

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION  
GRADUATE STUDENT SENATE  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY MINUTES

November 2, 2014

7:00 P.M.

SARKEY'S ENERGY COMPLEX A-235

Meeting called to order at 7:00.

Call for approval of last meeting's minutes by Senator 95, seconded by Senator 69. The motion passes.

The Chair reports that there will be two resolutions placed in front of the Senate today – GF14-23 will be in favor of not placing a rope around the new seal on the Stewart Landing, and GF14-14, which is in favor of a rope being placed around the seal. We, as a body, should only pass one of these resolutions.

The Vice chair is absent.

The Secretary, Academic Affairs, and Development and Philanthropy have nothing to report.

External affairs reports that a survey about the use of the CART bus system will be sent at to graduate students at some point. This survey is to gather data on how the busses can be made more effective, and to possibly justify extended hours for the busses to run.

Human Diversity reports that they have a Facebook page. They also report that there will be a town hall meeting tomorrow at 7:00 in the Meacham Auditorium. It will be about race (diversity, in the curriculum, inclusion, etc.) and it will be led by a student and a faculty cosponsor. This town hall meeting will possibly be delayed.

Internal affairs reports that they are working on the bylaws, and will hopefully have legislation before the end of the semester.

Public Relations reports that GSS has a twitter now ( @OU\_GradSenate ). They are working on a hashtag, and would appreciate suggestions.

Ways and Means reports that grants are finished, and the legislation is on the agenda tonight.

The motion that GF14-22 (Emergency Allocation Act #4) be moved from special orders to new business is made by Senator 88, seconded by Senator 86. Senator 46, seconded by Senator 88, moves that GF14-22 be brought to the floor.

This act allocates \$265 to Sooners For Israel, \$400 to Oklahoma Intercollegiate Legislature, \$178 to Graduate Physics Student Interdependence, and \$260 Counseling Student's Association Motion to pass by unanimous consent is brought by Senator 72, seconded by Senator 33. No objections, and the motion passes.

The motion that GF14-23 (Establishing a Tradition Act of 2014) be moved from special orders to new business is made by Senator 56, seconded by Senator 86. Senator 86, seconded by Senator 20, move that GF14-22 be brought to the floor.

The author of the legislation (Eli Potts) is not available this evening. Instead, Jason M Pudlo is presenting this act.

This act states that social pressure, not a rope, should be used to prevent people from walking on the seal. The resolution also states that, if necessary, a plaque shall be placed asking that people refrain from walking on the seal.

Lauren Aragon asks if the presenter is aware that this act plagiarizes another resolution written by her for Undergraduate Congress. The presenter is not aware.

Senator 86 ask that a friendly amendment be made to list Aragon as a co-author. A point of information is asked if co-authors can be added to legislation via friendly amendments, and it is confirmed that they can. The presenter agrees to the amendment.

Emily Sample asks if the presenter is aware that the undergraduate student congress passed a resolution that a rope be place around the seal, and that it was passed by unanimous consent. The presenter is not aware.

The Chair mentions that in executive council, it was discussed whether the rope was a hazard or not. As the area is well lit, it was agreed that the rope would not pose a hazard (to bikers, for instance). Senator 69 asks what is meant by a plaque. The presenter responds that it means that a marker would be places telling people not to walk on the seal.

Senator 65 asks if this Resolution is due to liability issues only. The presenter responds that the resolution is mainly about establishing a tradition, and ascetic issues of the rope around the seal.

Lauren Aragon asks if President Boren has been talked to about putting up a plaque. The presenter does not know. In addition, Lauren Aragon asks that a friendly amendment be made that the Resolution be a Concurrent Resolution. The presenter agrees.

Senator 27 asks the presenter how exactly this tradition is handled at other universities. The presenter does not know. The chair mentions that there is one other instance of the university seal on campus in the floor of the Union, and it is roped off.

Senator 97 asks how the rope or chain for the seal would be funded. The presenter does not know.

Senator 65 asks who will assume the liability if someone injures themselves on the chain. The chair mentions that this would be handled in the same manner as any other injury suit that takes place on campus.

Lauren Aragon asks if all visitors will be expected to read the plaque. The presenter responds that the plaque will only be placed if the social pressure is not sufficient to convey to people that they should not walk on the seal. Lauren Aragon then asks if every visitor will be expected to respect the seal. The presenter responds that he believes social pressure will be sufficient to prevent people from walking on the seal.

There is a motion to vote by placard by Senator 10, seconded by Senator 95.  
The votes are as follows:

Yeas – 96 97 49 71 90 6 25 27 5 98 85 34 94 57 93 59 2 44 52 60 20 16 56 69 11 77 19 95 21 3 54 91 76  
66 39 38 37 29 86 9 92 15 75 88  
Nays – 10 50 33 47 22 58 42 41 72  
Abstentions – 65 23 83 67 69 12 48 46

Total yeas – 44  
Total nays – 9  
Total abstentions – 8

The yeas have it, and the act passes.

The motion that GF14-24 (A Resolution Veterans Appreciation Week for 2014) be moved from special orders to new business is made by Senator 96, seconded by Senator 97. Senator 66, seconded by Senator 29, moves that GF14-22 be brought to the floor. This is a resolution declaring the week of Nov. 8-15 as Veterans Appreciation Week for 2014.

Senator 96 asks if anything is planned for this week to honor veterans. The author responds that nothing has been planned, and it is believed that the Veteran student organizations will most likely have their own events. Senator 96 follows up with a question on if professors and the student body have been notified about this week. The author responds that the student body has been notified.

Motion to pass by unanimous consent is brought by Senator 46, seconded by Senator 52. No objections, and the motion passes.

GF14-14 (A Resolution requesting that a rope be placed around the seal on the South Oval) is brought to the floor by Senator 41, seconded by Senator 66. As a resolution agreeing with the opposing viewpoint was passed prior in this meeting, GF14-14 is tabled indefinitely by Senator 69, seconded by Senator 20.

GF14-15 (An act relating to emergency funding eligibility) is brought to the floor by Senator 46, seconded by senator 69. This act rewrites bylaws to allow a student organization in good standing formed during the semester (rather than only the first four weeks) to request emergency funding a week later.

Senator 86 asks when this legislation would be effective. The author responds that this legislation would be effective next semester.

Senator 58 asks how an organizations standing can be determined in one week. The author clarifies that “good standing” is meant to indicate that the student organization is a legitimate one with students and a faculty sponsor. Senator 58 follows up with the query that a student organization needs exist only one week before receiving funding. The author clarifies that there is a vetting process that all organizations must go through in order to receive funding. Senator 65 asks why organizations are denied funding. The author is uncertain as to the specifics. Senator 58 proposes a friendly amendment for a grammatical error, which the author accepts.

Senator 45 asks if there is a maximum amount each organization can get. The author responds that there is not, but the amount given to a student organization is discussed in the congressional budget committee. Senator 45 then asks what happens to the money left over from the Emergency Funds. The author responds that the left over balance is transferred to subsidiary and emergency funds for the next year.

Senator 42 asks about the acceptance rate of those who request funding. The author responds with rough estimates – last year approximately 3 organizations were denied funding and approximately 12 organizations were funded.

There is a motion to vote by placard by Senator 86, seconded by Senator 20.  
The votes are as follows:

Yeas – 72 96 97 49 83 71 65 23 90 6 25 10 5 27 98 57 94 93 59 67 50 69 44 52 60 20 16 88 89 11 19 33 22  
48 47 1 54 66 76 39 38 9 37 29 86 75  
Nays – 85 34 77 95 12 46 58 42 92 15  
Abstentions – 41 21 3 2

Total yeas – 46  
Total nays – 10  
Total abstentions – 4

The yeas have it, and the act passes.

GF14-20 (Student Organization Subsidiary Funding Appropriation Act of 2014) is brought to the floor by Senator 86, seconded by Senator 88. This is an act allocating subsidiary funding to multiple student organizations for the upcoming year. Those denied funding did not complete the mandatory quiz about funding, did not submit a complete application, or were not a registered student organization.

Senator 69 asks if each organization that applied has to be a registered student organization. The author clarifies that this is true. Senator 46 asks if errors in the application would prevent the organization from receiving funds. The author says the organization is still eligible for funds should errors in the application occur. Senator 56 asks if records are kept to make sure the money is spent wisely. The author states that all records are kept with SGA accounts. Senator 3 asks if feedback is given to the organizations that are denied money. The author says that they are. Senator 65 asks if organizations can appeal the decision of the budget committee to deny them funding. The author responds that organizations can appeal the budget committee – an ad hoc committee is formed to review the decision, and that decision can be appealed to the Supreme Court. Senator 46 asks for an approximate number of organizations who are turned down for funding. The author responds that approximately 25 organizations were been turned down. Senator 46 asks if organizations were given the entire amount asks for. The author responds no – over one million dollars was requested from student organizations in total – many requests for funding were not fulfilled to the full amount.

Senator 92 asks how much money is allotted to student organizations. The author clarifies – not student organization is given a blank check or money directly. All purchases are made through the university or from the university (i.e. an event might be catered by the university, or item a club needs are purchased for them by the university).

Senator 77 asks for more information about the quiz. The author responds that it is an online quiz made by the executive branch. Senator 3 asks if student organizations are allowed to apply for subsidiary funding in addition to primary funding. The author responds with yes, although the primary funding an organization received would be a factor into how much subsidiary funding they would receive. Senator 33 asks what organizations do with the money they receive. The author says that most of the money an organization receives goes towards programs, activities, and events.

Move to pass by unanimous consent brought by Senator 46, seconded by Senator 86. No objections, and the motion passes.

GF14-21(An Act of Procedure Approving Travel/Conference/Research and Creative Exhibition Grant Awards for the 1014 Fall Semester) is brought to the floor by Senator 86, seconded by Senator 58. Ways and means report that they have written legislation giving travel, research, and creative exhibition grants. Grants were due on October 17th at 12:00. On the 19th at 2:00, the first round of evaluations took place. Out of 103 applications, 63 passed (based on the criteria that the application was complete and correctly formatted). On the 26th, the second round of evaluations took place. Out of 63 applicants, 57 were awarded funding. This was based on two individuals grading the application on a 100 point scale and then adding their scores together. Of the 100 points, 35 were based on the applicant's Statement of Importance and Participation, 25 were based on the professor's applicant assessment, and 25 were based on the professor's recommendation. 5 points were added to favor those who had not received a grant in the past. If an application scored above a 75% out of 200 points, they were given funding. This scaled according to their score (an 'A' received all of their requested funding, all the way down to a 'C' received 50% of their requested funding).

Senator 46 asks about the criteria that rendered applications ineligible to receive funding. The author responds that 15 applications were disqualified due to ID formatting, 11 were disqualified due to date formatting, 10 were disqualified due to decimal formatting, and 6 were disqualified for having no signature. Three applicants did not type, 3 applicants were missing parts to their application, and 2 had other errors. 8 applications had errors of multiple types, and 7 had repeats of the same error. Senator 15 asks if people needed to present at a conference in order to get funding. The author responds that it is not necessary to present at a conference to get funding. Senator 5 notes that over half the points of the application are from a professor, and their formatting cannot be checked by the student. The author responds that that is taken into account. Senator 15 asks if the location of the conference being applied for is taken into account. The author responds that the location is not a factor. Senator 58 asks why 29.8% of the applications are from communications. The author responds that these persons completed the application successfully, but in the future, caps on how many grants one department can receive are being considered. Senator 45 asks if any feedback is given to the disqualified applicants. The author responds that reasons why an application was disqualified are available upon request, but once an application was disqualified, not all errors were noted. Senator 46 asks if the 6 students disqualified in round two can appeal the decision not to fund them. The author responds that they may not, but perhaps in the future they can.

Move to pass by unanimous consent brought by Senator 66, seconded by Senator 86. No objections, and the motion passes.

The next meeting will be on the 16<sup>th</sup> of November. The motion to adjourn is brought by Senator 95, seconded by Senator 94. The motion passes, and the meeting is adjourned at 7:50.