Attendance:

Jim Cropcho
Matt Dodovich
Andria Fuquen
Brennan Howell
Ajmeri Hoque
Meghan Innes
Larry King
Ben Leland – alternate, Pat Sprinkle
Jason “Scoop” Rothacker
Steph Seger
Scott Surovjak

38-R-46

Dodovich: I really believe that the Senate didn’t read it and didn’t know what was going on. The Parliamentarian made a good point that the email addresses don’t need to be registered before pre-campaigning. I really think this resolution is pretty clear, and I don’t know how I could make it clearer.

Scoop: I really liked the pre-campaigning thing because then before you sent any emails out, it was registered.

Howell: so maybe we could say that before any emails are sent out, the address has to be registered.

Dodovich: The EGB director is saying “before Friday of the 10th week”. I’d like to make an amendment that would make it “by the Friday of the 10th week of winter quarter”, making the last “therefore” clause say: “Therefore, Let if Further Be Resolved, that non-OSU email addresses must be registered with the EGB prior the Friday of the 10th week of Winter Quarter.”

Vote on amendment:

Amendment passes.
Discussion on Resolution:

Scoop: I think people just got caught up on a couple of words.

Vote on Resolution:

Resolution passes, with Cropcho, Scoop, Howell, Hoque, Fuquen, Innes added as co-sponsors.

**R-47**

*Presented by Benson:* this would just put a clause into the bylaws that would make ballot initiatives binding. A couple passed last year, and nothing was done with them. This would make it so that whatever initiatives were passed by the students is put into effect much the same as legislation. This would make it clear that ballot initiatives are there for a reason, and not just for the heck of it.

Questions:

Brennan: wasn’t the problem last year that CSA said they couldn’t do it. The free tuition one I think should have been binding. The money that pays for their books, and we can’t do anything with that. But the public money can be changed. The other one, CSA was fine giving scholarship last year. They changed their policy after seeing our initiative, but now they’re reconsidering and will change it back and make it so that we can give scholarships.

Scoop: Do we know why nothing happened with the ones last year? I debated all year with the idea of filing a judicial complaint to make the JP say those are binding, but I decided not to.

Dodovich: as a member of CSA, from what I know from the meetings, the language wasn’t written strong enough so as to force what is voted on by the students to be done.

Dodovich: Are ballot initiatives binding forever? Under this, they would be binding for one year.

Scoop: Is there any reason we can’t make it permanent? The only reason I did it this way is that all senate legislation we pass is only binding for one year. I wouldn’t mind, I was just trying to keep it consistent.

Resolution passes unanimously.

**R-48**

Benson: this is a little more complicated. This would make some changes to the way the judicial panel conduct its business. One of the things that they make a lot of their rulings
on, and they’re trained to do this, is the spirit of the bylaws. So something could not be mentioned in the bylaws, but the JP can rule something to be against the spirit of the bylaws. For example I encountered a problem with the slate I was on last year, where there was no way of reporting the finances of a slate, but our spending was found to be against the spirit of the bylaws. Another example is Aftab’s campaign did some pre-campaigning, but didn’t say “vote for”, and was found guilty of breaking the spirit of the bylaws. The second thing this would do is make it so that the panelists cannot badger the defendant or make it so that they do not have to defend themselves. This would provide some basic rights to make the JP a little more professional with how it conducts its business.

Questions:

Howell: does this need to be done by the fifth week? Can we amend it and not be passed the deadline?
   Yes. You could amend it and it wouldn’t apply to this coming election

Benson- This will make justices act in a more professional manner.

Hoque: How will this stop them from asking you illegal questions?
   All you would have to do is cite this right.
Hoque: if they do this, how do you punish them?

Dodovich: They could go to the OSU Judicial Panel

Benson: Also, Senate can impeach justices.

Cropcho: Maybe it should be non-violation until beyond a reasonable doubt?

Benson: This follows the civil trial pattern, so it relies on the preponderance of evidence.

Innes: maybe the individual members of a slate should get separate trials so that what happened with Take Back USG doesn’t happen again.

Benson: I sent a letter to Chief Justice Teresa Stout informing her that I expected 38 separate trials because that was already in the bylaws.

Resolution Passes.

Bylaws suspended to allow Liz Ghandakly remain in meeting during debate.

Ghandakly:

1- Currently the write-in portion of the bylaws is not very good. There’s really nothing binding about it. It is important that write-in candidates be subject to EGB
bylaws. Instead of saying that the candidates sign a petition saying they’ll adhere, it will be a post-election thing, ensuring that they do.

Questions:

Hoque: how are you making them adhere to this?
After the election, there will be an EGB inquiry to check and see if they did anything crazy.
Seger: will you be checking into everyone?
Just the ones that are suspicious.

Resolution Passes.

2- this is about the candidate team bios for public viewing. The website will contain links to all candidate websites. We’re striking section C because with the questionnaire, which will include space for free-essay, as well as a link to their site, that will be superfluous.

Passes

3- last year, there were more votes for people living in West campus than there were people who live in west campus. We looked into it and discovered how unclear the living area election works. We will fix that by making the ballot a two-step process. Step one is chose your college and living area, then it will take you to the actual ballot which will only present you with the races in which you can participate. This will also make it so that the order of the candidates is randomized.

Questions:

Hoque: will the at-large seats be under the two-step process?
No, everyone will still be able to vote for those.

Debate:

Dodovich: I’d like to propose an amendment: add a “whereas” (sixth whereas) clause that says “whereas some students have majors in more than one college”. You should still be able to vote in either college, but still only one, if you’re in majors in more than one college. We also need a therefore clause that will call for the bylaws to be renumbered so that there aren’t two section sixes.

Amendment passes.

Resolution passes
4-There’s nothing in the EGB bylaws about slates and it needs to be. Basically, this will define “slate”, and says they are all subject to the bylaws. It also makes it so that the members of the slate are accountable for themselves and each other. Basically, a slate will become an entity as if it’s a candidate. This will also change the spending caps for the candidate slates/teams. I thought it was important to limit the expenditures the slate could do and monitor their spending.

Questions:

Dodovich: I don’t think we should have everyone be responsible for individual actions. Amendment: omit “the actions of their slate and” to change it to “each member of a slate is responsible for the actions of the slate’s members in the name of the slate” (last line of resolution). Also, the $125 contributions from senators should be changed to $250, in both instances (H-B and H-Ca). There’s a cap on the total, and if a small number of senators run together, it’s unfair that they don’t have as much to spend as a larger slate.

Amendment passes, Hoque abstains.

Debate on Resolution:

Dodovich: point of resolution. What is the confusion on the dollar amounts? What portion of the wording…?

Howell: The wording is just confusing and seems to contradict itself. I propose an amendment to change H-C to “slates containing a presidential/vice presidential candidate team shall be valued at no more than $3000 total.”

Dodovich: re-read resolution with amendments.

Hoque: I have a real problem with holding everyone responsible.

Innes: I kind of like it because then it forces the individual members of the slate to hold each other responsible.

Seger: I agree because what’s to protect me from something that someone else does with my knowledge. What safeguards are there to protect me from something someone else does on their own, in the name of the slate? Hopefully, you know the people you’re running with, but at the same time, things get crazy during election time, and you see sides of people that you don’t see at any other time.

Ghandakly: I see what your concern is, but I think that if we didn’t have this in there and not everyone on the slate was held responsible, then there would be a lot of problems. You could have instances where it is planned that one person who probably won’t win goes around and says a lot of stuff to get the slate publicity, but then the other members of the slate don’t have to deal with the repercussions.
Cropcho: it seems like the slates have all of the disadvantages and none of the advantages as a separate legal entity. Couldn’t you make it so that everyone has different trials?

Ghandakly: since slates combine everyone’s finances, why don’t we say that violations to one slate will not be directed to one member of that slate?

Hoque: Would there be safeguards for people?

Ghandakly: I think if we put in “the slate as an entity would be the handler and recipient of violations”.

Hoque: I guess that targets everybody.

Seger: This way, it will say the slate’s name instead of each separate person’s name.

Cropcho: You could put in something that would make it the case that you could try just one person on the slate if they were the only ones responsible.

Scoop: I think if you’re going to join a slate, you should be aware that if one person on the slate screws up, you all face the consequences.

“E Clause Amendment”: All violations against a slate shall be brought against the slate as an entity unto itself, as opposed to individual members of said slate.

Keeping of detailed minutes is suspended for remainder of meeting, with only important parts being noted.

Amendment passes.

Resolution Passes

5-Proposed amendment: strike forth whereas clause and replace it with: whereas, more signatures demonstrate a greater commitment to the elections process-PASSED

Resolution Passes

6- proposed amendment: strike third whereas clause-PASSED

Resolution Passes

7- proposed blanket amendment: renumber to make sure they’re correct.-PASSED

Resolution Passes

8-no amendments
Resolution Passes

9-no amendments

Resolution Passes

10-no amendments

Resolution Passes

11- strike first THEREFORE clause-unconstitutional.
   Amend second therefore clause: “if in the event that a slate is found in violation of EGB Bylaws, All violations against a slate shall be brought against the slate as an entity unto itself, as opposed to individual members of said slate.”
   Strike $100 and replace with $200

Resolution Passes

12- amendment: strike first Therefore-PASSED

Resolution Passes

13-no amendments

Resolution Passes

14-proposed amendment: add number 11, making it II A 11 in the second whereas clause-PASSED

Resolution Passes

Meeting is adjourned.