

Inter-Residence Hall Association
Parliament Meeting – Minutes
Memorial Union Campanile Room
13 April 2017 – 7:30 PM

- 1) Call to Order
 - a) Called in at 7:33
- 2) Roll Call
- 3) Approval of the Minutes
 - a) Minutes stand approved
- 4) Adopting the Agenda
- 5) Informational Speakers
 - a) Mohamed Ali - ISU Dining Changes
 - i) *See powerpoint presentation for more details
 - ii) *Minutes borrowed from StuGov presentation
 - iii) 07:02:51 – PROGRAM:
 - iv) 07:05:44 – Ali: Get some food.
 - v) 07:13:39 – Ali: We are looking at meal plans for Dining. Please welcome Scott.
 - vi) 07:14:05 – Scott Bruhn, Exec Chef: We want to increase food quality and offer more. We want to make food from scratch. Second goal was training. The second goal was to have more staff. More chefs at the locations to train, and increase food quality. Food safety assurance manager. They are to manage our food safety. We also have an R+D chef. Some special things that we specifically own. Here we have a machine that makes bagels. Watch the video on the screen there.
 - vii) We are bringing in new equipment as well. Including an extruder. It stuffs food with other food.
 - viii) 07:20:39 – Ali: I want to make fresh food for people. It is better for people.
 - ix) 07:20:55 – James: Friley Windows. Here is what it looks like inside and outside as well. It will have a great view of Lake Laverne. We are looking to have minimal noise during dead and finals week. We are putting up the low-noise things. They are trying to get as much done as possible, as quiet as possible. The loudest that should happen is the backing up of vehicles. Should be a quiet set of two weeks! jrlenz@iastate.edu to arrange a tour!
 - x) 07:25:54 – Jill O’Royle: Exec Director. Friley Windows is the 5th facility. Looking to have it all done on August 1st. The awesome thing about this is that it is within a building. With this facility, we want to add on the traditional stuff, and vegan/vegetarian. Homemade ice cream as well. On this next slide, here is the menu. The area by simple plate is going to be all-day breakfast concept.
 - xi) 07:29:43 – Ali: The place is a little small. The seating is ~340 people or so.
 - xii) 07:30:12 – Patel: Assistant Director. Here to talk retail. May have heard that Subway is bye bye. We are replacing that with our own concept. It will be sandwiches. Side Salads. Deserts. Meats and Cheeses are higher-end meat.

- Vegan and Vegetarian. All sandwiches are customizable. Subway's contract ends at the end of May. Since DoD is self-funded. So any money that we make will go back to the MU. Thursday at 11am is a taste test for folks on the MU Terrace. We are also looking to get a hot drink and cold drink option as well.
- xiii) We are also getting a food truck. We are naming it Dinky's. Upscale walking-taco option.
 - xiv) 07:34:07 – DoD: We are looking for a BoR vote coming up. These plans are something that many others are looking for. Meal Bundles à Express Meals. Transition to an unlimited plan. We are looking for a student engagement manager. They would be in charge of many different events around campus.
 - xv) Another thing we want to do is to work with other companies that we buy from. Bring them on campus to partner and bring stuff to campus.
 - xvi) 07:36:38 – Rutherford: Marketing and Communications for DoR and DoD. Some people on campus have no idea where we do or what we operate. We are looking at a full roll out of a new Logo. We are looking to be easier to find and understand. Bookends and the library. We have contracts with creative agencies. This isn't a literal mark. But it is our working logo.
 - xvii) 07:40:45 – Pellegrino: Improving that student experience and retention for employees?
 - xviii) 07:41:04 – Ali: We have discussed that a lot. My first job was as a dish room. I quit in two days. No one trained me. We are focusing on that. We are working on that. Incentives for the students as well.
 - xix) 07:42:28 – Lenz: Stop by the ESSO so that we can get some input.
 - xx) 07:43:29 – Pellegrino: Thanks for the Bagels.
 - xxi) 07:43:44 – Theisen: With all the changes, is there going to be information for current students?
 - xxii) 07:44:05 – Ali: We have been around to a lot of people on campus. Transitional period as well.
 - xxiii) 07:44:40 – Neely: Special Diet Kitchen?
 - xxiv) 07:44:47 – Ali: Yes. We are looking into that. Don't know when, but we need to go through a lot of new things.
 - xxv) 07:45:09 – Lenz: It's in the plans. We have to follow all the different University procedures to get it approved. This will not be in the fall coming up, but within a year. We will continue to see what we can do right now, and then we will see what else we can do in the future.
 - xxvi) 07:46:25 – Ali: Looking to move the kitchen else wear in order to better accommodate people. Other thing we are doing is to have people make things themselves. We have many many ideas.
 - xxvii) 07:47:38 – Woodruff: Voted on in one week. Vibe on their swing?
 - xxviii) 07:47:51 – Ali: Presentation in February. They liked the savings. They also told us to work with the other reagent universities to make sure that there are cost savings.
 - xxix) 07:48:37 – Freestone: More depth for the major change in dining?

- xxx) 07:48:59 – Ali: Food from scratch. Better customer service. Longer hours. More convenience and flexibility.
- xxxii) 07:50:10 – Freestone: Balance of C-Store and Any-Time?
- xxxiii) 07:50:21 – Ali: Not really sure. I think most will go to anytime dining.
- xxxiv) 07:51:27 – Lee: Looking for more student input on the food?
- xxxv) 07:51:48 – Rutherford: Social media, and email.
- xxxvi) 07:52:52 – Giles: Logo?
- xxxvii) 07:52:55 – Rutherford: They're official ISU pantone colours!
- xxxviii) 07:53:27 – Nixon: Is this a one-time increase?
- xxxviiii) 07:53:37 – Ali: Yes. We are always looking for a 1-4% increase because of inflation.
- xxxix) 07:54:13 – Scheu: They come to IRHA for input.
- xl) 07:54:41 – Ali: We have to fix the system right now. That is why the cost is increasing so.
- xli) 07:56:44 – Gomez: Sustainability. How do the new changes change what Dining is doing with Sustainability. Trays and so forth?
- xlii) 07:57:07 – Ali: Buying more local food. Express food.
- xliiii) 07:57:48 – DoD: We review our practices across the board. We are looking to start off on the right food. Convos meal-bundles are reduced and they are huge sources of plastic. ISU Horticulture farms will continue to be a resource.
- xliv) 07:59:05 – Warmuth: Bundles to Full Time Dining Centers?
- xlv) 07:59:18 – Ali: Yes.
- xlvi) 07:59:20 – Freestone: Clamshells are now cardboard. We are phasing out the green containers.
- xlvii) 07:59:41 – Ali: Phasing out the plastic across.
- xlviii) 08:00:44 – Gallery: Swipe in?
- xliv) 08:00:49 – Ali: Express meals, yes.
- l) 08:01:10 – Scheu: Very nice to have an actual director. Where do you wanna go from here?
- li) 08:01:23 – Ali: Make ISU Dining the best in the nation.
- lii) 08:02:16 – Nixon: Assurances to not increase costs?
- liii) 08:02:27 – Ali: We are trying to increase quality and cost. So they will be cheaper. Food gets cheaper as we make it more and more ourselves.
- b) Maple Colin: Will that just be a dining website redesign?
 - i) Yes, we will be re-designing the dining website
- c) Exec Kay: Will the food truck take express meals or dining dollars?
 - i) We will start with dining dollars
- d) At-Large Tia: How will guest meals translate?
 - i) You can use express meals however you want, whenever you want
- e) WW Dee: How is the Dinkey's food truck going to affect the other food trucks?
 - i) We will be moving the food truck around and see what works best.
 - ii) Jamie: The other trucks on campus are not affiliated with ISU dining
- f) Larch Jackson: Are we changing to fingerprint scanners?

- i) We are still looking into that. Won't happen this coming fall
 - g) Exec Aaron: Would you ever consider putting Dinkey's in CampusTown?
 - i) The food truck has to stay on campus
 - h) Friley Katie: You mentioned about a food safety position? What do you envision that position doing?
 - i) They will work on food safety - checking counters, serving areas, etc.
 - ii) They will also work with how long food is safe, etc.
- 6) General Orders
 - a) Great Bylaw Revision of 2017
 - i) Brown-Green Bylaws
 - (1) Read in by author: BLF Claire
 - (2) []: Move to waive second read
 - (a) Second. No objection.
 - (b) UC. No objections.
 - (3) WW Dee: Motion to amend 3.2.3.1 should say Parliament singular
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) Move to call to question.
 - (i) Second. No objections
 - (ii) UC. No objections.
 - (4) At-Large Tia: Move to call to question.
 - (a) Second. No objections,
 - (b) UC. No objections.
 - (5) Order passes
 - ii) Bright-Green Bylaws
 - (1) At-Large Leyton: Move to consider as read
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (2) At-Large Leyton: Move to waive second read
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) Call to question
 - (i) Second. No objections
 - (ii) UC. No objections
 - (3) At-Large Tia: In 5.1.3.1.4.2 Why did you change it from 2/3 to majority?
 - (a) Exec Wyatt: I thought that the majority of parliament was sufficient to waive second read on a parliament order.
 - (4) Friley Katie: I think waiving second read is a lot more serious than people take it. I think it should be relatively difficult to waive second read.
 - (5) Friley Katie: Move to recall 5.1.3.1.4.2 back to majority.
 - (a) Call to question
 - (i) Second. No objections.
 - (6) At-Large Tia: 7.3.8 wording?
 - (a) Jacob: Beyond was going to be changed to greater than
 - (7) At-Large Tia: Move to change "beyond" to "greater than"

- (a) Second. No objections.
- (8) WW Dee: If we want to add new bylaws, when should we bring that up?
 - (a) Jacob: I would do it during pink bylaws
- (9) Exec Kay: I have an idea for an amendment for 3.2.3.1. Are we wanting to just take off the his/her?
 - (a) Wyatt: Theirs is all inclusive
- (10) At-Large Tia: 12.3.4 you added in Student Government. What was before?
 - (a) Jacob: It just said GSB - was a name change
- (11) Friley Katie: Move to call to question
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) UC. No objections.
- (12) Order passes
- iii) Yellow Bylaws
 - (1) BLF Claire: Move to consider as read
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (2) []: Move to waive second read
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) []: Move to call to question
 - (i) UC. No objections.
 - (3) WW Iason: What is the process for 3.2.1.7?
 - (a) If Pres resigns he/she/they have to provide a transition report
 - (4) At-Large Tia: For the last one, why is it changed from 3 to 4?
 - (a) Wyatt: That was the intent. We just want to change it.
 - (5) Larch Jackson: If you are resigned from office, do you have to abide by the bylaws?
 - (a) Jacob: No, but we can withhold their stipend.
 - (6) Geoffroy Sonya: Is there a format for the written report?
 - (a) Wyatt: Up to the discretion of the person
 - (7) WW Dee: Are you all technically not a part of parliament?
 - (a) Yes, we are the exec council
 - (8) At-Large Tia: What does representative of an affiliated organization mean?
 - (a) Jacob: It used to say President, but we changed it to representative so the President doesn't have to do that.
 - (9) Exec Trey: 3.3.4.7 - was that changed from bills to requests?
 - (a) Jacob: Yes. It just makes it more inclusive
 - (10) Friley Andrew: Request could mean anything?
 - (11) Helser Lucas: Move to call to question.
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) UC. No objections.
 - (12) Bylaws Pass
- iv) Cyan Bylaws

- (1) BLF Claire: Move to consider as read
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) Larch Jackson: If I wanted to delete a bylaws, when should I do that?
 - (i) Wyatt: You can do it in Cyan or Pink
- (2) WW Dee: Move to waive second read
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (i) Call to question
 1. Second. No objections.
 2. UC. No objections.
- (3) WW Dee: Why is this just under the President? I have so-so feelings about one person being able to create cabinet members. Move to amend 3.3.2.9 to add "by themselves and the Vice President"
 - (a) Second. Objection.
 - (b) WW Dee: Why do people object to this?
 - (c) Buchanan Chrissy: I don't think getting two people's consensus is necessary. If our Pres/VP didn't see eye-to-eye, the President should have the power to create a committee.
 - (d) Jacob: Finance can create ad-hoc accounts, but that has to be approved by a bunch of people. Stipends are decided in the budget and not the bylaws.
 - (e) Larch Jackson: I would like to add even more approval. For example, doing an up or down vote by parliament.
 - (f) Friley Andrew: Move to call to question.
 - (i) Second. No objections.
 - (ii) Placard Vote: Amendment fails
- (4) Helser Lucas: I am in agreement with Jackson. I think it should be majority vote of the whole exec council. Would the cabinet members be voting members of exec council?
 - (a) Wyatt: No, they would not have a vote in exec council
- (5) Jacob: The reason why it would lie within the exec council is because generally a President/VP get to establish a cabinet. This would just be a guide to allow us to run our organization better. These cabinet members don't really have the same level of power as officers.
- (6) Friley Andrew: I think there should be some type of oversight.
- (7) Martin Madeline: If the committee or the chair was seen as a conflict of interest or unnecessary would parliament have a say?
 - (a) Wyatt: Right now, no. I guess you could impeach them?
- (8) Exec Aaron: The idea of oversight will just bog things down with bureaucracy. Kay is like an ad-hoc committee member.
- (9) Exec Kay: What I currently do is just show up and give updates. I am just here to service the committee that I have. I have no power.

- (10)WW Dee: In my opinion, an ad-hoc committee does have power. The finance committee could create an account and you can work on projects. I feel like that is a type of power.
- (a) Exec Aaron: You all have to approve that account
- (11)Jacob: I would suggest that we change 7.2.2 to the $\frac{2}{3}$ approval of Parliament rather than Exec Council. That would take care of the money side of things that seems to be an issue right now.
- (12)At-Large Tia: Move to divide the question on this bylaw
- (a) Second. No objections.
- (b) At-Large Tia: Move to call to question
- (i) Second. Objection.
- (ii) Placard Vote: Move into vote
- (iii) Placard Vote: Bylaws passes 22-4-1
- (13)Friley Katie: Change the word “project” to blue and strike word “event” in 3.3.2.10
- (a) Second. No objections.
- (14)WW Dee: Personally I do not think that it is the President’s or any exec members job to plan service projects. This isn’t to say service projects aren't awesome, but this adds a lot to exec’s plate.
- (15)WW Dee: Move to remove 3.3.2.10
- (a) Second. Objection.
- (b) Exec Aaron: As an exec member, I appreciate what Dee is saying. I think we need to have a purpose besides funding things. I think forcing exec members to plan event puts a lot on each exec member and also eats up funds from IRHA. It seems excessive to have every exec member plan a service project.
- (c) At-Large Tia: I see your point, but it doesn’t take a lot of time and commitment to plan a community service project. I am passionate about this and think we should do one per semester.
- (d) Larch Jackson: It might be a bit more work than you think to plan an event. It would be a perfect thing for an ad-hoc cabinet member of committee. Our exec team is already very busy.
- (e) At-Large Tia: I envisioned it as a position and exec kind of shot that down. They wanted to share that responsibility.
- (f) Larch Jackson: I think it is a larger step to have every person have to plan an event than one specific person.
- (g) Wyatt: I would suggest you add a bylaw for all exec members to collectively plan at least 3 events per year.
- (h) Willow Justin: If we switched this from a year to a semester thing would there be consequences if someone didn’t fulfill their duty?
- (i) Wyatt: Currently there is no consequence other than impeachment or removal by the President.

- (i) Helser Araceli: I think this bylaws is really ambiguous. You could plan one event collectively and it doesn't have to include the residence hall community. I think we should stop being so selfish and do some events for the community.
- (j) Buchanan Chrissy: If you guys want to add in something along “must plan x amount of projects per year” I feel like that will land on events committee. The intent of this is to include everyone. If this goes well it could become a position.
- (k) Friley Katie: A service event could be picking up trash outside BLF for like 30 minutes.
- (l) WW Dee: I am personally feeling a little bit disrespected right now. I don't think you needed to disagree with me. You can voice your opinion by voting no on the amendment.
- (m) Martin Madeline: I think the number is good. A lot of people have said they want to get out there what IRHA does. I think this is a good way to show what we can do for the community. The exec members would have knowledge that they have to plan an event in the coming year.
- (n) Exec Kay: I think that if the President does an event that would set a really good precedent for everyone else.
- (o) Exec Aaron: We are only talking about the President right now. If we take this one out, it sets a precedent for everyone else. I love service work. My fear is that we will continue tacking on events. I am not against planning events, but I am against piling more stuff on already busy people. There's also a really cool organization called NRHH that does a lot of service stuff.
- (p) Helser Lucas: This one is saying that the President plans one event. This is on every exec member, right?
 - (i) Wyatt: Yes
 - (ii) Helser Lucas: I would like to keep it one per exec member. That would be like 7 events per year.
- (q) Linden Francis: When you plan an event would that mean you are getting parliament members involved?
 - (i) Wyatt: We would open it to everyone
- (r) Friley Andrew: Move to call to question.
 - (i) Second. No objections.
 - (ii) Placard Vote: Amendment fails
- (16) Friley Andrew: I feel like it should be meaningful for all residence hall students. This could just be a checkbox. We want to do things that actually impact residence halls. Also, I'm not sure what IRHA does?
 - (a) Wyatt: We have a mission statement you can read.
- (17) Larch Jackson: I would much rather just have us create an ad-hoc position. I don't think there is any harm in doing that.

(18)WW Jenna: How does this work for the events director that overlaps years?

(a) Wyatt: Currently they have to do it once per year.

(19)WW Jenna: Move to change it to once per term of office.

(a) Second. No objections.

(20)Helser Lucas: Currently the VP and Pres work together to plan one event. I like how that reads. Could we change it so that each member plans an independent event? (Each person does one, not one overall).

(21)Helser Lucas: Move to add bylaw 3.3.1.5 under all directors so that exec has to plan a minimum of 4 events per session.

(a) Second. Objection.

(b) Exec Trey: There is a President and other members and a section for officers. This could go in either place.

(c) WW Dee: I think this is a good idea. If we add in this proposal and put it under all officers, then exec has to do at least 4 events? Would this be 8 total?

(i) Helser Lucas: This would ensure that exec in total plans at least 4 service events for the session.

(d) Larch Jackson: I would like to propose an amendment to change it from 4 events to 2 events.

(i) Second. Objection.

(ii) Helser Araceli: My worry with having this number as 3 or 4 is that it adds a lot of events. I kind of like the fact that it was ambiguous so we are at least doing 1 thing.

(iii) Larch Jackson: My idea with the amendment would be that there is a minimum and it isn't as ambiguous. You could change this amendment from 3 to 1.

(iv) Helser Lucas: I think the intent of this would be to eventually create a position for service. I would still like to see more than one event per session.

(v) Exec Olivia: The original intent was so we had each committee and President put on an event. We didn't want an ad-hoc committee because NRHH already is a service organization. We didn't want to take away from NRHH, but we would help with these projects.

(vi) Friley Andrew: I think there is a divide between people who think exec does too much or doesn't do enough. Doesn't exec already have a job they are already doing?

1. Exec Logan: The goal is to test interest in doing service events and in the future possibly convert that into a position.

- (vii) WW Dee: If the intent is that each exec member plan their own event, that is too much to put on each person. I think having it be ambiguous is much better.
- (viii) Exec Logan: Someone please call the amendment to question. I would recommend an amendment to change it from session to term.
- (ix) Buchanan Chrissy: Having it be ambiguous could be a really positive thing. Having to plan a bunch of events could constrict what members bring to the table.
- (x) Larch Jackson: Move to call to question.
 - 1. Second. No objections.
 - 2. Placard vote: amendment passes
- (e) Exec Kay: I would suggest that someone propose an amendment to make sure that we are incorporating parliament and residence hall students.
- (f) Helser Araceli: Amendment to change from session to term
 - (i) Second. No objections.
- (g) Helser Lucas[]
- (h) BLF Claire: Move to call to question
 - (i) Second. Objection.
 - (ii) Placard vote: Amendment passes
- (22)At-Large Leyton: Move to divide the question.
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) Move to call to question.
 - (i) Second. No objections.
 - (ii) UC. No objections.
- (23)Helser Lucas: If it's not an issue it is fine. Move on.
- (24)Larch Jackson: Move to strike 3.3.9.5. I think that the Director of Leadership would be better served to devote their time to other things. I think it is a misuse of funds to have a banquet just for us.
 - (a) Jacob: Personally, I don't think that there is anything wrong with planning a banquet. If there is an issue with funds, we can address that with the budget later on.
 - (b) Larch Jackson: If it is a bylaw, I want it to be funded.
 - (c) At-Large Leyton: The event is a leadership recognition event. The event could be very different in the future. We could change the name to a leadership recognition event.
- (25)Larch Jackson: I don't want to have a banquet be required. I still think we should recognize leaders in the residence halls. Move to change "banquet" to "an end-of-the-year recognition event."
 - (a) Second. No objections.
- (26)At-Large Leyton: Move to add word "recognition"
 - (a) Second. No objections.

- (27)Jacob: 4.3.3.4 should say “Events Committee”
- (28)WW Dee: Where do we discuss things that are underlined?
(a) That was just a formatting error
- (29)Helser Lucas: If this is just holding events accountable for events, we should just move on. I don’t think there is an issue with this.
- (30)Jacob: We should change 7.2.2 to say $\frac{2}{3}$ majority approval of parliament. That moves the power back to parliament.
- (31)Helser Lucas: So moved
(a) Second. No objections
- (32)WW Dee: Where do we talk about bylaws that aren’t color-coded?
(a) Wyatt: You can talk about that at any time.
- (33)Buchanan Chrissy: When was this bylaw made and what was the intent?
(a) Wyatt: The intent was so that we have to tell you about things that we purchase from our depreciation account.
- (34)Buchanan Chrissy: If someone would be open to just striking this from the bylaws and the budget, you can do that.
- (35)Exec Trey: The bylaw above this one specifies that expenditures from depreciation have to be approved by parliament or exec.
- (36)WW Dee: Is 7.2.9.2 a new bylaw?
(a) Wyatt: Yes, it holds us more accountable
- (37)Exec Trey: There is nothing anywhere that describes who has a vote on the executive council.
(a) Jacob: I basically removed every single vote from exec council without giving them a single vote. I have a bylaw that I will propose later that will cover that.
- (38)Exec Trey: I find 7.4.2.7 a little weird. I know our CAs work to make sure that residents are academically successful. It seems a little weird to preclude us from funding academic events.
(a) Wyatt: We are against funding academic departments
(b) Jacob: The intent is that academic departments fund their own events and don’t rely on IRHA for funding.
- (39)Exec Trey: I’m not sure this accomplishes it’s intent.
- (40)WW Dee: I am a little confused as to this wording. This is under primary funding. What exactly is this saying?
(a) Wyatt: It is just saying that we can’t fund organizations.
- (41)WW Dee: Why are we precluding NRHH from receiving funding from other organizations?
- (42)Helser Lucas: This doesn’t affect individual events.
- (43)Buchanan Chrissy: Is NRHH the only thing we primarily fund?
(a) Wyatt: Yes
- (44)Helser Lucas: Move to suspend bylaw on debate time
(a) Second. No objections.

- (45)Jacob: The goal of 7.4.3.2 and the bylaws underneath that is that we don't want to fund people's education or fund organizations that only include a very small group of students.
- (46)WW Dee: What is secondary funding?
- (a) Jacob: Bills. Anything that comes through parliament.
- (47)Helser Lucas: Does this affect my previous concern?
- (a) Jacob: No. Not on this bylaw.
- (48)Helser Lucas: My concern would be that if an organization hosted an event that we could no longer lower the cost for residents.
- (a) Jacob: This doesn't pertain to events, just organizations.
- (49)Exec Trey: I disagree with that distinction. Requesting funding for an event is secondary funding. You can't get around that.
- (50)WW Dee: I do think we should distinguish exactly what the definition of primary and secondary funding is.
- (a) Exec Trey: 7.4.1 is a definition already in the bylaws
- (51)Exec Trey: When I transfer funds to pay for something, I transfer money to an organization for them to do an event. We are funding the organization to put on an event.
- (52)Exec Logan: Trey does have a good point. We should delineate that language so that it is more clear for the future.
- (53)Buchanan Chrissy: When groups come to us to ask for money, they are asking for money for a specific event. We should leave it.
- (54)Exec Logan: Trey has to fund the organization. There is not a belief to it. The money has to go to an organization. The wording has to be changed to "an organization." It is a very clear "no"
- (55)Larch Jackson: The organization account is just a medium for the event. The money goes to that event and that is what you are funding.
- (56)Helser Lucas: Can we say in parentheses "does not include events"
- (57)Jacob: This is a lot of good debate. We could strike this and then work on it if this debate comes up in the future. Right now we are working with limited experience with it.
- (58)Helser Lucas: Move to strike 7.4.3.3
- (a) Second. No objections.
- (59)Jacob: 7.6.1.3 should say "2/3"
- (60)WW Iason: Move to amend 7.6.1.3 to 2/3 majority
- (a) Second. No objections.
- (61)Linden Francis: Back to the whole community service projects. I know the exec council does a lot. We should have a bylaw that hold the parliament accountable for attending these projects.
- (62)Jacob: It would probably fall under attendance (6.1). There used to be a bylaw for all parliament members to attend at least 2 events. It is really hard to track attendance at events and enforce that.

- (63) Buchanan Chrissy: In a perfect world, this would be pointless to have. Unfortunately there are no consequences. I want everyone to attend events, but do not think it is necessary to create a bylaw.
- (64) Jacob: I would propose an amendment to 12.3.2 to add “and notification to parliament.”
- (a) WW Iason: So moved.
- (i) Second. No objections.
- (65) Helser Lucas: We could withhold snacks.
- (66) At-Large Leyton: Move to call to question
- (a) Second. No objections.
- (b) UC. No objections.
- (67) Bylaws Pass
- v) Friley Stephanie: Move to recess for 5 minutes
- (1) Second. No objections.
- vi) Pink Bylaws
- (1) BLF Claire: Move to consider as read
- (a) Second. No objections.
- (2) At-Large Leyton: Move to waive second read.
- (a) Second. No objections.
- (b) []: Move to call to question
- (i) Second. No objections.
- (ii) UC. No objections.
- (3) Jacob: The goal of 7.4.3.4 is to allow us to still fund organizations to endorse Student Government candidates.
- (4) Friley Katie: There isn’t really anything in the bylaws to require at-large members and representatives to go to their constituency councils. I think you should have to go talk with your constituents.
- (5) Friley Katie: Move to amend to add bylaw that requires Student Government senators to attend 2 hall council meetings per semester.
- (a) Second. No objection.
- (b) Buchanan Chrissy: Is there anything that says that the at-large members have to attend meetings at different halls?
- (c) StuGov John: We would like to possibly hold town halls at different hall council meetings. I don’t know what standard you all want to hold us to.
- (d) Exec Aaron: I really like the idea of this.
- (e) WW Dee: At-large members are supposed to go to residence hall meeting?
- (i) Yes
- (ii) WW Dee: Doesn’t StuGov represent all residents?
1. Yes, but IRHA senators represent residents
- (f) Helser Lucas: It is important to put a name with a face.
- (g) Larch Jackson: Move to call to question.

- (i) Second. No objections.
- (6) Buchanan Chrissy: Propose an amendment to say that they must visit two different halls so they aren't going to the same hall every time.
- (7) Jacob: I would suggest proposing an amendment that would copy 12.2.1 and 12.2.2 and apply them to StuGov senators.
- (8) Buchanan Chrissy: So moved.
 - (a) Second. No objections.
- (9) WW AJ: Propose a new bylaw for 10.3 to add a grandfather clause for the events director to receive the same stipend both semesters.
- (10) Jacob: Any director will receive the stipend that was apportioned in the fiscal year in which they were appointed through their term.
 - (a) WW AJ: So Moved.
 - (i) Second. Objection.
 - (ii) WW Dee: This current amendment is one of two decisions that parliament could make. We could also put it in the bylaws to notify them as a change. I would prefer we just notify them of potential change.
 - (b) Jacob: That is a good point to bring up. The second semester is sort of up in the air for people. It may be difficult for people to commit to a position if they don't know the stipend. I think this bylaw covers what we intend. We could always change it with a policy in the future.
 - (c) Exec Logan: Putting the events director into a weird situation where their pay is variable is not fair to them.
 - (d) WW Dee: I don't want to be the one person on the other side. I get the vibe that I am the only one going for this. I move to call to question.
 - (i) Second. No objections.
- (11) Exec Olivia: For 3.2.1.4 it says that exec members cannot serve on hall council. Why is that?
 - (a) []: It would be a conflict of interest.
- (12) At-Large Leyton: Move to call to question.
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) UC. No objections.
- vii) Bylaws as a whole
 - (1) Jacob: I talked on how exec council no longer has a vote. Under 3.1 we should add that exec members have one vote on executive council.
 - (a) At-Large Leyton: So Moved
 - (i) Second. No objections.
 - (2) Larch Jackson: I want to change 3.3.2.9 to change "as deemed necessary" to a simple majority vote of "executive council."
 - (a) Second. No objections.
- viii) At-Large Leyton: Move to approve bylaws

- (1) Second. No objections.
 - (2) Placard Vote: Bylaws are approved by $\frac{2}{3}$ majority
- b) Great Budget Revision of 2017
- i) []: Move to consider as read
 - ii) WW Dee: Move to make a friendly amendment to increase res hall week from \$13,000 back to \$15,000.
 - (1) Second. No objections.
 - iii) Geoffroy Sonya: Do we know how much we have spent on res hall week this year?
 - (1) It is very close to \$15,000. Catering is expensive.
 - iv) Exec Logan: I would like someone to make a friendly amendment to change banquet to a leadership recognition event.
 - (1) At-Large Leyton: So Moved
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - v) Larch Jackson: I propose an amendment to lower recognition event budget from \$4,000 to \$3,000.
 - (1) Second. Objection.
 - (2) Exec Olivia: Why are we lowering it?
 - (a) Larch Jackson: I think you could find cheaper ways to recognize residents. You can do it for \$3,000
 - (3) At-Large Leyton: To counter, we are able to do a really good job at recognizing people right now. Recognition is incredibly important for leadership. If we stop doing that and limit it, it makes it very difficult for us to recognize the leaders in our community.
 - (4) Buchanan Chrissy: I think that this event is really super awesome. We also have an organization that wants to help fund it: DoR.
 - (5) Willow Justin: If we have an organization that is willing to fund us, we should take that help. Yes, it is our money, but it is additional money that we otherwise would never see.
 - (6) Helser Lucas: We have already made it so it is not a banquet. We should leave it at \$4,000. If we can make it cheaper for next year, we can cut the budget at that point.
 - (7) BLF Claire: We just changed the name of it because people didn't like the way banquet sounded. If we lower it and they need more money they can always come to parliament to ask for more money.
 - (8) Helser Araceli: We discussed that if we continue to have the DoR funding, that will eventually add up. We have reduced the cost of this event over the past few years. I think we are doing a really good job of recognizing people at this point. I don't think we should reduce that.
 - (9) Helser Araceli: Move to add \$1,000 to leadership development
 - (a) Second. Objection.

- (b) At-Large Leyton: We put \$2,000 back into events so they wouldn't have to come to parliament. We should follow that same principle with leadership to make them autonomous.
- (c) Exec Logan: We came to parliament last time. Instead of having to do that again, this would allow this to be autonomous. If we keep the money under the leadership event it has to be spent appropriately. The reason we are breaking away from the DoR is because we don't have CAs included anymore.
- (d) Exec Kay: We invite hall directors to our event and many CAs. That is not necessarily a huge group, but they are employees.
- (e) Friley Andrew: I feel like there could be some re-arrangement of funds and you guys could still have a great event. Move to call to question.
 - (i) Second. No objections.
 - (ii) Placard vote: Amendment passes
- (10) Exec Trey: Part of the budget is to roughly suggest what should be spent on each event. That is the point of having line items.
- (11) WW Dee: I personally want us to separate those two things.
- (12) WW Dee: move to divide the question
 - (a) Second. Objection
 - (b) At-Large Leyton: This is just delaying things. The majority of us agreed to the previous amendment to move \$1,000.
 - (c) Placard vote: question is not divided
- (13) At-Large Leyton: Move to call to question.
 - (a) Second. No objections.
 - (b) Placard vote: Amendment passes
- vi) Exec Logan: I want to thank you guys for passing that.
- vii) At-Large Leyton: Move to move on from leadership
 - (1) Second. No objections
- viii) Exec Aaron: Propose motion to change "No Frills" to "Regional Business Conference"
 - (1) []: So Moved
 - (a) Second. No objections
- ix) WW Dee: Could we change PR to director of communications? Move to change that.
 - (1) Second. No objections.
- x) Exec Trey: Since leadership development is a discretionary fund, would someone want to make an amendment to add discretionary to the title?
 - (1) WW Dee: So moved
 - (a) Second. No objections.
- xi) NRHH Olivia: We have talked about having more active service events with NRHH. This budget was made before we came up with those ideas.
 - (1) WW Dee: Can you give us the exact numbers?

- (2) NRHH Olivia: \$870 in my discretionary would be great (\$450 to service and \$420 to recognition)
- (3) WW Dee: So Moved
 - (a) Second. Objection.
 - (b) Friley Katie: I don't really understand why you need more money.
 - (c) NRHH Olivia: We are trying to get more people to submit OTMs. This would allow us to incentivize that.
 - (d) BLF Claire: I think it is a great idea to have recognition throughout the year and make it competitive.
 - (e) Helser Lucas: I agree that it is a good thing. Move to call to question.
 - (i) Second. No objections.
- xii) Jacob: Most people who go to Cyclone Cinema are residents.
- xiii) Exec Trey: Student Government also funds them. That has come up in the past as double-dipping, however residents probably get more benefit.
- xiv) Jacob: Personally, I think that a reduction in stipends is a good move. There are a lot of leadership positions that don't get paid on campus. However, without a stipend, some leaders may not be able to serve our community.
- xv) Exec Olivia: NRHH President should be changed to Representative. I also don't understand why their stipend would go down to \$0.
- xvi) Willow Justin: Why isn't there a flat reduction rate?
 - (1) Exec Trey: Finance committee liked a tier system to provide a higher stipend for exec members who have a committee.
- xvii) Willow Justin: Why are we introducing a new tier system? Why are we making it complicated?
 - (1) Wyatt: I don't personally like the tier system. I do think we need to reduce stipends. The tier system is almost unintentionally insulting. For example, several positions without committees work just as many hours, if not more, than exec members with committees.
- xviii) Friley Katie: Back to Olivia's point. No reps get paid to just show up
 - (1) NRHH Olivia: The NRHH rep is actually a position. They do just as much work as other exec members.
 - (2) Friley Katie: I also run Friley Hall councils. I work two nights a week, and we don't get paid to be here.
- xix) WW Dee: The sole reason why we removed the NRHH stipend is because according to our bylaws, NRHH is not a member of our exec board.
 - (1) Exec Aaron: They are a member of our exec board (3.1.2)
- xx) WW Dee: We were presented with the idea of the tier system and we liked it. If no one likes the tier system, we should change it around. Let's move forward and change things if you all want to.
- xxi) Larch Jackson: Move to change NCC, Communications, Events 2, NRHH and InfoTech to \$1,250.

- (1) Second. Objection.
- (2) Buchanan Chrissy: I didn't like the tiers, so I was on board with that. The NRHH representative still is a very important position.
- (3) At-Large Leyton: An NRHH rep would have to hold office hours
 - (a) Wyatt: Technically the bylaws don't specify that
- (4) Exec Trey: I think that the best ultimate system would be that the person's stipend would be directly matched to a person's duties. I thought even all stipends should be equal. I would suggest that you really look at the responsibilities of each position and try to quantify it.
- (5) Exec Logan: I would prefer that we bring all of us down vs. up. That would move everyone down \$500 which would be consistent.
- (6) Exec Logan: I do not believe an NRHH rep needs a stipend. We already fully fund their organization.
- (7) Friley Stephanie: An NRHH rep is here since they are primarily funded by us. That sets a precedent for providing stipends for representatives from any primary funded organization. I think we could give them a line item in their budget to provide a stipend if they so choose.
- (8) Willow Justin: I was going to originally propose an amendment to adjust everyone by the same amount. The point about setting precedent with NRHH is a good point.
- (9) Friley Katie: Is there anyway we could split the vote to vote on all the other directors and then on NRHH separately? I move to do that.
 - (a) Wyatt: Yes
 - (b) Friley Katie: Could you give a discretionary update?
 - (c) Exec Trey: Right now we have \$19,000 that will rollover. We would have about \$91,700 for next year. Discretionary will start out at \$27,000 at the lowest for next year.
 - (d) Second. No objections.
- (10) WW Dee: It kinda seems like nobody is really feeling the 3 tiers. That is cool. How does everyone feel about a 2-tier system?
 - (a) Wyatt: That is the amendment we are on right now
- (11) Exec Aaron: I really like this idea. A lot of what I do you don't see. I go this late often. I meet with people weekly. There is a lot more that we do behind the scenes that you all don't see.
- (12) Buchanan Chrissy: I know that Logan said something about moving all of the stipends down to \$1,000. How do you feel about that?
- (13) Buchanan Chrissy: I move to change it down to \$1,000
 - (a) Second. Objection.
 - (b) Maple Austin: Move to call to question.
 - (i) Second. No objections.
 - (ii) Placard Vote: Amendment passes.
- (14) []: Move to call to question.
 - (a) Second. No objections.

(b) Placard Vote: Amendment passes

(15)Friley Katie: It sounds like the general feel is to maybe put an NRHH stipend in their budget so they can give it out as they wish.

(16)Friley Jordan: We just amended the thing to be \$1,000 and \$1,500.

(17)At-Large Leyton: Move to remove proposed stipend for NRHH at \$1,250, but add \$500 to NRHH discretionary.

(a) Second. Objection.

(b) Exec Olivia: NRHH needs to have a representative here. You all thought I deserved a stipend, but I couldn't get it because I am a CA. In the future, a rep may be eligible for a stipend.

(c) Exec Logan: My perspective is that regardless of who is sent we should zero it out since we are a primary funder.

(d) Larch Jackson: NRHH does a lot of hard work and they do need to be rewarded for that. Putting something in discretionary and hoping that they use it for a stipend doesn't make sense. We should specify it if we want them to have a stipend.

(e) Exec Aaron: I would argue that the NRHH President does even more for IRHA than I do. In the past we all thought they did enough to deserve a stipend. I still think that this person deserves a stipend. They work hard for residents.

(f) Friley Stephanie: I believe we should give NRHH a stipend as a line item in their budget. I move to zero out NRHH Representative under stipends and add a \$500 to a line item for a stipend under the NRHH account.

(i) Second. Objection.

(ii) Larch Jackson: Move to call to question.

1. Second. No objections.

2. Placard vote: Amendment passes

(18)Friley Katie: Move to kill motion

(a) Second. No objections.

xxii) []: Move to call to question to approve budget

(1) Second. No objections

(2) Budget stands approved

7) New Business

a) None

8) Open Forum

a) At-Large Tia: I went to visit my giraffe and I have pictures.

b) WW AJ: It was an honor working with all of you.

c) Helser Araceli: We got our shirts, so thank you!

9) Student Government Report

a) []: We had the same presentation from ISU dining. We confirmed the remaining members of the Executive Cabinet. They were all confirmed by UC.

b) We passed \$40 funding for Ladies in Fitness Training

- c) John: I would encourage you to attend the StuGov Town Hall next week. It will be in the Multicultural Center on Wednesday

10) Officer and Advisor Reports

- a) President
 - i) We still have one meeting left. Please be here next week!
- b) Vice President
 - i) I don't have time to cry now. Thank you guys so much for a great year!
- c) Dave [RESIDENCE]
 - i) Left Early
- d) Pete [RESIDENCE]
 - i) Left Early
- e) Mohamed [DINING]
 - i) Left Early

11) Committee Reports

- a) Events
 - i) Res Hall Week is next week!! Talk it up in your halls!
 - (1) Monday - Cups on Campus
 - (2) Tuesday - NRHH Rockin' Recognition
 - (3) Wednesday - Towers Kickball & Picnic
 - (4) Thursday - Headphone disco
 - (a) Linden Francis: We will be promoting day of silence
 - (5) Friday - Carnival at Richardson Court
 - (6) Saturday - Carrie Lane Crashtacular
- b) Leadership
 - i) Thanks everyone. We are basically done for the year. We will be getting 50 gavels for the leadership retreat next year.
- c) NRHH
 - i) Working on res hall week
- d) Finance
 - i) So far you have spent ~\$27,000 this year. I think you all have done a great job of representing your halls. Thanks for the work on the budget.
- e) NCC
 - i) Olivia here is our NCCIT. You should come talk to her.
- f) CA
 - i) No report
- g) Communications
 - i) We will get res hall posters out tomorrow so we can get them up. This is my last meeting here tonight. Thank you all for this awesome year!
- h) IT
 - i) Read the minutes. They are super long!

12) IRHA Election Results

- a) Jacob: With little fanfare, Scott and Claire are elected.
- b) At-Large are Jackson, Martha, and Shelby

- c) Bye Bye Jacob and Wyatt :(
- 13) Closing Announcements (brought to you by Wyatt)
- a) Dee: Haram-bae reminded us of Res hall week. Harambe week, pls go. For unity. At night. Flier is MIA.
 - b) Leyton: Thanks bruh. Bye Bye Leyton. IRH-bae. Gonna miss y'all :(. Leyton grew (not actually, though he may wish). Passionate and stuff.
 - c) Leyton: Weather. Scary. Wet. Motion to adjourn.
 - i) Meeting adjourned at 1:56am on 4/14/17