

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Senate Meeting Agendas and Minutes,  
2007-Present

ASUM Student Government

---

1-26-2022

### Documents from the January 26, 2022 Meeting of the Associated Students of the University of Montana (ASUM)

University of Montana–Missoula. Associated Students

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/asum\\_minutes](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/asum_minutes)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---



**ASUM SENATE AGENDA  
WEDNESDAY JANUARY 26, 2022  
University Center (UC) – 6:00 P.M.**

**Public Comment Zoom Meeting ID: 941 9891 2038**

**Public Comment Zoom Meeting Link: <https://umontana.zoom.us/j/94198912038>**

**1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

**2. ROLL CALL**

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

- a. COVID-19
  - a. County Trends
  - b. Predicted State Trends
  - c. Instructional Planning Group
  - d. Campus Preparedness Response Group

**6. VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

- a. Committee Assignments
- b. Other

**7. BUSINESS MANAGER'S REPORT**

**Zero Base Carryover: \$266,858.56**  
**S.T.I.P.: \$247,587.21**  
**Special Allocation: \$19,359.04**  
**Travel Allocation: \$48,317.92**  
**Research & Creative Scholarship: \$9,938.24**  
**Contingency Fund: \$60,032.16**  
**Union Emergency: \$6,000.00**

- a. Final Budgeting
- b. Birthdays
- c. Other

## **8. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

## **9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- a. SB61-21/22: Resolution Advocating for Improved Resident Assistant Working Conditions
- b. SB62-21/22: Resolution Striking Article IV, Section 4 (3) (c) of the ASUM Bylaws
- c. SB63-21/22: Resolution Redefining Write-In in Article VII, Section 1 (42) of the ASUM Bylaws
- d. SB64-21/22: Resolution Redefining Third-Party in Article VII, Section 1 (39) of the ASUM Bylaws
- e. SB65-21/22: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 1 of the ASUM Bylaws Clarifying Eligibility for Candidates and Write-In Candidates
- f. SB66-21/22: Resolution Amending Section 14.3.3 of ASUM Fiscal Policy to Increase Travel Rates
- g. SB67-21/22: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 10 of the ASUM Bylaws Generally Revising and Clarifying Election Rules for Referenda and Fees
- h. SB68-21/22: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 2 of the ASUM Bylaws Generally Revising and Clarifying Campaigning Processes
- i. SB69-21/22: Resolution Amending Article I, Section 2 of the ASUM Bylaws to Enforce Transitions of Executives as an Executive Duty

## **10. NEW BUSINESS**

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

**ASUM SENATE MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY JANUARY 26, 2022  
University Center (UC) 225 – 6:00 P.M.**

To view a Zoom recording of this meeting, please click [here](#).

### **1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Meeting Called to Order at 6:00 pm

### **2. ROLL CALL**

Present: President Durnell, Vice President Lock, Business Manager Rinck; Senators Bell, Birdinground, Bowles, Glueckert, Gudmundsson, Hawes, Hawthorne, Heaton, Jolly, Kayne, Kiefer, McKenzie, O'Neill, Shaver, Ververis, Williams.

Excused: Senator Kuney.

See roll call [here](#).

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to Approve the January 19, 2022 Minutes by **Ververis-O'Neill**; UC Called

See the approved minutes [here](#).

### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT

- a. Alex Crisp (Student and Former Resident Assistant): I am speaking in support of your first resolution of the night. I was a RA last semester, but I left the job after writing a letter asking you and other administrators to help RAs. A lot of horrible things happened and happen to RAs, and I do not use the word horrible lightly. I am sure you can look back on memories of when you were freshman living in the dorms and coming out of your room to see an RA outside of another door with two cops- you never really knew what happened in that room, but your RA knew, and they had to deal with that thing. You have heard complaints from RAs plenty of times and you have seen classmates come into class teary eyed and unable to focus because something happened the night before that they cannot talk about. The professor does not call on them out of mercy, because they had to write that email saying they dealt with something they are not allowed to talk about, but something that was bad. Instead of listing off all of those issues, I will instead ask a question to all of you and everyone reading the minutes, including Sarah Swager, my former boss Sandra Curtis, and Seth Bodnar himself: last semester in your job, how many lives did you save? I ask that question because, if you pass this resolution, you will run into an argument with administration and housing where they will say that RA pay has to be justified with the committee meetings, the paperwork, the staff meetings, the desk and office hours, the random programs occurring all the time. I want you to think back to that question. I ask this partially to give you perspective on what RAs do. We all think of RAs as that annoying person who asks you to stop drinking or to be quiet. We all think an RA is a community builder who provides resources, but that is only part of the job. The part of the job that matters to the administrators is the paperwork, making the university look good, the programs and the desk shifts, to justify pay. I want you to think for a second, what is more important? A four hour desk shift or a student having someone like an RA to talk to on a bad night when that RA is the only person they have? Too add one more question, how many lives does an RA have to save to justify their pay? On a personal note, I was paid \$6,025. I will not argue if indentured servitude is a moral form of employment. I want you to assume that I did nothing in my job. As housing might tell you, I was irresponsible. I did not do certain parts of the job, but imagine the extreme, that I did not complete my responsibilities.

In my time as an RA, I recognizably, obviously, and sadly saved two lives at this university. Students whose hearts are beating every day. Was my \$6,025 paycheck worth them if I did nothing else in my job? Think about that when you move forward and vote on this bill, when this bill passes, and when you talk to administration. Do not be distracted by the numbers and justifications. I want you to think about those students, because my numbers are low compared to my former coworkers. My experiences are easy compared to some of theirs. So, think of what it is like to stare at someone in the eyes and listen to them say they do not want to be here anymore, and it is you between them and death. Between them and a bottle of pills in their dorm room that you have to ask if it's there. Between them and the pair of scissors in their closet which you know are there. You have to wonder every night if what you did that one time was enough. Think about the unconscious bodies in the bathrooms and dorms that RAs have to find and try to shake awake, because that is real and a thing you cannot forget. For me and my coworkers, I think we can all agree that these are things we have to live with for the rest of our lives. I want to make sure that in the future, RAs get to live the rest of their lives remembering those, because it is a matter of time if things do not change until it is an RA that says that phrase that they do not want to be here anymore. Before it is an RA that swallows that bottle of pills in their medicine cabinet, before it is an RA that has that incident report written about them that is marked until critical and they do not come back the next day. Thank you.

## 5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

### a. COVID-19

- a. County Trends: There was a recorded daily 344 cases yesterday and a seven day 233 case average a decrease from last week. To include hospitalization data, there are 29 Missoula residents hospitalized and 20 nonresidents hospitalized. The hospitalization numbers do not mean a lot if you don't compare them. At the peak of Delta in October, there were 57 hospitalizations and today we are at 49 hospitalizations with a different seven day average, meaning there are less people currently hospitalized than before, but there are many more cases. This could be the result of increased vaccination rates. 72.05% of the eligible population is currently vaccinated. The hospitalization records do look promising at this time despite how highly transmissible Omicron is.
- b. Predicted State Trends: COVID19.healthdata.org website includes metrics. It is a good source to go to for large scale trends. The peak for Montana is expected to be tomorrow with the data projection, but that is not binding. The peak for other states has been earlier. The conversation about the peak does not necessarily matter here as long as we are above that average threshold and continue masking. I am able to provide KN95 respirators for all of you. It is

voluntary but is CDC recommended. You have to fit them to your face and watch a tutorial to do that correctly. I suggest you put them in a paper bag as needed until the sanitization system is set up in the UC.

- c. Instructional Planning Group: They are no longer requesting assigned seating or attendance reports, which is something that was holding the university back because it was not an effective way to do contact tracing. Classroom spacing was a concern and they assured me that the capacity for seating has not changed at a university level. The headcount is up for last spring, and it is the beginning of classes, so it can seem more claustrophobic. The university assured me they did not do anything differently with spacing. If you have any specific classes where you are sure there are more seats or something is different, please let me know so I can report that because different setups are not allowed to prevent clustering. As far as remote courses, there was more flexibility offered for faculty and it was a faculty decision last semester instead of an administrative position.
    - i. Hawthorne: I had my meeting with Sarah Swager last week and she said another reason the classrooms might feel more claustrophobic is because they are not requiring social distancing, but generally encourage students to space out.
  - d. Campus Preparedness Response Group: There was an emphasis on student mental health and faculty and staff mental health. They noted that Q&I rooms were not full at that time but a few days later they reported that they are full. They also noted that the entire MUS system is noticing similar COVID trends. Larger events are being cancelled across campus. Some faculty data was also announced.
- b. Other
- a. Faculty Cabinet Meeting: on one of the surveys, they put out about COVID. Some of the findings- a lot of the faculty reported that their teaching workload increased substantially, and their service workload did as well. BIPOC faculty in particular noticed this. 95% of faculty experienced a significant worsening in mental health symptoms. A lot of those reasons especially for female faculty was exhaustion from providing emotional support and dependent childcare having to increase. They were also concerned about long term effects like childcare. The university is inclined to see how this data would compare to similar student data so I will look into that.

## 6. VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

- a. Committee Assignments

- a. VP Lock: I recommend that Senators Birdinground and Glueckert be appointed to B&F, Senator Birdinground be appointed to SPA, and Senator Bowles be appointed to Campus Lighting.
- b. Motion by **President Durnell-Ververis** to approve Recommended Committee Assignments; UC Called
  - i. Kiefer: A reminder that there are three open spots on Interview Committee.
- c. Motion by **BM Rinck-Williams** to remove Senator Williams from BOMO; UC Called
- d. Motion by **Williams-Glueckert** to appoint Senator Hawes to BOMO; UC Called
- e. Motion by **Shaver-Hawthorne** to Approve Committee Assignments; UC Called
- b. Other
  - a. None.

## 7. BUSINESS MANAGER'S REPORT

**Zero Base Carryover:** \$286,858.56

**S.T.I.P.:** \$247,587.21

**Special Allocation:** \$19,359.04

**Travel Allocation:** \$48,317.92

**Research & Creative Scholarship:** \$9,938.24

**Contingency Fund:** \$60,032.16

**Union Emergency:** \$6,000.00

- a. Final Budgeting: Big kudos to Gwen and Asher for helping to organize the last minute student group recognition applications that were due Monday at midnight. BOMO saw a large number of groups today and got those forwarded so thanks to the committee. This week I will be holding information sessions for student groups.
  - a. Gudmundsson: Where should we direct student group leaders to find information for information sessions?
  - b. BM Rinck: The links exist on the GrizHub student group leaders page and in an informational document on the ASUM site and a weekly newsletter that goes out from the SGC.
- b. Birthdays
  - a. Secretary Berna ☺
- c. Other
  - a. Resonate's period of sanctions is up on Friday, and I have received no complaints. They looked to be doing very well to encourage masking and seem to be doing better than the UC is doing in general. I will email group

leadership on Friday, and they will be seen as an unconditionally recognized group.

- b. Shaver: Will resonate fall into the deadline for final budgeting?
- c. BM Rinck: Yes, they fall into that time, but they have never sought budgeting before.
- d. McKenzie: How are you keeping track of how student group leaders are attending information sessions?
- e. BM Rinck: I will ask the individuals to put in the Zoom chat what group(s) they are representing. I will double check that all participants have a group accounted for.

## **8. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Senator Bowles**

#### **Relations and Affairs**

The Relations and Affairs committee met on Sunday the 23rd, to discuss nine Resolutions: Resolution Advocating for Improved Resident Assistant Working Conditions, Resolution Amending Section 14.3.3 of ASUM Fiscal Policy to Increase Travel Rates, Resolution Striking Article IV, Section 4(3)(c) of the ASUM Bylaws, Resolution Amending Article I, Section 2 of the ASUM Bylaws to Enforce Transitions of Executives as an Executive Duty, Resolution Amending Article V, Section 10 of the ASUM Bylaws Generally Revising and Clarifying Election Rules for Referenda and Fees, Resolution Amending Article V, Section 1 of the ASUM Bylaws Clarifying Eligibility for Candidates and Write-In Candidates, Resolution Redefining Third-Party in Article VII, Section 1 (39) of the ASUM, Resolution Redefining Write-In in Article VII, Section 1 (42) of the ASUM Bylaws, Resolution Amending Article V, Section 2 of the ASUM Bylaws Generally Revising and Clarifying Campaigning Processes

The first resolution went through a substantial amount of line level edits, and an objection by one committee member before being forwarded to the Senate. The second resolution went through minimal line level edits and zero discussion being forwarded to the Senate. The third resolution went through a fair amount of line level edits being forwarded to the Senate. The fourth resolution went through minimal line level edits, including adding the current executives to the sponsor line, being forwarded to the Senate. The fifth resolution went through almost zero line level edits before being forwarded to the senate. The sixth resolution went through next to no line level edits or discussion being forwarded to the Senate. The seventh resolution went through minimal line level edits but a fix in the title being forwarded to the Senate. The eighth resolution went through a few line level edits including using published instead of printed being forwarded to the Senate. The ninth resolution went through multiple questions and live level edits as well as amendments being forwarded to the Senate.



- a. Ververis (Gen Ed Ad Hoc): We reviewed three possible models and had discussions about the organizations of them and how many credits we wanted in each category: core for classes for every student, pathways for various subjects that are based on GLI themes, and you have to take a category of class in your chosen theme, and breadth classes that cover your math and science requirements and similar items. We are trying to nail down what general categories we want in the pathways and what we want those core classes to be. We will then talk to various campus constituents such as the humanities and sciences department to gain feedback and they will be here in a March meeting to talk to us. We will then take that feedback and condense everything into a plan.
- b. Glueckert (Basic Needs Oversight): Kat touched on how they hired an outreach coordinator and two neighborhood ambassadors, one of which is Senator Kiefer. The Bear Necessities grand opening is next week February 1<sup>st</sup> at noon in the UC. Please show up if you can, I am truly trying to push for Senator involvement here. We really need outreach right now. I am going to offer some incentives for taking part in some of these associated events with gift cards. Kat is getting the budget prepared for us and the Food Pantry's third anniversary is coming up. Kat is the person who founded the food pantry. They are doing a crowd fundraiser for the Food Pantry with a goal of \$3,000.00 to bring more specific food items into the food pantry, especially for those with specific dietary needs. Something I think is super exciting happening next year is that Kat is in communication with someone in the social work department and they will be able to accept a practicum student. The law school pantry shelf is receiving \$500.00 quarterly for the satellite shelf. Spring pantry hours are Tuesday and Thursday 10:00-3:00 pm and now we are offering evening hours from 5:00-7:00 pm, which sounds like they are being utilized quite a bit. There are stickers for the Bear Necessities agency and the Food Pantry available. We are looking to get cookbooks for those who primarily shop at food pantries, so they have more meal options. There is a pit count coming up this week with the event happening tomorrow to help measure homelessness and the pantry is going to be accepting pit counts this upcoming week. Some of our goals include Senate engagement by doing more tabling for basic needs so we continue getting the word out to students.

## **9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- a. SB61-21/22: Resolution Advocating for Improved Resident Assistant Working Conditions
  - a. Authorship (Bowles): Alex Crisp came forward with the issue of RA work four weeks ago and I got started on writing this immediately. We had a long conversation about Alex's experiences, and it was a lot. I had to take a minute at the end of that conversation to breathe because I was unaware of these concerns. It is an issue that definitely needs a lot of attention. This resolution

asks for a lot, but they are all things I hope we can consider basic and reasonable. For instance, the hours of RAs should be clarified more because the main point of our discussion is that the description of the RA position says 20 hours a week, and it is usually far more than that for RAs. This asks for the description to be much more transparent and asks for a pay increase. Pantzer RAs do not get any extra money besides room and board. Alex got paid \$51 every two weeks by being a Jesse RA. It may seem easy to justify that based on the fact that RAs receive room and board, but students have other expenses. This also includes expanding mental health resources for RAs because they go through a lot. I remember on the call with Alex he said it is uncommon for any RA to not have to deal with a suicide of some sort or the risk of one. The clarification of hours and the mental health resources are the two biggest asks here. I plan on meeting with everyone in the send-to line after this meeting to clarify everything with them and further discuss. Let's help out our RAs, thank you.

- b. Motion by **Bowles** to amend footnotes; Ruled Friendly by Author
- c. O'Neill: To Bowles- I know that at other MUS campus there are periods of time RAs are not allowed to leave campus. Is that the situation at UM?
  - i. Bowles: There are times during the holiday's RAs are supposed to be here and they work extra hours that are not fully recorded when they are not recorded.
  - ii. Crisp: On duty nights are counted for three hours of pay. For mandatory time on campus, every RA is assigned one duty night a week Sunday through Thursday where they have to be on campus, and it tends to be pushed toward them being on campus whether they are on specific duty. Those specific duty nights you were specifically not meant to be out of the building. For other mandatory things, we have to pick a duty set of time during a certain holiday and you are essentially on duty for 24hours, and you are not allowed to leave. Contractually, RAs are not allowed to be away from campus more than three weekends a semester, even if you are down the street at a friend's house. There are also duty weekends, all of which are assigned during the third day of training week when you do not yet know your schedule.
  - iii. O'Neill: I appreciate the work and thought Senator Bowles and Alex Crisp put into this. My freshman year my RA noticed I was withdrawing, and I was incredibly suicidal at the time. Had my RA not interfered, I certainly would not still be here. I commend the work and the need before us including the higher pay, but especially the mental

health services. I do not think it is an unreasonable ask at all. As we do talk about this, I encourage everyone vote to pass it.

- d. Motion by **Bell** for a slate- L15 add “to” after RAs, L39 “day” to “days”, L40 add comma after “community building”, L40 correct parenthesis and “occurs” to “occur”, L83 change “reflect” to “revise”; Ruled Friendly by Author
- e. Jolly: To Bowles- I lived in Pantzer last year and my RA for a while was the only RA of the four floors. Do you know how many RAs are needed and how many applicants they get?
  - i. Bowles: I cannot speak on the applicants, but RAs are in charge of up to 52 students on a floor. If they are given extra floors or extra students, I believe they are compensated one-time \$5 per student on different floors.
  - ii. Crisp: If it does not exceed 52 residents, they are not paid extra even if it is another floor. It is hard to fill RA positions. New RAs tend to come up after training or later in the year.
  - iii. Jolly: Do those RAs who start later in the year receive training?
  - iv. Crisp: We all receive training on Moodle before going through the full training, and we can argue if that is effective or not, but the RAs joining late do not receive the general training weeks.
- f. Motion by **Glueckert** to remove apostrophe on L66; Ruled Friendly by Author
- g. Bell: I lived in Craig last year and got to know the RAs well, and half of them quit partway through the semester because of what is involved in their jobs. The few of them that stayed are planning on quitting because nothing changed after last year. I cannot imagine how hard it would be to have so many responsibilities and not be properly compensated. It is so important that we recognize how important those jobs are, especially because they are so hard to fill.
- h. Hawes: Thank you to Senator Bowles for writing this resolution. I have seen the profound tolls taken on my friends who are RAs and I find the lack of compensation and support for RAs to be insane. There is a tremendous demand put on RAs. Requiring that students be responsible for responding to traumatic mental health situations is a huge part of this and it is not fair to students, especially when mental health resources on campus need to be expanded. These students are not compensated to go get therapy, are not trained fully, and do not even have the time given their workload to do so. I strongly encourage everyone to vote yes.
- i. McKenzie: To echo what have been said, I am thankful to Senator Bowles and Alex Crisp. This is a prime example of how to move forward with student concerns as a Senator. When I was a first year college student in Idaho, during

my first semester one of my dormmates committed suicide. That was traumatizing and there was only one RA for that wing, and to imagine what it was like to respond to that is extreme. I voice my full support for this bill. Also, if you search in the UM alerts in your email, I got at least five or six sexual assault related incident emails last semester alone and at least four of them happened in residence halls. One of them included language that said, “behavior involving sexual assault and strangulation of a student on campus in a residence hall”, which is one example of things that RAs have to deal with. I really encourage everyone to vote yes, and I want to put it out there that when sometimes resolutions are just passed and sent out sometimes time goes on without change. I hope that does not happen but if it does, I encourage you all to push back and continue advocating for these changes.

- j. Williams: Thank you Alex for coming forward about your experience, it takes a lot of courage. Thank you to Senator Bowles for your hard work on this resolution. I want to expand on something previously said about students not supposed to work more than 28 hours a week. In a previous position I had I remember working 25 hours a week and multiple students had jobs that exceeded those limits, and the university does not want that because they would then have to provide benefits. If RA hours are being falsely documented, they do not have to provide these benefits. I tried to double check this information on student HR university policy, but the link is not active, so student employees who want to see their policy do not currently have access.
- k. Motion by **President Durnell-BM Rinck** to strike “Director of” in L93; UC Called
- l. President Durnell: I am impressed by this resolution, and I am happy to offer my help for moving this forward. I echo sentiments about making sure this gets followed up on. We have to persist each year to assert our claims and I offer my services after this as well.
- m. Bowles: To clarify something, Alex did a great job at sending this resolution to RAs he knows. A lot of RAs have seen this, and one reached out to me to express their appreciation, and I want to thank Alex for coming in to answer questions and share their experience. If anyone wants to come with me when I meet with the people in the send to line, feel free to reach out to me and specify who you would like to meet with.
- n. ***SB61-21/22 Passed Unanimously.***
  - i. *See the approved resolution [here](#).*
- b. SB62-21/22: Resolution Striking Article IV, Section 4 (3) (c) of the ASUM Bylaws
  - a. Authorship (BM Rinck): This resolution eliminates conflicting deadlines for student group recognition in the Bylaws. One says the fifth academic day of

the Spring semester and the third Friday of the month. This gives student groups an extra weekend to submit forms.

- b. Gudmundsson: This is a helpful clarification in the same spirit as the Bylaws edits, we did this summer.
- c. ***SB62-21/22 Passed Unanimously.***
  - i. *See the approved resolution [here](#).*
- c. SB63-21/22: Resolution Redefining Write-In in Article VII, Section 1 (42) of the ASUM Bylaws
  - a. Authorship (Glueckert): Currently, write-in candidates may be recognized by the Elections Committee, but are bound to follow budgetary and rule requirements. I think this language fits better because they can be recognized but the main difference between a write-in and a specific campaign is their registration on the ballot.
  - b. President Durnell: I think this is an excellent clarification and a later resolution talks a bit more about how write-in candidates fit in with grievance procedures.
  - c. ***SB63-21/22 Passed Unanimously.*** [*Senator Heaton not present for vote.*]
    - i. *See the approved resolution [here](#).*
- d. SB64-21/22: Resolution Redefining Third-Party in Article VII, Section 1 (39) of the ASUM Bylaws
  - a. Authorship (Ververis): This comes out of a conversation during elections last year that was quite lengthy regarding what exactly a third-party is. Senator Glueckert and I did a lot of thinking about how to workshop this language into something more coherent and more pointed. We believe having it so it included an organization, group or party affiliated or not with ASUM encompasses what is meant by third party in accordance with our bylaws.
  - b. Authorship (Glueckert): I remember this discussion from last year and I feel like this is a good definition that truly incorporates what a third party is.
  - c. President Durnell: I think this language is in the best interest of improving the language and this is a step toward further improvement. This is something I agree with, and I consider it a compromise eight months in the making.
  - d. Williams: I fully share in the intent of the resolution to give third-party a more appropriate definition and avoid some of the ambiguities. Even with the revised language, in the whereas clause about social media accounts, does the new definition of third-party adequately reduce the possibility that a social media account that does not accurately represent an individual is resolved here?
    - i. Ververis: I believe it does. All of these things are up to interpretation depending on the year. The reason we wrote that whereas clause is because of the conversation last year. Representing oneself through a

- social media account is complicated and I think this does cover that as long as the intent of one person is there to endorse a candidate.
- ii. Glueckert: Expanding on that, if you have an Instagram and you are running a meme page not representing a whole group, such as a club page, then there is a clearer distinction.
  - iii. Williams: I feel like I could interpret that proposed language where the problem can still arise. Do you interpret that differently?
  - iv. Glueckert: I think the difference in my mind is that a fan account can identify themselves as an individual if they choose to, but they often do not.
- e. O'Neill: If I understand the previous line of questions, I am more amenable to this not objectively and succinctly accomplishing what it is intended to. For the sake of not repeating that last discussion, I would like to see this language change in a productive way, but I am not confident that this does that. There are many extra steps to justify these changes that I am concerned it does not set an objective and consistent standard.
- f. Motion by **Gudmundsson-O'Neill** to add "account" on L44; UC Called; Discussion Called by Williams
- i. Gudmundsson: I feel adding the word account contributes to what we might consider a third account but removes some of that objectivity of social media accounts.
  - ii. Williams: Regardless of anything else, I like the definition of account. I think if the intent of this resolution is to make is so that an account like UM 2024 is not considered a third party, then the definition still would not do that.
  - iii. President Durnell: Generally, what I see with this new language overall, is that it encompasses everything said in the previous thing but takes the pointedness off of social media and generalizes it which I think is important. The hesitancy I am experiencing now is around social media accounts, so I am okay with adding account for a reason to put that ambiguity away. I want to caution the Senate that this language will never have zero ambiguity, because that is something we have witnessed for years. Going on and listing will not improve this language. I would like to try to reel back the conversation and understand that no matter how many hypotheticals we put out, there will always be ambiguity in this language. I am happy to vote for account being added if this will help with that general ambiguity.
  - iv. Hawthorne: To VP Lock- Can you briefly explain what happened last elections season?

1. VP Lock: There was an Instagram page that claimed to represent UM freshman graduating in 2024 and that page endorsed us. A grievance was filed against us, and the Senate decided that grievance was unfounded because they felt that page did not constitute a third party.
- v. Glueckert: Senator Ververis and I did not bring this resolution forward because of any ill intent about something that happened last year. Whatever happened then is in the past. We want to make it an easier definition that can be used to decide on any possible grievances about third-parties. We did not write this because of us wanting to change anything that happened before. We are very friendly to other amendments and making third-party a better definition.
- vi. McKenzie: I am not comfortable with this just reading account because I refer to my own social media as a personal account. I feel like we should specify what we mean by account.
- vii. POI (President Durnell): This is only an account that does not remember an individual member, so by your definition, your account would not be permissible as a third party.
- viii. Gudmundsson: I am inclined to agree, and I feel President Durnell outlined it well because this is going to naturally be ambiguous, and I think the intention here is to provide a catch all with examples. Any discussion in the future using this language will still occur. By adding account, it gives the breadth for those who want the particularity of social media accounts while leaving enough wiggle room about discussing social media here.

1. *Motion Passed with three (3) abstentions.*

- g. Ververis: Going back to what Senator Williams asked earlier, we removed the word appear because a lot of things can appear to not represent an individual. We do not want to base it off an appearance but an actual representation of an individual. This changes the delineation of what Elections Committee has to discuss on a grievance basis based on appearance versus representation. There will always be ambiguity here, but we hope this decreases it.
- h. Motion by **Kiefer-Williams** to amend L45 to add “clearly and obviously”;  
UC Called; Discussion Called by Gudmundsson
  - i. Kiefer: I think this language makes it clearer than the previous appearance language. As someone who runs a multitude of meme pages, you cannot always tell if it is one or multiple people running the account. Something like UM class of 2024- you do not know if one person is running the account unless it is stated somewhere. This will hopefully direct any future discussions of this language.

- ii. Gudmundsson: I called discussion because I wanted to hear the reasoning for the language.
- iii. President Durnell: I think this pulls us back into that appears mode where represent is a truth and when we start to put in these adverbs, we start to focus on these words rather than representation. I feel like that can make this process clearer. Represent shows what we are striving for in seeking truth in these conversations because I feel like this proposed language contradicts the intent of the language change.
- iv. O’Neill: I encourage the motioner to withdraw their motion for those same reasons because adding these adverbs reframes the conversation and issue inappropriately.
- v. *Motion failed with one yes vote and one abstention.*
- i. **SB64-21/22 Passed Unanimously.**
  - i. *See the approved resolution [here](#).*
- e. SB65-21/22: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 1 of the ASUM Bylaws Clarifying Eligibility for Candidates and Write-In Candidates
  - a. Authorship (Glueckert): Some of the changes include removing the Kaimin section because we already moved that language last week. We removed subsections (d) and (e) to take out referenda language so we can put it into its own section, which is a later resolution we will see tonight. This allows write-ins to be subject to grievances. The new definition of write-ins is important to this that we just passed because they have to uphold budgeting and campaigning processes, though there is currently no sort of punishment they can face if they do not uphold these processes. Adding this in would allow write-ins to be subject to some sanctions such as not getting all of your campaigning money back.
  - b. Authorship (Ververis): While those other sanctions are not in the language directly, write-ins can be barred from candidacy. I think it is something worth talking about and Senator Glueckert and I agreed that write-in candidates should be subject to our Bylaws if they are seeking to hold office
  - c. Gudmundsson: Thank you to the authors. I think it is important to amend the current vagueness that leaves write-in candidates in a place where they get the privileges of running but none of the restrictions or responsibilities of a formal candidate. I encourage everyone to vote yes.
  - d. **SB65-21/22 Passed Unanimously.**
    - i. *See the approved resolution [here](#).*
- f. SB66-21/22: Resolution Amending Section 14.3.3 of ASUM Fiscal Policy to Increase Travel Rates
  - a. POI (BM Rinck): This resolution needs to be seen by B&F first per Fiscal Policy.



- b. Motion by **Birdinground-Gudmundsson** to send SB66 to B&F; UC Called
- g. SB67-21/22: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 10 of the ASUM Bylaws Generally Revising and Clarifying Election Rules for Referenda and Fees
  - a. Authorship (Glueckert): Eligibility was taken out of Article V Section 1 which we removed and are hopefully replacing in this new section. Subsection 2 does not have intense changes. Subsection 3 moves the referenda language so it is condensed in one place. I want to clarify- about subsection 4a versus subsection 4c. Subsection 4a seems to contradict the other but ballot referenda include fees. Not all referenda are fees, but all fees are referenda. If you look at the eligibility session, that language is included based on the past endorsement of increases to the sustainability fee. The difference is that the sustainability fee was voted on by the Senate at the time and we could endorse it, which is unlike constitutional referenda changes. Other changes were removal of language to clarify the language in the election section.
  - b. Authorship (Ververis): Last week we said we wanted to consolidate elections to be more understandable. This puts all of the referenda rules in one spot to make that procedure clearer.
  - c. **SB67-21/22 Passed Unanimously.**
    - i. *See the approved resolution [here](#).*
- h. SB68-21/22: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 2 of the ASUM Bylaws Generally Revising and Clarifying Campaigning Processes
  - a. Authorship (Glueckert): This continues to clarify the elections process. This puts the forum and debate into a timeline, so it has to be done at least one week before the General Election and it gets rid of the window lottery as it is unneeded given the change we passed from last week. This increases expenditures for candidates, and we felt that has this has not been changed in a while and because everything is expensive and takes a lot of effort during a campaign was necessary. This also includes language about increasing the expenditures for the primary.
  - b. Authorship (Ververis): This cuts out a lot of unnecessary language due to our previous resolutions.
  - c. Motion by **Ververis** to accept the amendments as shown (track changes); Ruled Friendly by Authors
  - d. Gudmundsson: Thank you to Senator Glueckert for sending out the language version with all accepted proposals- that made it easier to read. Given that at the beginning of this year we legalized other intoxicants for adults beyond alcohol, is it reasonable to include on L456 something about marijuana given its legalization?
  - e. Glueckert: I would be friendly to adding that because it is relevant now due to marijuana legalization in Montana.

- f. Motion by **Gudmundsson-O'Neill** to add “marijuana” on L456; UC Called
- g. Motion by **Bowles** to add a space in authorship line; Ruled Friendly by Authors
- h. O'Neill: I am very appreciative for the work on this resolution and am sympathetic to the intention of increasing the monetary expenditure reimbursement. How did you weigh the potential for a monetary arms race on who can spend up until this point and how that can impact low income students and their ability to campaign at this level?
  - i. Glueckert: That is a great question and something that I did consider. I had talked to some of the Executives about their thoughts of increasing what was used for expenditures. Do I think these rates could have been a lot higher to make elections ore competitive? Yes, I wanted to make this more accessible to people, though \$300 is a lot of money to many, but there is not a whole lot that we can do with increasing reimbursements specifically. I do not know the perfect answer, but I am open to discussing this more, though I would not be in favor of adjusting expenditure reimbursement without talking it over with those who are involved in the monetary ASUM accounts. It is worth noting that people can receive donations.
  - ii. Ververis: I think the 50% reimbursement is fair and allows for a bit more equity in that if you spend \$300, you will likely get \$175 back if they are reasonable expenses.
- i. President Durnell: I support raising the cap for expenditures. I was a campaign manager for one elections team and ran a campaign after that, and what was challenging is that there were 10,000 students we wanted to reach out to to inform them of elections and that is difficult to do with the current rate. There are many small things to consider spending on. One of my goals for the organization is increasing elections engagement. I understand the accessibility concern about students running a campaign, but I am even more concerned about students not knowing about us through elections, so there is a larger question at play. I do not think we should penalize the initiative to increase the cap, but I think we should consider that same initiative as far as accessibility with the reimbursement and other mechanisms.
- j. O'Neill: It should not solely be a candidate team's responsibility to make the student body aware of elections and I would hope that if the goal is to increase the visibility of our elections, we should see that with our entire body.
- k. President Durnell: I completely agree that it is largely the responsibility of M&O and the Elections Committee to establish a plan to engage students. Thinking about the individual candidates- we cannot adequately reach students with \$200, and I can say that with confidence in my own experience.

I can also say that with this increase there would still be a concern with reaching students, but it would be lessened. I am still supportive of the language but appreciate those concerns.

- l. Glueckert: I want to acknowledge that it is very much on ASUM to promote elections, but the way elections tend to get out is competition and engagement between candidate teams. We can go around using as much money as we wanted with ASUM funds, but I do not know if it would be as effective as what the teams do specifically in creating engagement. I think this current language will help raise the entire idea of elections and hopefully turnout elections. ASUM has made strides in making that happen and I hope this is a step in that direction.
- m. Ververis: While this year we have a great M&O committee and hopefully a good Elections Committee, we have to keep in mind that some years there may not be. Allowing more money in the pockets of candidates to increase engagement through that competition, it gets people more interested. I am always more interested in an election when people are pushing out information for me so I can hear about them and in turn ask questions and otherwise.
- n. Kiefer: As someone who also ran a campaign, when you are doing targeted posts on Instagram and Facebook, it is incredibly hard to reach students because they are not tracked specifically. It can take multiple tries to get an ad properly targeted.
- o. Williams: I think some great points were made on both sides of this with candidates having more resources and fueling a more competitive election is valid and the point that we do not want to put that burden on students is also valid. We don't necessarily need one without the other. If we pass this, we should also just know that we will be working our hardest to get the word out about the election. I think the more factors we have toward success of high turnout in an election the better.
- p. Glueckert: It is important for us to increase the amount per candidate team also because of the changing times with us using technology versus poster. Promoting posts on social media is more costly. I was on Elections Committee when it was completely online. Even though these rates are increasing, we did not touch the percentage of what is matched by ASUM.
- q. Williams: Another point I think is worth making is that I do not think the caps that are proposed in the resolution are so high that it would substantially disenfranchise people with fewer resources.
- r. ***SB68-21/22 Passed 17Y-0N-1A.***
  - i. *See the approved resolution [here](#).*

- i. SB69-21/22: Resolution Amending Article I, Section 2 of the ASUM Bylaws to Enforce Transitions of Executives as an Executive Duty
  - a. Authorship (Glueckert): One thing Senator Ververis and I talked about during revising the Elections Bylaws is how it was weird to have transitions within elections because it is more in the purview of the current and incoming Executives. In the past there have been very bad transitions for Executives and to ensure these happen more smoothly, we felt that having it within the duties gives it more concrete language for an Executive duty. The President overseeing this gives someone the authority to ensure these transitions happen.
  - b. Gudmundsson: I want to commend our seated Executives for signing onto this. We have seen you all lead by example before, but it is super commendable for you to sign up for further duties.
  - c. Motion by **O’Neill-President Durnell** to amend L151 to replace “be in charge of” with “manage”; UC Called
  - d. ***SB69-21/22 Passed Unanimously.***
    - i. *See the approved resolution [here](#).*

## 10. NEW BUSINESS

- a. BM Rinck: Resolution Amending Article 14 Section 17 of the ASUM Bylaws; to RA
- b. BM Rinck: Resolution Amending the Name of the Research and Creative Scholarship Committee; to RA
- c. Ververis: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 11 of the ASUM Bylaws Generally Revising and Removing Dilatory Language for Reserved Seats; to RA
- d. Ververis: Resolution Redefining Contribution In-Kind in Article VII, Section 1 (13) of the ASUM Bylaws; to RA
- e. Glueckert: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 2 of the ASUM Bylaws Generally Revising and Clarifying Counting Processes; to RA
- f. Glueckert: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 5 of the ASUM Bylaws Clarifying Suspension of Candidacy Procedures; to RA
- g. Glueckert: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 6 of the ASUM Bylaws Clarifying Grievances and Election Committee’s Duties; to RA
- h. Glueckert: Resolution Amending Article V, Section 7 of the ASUM Bylaws Clarifying the Elections Calendar; to RA

## 11. ADJOURNMENT

- a. Motion to Adjourn by **Hawthorne-O’Neill**; UC Called
- b. Meeting Adjourned at 8:30 pm