****

**LSA SG General Meeting**

**October 30th, 2019**

1. Call to Order
2. Opening Roll Call
	1. Brian Wang
	2. Mary McKillop
	3. Nick Bonde
	4. Jordan Schuler
	5. Kevan Casson
	6. Riya Gupta
	7. Danae Diaz
	8. Natalie Suh
	9. Tim Dalrymple
	10. Anna Colvin
	11. Andrew Goldman
	12. Emma Rose
	13. Sai Pamidighantam
	14. Alli Goodsell
	15. Kathryn McCaughey
	16. Jacob Cohen
	17. Josephine Fonger
	18. Tyler Watt
	19. Tyler Ziel
	20. Danica Miller
	21. Natalie Simmons
	22. Danny Hwang
	23. Zach Phillips
	24. Sarah Salino
	25. Sungmin Cho
	26. Sofia Kwon
	27. Gaby Torres
	28. Wyatt Puscas
	29. Sophia Rich
	30. Claudia McLean
	31. Riley List
	32. Joseph Meade
	33. Adam Grimes
	34. Prahar Dave
3. Announcements
	1. Bonde: Social tomorrow at my place!
	2. Goldman: Blood Battle has commenced! Donate blood! Beat Ohio State! We are the better school. Let’s prove it!
	3. Suh: Health event in this office this Friday!
	4. Simmons: Citizens Climate Lobby is having an event next Monday from 6-7 in the Dana!
4. Approval of Agenda
	1. Motion to Approve: McKillop
		* Seconded: Gupta
5. Approval of Previous Minutes
	1. Motion to Approve: Schuler
		* Seconded: Dalrymple
6. Constituents Time
	1. *What is your favorite type of candy?*
7. Guest Speakers
8. Executive Officer Reports
	1. President – Brian Wang (bmwang@umich.edu)
		* Thanks for coming this week! Run in the elections! Talk to anyone in Exec or other Elected Reps! Filing deadline is Sunday at 5pm! You can drop out if you feel uncomfortable too! It is not binding. See what running a campaign and creating a platform is like!
	2. Vice-President – Mary McKillop (marykmck@umich.edu)
		* New office! We will be moved into the Opportunity Hub by January 2nd! We do not have to do anything except move things into boxes. We have a kitchen with a fridge and microwave as well as couches and a coffee table. NO TABLE SYSTEM! We will not have 24 hour access to this office sadly due to safety concerns. 7am to 11pm access is still pretty nice! For guest speakers, we have a full schedule starting on November 13th with the Office of Conflict Resolution. Wolverine Wellness will have a wellness workshop during General. Dean of LSA will be here on January 29th, and the Opportunity Hub will be here January 18th. We are also working on returning the stolen Departmental Award of Excellence. Retreat is this Sunday. If you signed up, please show up! Let me know if you need help with your platforms. It’s a lot of fun, and I encourage anybody to run!
			1. Goldman: Which Wolverine Wellness workshop did you choose?
				1. McKillop: Either the 8 Facets of Well-Being or something about well-being for student leaders.
			2. McCaughey: Did you need help with packing up for the new office?
				1. McKillop: It will take only a couple hours, but feel free to help!
			3. Colvin: How long will the retreat last?
				1. McKillop: There’s a hayride and corn maze. Not sure how long it will take!
	3. Treasurer –Kaitlyn Colyer (kecolyer@umich.edu)
		* McKillop: Current balance is $50,617.48. Halloween events will be reimbursed by next week!
	4. Counsel – Nick Bonde (njudeb@umich.edu)
		* Hi everyone! IRC went well this week. 3 pieces of old business which you have already seen. New business is ballot questions. Be ready to discuss those!
	5. Academic Relations Officer –Jordan Schuler (jordschu@umich.edu)
		* We met with Deans Flint and Tim McKay this week for AAC. We are feeling a little discouraged due to some pushback we received. We talked about AB/IB policies, Foreign Language, and General Learning Center project. During AAC, we had two CSG reps talk about their AB/IB resolution and gave us some good perspective! We worked with Divya and UHS this week too!
			1. Suh: How do you meet with the UHS director?
				1. Schuler: Talk to Divya. She serves on their Student Advisory Board.
	6. External Relations Officer – Kevan Casson (kecasson@umich.edu)
		* COMM went well! COMM is Monday from 5-6! We sent out a bunch of forms this week. I am closing Member of the Month forms by the end of the month. We do not have enough responses. Sweatshirts, windbreakers, and crewnecks will be made. Since they are pricey, we can subsidize some of it but we are creating apparel that is more affordable. Run in the elections! DC email will be sent out next week, so let me know if you want to include something!
			1. Watt: Do we have a date and location for the Forum?
				1. Casson: November 15th. We are thinking about the North Quad room where we held the Gala!
			2. Pamidighantam: How is Member of the Month done?
				1. Casson: We decide at COMM! Who gets the most votes or based on our discretion!
	7. Student Life Relations Officer –Gurliv Chahal (gkc@umich.edu)
		* Colvin: Thanks to all who came to Pumpkinpalooza! SLC was good this week. We got over 100 responses from our survey. We worked on finalizing our survey for SG members regarding joining a group for MDining reform. We also worked on ballot questions. SLC is on Monday from 6-7!
	8. Secretary – Nicolas Pereira (nlpereir@umich.edu)
		* Bonde: I would imagine Nicolas would say go to office hours!
9. Committee Reports
	1. Appointments Committee – Emma Rose (roseemma@umich.edu)
		* Tomorrow is the Halloween Social at 9PM at Bonde’s house. There is a Facebook event. You can find the address in the Social GroupMe. Venmo me for streamers if you want any! @emma-rose-32
	2. Budget Allocations Committee – Danica Miller (dajemill@umich.edu)
		* BAC did not meet this week, and Kathryn helped us advertise at the UgLi for BAC applications! She will also be presenting at CCI Funding Basics. We will be sending emails to the different orgs we presented in front of!
	3. Committee Advocating for Transfer Students – Alli Goodsell (goodsela@umich.edu)
		* CATS went well. We are looking at changing the Bylaws a little bit for CATS. We are trying to get a permanent spot on Transfer Student emails. We are working with Michael to create an event for Transfer Students to meet each other. We also are working with Erica Johnson to add questions to a survey she sends out to Transfer Students
	4. Diversity Affairs Committee – Sai Pamidighantam (ppamidig@umich.edu)
		* This week, DAC had a meeting with the Spectrum Center and the LGBTQ Faculty Alliance. We have decided to move away from our sticker idea and are going towards a marketing push instead. They want to do a Humans of LSA thing with LGBTQ students on campus. We want to have a sticker contest going on around campus to spread support for the LGBTQ community. Divya had a meeting with the International Center and want help creating a brochure for international students. We are still working on our Cultural Night with CSG, which will be on November 18th on the Diag, Be sure to stop by! There is also a Ballot Question regarding the Spectrum Center
10. Task Force and Subcommittee Reports
	1. Health Subcommittee –Natalie Suh (nhsuh@umich.edu)
		* Health was great! Lots of meetings happened this part of the semester. During Healthoween, a menstrual rights committee was also tabling, and they will be presenting at Health next week! Maize and Blue Cupboard is meeting with us next month. We are asking for a meeting to see if they want to speak at General. There is a bonding event next Friday. You can bond some paper together while coloring. It will be a great way to meet others and practice self-wellness techniques. CSG is putting microwaves in the UgLi. We will try to put one in the Perlman Commons here in MATH Complex. We are looking into hosting a yoga class for students. Health is Tuesday from 5-6!
	2. Subcommittee on Technology, Advising, and Academic Resources – Frank Ferrari (frankfer@umich.edu)
		* Torres: STAAR was great. We talked about the amendment that will be talked about in Old Business. Frank and Chayton have a meeting with the Opportunity Hub in November. Let them know if you want them to ask the Hub anything! Come to STAAR!
			1. Dave: Did you know that I am starting I am starting a project on the Spanish Placement Exam?
				1. Torres: I did!
	3. Taking Responsibility for the Earth and Environment Subcommittee – Tim Dalrymple (tjamesd@umich.edu)
		* Last Saturday was the river cleanup! We rescued a Spin scooter that was thrown into the river. That way, our constituents can use them again. We worked on ballot questions, and we are setting up a meeting with the Office of Campus Sustainability.
11. Individual Representative Reports
12. Tim Dalrymple
	1. Hi again! Tim ran last Fall and is up for re-election. His platform was centered around sustainability issues around campus, specifically supporting carbon neutrality efforts around campus and in SG. We are finally gaining traction on sustainability in the dining halls. The other part of Tim’s platform was revolved around DEI. He has been focusing on other initiatives in TREES. Even within sustainability, intersectionality in the environment has an important linkage. Moving forward, Tim hopes to make this a bigger focus. Running last Fall, Tim did not expect to win. He did not have high expectations. He went right into it, and he is very grateful that everyone in SG was supportive of Tim. It may be intimidating, but it’s ok to push yourself.
13. Kathryn McCaughey
	1. Hi everyone! Anyone should post under Announcements what projects what they are working on. Kathryn’s main platform points revolved around security. Kathryn has been working with DPSS to work on giving all-hours access to different LSA buildings on campus. We also want to work with them on promoting DPSS through out social media. Kathryn wants to make sure her projects have a student demand. In terms of outreach, the best way may be through working with CSG and CCI to put advertisements in their newsletter.
14. Appointments, Elections, & Nominations
15. Budget Allocations Committee Recommendations
16. Lambda Theta Alpha: $594.00
17. Mentality Magazine: $1,200.00
	1. Motion to Approve by Acclamation: Goldman
		1. Seconded: McCaughey
18. Old Business
19. A Resolution to Amend Chapter 9 of the Bylaws to Improve STAAR Departmental Awards
	1. Watt: This amendment gives STAAR the flexibility to do something different instead of the Departmental Award of Excellence.
	2. Torres: I think that this is a good idea. Basically, the DAOE is not the best use of funds. It may be a nice thing to do with the departments. However, we can do something different instead of spend too much money on a trophy. It puts a significant chunk in the STAAR budget. We can also ask what departments want to showcase to students on campus! With the amendment, we can have it tabled for another week.
		1. Goldman: I am worried.
			1. Diaz: We want this changed because response rates are low. This is a better way to do it.
	3. Torres: We want to table this so we can be more specific about how we spotlight different departments.
		1. McCaughey: I feel like the purpose of this is not to get rid of the DAOE. It more so lets the STAAR leadership choose to not hand an award out if they do not want to do so. If they gain more of a presence on campus, then they should consider giving it out.
		2. Goldman: This gets rid of the award. If we only get 9 responses again.
		3. McCaughey: The intention is to make it optional. This is seen as a not so legitimate.
		4. Casson: Do you know where you want the spotlight to be at?
			1. Torres: Not sure! We can talk about it at IRC!
		5. Simmons: What are STAAR leadership doing to get more responses?
			1. Torres: Still figuring that out!
				1. Motion to Table for One Week: Suh

Seconded: Cohen

1. A Resolution to Amend Chapters 2 and 5 of the Bylaws to Improve Absence Flexibility
	1. Watt: This amendment addresses how the Secretary can be lenient on how he excuses absences. The culture we built in this government is a friendly one and that we are college students and something can come up and blind side us. This does not change anything that is already in practice!
		1. FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS
			1. Watt: Change the title to “An Amendment”
			2. Casson: Fifth Whereas clause, change the wording to “the duty to record absences falls on the Secretary”
			3. McKillop: Change the rest of the fifth Whereas clause too
				1. “The duty to record absences and determine which absences are excused or unexcused falls on the Secretary”
			4. McKillop: Add “reasonable” to the Bylaw change
		2. UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENTS
		3. Motion to Table for One Week: Goodsell
			1. Seconded: Colvin
2. An Amendment to the Eighteenth Chapter of the Bylaws to Establish an Internal Appeals Process
	1. Wang: We talked about this last General. Feel free to ask questions! We added some things, concerning bias and somewhat defining bias criteria. This is complicated as when you start codifying it, it may be too late to address. We do not want to restrict ourselves heavily. We also wanted the recusal to be clear. If Steering is too biased, it goes right to CSJ. This opens up an opportunity for people to internally solve this. This is new stuff and now we brought it up thanks to the former Elections Directors.
	2. McKillop: We have been really thinking about this since last election. We have discussed this with Nicholas Fadanelli (Shoutout Fadanelli). I believe this is the most fair thing we can do. It is not right that an outside person has to punish a candidate so they can’t participate in SG. This is one of the many Election Code recommendations, so stay tuned for more!
		1. FRIENDLY AMENDMENTS
			1. Puscas: Change wording in the last sentence.
				1. “The appeal decision of the Executive Board or the Steering Committee is final”
			2. McCaughey: Why would we not make this a General Body vote?
				1. Wang: It seemed like the previous Elections Directors that this was the best way to do this.
				2. Bonde: This also helps newer candidates not make a tough decision on someone they may not know.
			3. Watt: Would vice-chairs have a vote if their chairs recuse themselves?
				1. Wang: Nope!
			4. Dave: What is a “problematic ruling from CSJ?”
				1. Wang: CSJ adheres to our Bylaws, nothing more or less. It is not in your advantage to go to CSJ.
			5. Watt: Will Exec or Steering be looking at intent instead of the Bylaws?
				1. Wang: Not really. We want to take all factors into consideration.
			6. Dave: When was the report released?
				1. Wang: Winter 2019 like two days after the election.
			7. Watt: Would the Elections Directors be able to send a report if they cannot make it?
				1. Bonde: I would expect them to!
		2. Motion to Call the Question: Goldman
			1. Seconded: Colvin
				1. Result

MOTION PASSES

1. New Business
2. Fall 2019 Election Ballot Questions
	1. Exec Questions
		1. Table System
			1. Wang: No table system next semester! Since we are not doing it next semester, we want someone else to do it. This will show faculty and administrators that others should do it. We would fund the replacements.
			2. McKillop: For those that may not know, we were not supposed to run the table system. Digital Studies pretty much forced us to do this again. No one has still figured it out. This is disappointing and this should be propose that we ask this because this is important but we cannot practically do this.
		2. Safety Questions
			1. McCaughey: This regards how we can make campus safer (Note from Bonde: Sorry, I ran out for a hot minute)! One of these revolves around seeing if students want alternative bike paths created and the other is about how safe students feel about walking around campus an its surrounding areas!
			2. Schuler: There’s also a risk that if the majority of students don’t agree with a general government consensus, that is the stance we have to take. We usually do non-binding questions so we can record data without having to take a stance.
			3. Simmons: I like the sentiment, but there is nothing we can really do. Creating alternative bike paths is a large and expensive project.
				1. McCaughey: The intention is to work with DPSS, and they have expressed interest in this project. I would like to work with DPSS to start conversation about it.
	2. SLC Questions
		1. TREES
			1. Dalrymple: The first question is about recycling on campus. We want to put similar signs on recycling bins. The second is regarding that town halls regarding the environment and sustainability should be more accessible.
		2. DAC
			1. Simmons: Generally, we think there is a lack of awareness for services provided by the Spectrum Center and how accessible they are by asking the first question. The second question asks how comfortable students are with taking Ann Arbor’s public busing system. We think there is a lack of students who are familiar with The Ride.
				1. Casson: I think that these are good questions, but they made need to be rephrased. They should be given more context.
				2. Dave: I am wary using the ballot questions to advocate or speak on a minority group, like the Spectrum Center.

Simmons: We talked about this. This is DAC, so we attempt to target minority groups. It is difficult to target a minority when we do these Ballot Questions. I understand your concern.

Grimes: The use of the word “comfortable” can be a little confusing.

* + - * 1. McCaughey: How can we be certain that only LGBTQ people participate in the survey?

Simmons: I would hope no one lies about being a member of the LGBTQ community.

McKillop: I think people always could do this, so we always run the risk.

* + - * 1. Rose: We need another option for those that do not identify with the LGBTQ+ community. I also think we need more information on it for the entire student body and not just LGBTQ+ community.
				2. Phillips: I think the second question may be a little “double barreled.” I do not want to say you cannot ask two questions, but it’s tough to get a valid response.
		1. Health
			1. Suh: We want to make UHS services clear since the website is a little vague on details. We now know how to get a hold of UHS executives.
				1. Simmons: I think the neutral response is unnecessary.
	1. AAC Questions
		1. Schuler: These are the questions we are working on. The first on is Adam’s initiative.
		2. Grimes: We are looking through our peer institutions’ data. None of them take off Election Day. Our thought process was to ask if more students would vote if they did not have an exam on Election Day.
		3. Schuler: we did not want to straight up ask if students did not want exams on Election Day. If there is an overwhelming amount of votes, we can do something about it like create legislation! For the second question, we want to see how much difficulty students have with getting their assignments excused due to medical reasons.
			1. Casson: For the second question, did you think about including something about how you get adequate resources from professors to accommodate you?
				1. Schuler: This starts to stray from where the project is at.
			2. Puscas: Is the intent to look at more of the professors’ side? If so, this needs to be emphasized more.
				1. Schuler: We will change the wording!

Motion to Table for One Week: Bonde

Seconded: Simmons

1. Matters Arising
	1. Bonde: There is a social tomorrow! Come to my house and have fun!
	2. Colvin: If you have opinions, go to the committees!
	3. Casson: If you have projects or ideas about communicating, come to COMM!
	4. Meade: I am creating a list for study spaces for freshmen. Please let me know if you want to help!
	5. McKillop: Please go to the retreat if you signed up for it! Give me $7!
	6. Schuler: Did you know that we are working on study spaces in STAAR?
	7. Suh: Health bonding event this Friday
	8. Gupta: Run in the elections!
	9. Simmons: Fill out the survey regarding MDining about vegan and vegetarian options!
	10. Goldman: Venmo @emma-rose-32!
2. Snaps
3. Closing Roll Call
	1. Brian Wang
	2. Mary McKillop
	3. Nick Bonde
	4. Jordan Schuler
	5. Kevan Casson
	6. Riya Gupta
	7. Danae Diaz
	8. Natalie Suh
	9. Tim Dalrymple
	10. Anna Colvin
	11. Andrew Goldman
	12. Emma Rose
	13. Alli Goodsell
	14. Kathryn McCaughey
	15. Josephine Fonger
	16. Tyler Watt
	17. Tyler Ziel
	18. Natalie Simmons
	19. Danny Hwang
	20. Zach Phillips
	21. Sarah Salino
	22. Sungmin Cho
	23. Sofia Kwon
	24. Gaby Torres
	25. Wyatt Puscas
	26. Sophia Rich
	27. Claudia McLean
	28. Riley List
	29. Joseph Meade
	30. Adam Grimes
	31. Prahar Dave
4. Adjournment
	1. Motion to Adjourn: Goldman
		* Seconded: Gupta

**B F2019.04**

**An Amendment to the Ninth Chapter of the Bylaws to Improve STAAR Departmental Awards**

*A bill for the consideration of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts Student Government*

23 October 2019

Sponsored by: Frank Ferrari, Chayton Fivecoat, Tyler Watt, Gabriela Torres, Danae Diaz, Jon Reid

**Whereas,** the mission of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts Student Government (hereafter LSA SG) is to “actively seek the voices of LSA students and advocate their interests to improve academic and non-academic life”;[[1]](#footnote-1) and,

**Whereas,** LSA SG utilizes its Bylaws to structure and facilitate official business, and recognizes the need for amendments to the Bylaws to improve its function and reflect current practices; and,

**Whereas,** the purpose of the Subcommittee on Technology, Advising, and Academic Resources (hereafter STAAR) shall be to improve the general quality of learning environments, technology, advising services, and academic resources for LSA students;[[2]](#footnote-2) and,

**Whereas,** STAAR works in close cooperation with University departments and organizations to improve student access and knowledge of resources that contribute to their academic success; and,

**Whereas,** STAAR runs its meetings and operates as a subcommittee through their bylaws, enumerated in Chapter 9 of the LSA SG Bylaws; and,

**Whereas,** STAAR recognizes departments that have made great contributions to student success through their Departmental Award of Excellence (hereafter DAE); and,

**Whereas,** The STAAR committee realizes both the strengths and weaknesses of the DAE, and desires a greater degree of flexibility in their future work in recognizing outstanding academic units.

**Be it therefore and finally resolved,** that the Bylaws of LSA SG be amended according to Appendix A attached herein.

Appendix A

**Chapter 9**

**Subcommittee on Technology, Advising, and Academic Resources**

9.02.01 **Cooperation.** STAAR ***~~shall~~*** ***may*** work with the LSA Newnan Advising Center, LSA Instructional Support Services, LSA Information and Technology Services, Academic Innovation, the Digital Innovation Greenhouse, the LSA Opportunity Hub, the Science Learning Center, the Sweetland Writing Center, the Language Resource Center, the LSA Testing Accommodation Center, Services for Students with Disabilities, the Math Lab, the Physics Help Room, ***~~and~~*** ***or*** other relevant LSA and University units and resources to improve the general quality of learning environments, technology, advising services, and academic resources.

9.02.0***~~3~~2* LSA Student Government Departmental Award of Excellence.** Each year STAAR ***~~shall~~ may*** present a department within the College with the LSA SG Departmental Award of Excellence (hereafter DAE). The procedures for the DAE are as follows:

1. Questionnaire. STAAR shall draft a questionnaire for the relevant faculty or staff of each department to distribute to their students. The questionnaire should, at minimum, address administrative, advising and teaching practices of the department.
2. Criteria. The award shall be decided based on qualitative responses from students that extol the student’s experience with a department; the quantity of questionnaires answered in support of a department will not be considered as important as the caliber and intent of any single recommendation. ***A department honored with the DAE is not eligible to receive the award again the subsequent year.***
3. Deliberation. All members of STAAR shall be able to vote on the DAE. This award shall be presented to the winning department at a faculty meeting following the vote on behalf of the LSA undergraduates.

***9.02.03 STAAR Department Spotlight. STAAR may opt to recognize exemplary departments within the College on a biweekly or monthly basis, through a social media post, a letter of recognition, or by another method, at the discretion of the STAAR chair. The STAAR chair may opt to pursue this program of regular departmental recognition in place of (or in addition to) the Departmental Award of Excellence, whose process is outlined in 9.02.02.***

**B.F2019.05**

**A Amendment to the Second and Fifth Chapters of the Bylaws to Improve Absence Flexibility**

*A bill for the consideration of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts Student Government*

23 October 2019

Sponsored by: Tyler R. Watt, Nicolas Pereira

**Whereas,** the mission of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts Student Government (hereafter LSA SG) is to “actively seek the voices of LSA students and advocate their interests to improve academic and non-academic life”;[[3]](#footnote-3) and,

**Whereas,** LSA SG utilizes its Bylaws to structure and facilitate official business, and recognizes the need for amendments to the Bylaws to improve its function and reflect current practices; and,

**Whereas,** members of LSA are required to maintain certain attendance requirements as enumerated in The College of Literature, Science and the Arts Student Government Bylaws (hereafter Bylaws); and,

**Whereas,** the culture of LSA SG promotes understanding among its members in order to promote good relations, internally and externally; and,

**Whereas,** the duty to record absences and determine which absences are excused or unexcused falls on the Secretary; and,

**Whereas,** the ability of the Secretary to be lenient in awarding excused absences has yet to be enumerated, though this ability provides an option for the Secretary that encourages members to remain in LSA SG despite other conflicts they may have.

**Be it therefore resolved,** that the Bylaws be amended in accordance with Appendix A; and,

**Be it further resolved,** that the Bylaw amendment be enacted immediately and that the Secretary be moved to consider this policy in all future cases of absences**.**

**Appendix A**

**Chapter 2**

**Meeting Procedures**

**Absence Excuse Procedure**

2.03.00 **Excusing Absences.** Any member wishing to be excused from any General Meeting, Committee Meeting, ***~~or~~*** Office Hour***, or other member obligation,*** must submit a request to the Secretary before the week in which they will be absent. Approval for excused absences shall be the Secretary***’s decision,*** and any contestations shall be discussed ***~~at the~~*** by the Executive Board. ***The Secretary may exercise reasonable leniency with regards to the conflicts that constitute legitimate absences, and the time required to notify the Secretary of an absence before it occurs.***

**Chapter 5**

**Minimum Attendance Requirement**

5.01.02. **Excused Absences.** An absence ***~~is~~*** ***shall be*** excused by one of two methods:

(a) **Government Excused.** The Government may, by a two-thirds vote, excuse a member’s absence for any reason.

(b)**The Secretary.**The Secretary shall excuse absences on behalf of the Government.

(c)**Legitimate Excused Absences.**Although absences may be excused for any reason by the Government, in order for the Secretary to excuse the absence, there must be a legitimate reason as deemed by the Secretary. Absences caused by unavoidable situations such as (but not limited to) exams, work meetings, religious observances can be excused provided that the Secretary knows at least 24 hours in advance. ***The Secretary has the discretion to exercise leniency with regards to the time at which they are notified of an intended absence by a member before the absence occurs.*** It is the responsibility of the member to explain any clarifying issues to the Secretary. If there is a foreseeable absence and it is not brought to the Secretary’s attention in a timely manner, the member shall incur an absence. If there is an unexpected and unforeseeable absence such as a family or health crisis, the Secretary should be informed about these absences as soon as possible so that it may be excused. In cases where a person wishes to appeal an unexcused absence or the Secretary is uncertain about how to treat a certain absence, the Executive Board shall come to a decision on the absence by majority vote.

**B F2019.06**

**An Amendment to the Eighteenth Chapter of the Bylaws to Establish an Internal Appeals Process**

*A bill for the consideration of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts Student Government*

October 23, 2019

Sponsored by: Brian Wang, Mary McKillop, Nicolas Pereira, Gurliv Chahal, Jordan Schuler, Kevan Casson, Kaitlyn Colyer, Nick Bonde, and Lorraine Furtado

**Whereas,** the mission of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts Student Government (hereafter LSA SG) is to “actively seek the voices of LSA students and advocate their interests to improve academic and non-academic life”;[[4]](#footnote-4) and,

**Whereas,** LSA SG utilizes its Bylaws to structure and facilitate official business, and recognizes the need for amendments to the Bylaws to improve its function and reflect current practices; and,

**Whereas,** LSA SG elects representatives twice a year, and an executive ticket once a year; and,

**Whereas,** Election Director Nicholas Fadanelli and Assistant Election Director Nicholas Martire (hereafter the previous Election Directors) issued an extensive report following the Winter 2019 election in which they suggested changes to the current rules regarding elections and campaigning; and,

**Whereas,** referencing recommendation number 3[[5]](#footnote-5), 4[[6]](#footnote-6), and 21[[7]](#footnote-7) in the section labeled “Election Code Issues and Potential Solutions” from the Winter 2019 Election Director Report shows that the previous Election Directors state that an internal review process is necessary, “...because it removes discerning intent from the election directors’ judgement and implements a buffer between LSA SG election code violation punitive decisions and CSJ, which has been known to issue strange and problematic rulings.”[[8]](#footnote-8); and,

**Whereas,** the creation of an Internal Appeals Process for the Fall 2019 semester election is important to introduce before concerning Executive Tickets elections in the Winter 2020 semester; and,

**Whereas,** the creation of an Internal Appeals Process of Election Director decisions on demerits and punishments for candidates and non-candidates would be able to be discussed by the government taking into account the appeals by the candidate and non-candidate, and the circumstances outside the Elections Director’s purview.

**Be it therefore resolved,** an Internal Appeals Process will be created for both candidates and non-candidates to challenge the Election Director’s decision on demerits and/or punishments; and,

**Be it further resolved,** cases starting from the beginning of the Winter 2019 semester will be open to The Internal Appeals Process for Non-Candidates; and,

**Be it further resolved,** LSA SG will ensure that the candidates for the Fall 2019 Election will be made aware of the immediate changes before the campaign period of the Fall 2019 Election; and,

**Be it finally resolved,** LSA SG shall adhere to these Bylaw amendments, and they shall take effect immediately.

**Chapter 18**

**LSA SG Election Code**

**Campaign Period Rules**

18.06.00 **Implication of incumbency.** Only candidates previously elected to LSA SG may use the words "re-elect" or any other words implyingincumbency; however, previously appointed representatives may use the words “retain” or “re-seat.”

18.06.01 **Use of name in advertising.** Any individual in the election who uses the name of any student organization in advertising must secure and retain permission from the appropriate governing board and membership of the organization. Written permission signed by an appropriate official of the organization must be filed with the LSA SG Election Director. Under no circumstances may any individual running for a seat in the LSA SG election use the name of any CSG political party in advertising.

18.06.02 **Openness in campaigning.** All campaign materials must indicate the official source of the piece of campaign material. ***~~No person may campaign and no campaign literature may be posted in any computing site.~~***

***18.06.03 Campaigning in Computing Sites. No person may campaign and no campaign literature may be posted in any computing site.***

18.06.0***~~3~~4*** **Destruction of campaign materials.** No person under the jurisdiction of this election code shall, during the election campaign, engage in the destruction, defacement, removal, alteration, or transportation of posted campaign materials without the permission of the candidate they pertain to.

18.06.0***~~4~~5*** **Posting**. Campaign materials may be affixed or anchored to various surfaces in the following manner:

a) Rope, twine, or string may be used on any surface.

b) Thumbtacks and staples may be used on bulletin boards but not on any other wooden surfaces.

c) Masking tape or blue painter’s tape may be used on any surface.

d) Vinyl plastic bumper sticker material may be used on non-wooden surfaces.

e) No other adhesive or anchoring material may be used under any other circumstances.

f) Candidates must adhere to University policies as to the posting of posters and handbills.

18.06.0***~~5~~6*** **Prohibited Areas.**

a) No campaign materials shall be affixed to any glass or painted surface in or on any University building, except in designated posting areas.

b) There is no campaigning in the LSA SG Office or during LSA SG General Meetings.

18.06.07 **Defacement.** No campaign material shall be affixed to any surface that would be permanently and seriously damaged by the campaign material or the material used to affix or attach the campaign material.

18.06.08 **Rights of Access.** Candidates for LSA SG Representative, LSA SG President, LSA SG Vice-President, any other LSA sponsored election or seekers for any LSA referendum petition, shall have the same rights as any candidate for elected office as per University Housing’s guidelines.Any candidate campaigning within any housing unit after 12 AM will be guilty of a minor violation. University Housing must grant or deny the same rights of access to all candidates running in the election.

18.06.09 **Proper Use of Email Privileges.** A candidate can only send emails to email groups that are owned by the candidate as defined by “mcommunity.umich.edu.” and are created expressly for campaign purposes, during the current election cycle. The email group name must clearly indicate that it is a campaign related email group. Candidates and campaign volunteers are prohibited from harvesting student email addresses for campaign purposes.

18.06.10 **Campaign Finance Regulations.**

a) Candidates for Representative shall be allowed to spend up to $50 on their campaign. The Presidential and Vice Presidential Slate shall be allowed to spend up to $250 for their campaign.

b) Prohibited Donors. Any non-candidate is forbidden from donating to campaigns.

c) Report of Expenditures. The Election Director will be responsible for ensuring that candidates report their spending. The Election Director shall have discretion over the mechanism in which they require candidate expenditure reports.

**Voting Period Rules**

18.07.00 **Termination of Campaign period.** At 11:59 PM on the night before the voting period begins, all campaigning shall be terminated. This subsection applies to and includes but is not limited to verbal communication, social networking, texting, email messages, and canvassing in which a candidate promotes, or asks others to promote their candidacy.

18.07.01 **Government promotion.** Candidates may disseminate an approved LSA SG election message sent directly from the Election Director using social networking. Media messages created by candidates may encourage voting in the election but may not mention any particular candidates.

18.07.02 **Speaking.** Every candidate may speak on behalf of the election or answer questions about whether or not a student is running in the election when prompted during the voting period. The candidate may not promote their own candidacy when answering questions pertaining to the election.

**Violations and Penalties**

18.08.00 **Violations of Election Code.** Violations to the Election Code are divided into three categories with varying levels of severity. If a violation is not specifically listed in Section 18.08.01-03, it is up to the discretion of the Election Director to determine the categorization of the violation.

18.08.01 **Minor Violations.** Candidates will receive one demerit for each Minor Violation. Minor violations shall constitute the following:

(a) An unexcused absence from a required event, such as the Candidates Meeting, a General Meeting prior to the election, and/or the Candidates Forum

(b) Posting in a prohibited area, or by a prohibited fashion, as defined in Section 18.06.04-07

(c) Implying an elected incumbency status that a candidate does not have, as defined in Section 18.06.00

(d) Campaigning in any residence hall after 12 AM as stated in Section 18.06.08

(e) Not denoting the official source of campaign material(s) as stated in Section 18.06.02

(f) Violation of Section 18.06.09 with email listservs containing 1-100 members

18.08.02 **Major violations.** Candidates will receive three demerits for each Major Violation. Major violations shall constitute the following:

(a) Destruction of another candidate's campaign materials, as defined in Section 18.06.03

(b) Campaigning during the voting period

(c) Campaign Finance Violation as defined in Section 18.06.10

(d) Deception in advertising, which shall be defined as breaking any of the guidelines for advertising set forth in Section 18.06.00-01

(e) Misrepresentation of Endorsement. Using the name of a student organization that a candidate does not have permission to use Section 18.06.01

(f) Violation of Section 18.06.09 with email listservs containing 101-399 members

(g) Parties: If the Election Director feels that a candidate has explicitly or subtly joined a party, they may reach out to them and ask them to cease and desist all references to this party within 24 hours. If the candidate cannot remove all notices to a party within 24 hours due to extenuating circumstances, they must inform the Election Director. Should the candidate not cease and desist within the designated time, a major violation should be applied.

18.08.03 **Egregious Violations.** Candidates will receive four demerits for each Egregious Violation. Egregious violations shall constitute the following:

(a) Preventing an eligible voter from voting in any manner

(b) Bribery. No candidate may promise or offer compensation, monetary or otherwise, in exchange for vote(s). Campaign pledges shall not constitute violations of this rule. The distribution of campaign material to voters shall not constitute a violation of this rule

(c) Violation of Section 18.06.09 with email listservs containing more than 400 members

18.08.04 **Exclusivity of Campaign Rules.** No single piece of campaign material may violate more than one campaign rule. All campaign rules shall be mutually exclusive. No candidate may be in violation of more than one campaign rule for a single act.

18.08.05 **Interpreting procedures.** In interpreting these procedures, it shall be the policy of LSA SG to encourage the active and free dissemination of materials relating to LSA SG and that all rules shall be construed liberally in favor of free and open communication and debate. The purpose of the rules and regulations regarding student government elections is not to be used as a method to remove candidates from election, but rather to protect the integrity of the election process.

18.08.06. **Extenuating Circumstances.** If an offense is listed under a specific category for Section 18.08.01-03, the Election Director may treat a violation as one that is from a less severe category if there are other circumstances that cause them to believe it should be punished less harshly. The Election Director may not, however, treat a violation from a less serious category as one from a more serious category.

18.08.07 **Charges of Violation.** The Election Director may assign demerits to Candidates. They may also find a student, group of students, or student organization guilty of violations of this election code. Any student, staff, or faculty member at the University of Michigan Ann Arbor may request that the Election Director investigate potential violations. All demerits can be appealed to ***the LSA SG Executive Board or*** CSJ. A CSJ decision is final.

18.08.08 **Penalties for Non-candidates.** Any violator of this election code who is not a candidate shall be subject to a fine of up to $250, possible disqualification from holding a future office in LSA SG or receiving an appointment from LSA SG, as determined by the Election Director or the CSJ. The necessity for a fine shall be determined by CSJ.

18.08.09 Penalties for Student Organizations. Any student organization who violates this election code may face a possible fine of up to $250 or denial of right to request funds from LSA SG for a limited period of time not to exceed one year, as determined by the Election Director or CSJ. The necessity for a fine shall be determined by CSJ.

***18.08.10 Internal Appeals Process for Candidates. Any demerit(s) and/or punishment(s) issued to candidates or Executive Tickets during the campaign period may be appealed to the LSA SG Executive Board, with all conflicted parties on the Executive Board recusing themselves. Examples of conflicted parties include but are not limited to: members who are directly involved with the candidate’s campaign, other candidates who are running in the elections for the same position, and members who have publicly campaigned for the candidate or an opposing candidate. If at least a third of the Executive Board recuse themselves, the process shall follow the procedures listed in 18.08.10 (a). If the Executive Board does not believe all conflicted parties have recused themselves, a decision regarding a candidate’s appeal will not be made until the Executive Board agrees unanimously that all conflicted parties have recused themselves. If any candidate(s) wishes to file an appeal, they must email the Election Director, the LSA SG Executive Board, and the LSA SG Steering Committee within 48 hours of the Election Director’s posted decision but no later than the start of the voting period. Appeals will be discussed when the Executive Board next meets. The Election Director and candidate(s) will be present when the Executive Board discusses the appeal. A two-thirds majority is required to change the initial decision of the Election Director to either fewer demerits and/or a less severe punishment. If there is not a two-thirds majority to change the initial decision of the Elections Director, then the initial decision stands. The Executive Board’s decision can be appealed to CSJ by the candidate and/or the Elections Director.***

***(a) Steering Committee Appeals Process. If at least a third of the Executive Board is either running in the election in question or considered a conflicted party and would have to recuse themselves, then the Steering Committee would make the appeal decision and any conflicted member(s) would have to recuse themselves from the appeal process. The Steering Committee shall be encouraged to converse on possible conflicted parties within the Steering Committee Appeals Process and ask any remaining conflicted parties to recuse themselves. If the Steering Committee does not believe all conflicted parties have recused themselves, a decision regarding a candidate’s appeal will not be made until the Steering Committee agrees unanimously that all conflicted parties have recused themselves. A two-thirds majority is required to amend the initial decision. If there is not a two-thirds majority to change the initial decision of the Election Director, then the initial decision stands. The Steering Committee’s decision can be appealed to CSJ by the candidate and/or the Elections Director***

***(b) Appeals Process for Demerits and/or Violations Issued During the Voting Period. Any demerit(s) and/or punishment(s) issued to candidates during or 12 hours after the voting period may be appealed to CSJ and shall follow the process stated in 18.04.07.***

***18.08.11 Internal Appeals Process for Non-Candidates. Any demerit(s) and/or punishment(s) issued to non-candidates may be appealed to the LSA SG Executive Board, with all conflicted parties on the Executive Board recusing themselves. If at least a third of the Executive Board recuse themselves, the process shall follow the procedures listed in 18.08.10 (a).***

***(a). If any non-candidate(s) wishes to file an appeal, they must email the LSA SG Executive Board and the LSA SG Steering Committee. A non-candidate will have a full academic semester to file an appeal, excluding the Spring and Summer semesters. Appeals will be discussed when the Executive Board next meets. The non-candidate(s) will be present when the Executive Board discusses the appeal and the Election Director’s posted decision. A two-thirds majority is required to change the initial decision of the Election Director to a less severe punishment. If there is not a two-thirds majority to change the initial decision of the Elections Director, then the initial decision stands. The appeal decision of the Executive Board or the Steering Committee is final.***

18.08.***~~10~~12*** **Hearings**. The hearing by CSJ in cases of possible violations shall be in accordance with the Constitution of the Student Government of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts.
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