I. Opening
   a. Call to Order
   b. Attendance
      i. Sami.3 for Kauffman
      ii. Meersman.1 Chang
      iii. La Pointe.17 for Sullivan
      iv. Kaczmarek.28 for Prayner
   c. Swearing in of Alternates
   d. Approval of Minutes
      i. Minutes approved.

II. Open Forum for Public
   a. No one.

III. Updates
   a. Danielle Di Scala: I don’t have anything critical.

IV. Executive Report
   a. Gerard Basalla: Even a couple days after this happened Danielle and I were having a conversation and we are heartbroken about this loss and as student leaders we are facing a difficult time. I am constantly reminded of what Buckeye love and Buckeye friendship means to me. There is a huge problem when we are combative and don’t tell people we love each other. Tell your friends and family that you love them because this world is a crazy place and this is not normal. That’s what I’ll say. It’s sad, and Danielle and I will continue to work with you. We have been taking GA resolutions to administrators. We have seven meeting tomorrow and five involve resolutions. Continue to stay positive in campaigns because you represent USG, so talk about what you are campaigning for now.
   b. Bodey: Can we get an update on the JP audit of the campaigns?
   c. Basalla: We have a call tomorrow. I have nothing to do with campaigns at all. I will give advice, but the JP answers all questions and all media inquiries go to them so we hope this happens fast.

V. Committee Report
   a. Allocations—Derek Whidden
      i. $500 for East Asian Culture Club
      ii. $500 for Taiwanese American Student Association
VI. Old Business
   a. 49-R-47 A Resolution to Recommend an Increase in the TOEFL Requirement for Undergraduate International Admission
      i. Di Scala: I talked with senator Liu and we are going to keep his resolution tabled for another week because he has a meeting next week.
      ii. Motion to amend the agenda to start with 49-R-52.
      iii. Motion passes.

VII. New Business
   a. 49-R-52 A Resolution to Advocate for the Implementation of Dialogue Spaces
      i. Bidna: So hello everyone. This resolution has been revamped and I spoke with the Director of the Union about this. Every administrator I’ve spoken to has been in support and it has been even more necessary due to how Buckeyes are feeling on campus and there is a further need for dialogue spaces. I brought this resolution up to my own constituency; they all gave acclamation that this is necessary. It will not happen this semester, but I hope the next GA will pick it up. The changes in this are there is more research on three schools that have this—Nebraska, Michigan and Michigan State. They are each diverse and how we can form our own spaces, but there is a physical outline of what they have. They [Michigan] suck, but they do a good job of outlining the accessibility of the space and the resources available and the nature of the resolution has changed to go from Framework 2.0 to giving three suggestions to the administration proposed to me by the Director of the Ohio Union. There is a demand for it now and he and those in charge of STEP will look at the underutilization of the rooms and that they need to be looked into. It was brought up to me by my constituency that there should be a place in Thompson or the Union so I felt the need to add this for the sake of rounding out the resolution.
      ii. Glass: I was in favor of this when it appeared and it was less prescriptive, but the chamber wanted a clearer suggestion to bring to the administration and the author does a good job of hashing out some of these details suggested by the chamber and I think this really identifies a need we have on campus.
      iii. Buss: I think the two of them said it all. The changes were necessary and positive.
      iv. Moved to questions.
v. *Kaczmarek:* The Michigan State mission statement says they need a space for students and the greater East Lansing community. Is this resolution just for OSU students or Columbus?

vi. *Binda:* Just OSU. I looked at that but I felt it was better first for OSU. They call it a safe space, but I was looking more at the resources they used

vii. *Moved to discussion.*

viii. *Frank:* Friendly amendments.

ix. *Frank:* Great resolution. I am happy with how this came back and how it is more prescriptive and how it fits into OSU. It says we’ve thought of these three places and it goes beyond the resolution and I hope it passes.

x. *Belfiglio:* Friendly amendments.

xi. *Belfiglio:* This is a great resolution and a great example of tabling to improve a resolution so I hope this passes.

xii. *Vargo:* Friendly amendment.

xiii. *Motion to pass with unanimous consent.*

xiv. 49-R-52 A Resolution to Advocate for the Implementation of Dialogue Spaces PASSED.

b. 49-B-4 A Bill to Overturn the Allocations Funding Decision for John Glenn Civic Leadership Council

i. *Whiddon:* Hello everyone. We are here for a funding appeal for their event that is occurring on March 24. They were denied funding because they felt the event was not open to all students.

ii. *Rigney:* My name is Claire Rigney. I am the Membership Chair of JGCLC and I’m a molecular genetics major.

iii. *Graeter:* My name is Luke Graeter and I’m the Policy Chair. I want to introduce what we are about. We are the flagship organization for the John Glenn College. We serve public affairs majors and non-public affairs majors. Those who are interested can come to our meetings and discuss service activities. One of our pillars is membership and one of the things we are doing is having a semi-formal. A lot of students transferred to or added a public affairs major. Many don’t know each other or some have adverse experience with debates in class and we want them to meet outside of class to network with fellow majors or non-majors. We want to create a fun environment to serve the interests of our members or those who want to engage in the organization.

iv. *Rigney:* We want to emphasize that we are opening this event to all. The members we will talk with later are those who help plan events. We want
to reach a wide ranging audience I am a molecular genetics major and I just don’t want Glenn majors. We want multiple majors present. It is March 24 from 8:00 to midnight and we are looking to finance the food. It is appetizer style and we estimate that 150 will come based on the size of the venue, which is the policy forum in Page Hall. The price is—we are requesting $900 for food based on how many we think will be attending with previous financing. Other costs will be paid for by the CLC. This is an example of the table of costs. We cannot pay for the whole event and we really appreciate financing for this event because we want to have networking, but also for other majors across the university. Hopefully this will cover the cost of food and drinks so we don’t have to charge for this event.

v. Moved to questions.

vi. Frank: So considering the initial funding was denied for lack of outreach, what can we expect going forward?

vii. Graeter: I would clarify that it wasn’t the event outreach, but lack of conveying the outreach.

viii. Rigney: We will create flyers and will advertise in Facebook groups.

ix. Kaczmarek: Can we get an update on the funding?

x. Whiddon: I want to make the distinction for last week. That group was granted partial funding already. This group was denied funding all throughout. The committee’s concern with the marketing, not that the club wasn’t open, but it is clear that it is marketed to all students so in my opinion it fits that definition. We have $1,638 for this quarter and we have two groups left. We started with 10 groups before with $55,000. That is the situation.

xi. Merchant: I don’t know if this is the question, but is there a way we can change the event name?

xii. Whiddon: No, we cannot.

xiii. Motion to move to discussion.

xiv. Moved to discussion.

xv. Bodey: I want to say that I’ve been disgusted with Allocations and what they have given and what they haven’t and I think that if they had asked the organization about the event and how they came about, this could have been avoided. This organization is neglected by USG because their events fall in the spring. They are a student organization that has been denied funding and they have been forced to appeal for three years. It has an unprecedented level of exclusion. The JGCLC was funded and founded by
Res Life and it is a learning community. They all have in interest in John Glenn’s life and the students in this organization use this and view this as a service organization. There are students who come from many colleges and for someone to say that this is not open is a generalization. I am really upset that this group has been planning this event for three months and they feel that they want to bring the Glenn College together. They deserve full funding and I will not sit idly by while they get denied funding. I will not say that they cannot get full funding. The executive branch has funding left and right and when we say they don’t have money we know it can be moved and it is a pure mismanagement. I stepped done from Allocations [Committee] for many reasons and the groups that work hard don’t get funding and we tell them it is their fault. If they do not get full funds, then I am ashamed of this body. I know I am biased but I want them to be fully funded with no questions asked.

xvi. Liu: I think this is a great organization. I am looking at their org online and I see that I would totally say that policy doesn’t exclude attendees. The only concern is there might be events on that day that might draw a lot of people away.

xvii. Shaffer: I don’t think anything else has to be said.

xviii. Gracia: I would like to- first, there should be respect in this body and a lot of attacks have been thrown. We hear all groups equally and we don’t make some groups have priority. We have been strict on the funding we give internally and we have taken money out of the internal budget and I have nothing against this group, but with other groups we have decided to hear all groups equally. I hope you have a successful social.

xix. Rigney: The group that previously put in their apps, were they also given less funding because of potential future bids?

xx. Gracia: Yeah, since this is in a quarter, we have been looking at future groups.

xxi. Kaczmarek: I yield my time to Whiddon.

xxii. Whiddon: The concern wasn’t the group; it was the marketing. They clearly showed that it can be marketed to all students and I recommend funding the groups.

xxiii. Kaczmarek: I move to amend that the last ‘let it further be resolved clause’ to say $536.

xxiv. Motion to amend the resolution.

xxv. Moved to questions on the amendment.

xxvi. Bodey: Can Mr. Kaczmarek explain his reasons in for that amount?
xxvii. Kaczmarek: Yes, I dived the remaining budget for the remaining groups.
xxviii. Bodey: Are there specific items you would like to not fund?
xxix. Kaczmarek: I am fine with the last six line items going to them.
xxx. Shaffer: Don’t we have to fund this on the line items?
xxxi. Whidden: It depends- yes we fund line items. If it is more, like if they are asking for $2,000 for food, we can only fund $1,500. But we can fund all of that.
xxxii. Shaffer: I thought we could only fund specific food?
xxxiii. Whidden: It can be just specific groups.
xxxiv. Moved to discussion on the amendment.
xxxv. Belfiglio: I think this is a good amount. I feel bad because we are at the end of the quarter but we have been giving all money to organizations. We have been moving funding from internal to external. In my opinion, it leaves only $690 for the next organizations and they’ll be asking the same question. Our budget is tight but I feel like Kaczmarek has proposed a resalable account. You said it would zero out your budget?
xxxvi. Greater: We are not the treasurer and we don’t know. The idea is we’d get the funding and figure it out. To make the event open to as many as possible and to have no charge that was the plan.
xxxvii. Rigney: We do have the contingency.
xxxviii. Belfiglio: It is unfortunate, but the other events want to be funded as well.
xxxix. Kaczmarek: I see that charging only $2.50 per person would be enough and I don’t think this would cost too much. We can still add more money after this amendment and we can change it to $900 then. It should be in that amendment and not this one.
xl. Reed: $300 is a lot for a non-OUAB or USG group and that is a lot of money to cover. I lead a group of 20 orgs and it’s hard to get this money. That is a dent in their pocket that is hard to make up.
xli. Bodey: Thank you, Senator Reed, for your comments and I would like to say that I think this group deserves a tremendous amount of praise and they did say they have contingency and those of you that are staying in the chamber --if you are back and if you are affiliated, I want you to remember splitting this up and I think this shows a lot of what USG stands for and that there is internal thinking that needs to be done. I will be voting no on this amendment because I believe they deserve more funding. $900 is a lot so I will be proposing another amendment that their contingency can afford.
xlii. Clark: What makes this a particular event more important than the upcoming events? I love what they are doing and I am a Public Affairs major but what makes this more important?

xliii. Lovejoy: I’m curious, you said you expect 150 people to attend. How many are in your organization?

xliv. Greater: We extend an invitation to all majors to all John Glenn majors and the John Glenn community. There are about 40 people in it and they do related events. Our mailing list of members is somewhere in the hundreds, like 400-600 people. We don’t have 400 in Page Hall in our meeting, but this is the way we are set up.

xlv. Shaffer: So I think it was said earlier that Allocations doesn’t take into account the different orgs, but this seems weird. This org puts on an event for 150 but the college is tiny. This org has come to us three times and has been denied funding. Why? This org has put on events that reach a lot of orgs, but student orgs that don’t do that much and come in for what reason? I don’t mean to attack the committee in how it was run, but it would be wise to approach allocation differently based on how successful their events were. I will be voting to fund this is full. I don’t think the next event will need 100s of dollars and this will touch a lot of people and I’d rather give this money to this event than an org that only touches 10-15 people at best.

xlvi. Bodey: I’ll be voting no and proposing an amendment for $850.

xlvii. Reed: Aren’t there a lot of—so are when it comes to events, is it based on chronological order?

xlviii. Whidden: So who is this works is we have certain money for each quarter and the applications start coming in and they are scheduled in the order the events occur. If you remember, when there is money that isn’t spent in the internal budget, we move it to this. I will say that in the level of funding, we have funded more this year than all four quarters last year.

xlix. Reed: In my opinion, if it is in order, they had their request in earlier and I don’t think their funding should be contingent on the events that occurred earlier.

l. Buss: So, quickly, I’m going to yield to Senator Bodey because I have questions about the 850 amount.

li. Bodey: I’m all about compromise, but they deserve more money. The paper ware and things like that—I know that they were upset and they said they can help with paper ware if it meant that they can still have the event. Paper ware I know is not the amount that gets to $850. I know that food
will be covered and it will continue. I know that their people are upset about this and to have this event with USG funding, if it means it will pass, it is fine with me.

lii. *Buss:* Can you work with $850?

liii. *Buss:* Based on all of that let’s give them $850.

liv. *Liu:* I just to answer Kaufmanns’ question about the number; there are 263 people and public health and social work have 1,000. Exploration have 2,126 majors and with the same percentage there are potential public affairs majors. Can I vote on amendments on the bill?


lvi. *Clark:* I want to yield time to Whiddon on the funding and the comments he has.

lvii. *Whiddon:* We don’t take into account how many majors there are and this is not about the college, it is about the organization. That being said, just to respond, that plays no role in funding. We have two more groups and we have two more apps and will start hearing quarter 4 events Sunday.

lviii. *Clark:* Can you elaborate?

lix. *Whiddon:* I’ll get back to you.

lx. *La Pointe:* Is this the first time this event will take place?

lxi. *Rigney:* Yes.

lxii. *La Pointe:* Planning an event for the first time is difficult and I would hate for an event like this to be stopped.

lxiii. *Rigney:* The VP of the organization is the Director of Events for BuckeyeThon and the fashion show is attended by 1,000 people.

lxiv. *Graeter:* We came up with these estimates with event professionals.

lxv. *La Pointe:* I commend you guys for this event. And I would do not for an event like this to not take place. It is a tricky situation and it is hard to put one event over another, but if they could successfully put it on with $850, and not putting orgs over other, orgs, I’m in support.

lxvi. *Glass:* I would encourage discussion to be germane to the amendment and discuss the resolution after.

lxvii. *Belfiglio:* I yield my time to Derek.

lxviii. *Whiddon:* after looking through the apps,

lxix. *Belfiglio:* I believe this is germane to the budging decision.

lx. *Di Scala:* We have already asked about the budget and we need to consider this event and not future events and it’s not germane. We have already discussed the budget.
lxxi. *Whiddon*: I made a mistake. We only have one event coming in for quarter 3. My mistake and I apologize.

lxxii. *Belfiglio*: With that being said, I think we can fully fund this event and will be voting no. I think we are unclear of the process, but it is not literally first come first serve. They look at what they can and cannot fund and it’s not abnormal to expect some self-funding and if you apply, it is fair to say how many are coming for just one org instead of considering future orgs.

lxxiii. *Lovejoy*: I think now that we know this, I am okay with funding it. I have advice for the future and I would say that cubed cheese and cracker trays without catering is cheaper.

lxxiv. *Bodey*: The event is in Page Hall and the catering contracts cannot be avoided.

lxxv. *Amendment withdrawn.*

lxxvi. *Bodey*: I would like to amend the resolution to read that $914.70.

lxxvii. *Moved to questions on the amendment.*

lxxviii. *Bodey*: I move to cap the speaker list.

lxxix. Speakers list not capped.

lxxx. *Kaczmarek*: Five minutes ago the senator that made the amendment said that it would be $850, what changed her mind?

lxxxii. *Bodey*: Well, we found an error and the body was not permitted to hear the other groups, but we know that the amount given was incorrect and my compromise was no longer necessary. After they sat through an hour’s worth, I think they deserve full funding.

lxxxii. *Kaczmarek*: There were comments about the paper ware and how it didn’t need to be funded. Why are we doing this?

lxxxiii. *Bodey*: That is not true, it would have been through donations and the budget that this came from has been strapped and is at its capacity and that’s why the group was frazzled. They care about this. Now USG can right their wrong, they deserve funding for paper ware.

lxxxiv. *Whiddon*: We don’t just look at the group and we just look at this event.

lxxxv. *Moved to discussion*

lxxxvi. *Motion to call the question.*

lxxxvii. *Question is called on the amendment.*

lxxxviii. *Moved to discussion on resolution.*

lxxxix. *Motion to cap the speakers list.*

xc. *Speakers list capped.*
Belfiglio: I think we should fund this fully and we should keep in mind our tone. Not just this example, but we’ve been overzealous in capping and calling questions but this is why we have to yield so often to not unnecessarily limit debate.

Lovejoy: I think it is great you are getting the funding. Thanks for coming. I think we could have gotten through this without being hostile and I you catch more flies with honey than vinegar.

Buss: I want to say that Derek says to directors to please let us know if you aren’t using your funding because we want as much as we can and I want that on record. We really have tried to give as much money as possible and I want to thank you for coming here and appealing your decision. We clearly have the money so let’s just do this.

Gracia: I know this isn’t easy and I want to reiterate what Senator Lovejoy said. We want to be constructive instead of attacking.

Frank: Friendly amendments.

Frank: I apologize for the treatment you have received in the past and it is not to reflect that we don’t value you, but allocations is stressful and funding as much as we can is difficult and I understand that managing money in USG is not easy and I want to apologize for that and I would like to comment that if you have issues with how much is fixed, it can be amended. I realized that funding in health and safety was mismanaged and I took it away. It is not something to take this out on individuals who are trying to find this. I know it would be better to ask for funding early and I know that’s weird to say. I apologize for the treatment you received and I would like senators to maintain a level of respect so other students don’t have panic attacks in the chamber.

Glass: I have a few comments. First, let me say thanks for coming in and thanks for being here. Two things have come from this. Allocations should have a clear way to allocate funds and that is not to say the intention of the committee is not pure; members who have sat on the committee have tried to do what is best with their capability. How we communicate how the money is allocated should happen in the future and I feel that is constructive. I would like to drive the point home that this is a representative democracy; respectful decorum is necessary and it is undermined when words are used like ‘disgusted with’ and ‘repulsed by’. We need to, as a body, be constructive and that does not happen when we attack each other. I am happy senators are passionate and going to bat, but it shouldn’t be at the cost of the decorum or respect of other senators. I’m
not one for grandstanding, but going forward, we need to pay considerable attention to how we behave. There have been plenty of times I was upset and wanted to express my feelings in a not productive way. I encourage all senators to take three deep breaths and make sure this is what you really want to say and that we could have gotten this done if we were respectful.

xcviii. **Motion to pass with unanimous consent.**

xcix. 49-B-4 A Bill to Overturn the Allocations Funding Decision for John Glenn Civic Leadership Council **PASSED** with unanimous consent.

c. 49-R-53 A Resolution to Support the Implementation of Reusable “To Go” Containers at The Ohio State University Dining Services Facilities

   i. **Motion for a five-minute recess.**

   ii. **Motion passed.**

   iii. Di Scala: Senator Glass, would you like to introduce the resolution?

   iv. Glass: It would be my honor. I will say that Senator Reed was going to be a cosponsor but I failed to put it on. This came through Student Affairs and it was done by Jacob Brinkman. This is just an opportunity to achieve and work towards achieving these sustainability goals. There is a list of orgs that come here and it would enroll in a program that gives reusable containers they can fill with food and eat the food. This would cut down on the waste when we get food for the dining services and we can cut down on the waste.

   v. Merchant: I would like to reiterate everything Senator Glass said and we see students using this and it is simple to do and show the admiration that this is a priority.

   vi. **Move to questions.**

   vii. Bidna: Who washes the containers? Do I wash it?

   viii. Glass: It would go into a mechanism to be cleaned by the facilities and dining services would find that solution. This goes with other universities.

   ix. Reed: Most of these reusable programs- the student doesn’t wash it. The student is given a token and it is out of your hands. I’ve talked to CEOs like from Ozzy Corp and they are picking up steam and they reduce the amount of time to cook in the kitchen.

   x. Kaczmarek: As an off campus student who eats on campus once or twice a week, would you have to hold onto a dirty dish that I might forget?

   xi. Glass: I yield to Senator Reed.
xii. Reed: So when it comes to this program, you can take the box home and it is on you but if you want to eat it during the course of the day, you can bring it back. One thing to note is that when it comes to places to return it, you would have multiple in different facilities.

xiii. Glass: I believe the Clemson example is like the bike share program where you pay into this program

xiv. Kaczmarek: There would still be an option for how this it is now handled on campus? Would this switch fully?

xv. Glass: It doesn’t state this either way but we are advocating this for an option and it is a broad stroke. Here are six universities that have this working for their campus and we’ll have to define what it means and we’ll discuss this.

xvi. Kaczmarek: Would this eliminate all disposable to-go options?

xvii. Reed: I’d get rid of them, but my way is not going to happen and the single use containers will likely remain and we are creating resolutions for the food panel and they are becoming the decision maker. This would fall into that portfolio and I’d be hard pressed to believe they’d get rid of it.

xviii. Tyson: Does this apply to Traditions or other locations?

xix. Merchant: I guess this applies to the last question and as Senator Glass mentioned, we don’t have the specifics of how this is implemented, but a good example is My Cup. All first year students with meal pans were given My Cups. They did not get rid of disposable cups and this is a way for first year students to have a reusable option. It would probably be something similar and I would assume that they would start with traditions, but that doesn’t mean it won’t be phased into the Union Market.

xx. Belfiglio: Just to clarify, this would be an opt in and they could choose what to take.

xxi. Glass: My guess is this is just the first step and we can see how this is implemented. There are examples of how this is used and it is done slightly differently and it wouldn’t do this program justice for the future. We need a lot more discussion on this, but this is saying that this is something new we are interested in.

xxii. Belfiglio: With My Cup, I know that students wash it is it a health thing.

xxiii. Reed: Yes.

xxiv. Merchant: This is focused on Traditions and the To-Go option didn’t exist last year and those other options already exist.

xxv. Liu: Won’t it be more cost efficient to suggest students bring their own plates and stuff?
xxvi. **Dweik**: I had a meeting about sustainable options. Ohio has strict sanitation laws because they can’t hand things over the counter and a lot of the cost is for the cleaning of facilities. Ohio is strict with sanitation when we are eating even if it is more sustainable not to do this. Ohio laws are tougher to change.

xxvii. **Liu**: The Ohio State dining director—the faculties are proud of their cleaning process and the dining director say they are confident of the quality of their cleanliness.

xxviii. **Zayn**: In theory that’s right, but say I wanted to get people sick, I can do disguising things to the container and they would have no idea and this is a way to avoid that.

xxix. **Kaczmarek**: Why would people bring things back? How did the other schools address that?

xxx. **Glass**: To get a new clean To-Go back, you have to bring back the old one or have a token or identification.

xxxi. **Reed**: The incentive is you get your food to go. It is kind of like—you can spin it that you feel good inside as well.

xxxii. **Bidna**: I love this resolution and I have a question, why did you just have to go containers? Is this just another line in sustainable food options, like utensils? That seems easier.

xxxiii. **Reed**: That’s a good point. I like that. We don’t have much time left but this is more specific to food and when it comes to plastic utensils, I don’t know of any programs like this and there is already an infrastructure for that.

xxxiv. **Bidna**: Can you have conveyor belt like the Traditions?

xxxv. **Merchant**: At Scott, you are using reusable utensils and if you are taking this to go, you are not next to the trash can anyway and students have asked for this as an option. Students can take advantage of this. We don’t know if they would bring this back.

xxxvi. **Buss**: Just a quick question, what is the incentive to bring it back?

xxxvii. **Reed**: They pay for it and if it is opt-in. If they want another clean container you need to bring in your dirty container.

xxxviii. **Merchant**: We are planning on doing focus groups to see the best way to do this and to have this like the program, we don’t know yet how this will be implemented in terms of if you will pay for the first one.

xxxix. **Glass**: The University of Michigan, I know I hate to do that, but the way they do it is they have a deposit on your To-Go tray and if you have $3-5,
you get your deposit back and if you lose it, you lose your $5. That won’t ruin your life, but there is an incentive for that.

xl. Dweik: I know when we did this a while ago, but in Eckerd College in Florida, I’d like to talk with sustainability and student affairs is in a similar fashion and we can have your BuckID linked. If you have a To-Go box you need to have another so it is registered there. When you opt in, that covers you for four years and now that there is more traffic, this is a great plan.

xli. Moved to discussion.

xlii. Belfiglio: I think that would be the best way to do this, but it’s like a library card; you can drop it off and that would be the easiest way. I think starting with Traditions is a great plan.

xliii. Liu: I hate plastic containers and then other To-Go boxes get soggy and I hate that and having reusable containers that hold the food will-- am fine with it.

xliv. Frank: friendly amendments.

xlv. Frank: This is a great resolution and I would like to see where this goes It helps us obtain zero waste by 2025.

xlvi. Motion to pass with unanimous consent.

xlvii. 49-R-53 A Resolution to Support the Implementation of Reusable “To Go” Containers at The Ohio State University Dining Services Facilities PASSED with unanimous consent.

d. 49-R-54 A Resolution to Support the Increased Implementation of More Merit-Based Scholarships

i. Clark: This resolution is advocating for merit based scholarships and here to speak more on that is Deputy Director Kaczmarek

ii. Kaczmarek: Basically, if you want a merit based scholarship, you need to be a freshmen and if you are a transfer student you aren’t eligible for scholarships. If you got a 27 on the ACT and need a 28, but you are a 3.8 chemical engineering major, you should get scholarships. This is a first step for that.

iii. Abusway: I don’t have any new thing to say, but I encourage this to be passed to have this work like other universities to implement older students.

iv. Clark: I am part of the College of Arts and Sciences Deans’ Advisory Board and they are in full support of merit based scholarships.

v. Moved to questions.
vi. Frank: In the last clause Indiana is mentioned with no link, is there a link?
vii. Clark: There is. I will email to Mario.
viii. Colvin: What is the difference between this and what Senator Lovejoy passed a few weeks ago about merit based scholarships? I think this should pass but she should be included in the next stages.

ix. Moved to discussion.
x. Clark: Friendly amendments.
xii. Colvin: What is the difference between this and what Senator Lovejoy passed a few weeks ago about merit based scholarships? I think this should pass but she should be included in the next stages.

xi. Frank: Looking through our past resolutions, Senator Colvin was right. It was 49-R-30 to encourage to make this more affordable and to have scholarships that are not based on ACT/SAT scores. This is just expanding upon that. Would it be appropriate to mention this?

xii. Belfiglio: We usually don’t self-recognize, but I don’t care. It’s a free country.

xiii. Frank: Friendly amendment.

xiv. Clark: I would also like to commend Senator Lovejoy for her dedication and for her knowledge in writing in the previous resolution and I apologize for not mentioning her commitments earlier.

xv. Liu: Friendly amendment.

xvi. Motion to pass with unanimous consent.

xvii. 49-R-54 A Resolution to Support the Increased Implementation of More Merit-Based Scholarships PASSED with unanimous consent.

VIII. Announcements

a. Liu: Safety services.

IX. Adjournment