th</sup>?
      - Yes
    - Move the April 6<sup>th</sup> meeting to March 30<sup>th</sup>?
      - Yes.
  - Last meeting – move to April 13<sup>th</sup> – the party meeting, and swearing in new officers
  - EC also needs 6 meetings – we’ll work on this
- Elections around the 14<sup>th</sup> of March
- Motion to adjourn
  - Passes – meeting adjourned at 8:24