



UtahStateUniversity™ STUDENT ASSOCIATION

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING MINUTES

12/4/2017 | 4:00 PM | USUSA Senate Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND THE FIGHT SONG / SCOTSMAN

Approval of minutes: Senator R. Thomas: **Moved** / Senator D. Thomas: **Second** / **Passed**

Senator R. Thomas: **Move to move Unfinished Business ahead of Council Updates** / Senator Wise: **Second** / **Passed**

Senator Dowdle: **Move to move Sophomore Scholarship discussion to New Business** / Senator R. Thomas: **Second** / **Passed**

Senator Dowdle: **Move to move college election debates discussion to New Business** / Senator Wise: **Second** / **Passed**

Officer accountability

PUBLIC FORUM

Utah State University Dance Marathon

VP Todd Brown: [Video presentation on this new event.] It's going to be a dance like normal, but we're asking people to create a page and raise donations instead of charging people for tickets. There is not a required amount, but we want proof that people are trying to fundraise for it. There is a website, and I will include that in the minutes. [<https://events.dancemarathon.com/event/USU2018>]

VP Harms: **Why the name Dance Marathon?**

VP T. Brown: **It's similar to events other universities do. It will be going for 8 hours.**

Senator Wise: **When is it?**

VP T. Brown: **February 2nd.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2018 Election Bylaws [attached as an appendix]

Tim: Just want to begin by opening this up for discussion.

Senator Khasgiwala: In the definitions section, shouldn't "campaign materials" include digital items? Like a video recorded and put on Facebook?

Senator Bess: Maybe we could put a clarification--tangible or digital.

Tim: What if we broadened the definition so it's just campaign materials.

Senator Dowdle: **Motion to suspend parliamentary procedure** / Senator Olson: **Second**

Senator Dowdle: I think we should suspend parli pro because that's what I think.

All: [Chuckles.]

Passed

[Minutes were not taken while parliamentary procedure was suspended]

ASB 2018-02 — "Academic Opportunity Fund Application Revision" [attached as an appendix]

VP Harms: Linda, do we need to actually read the bill again?

Linda: Did you have any changes from last week?

Senator R. Thomas: Just what we voted on last week.

Assistant Johnson: We did the first reading, then there were two changes we voted on.

Linda: It isn't a first reading until you pass it.

VP Harms: We voted on it after changes.

Linda: Then you don't need to read it again.

Senator Olson: **Move to vote on ASB 2018-02 without discussion** / Senator D. Thomas: **Second / Passed**

Vote on ASB 2018-02: Passed unanimously

2018 Election Bylaws (cont'd)

Senator Olson: **Move to suspend parliamentary procedure** / Senator R. Thomas: **Second**

[Minutes were not taken while parliamentary procedure was suspended]

Straw poll: Passed unanimously

NEW BUSINESS

TSC Post Office Discussion

Tim: Just to make you aware, nothing is necessarily imminent, but the Post Office downstairs is struggling financially. We just want to make you aware so you can remind people that we have a post office here

that they can use.

Senator Bess: Is it ok if I have an opposing opinion?

VP Harms: Senator Bess, I think Linda's appointment will be very quick. Do you mind if we let her go?

Linda: It would really affect our international students. The PO boxes are how they get their mail. They are the largest group that would get affected. For all of us, we use the Post Office daily. I would love to hear your opposing view.

VP Harms: I think we should all ship our Amazon purchases here! Problem solved!

Linda: Mostly it's students buying stamps there.

VP Harms: Ah. Well, I did what I could. [Chuckles.]

Senator Bess: I think to some degree this is a national issue. The Post Office has been getting federal funding for years. Financially, I think it's going out. I think the international students are a genuine concern. Maybe we should be looking into how we can offer them a PO box. Students are going to continue sending and receiving mail regardless of whether this office remains in business. Could students still receive mail without a standing clerk? Maybe that's something we could look into at the administration side. In Oklahoma, they have PO boxes with no people there.

Senator Khasgiwala: Two points. One, international students can receive parcels at the Office of Global Engagement. They will send students emails once they receive packages for them. Second, point of clarification: do students pay rent for PO boxes at the TSC?

Linda: I don't know because it's a service to students. They might. The one thing I really appreciate is they will check FedEx, UPS, and the Post Office, and they will find the cheapest way to mail my package from there. It's kind of a combined service for our students.

Senator Khasgiwala: I have used their service. My question is if they are struggling financially, I think the major problem with the financial issue is the rent they are paying to the TSC.

Senator Olson: Do we have any demographics of usage? Numbers? I think if we were knew who was using it it might be easier to find a solution.

Linda: You can request that. They just came to us asking for outreach.

Senator Bess: My other question is what stops an international student from receiving mail at their place of residence?

Senator Khasgiwala: Nothing.

Senator Bess: As far as a PO box, I don't think that's contingent on being an international student. PO boxes are still available in town. I understand that international students may not be able to drive into town. The other question is, if this falls under business services or auxiliaries, could you have the Campus Store accept packages for students?

Linda: Probably not. Like people outside the bookstore?

Senator Bess: Staples does things like that. They contract it and receive mail. I'm just wondering

if the Campus Store could do something similar. Walmart sells stamps.

Linda: They just want us to do some outreach.

Senator Khasgiwala: To Senator Bess's point, all the internationals usually give the Office of Global Engagement's address. It's in safer hands there.

Executive VP Charter

VP Harms: I am just making a small change to the Deans Luncheon. "The Executive Vice President will coordinate and plan the Deans Luncheon." It used to say "every fall semester," and I've now changed it to "during the school year as needed."

Linda: I would change it to breakfast or luncheon. Deans in the past have seen more availability in the morning, as well as "as needed."

VP Harms: It became apparent to me this year that because this year we all have other things going on and we may be doing something in the spring, that clause didn't allow the Dean's Luncheon to be shifted into the Spring.

Senator Bess: Why was it originally fall?

Linda: I didn't know it was written like that. I feel like if we're working on something and you have concerns you'd like to talk to the deans about, you could have a meeting you could all choose. I told Blake to make the definition more broad so you're not limited to the fall. If you need it twice in a semester, you should be able to meet them twice in the semester.

Senator Bess: So the purpose of these luncheons are to discuss something with all the deans? Why are you required to do this?

VP Harms: It's purpose is attached to writing a resolution prior to going to Stater's Council.

Linda: For example, the last couple years they've had a resolution on No Test Week. The deans can give you direction on if they support your initiative and how to work with it. It's gathering support from the deans for whatever you're working on.

VP Harms: Any other discussion points?

Linda: I would just add in the headline, too. Breakfast or lunch.

Senator R. Thomas: **Move to vote on Executive VP Charter Change** / Senator Bess: **Second**

VP Harms: And this is more just a formality, right?

Senator Olson: It has to be approved by EC as well.

Assistant Johnson: Because you sit on both AS and EC.

Senator R. Thomas: Well, ours would have to be approved by EC as well.

Passed

Sophomore Scholarship

Tim: Typically, we've had less applicants than awards to give out. Last year, however, we had 750 applicants and 17 awards to give out. The only current parameters are GPA. What other parameters could we implement?

Senator D. Thomas: I think this is on AwardSpring, yeah? Do we have any control over what can be put on there? Do we have a say in who gets the scholarship? No? Why not? If we can set the parameters, why can't we decide who receives them?

Linda: It's no different than any of our scholarships. Dr. Morales has a group that reviews all scholarships. The problem is now that there are 1,100 students. Other than GPA, we need other parameters.

Senator Olson: I feel like scholarships generally favor the same kind of people all the time. I would like to work on some ways that we can make them more inclusive of people who don't usually get scholarships.

Senator Lieber: Having the parameters be 3.98 is ridiculous. I think a writing component would be great. I think we can do that on AwardSpring.

Senator Bess: With AwardSpring, my question is how is this funded? Student fees?

Tim: I'm not sure.

Senator Bess: I believe this comes out of SILC or USUSA budget, and I wonder why a student fee-funded scholarship completely bypasses us. Compared to AOF, why does this go through us? I think this is a concern we can express to James. If it's coming from student fees, it shouldn't be completely out of our hands. Parameters aren't enough. I understand that AwardSpring makes it convenient. However, I don't like that it's left the USUSA body.

VP Harms: What should we do about that?

Tim: I'll take that back to Linda, Kevin, and James. Find out what options exist.

Senator R. Thomas: Is this scholarship specifically need-based, similar to FAFSA?

Tim: The eligibility is: "Students must have completed at least 24 USU credits but no more than 45 USU credits (credits received in high school will not be used for consideration). The upcoming fall semester must be the student's third or fourth semester at USU, or the student must have completed at least one full academic year at USU as a full-time student. Students must be a full-time student during the semesters for which they will be receiving the scholarship. Full-time student status is considered as having at least 12 current USU credits. These credits may include online classes and/or classes associated with a pass/fail grading option. If you are receiving any full-tuition USU scholarships for the upcoming academic year, you do not qualify for this scholarship."

Senator Wise: The criteria sound vague, so we would want to decide what the scholarship would be. I agree with Senator Olson. We should make this merit-based. What they do in the Honors Department is have students foster relationships with faculty. The students have to have the initiative. If we really want to give this to a student at the university-level who doesn't have the best GPA, maybe by involving a faculty component we could incorporate that.

Senator D. Thomas: This is out of curiosity, but Heather might know the answer. Last year it was 3.98, there were 17 awards, 1,100 people who applied. Were there more than 17 with a 3.98?
Senator Lieber?

Senator Lieber: I can't remember specific numbers, but GPA was never intended to be the parameter for this scholarship. That happened by mistake last year.

Senator D. Thomas: If we make it too specific, not enough people will apply. But if it's too broad and we have people with the same qualifications, how do you pick 17 of the 300?

Senator Lieber: I don't know if there was a minimum GPA before, but I feel like a 3.0 minimum GPA is reasonable. I would be comfortable with that, and requiring that essay. I imagine a lot less people would write an essay.

Senator R. Thomas: Just a thought--maybe if we use a minimum GPA, we should hold them to the same GPA as ourselves: 2.5.

Senator Khasgiwala: I have few points. What is the scholarship amount?

Tim: \$2,000.

Senator Khasgiwala: Second, we can make it, like I sit on enhancement award, very similar to a scholarship, \$4,000 to 20 candidates. We get a certain number of words of essay saying what you have given back to your programs. We also require you to have a letter of recommendation about how you have given back to community from what you have gained from graduate programs. We allow it to be anyone from the community, not your professors. We can look for these ways.

Senator Olson: Grant mentioned this too, but why do we have this scholarship? It's not really tied to SILC because it's for sophomores. I'm all for philanthropy, but not when it's coming from student fees. We're taking money from some students and giving it to other students with good GPAs. Even if we had an essay component. In this case I feel like it's true. I don't see why other students should be paying for these scholarships.

Senator Lieber: I think we should clarify if it is coming from student fees or not. Is all our office coming from student fees? The entire SILC is student fees?

Senator Bess: I think this was a line item on the budget. I agree with Erik. I don't think it should be decided by James and an outside committee, I don't think it should be tied to USUSA. If it's going to be coming out of our fees, the only logical reason to have this scholarship is if we decide it, like AOF. That gives officers a chance to give specific students who are contributing to the student body at large. That way you're creating student leaders. You're giving a scholarship to student leaders on campus who are not necessarily a part of our office. That makes sense to me if those are our parameters. If it's a GPA-based scholarship, it shouldn't be coming from USUSA-funded student fees.

Senator Lieber: I think we've all generally decided it's not going to be a GPA-based thing. We haven't taken a poll, but we all agree that shouldn't be the sole decider. My understanding is that we would be the ones going through essays. That's why it's justified through USUSA. If that's not how it is, I would like to know more about that.

VP Harms: Could we get a response to that?

Tim: Yeah, I'll do some more research. Kevin said to go to AS.

Senator Lieber: I would love to have more information about how it's been done in the past.

Senator Lieber: **Move to table discussion pending more information** / Senator Olson: **Second**

Senator Bess: Point of clarification: Why did the amount of applicants increase last year?

Tim: Because it was on AwardSpring.

Senator Lieber: Because people had to proactively find it before, but now it's all through one application.

Senator D. Thomas: Once you apply for one GPA one, you apply for all GPA ones.

Passed

Senatorial Election Debates

Tim: Let's have a discussion on the idea of holding election debates. Linda threw out the idea about having them the same time as the Statesman Debate. There are some good arguments about why that should not happen. Should we have a debate between senatorial candidates, and how should we organize that if we want that to happen.

Senator R. Thomas: I think it's a great idea, but not at the same time as the Statesman debate. Why should we make students choose between debates?

Senator Lieber: Last year, because I was in the position last year, we played around with the idea. We didn't want to plan a separate event in the evening. What we ended up doing was bringing candidates to the dean's leadership council. As far as having one specific to my college, I don't think it would work.

Senator Olson: I actually disagree with Senator Lieber. I think these can be a good idea, not always. This is something that can be set up in a charter in the future. Our job as an organization should be increasing access to these. Requiring it in a charter could do that.

Senator Lieber: I think it's a good idea to require something like that. I think it's the kind of thing that if you wanted to require it with a leadership meeting within your council. Perhaps during your normal meeting time, but publicized within your colleges. That would make it more worth it in my mind.

Senator Dowdle: Senator Olson, are you talking about our current charters?

Senator Olson: Yes, for when we leave next year. If we do do something like that, for the same reason as Senator R. Thomas.

VP Harms: It sounds like we're all in agreement on not having one during the Statesman debate.

Tim: It sounds like we're all in agreement on the idea that it would be a good idea to have these debates.

Senator Khasgiwala: I am a senator but I don't have a college. I was not involved during the EC debates.

Tim: Do you think it would be helpful to have one for

VP Harms: We're all in agreement?

Senator Lieber: Are we talking individual events or one all together? Did you have one or the other in mind?

Tim: It was more if you thought separate ones would be more beneficial than having an election-sponsored event.

Senator Lieber: Could we do a straw poll on separate events or together?

VP Harms: Do we feel like we've had enough discussion? Great.

Straw poll: Holding a debate together as all colleges: Two in favor, five opposed, one abstention

Senator R. Thomas: This is probably only if the events are specific to colleges, I think this is something more specific to my college who is almost yearly at the risk of having one candidate. It doesn't have to be as much of a debate as a candidate presentation.

Senator Dowdle: There are certain positions that are required to attend EC debates. Does this become a required event during a campaign?

Senator R. Thomas: Technically I don't think that any of them are required.

Senator Olson: I think we're catering to different audiences with different events. I'm going to get a lot more attendance at the engineering building than at the TSC.

Senator D. Thomas: My biggest concern is that I don't see a lot of students in my college attending an event like that. I don't see the need to put one on. As a candidate last year, I would have felt valued in that sense rather than only three people that showed up.

Senator R. Thomas: As much as I am in favor of all the colleges holding their own events, I think it is something to think about with logistics if you have current senators planning their own debates. I don't know if that becomes a problem if you have a high number of senators going for reelection.

Senator Wise: I think that the people who attend are the ones who vote for you. I like what Heather said — integrating it into a body that's already present.

VP Harms: Especially if it's for you for reelection.

Senator Olson: It would be better psychologically if there are a lot of people at your events, but that won't matter if none of them are voting for you. That's my biggest concern.

Senator Bess: Question for the election committee. We have the Statesman debate, Presidents debate, Greek Town Hall, RHA Town Hall... I know Huntsman did theirs in the middle of the day last year. I'm just trying to imagine. I'm already planning on doing this event. But because I like Huntsman's idea, I would like to try this in my college. With what the current schedule is, what time are we looking at?

Senator R. Thomas: I would poll not for the night. I think we have a hard enough time getting people to events outside of regular schools anyway.

Senator Olson: I feel like along these lines, it should primarily be organized with your college rather than this body. I don't see the need for you all to hear my thoughts on what I want to do.

VP Harms: In the event of running for office again, all the responsibilities to sign their statements and finance is on the Executive VP within this body, and I also think this debate could fall on the Executive VP to match with that.

Senator Lieber: I would agree with that, but also maybe not. I think of Ryan Bentall working with my associate dean. It almost seems counterproductive. Me planning it didn't make it biased at all. We made it an open event with all candidates.

Senator R. Thomas: I don't see a huge problem, but it depends on the person. They could, in theory, also plan it at a time that's available for them but not for their competitor.

Tim: In response to Senator Olson, I wonder if we had the senators work more with the colleges. Linda likes to have all the information on the election packet, and it would be nice to have a time and day. If we leave that up to be determined later, she'll be concerned about that. I don't know how much a concern that actually is.

Senator Olson: Two points about that. You could just have it be required to be set up by a certain time. E.g., make sure by November 15th you have a date set for a debate. Especially with a charter requirement to back it up. That could satisfy Linda's concern of wanting that to be on the packet.

Senator Dowdle: I don't think it's that important to have a date scheduled early. As a candidate, I'm still going to weigh the pros and cons of me going to that event anyway. Is it worth my time or not? I think you can just work on the college level, and Erik can announce to the candidates that this is when it is being held, and you can choose to come or not.

Senator R. Thomas: Point of information: the election packet is going out Friday, so if it does go in the packet, that needs to be decided this week.

Senator Lieber: In the nature of the packet being released and needed to decide by then, what I would feel comfortable doing is having senator debates at individual locations TBD but that would all mean committing to that without changing our charters. Maybe we could do that the first meeting of next semester. With the packets, we may need to say some colleges need to put on senator debates. If it's something we really want to crack down on, we go forward with charters.

Senator Lieber: **Move to exhaust the speaker's list and adjourn meeting** / Senator D. Thomas: **Second / Passed**

Senator Bess: I would propose we don't add anything to our charters until after elections this year. I think we see how they go this year and see how successful they are. I'm not trying to get myself out of anything, because I've committed to that already. We can put TBD in the packet, we can email them out and say, "because it's not a required event," I don't think there needs to be anything official in the packet. I don't feel comfortable putting specifics on that yet.

Senator R. Thomas: Maybe we put "College Senatorial Debates TBD, consult current officer."

ADJOURNMENT

IN ATTENDANCE: Linda Zimmerman, Tim Olsen, VP Blake Harms, Senator Anuj Khasgiwala, Senator Grant

Bess, Senator Travis Dowdle, Senator Rebecca Thomas, Senator Deidra Thomas, Senator Sierra Wise, Assistant Dallin Johnson, VP Todd Brown, Senator Heather Lieber, McKenna Allred

Utah State University Student Association (USUSA) Election Bylaws – Logan Campus

This document is ancillary to the USUSA Constitution.

The Utah State University Student Association election bylaws govern the election of both USUSA Candidates and referenda affecting the USU student body. These bylaws derive their authority from the USUSA Constitution Article III, Section 7.

Candidates, Campaign Committee Members and supporters, proponents, and opponents of referenda must follow all university policies, as well as local, state, and federal law.

Definitions:

Actual Cost: is defined as the cost presented on an official sales receipt.

A-frames: are defined as a freestanding object that must fit in an 8-foot by 8-foot by 8-foot (8'x8'x8') square.

Bribery: is defined as the act of offering, giving, receiving or soliciting any item of value that may influence the actions of a person.

Campaign Committee Members: are any people who are helping Candidates campaign.

Campaign Materials: are any item, tangible or digital, with the purpose of garnering attention and increasing awareness for a specific Candidate or ballot item.

Candidate(s): are registered USU students at the Logan campus that are in Good Standing and have filed a Declaration of Candidacy.

Donations: are defined as any monetary contributions or physical goods used as Campaign Materials.

Elections Week: is defined as Sunday, Feb. 25, 2018, at 3 p.m. through Thursday, March 1, 2018, at 8 p.m.

Fair Market Value: is an estimate of the value of property and services based on what an average buyer would pay to an average seller in the market.

Good Standing (behavioral and academic):

- Carrying a minimum of 12 credits per semester, or considered a full-time student by the School of Graduate Studies during their entire term of office, including the spring semester of election or appointment.
- Free from academic warning, probation, or suspension.
- Free from USU Student Code violations and/or student conduct probation, including any pending issues.

Handbill: is a small printed advertisement or other notice distributed by hand.

Poster(s): are printed or other types of Campaign Materials on paper to be hung in appropriate buildings on campus. This includes digital signage within appropriate campus buildings.

Reception: a meeting organized by the Elections Committee where students meet the Candidates and ask the Candidates questions about their platform and goals.

Slander: is defined as the spreading of an untruth about other Candidates or their campaigns in a way that may hurt their campaign or reputation.

I. Candidate Requirements

A. All Candidates must be in Good Standing.

a. Eligibility: Any appeals to the eligibility criteria may be submitted to the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. Extenuating circumstances may be cause to appeal Candidate eligibility.

b. The Vice President for Student Affairs may grant exception to Candidate requirements based on circumstances. Those wishing to appeal Candidate requirements must see TSC 326. Any decisions made by this office are final.

B. Candidates must be at the mandatory campaign meeting held by the Elections Committee to review the election policies and procedures. Absence will result in automatic forfeiture of candidacy unless prior approval of the Election Co-Chairs. While campaign managers are encouraged to attend the meeting, they cannot take the place of the Candidate.

C. College Senatorial Positions: Candidates for the office of a college Senator must be registered in the college they wish to represent as of the filing deadline for Declaration of Candidacy. Graduate students may run for a senatorial position in their respective college.

D. Graduate Studies Senator: Candidates running for Graduate Studies Senator must be a current, fully

matriculated graduate student in the School of Graduate Studies by the filing deadline. Matriculation requires the student to be in Good Standing and taking graduate courses.

E. Write-In Candidates:

- a. Must file a Declaration of Candidacy and abide by election bylaws, but are not required to pay the \$20 filing fee.
- b. Will not be included in ads, pictures, or biographies paid for by the Elections Committee.
- c. Must notify the Election Co-Chairs if they choose to participate in forums and debates during USUSA Elections Week.
- d. Will not be present on the primary election ballot and will only be included on the final election ballot if:
 - i. A Candidate comes in either first or second in total vote count, is eligible to hold office;and
 - ii. reaches or exceeds 10 percent of the vote total in the respective election. (See EC Bill 2014-06)

II. Timeline

A. Deadlines:

- a. A Candidate must sign a Declaration of Candidacy. The current USUSA officer holding the position should sign the form. This allows the Candidate to discuss the position with the incumbent officer and to more fully understand the position for which they are applying.
- b. If the current officer is unavailable, or is a Candidate, then the USUSA advisor that advises the Candidate's position may sign the form.
- c. This form and \$20 non-refundable filing fee are due in TSC 326 on the date set by the Elections Committee.
 - i. Any student may apply for a waiver of this \$20 fee through a written appeal to the Student Involvement and Leadership Center (SILC).
 - ii. The \$20 filing fee is for processing purposes and publicity by the Elections Committee.
- d. To withdraw a Declaration of Candidacy, Candidates must submit a document in writing to the Election Co-Chairs prior to the announcement of final election results. After the Election Co-Chairs have received the withdrawal, the Candidate cannot be reinstated and the \$20 filing fee is forfeited.
- e. If after the filing deadline, there are no constitutionally qualified Candidates for an office(s), the Elections Committee shall reopen the filing process for that particular office(s), accepting Declaration of Candidacy forms at the date set by the Elections Committee. Notice of the secondary deadline shall be advertised in The Utah Statesman.

III. Voting

A. Plurality to Elect:

- a. The names of the two Candidates on the primary ballot receiving the greatest number of votes shall be placed on the final ballot.
- b. In final elections and special elections, the Candidate or ballot item that has the greatest number of votes will be declared the winner.

B. Ballots:

- a. Ballots will be accessed via www.vote.usu.edu
- b. The names of all Candidates for each office shall be placed on the ballot in alphabetical order by last name, along with a space(s) for write-in Candidate(s). Permanent nicknames, however, may be approved by the Elections Committee (e.g. Bob for Robert, Sue for Susan, etc.).

C. Eligibility to Vote:

- a. Logan Campus students
 - i. All registered students
- ii. In USUSA Presidential election and select referenda, Elections will be open to all Regional Campus students.
- b. In senatorial races, students are only eligible to vote for senators of their respective college.
 - i. If a student has declared a major in two or more separate colleges, they are eligible to vote for the senatorial candidates running to represent each college.
 - c. Only matriculated graduate students can vote for the Graduate Studies Senator.
- d. Proxy voting is prohibited.

D. Counting Votes:

- a. Votes shall be tabulated immediately following the closing of the polls.
- b. No ballots will be accepted after the published time of closing. Votes are tabulated and verified by a committee

of two student involvement advisors, one staff member of the Information Technology (IT) department, Election Co-Chairs, and the USUSA President.

i. In the event the current USUSA President is running for office, the officer following the line of authority shall take their place.

c. Tie-Breaking Procedures: Should an exact numerical tie occur between any candidates running for a USUSA elected position, the following procedure has been outlined and established as the method of breaking the tie.

- i. Upon announcement of the final elections results, the tied candidates will be brought together by the Election Co-Chairs, the current officer in the position of the tied candidates, and at least one of the Student Involvement advisors to follow these tie-breaking procedures.
- ii. The tied candidates will be given one hour to choose, at their discretion, whether they would like to participate in a coin toss by the Vice President of Student Affairs Office or in a special one-day election to break the tie.
- iii. This election will occur within two weeks of the final announcement, will be on the selected day from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., and all election bylaws shall apply (including remaining within the given budget allotment).
- iv. If the candidates cannot come to a consensus within the hour given, the choice will be removed and a special one-day election will occur.
- v. If a second numerical tie should occur between the same candidates, the tie-breaking procedure will be a coin toss by the Vice President of Student Affairs Office.

E. On-Campus Voting Locations

a. The Elections Co-Chairs will have voting locations throughout campus for the convenience of students.

b. Candidates and their Committee Members may not offer any devices to students for voting.

c. No campaigning or campaign related activities shall take place within 50 walking feet of a polling station.

F. Results:

a. All results are final after votes are tabulated and verified. This extends to Candidates, initiatives, referenda, or any other matter submitted to the USU student body for a vote.

IV. Money and Finance:

A. Campaign Value:

a. The campaign value limit is \$400 for Executive Council Candidates and \$200 for Senatorial Candidates.

Candidates violating the campaign value limit (overspending) will be disqualified.

- i. Any money spent towards a campaign or campaign materials prior to Declaration of Candidacy must be documented and will count towards the campaign value limit.

b. Audits

i. Candidates must submit to the Elections Committee by the specified audit deadline, original receipts and a complete list of all campaign expenditures, Donations and the Fair Market Value of materials purchased or used in their campaign ("Financial Statement"). Candidates failing to submit their Financial Statement by the specified audit deadline will be disqualified.

ii. Candidates will be audited twice: once during primary elections and once during final elections. Candidates may be subject to additional audits if deemed necessary by the Elections Committee.

iii. If a receipt for a campaign expenditure is not available, or if the item has been donated, it will be assessed at Fair Market Value by the Elections Committee.

c. Fair Market Value (FMV)

i. It is the responsibility of the Candidate to obtain from the Elections Committee a FMV for any Campaign Material not appearing on a FMV list provided at the mandatory Candidate meeting.

ii. Should a Candidate feel that FMV has been determined inaccurately or unfairly, they may submit a written appeal to the SILC Director and the Student Advocate VP who will then decide the FMV. All decisions by the SILC Director and Student Advocate VP will be final. The FMV will be communicated to the Election Co-Chairs.

iii. If the Student Advocate VP is running for office, the SILC Director will select an elected student body officer to take their place.

V. Campaign Rules:

- A. Neutrality
 - a. USUSA Hearing Board members are not allowed to wear Campaign Materials or endorse any candidate.
- B. Campaign Committee and Meetings
 - a. Social and electronic media may be used for the purpose of communicating with Campaign Committee Members, but must follow Election Bylaws.
- C. Campaigning within campus buildings
 - a. Campaigning in or around the Taggart Student Center must be in compliance with the Taggart Student Center Policy Manual (available at tsc.usu.edu).
 - b. Campaigning within campus buildings is subject to the approval and reasonable limitations of the appropriate colleges and/or departments. It is the Candidate's responsibility to receive permission prior to any campaign-related activity.
- D. Signs, Literature and Structures
 - a. General Policy
 - i. The University shall provide reasonable space outdoors for the posting of signs, notices and posters by Candidates and Campaign Committee Members. Such signs, notices and posters may deal with any subject matter including, but not limited to, notices of meetings or events and expressions of positions and ideas on social or political topics, and must clearly identify the author or sponsor of the materials.
 - ii. Further information can be found by visiting usu.edu/facilities and reading the "[Signage Standards](#)" document.
 - b. Time, Place and Manner Restrictions
 - i. Signs literature and structures are not to be distributed, placed or otherwise erected on campus property prior to Elections Week
 - ii. Candidates and Campaign Committee Members may post signs, notices and posters on bulletin boards and kiosks maintained by the University and located on the campus. Signs, notices and posters shall not be attached to trees, buildings, walls or other University structures unless otherwise expressly authorized by University Facilities.
 - iii. Messages or slogans of any kind shall not be painted or otherwise written on trees, buildings, grounds, fountains, walls or other University structures or surfaces, or on the personal property of others.
 - c. Candidates and Campaign Committee Members may also post signs, notices and posters on designated bulletin boards and kiosks maintained by the academic and administrative departments of the University subject to the approval and reasonable limitations of the appropriate departments. Colleges and departments may adopt reasonable time regulations limiting the time for display of signs, notices and posters on bulletin boards maintained by colleges and departments to maximize everyone's opportunity to use designated areas for signs, notices and posters and may prohibit attaching signs, notices or posters to walls and other surfaces in order to prevent damage to walls and other surfaces.
 - d. Any sign, notice or poster must be removed within 24 hours of the posting of the Election results. Failure to comply may result in a fine.
 - e. Responsibility for Content of Signs, Notices or Posters
 - i. Candidates and Campaign Committee Members shall be personally responsible for any signs, notices or posters they sponsor or post on campus. By posting the sign, notice or poster on campus, the person or organization agrees to hold the University harmless for any assessed damages or liabilities incurred as a result of the sign, notice or poster.
- E. Distribution of Handbills, Fliers, Petitions, Stickers and Other Written Material
 - a. General Policy
 - i. Candidates and Campaign Committee Members may hand out and distribute non-commercial handbills, petitions, stickers or other written material on campus without prior approval, so long as such distributed materials clearly identify the

- author or sponsor of the materials.
 - a. Stickers must not be affixed to any university grounds or property. The Candidate is responsible for removal of any sticker affixed to university grounds or property. Failure to comply with this rule could result in a fine.
- b. Time, Place and Manner Restrictions
 - i. Distribution of materials on campus property is not permitted prior to Elections Week
 - ii. Distribution outside of University buildings is permissible but must not interfere with the entrances to the University buildings or the normal flow of pedestrian or vehicular traffic.[SC1]
 - iii. Distribution inside buildings is permissible so long as those distributing handbills or other written materials do not disrupt the functioning of the University or interfere with the rights of other members of the University community.
 - iv. The Candidate is responsible for learning and following all building-specific rules and regulations (such as the TSC Policy Manual).
 - v. Handbills or other written material may not be attached or affixed to private property without the owner's permission.
- c. Responsibilities Associated with the Distribution of Handbills
 - i. Candidates and Campaign Committee Members distributing handbills or other written material shall be personally responsible for the content of the material and hold the University harmless for any assessed damage or liability incurred as a result of the distribution of the material.
- F. A-frames On Campus
 - a. Assigned areas for two (2) A-frames will be granted to Candidates during primary elections. These same A-frame locations will be permitted during final elections.
 - b. A-frame locations will be assigned in the order of candidacy declaration. Please see the map included in the Elections Packet for designated A-frame areas.
 - c. If there is snow, A-frames must be on grass areas to ensure that facilities can clear walkways.
 - d. A-frames cannot be moved without Election Co-Chairs approval.
 - e. A-frames must not lean against or be attached to trees, shrubs, buildings, or list posts. No stakes or signs stuck into the ground are allowed.
 - f. A-frames must be constructed so they are not a hazard.
 - g. USUSA is not responsible for any lost, stolen, or damaged A-frames during the course of Elections.
 - h. Candidates must respect each other and not vandalize A-frames or other campaign material. This also applies to Campaign Committee Members, as well as those affiliated with the Candidate.
 - i. Candidates and their respective Committee Members are not allowed to provide electronic devices to students for the purpose of voting within the A-frame area.
 - e. Responsibility for Content and Safety of A-frames
 - i. Candidates and Campaign Committee Members shall be personally responsible for the content and use they make of the A-frames they erect on campus. By erecting any structure on campus, the Candidate or their representatives agree(s) to hold the University harmless for any assessed damages or liabilities caused by the structure itself or caused by libel or slander in the message it conveys.
- G. Clean-Up
 - a. Primary Candidates not advancing into final elections are responsible for removal of all Campaign Materials by the appropriate time set by the Elections Committee on the second night of Elections Week following primary elections.
 - b. Final election Candidates are responsible for the removal of all Campaign Materials by 8 p.m. on Friday, March 2, 2018.
 - c. A \$50 fee will be charged to any Candidate who does not clean up all of their Campaign Materials by the appropriate time set by the Elections Committee. If the student does not abide by this regulation, the USUSA Hearing Board will meet with the student accordingly.
 - d. The USUSA Hearing Board will investigate any charges of vandalism. USU is not

responsible for any acts of vandalism committed by Candidates, their campaigns, or their supporters.

H. Copyright and Trademark Infringement

- a. Use of USU, USUSA, and all affiliated organizations copyrighted or trademarked material is prohibited.
- b. USUSA, USU SILC, and/or USU claim no responsibility for the illegal use of copyrighted or trademarked materials by Candidates.

I. Bribery and Slander

- a. The foundation of USUSA elections rests on campaign ethics. Therefore, Candidates, campaign committees and supporters, and proponents and opponents of referenda must follow all university policies and local, state and federal laws. This includes, but is not limited to, a prohibition of:
 - i. Bribery, in any form, either to voters or other Candidates.
 - ii. Slander.

J. Off-Campus Campaigning

- a. Candidates and Campaign Committee Members must have the permission of the building or apartment owner/landlord/manager prior to door knocking, displaying or distributing any Campaign Materials.
 - i. The policy for off-campus banners and signs comes directly from the Logan City Land Development Code Section 17.40 (this policy is subject to change).

VI. Social and Electronic Media:

A. Social Media

- a. Candidates and Committee Members may use social media platforms to promote their candidacy, however, they must use personal accounts. Use of any official university affiliated or departmental social media accounts is prohibited.
- b. Throughout the election process, Candidates are not allowed to post on any official university or departmental Facebook pages or groups (e.g. USU, USUSA, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Huntsman School of Business, etc.).

B. Election Video

- a. A video will be made by the Elections Committee of the Candidates' platforms. This video will be added to the USUSA website and social media accounts.

C. Election Website

- a. All final Candidates' election information (one picture, campaign platform, goals, and qualifications) will be uploaded to the USUSA website.

D. Mass messaging

- a. Use of USU mailing lists (e.g. Canvas or class contact information) is strictly prohibited.

VII. Violations and Penalties:

A. Fines

- a. Any fines levied against the Candidate and/or Campaign Committee Members – either by a University or city entity – count towards the Candidate's Campaign Value Limit and must be reflected on the Candidate's Financial Statement.

B. Hearing Board

a. Jurisdiction

i. Pursuant to Article V of the USUSA Constitution, the USUSA Hearing Board will hear all Election grievances. The USUSA Hearing Board will render a decision on each grievance, and will assess a penalty if necessary.

b. The Violation Process will be as follows:

i. During Elections Week, any charges of violation of campaign regulations will be submitted in writing to the USUSA Hearing Board within 24 hours of the incident, but no later than the closing of the polls.

ii. If an elections bylaw violation comes to light after the final election results have been announced, a complainant may file a grievance until noon on the day of inauguration.

a. Prior to Election Week, there is no time limit, although the USUSA Hearing Board will not meet regularly, and will hear cases on an as-needed basis.

iii. In the event of a violation, or a grievance being filed, both the accuser and accused must be called before the USUSA Hearing Board together. Upon hearing both sides, the USUSA Hearing Board will render a decision and

assess a penalty if necessary.

- iv. Election results for the office(s) in question will not be made public until all grievances have been heard by the USUSA Hearing Board, ruled upon penalties assessed, and the Candidate(s) notified of the decision.
- v. Candidates will be responsible for submitting grievances for their own campaign.
 - a. Any student who was affected by, or a direct witness to, any violation of election bylaws by campaigns or those campaigning for ballot issues is requested to file a campaign grievance.
- vi. The burden of proving that a bylaws violation occurred is on the person filing the grievance.
- vii. Explanation of how to file a grievance will be discussed at the mandatory elections meeting.
- c. Penalties
 - i. Penalties from which the USUSA Hearing Board may choose are as follows:
 - ii. Confiscation and/or restriction of Campaign Materials (e.g. only one sign as opposed to two);
 - iii. Restrictions on campaign times (e.g. not being allowed to attend town hall meetings or campaign on campus during certain times);
 - iv. Budget restrictions;
 - v. Ordering a new election for a particular office pursuant to Article III, Section 1 of the USUSA Constitution;
 - vi. Disqualification of Candidate(s);
 - vii. Or fines to be paid if the violation is discovered after the election has already taken place.
 - viii. Fines shall not exceed the respective Candidate's campaign expenditure limit (see Article IV.A.a.).

VIII. Appeals Process

- A. One faculty member, and one professional staff employee to serve as the Appeals Board for the upcoming academic year. The faculty member shall serve as chair.
- B. The decision of the USUSA Election Grievance Board may be appealed by the student who was found to have committed a USUSA Election Bylaw or a Misconduct violation. The Appeal must be made in writing to the Director of Student Conduct within three (3) days from the date of the USUSA Hearing Board's decision.
- C. If no appeal is filed within the time provided, the decision shall become final.
- D. If an appeal is made, the Director of Student Conduct shall refer the matter, with all supporting documentation, to the chair of the Appeals Board. The Director of Student Conduct shall inform the parties of the names of the members of the Appeals Board.
- E. The parties involved shall have the opportunity to challenge the Appeals Board for bias in the case. Guidelines for the Appeals Board are as follows:
- F. An appeal shall be limited to a review of the initial hearing and supporting documents for one or more of the following purposes:
 - a. To determine whether the decision reached regarding the student was based on substantial evidence; that is, whether the facts in the case were sufficient to establish that it was more likely than not that a violation occurred or that the imposition of an election sanction was warranted.
 - b. To determine whether the penalty imposed was appropriate for the violation which the student was found to have committed.
 - c. To consider new evidence, sufficient to alter a decision, or other relevant facts not brought out in the original hearing, because such evidence and/or facts were not known to the person appealing at the time of the original hearing.
- G. If new evidence and/or facts could be the basis for altering either the decision or the penalty, the matter shall be remanded to the original USUSA Hearing Board for reopening of the hearing to allow reconsideration of the original determination and/or penalty; the USUSA Hearing Board shall report its conclusion to the Appeals Board for further review in the appeal process.
- H. If new evidence and/or facts are not presented, the Appeals Board may confirm or modify the decision of the USUSA Hearing board and/or may uphold or reduce the penalty imposed by the USUSA Hearing Board. The Appeals Board may also remand the case to the original USUSA Hearing Board to reconsider whether the penalty should be increased; the USUSA Hearing Board shall report its determination to the Appeals Board for further review in the appeal process.
- I. Upon conclusion of an appeal in a case involving an election violation, the Appeals Board shall forward its finding to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

ASB 2018-02

Committee:	Academic Senate
First Reading Date:	27 November 2017
Second Reading Date:	4 December 2017
Final Action Date:	4 December 2017
Final Action:	PASSED

Academic Opportunity Fund Application Revision

Description: Revision of the Academic Opportunity Fund application's Policies and Procedures section to clarify the academic opportunities this fund can support.

WHEREAS the introduction of the Policies and Procedures section of the Academic Opportunity Fund Application reads, "The purpose of the Academic Opportunity Fund (AOF) is to provide financial support to undergraduate students who wish to present research or to participate in an academic competition at a reputable event;"

WHEREAS the Conference Information section of the Academic Opportunity Fund Application recognizes poster, paper (presentation), exhibition (art), academic competition, performance, and other as legitimate forms of presentation;

WHEREAS the Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee has recognized discrepancies between these two sections;

WHEREAS these discrepancies have caused confusion during multiple Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee meetings;

WHEREAS the Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee finds it appropriate to reconcile these discrepancies;

BE IT THEREFORE ENACTED THAT the first paragraph of the introduction of the Policies and Procedures section of the Academic Opportunity Fund Application be rewritten as, "The purpose of the Academic Opportunity Fund (AOF) is to provide financial support to undergraduate students who wish to present research, showcase creative work, compete in an academic competition, or actively contribute to another reputable academic event;"

BE IT FURTHER ENACTED THAT the Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee shall award funding according to this new Policies and Procedures section effective immediately;

BE IT FURTHER ENACTED THAT the Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee will clarify this new Policies and Procedures section to any individual or group presenting to the committee who has already applied for funding under the old Policies and Procedures section.

Tags: Academic Opportunity Fund, AOF

Sponsors: Erik Olson, USUSA Engineering Senator

Co-sponsor: Dallin Johnson, USUSA Administrative Assistant; Rebecca Thomas, USUSA Natural Resources Senator

Policy Paper

Committee: Academic Senate

In Attendance: VP Blake Harms. Senator Anuj Khasgiwala. Senator Cody Davis. Senator Heather Lieber. Senator Grant Bess. Senator Travis Dowdle. Senator Rebecca Thomas. Senator Deidra Thomas. Senator Sierra Wise. Senator Erik Olson. Director Spencer Perry. Assistant Dallin Johnson.

Absent: None.

History:

The Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee first recognized a problem with the Academic Opportunity Fund Application in an October 2, 2017 meeting. The committee was not able to award funding to a group attending the American Society of Landscape Architects National Conference because their attendance did not qualify as “[presenting] research” or “[participating] in an academic competition at a reputable event” under the Policies and Procedures section of the application. This issue was discussed with Linda Zimmerman on October 16, 2017 and in Academic Senate meetings on October 9, 2017 and October 16, 2017. Linda and a majority of the Academic Senate were not in favor of adjusting the application’s requirements, but some indicated initial favorability to changing the name of the Academic Opportunity Fund itself. However, due to the infrequency of the problem and a lack of plausible ideas for a new name, the Academic Senate voted in a straw poll that they did not favor a name change and the issue was tabled.

The Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee recognized the problem again in a November 13, 2017 meeting. The committee hesitantly awarded funding to a group attending the Mountain West BFA Actor Showcase because their attendance qualified as a performance under the Conference Information section of the application, but not necessarily as “[presenting] research” or “[participating] in an academic competition at a reputable event” under the Policies and Procedures section. Following the meeting, a number of committee members recognized the need to revisit the issue to reconcile the discrepancies between these two sections.

Purpose:

This bill reconciles discrepancies between the Policies and Procedures and Conference Information sections of the Academic Opportunity Fund Application to provide the Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee clearer guidelines on what types of events they are able to award funding to.

Pros:

The Academic Opportunity Fund Allocation Committee will have clearer guidelines on what types of events they are able to award funding to. Additionally, students applying for the Academic Opportunity Fund will have clearer guidelines on whether their events qualify for funding.

Cons:

A shift from old guidelines may yield initial confusion. Additionally, it will take time and effort to update the application.