Lauren Fechtel
Secretary of the General Assembly
3150 Ohio Union
1739 N. High Street
614.736.2390
fechtel.1@osu.edu

OHIO STATE

USG

UNDERGRADUATE
STUDENT GOVERNMENT

49**th General Assembly**
Autumn 2016, Session 13
November 30, 2016

I. Opening
   a. Call to Order
   b. Attendance
      i. La Pointe.17 for Reed
      ii. Honaker.41 for Lovejoy
      iii. Ellis.703 for Glass
      iv. Quadri.8 for Serfozo
      v. Polavarapu.4 for Ford
      vi. Dretzka.3 for Bodey
   c. Swearing in of Alternates

II. Open Forum for Public
   a. No one

III. Updates —*Danielle Di Scala*
   a. We have some exciting news. The Judicial Panel has selected their new Chief justice, Connor Greenwood. We will hopefully be appointing two new justices. We have two more applications and we want to interview them so we are taking the time to do that. Thank you for filling out the input form. The general consensus is that these meetings are not always the most interesting meetings and you get out of this what you put in to it. Reaching out to constituents is how you get ideas. Think of ways to push policy along. This is important for policy and to push things along in University Senate. The work you do here is important and we appreciate it. Also, we are holding general assembly next week because we need it for appointments.
   b. *Greenwood*: I'm a third year studying political science. I've been on the Judicial Panel since April of 2015. I worked closely with Taylor Marsilio, the last Chief Justice.

IV. Executive Report—*Gerard Basalla*
   a. Obviously it's important that we reference what happened this week, the tragic act that happened on north campus. We were in constant contact with law enforcement and administrators. We wanted to make sure that students weren't going to class and that we got information out about sheltering. We are very thankful for the law

enforcement for acting swiftly; they took less than two minutes to respond. We are in solidarity with the people who are being prejudiced against. We have been in meetings with student groups and administrators. I gave an address at St. John's Arena yesterday at the vigil. To sum my speech up: you matter here regardless of your background. We are proud of our progress, but things can improve. University Senate will be kicked off this week and we met with President Drake to discuss strategic planning. We are looking forward to seeing that. The textbook will officially have a report. It has been well vetted and we are bringing that to fruition. We have had a long month. If you sent me an email, I haven't been able to respond to everyone in a shift manor because I am a student and I get over 500 emails a day. I will respond and I'm doing it as quickly as possible. I will not speak to the legislation today because that is not my place, but please have a good discussion today. In the past few weeks we have been passing things briskly, but I would like to see discussions about this.

b. *Clark*: I have heard reports about professors and TAs not knowing what to do in situations like we had on Monday. Is USG doing anything about this?

c. *Basalla*: That is the first thing I brought up with administrators. There is a procedure for this in training. When the university says to shelter in place, you are not allowed to have class. We have to make sure professors remember this and students know this. This was brought up by the new director of Public Safety and there is an idea to make a 30 second clip during orientation about this. This is an issue that we are very concerned about.

d. *Shaffer*: It seems that a lot of people thought the shelter in place was lifted too quickly. Is that the case?

e. *Basalla*: it was lifted at the correct time. The question is 'should you go near the garage?' I said no, but it was safe.

f. *La Pointe*: Neither I nor Senator Sullivan received a Buckeye Alert text. I know others who didn't get them as well.

g. *Sullivan*: I got them hours after the fact and it was concerning because we wouldn't know what is happening.

OHIO STATE

USG

UNDERGRADUATE
STUDENT GOVERNMENT

Lauren Fechtel
Secretary of the General Assembly
3150 Ohio Union
1739 N. High Street
614.736.2390
fechtel.1@osu.edu

49**th** **General Assembly**
Autumn 2016, Session 13
November 30, 2016

h. *Basalla*: That has not been a concern I have received yet, but I will look into that. If you can send me a blurb I can forward it on.

V.   Committee Report
a. Allocations
i. *Frank:* Allocations did not meet this past Sunday, but we amended the budget and funded:
1. MUNDO: $1500.00
2. Organization of Arab Students: $622.69
3. Chi Alpha Christian Fellowship: $1500.00
4. Coped Field Hockey Club: $1500.00
5. Women's Soccer: $1500.00
6. Buckeye Bhangra: $1500.00
7. Delta Xi Phi Multicultural Sorority: $1000.00
8. Chinese Student and Scholar Society: $520.00
9. Men's Club Soccer: $1500.00
10. Survivor: Time and Change: $1073.00
11. Japanese Student Organization: $299.00
ii. *Frank:* We are not taking any more applications this quarter. One event I'd like to highlight is Survivor: Time and Change. They are coming and are creating the show on campus and it sounds like it will be a cool event. People have been chosen and it will be on YouTube so we can follow along.
iii. *Clark:* The founder of that is in my fraternity and he's very excited about it. Let me know if you want to do it next semester.

b. Oversight—*Mario Belfiglio:*
i. 49-R-25 —This has been passed and been brought to the floor this week. The Judicial Panel submitted bylaws for us to approve. This proposal will be held in committee so the panel can make changes if they want. We can recommend changes but we cannot change it ourselves.
ii. 49-R-24 —There are two members on that resolution, Michael Branum and Ryan Moore. We are waiting for the two other applicants so they can be interviewed and they will be here

Lauren Fechtel
Secretary of the General Assembly
3150 Ohio Union
1739 N. High Street
614.736.2390
fechtel.1@osu.edu

49**th** **General Assembly**
Autumn 2016, Session 13
November 30, 2016

next week. They haven't been denied, but we just wanted to do everything properly.

VI. **Old Business**
   a. No old business.

VII. **New Business**
   a. 49-R-24 A Resolution to Appoint Members to the Judicial Panel
      i. *Di Scala*: If this passes, the members will resign and we will fill their positions.
      ii. *Bodey:* I would like to ask them why they want to switch from General Assembly to the Judicial Panel and how they will best serve USG in this position.
      iii. *Moore*: Danielle and I had a discussion about being involved and I'm most interested in the internal motion of the organization. I felt this would be the best way to help. I feel I will be more passionate about this role than my current role and I feel this is a better fit for me. I have submitted why I think I'm qualified in my application. I'm trying to take advantage of how to best improve this organization with my qualifications.
      iv. *Branum*: I have a lot of the same sentiments and I would feel more purposeful in this position.
      v. *Frank*: In our constitution, it says that candidates who have been involved in elections are highly discouraged from serving. How are they eligible for this position if they have both been on a campaign?
      vi. *Di Scala:* We were given a limited number of applications and they did not serve in leadership positions in the campaign. This was considered, but we did not feel this would hinder their ability to perform their duties.
      vii. *Frank:* How many justices are there currently on the panel?
      viii. *Di Scala:* This would make it six.
      ix. *Shaffer*: The purpose is for the Judicial Panel to be unbiased. By the nature of your current positions, you have met friends who may have certain biases and you may act on them without knowing. How would you respond if you were accused of

favoring a senator? How would you defend your unbiased position?

x. *Moore:* I'm very disinterested in the politics in this organization and I have no desire to have power in this organization. I would substitute my decision with documents and stress the lineage that brought me there. I am leaving my senate position and I'm very disinterested in this position.

xi. *Di Scala:* I want to correct my earlier statement; we currently have six justices and if we approve this resolution, it will become eight. One justice will be graduating at the end of the semester.

xii. *Bodey:* I would like Branum to answer that question as well.

xiii. *Branum*; I have a lot of the same sentiments. I'm not drawn towards campaigns and the grab for power. I feel like I will be impartial in this role.

xiv. ***Moved to discussion.***

xv. ***Motion to pass with acclamation.***

xvi. ***Motion failed.***

xvii. *Frank:* So, I have a lot of concerns with approving these too strictly looking at the constitution. I feel concerned about their involvement in campaigns both last year and planning for campaigns this year. Their involvement in this makes me feel uncomfortable approving them. I still find too many reservations about this. I would encourage the senators to delay this until the others can come through. I would prefer other members that are unaffiliated to be considered first.

xviii. *Bodey*: I know they won't say this themselves, so I will. This is an example of people who are disenchanted with USG and they feel this is a way to still serve USG to help. Its's unfortunate, but some people are pushed out do to attitudes and I like they are holding on.

xix. ***Questions is called.***

xx. ***49-R-24 A Resolution to Appoint Members to the Judicial Panel*** PASSED.

Lauren Fechtel
Secretary of the General Assembly
3150 Ohio Union
1739 N. High Street
614.736.2390
fechtel.1@osu.edu

49**th General Assembly**
Autumn 2016, Session 13
November 30, 2016

b. 49-R-25 A Resolution to Support the Judicial Panel's Implementation of Ranked Choice Voting in USG Elections
   i. *Warnimont*: This is about encouraging the Judicial Panel to implement ranked choice voting. It is a form of voting that gives boxes to rank the candidates in the order you'd like. One vote per person is called First Past the Post (FPTP), and it is what we currently have. It is straightforward, but it has problems. The first thing I care about is minority rule. People can dislike a candidate, but they can still win. The likelihood of this increases with more groups running against each other. Only 14 USG elections since 1964(?) have won with a majority of votes. The majority of voices are not heard in FPTP. With Ranked Choice Voting (RCV), the last place person is eliminated. The votes of the people who voted for this group will have their second choice votes counted with the remaining candidates until one candidate gains a majority of the votes. The second thing I'd like to discuss is the Spoiler Effect. It occurs when more candidates run with similar views. This isn't as big a deal in USG elections, but FPTP voting would erase this. For example, if two candidates support CABS buses, the votes would be split between these two choices and the other candidate with minority support may be elected. With FPTP one may vote for someone that they fear rather than who they like: you are voting against a candidate instead of for one. You can choose not to vote for the person that you hate with RCV. RCV is used in 8 Big Ten schools and Maine has recently voted to implement this. We should be on the right side of democracy and electoral reform by passing this resolution.
   ii. *Shaffer*: I have nothing further to add.
   iii. *Chang*: This is a good idea and Senator Warnimont did a good idea of explaining this.
   iv. *Bidna*; I would like to thank Joe for this. This means that everyone is voting for an honest vote. There are statistics that say that those voting using the ranked choice system are more satisfied because it represents more minority votes. African-Americans and women felt more represented, as well as

Independents. More people feel represented and I'm very much in support of this.

v. *Clark*: Realistically, when will we see this implemented if it passes?

vi. *Warnimont*: I spoke with Tim Marshfield, who works on the website, and he said that he couldn't give a definite estimate without more standards. I don't anticipate it getting passed for this election cycle. If the Judicial Panel decided to implement it, the 2018 elections would most likely be able to use this.

vii. *Clark*: Did he give a rough estimate for the cost.?

viii. *Warnimont*: He said it would take 60-80 programmer hours, which would be about $6,000, but it could be less.

ix. *Belfiglio*: I have one question: How would this work for senators with seats that have three or more positions?

x. *Warnimont*: If there is more than one seat it would be called Single Transferable Vote (STV). You can look up more information about it. You need a majority to win with ranked choice. With STV it is more complicated. It's similar in that the last place person gets eliminated.

xi. *Frank*: Have you had conversations with constituents about this? Did a constituent bring this idea to you?

xii. *Warnimont*: No, but constituents have agreed with me when I have discussed it with them.

xiii. *Colvin*: Don't you think that a lot of people will still only vote for one person? Will they actually take the time to rank?

xiv. *Warnimont*: We can't mandate that people rank their votes and it's still possible that people only vote for one, but it is important that they have the option to vote for more. In real life, there is a good use of ranking multiple candidates.

xv. *Fechtel*: Are there unintended consequences with this system?

xvi. *Warnimont*: It is possible for minority votes to win if they only vote once and don't rank their choices.

xvii. *Frank*: If I only voted for one, and that person loses, does my vote no longer count?

xviii. *Warnimont*: If my candidate loses, your vote would go away. It's called an exhaustive ballot. If I voted for candidate C and

they win with 45% of the vote, you are limiting your voice to voting for one person.

xix. *Gracia*: Does this only work if there are more than two teams running?

xx. *Warnimont:* Yes, are there will always be write-in candidates.

xxi. *Ellis*: Would this open up the possibility of voting for more positions?

xxii. *Warnimont*: The second place person with the most votes win. It follows a strict way of choosing the next vote, a path. It's pretty well systematized.

xxiii. *Liu*: Will you be extending the duration of the voting period? Like it is week or several days, will you extend the days to account for how much longer it would take to count the votes?

xxiv. *Warnimont:* This does not address the amount of days. There are currently 3 and we will not need to hold another election to know the results.

xxv. *Belfiglio:* Would you be okay with implementing this for presidents and not senators?

xxvi. *Warnimont:* Totally, because it increases democracy.

xxvii. *Belfiglio*: If there are two teams voting and each person had the least number of votes, it is no confidence.

xxviii. *Warnimont:* Whoever gets the most votes would win in this.

xxix. *Clark:* Is this changing the Judicial Panel bylaws and not the constitution?

xxx. *Warnimont:* Yes.

xxxi. *Clark*: Can you elaborate on write-in candidates and how they would work in this system?

xxxii. *Warnimont*: My understanding is that they would add up how many write in votes and put that into who won and who lost. If there is a major write-in campaign, it would still place them in the correct order of votes and the least candidate would still be eliminated.

xxxiii. ***Speakers list capped.***

xxxiv. *Polavarapu*: Is there a chance to add a none on the above option if you are dissatisfied?

xxxv. *Warnimont:* That is in place in Nevada, but I didn't mention that in the resolution.

xxxvi. *Shaffer*: That was done in Russia and that option almost won, so I would suggest not doing that.

xxxvii. *Merchant:* How would this system affect write in candidates?

xxxviii. *Warnimont*: In other elections there is only one write in slot and that would stay the same.

xxxix. *Merchant:* Could you have the situation where 40% of the electorate vote for the other parties and there is no majority? If these candidates have similar platforms, could you have a scenario where a team gets the most votes even if only ten percent of the body wanted them to win?

xl. *Warnimont:* The fact that they get to the majority shows that enough people agree with this.

xli. *Merchant:* The second choice would receive the same amount of votes if their first choice was eliminated?

xlii. *Warnimont:* Yes.

xliii. *Frank:* Would this money come out of the USG budget?

xliv. *Warnimont*: They have a set amount each year to change the budget. The money would not come just from USG funds; it would also come from the website money that is set aside every year.

xlv. *Warnimont:* Is this a good use of the money?

xlvi. *Warnimont:* Yes, this is only 2-3 percent of the budget and it increases representation.

xlvii. *Gracia:* Would this increase voter turnout?

xlviii. *Warnimont:* I would say yes because their voice is heard.

xlix. *Gracia:* How would voters know about this system?

l. *Warnimont*: The Judicial Panel already advertises elections and I think they would advertise this as well.

li. *Dretzka*: I know that in the past USG has had write-in candidates before that had non-serious platforms. Would this system make it easier for them to win?

lii. *Warnimont*: People need to vote for who they want to and if this encourages that I don't have anything negative to say about this.

liii. ***Moved to Discussion***

liv. *Belfiglio:* I think we had some great questions and Senator Warnimont did a great job. It would be hard for 50% to write in a vote and this system might allow students to do their funny write-in a vote and their serious vote. You can write in Al Jones and then vote for serious candidates. I would also like to discuss just doing this for the presidential race as a trial run. Running as a senator, it is harder to get votes and explain to constituents the new system; it might be good to do this for just the presidential election.

lv. *Buss*: I agree with Senator Belfiglio and the work that was put into this resolution; it is great. My fear is that a lot of people's actual choice may be discouraged. Let's go back two years, Abby and Abby and Michelle and Knoll, and let's add Gerard and Danielle. Not Gerard and Danielle, but a third party not involved in USG that doesn't have much of a platform. Let's say Abby and Abby get 49% of the vote, Michelle and Knoll get in the upper 30s and the other gets in the 10s. Would the third choice get propelled? That's what I don't understand. I would be open to just doing presidential because the senator races would be confusing.

lvi. *Belfiglio*: In your example, the third party would be eliminated. Their votes would be put under the other two candidates. If there are 7 candidates, their votes are distributed until one candidate gets the most votes. No one can win without 50% of the electorate ranking them as their choice.

lvii. *Frank:* I move to strike Branum's name from the sponsors list.

lviii. ***Motion approved.***

lix. *Clark:* I would like to commend senator Warnimont and I would like to echo having a trial run. It would be a good test of the system initially and if it doesn't work out it's a simple fix and the Judicial Panel can amend the laws after.

lx. *Shaffer*: I agree that the senator voting doesn't need to be done differently. And if a goat wins, we need to look in on ourselves. I think we should pass it.

OHIO STATE
USG
UNDERGRADUATE
STUDENT GOVERNMENT

lxi. *Belfiglio:* If we do a presidential trial run, it would potentially reduce the amount of buyer's remorse.

lxii. *Warnimont:* With the senators, it would be the same as ranking, but it would be counted differently. However, if people think it's too far to go right away I am okay with just having presidential votes.

lxiii. *Liu:* I like the idea, but I don't think people vote because of the choices; I think people don't vote because they don't like USG. I don't think this would make a difference with turnout.

lxiv. *Frank:* Even if it doesn't turn out more voters, it gives those who do more of a voice. This would help people address the apathy in USG and this will be a step in the right direction. Other schools have done this around the country and it's time to do this now.

lxv. *Abusway:* I feel both sides in this. Let's say Abby and Abby get 49%, Michelle and Knoll get 26%, and a third party gets 25%. If everyone who voted ranked Michelle and Knoll second, they would win with only 26% first. As it stands, if that election were to happen, they wouldn't have won. I just want to raise this as an issue.

lxvi. *Buss:* That is what I was going for and thanks for clarifying this. I'm torn because I like hearing both sides. I don't like the idea of voting for more than one because a lot of people just want to vote for one and if they do, it might mess up the system. I don't think people necessarily want a majority. If you remember 1992, Bill Clinton didn't win the majority and still won. In 2016, that happened. I still want the person to win with the most votes. I understand where it's coming from and I support this point of view.

lxvii. *Shaffer*: I understand this, but this system works to improve what would be a statistical weird thing.

lxviii. *Frank:* Senator Shaffer hit this on the head. 11% of the voters should not decide who wins. For people who are hesitant, it is simply a recommendation. It would still have to come back to us and this discussion will be had again. We have done a lot of vetting tonight and I'd like to call to question.

lxix. *Warnimont:* Speaking to the scenario mentioned before, that is a reflection of the scenario I brought up in my speakers list. The point of this system is that more voices would be heard. It's said that 49 percent cast the first choice, but in 1991, the votes were off by 10 votes and they only won with 40% of the votes. I believe RCV would fix this.

lxx. *Bidna*: I support this as it gives more choice to the people.

lxxi. *Belfiglio*: In 2012, Taylor Stepp won with 32% of the votes. Let's say Taylor was pro-traditional USG candidate and 70% of the electorate voted for radical change. This vote was just split with more teams. This a clear mandate and this is where the system addresses the problem. I think it's fair to say that close to having 50% is okay, but with only a small percent, that is a problem and RCV takes care of that. I move to amend the resolution in order to make it just president and vice-presidential elections.

lxxii. ***Moved to questions on the amendment.***

lxxiii. ***Moved to discussion on the amendment.***

lxxiv. ***Called to question the amendment.***

lxxv. ***Motion failed.***

lxxvi. *Bidna*: Does anyone have any basis that this would cost less money?

lxxvii. *Belfiglio*: This would take less time with coding. I'm not amending it for the money, but just to figure this out. The senator votes are not majority and people would be nervous with the statistical anomalies and I think it's good to try this out and I think you see this issue more with presidential elections.

lxxviii. *Frank*: The Judicial Panel can change this as well. This discussion is stupid [redundant] because it does not give the full effect of this.

lxxix. ***Amendment passes.***

lxxx. *Liu*: I left my umbrella upstairs and I want to go get it.

lxxxi. *Merchant:* Senator Belfiglio, I think there is a case where 30 percent go to Stepp and the rest have different platforms, so that can be ignored. We don't actually know how many people

will take advantage of this and we don't know how these people will actually vote with more than one candidate. I might just vote for one candidate and we don't know how many people would vote for just one.

lxxxii. *Quadri*: I am in full support and from a minority perspective, I know some people don't feel their voice is heard if some candidates have more money or more marketing. I feel like a lot of people are dissatisfied with that and this gives minority candidates a better chance.

lxxxiii. *Clark:* I think the pros out way the cons and I'm in full support of this resolution.

lxxxiv. **Question is called.**

lxxxv. ***49-R-25 A Resolution to Support the Judicial Panel's Implementation of Ranked Choice Voting in USG Elections* PASSED.**

VIII. Announcements

a. *Buss:* I know I've yelled at you, but please retweet the End Hate OSU video.

b. *Liu:* If you want to be a Greek facilities recess apply. Sit for hours and get money.

c. *Shaffer:* Dotti had an interesting week and slept through the game. She vacationed in Greenville, SC, and received a plate of my parent's cooking while I ate with my friends at Bob Evans.

IX. Adjournment

a. Meeting is adjourned.