SECRETARY’S REPORT NO. 15, JANUARY 5, 2011.
REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN AT THE MEETING OF THE USG SENATE

The Student Senate met in Regular Session on January 5, 2011 at 6:30 PM in the Senate Chamber. Speaker of the Senate Andrew Mikac presided.

Present: 34 Absent: 3 Alternates: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>Gushing</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antani</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahm</td>
<td>Homan</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunner</td>
<td>Hosa</td>
<td>Reinhard: ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins: alt</td>
<td>Howard: alt</td>
<td>Reu: ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeDonato</td>
<td>Hutchison</td>
<td>Ryan: alt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeFrance</td>
<td>Ingram</td>
<td>Schaffer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugginenni</td>
<td>Kedia</td>
<td>Schmitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farinacci</td>
<td>Liles</td>
<td>Shoub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson: ab</td>
<td>Mbagwu</td>
<td>Smidt: alt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>McFarland</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flis</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>Tichenor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gildenmeister</td>
<td>Mikac</td>
<td>Wurster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senators and Senate Alternates were sworn in.

Approval of the Previous Secretary’s Minutes

Open Forum For the Public

Executive Report
Kamrass: I want to thank a lot of you for your support. Many of you have checked in on us and I want to thank you to for letting me step away from the USG work for a while. It’s a nice reminder that we are family and it’s a student organization that can be there for each other. Thank you to all that helped with the Thompson Library
project. We are anxious to hear the numbers it was a good team effort between cabinet and senate and we are looking forward to more of that in the future. In the present, at the beginning of this quarter and end of autumn we are re evaluating our platform and seeing what needs to still be accomplished. We have about four months left and we really want to make the most of it. We are going to be setting the agenda with cabinet and working with all of you as well. Brad and I have been in touch with the athletic department on all of the unfolding football news. We are happy with how things are being handled and if you have any questions about the process or anything brad or I will be glad to answer those. In old business you have legislation on Mandy Emerson as being the possible new press secretary we are excited to get her involved with all three branches. We want to step up our involvement with Buckeyethon and many of you have already signed up and that’s great. Future academic admission grants more information about those in the next couple of days if you have any questions please speak to Laura or Kelsey. UC is coming Jan 22, a lot of people are coming I got a chance to hang with them over break and they are a great group of people with a lot of ideas. Lastly last meeting it was kind of jokingly but I do really want to start a USG acapella group. If you want to be a part of this be sure to let me know. Any questions?
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PAST

- Winter Break
  We hope you all had an enjoyable one!

- Thompson Library – Extended Hours!
  Thanks to all Senators and Executive Cabinet members that helped out with this initiative. It had great success, which we hope to use as leverage for discussion – we will be working with administrators and University Senate to make this a permanent thing!

PRESENT

- Micah & Brad Platform
  We went through this platform during break to understand what has and has not been achieved. We will be looking for help on projects coming up, which will be highlighted in the Exec Report. Please ask if you’re interested in helping!

- State of the University – January 26, 2011
  Upcoming agenda will also be made clear in State of the University, held January 26. Invitations to State of the U were sent to administrators and student organization presidents. As we near the date, announcements will appear in campus media, like BNN.
Football News
We were in touch with university administrators about the football scandal. A long process remains ahead but we are confident that the university is handling it well.

Press Secretary
Pending approval today, we will begin transitioning our new press secretary, Mandie Emerson, from an Executive side. Please remember to reach out to Mandie with projects you are working on!

Buckeyethon
USG will help Buckeyethon in a larger role this year. Let Liora Friedman know if you would like to help! USG will definitely have a team this year!

FUTURE

Academic Enrichment Grants
Laura, Kelsey, and the AEG team finalized the application, and it will go live this week! Please direct your friends to visit the USG website for the application. We will send out a formal announcement via the USG listserv, as well as other media outlets. Pass on the word! Email Laura, Kelsey, or Brett with questions.

University of Cincinnati / Ohio State Retreat
Save the Date! January 22, 2011 – Want to help plan? Tell Laura!

USG A Cappella Choir
Micah is starting one. We need people. Let us know if you’re interested!!

Committee/Constituency Report

Antani: CAA met today the following have been approved Semester Conversion proposal for the core College of Engineering, BS in Biomedical Engineering, BS in Welding Engineering, Minor in Biomedical Engineering, Minor in EEIC, Technological studies, and Minor in Environmental Engineering.

DeDonato: CSA is further discussing the Carve-out policy and we vote on it next week. We are also talking about in sub committee about having off campus students submit their campus. The Off Campus department is all for this they just need the students support.

O’Connelle: The Office for Disability Services at Penn State was just sued for not having captioned or visual notes for their deaf students. So right now we are just trying to make sure that that doesn’t happen to us. Because as it stands right now deaf students have to request something if they want it captioned. We also looked at Security and the Carmen policy as well.
Antani: was there any update on the 150 seats in SEL?

O’Connell: no I haven’t heard an update on that.

Kamrass: I just would like to remind you the committee to select the next undergrad member on the board of trustees that if you are interested in applying for the job you should do so now. The applications are out you can go to trustees.osu.edu, the due date is January 28th. The best person to go to if you have any questions is Alex Swain at swain.64@osu.edu. It’s a very important job and its two years so you need to be sure you’ll be a student here for another 2 years.

McFarland: do you know the time requirement for the selection committee? How often do they meet?

Kamrass: that all depends on how many applicants there are. Any other questions?

Flis: Council on Enrollment and student progress met Tuesday they just passed the rules and we got all those out. And we are having the ROTC priority scheduling coming back to us. So we should see that next time around.

**Project Updates**

Mbagwu: Right now I’m currently working on making another committee for senate it would kind of be under Diversity Inclusion. I think a lot of what we deal with at Senate and a lot of the problems that we have might not always fall under B&F, P&F or Student affairs etc. So we are brainstorming and just seeing how we can make a committee like that work and be effective and have real work for them to do.

Mikac: any other project updates? Seeing none ok we are now going to move into the presidential veto’s.

**Presidential Veto**

43-R-51 (Fitzpatrick) *A Resolution to Reapportion the USG Senate*

Mikac: Micah gets the first and final word. We’ve done this before so Micah take it away.

Kamrass: This one is pretty simple I think you guys actually did a great job on this and investigating on how we can do a great job of representing our student body. The only thing that I took issue with that I would love if we could change now is these changes go into affect the next election cycle and I would like to see them go into affect for spring 2011. It seems to me we have found the best way to represent students at Ohio State and we should do that as quickly as possibly. It would be hard for me to go back and tell the students we found the best way to represent you but
we are going to wait two years to put it into affect. So I think we are far enough away from the election according to our rules that we can do that. So we can do that still and our rules allow for that and by spring of 2012 our numbers may have changed so it seems to me the numbers that we have are the current population and if we can make the change I think we should. If we put it into place by 2012 it may be different. I like this one and I think its ready to go and if we have something for the students we should go ahead and give it to them.

Mikac: any questions?

McFarland: I guess if we do enact this for the cycle that means that it would go into affect before then or like.

Mikac: it's proposed that it would go into affect on the upcoming ballot.

Kamrass: and to clarify you all passed two different pieces one went into affect immediately so it just seems to me this one should as well and it would go into affect during our new senate elections.

Mikac: questions? Seeing none we will now go into discussion.

Antani: Does anyone have an argument why it should be 2012?

Fitzpatrick: the reason it was like this was because that’s what we were tasked to do. We didn’t feel like we should push the boundaries in terms of what I think I understand Micah’s argument things should be changed but when it comes down to it there are a couple reasons why it shouldn’t. One is president, where we don’t start a cycle where senators start benefiting themselves. For example you set your constituency larger you have a better chance of making it and if you set it smaller you have a harder one. It’s really to take your personal interest out as much as possible. That’s the logic behind 2012 or 2011.

Farinacci: my only concern is there are more off campus seats then academic being added.

Mikac: any other discussion?

Messenger: I’m going to agree with Micah on this one. I mean there is a concern of ethical process but I kind of think in the bigger picture how we approach this we had a pretty big fight over the committee on this and if I’m correct that ended up being all people who were going to graduating and not pertaining to senate or USG next year. So the committee did kind of set this up and came up with this solution and they were a pretty ethical group. Therefore I don’t see a problem in changing their timing because the committee themselves were pretty ethical.

Fitzpatrick: I just want to clarify if we change this for 2011 since the process has been done in 2012 in mind we sort of created this solution under the pretence of the removal of personal interest from it. In terms of ethically do I think this is wrong no but when it comes down to when the next senate comes to review it and they come in with the mind set that ok we can do this next year to a certain extent that’s the next senates problem and not ours.

Flis: Point of information I sat on the committee and we looked at the numbers and considered reapportionment were they 2012 numbers or current?

Fitzpatrick: they were current.

Farinacci: I just want to emphasis that I feel that having a decent size of seats coming out of academics and being added to off campus it really only appeals or benefits a small number of students.
Kedia: the reason we decided to do it this way is because there are a lot more academic senators then off campus and technically you live somewhere and you go to a college so it wouldn’t be an equal number. So we thought it should kind of be kind of equal because a living campus senator is representing more constituents per person.
Mikac: just as a reminder we are referring to the veto.
Messenger: I was just going to agree with Kedia. 40,000 live off campus and giving them that extra representation I don’t feel like is such a bad thing.
Fitzpatrick: I just want to say that I encourage you overturn the veto I don’t think its going to be a terrible thing if it gets overturned and I’ll just go ahead and change it to 2011 and submit a new piece of legislation for next week so I just want to clarify.
Messenger: point of information could we just motion to reintroduce the same text and title it with a different number
Fitzpatrick: technically we have to have copies of it.
Mikac: any other discussion?
Messenger: I call to question.
Mikac: it has been called to question. Any objections? Seeing none.
Kamrass: I’m just encouraging you to not overturn the veto on this one.
Mikac: 2/3 vote to overturn the veto. If you got “I” on this you are voting to overturn it if you vote nay that means you do not want to overturn the veto and abstain is abstain. All in favor of overturning please raise your hand 3-33-2
43-R-51 stands vetoed.

43-B-19 (Fitzpatrick) A Bill Supporting COSI After Dark

Kamrass: On this one I’m a little less knowledgeable since it was introduced directly on the floor and I wasn’t here. Brad filled me in and I talked to a few of you, my general feeling on this one is that there are a couple things that I was a little uneasy with. One I think it’s important that things go through our committee process when they can. I know Brett is working on fixing some of those issues so that’s good but that level is extremely important. I know last senate was hectic and a lot went on I just want to make sure that this got looked at the best that it could. The other thing I’m a little uncomfortable with is that student activity fee money should go to events that are planned by students. For example when the change was made for money to go to activity events it was made a requirement that students are involved are in the planning. This is an event that happens and will happen with or without our money. It’s a good event so I didn’t veto it because I think it’s a bad event, I love COSI and I think its great for OSU students to go. But it seems to me it just may have been an example of us saying it’s the end of the quarter we have some money left in the account lets just give it to this event. It’s going to happen with or without the money I feel like its ok we hold back the money get more students involved. I don’t know if they are counting on our money or not. It seems like its getting money from a lot of different sources. I don’t have hard feelings if you disagree I just wanted to throw that out there and have it considered. Because I believe every cent of the students money should be in the best interest and I want to make sure we are all on the same page.
Farinacci: Is the even still going to happen without the funding?
Mikac: yes. Other questions? Seeing none we will now move into discussion.
Fitzpatrick: I highly encourage you to overturn much more then on the last one. One I just want to clarify it didn’t go through the committee process but the committee was consulted. There is no process for a bill like this to go through the committee because it’s technically not sponsored by a student organization. I know that was one of the things Micah had some issues with it may not have been planned or sponsored by students but they were highly involved in the event. There is a clothing drive, volunteering, at COSI, transportation. Ultimately it will benefit a lot of students as of today there was 1,000 saying they were or might go. It was strongly advertised. Also they went ahead and put our information on all of their marketing as well. It’s a good event I know its not sponsored by students but they are very much involved and in a large part benefiting from this and allows us to interact with the university committee as a whole.
DeFrance: so there are a couple of aspects that I think are really non essential that the event is still going to happen is irrelevant. We should generally not sponsor ones that aren’t going to happen without us because that means they weren’t all that well planned or financed. But instead we get to be a part of this not being a big drain and allow it to be known that this event will happen in the future. There’s also the question of is it important that the students didn’t plan this? What is important is this is going to benefit students and is open to pretty much anyone and anyone can do this I know a lot of people that go year after year. Ultimately we have been advertised as a sponsor that also isn’t our issue its there mistake but it is a nice little perk. I am all for overturning this veto.
Antani: to expand off of James third point of that it doesn’t matter if students planned it they will benefit from it. Micah brought up that student activity fee generally doesn’t go to things not planned by students which is true when it comes to CSA funding however I just do want to clarify that we have the D-Tix program. This is student activity fee money is used to discount tickets for events that aren’t planned by students. This kind of contributes to that where COSI tickets are a ridiculous 30 or 45 dollars and we are able to discount and help and I think it’s a great event that benefits students. So I also want you to overturn the veto.
Mbagwu: so I’m undecided on this but I might be leaning towards supporting the veto for a couple of reasons. The first one is that if you look at the income a lot of this is coming from student activity fee money. Two I do have some problems with the direct oversight of not seeing where all of this money is going. I know the senate has shown itself to be meticulous for a lot of things that go through here. From a budgetary standpoint its one of the most loosely planed ones.
McFarland: I guess as far as consistency I would prefer for something to be a little more planned. It gives a little more accountability to where this is going. It says that let it be resolved that 1500 will be given to sponsor cab transportation to and from COSI after dark but it doesn’t tell where its going who’s going to be spending that money and ummm I guess that was the issue that I had with it. It’s a good program and has a lot to offer. I guess for any future references I would actually support the veto just because of accountability purposes. There is no group this money is going
to and it would be hard to see even for a reimbursement check to see whom this is going to.

Messenger: I just have a point of information. Suppose this wasn’t vetoed we are under the winter quarter budget would it be coming out of that budget?

Kamrass: It would come out of Winter since that has already been approved. Messenger: so it was originally written to come out of Fall budget but is now coming out of winter? Correct? Ok. So how much money is left?

Mikac: 12,800

Kamrass: I don’t want that to be a concern though.

McFarland: I have to talk to Paul Berry because there are a couple of groups that didn’t spend all their money and some that haven’t received a check. There will be a few more dollars left then what we approved.

Kamrass: procedural it should be winter but there are things we can do to get that money back to you if need be.

Fitzpatrick: yea I just want to clarify a few things its going directly to busing and its university residential services and that committee is made up of 3 housing members a hall director and an assistant hall director who are in charge of running the actual event itself. So that’s whom that money would go to. No it wouldn’t be going to a DJ or balloon artist but busing to and from the event.

Antani: I was going to say withdrawn but now I’m not. Now that someone has brought it up I don’t like that in the Therefore let it be resolved clause that there is no entity that it is going to. It just says to pay for cabs transportation not to University Residence and Dinning Services so one of the hall directors could say I planned this I need to get reimbursed and I actually don’t like that now and I’m going to tell you to stay the veto.

Kamrass: I just want to add I don’t think this is a bad thing I just wanted to challenge you all I really do think that student activity fee money should go to events that are planned for it. I think it’s the educational value of planning the event and I will tell you my personal experience weighs more then what I learn in the classroom. I see this problem every year we this one great event we want to give it money and then when we get to the end of the year we have six groups that are all wanting money and I would feel bad looking to this and saying I would rather have that money go to something that benefits students and was planned by students. This event is going to happen I do think that matters I think our money should go where there is need not just value but both. One thing you all have shown and that I’m proud of is you have gone to new student orgs as well as small ones and say how can we help you launch and event that will last a while. I would just like to see this money go to that instead of University Residence and Dinning Services.

Liles: just as a transparency issue if someone wanted to be reimbursed for something other then cab transportation to and from COSI they couldn’t be correct?

Mikac: correct.

Schmitt: Just out of curiosity I’ve never participated in this event but what would be the adverse affects of us not sponsoring the events. I mean I know we’ve said it will still go on but does that mean that students won’t be able to participate?

Fitzpatrick: The reason that we did this for cab transportation is because that’s how students get to the event more busing the easier its going to be to get them there. As
to whether or not it’s going to be reduced I’m assuming they will work to cover that. But I’m not sure the process on that.

Kamrass: It will still be the same number of buses.

Fitzpatrick: They added an extra bus with our money. So their minimal was 5 buses and this was to try to add and increase the flow.

Messenger: I don’t want to repeat but I am uncomfortable with University Housing and Dinning coming to us and asking us to use student activity fee money that should come out of their budget and with that I call to question.

Flis: There have been some concerns with when we get later in the year and we are all students here too and this is kind of cool because this is something we can all attend and it’s not something that’s geared toward one group or another. It’s benefiting a whole lot of students and I encourage you to overturn the veto.

Fitzpatrick: Yea I just want a point of information. What was the vote count on this?

Mikac: It was unanimous.

Fitzpatrick: Yea guys it was passed unanimously and some of you have come up with concerns I encourage you to stand with your beliefs when this came out originally you all thought this was a great event or else you wouldn’t have voted that way so I ask you to think to that. And ultimately this is a great event last year it had about 6000 attendees and that’s the biggest amount we will get and its also students interacting with the community and a lot of students are helping with this and I know they weren’t the major part and if you have concerns with them not being the primary planners I think that might be a little short sided. We should be judging on if they are good for students and if they will benefit them please overturn the veto.

DeFrance: withdrawn

Mbagwu: withdrawn

Kedia: I have a couple things to say Micah said it was educational for students to put on these groups but you also have to look at who gets the benefits and if that’s educational. We gave a lot of money for lights and I don’t know how educational that was. We need to look at both sides yes it takes education to put on an event but also to come out of an event as well. Obviously COSI is a good thing. I have a specific question to some people that think, do you think some people are going to pocket the money I mean it is going to buses. I encourage you to overturn.

Antani: I love this event I think we should fund it and I completely understand and agree cab transportation is specific however it doesn’t say to whom this money is going. So for me without this saying specifically who this is going to without that any person that has a cabs transportation invoice can get this and I know there is security issues put in place. But I’m just not comfortable and I don’t like that.

Fitzpatrick: point of information for Matt. You have to go over and check off all of our spending right.

Matt: internal transfer of funds would do this.

Kamrass: So I just want to clarify a couple of things Sean brought up how you voted last time and I think its true you shouldn’t just randomly change but I think if you are presented with an argument that you may not have thought of it is your duty to change. This process was a little different the committee didn’t get a crack at this, and then the second meeting there was a lot going on I don’t think it would be anyone’s fault if they just now thought of something they hadn’t last week. I had a
week to sit and think about this as well. So I don’t think you necessarily have to be tied to your last vote but if you thought of something you are entitled to change it. I do think this is a good event like it has been stated and I do think its going to be a great event without our money. And there is a value to need our money and lots of people should compare evens down the line but the fact of the matter is it’s a naive approach because when its gone its gone and you can’t get it back at that point. To me it does matter and anything we fund we only get one shot and I want to make sure every time we do we are using it the best way we can. Also to Kedia on the educational why the idea of putting up lights or making sandwiches might not seem like a lot the responsibility of being in charge of an event without the help of someone that gets paid to do such a thing is really valuable. It may be a medial task but the response is very educational. I just want to conclude by saying that we as an organization are capable of better you all have shown that and I hope you will uphold the veto and you all as a senate can do better and aliquot that money to a an organization or an event planned by students.

Mikac: ok we will now move into a vote.
Fitzpatrick: I call for a roll call vote.
Mikac: ok it still needs a 2/3 vote to overturn the veto. Keely will call your name and Sean and I will record your votes.
Veto is not overturned it will remain a veto.
Mikac: we will now move into old business.

**Old Business**

43-R-48 (Mikac) *A Resolution to Appoint a USG Press Secretary*

Mikac: This is my resolution to appoint a USG press secretary. We selected Mandy through IOSC which was made up of Laura, myself, and Lindsey. Mandy was chosen and that’s who’s before us. What questions do you have about that process or about this in general? Any questions?
Fitzpatrick: How are you going to balance the duel role of Senate and Exec?
Emerson: The biggest thing is I want to attend as many meetings with both of them as I can. And also making an office time where I can be in the USG office and anyone can come and talk to me and bring me their concerns and ideas.
Fitzpatrick: how would you deal with an issue where senate and exec take two stances?
Emerson: I would see if we could discuss it. I would bring the two together probably in here and do what we just did and what the final vote or count was that would be the final decision.
McFarland: lets say USG gets into some controversy like a group of us goes and gets tattoos with Senate funding. Just saying. What would be your response and how would you bring out the best light for all of us?
Emerson: I would come and talk to senate and bring them all in one by one and try to feel what everyone was feeling on the situation. I would bring all of their opinions
together and that is better when you can bring them all together and have an opinion that everyone can agree on both exec and senate.

McFarland: say something happens but not everyone knows. What would be your next course of action if you were asked to make an immediate statement?

Emerson: I think it’s hard to make an immediate statement and can be very harmful. I would contact Micah, Brad, or Andrew and discuss the situation and I feel that would be my best option rather then making a statement first.

Antani: what is your major, year, and why are you pursuing this? And what is your experience on the topic.

Emerson: I am a junior; my major is Strategic planning and public affairs. I’ve interned in Canal, did community affairs. People would call in with questions and I would answer them. I did all of their internal work and I handled crisis management. I have worked on campaigns and I just started doing work with the corporate law downtown. I wanted to be Press Secretary because I think USG is really beneficial and it’s important to communicate that. I feel I am qualified and I am pretty familiar with sources around Columbus. I also did work with the lantern.

DeFrance: Outside of these people here what do you feel is the general University opinion on USG?

Emerson: Coming from being an officer for an organization and hanging out with my friends and roommates they all know what USG is they and they have a positive outlook. But they too expect things from us.

Mikac: Any other questions? Seeing none. We will now go into discussion and I’m going to ask that anyone that is not a member of senate please leave.

Move for acclimation. Moved and seconded.

Messenger: I would like to move to introduce a piece of legislation into Old Business. Same text just with the correction that all changes will go into affect for the next election cycle.

Mikac: o.k. so you can refer to item 43-R-51 in the presidential veto the only line is different is the time.

DeFrance: point of information are we going to need to suspend the rules to make sure this is totally kosher? I move to suspend the rules.

Moved and seconded. Objection

Mikac: ok we will now move into discussion on suspension of the rules.

Fitzpatrick: basically we operate under a set of standing rules that we have to follow when it comes to passing legislation and introducing legislation what we are considering is not following those rules.

DeFrance: sponsoring this motion just because what we are doing is all good. But you need to make sure it’s totally kosher so we don’t have an issue down the road.

Mikac: ok we will now vote on suspending the rules it requires a 2/3 vote. All in favor please say aye. 1 opposed and 1 abstained. Ayes have it we are therefore moving into discussion with the rules suspended.

Messenger: I would like to introduce 43-R-55 which will have the same text except for in the last there for let it be resolved clause it will now read in affect for the upcoming election.
Moved and seconded. Objected.
Mikac: ok we will now move into discussion on this motion.
Messenger: TO me it kind of makes sense it’ll go back to steering and it will likely pass the same the first one did and then just come back next week. In the interest of saving our time we should do it tonight.
McFarland: withdrawn.
Mbargwu: I call to question.
Antani: I have a Point of information. Is there any change to 43-R-55 then what the presidential veto stated?
Antani: This actually came up over break the college of Arts and Sciences went from 11 seats down to 9. I’m not going to argue vigorously for this but as someone that represents a division in the arts and sciences I don’t want our representation.
Mikac: we aren’t on that discussion yet.
Antani: I have an amendment.
Mikac: well we can’t really consider those yet so please hold that.
Fitzpatrick: Lets get this over with tonight
Mikac: ok we are now going to vote to consider this immediately. 3 abstentions
Messenger: Just to Niraj’s concern these are still the same numbers based on enrollment so it’s the numbers based on the university’s population.
Mikac: we now move into discussion.
Messenger: I call to question.
Mikac: it has been called to question. Fitzpatrick, anyone else like to be added?
Fitzpatrick: I know this is kind of crazy. Guys this is a lot of work and effort put in by a lot of different people. You all know this has been a big concern of mine so please support this Niraj, yes your college is losing seats but that’s because they are being over represented. We did this on the tier thinking because you want to take those concerns out and make it as fair as we can to all students. I encourage you to pass this.
Antani: Withdrawn
Farinacci: withdrawn
Mikac: ok we are now going to vote on 43-R-55. 1 opposed. 1 abstention.

43-R-55 passes.

Antani: I move to return to rules.
Moved and seconded. Objected.

Kedia: With the carve-out policy how will it affect the rules being in place or not being in place?
Fitzpatrick: technically this whole organization thing we are doing doesn’t exist. We have no system to evaluate. Our governing document everyone has to raise his or her hand doesn’t exist right now and we really need to have that so we can have an organized discussion on this. I have no idea how I stand on this but I know a lot of people feel very strongly one it one way or the other.
Mikac: ok we are going right into a vote all in favor of returning to the votes please say aye. 3 opposed. We are going to return to rules. We are going to proceed as follows. Let me explain the steps because the steps are important with how things will go. If you guys have been paying attention and hopefully you all have. This should not be a surprise with what’s about to happen and if it is I’m really disappointed in you guys. So what’s about to happen we are going to consider the religious carve-out exemption of the non-discrimination policy for the student organizations as has been presented by Carrie. We’ve seen it, we’ve seen all kinds of information about it and you should have done some research about it over Christmas break etc. The way we are going to do this is make an opinion in the follow way. Niraj Antani will in a second introduce a piece of legislation to remove the carve-out in its entirety during that time a motion will be made and we need to vote on considering it. When we are in discussion on Antani’s piece of legislation keep in mind that if that does not pass and only if that should fail then we will move into consideration of a piece of legislation that Maria Ahmad put together. Which is going to remove the carve-out with the exception for leaders. That will only be considered if the first option fails. The third option if Marias fails is one by Jen Flis that will keep the carve-out as it exists. Those are the three options. The fourth option if we fail all of them is to not take an opinion at all or we can just vote to note consider any of them. Which the motion has to be made, if you vote to turn down one I would expect that you would do the same for the rest of them. Ok so any questions on the procedure we are about to do? Ok I will now entertain a motion to enter new legislation into immediate consideration.

Antani: I move to introduce 43-R-XX a resolution to support the repeal of the exemption in the registration guidelines for student organizations into immediate consideration.

Mikac: we are now going to move into consideration of 43-R-56.

Moved and seconded

Mikac: I’ll let Niraj pass those out and then we will get started.

Antani: Keeping in mind that we have a few alternates that haven’t been able to learn about the issue and its been three weeks since probably everyone has looked into it I would like to yield my time to Brian Ashton to introduce the topic if he would like.

Ashton: As some of you may have heard last quarter the current student organization guidelines have a non discrimination policy fairly standard non discrimination policy which contains an exemption for groups that are founded on a sincerely held religious belief. It allows for discrimination of membership. The issue was brought to the forefront this summer in response to a Supreme Court case that publicized the idea of religious parliaments if that’s the right word in student organizations. The office of student life and vice presidents office has asked the Council on Student Affairs to examine the issue and make a recommendation to her office as to whether we feel that that clause should continue anything that CSA makes will be a recommendation and then further deliberation. There is a lot of room for input and we are looking forward to the discussion.

Mikac: any questions for Bryan?
Kedia: is there a way to require them to have a basic non-discriminatory clause? Could you instead of saying you have to believe homosexuality is a sin?

Carrie: technically student organization that are formed to foster a sincerely held religious belief are still required to have a non discrimination statement as it applies to their membership. It’s just that that statement has to be consistent with their firm beliefs. They would have a statement and maybe drop religious out and say they only want Christians from this denomination to be members of our group. Does that make sense?

Mikac: the current carve-out allows for what you are saying is that correct?

Carrie: yes.

Mikac: ok any other questions?

Messenger: we can ask questions throughout the process right?

Mikac: yes I’ll allow for it because I think that’s why I asked them to be here.

Antani: I introduced the resolution because I support what’s in it.

Mikac: Ok we will now move into discussion instead of questions for Antani.

Antani: So on the numbers that I have in regards to the organizations, just to put into perspective 12 organizations have statements that limit their leadership to sign in this statement of belief. Two of them limit their voting members and make them in order to be a voting member you have to have the same sincerely held religious belief. And five of them all of their members have to sign this pledge to me a member of the organization. Also one of them its both leadership and voting. Sort of to go off of why I support my position that not only should the carve-out for all comers, voting members and leadership be taking out because first and foremost I completely believe that students have the right to join organizations that students have the right to form organizations that come around religious beliefs however how I feel about this and I’m going to mainly concentrate on the leadership portion because I feel that’s what people are more inclined to support is that this denies students the opportunity to join an organization. If you limit leadership or any of your membership to a sincerely held religious belief you know you are sensational denying students who pay student activity fee and who pay tuition who pay a union fee the opportunity to join this organization and advance in said organization. So for example in the 2011 registration guidelines for organizations at Ohio State within the guiding principal there are two bullet points that really come to favor why this carve out should be removed. Number one says student organizations should contribute to the development of skills but not limiting to leadership, inner personal life management and all of its members. Also all students at Ohio State should have the opportunity to become involved in a student organization and to participate as a student leader. So in the registration guidelines it clearly states that not only should students have the right to join because they pay the student activity fee but that they should have the opportunity to advance in that organization as a leader. So if you leave the carve-out with the leadership portion in there you are denying students with what is explicitly stated in the guidelines. Not only that but every student pays a student activity fee and as I understand that these religious organizations that utilize the carve-out can not get programming fees however they can get 200 dollars of operating fees. The students who decide what those operating fees are for are the leadership. So if the leadership is using students who may want to join and advance
in this organization but cannot because of the carve-out yet their money is still going to this organization to be used. My last point is that when I think the people who do support the leadership example or all of it is they bring up the hostile take over situation where someone will come and you know want to sabotage the organization by coming to leadership but since they don’t have the sincerely held religious belief they will wreck the organization. But to me that can happen in any organization I think that there was some student government where one presidential candidate ran on the fact that he was going to do nothing and when he get elected he did nothing. But there are processes of removal and you can remove those officers if they are not fulfilling the mission statement of the club. Hostile take over situation can happen in college democrats and college republicans. Now I understand that students have the right to association but as someone that represents the college of social lyrical sciences and the students in it, it denies them the right to advance in leadership and that’s all I have for right now.

Stepp: I understand that the university guidelines clearly state that there isn’t supposed to be people not allowed to join an organization but I just really feel like this bill is un American. I mean we all have the ability to join organizations that foster our beliefs and individual ideas on things and to me is absolutely crazy that we are trying to shoot something down like this that would just absolutely really hurt individualizing at Ohio State which is already having trouble gaining identity with its size already. I think anytime you can boil down Ohio State to an individual level that’s great and it justifies the operational funding of 200 dollars. I think you should vote against this bill.

DeFrance: So interestingly I’m actually a fan of discrimination and not because I wish to somehow reserve the right to use it. There are a number of organizations throughout the country as well as this university where I could or would be desired to be denied entrance. It could be for a number of things my gender, sexuality, my lack of faith any number of reasons. In general I’m a fan that these things are allowed to exist. That is what we are talking about that they are allowed to exist in our society and our country but we should not confuse this with what we are looking at specifically which is the carve-out at the University with student organizations. IT should not be confused with the law or the fact that we are expressing an opinion about what we feel our University should run this particular aspect. The religious carve-out is actually ironic because it is discriminatory. Its discriminates against all the other possible things we could discriminate for. We have an anti discrimination policy for other issues but not religion. This one thing we have this issue right here and I’m not entirely sure why it was made to exist because it’s unfair. If we preserve this we are keeping a status quo that is unequal and there is just no parody between other issues. Also as we are going to be looking at the next item, which is the leadership carve-out, this does not prevent an organization from having restrictions on who can vote because they can set up restrictions on who are voting members based on attendance, dues, and other policies. You would be constricting membership but not based on your faith express that you are a member in good and full standing. So if you wanted to have a hostile take over you would have to work really hard. And hopefully come to see this beauty of the organization that you came a part of. I am in favor of passing this resolution
because it's the way many other Universities will be going as well and we should be a part of that. We should be upfront about not carving out religion as an entity that can discriminate. If that change does happen it's going to protect the university from controversy and legal issues that will be non-existent. The religious groups are going to flourish and they will be fine but they are going to be open and that's actually good and that is a very American, Ohioan, and OSU thing, to be open and to not discriminate. Thank You.

Flis: so you are going to have to go with me I just got nervous. What I found when I was writing my resolution I got really tangled up in words. Reading through it and trying to write my own resolution it was like if I put this word here it totally changes the meaning and integrity of what I’m trying to say. As I was reading briefs and summaries and all that again if someone would put an only there and an if there it made it totally different. I had plenty of Christian engineers that was a big thing for them and those are the constituency members that actually approached me. We can talk about leadership and voting members and that's all fine and good but some of the organizations that I've been a part of they choose their leadership not by voting so when you consider bible study leaders or faith sharing focus group you choose your leaders you don't vote for them. Largely for that reason I am advocating for voting down this consideration and yes we are carving religion out of whatever the discrimination policy may be but it tends to get carved out of a lot of things anyway. It seems to me that yes this exemption seems odd but its there and it works well. If your part of a religious organization that doesn't believe in something you don't want them leading your people. When we remove this and someone says I prefer someone didn't do this you are going back to words and people will say well what does this rule say and how can we penalize so and so because of this. Your going to get caught up in words and everyone is going to get confused, I understand why it might not seem fair to have a carve-out in a religious way. The hostile take over situation is something that I never considered, yes I’m sure it could happen but you would have to try really hard. It's just the little niches that you go changing that could change the spirit of the organization and if you go changing the spirit of the organization you start to change and lose your diversity and that's not a good thing. So having this clause protects that, each of these little religious organizations can have those niches. That way everybody in OSU can really find a place among the 80+ different Christian groups and say oh no this one is really my niche. So they aren’t just the same thing with a different name. I definitely support voting this down and thinking about why this is applicable and why it should remain.

Mikac: just because Jen was talking about the other options I don’t expect us to have this conversation three times in other words we can be talking about all the other options now and then ideally we have the discussion in entirety now and then vote three times so we don’t have to keep going back.

Fitzpatrick: point of information real quick for one of our information folks. About how many people are affected?

Matt: No.

McFarland: Just a couple of quick points. One it was brought up about the leadership that it needs to be open and it shouldn't discriminate and I kind of feel that especially in the religious sector it could bring a little bit of dilution what the
original beliefs were. If you were to say that maybe a Muslim or a Hindu organization that had those leaders and then you brought in different Christian aspects if you brought those in on like an executive board there might be a lot more arguments and disagreements on how the organization could be ran. I know we should be open but sometimes these groups are trying to find their niche on campus and could be there only chance to be around people with there similar beliefs and I wouldn’t want to pre oppose someone else’s beliefs on them especially in a group that they can find refuge in. As far as the money goes I think that we might be looking at it in a different manner. The budget is 200 dollars and usually this goes to food or outreach materials or marketing. I don’t think that just because somebody may be different from somebody else that that will have a huge impact on what food they should buy. I believe that whoever the leaders are and like Jen said they aren’t just elected they found trust and value from members of their group and they would be interested in taking care of their group. That’s my view on that I would actually vote against Niraj’s and I like Marias and Jens it would be one of those two if we get down to it.

Mbagwu: This is one of those things where it’s hard and you can see it from both sides. But the first thing I want to discuss is it was mentioned that why do religious organizations have special treatment first thing religion by definition is a belief. And a belief is highly subjective and I would dare say that it is different from individual to individual and the problem I have with removing it completely is that in some way it might inhibit the freedom of expression of your belief. Now Rhadika pointed out for some its what are these core values of these beliefs and the point of allowing having a carve-out is just that that for some they may allow gay membership or leadership you do allow certain criteria but for some other organizations you might not necessarily want that. By letting a carve-out stand you allow the expression of that the main problem I have with Niraj’s is that it forces arbitrarily by the University they are saying that lets take all of this out. We are dictating to you how we see fit for you to practice your religious beliefs. And again as I said before you don’t have that ability to tap into my mind to see how I want to run that so let me do what I want and I’ll let you do as you please. No Niraj also talked about the hostile take over thing and I in this heated climate wouldn’t put it past anybody to do anything the point isn’t if they will it’s if they can. So from an ideological standpoint its lets prohibit this if we think it could happen and if we think the happening of that is wrong. Its again I would hate to use the word discrimination. It reminds me of how people use the term pro life or pro choice. Well no one is going to be anti life and no one is going to be anti choice. But you twist the words depending on what side your on to make it fit you. Like one side will call it discrimination while I’m up here calling it freedom of choice. So again I don’t want people to be married to that word what is it anyway.

Liles: I do think that religion is somewhat different from the other classes you know your race and your veteran status are inherited where as your religion is much more of a political stance. Something that is objective and I have been to a lot of events where religious events have been voicing their concerns and their biggest concern is whether they can ask questions of their leaders while upholding elections. Can they ask about their religious beliefs to decide if they want them to be
leaders? Which I think if you deprive them of the right to ask religious questions which is the fundamentals of their group its very hard to ask them things that will help you make an educated choice. I think that it’s important also to understand what are the main things her what are we worried about. Like if this carve-out remains what’s wrong with that I mean we are reviewing this even though the Supreme Court case didn’t directly affect it. And I mean why I don’t think there have been any particular complaints on the carve-out causing problems and also I’m actually Muslim and a member of Pentecostal group. I haven’t had any problems I’ve heard people say why would you want to join a different religious group. But I happily wanted to join and if elections come up and they can’t ask me any religious questions they wouldn’t have any way of knowing and I think they have every right to know and they have the right to ask those questions. However I don’t think that right should infringe upon the other protected classes.

Pyle: I just want to clarify it seems some of you might be ambiguous on this. These groups will still be able to exist if they don’t comply with this. The only thing that will change is their receiving of money. Correct me if I’m wrong.

Carrie: Basically what it means they would be an unrecognized organization so their benefits provided by the University would be limited to that. They could be in the directory and they would be able to meet however they could not receive the financial benefits of registration such as free rooms. So they would have to pay a general rate that the public would pay for the Ohio Union. But that doesn’t mean they couldn’t meet at other spots on campus for free it would just depend on maybe what college they are affiliated with or academic apartment.

Pyle: So the discrimination fee we are looking at here is whether or not people that pay into the student activity fee fund are allowed to take every advantage of it possible. So these religious groups are declining them the right to do that and I think that’s why Micah and I are so adamant about this. There are three resolutions in front of you and its no discrimination, a little discrimination, or complete discrimination. I am in favor of no discrimination I can’t fathom why anyone would want any other position. I’m going to yield my time to Micah because he knows a little more of the legality’s then I do.

Kamrass: So we’ve been looking at this since the case came. I’ve been struggling with it. I think its interesting and a lot of different views and understandably so. It’s an interesting position for me as well because as some of you may know I was a president of an organization that was exclusively Jewish people. I bring that perspective to the table as well. In review and thinking about it, it occurred to me that we have the opportunity to be a part of something big here we have the opportunity to make a major change that I think is the right change. I don’t want to say right or wrong because I don’t believe there is a right or a wrong in this situation but we have the opportunity to say by voting for Niraj’s resolution that Ohio State does not stand by discrimination of any kind and that a student who would be discriminated from a group that that group doesn’t get to spend that students activity fee money which I think is very important. And to say what it really means to be an Ohio State Student and what it really means to be a buckeye. To use the example in front of us you know I would hope that any group of Ohio state students that want to meet and discuss a certain religion and they think that they aren’t able
to comfortably do that around people who don’t think homosexuality is an abomination I would hope that they are still able to meet to practice their religion but I do not want that happening with the Ohio State name on it and I especially do not want them spending the money of a student who they think is an abomination and they wouldn’t let them join that group. That is what its about to me. So if this is American I don’t think that’s what we are talking about here. I think we are talking about what it means to be an Ohio State Student Organization, what it means to be an Ohio State student and how does Ohio State student activity fee money get spent. I think Niraj’s resolution allows all Ohio State student organizations to be non-discriminatory in any way, to make sure student activity fee money is spent by organizations who wouldn’t deny someone membership merely because of a way they were born or a religion that they practice or a life choice they choose to make. I think that that’s what is important here and I hope its something we can agree on. I’ve been working with other student government presidents on this for a while I think of them has already passed a resolution like the one Niraj gave us and the other one is informally passed something.

Carrie: the council of graduate students has passed a resolution to repeal the carve-out.

Kamrass: I think that they are dead on that one and I think we have an opportunity to take a part in this and I hope its something that will happen. I’ve been talking to Bryan and Dr. J on this for months and advocating for exactly what this says right here. I think that most of the groups affected by this would understand and again I say this from a perspective of a president of a group of people of one religion. I think they would understand and some changes that would need to be made and any changes always bring about people that are upset but I don’t think that that should stop us from making a change that I think is right. So we have the opportunity to do something big and look back at our time and look back at hours spent in this room and say we were a part of something important and something that made a difference. I hope you will join in that and I think the other resolutions are exactly what Brad summed them up to be. I think this one says that Ohio State student organizations are not for discrimination of any kind and I think the next one says Ohio State student organizations are for discrimination of some kind and then the last one says Ohio State student organizations are for discrimination. I think we have a pretty clear choice on this one and its not an attack on anyone’s personal beliefs I think that its actually a really incredible thing and have it they way we are having it tonight and having so many view points represented and that’s a testament on where the organization is and what you guys have been doing this year. I think we have the opportunity to do something big and do something right and I hope you guys will do that by voting for Niraj’s resolution.

DeFrance: Can we have the other resolutions since we are discussing them all now?

Schmitt: I really am not sure what else I can say then I completely agree with what Micah has said. I think they really summed up my stance on this and I know this is a heated topic for a lot of us in this room but you have to remember you can’t take this personally this is an issue that we are dealing with it right now and its something we should take what Micah said to heart and look beyond our personal views on the matter and think about how it affects the students we are representing here. Think
of it also as a personal way that if you were in the position to be denied access in either leadership or involvement that you are in essence paying to support how would that make you feel?

Kedia: So I feel like I’m going to talk a little long and I’m sorry. I did a lot of research on this. I talked to one girl who is a leader of a Christian Organization and she was telling me that last year they didn’t have any discrimination clause and they were thinking about adopting one that a lot of the other schools had adopted and in this there was a line about speaking in tongues. She personally felt she couldn’t sign this because she couldn’t speak in tongue, but it was a big thing because she believed lines a through f but had problems with g. When you have a carve-out policy you can’t restrict them from saying you can’t say this or this I mean it can say what it wants really right?

Carrie: It has to be consistent with their strongly held religious beliefs. So for example Quakers this might not be the best example but say they want to drop out Veterans status they could drop that but couldn’t drop women, ethnic, unless it is strongly associated with their beliefs. The university doesn’t say that you have to believe these Quaker beliefs to be a part of them its just your statement has to represent that belief.

Kedia: so basically I think it is discrimination. Jen talked about how there are about 80 Christian organizations on campus and how the carve-out policy allows them to be different and lets them have their own niches. But they have different mission statements, there are a ton of different fraternities and they are similar in many ways but different as well. For example the people that join them and their mission statements are slightly different. It can still be different without having this policy. ISA, IASA, so there are different ways and people join them for different reasons. So therefore the carve-out policy isn’t necessary to differentiate them. So I don’t think that the carve-out policy would really help that. And for Masons statement if you can’t ask questions to your leaders then how can you know what type of religion they are. But you can always ask questions like in a round about way to know what their beliefs are. I don’t think you need to be a certain religion to join or be a leader of a club. I firmly believe in Niraj’s resolution.

Fitzpatrick: I have a point of information really quick. Religious fraternities are not subject to this carve-out correct?

Ashton: they are exempt under title 9.

Antani: So you know I do believe in the discrimination argument and that the current carve-out discriminates. And I do believe that my money and your constituent’s money should not go to an organization that is in direct conflict with the guidelines and the principals laid down in those guidelines. But you know when it comes down to it I think that this boils down to a very simple question do you believe that your constituency individual students have the right to join an organization and be a leader. I don’t think that whether it can be done, should be done or will be done I don’t think the hostile situation will happen I don’t think that anyone who doesn’t have similar religious beliefs will actually want to pursue leadership in that organization. You know I’m Hindu I have no want to join a religious organization otherwise. It boils down to do you believe in the right that is given to individuals under the constitution that they cannot be discriminated by
religion. Do you believe in this discrimination policy based on race, color, creed, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, sex, age, handicap, veteran status, do you believe that. Do you believe that your constituents would want to have their ability to join this organization limited? I leave you with that and I call the question. Mikac: it has been called to cap the speaker's list. Any objections?
Fitzpatrick: I object.
Mikac: O.k. guys it requires a 2/3 vote. We will now vote to call the question.
16-15 not 2/3 we will continue the discussion.
Fitzpatrick: I really want to hear from people and people that haven't really talked a lot. Everyone on the speakers list is people we usually hear from I want to hear everyone. I’m not sure how I feel about this but this is important.
Messenger: I don’t want to repeat a lot but I do want to talk about the hostile take over situation. Someone that doesn’t mesh and would come in and take over it and steer it astray. I just don’t buy into that I feel like legislating to that hypothetical situation is legislating on fear and it’s like a reactionary thing. But its never happened at Ohio State that anyone in this room could point out to me. I mean I could be wrong. I yield my time to Brett.
McFarland: So this isn’t like a religious hostile take over but I was the president of the Black Student Association and if you didn’t know it was for the past 12 years all female leaders. So this is kind of like a medial hostile takeover but I told my advisor at the time and I told him that there needed to be a male leader of the organization. He was a male as well and he said yes I would have to agree with you. There was a female candidate who may have one but I don’t know but he told her to be my vice president and he took that authority figure and instead of her running for president which she had aspirations of doing she ran as my vice president. Like I said it’s on a small-scale male to female but just the fact that people can probably talk to advisors and influence others to be in that position of power. It happens a lot more then you think when people influence one another.
Messenger: I guess my point is even though for gender reasons she ran as your VP and you became president of BSA you didn’t run your organization astray. Legislating this comes to intent it’s a situation that could happen but I don’t think Brett had bad intentions of doing what he did and I don’t think anyone is likely to do it with negative intentions. I don’t think I’m about to see a devote Christian member join the Muslim association and try to purposely become president of the group just to do something terrible. I don’t know that legislating out of that fear is appropriate. But on that note I think its interesting to see the discussion coming out of this room because for the last quarter a lot of our discussion seemed to be senate vs. exec and what is exec doing and what are we as senate doing. It was a very collective argument and just listening to the arguments tonight its very individual based each individual is bring something separate. I think this debate is allowing us to define ourselves as people and not as a collective senate but at the same time we have to keep our job in scope. My job isn’t just the vote of a catholic student but also the vote of the Buddhists students that live in my constituency. I think it’s unlikely that whatever outcome we see tonight that we see a consensus and I don’t think we should see a consensus. I don’t think that a room full of students that the only requirement to join was to get 50 signatures on a page. We didn't have any
requirements to take this job. We didn’t have to take a test, get a background check, or have to talk about our religion during the campaign. But the fact is we ended up sitting here and our votes aren’t just our votes they are the votes of the students that live in our constituency and so I guess when each senator votes encourage to keep that in mind its not just the vote of you and your belief but all the beliefs in your constituency.

Stepp: I would like to say that the Hostile take over is very viable. Are people that aren’t like-minded monopolizing the conversation? For instance during bible study and someone in there is a different denomination then you they can maybe plant a seed that may monopolize the conversation in a negative way. I don’t think that’s very good at all I don’t think you should have the power to eliminate that. I think it gives students the chance to express themselves on a more intricate level. I would also like to say that there are people out there that their purpose in life for whatever reason is to bad mouth a certain religion that they have had a beef with or something. They try to defy the religion or they do things that wouldn’t be kosher for that group in order to offend people. I know people that purposely would do that if I joined an organization and I’m sure you all do as well. That is my issues with this and I completely support Senator Flis’ resolution. I think that would be a very good resolution for the senate. I think we need to stop focusing on the discrimination of the people that wouldn’t be in line with them but instead the people in those groups that could be adversely affected with this people coming in and join their groups.

Stanley: I have a quick point of information. With the carve-out standing the way it is now I'm a comparative religious studies major would I be able to join like a Muslim group?

Carrie: It would depend on the organization itself. So you've probably heard a lot from organizations that use the exemption and just to give you a little history all different religions and some were before the carve-out so currently as it stands there are probably Jewish groups you could join and some you couldn’t it just depends if that group has decided to utilize the carve-out or not.

Stanley: I’m going to keep it brief but I believe that a main reason why people come to a university is to expand their horizons and be open to diversity and if we keep the carve-out the way it is it closes off that availability of diversity for a lot of different students. I know me personally I love to go to other groups and learn I have no harsh intent and I feel like why we are all here is to learn about people that are different and with the carve-out as it is now that doesn’t allow that to happen and I’m in full support of Niraj’s bill because I think that represents best what we as a University promote. Which is being diverse, open, learning, and getting to know people that are different from you.

Pandey: you are still allowed to attend meetings if you aren’t a member right?

Carrie: Again it depends on the organization. They may have closed meetings to just members and depending on their membership guidelines you may or may not be able to attend.

Pandey: what about events as well?

Carrie: it would again depend. If they us CSA money it would have to be open to all students if they had funding from another source they could close the event to members or whatever group they wanted to close it to.
Antani: point of information. By my count and my count only 6 organizations don’t let anyone join without signing a statement of belief, 2 limit and do not allow you to vote if you do not sign this statement, and 12 limit you and say you can not be a leader if you do not sign that statement of belief.

Ahmad: I just want to tell a story about myself just so you guys know where I’m coming from. I grew up in Mansfield and there is no diversity there so it was just my parents who told me about their religion. They wanted me to go to the Mansfield campus but they sent me to Columbus so I could actually make Muslim friends. I came here and joined MSA and the president then I had looked up to him because I felt he was chosen to represent me as a Muslim and as a buckeye so I looked up to him and what he did so I feel like leadership is representing people. I’m the president of MSA right now and I get emails all the time about people wanting to come to our meetings and asking any questions and I feel if someone doesn’t follow or believe that religion they wouldn’t be able to answer those questions. I feel that membership should be open because as was stated college is a time to learn and get to explore new things but leadership since it represents the religion it should be someone in line with the mission of the group. For example when I ran for president last year we had a debate and some of the questions that were asked were related to our religion. We asked like where would you get funding from but also like Muslims don’t eat pork so the question was would you eat it or not. To be able to ask those questions is how you get to know the candidates and it’s important for religious groups.

Shoub: point of information why wouldn’t they be able to ask religious questions?

Carrie: I think if you ask somebody if they eat pork that would actually be an o.k. question and each individual can vote their own candidate. Like if you wanted to ask them to name something in the Koran or bible but if you say are you Muslim or it’s more about if they are that religion not if they know information on it. Does that make sense?

Flis: I’ll try to keep it brief but listening to people talk I realize I might not have come across as clear on something last time as I would of liked to. So I don’t think that the difference between each organization exists because of this clause in my experience you go and you get a feel for what their niches are and do they lean this way or not and as a catholic student I know what it feels like to not be accepted by a larger religious group. I do know what that’s like but it wasn’t like I figured that out because they were like do you believe this this this and this you can kind of tell by when you speak to them. Here you are going to figure out if you want to be a part of that group or not I mean there are some groups that even if we were to remove this clause they still wouldn’t like teaching other people about their religion. Whether that clause or is in place or not you will still run into the fact that there are some groups that don’t want to teach you what they are about because they are such strong believers about what they are about it would exist with the clause and so the last question kind of brought this up that I was concerned about wording. Saying do you eat pork isn’t asking about religion but if someone where to lose because they said yes I would eat pork someone is going to ask. And having that clause protects them for voting for whatever reason and no one has to come out and say I voted against him because he eats pork but if you didn’t have that clause things like that
could happen and I think overall its better to keep that clause there and protect that.
So keep that there and if you’re interested in learning about a group and they aren’t
interested in teaching you find a different group. I do have a question for you guys. I
don’t know if you know about this but title 9 comes up sometimes the women in
engineering program men aren’t welcome in the events they are but they aren’t. So
I’m asking like someone like that why is that ok?
Carrie: I would say that isn’t a title 9 issues I would say they have no formal thing
against men joining. I actually gave their etiquette dinner and there were men there
and it appeared they had a good time. I suppose if there ever was a complaint but
there hasn’t been and their paper work is in order.
Flis: I’m not trying to call them out but I wanted to see what it was. It was something
I read online. I don’t know its just not that I support discrimination but when it
comes down to this it should stay protected and that’s why I think its important to
vote against this.
Fitzpatrick: I guess for me this is a tough one that I want to start off by saying I don’t
think this is clear at all. I firmly believe that OSU is here to education and exploited
people to all kinds of different things as well as encouraging diversity. It’s hard for
me to recommend that OSU should keep this carve-out because to me it conflicts
with the mission of what we are all here to do. I have a hard time saying that you
have to let somebody come in that does not believe what you do and let them
participate in your church. That aside ultimately there are a lot of people come
down on both sides of this and not only in senate I’ve talked to a lot of people
outside as well. Which leads me to the question of where I am personally I can see
myself voting either way but ultimately when I talk to people there are people on
both sides and its hard for me to say that I know my constituents believe this way
over the other because I don’t so yes I can make that decision on my own beliefs but
I don’t think I or any of us should we are trying to represent the student body not
tell them what is right for them. Especially with an issue like this we are
recommending this for student involvement we need to be addressing not only how
I think but also how students want to get involved or be involved. And a lot of
students want to be involved with organizations that have this carve-out because
it’s a safety net feeling. So I would encourage us to take the fourth option and fail all
of these because I believe that its hard and I don’t think anyone of us can stand up
and say that we know what the students of OSU want one way or another. But that
would be my recommendation to all of you.
McFarland: There are discriminations set in place all over society and for some
religious organizations these are kind of guidelines and set of characteristics that
they look for in the leaders. I’m fine with these organizations to say that leadership
should enable the following qualities. This is the characteristic we want the face of
our organization to look like. These guidelines should dictate or resonate in people’s
minds. Also people paying dues if student wants to pay dues that won’t promote
them that’s on them. You know we are in college and we should be able to if its not
for us don’t pay money for it. I think that just saying that they don’t want to pay dues
and it’s not fair to them. It’s a very valid argument but students who if they want to
and they don’t align with their beliefs or goals then they shouldn't pay the dues that
is their decision. I think people that pay dues you should support them and think of
the long-term benefits. As far as leading the way and being the new wave I think 
people get to caught up in this and being a school that is very open to different 
groups and we all work very hard to increase international students and such but 
we also have the right to give the a reminisce of what their home was like. Lastly I 
think that if we set the precedence that says you have to take the carve-out out I 
think as far as leadership especially in religion caliber there could be characteristics 
they could look for but if we say they can’t do this and then for some that are a part 
of national sectors I would hate to say that if they come to Ohio State and have a 
convention and say that this is the only group that doesn’t match up with other 
chapters I feel like that would be taking away from the purpose of that organization 
and taking away from their identity of other organizations like them. Both locally 
and nationally again I will strike down Niraj’s and if you want to keep it and keep 
parts of it those are the ones that I encourage you vote for.

Fitzpatrick: I move to limit debates to 3 minutes per person.
Moved and Seconded. Multiple Objections.
Mikac: this requires a 2/3 vote with a discussion.
Fitzpatrick: I just want to clarify I want to make sure that everyone has time to 
speak but its already 9 o’clock and we have to decide this issue tonight and 3 
minutes should be enough time for everyone to say what they have to say and to 
clarify that is 3 minutes total so you can use a minute and then go back and use 
another 2 minutes. I think it might help us one clarify our thoughts and two make 
sure everything is going to flow well tonight.

Antani: I motioned to cap the speaker’s list earlier and you objected to that in order 
to let everyone to speak. I understand that if the person that makes the motion 
wants to hear from people that haven’t spoken then that person should be able to 
hear from those people in their entirety.
Kedia: I think that it doesn’t matter if we are here till midnight. This is important 
and a lot of people are affected by this which we can see by all of the guests that are 
present. I don’t think it should matter what time we get out this is our duty and I 
object to it.
Antani: call to question.
Mikac: this requires a 2/3 vote to enacting a 3 min limit on all speakers. All in favor 
say aye.
The motion fails
Mikac: we now move back into discussion on 43-R-55
DeDonato: As a voting member of CSA I have been thinking of this issue for 
sometime now and when I came here today I had formulated a small opinion on it 
but I came in here with an open mind and I want to make sure my vote reflects USG 
and not just what I researched individually. With that being said my first point is 
just to address Sean’s idea that we should go for the fourth option. I really think its 
important for us to vote this is the one chance you have to have a say in it and me 
and the other USG representatives on CSA will make sure that whatever you say will 
be in count when we make our vote in CSA. I encourage everyone to let us know 
what you think and also to vote. I also want to clarify a few points without telling 
you how I think you should vote or imposing my opinion on you too much. First I 
just want to make sure you know why these groups are upset. They are upset
because the majority of them are ok with having members that aren’t with their faith if that’s the reason you aren’t for this but I haven’t seen or heard from any groups that this was an issue. Secondly what really concerns me was the fact that no student brought it to CSA it was more the faculty and so its just kind of a red flag and the fact that the majority of the people that are speaking up about it and are upset are students that actually use it the majority that speak up and bring up good points to remove the carve out those students aren’t students that aren’t going to be directly affected by it I haven’t personally heard anyone speaking up about this directly affecting them whereas on the other side I feel like I’ve heard a lot from the students that this is directly affecting and that the removal of the carve-out would hurt them. And then one other thing that people have dwelled on is the number of people I know it was a small amount of organizations that use it but I know in senate we are use to looking at numbers and the fraction of how many students are here I think that’s important but this is one of those things that just because it is a small percentage of students that use it doesn’t mean that we can overlook it that happens a lot because we are such a big university. It’s easy to just lump everything together and please as many people as you can but I urge you to think about when you think about your constituents and you think about how you feel about it I urge you to think about people who aren’t as represented. With that said I have been back and forth so I am really open minded and I’m excited to hear what you guys have to say. Liles: All right I have a point of clarification. This is something that from talking to organizations this is a big issue on what questions you can ask a potential leader. Could you ask question about their religious leaders if the carve-out is removed? Instead of just saying if this carve-out is removed there are registered organizations and unaffiliated organizations I don’t think that that is necessary or the best approach. Considering that the majority of the funding these groups get has to be open to students especially if you go through CSA or USG. IF your event is not open and it’s not an event we think will benefit a large sum of students odds are we are not going to make it anyway. If they aren’t registered they can’t apply for this funding and its funding that won’t be used in a discriminatory way even if they are discriminatory organizations. Carrie: So I think that for the most part your questions that you asked would be fine if would be more of a do you believe rather then do you know. So intelligence or knowledge based questions are fine. I’m not really sure what the difference is between the lesser jihad and the other jihad. So you could ask me that question compared to do you believe more in the trinity versus not. That’s probably not the clearest but its ok if its knowledge based rather then belief. Liles: So asking personal practices would be unacceptable? Carrie: like you shouldn’t be asking if they take communion but you can ask if they know what it is. If you had a test about your religious book like others may have an operating manual like knowing if they know the deference between debit and credit you can ask that as long as its not serving as a proxy of whether or not they are a particular religion or creed. Liles: so I think the two main concerns here are funding and this right to discriminate religiously. I think that we might be able to find ways to avoid that and I don’t know how but I think first of all you should allow them to have access to
funding that will still be reviewed and required to be open and potentially word this carve-out that if their rights infringe on others that they are some sort of protected class. I would also like to motion for a 5-minute recess.
Moved and Seconded. Objected.
Mikac: ok it’s a majority vote. All in favor say aye.
Mikac: ok we are now going to return to consideration of 43-R-55 at this time the speakers list reads as follows.
Mbagwu: So one thing I will bring up is we talk often about fees and whether or not students should pay fees for something they do or do not support. To remove the carve-out it still wouldn’t fix what the other side has talked about for instance why should a gay student pay activity fee for a Christian organization they can’t be a part of. That’s true and I’m sympathetic towards that so lets say we do remove it for instance Maria is a Muslim and she doesn’t eat pork and without this her money would still be going to the OSU BBQ club and I’m sure she doesn’t want her money spent like that. Does this rule some how fix her problem no. That’s one thing I would like to put out there and secondly every organization on this campus that I support or I oppose I think I respect their right to exist and more importantly exist in a way that they see fit. Now all of you here are student leaders but you are not experts on your constituencies and I think all of us would agree on that. I do not know every single wish of them but I do my best to represent them. I would not go to another student organization like the MSA or the BBQ club and tell them how they should lead or what selection criteria they should use to chose their leaders. I don’t know what constitutes a good member for MSA I don’t know what a good ISA member is or a good BSA member is necessarily but they do. Again they are the expert’s let them decided. This is one question that I want to throw out there if we do take out this carve-out how could anyone justify any form of selection criteria since now it appears we are cherry picking what selection criteria we see kosher for lack of better words or what we find politically correct and what ones we have issues with. So again I just want to throw out there how could one say we don’t want the carve-out but we have other selection criteria for example GPA even though that’s a silly example but seriously. How do we have any selection criteria at all for any group?
Mikac: as a point of clarification my understanding is that every organization is to have criteria through which officers can be removed. They cannot exist without one in place and that is approved through their constitution that they created at the beginning of their term.
Mbagwu: I guess I’m saying how do we justify that. But we are saying that this one is bad but other ones are ok.
Pyle: First off I want to say that joking and laughing during this is offensive, we are talking about whether or not students can join an organization. We have been talking about elections, taking over organizations and well we just had an election this spring and Micah and I happened to win with 4,159 votes we ran on a platform supporting all students. Moving on to the big issues student activity fee if you guys want to vote on being ok with discrimination that’s fine but I’m going to give some serious thought to stepping down because I’m not going to be associated as a leader with anyone that is ok with discrimination.
Kamrass: so this is obviously an issue that we are pretty passionate about. A few things that I wanted to bring up one, Emily made the point that she didn’t feel this came from students to clarify it did come from students it came from three; me, John, and another student. We were fearful that the university administration was going to make a decision without consulting the students we told Dr. J we felt strongly about it and that it should go through CSA and that all student organizations and governments can weigh in on it before she makes her decision. Which in the end this is her decision. I think that we are talking about a lot and a lot of heavy issues here but I think we are missing the practical eliminate of this in these discussion. For example many of religious organizations didn’t even know they had an exemption policy they don’t do anything to discriminate they don’t do anything that this exemption gives them the ability to do. They just simply wrote their constitution and didn’t know that they could say or that they had the option to say the non-discrimination clause. And just so you know USG didn’t have a non-discrimination clause until last year. There are groups that are unaware and some that getting rid of this won’t be affected and on the other side there are some groups that will be affected. I don’t think that’s something that we should be scare of though as we go to change this or to do something that might upset them. I’ve heard comments tonight like I’m not sure which one my constituents would be more in favor of and one group is louder then the other but I don’t think its out job to go out and poll but to say this is what’s right and this is what’s in the best interest of the students. To me the first option the one that Niraj proposed is the one that’s in the best interest. I don’t think it adversely affects almost anyone, I think most groups that have a religious exemption will just get rid of that really quickly and the ones who wouldn’t would still are able to meet. IT wouldn’t be in the Ohio Union for free which I think is ok there are a lot of groups trying to get in there for meetings that aren’t able to. And they would still be able to do their thing and practice their religion. We aren’t being practical about this if you look at the history of our country there have been lots of ways framed why people can’t join a certain organization. Its embarrassing to me that we are one of those places right now, its embarrassing to me that a group can say someone can’t join based on their sexual orientation they can’t be a part of that organization. They can say it’s their religious belief to hate someone of a certain race and get away with it. I don’t think we can really challenge that it’s not their sincerely held religious belief. So the rules we have right now say you cannot be a part of something simply because of whom you were born or how you chose to live your life. Its embarrassing to me and its embarrassing to me that they get our money, that their money can go to those groups, its embarrassing to me that The Ohio State University name, which you all know I cherish deeply is associated with that. I think we have the opportunity to change that and say I was a part of that we capitalized and we did the right thing for students. WE did what we were elected to do and I would be very upset to see us pass this up. Especially with other student governments already partaking in it and especially when we fought so hard for the administration to let us look into it. We can say here’s what we did during our term I think this is our chance and really hope we don’t pass it up.
Homan: Thank you Micah and Brad you make some excellent points. Thinking about my constituency unfortunately we are a very conservative constituency and I’m very confident that if my constituency had known some of the bills that I had voted to fund they would probably be upset. Because they are very conservative and I think that’s very unfortunate. That is something that I ran on I really wanted to really open my side of the campus and connect them to the rest of the campus. I went through the Multi Cultural Centers Diversity Training and I passed with flying colors I even have a little certificate for that. So I’m a little appalled, I am going to vote no on this and I’m a little appalled that I’m being accused of discrimination. My rational behind this is the United States Government can’t even make a decision about this. What I mean by this is there is a separation of church and state. Our first amendment says that we have freedom of religion. Its not a separation of state and Caucasians, its not a separation of state and homosexuals it’s a separation of church and state. I think there is something to be said that the past 300 years there has been this separation for a reason. That’s my rational behind it its not because I discriminate and I’m a little offended. I’d like to think that I have broadened by view especially coming from a constituency that is firmly held on their view. That’s my rational for voting no.

Mikac: as a point of clarification make sure that you are not accusing anyone in this room or anything. We should not feel threatened by our opinions or feel threatened that a stance we take is somehow a negative one because of the opinions of the other ones in the room. So if you do feel threatened don’t take it personally. Try to portray arguments that will avoid that thank you.

Dugginenni: All right so there are a lot of things that have been said today and it’s interesting for me because I am not an expert on this and I haven’t done the research that some other people have. Actually I don’t believe as strongly as other people do one way or another. Though I do have an opinion and I would like to share it. Before I start I would like to read what the Ohio State has instituted as the carve-out policy. It states that a student organization formed to foster a sincerely held religious belief of its members may adopt a non-discrimination clause that is consistent with those beliefs. My question and I would like to hear it discussed is why is it just religious beliefs? What makes these religious beliefs so separate from any other beliefs that people can discriminate against that? I am using the term discrimination as an umbrella term I’m not using it as a negative term. However why is just religious beliefs, why can’t if I have a really strong belief what makes it different from that religious belief? That’s my biggest problem I think when we are voting today we are not only voting on practicality but principal as well. What principal that we as students at The Ohio State University we as students that represent other students here. Like Emily said this is our one chance to have a voice in this and we are not just representing us but all other students here as well. I really would like to hear what people have to say about that, it’s the fact that although religious beliefs may be strong there are other beliefs. Even the craziest beliefs like I believe this water bottle right here is worth 1 million dollars and I want to form a club and everyone who joins believes this. There is no clause that says I can discriminate against someone that doesn’t believe this water bottle is worth that. Why is that religious beliefs can have that policy, and for anyone that thinks
this I’m not downgrading religion to this made up club I just came up with its just an example. It’s the face that with religious beliefs no matter how strong you believe in something there is also principal that this University stands by and that is openness to every degree. I want to bring out something that Rhadika said earlier taking away the carve-out policy doesn’t take away your identity. All it says is the principal that Ohio State stands by, that no matter what you believe in you can join any club on campus and that’s because we at Ohio State are a family no matter what you believe in and if its religious or not. And to discriminate against religion and not anything else is by far the most unconstitutional thing. And in response to what Mike said why are we voting on this the reason this whole issue got brought up is because the Supreme Court ruled it that way. I honestly believe that had that Supreme Court ruling not come up it wouldn’t be an issue.

Mike: well what I was saying was why are we saying its not ok to set criteria on religion but it is ok to set on GPA and other characteristics.

Carrie: well they did this because these are things that the government can’t discriminate on.

Dugginenni: I’m just going to wrap up I feel like I said most of what I wanted to. But I’m going to wrap up and say in my personal opinion that I will vote against the full retention of the carve-out but I am a little up an down about the other two choices. But I feel it needs to be fully removed or amended.

Kedia: I have a few things a little bit of background about myself I too used to live in Mansfield. Then I moved to Cincinnati and then to Ohio State. When I was in Mansfield it was really really small I was the only brown person for like four grades up and four grades down. I was the only, Hindu, vegetarian, along with 5 million other things. You know I was discriminated against in every aspect of everything, that’s how I felt. There were a lot of people who belonged to the KKK or their parents belonged to the KKK that went to my school. Then moving to a different school that was very diverse and very awesome and then moving to a University that is also very diverse and very awesome really showed me that you could be very strong in your beliefs and still accept other peoples. It is for me I completely agree with Niraj’s bill because I think everyone should be included in everything. I have gone to Catholic Church, Jewish temple and so many different things because for me to believe in what I believe in I need to know what others believe in. Real life has the open forum thing and I really enjoy going to that and if I couldn’t go to that I would be really upset. I think like Duggeninni said why discriminate on just this. I am a really strong vegetarian and the vegetarian club can’t say oh if you eat chicken you can’t come. There is a reason for that and Hindu’s and beef aren’t supposed together but there are Hindus that do eat beef and if the Hindu club wanted them as their president I think that’s fine. It’s not saying these clubs shouldn’t exist its saying we don’t feel they should get students money who aren’t able to join.

Antani: I’m very disappointed that homosexuality was even brought into this. My name is on the resolution and for me this isn’t what this is about at all. This is about whether students have the opportunity to join a student organization or not. Should certain student organizations be able to deny certain students the opportunity to participate, vote, and lead that organization based on a characteristic that is protected in the United States Constitution. We talked about this University as the
University of the American dream. How can we say we give citizens education when we don't give them opportunities to lead? When we don’t let them decide what organizations they want to join. When we don’t let them decide what organizations to lead. Brett brought up a great point that there was a hostile take over or whatever word you want to use for it and Jen brought up the fact that the women in organization also have a strong belief that the organization should be to women and Duggeninni brought up that other organizations have these strong beliefs. I talked to a professor and we discussed it and why should certain organizations be allowed to discriminate when others don’t when they may have those strongly held beliefs. That being said when it comes to leadership selection I actually think this carve-out really undermines these members. This carve-out is telling the members that you know you are not capable enough to decide the leaders or which leaders will actually align with your mission statement. A mission statement that clearly expresses the views of that organization and why it exists. Every organization has a mission statement the votes, we are a democratic country and this is a democracy, the voters of every student organization should have the full right to decide they believe will best fulfill their mission statement. When it comes down to it and I know I said this before but don’t vote on what conception you personally have but vote on how your constituency would answer these questions. Am I ok with paying into a system that will go to an organization that I am not allowed to be in. It was brought up the fact that I may not want my money to go to an organization that sells pork well that’s different I can still join the organization that sells pork. However I can't join this religious organization, are you constituents ok with paying into a system that will give these groups money that they can’t join. Are you ok with existing on a campus where there are organizations that you cannot join simply because of your religious beliefs? This is not a matter of practicality this is a matter of principal this is a matter of the rights that are given to us. IF you believe you should have the right to join these organizations regardless of your religious beliefs then vote for this resolution. I call to question.
Mikac: it has been called to question. Any objections? Seeing none.
Farinacci: I truly feel that the Supreme Court Ruling has nothing to do with this this is our money and we as students need to decide what the best way to handle that is. I do believe that this organization should take a stance and say that we will not tolerate discrimination. I think Niraj did the right thing by bringing this resolution to us.
Shoub: withdrawn
DeFrance: I agree very strongly with Micah and I agree very strongly with Homan at the same time. This is something that I jump around and I have actually changed my decision on this while hearing everyone speak. Looking at Marias resolution it would actually recommend that we strike the carve-out but also preserve the organization in making sure that the leaders have the same religious beliefs. This is a protection it allows the group to make sure that they are a catholic group and they have a catholic leader. If that’s something they want to do and it doesn’t say that they have to it doesn’t say they have to have a leader that is just like them. I’m in favor of this not because its just some sort of compromise its not it’s a mutual protection. It makes sure that there is no discrimination and also preserves what
these religious groups desire and if you don’t think that’s something that your University should be in favor of for one thing or another that’s fine. But again I think you should already this has been pointed out already student money is being spent on things that student don’t want. Students absolutely should have the ability to try to prevent having money go where they don’t want it to. They can still be members of these groups and they can still go to a student organization and have an impact in that group but what they can’t do is harass that group or change it in a way. I would prefer this to say at the end of the first there for let it be resolved clause will allow the organization to select leaders with the same sincerely held religious beliefs but will not allow them to discriminate against protected classes.

O'Connell: A while ago DeDonato said that she knew or heard a lot by the people that were directly affected by this. I did go and talk to some students that would not be affected and they were surprised that it even existed. I feel that they aren’t speaking up about it because they don’t know its there. They think they follow what the entire University does. I’m going to vote for Niraj’s bill and represent them.

Messenger: Before I start I do want to go back to what Farinacci said. One vote makes a large difference in the Supreme Court. I do like tonight though how Senate we are speaking out on various things and its great to see where everyone stands on this. I think the key problem is quality of empathy we are one community 50,000 people we are one buckeye community. When one is struggling we all are. I want to cast my vote and defend a group or even just one person from having to be discriminated against. I want to be able for me and them to be able to go to a religious organizations meeting without the fear of being discriminated against and I think the majority would agree with me. We have a unique opportunity and I think this is great we can stand up and be leaders. I think you should place your own opinions aside and step up and make the right decision there is no right or wrong by saying right I mean the best decision that is best for this community. I think there are a lot of different opinions I think we have learned a lot about each other today and the way we think and that’s valuable. I don’t regret spending any of this time and I think it was a good experience for my constituency. We have the ability to change this and I will cast my vote for South Campus residents to not discriminate.

Pandey: My stance has been for USG to steer away from any controversy. I don’t think we should have an opinion, I don’t believe I can represent the opinion of my constituency. I think its almost impossible, especially something so controversial. I think they should go straight to the students and I’m going to vote no on everything.

Fitzpatrick: I disagree with Emily, it is in fact taking an opinion for USG to stand up and say that this issue is so complex. Regardless of the majority one way or another as a student government we can’t get together and say this is the student bodies decision. In the end of all of this I guess from my personal opinion I agree with a lot of what has been said but I will not vote on my own opinion. I’m trying to step away from my idea and do what the students believe is right. I have talked to a lot of people they like the idea of the carve-out and then you have some that are appalled that it exists. Out of these people there was no clear answer as to what they wanted and for me that’s not enough to make a decision for them. I think if we take an opinion I don’t really think it will weigh that much on what CSA wants or vice versa. I sort of agree with Saul I don’t think I have enough information in my hand to take
an opinion of what North Campus or me as a Senator should be voting for. I have my own personal opinion yes but regardless I just want to say please lets think about the long lasting affects. This is a tough issue and an extremely personal one.

Mikac: I just want to say that this all came from me. I’ve been preparing you and to Sean’s point and Natalie’s I have always wanted you to go out and talk and do research. I proved you with information and my understanding is that you should be prepared enough to make a decision and if at this time you do not feel you are prepared then of course you shouldn’t vote on them. I will be voting on this in CSA but not in here.

Perkins: Point of Information how did the faculty feel about this?

Kamrass: They haven’t taken an opinion they respect that it’s a student issue and respect us enough to see where we are coming from.

Perkins: Ok I understand those that don’t want to have an opinion on an individual level but I also agree with Nick. As a senator of South Campus I can’t be for something that is discriminatory and I’m going to vote for Niraj’s bill.

Ahmad: I just want to say that not all leadership goes through elections. That’s why I think membership should be open and basically the membership and leadership fulfill the mission statement. Group members invite people into the organization and the leaders uphold the beliefs without having leaders of the same belief you are not upholding the mission statement. Members of the group look to these leaders and I think it helps the image of OSU by having this diversity and having strong leaders.

McFarland: I agree with what everyone is saying and I guess to touch upon the story of Kedia you said that there are different groups that didn’t like you and that’s sad that happened. The similar thing happened to me growing up in the south I went to a predominately white school. I was on the honor roll at my elementary and they invited me to come to their ceremony. I invited all of my family and then I got no award, my family asked why and they stated they didn’t want to give it me and that was the best reason they could come up with. I just feel that leadership is important to these organizations and if you allow anyone to come in and be a leader for example you have a basketball club and cook comes in and is a leader that takes away from the groups bond and strength. I think it cripples the group and in some ways isn’t fair to the members. I also think that by removing this carve-out policy that it won’t be the end to discrimination. But with Marias resolution this is more of a compromise it protects the group like DeFrance stated but also allows anyone to come to the groups just not run them.

Stepp: I would just like to say the reason religion groups are so protected is because it is so individualistic. I don’t think its fair to say be in a bible study and let anyone come in that wants to and then ruin that atmosphere and ruin the group. And you are all saying that its not right for homosexuality to be an abomination but its also not right for USG to come in here and say how these groups should run their meetings. I’m all for facilitating people to be their best but I’m going to vote against this.

Antani: I call for a roll call vote.

Fitzpatrick: I call for a secret ballot vote.

Antani: I call for rule suspension.
Mikac: ok we will now vote on the rule suspension. Motion fails
Secret Ballot
43-R-55 passes 19-15-2

New Business
43-R-54 (O’Connell) A Resolution to Support Requiring Off-Campus and Commuter Students to Provide Updated Addresses

Announcements
Saul: we are trying to get together a place where we can have a pot luck type of thing for senate if anyone is willing to let us use your place let us know.

Adjournment