

48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

# I. Opening

- a. Call to Order
- b. Attendance
- c. Swearing in of Alternates
- d. Approval of Minutes

# II. Open Forum for Public

a. No one from the public came to speak.

## III. Executive Report

a. Abby Grossman: The Lifeline Response mobile application is now live! The email went out between 1 and 2pm yesterday. It went out to all undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. Between that time and midnight last night, 700 trips were taken from point A to point B. Make sure you guys are spreading the word on that. Get it out on social media and encourage people to actually use it! You get out of the app what you put into the app. If you use the app while you're walking, then you're being proactive about your own safety. Also a small pitch for Sam Reed, please attend the Comprehensive Energy Management Plan Town Hall tomorrow from 6pm to 8pm in the U.S. Bank Theater.

## IV. Committee Reports

- a. Allocations Jenna Gravalis
  - i. Allocations met this past week and we funded these organizations through the Student Activity Fund:
    - 1. Professional Development Program \$160
    - 2. OSU Genesis \$810
    - 3. Project Heal \$500
    - 4. Operation Smile \$500
    - 5. Students for South Asian Service \$185.75
  - ii. Contact DiScala.1 for questions about constituency events and contact me at Gravalis.2 for funding.
- b. Oversight Daniel Marchese
  - i. This week, Oversight saw an appointment and some bylaw updates, both of which you will see on the floor.
- c. Constitution and Bylaws Review Commission Update
  - i. *Abby Waidelich*: The Constitution and Bylaws Review Commission had its first and only meeting this week. There has been one resignation, by Max Cross, for reasons of



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

miscommunication and unmet expectations. He signed up without knowing the full extent of his appointment. Any questions?

- ii. *Bock*: So are we looking for someone new?
- iii. *Abby Waidelich*: No, we still meet the quota on the members we need to meet the requirements of the CBRC.
- iv. *Harper*: Will there be an extension since they've only met once thus far?
- v. *Abby Waidelich*: No, because changes or recommendations are due to the General Assembly five weeks before the next general election, which is on Monday.

#### V. Old Business

a. No old business.

#### VI. New Business

- a. 48-R-32 A Resolution to Approve Zawwar Khan as Director of Outreach
  - i. Motion to bring 48-R-32 to the top of the agenda.

#### 1. PASSED and moved from c to a.

- ii. Grossman: Zawwar Khan has been doing amazing work and he has wonderful ideas for how to engage the student body. He's got our full support—the executive branch, senior staff, et cetera.
- iii. Zawwar Khan: I joined the Undergraduate Student Government as a freshman. I joined Emmy and Celia [Wright]'s Sexual Violence Task Force and this year I was a Deputy Director of Outreach. I focused on making sure that our university community was aware of what USG was doing—in General Assembly, Cabinet, and University Senate. I want to make sure everyone is aware of the hard work we're doing here. We did pass a resolution last semester on senators' organizational requirements. I'm really hoping everyone can reach their constituency organizational requirements, but please reach out to me if you have not.
- iv. *Cramer*: Friendly amendment to line 20 to add "therefore."
- v. *Grossman*: Friendly.
- vi. Motion to pass 48-R-32 with acclimation.
- vii. 48-R-32 PASSED with acclimation.
- viii. Motion to suspend the rules of the chamber.



- 1. *Harper*: Is there a possibility for the chair to speak on yeas versus nays from the CBRC members? What was the vote on the CBRC?
- 2. *Marchese*: We voted on the Constitution and Bylaws separately, and both got a simple majority. This was after the member resigned.
- 3. *Honaker*: How many CBRC members were there after Max Cross's resignation?
- 4. Waidelich: 8.
- 5. Motion to move into discussion.
- 6. Moved into discussion.
- **7.** *Bodey*: I'd like to express some sentiments that have been given to me from members of the CBRC. We appointed two students to be non-USG representatives on the CBRC. Both students have come up to me to say that they have not been adequately involved in the discussion of the CBRC. They feel that the time constraints are not respectful of their schedules and negated their opportunity to gain experience on the CBRC, which they were looking forward to. My main concern on bringing it on the floor and voting on the Constitution tonight is that we are perpetuating the student sentiment that there is a majority controlling USG and that undergraduate students are not included in the discussion. Regardless of whether they would have been included or not, one week is not enough time to write it, properly vet it, review it, and pass it. It's like it was thrown together overnight.
- 8. *Cramer*: This was proposed before the CBRC where both documents passed with the threshold required to pass them. We've been working on this for the past 5 months and were unfortunately given a deadline of less than a week to do this entire procedure in accordance with the previous CBRC. I don't necessarily agree that this was thrown together overnight. I will admit that the typing was done in a very coffee-fueled night. The actual work



- has been done over the course of five months. This is work we can be proud of going forward.
- 9. *Marchese*: I'd like you all to see the work we've done. After being informed less than 24 hours we needed to submit this to GA to get this to happen, it'd be unfortunate that no one will even get to see this.
- 10. Harper: I think it should be seen, just to go off of Senator Marchese's point. I was also approached by a non-USG CBRC member. This person does not even want her name on the work that was done just because she knew that she was not part of it. We don't want non-USG members of the CBRC to be a placeholder for the work we've done without them. The whole point of having non-USG members is for there to be an outside perspective in the new or edited documents. They've been given a week to see what's been done over five months, which isn't enough time. It's disheartening that she did not want her name on it because it goes against the intention of us having non-USG members as part of the CBRC.
- 11. *Bodev*: I think there's a lot to be said about the time that was given for these students that were approved onto the CBRC to approve the document. It was limited, between General Assembly tonight and when the students were given the document. I think that if it is presented tonight, these students need to recognize that and the body should recognize that there's a huge need for an extension for these other students to be involved in looking at this document. I don't know what would need to be included in that, I know that not passing it tonight would be a violation of the Constitution, but I also argue that these students came to be involved in the new Constitution but were given a small amount of time. It should come after some kind of agreement has been made after giving them more time to review the documents.



- 12. *Marchese*: I could spend days giving you context on the chain of events that has led to what is going on here. I at least ask you to bring this to the floor so we can discuss it. We can vote it down or ask for an extension, which I don't believe will work, but I want everyone's eyes on it, which is my biggest goal. As the rules stand right now, if this is not approved today, and we don't have an emergency meeting sometime between now and the deadline, then the CBRC was convened, did not make any suggestions, and didn't meet the deadline. I want this to come to the floor so we can talk about the circumstances surrounding it.
- 13. *Belfiglio*: The tight timeline isn't anyone's fault. I think it's at least worth considering. If we feel that the changes seem rushed and brash, then I think that it's only fair to the members who've spent so much time working on these to look at them.
- 14. *Poe*: I wouldn't mind hearing a bit of context surrounding this time crunch. It sounds to me that the entire CBRC didn't work together on this. I don't think everyone put the fair amount of time in, so I don't know where I stand right now.
- 15. *Harper*: It's not that I don't respect the work or the time crunch. We put such an emphasis on having non-USG members on the committee, so I don't think that we can sacrifice those values for the time crunch, especially if the non-USGers don't even want their names associated with the work that was done.
- 16. Bodey: Article 7, Section B of our Constitution—in years ending with 2 or 7, a CBRC will have to be formed.

  There will have to be a CBRC next year no matter what because it's a year that ends in 7. I'm more than happy to bring it to the floor because people would like to see it, but the chamber needs to recognize that it doesn't have to be done this year.
- 17. *Rollins*: I can agree with all these points, but I disagree that it's an issue of whether we should bring it to the



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

floor. I think it's an issue of whether we should vote to approve it or not.

- 18. *Belfiglio*: We approved the CBRC last week, and the deadline is next Monday. I think they need to be looked at this year. Something has to change, based on elections from last year. While things may not have worked out perfectly with the CBRC, it's a big deal. We don't know whether past CBRCs have agreed on everything.
- 19. *Marchese*: I am myself not happy with the way that this turned out. I don't know what the discussion comes to, but it's not like I willed this to happen and organized it to leave these people out. I'm angry that it turned out like this. There was nothing we could do. This was the only way that we could do this. We were given 24 hours notice that we would not have the extension we thought we were going to have.
- 20. *Cramer*: The 47<sup>th</sup> GA mandated that this has to happen. It's not true that it doesn't have to happen. We all know why this has to happen. We got hit with a bad situation and we're doing what we can to correct these issues. I'm appalled that we're debating on whether we should even consider this. This is something that has to be done. Let's move forward.
- 21. *Harper*: I think that we should hear this tonight on the floor. I don't think there's any reason for me to feel unjustified in my feelings, and I will make those clear through discussion.
- 22. *Gonzalez*: Can someone explain the process we have to go through to get the extension and why they weren't given the extension they thought they were going to get?
- 23. *Cramer*: Judicial Panel members did not approve the extension.
- 24. *Belfiglio*: Senator Cramer said it. The Judicial Panel does not want to do the extension. I think we have to see the document at least.



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

# 25. Motion to add 48-R-xx to the agenda. 26. PASSED with a 2/3 vote. Added as section b.

- b. 48-R-36 A Resolution to Place the Proposed Constitution, and Election Bylaws on the Annual Ballot
  - i. *Marchese*: 47-R-31 was passed last year. It required action at the end of it: that the CBRC shall be confirmed no later than the fourth meeting of the 2015-16 General Assembly. We have not proposed changes and we have not proposed changes, so that's what bringing this to the floor will achieve. This will be the longest part of the meeting, but that's how this works. I'll be happy to answer questions about the circumstances later on. I'm not happy about this situation, but I guess those are just my feelings.
  - ii. Shaffer: Will we get the attached changes?
  - iii. Marchese: Yes, we'll pass those out right now.
  - iv. *Marchese*: We're changing the system slightly back to what it looked like before the CBRC, and we added our own things to it. This is the list that was provided to the CBRC when they voted on the Constitution, so I'll walk you down the changes. As a point of clarification, the first thing we did we're not calling GA members senators. We're calling them representatives to clear the confusion. The other thing we did was that we removed voting rights for appointed directors. It's an interesting concept that the President can appoint votes at will up to a certain point, so we removed it. We also updated seats: we separated college of public health and medicine. Added another seat to north campus, because there will be an equal amount of students on north and south campuses after the new dorms are built. We made regional campus two seats total. There are a large number of regional campus students and the one we have now is not proportional. We brought back Speaker of GA. Now the VP is speaker. If you're going to pass resolution that extends past the end of your current session, tougher requirement to last beyond current session, because people you're affecting will not be in USG when it is passed. The other thing we did is require full body to approve budget. Used to require 2/3 of this body to approve budget. Changed



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

succession, censure, impeachment. Technically, the Chief Justice could preside over own impeachment. We also took committee charters out of Constitution. Put back in bylaws (organizational bylaws). Right now current system is if after one week we pass something and the President doesn't do anything, then it passes. Every other student government does the pocket veto system. If the President doesn't take action after a certain amount of time, then it's a pocket veto. That's what we're changing it to. For appointments we created request for confirmation for appointed position. Clogs up agenda a lot less and makes it easier. President now appoints 8 directors not 9. Require 2/3 vote of GA. When director approved, retain speaking rights not voting rights. Same stake in GA as Halie Vilagi. Restructured senior staff and left vague so President can set structure of their own Senior Staff. Other thing is that Senior Staff doesn't need to be confirmed. Only person to be approved is the CFO because they handle the money and when they are in charge of allocations, then they are organizing GA. Also State of the Undergraduate Student Body e.g. exec report every week, or addressing full session of USG if she wanted. Mandate updates at some interval. Also changed terms to 2 years and can be renewed. 4 years is lengthy and part of problems last year when we got to "fun" part of elections. First appointment works as it does now. Has to be confirmed by oversight and GA and after 2 years has to be approved by GA basically a vote of confidence you did a good job you can do it again. Elections Governance Board, seperate entity from the Judicial Panel. Sep power of the Judicial Panel to oversee elections so we don't have the thing last year like Clerk v. Campaign cases where Judicial Panel is plaintiff and arbiter. We also made so that GA can propose amendments to bylaws. Chief Justice has to find amendments friendly. The Iudicial Panel is still the overarching body to run elections. Used to be a clause that Judicial Panel can make rulings not outlined in constitution, so we removed that.

v. *Luther*: Is there any way you can send this out? This might help me follow this better.



- vi. *Marchese*: Yes. I'll send it out now.
- vii. Motion to move into a 2-minute recession, reconvening at 7:24pm.
- viii. Motion PASSED. Reconvened at 7:24pm.
- ix. *Marchese*: Changed CBRC to every 4 years. General college tenure is 4 years, so why not have it 4 years. Added judicial members to the CBRC nice to have someone to make interpretations. Committee consisting of President, Speaker, Chief Justice, and they can nominate themselves. One problem was finding non-members. Part of reason for fall-back. We also clearly defined the transition between administrations. Deadlines for appointments. Built out a calendar to make sure it all works. This calendar has been looked over at least 80 times to make sure it works. We ourselves can edit the organizational bylaws so we can add and subtract members as we please during session, so we moved that to the Constitution so it's not changed so we can't add seats because we feel like it. Even numbered years when CBRC doesn't meet census committee—appointed same as the CBRC. Appointed by President, Speaker, Chief Justice. Can propose changes to apportionment of the seats and can choose to add and subtract constituencies according to certain rules. We realized that there were a couple of constituencies that we didn't hit. It changes relatively often. I will also entertain questions about why the members were left out, but if you have questions I will answer them.
- x. Motion to split the discussional question between the Constitution and the Bylaws.
- xi. Motion PASSED.
- xii. *Ferzacca*: You mentioned it was a simple majority vote. What was the vote?
- xiii. *Marchese*:
- xiv. *Bodey*: Was the Judicial Panel consulted in the writing of the Constitution?
- xv. *Marchese*: Yes, we spoke to Taylor Marsilio. He was bcc'd on all the email conversations between committee members.



- xvi. *Harper*: When were the non-USG members made aware that this time crunch was happening?
- xvii. *Marchese*: We were informed last night at 10:30pm, and we wrote the Constitution and Election Bylaws overnight and today we contacted the members and let them know what happened. I wish you could read the email correspondence tonight. I'm embarrassed for our organization on the way this turned out. Under any other circumstances, I would say don't pass this because they didn't have a voice.
- xviii. *Villari*: In your opinion, would you say that what we have in front of us here, is this the best and most inclusive work we can do? Is the community outside of USG going to look at this and say that we made this as inclusive as possible, given our reputation? Does this pass that Litmus test?
  - xix. *Marchese*: Given the time frame we were given, this is the best work we have done. I don't know if this could get much better. Unfortunately, we didn't get the non-USG members onto the committee until last week, five weeks before the deadline.
  - xx. *Honaker*: Were there plans to meet more than this one time you guys met?
  - xxi. *Marchese*: Yes, every Sunday and Wednesday, under the expectation of getting a two-week extension. We were going to meet as many times as allowed. The original meeting was supposed to happen today after GA.
- xxii. *Honaker*: How much did you include the non-USG members in this first meeting and were there plans to include them more in the future meetings? Was there a reason they weren't in the first meeting?
- xxiii. *Marchese*: We either had 6 or 7, both of non-USG members were there. First meeting no idea time crunch. 2 days on each of documents we had opportunity to edit. Start with election bylaws. First assignment was go down election bylaws and make notes they wanted to change, worked well, wanted to change. We wanted to discuss today and talk about Election Bylaws. And do same for Constitution and Organizational Bylaws. Never got around to discussing. Yield to Ben.



- xxiv. Ben Schulmann: Inclusiveness under impression that we had time and had a timeline for it to work. Bring in members of current admin, talk to people who were working on, say, role of President or VP, bring in President or VP and ask their opinion. Wanted time in cabinet to do mini Town hall to ask for peoples' opinions. What we put together is by no means what our goal was. Goal was to reach out to as many people as possible. Dan and I have done this for five years now and we don't have all the fresh ideas that every person has in their experience in their roles. Our goal was to work with as many people as possible we just didn't have the time. Yield to Levi.
- xxv. *Cramer*: I'm not proud of the way in which we had to create this doc, but I'm proud of the doc that was produced.
- xxvi. *Bodey*: Vote taken in CBRC taken through email or in person on the final document? When was that correspondence take place?
- xxvii. *Marchese*: 5-2-1 final vote on both of the items. Vote taken today 12:30pm today and second one a little before 5pm.
- xxviii. *Bodey*: All members expected to review the Constitution of the USG between 5pm and 6:30pm?
- xxix. *Marchese*: First one they tech had 6.5 hours to review Constitution on short notice. The Election Bylaws sending out second a lot less changed than those. Cannot expect someone to go thru all that in the time it was given. Only option as far as we were aware of, so we sent out the emails as soon as we had everything together.
- xxx. *Harper*: Who notified at 10:30pm that time crunch and who was left out? Or rather, why weren't non-USG members alerted at 10:30pm to be part of this?
- xxxi. *Marchese*: Became known in Senior Staff at 10:30pm. Yield to Ben.
- xxxii. *Schulmann*: Told to operate under assumption that we had 2 weeks. Last night at Senior Staff meeting was first we heard that we did not have the 2-week extension. The Judicial Panel made the ruling on Sunday and we weren't made aware until last night.



- xxxiii. *Marchese*: Other members not contacted last night at 10:30pm. Made decision and under the opinion that if we decided to send out this email to the non-members that we might lose both because of the impression we were giving them and if they left then the committee was no longer valid.
- xxxiv. *Luther*: Request for confirmation I don't understand the mechanics behind that and how that will change process of appointing the positions. CBRC process in order to avoid these sorts of time crunches where we can't get enough non-USG members, that will be made easier. I'm not sure if I see that in here. How does the request for confirmation work and how are the CBRC appointments amended to make it work better?
- xxxv. *Marchese*: treating appointments like legislation can be a cumbersome process. We've only declined one appointment in the last four years. Reflected in the bylaws oversight committee would become functional. Right now the oversight committee we'll talk about it and maybe they'll come in, the system was intended to work so that oversight would vet the candidates and they would come to GA for final approval. Oversight would say we believe good candidate and GA take your pick as opposed to GA talk to person and then vote. Similar to the way US Senate does it. Changed way in which members are selected. Didn't change membership requirements. No campaign ties so they're not on CBRC to be appointed later on. Right now the appointments are made by the Vice President. Changed to committee with President. Speaker, and Chief Justice. Week 8 session of first semester automatically approved if not going on.
- xxxvi. *Ferzacca*: Why so pressing that we handle this now given how not proud overall of this entire process?
- xxxvii. *Marchese*: I am proud of the document that was produced, not of the process that produced the document. Best work of the people who produced the document in the time that we had. This is a complete waste of the GA's time looking for committee candidates and the time they put it together. Deadline's Monday.



Abby Waidelich Vice President 3150 Ohio Union 1739 N. High Street

614.736.2390 waidelich.11@osu.edu

- xxxviii. *Ferzacca*: What's the point in doing this at all? We have a Constitution in place. Why going about this now in the incorrect process?
  - xxxix. *Marchese*: Because the resolution that created it mandated that we have results. I think we have results that are good enough to pass. The last constitution we were under I remember impeaching people for, because they discovered powers they had and abused them. They're still abusable powers.
    - xl. *Buss*: Can you speak more as to why you think the Judicial Panel did not grant your extension?
    - xli. *Marchese*: It's my understanding that there were other groups unhappy that we would get an extension.
    - xlii. Abby Waidelich: We'd go against what our Constitution says.
    - xliii. *Marchese*: I'd argue that we have precedent.
    - xliv. *Gonzalez*: GA approving budgets logistics and dates?
      Allocations last budget we passed was day after Christmas on a Google chat. Any consideration to logistics and date of that?
    - xlv. *Marchese*: Technically supposed to be approving budgets as full body. In my first term as a senator, I saw the budgets on the floor and approved them. Cannot speak to logistics because not privy to them.
    - xlvi. *Honaker*: Plan was to have members of CBRC make notes on what they wanted to change, I can't remember if it was the Constitution or the
  - xlvii. *Marchese*: Didn't contact anyone until 12:30pm today. I was under assumption that we'd have meeting today after GA to collect those notes.
  - xlviii. *Shaffer*: how speaker of GA appointed or elected?
  - xlix. *Marchese*: defined in bylaws. Case with powerful positions and branches.
    - l. *Mubarak*: If resolution is not passed tonight, doesn't CBRC still have power to put on the ballot?
    - li. *Marchese*: I'd make that argument, but not up to me.
    - lii. *Bodey*: In referencing need for this to come forward tonight, judgment based on 47-R-31. Did CBRC use 47-R-31 to make judgment call that they could not write a Constitution in time constraint and instead submit a statement to the GA?



Abby Waidelich Vice President 3150 Ohio Union 1739 N. High Street

614.736.2390 waidelich.11@osu.edu

- liii. *Marchese*: The reason we are bringing it in front of the General Assembly now is because of the Judicial Panel ruling.
- liv. Abby Waidelich: Which ruling are you referring to?
- lv. *Marchese*: I don't know. I just know that we were not granted an extension by the Judicial Panel.
- lvi. *Bodey*: Is 47-R-31 the resolution that the CBRC used as a judgment call that they needed a CBRC now?
- lvii. *Marchese*: Yes, convened by the fourth week. Vetted by Judicial Panel at that time.
- lviii. *Bodey*: Knowing circumstances, why did CBRC continue writing Constitution when the second to last TLIBR clause said that they could submit a statement to the GA?
- lix. *Cramer*: To be blunt, last year was a nightmare. EB need to be adjusted. There had to be changes made. That's why we proposed changes instead of writing a letter.
- lx. Bodey: My question regarding the Bylaws wasn't answered.
- lxi. *Marchese*: The organizational bylaws are there to describe the more minute structure, some procedures and standing rules. We were framing the new system, not designing it from the inside out. Yield to Levi.
- lxii. *Cramer*: Required major Constitutional change based on the individuals appointed. We had to make changes to the bylaws as well to add a level to legitimacy to check the power of certain individuals.
- lxiii. *Marchese*: The Judicial Panel is allowed to make rulings outside.
- lxiv. *Harper*: Confused as to where Judicial Panel ruling is coming from. Is it something I can see in front of me? Can I have more elaboration on it?
- lxv. *Marchese*: Statement made by Judicial Panel. Bothered.
- lxvi. *Ben*: Taylor told us to operate under the assumption that you will have an extension. He told us in the office one day. Two-three week extension. But we never saw anything stating that we did not have extension. Told to me by Waidelich and told that the Judicial Panel decided that it was required by our docs that this come to floor of GA to make it onto the ballot.
- lxvii. Harper: Who is we? You keep referring to we, so who is we?



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

lxviii. Schulman: Last night's Senior Staff meeting.

lxix. Waidelich: Cons stated that it must go through the GA to be put on the ballot. After speaking to the Judicial Panel about deadline extensions, we cannot amend Constitution or suspend for whatever we want to do, so I stated that in SS last night. Under my impression at 12:30pm on Cramer saying that we need an emergency session—Cramer and Marchese were there, as I'm under the impression.

lxx. Motion to move into Executive Session.

lxxi. Moved into Executive Session at 8:06pm.

lxxii. Back into normal session at 8:51pm.

lxxiii. *Hardin*: We have to vote on these together? The Constitution and the Election Bylaws?

lxxiv. *Marchese*: Historically spread out over several GA sessions to vote as separate documents. We would separate the question. I wish we had that luxury today. We can vote on them separately tonight if needed.

lxxv. *Punugu*: So the CBRC is meeting now. Next year, is the CBRC meeting?

lxxvi. *Abby Waidelich*: There will be a CBRC next year.

lxxvii. *Honaker*: I just asked that question, and they said that the new Constitution would not mandate a CBRC next year.

lxxviii. *Abby Waidelich*: If it passes with a 2/3 vote during the General Election, then we will have a new Constitution next year and there will not be a CBRC next year. We will not have a new Constitution next year. If it does not pass next year, there will still be a CBRC this upcoming year.

lxxix. 15-minute recess until 9:10pm.

lxxx. Move into discussion.

lxxxi. Warnimont: I do not like the new Constitution for the following: VP powers have been severely reduced into a ceremonial role where they do the appointments, but it involves decision of the entire executive branch. Current position as speaker gives them some power in the GA. I don't know if I'm alone in feeling this, but preferential voting is not good measure. It deserves a mention in the Constitution, and I can't support the Constitution because of that.



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

lxxxii. *Buss*: Lots of things said tonight and it's been an interesting discussion. Preface with very little to do with content of the amendments made to the Constitution and Bylaws. I commend work done in 24 hours, as it's a lot, but I think the process does not justify what's in front of us tonight. We appointed people onto the committee who do not come from USG for a reason, but I don't believe that the time crunch is enough. I believe that it would be very embarrassing for our org to look so bureaucratic and back-door, when the intention was not bureaucratic and back-door. I'm not tuned into elections, so.

lxxxiii. Bodey: I think we have been truly blessed with a group of people in the CBRC with brilliant policy minds with the ability to craft things eloquently. I do not believe that the CBRC has crafted a Constitution which has things we hoped it would. I am disappointed that there was little inclusion in such little time and in the overnight writing rush that occurred. This Constitution was written in a week, and that's something we cannot take back. The way that the CBRC was structured included new CBRC members essential to the writing of the Constitution, and they had one week to boil down what this group had done in months. I'm really disappointed that it took office to break the stereotypes of USG backdoor shady org that did whatever it wanted and I have to sit in GA and watch these shady backdoor conversations come to the floor. As a rep of my constituents, I cannot sit back and watch this GA and undergraduate students come back to me and tell me they were not include din that process, yield time to Hannah Diewald to discuss her experience on the CBRC.

lxxxiv. Hannah Diewald: I'm a Public Affairs student and I have a fair amount of interest and experience on policy. I'm not trying to attack people on committee, but I don't think this situ will ultimately be helpful to your organization. Required that there's an outside USG voice. Regardless of circumstance, this hasn't happened. This something is better than nothing policy is better astounding. I don't think you want to have this boys club stereotype on you, but you do since leave out people who are constitutionally supposed to be included.



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

lxxxv. *Bodev*: Our earlier conversation pointed to a Judicial Panel ruling told that the Judicial Panel told us we had to pass this tonight. I'm under the impression that the Judicial Panel would have to submit some sort of formal writing. I don't think the CI telling someone in the office that this has to be done is an acceptable way for this to be done. The resolution from last year CBRC had an option to say no and the Constitution didn't need to be amended. They thought it needed to be amended, so they didn't. Monday five extra days, just two days shy of the deadline. We have precedent of doing other things within the Constitution like this. We also have the ability ot use legislative powers not expressed in the Constitution. If you're worried about breaking the Constitution or doing something that doesn't apply to what has been set forth, I think that each member of the GA would be very upset if their constituents found out that this was carried out in the way it was carried out. And would appreciate each of you taking the stance and giving the CBRC additional time, properly pose questions, and pass the Constitution in time. If you're worried about breaking deadlines, I think constituents would be appreciative of taking the diligent time to go through this and give the CBRC members additional time to review this. I am going to ask members of GA to table this resolution and consider an additional meeting of the GA to pass the Constitution in time to appear on the ballot.

- lxxxvi. Shaffer: What is the process for calling an emergency meeting?
- lxxxvii. *Abby Waidelich*: Has to be posed by the VP to the Steering Committee and pass in Steering with a 2/3 vote.
- lxxxviii. Singh: Issues with content in the Constitution? Yield to Bodey.
- lxxxix. *Bodey*: I feel that as a governing document, I would appreciate the time to even be able to look at those aside from the 15-minute recess we were given.
  - xc. *Shaffer*: Is there any way to guarantee that we'll have an emergency meeting?
  - xci. Abby Waidelich: It has to go through Steering.
  - xcii. *Honaker*: If we were to table this resolution, then you would have to suggest that to Steering?



# Abby Waidelich Vice President

3150 Ohio Union 1739 N. High Street 614.736.2390 waidelich.11@osu.edu

- xciii. *Abby Waidelich*: I would have to call Steering on holding an emergency session.
- xciv. *Honaker*: So you would have to ask Steering, it has to pass through Steering, and it would come to the floor?
- xcv. *Luther*: Are you going to propose it?
- xcvi. *Abby Waidelich*: Yes. I have already posed holding a special steering meeting to ask for this, but we won't be able to have a full steering meeting until Sunday.
- xcvii. *Belfiglio*: I believe the GA could meet as a committee of the whole to decide a meeting time.
- xcviii. *Abby Waidelich*: I would not do that. There's a meeting on Sunday we can do that in.
- xcix. Belfiglio: I think that's fair, thought.
  - c. *Abby Waidelich*: There's a motion on the table, thank you proxy Parliamentarian.
  - ci. *Mattamanna*: It would have to be before Monday?
  - cii. *Cramer*: Monday at noon. I was unaware that it had to be proposed by the Chair of Steering.
- ciii. *Abby Waidelich*: It is in my opinion that I should be the one to do it.
- civ. *Cramer*: I was in contact with all members of Steering last night, and they're all okay with it.
- cv. Abby Waidelich: There's been more discussion.
- cvi. *Honaker*: Are there enough members of Steering to hold an emergency session tonight after this meeting?
- cvii. *Abby Waidelich*: I will call a meeting of Steering prior to the Monday at noon deadline. I won't block it.
- cviii. *Bodey*: There will be schedule conflicts, so is there any way that we could vote by proxy and not physically be in this room?
  - cix. *Abby Waidelich*: You have to be here for discussion. The rest is by discretion of the Chair, me.
  - cx. Motion to table 48-R-36.
  - cxi. 48-R-36 TABLED.
- c. 48-R-33 A Resolution to Support the Inclusion of Sexual Violence Resources on Course Syllabi
  - i. *Challapally*: I was on the Sexual Violence Task Force last year.



**Abby Waidelich Vice President**3150 Ohio Union
1739 N. High Street
614.736.2390

waidelich.11@osu.edu

- ii. Wydman: We have an amendment, depending on questions, that doesn't change the nature of the resolution at all, but it does supplement it. I'll propose another "Let it further be resolved" clause, and that was created in coordination with the Sexual Violence coordinator. I wanted to make sure that that was cleared up.
- iii. *Belfiglio*: It's a good idea to help students be aware of more resources.
- iv. Jackson: Everyone that helped with this did a good job.
- v. *Warnimont*: Has any work been done on implementing these on course syllabi, like talking to the Registrar?
- vi. *Challapally*: The Buckeyes Ask Task Force has been doing stuff. I think that having the support of the student body will be a good way to start off the conversation.
- vii. *Belfiglio*: It's up to the Office of Academic Affairs to implement it, not the Registrar.
- viii. *Wydman*: I'm thinking it could be proposed as a group together to have all these resources available to students.
  - ix. *Souders*: Understanding the barriers to implementation by department, have there been any other avenues we've explored to get these resources to students?
  - x. *Challapally*: Currently it's through Resident Advisors in the dorms. Every single class at Ohio State is required to have a syllabus, so each student will have at least one syllabi. That will be the best way to get these resources out to students. When we created the Sexual Violence Task Force survey last year, we purposely put down wrong answers like the D-tix desk to see if students were aware of the resources that were available to them, and it turns out that many were not.
  - xi. *Wydman*: This would be a great supplement to the mandatory online training next year. This would go hand-in-hand. We received this training, and it's also implemented in every class.
- xii. *Bock*: Can you tell us how long it will be, what it will look like, just kind of stuff like that?
- xiii. *Challapally*: One of the links on the resolution leads to the Sexual Civility and Empowerment website.



### **Abby Waidelich Vice President** 3150 Ohio Union 1739 N. High Street

614.736.2390 waidelich.11@osu.edu

- xiv. *Wydman*: The wheel has it. I'm not sure how much text supplement we would need besides the wheel.
- xv. *Warnimont*: My understanding of syllabi is that it contains information relevant to course and academics. You connect sexual assault to academics in line 19. Is that your intention in this statement, to connect it to academic purposes?
- xvi. *Challapally*: Sexual violence resources are a subset of mental health resources. One doesn't cause the other, but they are connected. Sexual violence may trigger the need for mental health resources.
- xvii. *Souders*: Given Warnimont's question, this resolution, and the resolution suggesting the mental health statement, is there a larger vision for this? I don't think they should end at the course syllabi.
- xviii. *Challapally*: It has to be implemented by each department. I can't speak for other resolutions, but I think that if they all passed we could work on getting them more centralized.
  - xix. *Belfiglio*: The worst case is the recommendation. Most comply, but it's just the question of how they do it.
  - xx. *Harper*: Have you seen these resources implemented at other schools similar to ours?
  - xxi. *Challapally*: That was difficult for me to find, and a lot of them do have mental health statements on syllabi, but more and more schools are starting to talk about them.
- xxii. *Wydman*: It hasn't been talked about that much, but I think we need to realize that a lot of schools follow Ohio State, and this would be something they could get on board with.
- xxiii. *Harper*: I was asking because I want to be the first to do this, just to clarify.
- xxiv. *Warnimont*: Do you think this is the best way to advertise sexual health resources? If I'm sexually assaulted, I'm not going to be looking at my math course syllabus.
- xxv. *Challapally*: Having that core resource there would be very helpful. Many students have no idea where to go for certain resources. If you're a student who's not that involved on campus, there's a chance that you won't come across a lot of the resources on campus. You get sexual violence resource



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

information at Orientation, but otherwise nothing more until graduation. We're looking for the Buckeyes ACT Training to become mandatory and part of FYSS, possibly. I think that less than 5% of people who got the email took the training, so people aren't looking for the training. People who need the information may not know where to go. I think it has to do with mental health, and that could be my opinion, but I do think it does.

- xxvi. *Wydman*: This is their most marketable item. Once you see something enough times, you understand what it is and what it's offering you. It's a good way to push it into people's minds.
- xxvii. Motion to cap the speaker's list.
- xxviii. Motion PASSED.
  - xxix. Motion to move into discussion.
  - xxx. Moved into discussion.
  - xxxi. *Buss*: There were questions about whether this is the best way to advocate for these resources, and I don't know if that's necessarily relevant, because we can all agree that these are all relevant, so we might as well have it on the syllabi. Whether they're used or not, it's important that they're there.
- xxxii. *Gonzalez*: I think one of the major benefits of putting this on syllabi normalizes the process. A lot of sexual assault victims don't seek help, so I think putting this on the syllabi will be a huge step for normalizing it. I'm not sure how many of you went to the Joe Biden event, but both survivors spoke on how their sexual assault experience affected their academic life. My third and final point would be that if I break my right hand, knock on wood, I know that I could reference one of my syllabi and find contact information for the Office of Disability Services and have my situation solved.
- xxxiii. *Frank*: I want to say how appreciative I am of Senator Challapally for this, especially in the mental health department. Linking those two and showing how those could severely affect a person's academics is so important. It really does make an impact on the student in a holistic sense.
- xxxiv. *Warnimont*: The footnotes are in blue. They should not be. Friendly amendment to change it to black.



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

xxxv. *Abby Waidelich*: We've been trying to change that, so we will.

xxxvi. *Wydman*: Friendly amendment if to it in line 38. Another one: "Let it further be resolved that a clause explaining the mandatory reporting obligation of all University employees should also be included on the course syllabi directly below the sexual violence resource wheel."

xxxvii. Motion to add amendment to the resolution.

xxxviii. Motion PASSED.

xxxix. Motion to pass with unanimous consent.

xl. 48-R-33 PASSED with unanimous consent.

- d. 48-R-31 A Resolution to Approve New Organizational Bylaws
  - i. *Marchese*: I'm not going to keep this for too long, because this is not necessary for tonight and I will motion to table this after discussion. It's a great resolution.
  - ii. Motion to move into discussion.
  - iii. Motion to table 48-R-31.
  - iv. 48-R-31 TABLED.
- e. 48-R-34 A Resolution to Support the Inclusion of a Bias Assessment and Response Team Statement on All Course Syllabi
  - i. Gonzalez: I can imagine that for a lot of you this is your first time hearing about the Bias Assessment Response Team. A lot of us in Diversity & Inclusion have also not heard of it until the beginning of the school year, until Adrienne brought it up at the beginning of the year. The reason it wasn't being used is because students just don't know about it. The Office of Diversity and Inclusion is very involved and I have never heard of it. The main concern I hear from students of diverse backgrounds is that Ohio State does not care about them and that Ohio State just uses them for publicity. Many are just not aware of resources offered to them. For example, when I was first elected, a friend reached out to me about having counselors for LGBT students. Turns out we did and she just didn't know. We can use it to report bias and hate crime. Not only does it deal wit the case 1:1, but they use all the reports to create data and find trends about bias within our University. It's unique in that sense and that's why it should be on the course syllabi. It's hard to say what you're going to do when



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

you face discrimination, especially in the classroom or dorm room. Because they don't know, students feel isolated and that OSU doesn't care about them. One reason it should be advertised on the course syllabi instead of in specific groups is that it's inclusive to everyone. Anyone in this room can file one at any time if discriminated again. ODI, Hale Center, one important thing is that it's included with regional campuses. BART started 7 years ago in 2006 as a reaction to 2 different incidents: one here in Columbus and one on a regional campus. The University then formed BART, which grew into what it is today. Since then only 2 reports out of regional campuses, I've spoken to students who've attended these regional campuses. Social climate was worse and more discrimination. I believe this will change the social climate because when a student feels like they are discriminated against or biased or hate crime they do not feel hopeless. Cautious of this resource and has weight because coming from syllabi and University cares for them and professors care for them. Finds trends and University makes decisions off of that. Most cases in OSU residence halls. One instance the Lantern received most reports against it for discrimination and reports went up during last Presidential election.

ii. *Buss*: Many of you may know that I also work in the MCC where BART is housed. I personally know the BART coordinator and he has seen our resolution and I can tell you he is very much in favor. I have a written statement from him that I'd like to read to you now: "To The Body of the Undergraduate General Assembly: As the Bias Assessment and Team Response (BART) Program Coordinator, I, Adan Hussain, oversee BART processes and train hundreds of campus students, staff, and faculty in identifying and reporting bias. BART is both a tracking and a response tool. The data is used in order to create proactive approaches to address current issues on campus as well as creating healing spaces for those affected by incidents. As The Ohio State University strives to be the leader in inclusivity and diversity, incidents of bias are commonplace as they are everywhere else; however, underreporting is a



**Abby Waidelich Vice President**3150 Ohio Union
1739 N. High Street

614.736.2390 waidelich.11@osu.edu

48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

consistent issue with the program. In the most recent report from the 2014-15 year, only 60 reports were received from all campuses. While we strive to minimize incidents on campus, my trainings and the plethora of unreported stories are not properly represented in BART data. Having BART listed on syllabi will help move the campus to greater awareness about the program and also assist the Multicultural Center, as well as OSU as a whole, to better create a safer environment for all communities."

- iii. *Jackson*: Like Caroline has said, as the Diversity & Inclusion committee we had no idea what it was until we started talking about it. It's crazy that we didn't. I also have a statement from Emily Underation that I'm going to read...
- iv. *Mubarak*: I think all of them have done a great job emphasizing the importance of having this on the syllabi. I urge all senators to vote yes.
- v. *Kaczmarek*: They said it best. I won't echo what they said. Pass it.
- vi. *Belfiglio*: From an Academic Affairs perspective, the majority of BART reports comes from residence halls because only RAs are aware of this. This pertains to academics and experience in academics and deserves a place on the syllabus.
- vii. *Chang*: As a Resident Advisor on campus, I was trained on BART during summer training. However, even as a student who's pretty well-informed on resources and who actively seeks new campus resources for my friends and residents, I didn't know about BART until RA Training, and I think it's a wonderful tool that should be publicized beyond the confines of the residence hall walls.
- viii. *Bock*: Ok so what exactly will it look like or will it just be informing of like what BART is? Also, like, um I had another question but I forgot it.
  - ix. Gonzalez: Contact information and information about BART.
  - x. *Bock*: So what happens when a BART report goes in?
- xi. *Tony*: (Explained the process, available at the website below.)
- xii. *Chang*: You can find more information at studentaffairs.osu.edu/bias.



Abby Waidelich Vice President 3150 Ohio Union 1739 N. High Street

614.736.2390 waidelich.11@osu.edu

48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

- xiii. Gonzalez: It varies from case to case.
- xiv. *Buss*: Friendly amendment line 42 strike "current or previous medial conditions" and replace it with "HIV/AIDS status."
- xv. *Harper*: I want to say that I've done BART and Open Doors training for being a campus ambassador, and I realized how valuable it is afterwards. I think this is an amazing idea and am surprised that it isn't already on syllabi.
- xvi. *Gonzalez*: Friendly amendment to add Emily Underation as a sponsor.
- xvii. Motion to pass with unanimous consent.

xviii. 48-R-34 PASSED with unanimous consent.

i.

- f. 48-R-35 A Resolution to Support the Increased Use and Publication of Student Evaluation of Instructor Assessments
  - Souders: SEIs are something most of us have all taken most likely. However, SEIs were created to centrally locate evaluations at Ohio State. It's not required in all courses. An upper level small class could be compared to a small class with just ten students. The comparison has nothing to do with the relevance of the instructor in their quality. First ask is to centralize in Buckeye Link so that when searches are conducted you can centrally see those resources. The second ask is more or less to see all ten SEI questions. There are extended response questions that cannot be seen because of FERPA, but all ten SEI questions are not published because of lack of transparency on part of the University. The third ask is that the comparison of SEI results should be a greater indicator of instructor quality. Also, the comparison by department and publishing response rates at the University of Michigan response rates published by departments there was an increased response rate from students when they were published. Publishing will increase the validity of this measure. All students are required to complete to get their grade. Use tenure instructed instrument, which is jargon that doesn't allow students to understand quality of the instructor. If all courses have to complete SEIs, then we can compare



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

them across the board. U of Minnesota has done something like this that I would like to see at Ohio State. Common sense reforms. We need to take seriously.

- ii. *Belfiglio*: How many people here knew you could view SEI results online? (6 raised their hands). Yeah, that's crazy because we're so well-informed. Many students don't fill it out because they don't see the results. We want to make it a fair metric and want them to be able to see all the metrics. The last thing is that we see is the rating compared to the overall department's ratings. Students filling out SEIs would feel like they're doing something.
- iii. *Kaczmarek*: When I really wanted to say how much I liked or didn't like a professor, or when they offered extra credit. I haven't filled out that many. This would drive up participation and would make the SEIs mean something because right now departmental basis to use them. Most of them don't care to use them and we'd get a better turnout.
- iv. *Honaker*: Important in some departments like ROTC department because there's nothing you can really do with bad professors. I love it, it's a great bill, and we should do it quickly because it's 10:30pm.
- v. *Bratton*: Two weeks ago I changed one of my majors and had to revamp my schedule. Having a resource like this would have really helped and made the process less stressful. This would be better than rate my professor because they're either extreme highs or lows.
- vi. *Cramer*: Line 49 we're not advocating that they start shaming professors that opt out of SEIs are we?
- vii. *Souders*: It would be required. We don't want to publish the list but we want to know that all students at OSU are completing the SEIs and that they would have the freedom to do that. This would be a baseline.
- viii. Warnimont: Do you know how long the SEI tool has existed?
  - ix. *Souders*: 2009 is when it was converted to online, piloted for 4 years before that.
  - x. Warnimont: How long did the faculty rule exist?



**Abby Waidelich Vice President**3150 Ohio Union
1739 N. High Street
614.736.2390

waidelich.11@osu.edu

- xi. *Belfiglio*: It was during the process in which the University had to vote to create SEIs. Some faculties did not like it, so that clause was added into it. Profs who really didn't want to do it didn't have to do it.
- xii. *Singh*: What are the six other metrics?
- xiii. *Souders*: The six other questions not included?
- xiv. *Belfiglio:* 10 questions plus three other categories. We'd like to see the individual averages.
- xv. *Souders*: The first question is "The subject matter of this course was well-organized," etc... Currently, they have the average rating of the professor.
- xvi. *Belfiglio*: Instead of showing us those averages, show us all ten.
- xvii. *Singh*: There's no accountability on their end, so whatever we say in terms of our SEIs, what do you recommend? I don't see anything in terms of accountability on this.
- xviii. Souders: It depends on the department. Yield to Bodey.
- xix. Bodey: Specific professors are consistently receiving terrible SEI reports and allowed to teach. Require undergraduate curriculum committee to review SEIs before approving them to teach a course. That's not really something that has been done before and in researching this between the dean and myself and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the SEIs were available on a need-to-know basis. Graduate assistant only person that saw SEI prior to this was supervisor of graduate assistant. Not required to report to dean, chair of any kind, or chair of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Could easily be swept under the rug. Now all SEIs have to be reported to chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and anything seen as major can call for prof to not be allowed to teach anymore.
- xx. *Belfiglio*: Professors who want to have tenure have to have SEIs reviewed. Young professors' SEIs are incredibly important.
- xxi. *Drenkhan*: I did research a little bit ago. Something that I came across was that using SEIs against professors if they get bad ratings and taking action against them is something they're fearful of and something they don't want. Some of the research that I read was on some people that were fired because an



Abby Waidelich Vice President 3150 Ohio Union 1739 N. High Street 614.736.2390

waidelich.11@osu.edu

January 27, 2016

48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18

angry student could put their job on the line. My question is have you thought about what other things might happen as a result of this? How it would offset scheduling?

- xxii. Souders: I considered it, because I think that President Drake's initiative to offer resources to professors. Reevaluate. I don't think this should be a mechanism to endanger tenure. It's one of many evaluation instruments the University uses. The student voice should be heard consistently.
- xxiii. Bodey: This sounds extreme in plainspeak, but I by no means foresee someone being completely called not to teach anymore, but put a bit more supervisory role in some professors because professors who have tenure and don't have good SEIs are not reporting that to anyone. This calls for more accountability. In a Glenn College class that went horribly as students we had the ability to bring those things forward and that resulted in this. This by no means means that that professor won't teach again, but means that professor is part of a teaching and learning seminar, or receives supervisory provisions because of past SEI reports, whereas in the past that further role wasn't even possible because SEIs weren't reported.
- xxiv. Motion to move into discussion.
- xxv. Moved into discussion.
- xxvi. *Marchese:* I hope this, some time, gets passed by unanimous consent, but this is a very well-crafted resolution and it's clear a lot of work was done.
- xxvii. *Abby Waidelich*: This was sent back from Steering to clean it up, and it was brought back very nicely.
- xxviii. Motion to pass 48-R-35 with unanimous consent.
  - xxix. 48-R-35 PASSED with unanimous consent.

## VII. Announcements

a. *Abby Waidelich*: Tomorrow night from 6pm to 8pm, there will be a Comprehensive Energy Management Plan Town Hall in the U.S. Bank Theater right here in the Ohio Union. It will be on the privatization of energy. This is a chance for students to ask administrators about the energy, where the money will go, etc.



48<sup>th</sup> **General Assembly** Spring 2016, Session 18 January 27, 2016

- b. *Buss*: If you haven't filled out demographic survey yet please do. Right now results are skewed. A couple of you haven't filled it out yet, so please do so.
- c. *Cramer*: Fill out the DC application open for the next hour and a half.
- d. *Harper*: I will see you all at Bullwinkle's to celebrate our favorite Director of Health & Safety.
- e. *Marchese*: If you're curious about the CBRC, I'd love to talk about it outside for the next ten minutes. I apologize if I snapped at any of you. If I haven't directly, please assume that I have.

# VIII. Adjournment