**Associated Students of Colorado State University**

**Forty-Fourth Senate**

**Tenth Session**

**October 29th, 2014**

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge
3. Move to suspend the dress code
4. Roll Call
5. Gallery Input
6. Consent Agenda
	* 10.22.14 Minutes
		1. Bondi: I move to approve the consent agenda.
		2. Vote: 19.0.0
7. Guest Speakers
	* Scott Rickets - Stadium Survey Questions: As one of the aspects of the department I’m in, I work with the student voice survey. An issue coming up is the stadium. There have been multiple ways for gathering feedback, but me and Senator Laffey have been designing a survey for random students to say what they think of the stadium. I will start with an introduction of what Dr. Frank is thinking and that he is thinking of four options. We will talk about the general fund and then the four options on the PDF. Tony Frank has given a lot of detail as to each option and it gives you full descriptions and so we pulled the main points in bold that sum up the options and put it into the survey. We are adding additional info at the bottom so they can get the in depth look if they want. The survey is being used to help Dr. Frank and Sam Guinn. We want to have an open discussion on your opinions of if the questions are impartial and unbiased. We want to give students clearest and concise options.
		1. Bigham: I would like to commend you on this, this is what we were imagining in university affairs. I think it’ll be great.
		2. Yearby: I think that I would like to see a more visible approach than sending out an email, letting all students possibly have a say if they want. I would like to see creative ways of getting student opinion.
			1. Ricketts: Why we have been taking the survey approach is so they have all of the information necessary to be educated. Not sure how to get all this info in a plaza event. We could look at other options in addition to that though. We are looking at a survey so it will be random. We want diverse students answering, and may even do more than one.
		3. Gallery: I notice you have a possible 5th option.
			1. Ricketts: We thought we wanted to have an ‘I don’t know’ option.
			2. Gallery: Maybe just a public comment option.
			3. Ricketts: We have been talking about this. We are having the four options because Tony Frank is going to pick one of those four options with the feedback he gets. I don’t know if he’s entertaining any other options. But I think a comment section would be nice.
		4. Yearby: I don’t think the options are too complex, we should do something a little more visible so that any student can have a say and voice. I think they would appreciate it.
		5. Crites: I think having a survey is a good idea. I know I wouldn’t be able to get every option detailed and present them without bias. This is a way so that there are standardized words that every student gets. It’s the best idea. A wider spectrum might be appropriate. I don’t think this should be in the hands other than an official who knows the information very well.
			1. Ricketts: I like your point at looking at how big it is and maybe adjusting that. We want to make sure this is not a small group of students. We have to look at response rates and make sure we can get as much as we can.
		6. Watson: I know that the survey will only be offered to a certain amount of students. Have you considered posting a Collegian ad with a link to the survey?
			1. Laffey: I don’t think that’d be a good idea because anybody like community members can do that if that’s the case, while we are trying to get student opinion.
			2. Li Puma: Email is considered a random sample. By opening up to anyone, it’s not considered a random sample anymore.
			3. Ricketts: I think it’s an interesting option to explore. The point of this survey is to give Dr. Frank hard evidence of what the students want.
			4. Watson: How many emails do you plan to send out?
				1. Ricketts: I will know tomorrow after my meeting. It’s a large enough amount to get valid info but not an overwhelming amount. I’ll be discussing that.
		7. Yearby: I would like to reiterate that the CSU students are not stupid. They can understand the language. The actual plan is fairly simple in all four. Throwing around the fact that people can’t understand is short sided. Going off what was said by the chair, it creates the same extreme biases because there is no incentive of people who are in the middle position. It creates it but is a little better but creates the same problem. What previous speaker said is not accurate.
		8. Maher: Being very involved in statistical work, I would say that what I’ve seen so far seems to be up to terms in statistical significance.
			1. Ricketts: Numbers is something I don’t know yet.
8. Ratification & Swearing in of New Members
	* Madison Gruber – Deputy Director Community Affairs
		1. Yearby: Can you explain some of what you want to do in the community?
			1. Gruber: Just reaching out so students can be aware of the issues. Some of the things we are talking about at the roundtable are things like social ordinance.
			2. Yearby: What are your top issues of the community on CSU?
				1. Gruber: I would like to work on CSU’s image in the community and homelessness and financial problems among students are some big issues I’d like to focus on.
			3. Vote: 19.1.0
9. Executive Reports
	* Wester: I have a few announcements from Mackenzie: 1) she wanted to remind you of notice and respond training from 6:30-8pm tomorrow night. 2) University of Wyoming is coming tomorrow between 2-4pm, Come on out to the office. 3) Suicide prevention awareness panel Nov 10th from 4-5 in grey rock room.
	* Pasillas: This Saturday is fall clean up. Speak with Natalie or the front desk. We are looking for 10 more members. A few members have been working on social ordinance host that is new legislation that will affect underage drinking in Fort Collins. Parents feel that a lot of their high school students are attending house parties. This makes the owner responsible for any underage drinking. To get an MIP, they used to have to have direct contact with the person providing the alcohol but this way the owner will get an MIP automatically. We will be on the plaza getting student opinion on Friday with more info. You can look up social host ordinance. It will be reviewed Tuesday but brought up Nov 18 to see if they can vote on it in January. Let us know if you have questions.
	* Bruce: I’m speaking on behalf of Jake, we have the roundtable coming up where we will address community issues. We are looking for 1 or 2 senators. Nov 3rd from 430-6 in Longs Peak room. Talk to me or Jake if you are interested. We are working voter mobilization campaign. Trying to lower costs for voters. We have a lecture of about 150 people and will need 1 or 2 more people to help us hand things out and possibly co-present. We have two more presentations at fossil on 7:30am on Monday and 2pm on Monday. Come talk to me if you’re interested.
	* Ricketts: Please email ascsu\_university\_affairs@mail.colostate.edu . If you need to get on internal and external committees. If you are an associate, you need to sit on either one.
10. Judicial Reports
11. Senator Reports
	* Yearby: I would like to report about last week’s meeting, what I feel happened was unfortunate that the judicial branch made a decision that was opinionated just because the $10M Cap was a survey that was at the same time the ballot happened. It shouldn’t have been brought up until we said certain things would happen. Think about that when making decisions. The heart of the bill was getting opinions of students on fees. There’s a lot of things going on that students want to have a voice on. On any of these issues, students are not stupid. They understand fees, benefits and are able to weigh them out themselves. We have this elitist mentality instead of trying to give more info to students.
	* Crites: Alyssa and I have an unusual college council structure. We do a whole host of different things but we have said that several of us are trying to redefine the line between Ag ambassadors and Ag senators. There might be some structural problems for a while.
	* Laffey: Earlier today I attended classroom review board, we discussed a new concept called flip classrooms. It’s flipped on where you do homework and where you do class. I am writing a resolution regarding this.
12. Associate Senator Reports
13. Confidence Business
14. Committee Reports
	* Internal Affairs
		1. Seel: Last Thursday internal affairs worked on two bills. The first was Bill #4407 Creation of Assistant Director of Finance. The revisions we made was to the title making a grammatical change. According to the deputy chief justice, it’s not against the bylaws if you don’t change the number. We changed the job description where we had to delete the fourth bullet because it is not a paid position. This job will be focused on other duties while the director deals with that program. It will be up to the director of what they do. We endorsed this bill. We sponsored the inclusive excellence bill as well. Besides that, that’s everything.
	* External Affairs
		1. Crites: We had Resolution #4409 Senate Ratification Information. It was the one about having a couple questions go out to the appointees. We wanted to endorse it, we talked about logistics. There were a couple concerns with the questions but reminded everyone that in the next therefore clause, it doesn’t say we will put these questions in word for word. We also decided that when we endorse something it is with a 2/3 vote. It’s not like a couple of us endorsed it. Its over 2/3.
	* University Issues
		1. Dugger: We didn’t really have any bills. We talked about Laffey’s classroom ideas and he told us about the legislation to talk about later.
15. Old Business
	* Bondi: I move to close old business, open new business and adopt bill 4408.
		1. Vote: 19.0.1
16. New Business
	* Bill #4408 Inclusive Excellence
		1. Seel: This bill is proposing that an external committee will be created and held responsible for two goals: forum of discussion that any student can be a part of. They can talk about broad issues or specific. Secondly, provide a permanent home for the representatives. This would provide a good base for those who want to promote diversity on campus and so that they know that the issues will be heard and have resources to address those concerns. We have the executive chairing it and CSU admin backing it up and two senators on the committee so that these people can bring forth the concerns of underrepresented groups. We will have the same relationship as SFRB and BSOF. We have to ratify the representatives because they will be the voice for the committee. The membership of the committee will be open to people who come in and submit an application to the chair if they want to be voting members. We want a place where they can be represented.
			1. King: What power will they have to bring to senate?
				1. Bondi: 1) We have the requirement that we have to have a minimum of two senators sitting on it to help write legislation and the senators sitting on the committee will be passionate about diversity. They have speaking rights as representatives and bring forward issues. I would like to believe that senate is diverse enough to understand the concerns. Gender inclusive bathrooms on campus is a big issue. Something like that being brought forward to senate, we will be able to do something about it.
				2. Seel: One of the ways is this is supposed to operate is this is a base of expertise. A group with a large enough voice of the student body and with the representatives, they will have a focused voice so that the issues they bring forward will be heard. It will be an external committee to have more independence.
			2. Yearby: Would the writers be open so that the current representatives are restored as representatives of this group?
				1. Wells: We are fully open to this so that the representatives would need to join this committee to be a representative in senate.
			3. Crites: Besides the distinction between voting and non-voting members are there any officer positions in the committee?
				1. Bondi: This is a foreign concept of how it would go down. The chair would be taking minutes and giving this committee the ability to self-govern, they can figure that out. We want to have this out by the spring and there will be conversation about what form this will take. At the end of the semester, it will probably come back to us to help formalize it.
				2. Seel: It’s looking to be a fairly open committee. The thought is the representatives will take a hierarchy because of their speaking rights and such. We will see how it works during the spring.
			4. Yearby: Why is there no distinction about how many representatives there can be?
				1. Seel: It was the feeling in having this be the open committee it’s supposed to be. Putting a limit on representatives formed a barrier. Anyone that wants the responsibility to have a voice, they can. Representatives will have the same description as an associate. The bills and ideas coming out of the committee will have support from representatives.
				2. Bondi: We have basic bylaws set but seeing the bylaws would be finalized by the committee, if they felt they needed to set a limit, they could do that if that’s a problem. We don’t want to set barriers that aren’t necessary.
			5. Balster: Is the job description the same?
				1. Bondi: Instead of requiring you to sit on a different committee, you’re required to sit on this committee. You will have one office hour that will be served in ASCSU or another group on campus. Until it’s ratified though, it’ll be the same.
				2. Seel: We have the job description that we can look at during the next reading and you can see what we have as a basis.
			6. Laffey: Bylaws and description is under senate?
				1. Seel: We ratify it and but they can change them if they feel necessary. They can come back to us to change it if they want. SFRB presents bylaws if they have a change, they will do the same.
			7. Yearby: What is the timeline?
				1. Wells: We are looking at getting our promotional push in early February. It will look like a really public promotion with posters and social media push. By mid-march we want to be able to have initial info sessions. Anyone can attend it but they don’t have to be members. We want to have those conversations so they know how it works. By late march, we want to establish an actual committee and turn it into an active committee. Moving forward from there is when we will start to assess the committee. That’s a basic timeline.
			8. Seel: Addressing some concerns, I’d like to inform you that two of the amendments do codify the director of diversity into the constitution. That way it would make it an official constitutional position.
			9. Bondi: The endorsed byline is empty because PJ and I have been very busy and struggled to talk to anyone who wanted to endorse it. Feel free to let me know if you want to endorse it though.
		2. Yearby: I think it’s a great bill as someone who has tried to write many bills getting closer to this. It establishes a few things I wanted, creating a committee/council dynamic without having directors involved although they have obvious under representation. It does expand to other models and permanently keeps the department of diversity like I wanted. It hurt ASCSU last year not having it. A lot of the things my bill was trying to do is doing what I wanted. The only difference is that it still doesn’t address the fact that they don’t get a vote. I think that’s a problem that we don’t allow people who come every week to have a vote. When its 10 people coming every week and not getting a vote, it is short sided but this bill creates a more solidified process. The double barrier that I’m seeing is that someone has to apply to the director of diversity and be ratified by senate. I think that’s a little much for this area. I feel that people who want to support diversity is being hindered by the system. Senate shouldn’t be voting on a member if they are not passionate about the issues. It’s a great bill if those things were adjusted, I’d feel more comfortable.
		3. Jordan: I do like the bill, I see one possible problem. Let’s say it passes and it’s not till march, until then, our current representatives don’t have a position. I’d like an amendment saying that the representatives maintain their position until senate approves bylaws.
		4. Hansen: I move to make a friendly amendment to make two endorsers.
		5. Maher: One of the questions I was looking at with concern is the idea that the voting status will still remain non-voting members.
			1. Bondi: The idea we had is that senators are representative of students of their academic areas. If they’d like to have voting rights, they would be one of the prime candidates to then go to college council to go that direction. We want someone involved on campus but not being a senator. The senator job requires 9-10 hours a week. Once you come in as a senator, you are representing your college and the body as a whole.
			2. Maher: It functions very much like US government interest group aspect. I view this as something like NAACP. We are mirroring US government in a good way by finding the voices be heard but have the colleges representing like states. I think the way this is drawn up represents our students but making sure that senate is functioning in a constitutional manner.
		6. Li Puma: This would be a great house of representatives that allows easy access to senate. Have you considered using our new bylaws about having a committee be able to approve bills? That way the bills could be sent to a committee before presenting it on the senate’s desk.
			1. Bondi: That’s a wonderful idea. I’m open to that idea. If anyone wants to add that inside of senate we have ability to have bills come to the floor with sponsorship of committee, this would give committees the ability to bring things to the floor without having to go to an internal committee first.
			2. Watson: It’d be great if the group is open to all CSU students, but there’s a conflict there. If the committee votes and the members are people who aren’t affiliated with senate and involved in committees, it would sway a vote that would be brought to the floor.
			3. Bondi: Concerning that comment about membership status and having full ratification, we are looking at after an individual has attended two meetings, they can apply to the chair to have voting rights. It’s upon the request to become a representative which has to be voted on by the body. They then have to be elected before the group and then come to senate to be ratified.
		7. Guinn: I want to hear representative opinion.
		8. Carnillo: As I was talking to the authors, I was in support of this bill but the things I’m still iffy about is how we will enforce it bringing it back to senators. I would like to see in the amendments how the representatives will still be a part of it.
		9. Laffey: I think the idea is great. I echo previous speaker concerning interest groups. I am concerned about empowering a certain interest group and how we can add more. I think we should send this to a committee.
		10. Seel: I would like to apologize to the representatives. The intent was to continue the representative position until this happens. Regarding the representative position, considering concerns of the availability of positions, I consider it that when you’re in a committee, you have to attend the meetings and have voting rights in the committee to be able to be nominated to be a representative. This way the chair will determine that this person will be capable of having a voice in senate. I still feel it’s open that the people taking on the responsibility should be seen as keeping their voice. In reference to what the representatives can do to support their own bills, this committee will have the same power to approve legislation so they will be able to present bills to the floor. When a committee endorses something, this is a group of people who have taken time to amend bills and look at them, if we give this power, we are giving them the two more important aspects of this bill since they will have the appropriate endorsement. In terms of an interest group, the purpose of this committee is to bring inclusivity to senate. This does not say who and how many different interest groups will be presented. The idea is this committee will take all of the issues on campus to take the most ideal form to address these issues. Having the director be the chair will be good because it will bring them together.
		11. King: I want to endorse this bill. I like the idea of external committees having the power to endorse bills. It’s important these bills do go to internal committee though. I would encourage that internal committees can still endorse this and have that power.
		12. Balster: As one of the senior sitting representatives, I applaud the authors for coming up with this bill and discussing this with us. I feel that for me personally, one of the reasons I wanted to be a representative was not just to be a speaker for issues related to me but to be involved in all issues and bring things from a different viewpoint. This bill brings up that there was a lot of concerns prior to giving voting rights. It brings a lot of different voices. I still like the idea of us being able to be involved with internal committees. I don’t see it as a special interest group. A lot of issues aren’t purely academic issues. Anything trying to get as many voices heard, will be an advantage. It won’t put certain voices above people.
		13. Crites: I wonder if we can alleviate this concern of requiring an application by submitting a letter of intent and rather than an application, perhaps more of a dialogue approach explaining why you would be a good voting member. “Application” is kind of a scary hurdle. A letter of intent allows people to voice opinions without having to worry about matching their responses to what they think people want to hear.
		14. Watson: I do support this bill as is. I am on internal affairs, we were at quorum. My concern is about the whole bringing bills to the floor, the reason for that is because I wouldn’t consider it a special interest group but the group is of similar people. Regardless of their background, they are all interested in diversity. The things they will support is clear to everyone from the beginning. Also, it’s not really in line what the current external committees are doing. That’s adding a new component to external committees. I think the idea of having senators sit on the committee.
			1. Bondi: When SFRB submits a bill, they have to get it approved by senators instead of just bringing it to the floor. If we do this, they will be able to.
			2. Watson: How many senators have to sponsor it?
				1. Li Puma: 3.
				2. Watson: We are only making them go find one extra person to support it. If it’s that hard to go out and find one more person that supports it, maybe you shouldn’t be writing it.
		15. Wells: Addressing the application piece, I think that maybe us using that word isn’t the best word to use. The application is similar to what Senator Crites described. We are looking for information of what social justice they have and what issues they want to focus on. It’s so that the space is a safe space and to make a place where knowledge can be set and that everyone has the same understanding. I think it wouldn’t be something the committee would have to use consistently. Since they have 2 senators, they wouldn’t lack support because they have me as well. Maybe it’s an issue that individuals don’t understand why legislation needs to be brought forth. This would make sure that they have the right for at least they will be heard.
		16. Hill: I acknowledge that I’m new, but I guess some of what made me raise my hand is that it is a special interest group, I came to CSU because they sold it for diversity. I was told this was a place of diversity. It is more fulfilling what CSU is pushing towards. That’s what I believe and thought to believe was going to happen. As far as predictable legislation, its diversity. If we are talking about true diversity, we will have people in the group that maybe we don’t agree with but having their voices heard. I think we will be surprised of who will want to join and be in that committee.
		17. Yearby: I wanted to touch on that language that this being an interest group is kind of inappropriate, it is a duty of our body to create this. I really love the idea of a letter of intent. Like I said I want to create as little barriers as possible. That should be the main focus. Becoming a senator is too hard. Going further, I’d like to put support behind this body having the process of this going to the floor. The senators would know the right format and it would be peer reviewed by students that are not stupid. Being able to bring it the floor is more than enough. Bringing that power would eliminate those issues.
		18. Hansen: There is a couple things I want to address, unlike the way its set up now, to disregard the concern of this being an interest group, its bringing all interest groups to make a large interest group. We have no idea what’s going on the back offices. This one committee would allow us to be able to talk to us more and bring a more cohesive group to this body. We want to bring in alignment what the administration is doing back and forth. They want to bring stronger diversity voices. We are at the point when ASCSU and CSU admin are on the same page.
			1. Yearby: I think what this bill does is it does have a focus on underrepresented populations. I would like to see a liaison ship with offices. Students who didn’t have this info would get this info.
			2. Hansen: Representatives would also be something that the majority would not have. Each representative will be a subject matter experts of whatever identity they represent. With things like convocation, being in a crowded room, veteran learners are uncomfortable with that. We bring voices you don’t have.
		19. Maher: I want to bring up the fact that when I brought up interest groups, interest groups are people who come together to form common goals. That’s what we have. I wasn’t meaning it in a bad way. We are running into a debate of running into being able to bring legislation to the floor or not. I would think that these two senators would support these bills, this would count in as those people. One of the things I saw is that it talks about bringing up how it will establish rules of order, there is no working on representation. As now it is mostly individuals who are interested in diversity. It could happen that many people over emphasize one issue since they come from one group. I would like to see language wanting minimum representation coming from all groups. If we just say someone who is interested in diversity can join, there will be issues.
			1. Hansen: It is unconstitutional to say how many people there can be.
		20. Laffey: I hear a lot of talk about cut and dry stuff going from committee to senate, if we put language into the bill of that, I would like to see similar language in amendments for BSOF and SFRB since they are comparable.
		21. Seel: For the bylaws, one of the intentions which we haven’t clarified is there is the intention that this committee will have full correspondence with groups of information sharing. They will have correspondence of communication with what is represented. It has the intention to have info to be pulled from multiple organizations.
		22. Bondi: Myself and the two other authors, we have talked to many directors of those offices and have the intention of going through and talking to the rest as well. The students can come from anywhere. They said one was going to be involved the hope is that there are members in that group that want to have communication.
		23. King: I move to send this to external committees.
		24. Li Puma: I will send this external committees.
		25. Bondi: I move to adopt to conduct a list of who want to endorse this bill?
			1. Kat Balster, Duane Hansen, Michelle Crites, Kyle Gruenhagen, Andrei Gurau, Scott Ricketts, Yunus Ozekin, Jessica Teal, Michelle Sogge, Clayton King, Avondine Hill, Spencer Nolan, Filip D.
	* Catron: I move to move out of new business, back into old business and adopt bill 4407.
		1. 17.2.0
17. Old Business
	* Bill #4407 Creation of Assistant Director of Finance
		1. Seel: There are 3 things we changed, changing the title and deleting fourth section of job description because they can’t handle software. The committee endorsed this bill.
			1. Bondi: If you go to job description, by striking the position, you have to change the numbers.
			2. Seel: The hope is that his will automatically change.
		2. Li Puma: I ask consent to read the title
		3. Bondi: I move to adopt the amendments on internal affairs committee.
			1. Vote: 20.0.0
		4. Laffey: I call to previous question.
			1. Vote: 19.1.0
		5. Vote: 19.0.1
	* Resolution #4409 Senate Ratification Information
		1. Bondi: I move to adopt bill 4409.
		2. Li Puma: I ask for consent to read the title (no dissent)
		3. Nolan: I move for a two minute recess. (passed)
		4. Crites: The amendments are up there that we talked about already.
		5. Laffey: I move to accept all the amendments.
		6. Watson: I move to previous question.
			1. 19.1.0
		7. Vote: 18.1.0
		8. King: I move to previous question.
			1. Vote: 18.0.1
		9. Vote: 19.0.0
18. New Business
	* Res #4411 Office Hour Database
		1. Bondi: I move to adopt resolution 4411.
		2. Bondi: This is a wonderful idea.
		3. Gurau: This is the office hour database I’ve spoke about for a while. It’s pretty open ended on how the format will be. It has admin support. It applies for instructors to give their office hours and update them at any time
		4. Bombardier: Everyone’s been really behind the bill. I’m sure you can all relate of wanting to get in touch with a previous professor. They have expressed frustrations that they aren’t utilized to their full potential and I think that because a lot of this info is lost at the beginning of the year and it would make it accessible for students.
			1. D: Who would be in charge of putting this together?
				1. Gurau: The people it’s sent to, I would like to see who would take this under their wing. I don’t know who will host it. There will be a home but we are trying to see who wants it.
				2. D: Which generation of professors will this start getting all this info?

Gurau: It’s all current faculty. Anyone that teaches you in class would be on this database and would be updated by semester. This also shows that there may be something to be able to contact past faculty who don’t work here now.

* + - 1. Watson: Have you anticipated the cost structure?
				1. Bombardier: No, not yet. This is our first initial step of just creating the interest first. We haven’t figured out these logistics yet.
				2. Watson: do you have a time frame?

Bombardier: I think we will have to hear back from what they say when we send it to them.

Gurau: if this were to pass, we want to see it put on expedited status so we can send it to them as soon as possible. Then we could send back this information.

* + - 1. Crites: My concerns are that it seems like you’re doing it backwards, have you talked to any admin at all?
				1. Gurau: Thanks to people who have contacts with admin have talked to Jody Donovan and she wants to see student support by a resolution before doing anything with it.
			2. Seel: Do you have any pushback from professors?
				1. Gurau: I have spoken to some and GTAs and they have been behind it. Our aim is to make this available for professors to cancel office hours as well.
				2. Seel: Would you be open in addition to professors, to have our office hours as well?

Gurau: I feel comfortable with this for sure. This would be another step of involvement if you guys are okay with it.

* + - 1. Bondi: Would you be open to changing the title of the bill to say investigate office hour database? Jody Donovan wanted to talk about it. One of the hesitations I have is that I don’t know what we are recommending yet. We don’t know any specifics. Going forward on an investigation first would make most sense.
				1. Gurau: We have spoken to over 100 students about it. I feel comfortable with how it is. A lot of students wish to see this happen. This won’t increase office hours but just notify when they have them. An investigation is not worth it at this case. This bill is more of wanting to start broad.
			2. D: Say there is a professor at CSU who does not want to be contacted, do they have the option to opt out?
				1. Gurau: Yes.
				2. Bombardier: It would be almost an editable database for all the professors to go in and let students know when they will be in and not. It’s not like a directory.
		1. Seel: I support this, all I would like to see is once this is passed to provide a report or plan of what they imagine to see to implement this. I’d like to see concrete plans.
		2. Laffey: I move to place this on expedited status.
			1. Catron: I would like to see this go to a committee to look at some changes we recommended.
			2. King: I echo previous speaker. I would like to see some things addressed beforehand.
			3. D: I also echo and I see this bill has huge potential but there are some things I’d like to see.
			4. Watson: I move to previous question.
				1. Vote: 16.1.2
			5. Vote: 3.13.3
		3. Seel: I move to send this to internal committee.
1. Announcements
	* Bondi: I want to announce to everyone that this is not from me but Blanche and Mary Ontiveros. Both of them were very happy and glad we had the conversation and the way they handled it tonight. They felt it was handled in a professional manner and are excited to see where it goes.
	* Hansen: Thank you. Adult learner veteran services office holds 5k. We do the run in honor of the veteran who has died in service. We tie that into celebration and bring family and announce them at half time on football game. Alvs.colostate.edu to sign up/register. The date is Nov 8th at 9am at the oval.
	* Earle: Yay box and birthday.
2. Roll Call
3. Adjournment