

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION



UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CONGRESS
Session XCIX

General Body Meeting
7:00 pm, Tuesday, April 10, 2018
Devon Hall 120

Session XCIX

Roll Call -

Flag Salute – President Shurbaji

Approval of Minutes

Representative Holt seconded by Representative Rojas

Chair's Report- hi everyone, and welcome to all of our new members! We do have to finish Session 99 before we open Session 100 tonight. It will probably take us a couple hours to finish up Session 99, and then you will all be sworn in come the start of Session 100. Just hang back for now, eat food, and watch the process! For those of you that haven't met me yet, I'm Kaylee Rains-Saucedo and I am the Congress Chair for another week. To our outgoing members who are not returning after Session 99, it's been so great getting to know you! We appreciate your dedication to this body and the students, and we will miss you so much! If you ever want to come back and you're not graduating, apply to be an associate or run again because we would still love to have you! I have a couple of other things. First, we have a lot of bills on the agenda tonight, I think it's 15. I'm going to be very strict on using ParliPro, so make sure you're following that! Don't speak unless you're recognized, and try to stick to decorum at all times so that we can get through this as quickly as possible. Also, please do not ask the same questions over and over again! Just read the screen and pay attention so that we're not asking the same things. Another thing is that a few Exec members are going to visit the OSU SGA meeting tomorrow. If you're interested in coming, we'll be seeing how their SGA works. There's a group that will leave at 4:30, and you're all welcome to join in! Catch me, Sanah, or anyone on Exec after this meeting to tell us if you want to come. Also, this is my last full meeting as Chair with you guys, and it's been a great time! I will miss all of you. And, make sure to also thank Sanah for the food!

Vice Chair's Report- thank the SAF for the food! And Hennessey, of course. Make sure you come and eat the food before the meeting ends because we don't want leftovers. Seriously, just come down anytime. Lastly, for those of you that are new, I'm Sanah and I'm the Vice Chair for the next week. If you have any questions, please come ask us! Normally you would get an orientation to learn everything about Congress, so if you have questions let me know!

Secretary's Report- Hi everyone! For all of you who I haven't met, I'm Mackenzie and I'm the Congress Secretary until next week! I just have a couple of quick things to remind you all of. First, for those of you who are Session 99 representatives, you will still need to complete your April constituent service and office hour requirements. You've heard me say week after week what those are. Also, attendance resets tonight, but Session 99 representatives still need to stay until the end of the meeting! We have a lot of important legislation to see and we'll need quorum. Also, please bear with me tonight! This meeting is expected to break our record, so that means I'll be typing a lot. Please make sure to be using ParliPro and using the friendly

amendment sheets to help me out. That will help me stay on track during tonight's meeting. Lastly, thank you all for letting me serve as your Secretary this year! While I won't always miss typing for hours, I will definitely miss standing up here and seeing all of your wonderful faces! So yeah, thank you all for allowing me this incredible opportunity, I love you all!

OI Chair: session 100 is when nominations will happen for the 3 exec positions. That's in 2.5 hours, so if you're nominating someone, you have to be here for that. If you're being nominated and you're not here, you will 24 hours to accept the nomination outside of this meeting.

Committee Reports-

- **Communications:** Hi, I'm Richard Holt and I am the Communications Chair. I have a few things to mention to you guys. First, for new members, we have a GroupMe that I will add you all to! We send a lot of announcements in there and talk about lots of stuff, so make sure if you don't get added, come talk to me! For those of you that signed up for Big Event with SGA, you have to go pick up your t-shirt for that on the 3rd floor of the Conoco by the end of Thursday. You all need to do that to have the t-shirt on the day of. Also, this Thursday there is the IAC/SGA mixer we've been talking about. For new members, one thing that we've heard is that SGA needs more international student involvement and needs to be more aware of those communities. This event is a great opportunity to get to those members and it's also counting for a constituent service hour! It will be at Jim Thorpe from 6-7pm on Thursday. Lastly, we're still doing Meet Your Representatives on our Instagram account. If you're interested in being spotlighted, please come talk to me, Faith, or Amer!
- **Congressional Administration:** I'm Tom Cassidy, for those of you that don't know me, and I'm the Congressional Administration Chair! This weekend ConAd had a 2-hour meeting, so thank you to all of my members. First, we saw 990105 and that got a rec of do pass. If you want a cheat sheet for that bill, it's up at the front! We also saw 990106 which got a rec of do pass. 990116 got a rec of no rec, especially after a lot of great discussion. Next, 990117 got a rec of do pass, and 990118 got a rec of do pass. We then saw the Session 100 bill numbering act, which also got a do pass. Lastly, 990707 got a rec of no rec from us since it is an appointment bill. I'm really excited to present our semester-long projects tonight because my committee has put in so much hard work! Feel free to ask any questions you may have, and there are cheat sheets for the Bylaws and Election Reform bills up front.
- **External Affairs:** I'm Alex McClintic, the External Affairs Chair! It's really great seeing a full house tonight! Just an update for you, EA is the liaison between OU and the off campus community and its issues. Thursday we are holding a voter registration drive in the Union, and we're looking for help with that! By volunteering for that, you can also get constituent service hours. I'm also passing around a card to sign as a thank you for Anthony Francisco who came to talk last week. Please sign that!
- **Human Diversity:** I'm Julie Chen, the Human Diversity Chair! I just want to reiterate some things that Richard talked about in that the IAC/SGA mixer is this Thursday. That will be a fun event with food and ice breakers going on, so come out to that! Also, Stick it to Stigma Week is coming up from the 23rd-27th of April. Please come by to any event throughout the week. You can also volunteer for those events to get a service hour! For those of you who are new, HD has been working on projects such as disability inclusion and awareness, ADA compliance, creating a world religious forum, and researching faculty of color statistics at OU. I look forward to working with you all!
- **Problems and Projects:** I'm Gabi Thompson, the Problems and Projects Chair! We had Problems, Projects, and Puppies today, which was a huge success. We had a lot of cool suggestions come through. We also want to shout out to Nina from the Bella Foundation because she continually told me how much she loves coming to OU and how wonderful our students are! She also wants to come back for finals week, so be looking out for that. Turn Up for Transit is tomorrow from 11-2pm on the South Oval. If you come help out with that, you can get a service hour. Parking services, CART, and many more people will be there. For those of you who don't know, the suggestion box I mentioned is a project to help get more feedback from students about SGA, and it's on Orgsync!
- **Sustainability:** I'm Tim Kuketz, the Sustainability Chair! We deal with sustainability issues on campus including recycling and many other things relating to the environment. We did see a piece of

legislation this week! 990404, the EPA Resolution we've been talking about, got a rec of no rec because we want the body to determine how they feel about this political issue. The Sustainability Movie Night is this Thursday at 7 pm in Meacham. I know there is a lot going on that day, but try to come after the mixer! Also, Green Week is next week, so keep an eye out for their events.

- **University Policy:** I'm Karla Bonic, the University Policy Chair! We have 3 bills coming up tonight on the agenda. University is a new committee this semester, so these are the first bills we've produced! First, the Early class cost estimation bill got a rec of do pass. Next, the teacher evaluation bill got a rec of do pass as well. Both of these are going towards a larger textbook affordability plan. Lastly, we also saw the Crimson Cruiser bill, which decreases the parking radius, and that also got a rec of do pass.
- **Ways and Means:** I'm Hennessey Chism, the Ways and Means Char! We are responsible for allocating hundreds of thousands of dollars per yet to registered student organizations on campus, which is really exciting! On Sunday, we funded a lot of organizations in aux, which will hopefully be our last aux bill of the semester! One of those is a Congress funding bill, and we wanted that to be separate from other organizations in order to be transparent with the Congress funding. There are also 2 Primary funding bills on the agenda. The reason those are on there is because the Code says that Primary must be moved in the body by the 12th week of the semester. We have put these on the agenda to follow that rule, but we need to table it because Primary is obviously not done. We will start those funding meetings tomorrow night, and then we will have other ones on Saturday and Sunday. We are required to separate regular and governmental primary allocations, so that's why there are 2, by the way. To people who are new committee members, please see me after this meeting. Also, don't freak out that you're being assigned to WAM, we just have to have enough people to see Primary!

Liaison Reports

Bishop: the OU Lacrosse team has grabbed 1 of 2 number one seats for the conference tournament. This Saturday at noon is their home game at the IM fields. Come get rowdy and support!

Kabrick: if you live in a housing center and you have attended an HCSA general council meeting this year, you are eligible to vote in our elections starting next Monday at 7:30! Let's make housing a better place!

Holt: OU Rotaract has an event called Puppies Against Polio coming up. If you could go to that anytime from 10-3pm on the south oval tomorrow, that would be great!

Special Orders

Student Concerns

Old Business

Items to Be Considered

OI Chair: I would entertain a motion to see the parking nomination first! Then, we should see SFC and Election Reform because we have guests here for that.

9909105 – Undergraduate Student Congress Bylaws Repeal & Replace Act of 2018 (Cassidy/Rains-Saucedo/Schneider) (ConAd – rec of do pass)

990106 – Undergraduate Student Congress Standing Rules Repeal Act of 2018 (Cassidy) (ConAd – rec of do pass)

Motion to see bills 990105 and 990106 as a block with 5 minutes of author's explanation

Representative Cassidy seconded by Representative Rojas

Cassidy: please look at the cheat sheet for this to follow along. These repeal the Standing Rules and the current edition of the Bylaws, and replace them with the current Bylaws and Standing Rules combined into one document. These bills are mostly just reorganization, but there were a couple of changes. It is almost always what was already in the Bylaws and Standing Rules, there were just a few minor changes.

Schneider: This makes new sections in the Bylaws. I'll just read off the cheat sheet what these all are. 1. Index, which is up to the Vice Chair to compile after the formatting is finalized. 2. Rules Governing the Bylaws. 3. Standing Rules. These are the same, but compiled from elsewhere in the Bylaws. Included in this section are things like definitions, speaking rights, motions, voting conduct, and decorum. The biggest changes happened in the speaking privileges part. 4. Membership, with subsections on districts, classes, responsibilities, liaisons,

and how you can be removed from being a member. 5. Congressional Officers. 6. General Meetings, which stayed the same as it was before. 7. Committees. There weren't really changes, but there was stuff scattered around the Bylaws, and we just compiled it all here. 8. Legislation, and a big thing we did here was compile all the rules about legislation here. 9. General Provisions, which is a catch all for things that didn't quite fit in anywhere else. It's pretty much the same, just some reorganizational things.

Cassidy: some other changes that we made were we removed the membership class of Appointed Members because now the language will specify that Executive Committee members are automatically considered an associate for their term. We also limited the succession line to the top 5 named officers, then Executive Committee by seniority, followed finally by seniority within members of the body. The reasons behind this is that senior members may have more experience than someone that is brand new. We then removed New Business from the agendas because we can't use it because of the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act. Lastly, we removed obsolete responsibilities from Congress and Committee officers that we don't practice.

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment in Section 4.2.3. iv. to add “, according to Bylaws section 4.2.3c,”?

Cassidy: yes

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment changing all instances of his or her and she or he to “their or they”?

Cassidy: yes

Bishop: in Section 3.4, Conduct During Voting, considering that it the way it reads lets candidates stand in the room while voting happens, would you accept a friendly amendment saying “no voting member of Congress shall be barred from voting?”

Cassidy: yes

Bishop: in Section 4.2, Sub-Section 5, General Meetings, ii/iii/iv, would you accept a friendly amendment cleaning it up by saying “No associate may vote in a general meeting except during Committee of the Whole. No associate may make any motion in a general meeting except during Committee of the Whole. No associates may object to motions in general meetings except during Committee of the Whole.”

Cassidy: yes

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment in Section 4.2., subsection 5- Committee Meetings to clean it up by saying “ii. Associates may vote on all questions in committee except as voting privileges are temporarily suspended. iii. Associates may make any motion otherwise in order in committee”

Cassidy: yes

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment in Section 4.5, Section 2b to say “absences may be excused at the discretion of the Secretary. All absences not excused shall be recorded as unexcused.”

Cassidy: yes

Williams: the purpose of the repealing of the Standing Rules is to add them to the Bylaws. When can we suspend the bylaws?

Cassidy: you can have a 2/3 majority vote by the suspension of the rules to do that.

Kabrick: would you accept a friendly amendment to Section 3.3, subsection 4a adding to the end “and shall be used to suspend any of these Bylaws relating to business procedures”?

Cassidy: yes

Fees: regarding appointed members, are they an entire class outside of associates?

Cassidy: yes, they are an entire class. Appointed members are appointed because of their executive committee membership. There are currently 3 classes of membership: Representatives, Associates, and Appointed Members. Those are the people on exec who automatically get an associateship.

Hedgcorth: you mention here that on the motion to vote on all pending questions is always out of order?

Would it still be out of order with a suspension of the rules?

Cassidy: you can suspend the rules whenever you're allowed to.

Hedgcorth: these committees are standing committees as you mention. Have there ever been non-standing committees?

Cassidy: those would be ad-hoc committees. I don't know if we've ever created them, but sometimes we call them “working groups”. For example, we had an election working group for the elections bill. This doesn't provide that the Chair can create ad-hoc committees, but is just to say that we can have non-standing committees.

Motion to suspend the rules and extend time for questions by 10 minutes

Representative Hedgecorth seconded by Representative Bishop

Hedgecorth: part of this bill has the removal of representatives. Can you explain this?

Debate

Cassidy: we are not removing the ability to appoint representative like ConAd currently does. There was something called “appointed members” before, but those members are just associates made that way by being on exec.

Hedgecorth: part of this bylaw amendment removes new business. I haven’t seen this, but it may be used for emergency legislation. Is this a good idea?

Certain way

Williams: didn’t we use New Business to see this bill in committee this weekend?

Cassidy: it was a mistake on my part, I meant to put it under Old Business.

Bishop: what does “motion to commit legislation to committee” mean?

Cassidy: like with the polling location bill we saw last week, we made the motion to send it back to ConAd. That’s that motion – just a motion to send a bill back to committee.

Bishop: in Section 3.4, it says the only acceptable answers for voting are “aye, nay, or abstain”. Since we do not do this, is every vote we’ve ever done invalid?

Cassidy: no, because no one called point of order.

OI Chair: also, the parliamentary equivalent of those are “yes, no, and abstain”

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment in Section 3.4- Conduct During Voting, under subsection 4 to read “yes, no, or abstain?”

Cassidy: yes

Consent

Passed by unanimous consent

990116 – Election Rules and Procedures Reform Act of 2018 (Cassidy) (ConAd – rec of no rec)

Representative Fees seconded by Representative Bishop

Amendatory motion to suspend the rules and consider 990116 with 10 minutes of authors explanation

Representative Cassidy seconded by Representative Bishop

A. Cassidy: first thing, this has been a semester long project of an elections working group made up of President Shurbaji, Vice President Hardin, Chief of Staff Adran Gibbs, CAC Chair Alex Armer, various Legislative Branch members, and the Judicial Branch. Although I’m the only author listed, I would be open a friendly amendment to add others that would like to be on it. I’m going to be going off the cheat sheet here, so you can follow along on that. In Section 1, we redefined what is business day is to reflect what one would normally consider it to be. In Section 21c, dealing with campaign finance, we added a subsection clarifying that all fines shall count towards campaign expenses, at the urging of Superior Court. We don’t want to create a pay-to-play system that favors people that can break the rules, but afford to pay the fines. This fixes that issue. We also added Section XI to say that all expenses accrued count against the spending limit. Even if someone donates to your campaign, you are still spending the money (EX: t-shirts being sold), and that counts towards the spending cap. In Section 21d, the biggest changes were made to campaign procedures. After every rule violation, there is a now a range of points assigned for those grievances. In the past, all grievances were the same and you all that could happen was if you got 3, then you could go up for a vote of disqualification. But, some grievances don’t have the same weight, and our law should reflect that. You’ll see the criteria for the points later on in the bill. We also removed Rule 12, the truthfulness clause, because a majority of the committee voted to remove the rule on concerns that it could not be enforced. We also added that non candidate may prominently use SGA logos in campaign ads, and merged the rules on CART and elevator campaign rules. Also removed the part about prosecution. In Section 21e, this is also about point assignment. Section 21g is about good faith or bad faith grievances filed. We added those different types in previous election reforms, and their purpose is to clarify what is and isn’t a grievance. You’ll see here and in Section 30, that now the Election Chair has the right to file complaints as grievances, or whatever category the complaint best fits in. Then if it’s an honest mistake, this fixes the filing practice. In Section 22, we

changed that run-offs are now on the Tuesday's after, not an immediate online election. This is our current practice. In the Disqualification section, we switch it from receiving 3 infractions to receiving 5 cumulative points before being considered for disqualification. We also added a 6th reason why a campaign could be disqualified, which is if you continually fail to adhere to campaign punishments, that is a possible reason for disqualification. Rather than saying you'll get points and that's it, the Election Board can now vote on a candidate that is clearly breaking rules. We also added that when a candidate receives 7 total points, the Board has to vote on the disqualification of the candidate. Then, for every infraction after, they have to vote again. Doing the vote throughout makes it easier to keep the Board and candidates accountable, we think. We then clearly state that the margin of victory cannot be used as a reason to not disqualify a campaign. This just codifies the Superior Court's decision from last year's election. In Section 28, this is the back end of the points system. We now require that the Board members have to issue their own decisions in each vote. You now have to say why you are voting the way you are voting on a grievance. This is just to make sure the members are considering everything. The next section shows what you need to consider when assigning points. Those criteria are: (1) the severity of the rule violation (2) whether the candidate has prior violations of that particular rule (3) whether the candidate knowingly or negligently violated the campaign rule and (4) the effect which the campaign rule violation may have had on the campaign, on other candidates, and to the campus as a whole. In Section d, these are the punishments for receiving a certain amount of points. We also lowered the limit on fines to \$15, because we as SGA should not profit off mistakes of campaigns. We've just added some punishments like losing chalking zones or right to post signs on campus. Section 30 is the complaint section. If someone misfiles a complaint, then the Election Chair can switch it over to the accurate section. Section 36 allows the Superior Court to validate completed elections separate from other uncompleted elections. Section 42 says that a campaign has to pay off your fines before the run-offs. And lastly, Section 43 repeals the Curative Act provision.

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment to the short title removing the brackets and adding "amending Title VI of the Code Annotated"?

Cassidy: yes

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment under the definition of the Business Day to make it "Central Time" instead of "Central Standard Time"?

Cassidy: yes

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment changing every instance to of his or her and he or she to they or their?

Cassidy: yes

Mazeitis: would you accept a friendly amendment adding a definition under Chapter 1 for unsolicited electronic messaging to read: any unrequested electronic message sent through an OU-maintained messaging service, including OU e-mail and Canvas, or sent using a closed messaging group maintained for the purpose of conducting official university or university-affiliated student organization business for the purpose of explicitly requesting a vote or support. Whether or not a closed messaging group is maintained for the purpose of conducting official university or university-affiliated student organization business shall be at the discretion of the Election Chair and shall be uniform across all rulings. Also striking the ability of the Election Chair to define what unsolicited messaging is in Section 21d?

Cassidy: yes. We have been working on a definition for that, so now I will accept that.

Mazeitis: would you accept a friendly amendment under Chapter 21, Section c adding the words "monetary and/or in-kind" before "donations"?

Cassidy: yes

Mazeitis: would you accept a friendly amendment in Section 28b changing the language to "Dissenting members of the Board shall issue their own, separate opinion?"

Cassidy: yes

Kabrick: are you aware that there is a scrivener's error in the enacting statement?

Cassidy: yes. We'll change it

Williams: is the fine legally enforceable?

Cassidy: when they sign up to run, they say they will abide by the provisions of the Code Annotated, and this is part of it. It's enforceable in that way.

Williams: would you accept a friendly amendment to Section 26 adding a new subsection reading: once a campaign passes a threshold of fifteen (15) points, they will be automatically disqualified?

Cassidy: no. the working group thought about creating a threshold, but we decided not to. We could not agree what that level that should be at, and we didn't want an arbitrary number. Also, that infringes on a candidate's right to due process. You have the right to go through a hearing and then appeal the decisions to Superior Court. I think Superior Court would strike it down anyway.

Motion to extend time for questions by 10 minutes
Representative Fees seconded by Representative Hedgorth

McClintic: in Section 30, when the ConAd committee is reviewing unofficial complaints, they decide that further action should be taken. Would it force the Election Board to hold a hearing?

Cassidy: what we imagine these hearings would be is ConAd looking at complaints to see if we should add that prohibited activity to the Code Annotated in future reforms. All the things we could act on would be legislative options. Anything that requires Board or Superior Court to take action would be a suit.

McClintic: in that case, all those complaints won't have an effect on the election that just happened?

Cassidy: yes, they would be things that don't impact, but just issue an opinion on something.

Fees: in Section 21a, it talks about objective beliefs about grievances. What would stop an Election Chair from moving something that they don't like as a grievance even if it may not be?

Cassidy: in the same way that they can call anything they don't like as "bad faith". I would accept a friendly that says the Election Board can overrule the Election Chair's decisions about filing.

OI Mazeitis: is any decision appealable now?

Chair: yes, to Superior Court.

Chism: in your opinion, on the friendly amendment that we made about unsolicited messaging, if that excludes GroupMe's, why are we doing that and not all excluding all group messaging?

Cassidy: there is a dividing line of texting your roommates in your room's group text, as opposed to texting in an official GroupMe of a campus group. We give the Election Chair the ability to determine what that group qualifies as, but it must be consistent across grievances.

Chism: for example, Pan-Hellenic's GroupMe's, are those excluded?

Cassidy: they are an official university or RSO, so I think that would fall under that specific category. You can tweak the wording if needed.

Hoefke: regarding the good faith bad faith section, does that misfiling really happen?

Cassidy: the 2 forms are right next to each other on Orgsync, so some people misfile. We just want the Board to be able to switch a complaint over if needed, instead of throwing them out.

Kabrick: aware of the scrivener's error in the long title?

Cassidy: that was amended earlier.

Waddell: in Section 26c, I agree, but how do we enforce it?

Cassidy: because it is a decision of the Board, they would have to write an opinion on that too. Also, this is still appealable to the Superior Court if you hear something that suggests the Election is not following this rule.

Fees: would you accept a friendly amendment in Section 21g, subsection i to read "The Election Board is able to overrule any decision made by the Election Chair by a majority vote?"

Cassidy: I would change the wording to be: "The Election Board may vote to overrule, by a simple majority, any decision made by the Election Board Chair pursuant to this section."

Fees: would you accept a friendly amendment adding the wording you like and just said?

Cassidy: yes

Begovic: because the decision about unsolicited messaging is up to the Election Chair, doesn't this leave room for bias?

Cassidy: it allows the Election Chair to decide what is unsolicited messaging in all instances. We think this can get murky, but we want to leave some discretion to the Election Chair.

Kabrick: it is my current understanding that the HCSA elects their own president, but that is not reflected in here. Can we strike all mentions of HCSA?

Cassidy: do you hold your elections on Orgsync?

Kabrick: we elect them with the same procedure as the rest of the board, at the meeting.

Cassidy: then yes, we could strike HCSA.

Kabrick: *would you accept a friendly amendment striking all mentions of HCSA and HCSA President?*

Cassidy: *yes*

Mazeitis: *would you accept a friendly amendment under the definition of unsolicited messaging to changing “RSO” to “university-affiliated student organization?”*

Cassidy: *yes*

Motion to extend time for questions to the end of the list

Behara

**Amendatory motion to extend time for questions to the end of the list by suspension of the rules
Representative Fees seconded by Representative Holt**

Fees: are you aware that you did a banging job on all this?

Cassidy: thank you to my whole committee!

Debate – Representative Mazeitis

Motion to recess to draw up Debate lists

Representative Holt seconded by Representative Williams

Proponency

Representative Begovic

Opponency

Motion to move a hostile amendment

Representative Mazeitis seconded by Representative Chism

Mazeitis: I have 4 reasons why I drafted this amendment. I was part of the election reform committee and was a member that didn't agree to strike this clause. 1. The Superior Court's Chief Justice said to keep it in. I am not a 3L like he is, and I would trust his opinion. 2. Truth is good and mandating that candidates say truthful statements to students is a good thing. We have an election system that isn't always confrontational, so without that, it's hard to challenge inaccuracies. 3. We haven't had any issues with this in the past, so there is no need to repeal it. 4. Candidates should be responsible for the accuracy of their statements. A lot of a person's platform is databased, and checkable. There are a lot of things that are posted or recorded, and we can use that as fair game. It encourages candidates to be truthful. At the end of the day, truth is good.

Chism: we are representing the students and so are the people that are running in these elections, so we want them to be truthful to our students. The point limit is low compared to other things, so it won't be the end all be all as well.

Mazeitis: we need to consider this, and I urge you to vote for this amendment.

Hedgorth: you say that this rule is possible to enforce, but what do you think it will take effort-wise to file these factual complaints?

Mazeitis: I submitted complaints and those were recorded every time. I also cited the sources of information that backed up my reasoning, and it wasn't hard. We are just using the enforcement system that we have in place already.

Blank: you said you haven't had problems with this rule in the past. By that, do you mean problems that it doesn't get called into question or broken?

Mazeitis: I would argue the first. Very few people have used it and challenged it.

Blank: yet it's still important to have it?

Mazeitis: just because people haven't done it in the past, it doesn't mean a candidate won't make untrue statements in the future.

Cassidy: can you give us an example of a violation?

Mazeitis: say a candidate is really upset about hours at the library and they think it should be open more. Therefore, they list the hours that the library is currently open. If those listed hours are wrong, then that is easy to fact-check. We need to ask people to be factual with hours, facts, statements, or something about a department.

Chism: also, if a candidate says that SGA never sends out emails, that would be untruthful and easy to check.

Holt: there were concerns that the author of this bill brought up about infringements on freedoms of speech. In the future, if that were brought up, what would you say about that?

Mazeitis: the Superior Court Chief Justice said we should keep it in and he is the expert on this stuff. Leave it to be challenged when it is.

Waddell: did Representative Cassidy state that the Superior Court told him to strike the clause?

Chism: I don't think so.

OC Waddell: Then if only the Superior Court Chief justice said to keep it in, were there still some other justices who disagreed?

Chism: we only spoke with the Superior Court Chief Justice. He said there will be tricky situations, but freedom of speech would be opinions about something rather than facts

Motion to extend time for questions by 5 minutes Representative Bishop seconded by Representative Holt

Waddell: since in the last election we had the example you gave, why did that never get challenged with this rule?

Chism: someone from the student body would need to submit a grievance, and they didn't.

Fees: outside of assigning a point value, is there a mechanism to correct incorrect statements?

Chism: as a punishment, the Board could say that the statement must be removed from electronic platforms.

Bishop: is it true that when the Superior Court Chief Justice was talking about leaving this in, he said that some instances of lying, while protected by the 1st amendment, can become slander, which would not be protected?

Chism: he did say that

Debate

Proponency

Representative Bishop

Representative Fees

Representative Williams

Representative Waddell

Representative Rojas

Opponency

Representative Cassidy

Representative Coen

Associate Kabrick

Associate Begovic

Motion to rise from Debate on this hostile amendment Representative Hedgorth seconded by Representative Behara

Chism: I really like the law and America. I watch Law and Order and I've seen the West Wing, so like to think I know a little. But, I'm a sophomore in college, and the Superior Court Chief Justice is a 3L. And, he says that we should keep this in. Speaking of which, we are the representative of the students, and you're not representing yourself, you're doing what is best for the student body. We shouldn't allow people to say things

that are untrue and mislead our students. We do have some checks in place, but we should enforce that with a mechanism because that is what the entire Code Annotated is for. We all know what it's like to have your election jeopardized. But, we need to be responsible to the students and not our own opinions. Also, the Superior Court Chief Justice said to keep it!

Hostile amendment fails by a roll call vote of 11-16-2

Motion to move a hostile amendment

Representative Williams seconded by Representative Rojas

Williams: the reason I have authored this hostile amendment is because there should be a hard line drawn where if rules are continuously broken by a campaign, said campaign will be expelled. If we have people who aren't accountable or an Election Board that is too lenient, there needs to be a line that can be drawn. This is made in light of elections like 2007 where the voting website was hacked, or 2010 where people made a fake polling site. When people break laws, we need this hard line. I want there to be a line in the sand where the Election Board renders a campaign this violation and they are disqualified.

Begovic: you provided us with only one kind of example, something that was horrible. What if these fifteen points are made up of violations not affecting the number of votes?

Williams: a consideration of votes won't be in consideration, which we already stipulated. If you want to run for an SGA office, you have to follow the rules and understand them. It's not a hard thing to do, and if you show a pattern of breaking them, I want there to be a hard line. The reason I have it at 15 is because it is just beyond double the first disqualification vote limit. This shows that the Election Board needs to be cut off from voting and the campaign simply needs to be disqualified.

Waddell: the bill already states that there is a vote every time past 7 accrued points, so the Election Board will have already voted 4 times already? Why 15 if there have been 4 votes already and the Board is unlikely to change their decision?

Williams: I put it at 15 because double the first limit is such a large amount, that it becomes an egregious action by the Election Board if they do not disqualify them.

Fees: do you agree that if there have already been several votes by the Board to not disqualify, that they are not being held accountable and this would hold them?

Williams: I do agree to that statement.

Holt: the number seems arbitrary. Why that number and are you comfortable with it being somewhat arbitrary?

Williams: I'd like to keep it as a multiple because it shows the general accountability of the Election Board and shows a line in the sand.

Holt: you said that there would have been several votes by the Board already not to disqualify. However, it's not clear that it would only be because of some fault of the Board that the campaign has not been disqualified. There has to be some reason behind their vote., so are you comfortable with taking away that discretion granted to them?

Williams: I am okay with that. I have heard of the Election Board being swayed. There have been times when the Election Chair has just not read the code, or has been bribed, or has directly swayed the Board's vote.

Kabrick: would you see a potential benefit to allowing the Board to set this number each election cycle?

Williams: no

Cassidy: you mentioned that if someone has reached 15 points and the Election Board hasn't voted to disqualify them, there is obviously a reason they've chosen that. If we have this hard cap, do you think it would encourage the Board to either find people not guilty of grievances or assign them less points if they don't want them to be disqualified?

Williams: If they did that, that would be more egregious and could be appealed to the Superior Court if the Board is favoring a candidate. It would hold the Election Board accountable and the campaign.

Motion to extend time for questions by 5 minutes

Representative Rojas seconded by Representative Holt

Schneider: what about the candidate's right to due process? Because this final capping would take their right away to a judgment on the grievance

Williams: they could still appeal it to Superior Court.

Waddell: do you see it ever getting to 15 points? If someone got to 12-14, that's still a lot of violations.

OC Waddell: do you think 15 is too high? Because if someone violated enough rules to get to 14 and not 15, they would not be disqualified.

Williams: I think allowing the Board discretion is fine. This 15 rate shows that beyond the double amounts of votes they're having, they have not held the candidate in check, and at the 15 mark, they candidate is held responsible

Hedgorth: you know how our framework is set up. If we have a candidate in clear violation, is it not possible for us to disqualify them?

Williams: there is no way to disqualify them.

Holt: do you think it's fair to future Election Boards and candidates who would be disqualified to just assume that the Election Board is more prone to internal biases than Superior Court?

William: yes, because we've seen it.

OC Holt: is it fair to punish future candidates?

Williams: yes

Rojas: would the severity of the grievance be taken into consideration?

Williams: it would still be based off the points system already given. Therefore, severity would be taken into account, yes.

Fees: could you say what the vote was like in the working group committee on this issue?

Williams: 5-4 on whether or not to include this automatic vote.

Motion to extend time by 1 question by Representative Bishop

Representative Fees seconded by Representative Hoefke

Bishop: I would like you to go back and think about your last answer. Was this vote really brought up, because it's my understanding that it was just Representative Cassidy and I that talked about punishments and we didn't vote?

Williams: I remember that we did vote. The majority of the group said that they didn't want this

Motion to previous question

Representative Chism seconded by Representative Coen

Hostile amendment fails by a roll call vote 6-24-0

Motion to rise from Debate

Representative Behara seconded by Representative Holt

Cassidy: thank you for surviving it. I ask you to vote yes on the bill.

Passed by a roll call vote of 29-0-1

990117- The Election Board Selection Act of 2018 (Mazeitis/Cassidy) (ConAd – rec of do pass)

Representative Mazeitis seconded by Representative Keefer

Mazeitis: I'm Jake. This is a bill separate from the election bill. In the past, the Election Board has been chosen by the Election Chair. There is a committee comprised of the Chairs of the branches, the President, and others, who choose the Election Chair. The Chair then chooses their Election Board. This can create a homogenous Board that inherently vote similarly on all issues. This bill changes the requirements so that everyone, both the Chair and the Board, is appointed and chosen by that same original committee. This allows for a diversity of opinion on the Board. Voting decisions are usually unanimous because in the past,

members have been chosen for their ideas that align with the vision that the Election Chair alone has for the Board. All this aims to do is change that selection process to be like other positions in SGA.

Cassidy: currently the process for choosing the Board is very time consuming. IT takes a couple of weeks to pick and confirm the Election Chair, then the same for choosing the Board. If we get a little behind at the very beginning, it makes the whole process late and that can really hurt us when we're trying to organize election details. This bills will fix that process by appointing everyone at the same time.

Holt: I'm not sure that I'm yet convinced that being appointed by the Election Chair causes that homogenous opinion like you talked about. Can you explain a little more?

Mazeitis: I can say that when I was on it, I was appointed for my opinions on things that aligned with the Chair's beliefs about elections. That was a large factor in the Chair's decision. We haven't conducted actual research on this, but as a former member, I can say that all of us had very similar opinions. Even with dissenting opinions sometimes present, the Board seemed set on a 5-0 vote. It's just something I've noticed.

Waddell: who currently appoints the Election Chair?

Cassidy: the President. However, the practice has been that the SGA President in addition to the branch Chairs and Vice President, create the application together.

Mazeitis: we also picture this being an application for the Chair and Board at the same time. That way if you don't get Chair, you can still possibly be on the Board. It's basically a rank order system.

Bishop: would the Board coming before Congress not mitigate this problem? Can't we ask these questions of them?

Mazeitis: a lot of what we ask them currently is about their experience and how they will do PR and debates. We don't really ask them their opinion on the Code or how they would act as a representative of the election. It seems more about ability and skill verification.

Cassidy: also, the confirmation process before Congress is different than choosing a person. Nothing really replaces that front-end application and interview where we can get it down to people we really want for the position.

Holt: can you elaborate on how the Election Board's Chair's application is different than the application the President will give?

Mazeitis: first, you will have multiple people sitting in an interview room. I would say that the fact that there is more than one person involved, those that represent multiple parts of SGA, allows for a diversity of opinion.

Cassidy: also, the President doesn't sit in on all the Board interviews currently. So, he's confirming people he hasn't completely seen.

OI Fees: where is that section that you're talking about?

Chair: that's nothing we can codify, but it's the existing practice.

Motion to extend time for questions by 5 minutes

Representative Bishop seconded by Rojas

Ball: who is in the interview to choose the Election Chair?

Mazeitis: required is the President. In practice, those we mentioned before.

Ball: should we not codify having those additional people as a standard?

Mazeitis: I get where you're coming from. But our Constitution mandates that appointments of the Exec Branch must be appointed by the President.

Ball: say the President is a sophomore and ran again in the following year. Could they be choosing their Election Board?

Mazeitis: this legislation wouldn't solve that problem. Regardless, we would still have the President choosing the Election Chair. We can address that in another bill if needed.

Waddell: since the legislature gives advice and consent on these, do they have to approved by a bill?

Mazeitis: Yes

Waddell: doesn't that mean then that that is codified?

OC Waddell: the codification of a) multiple people being in the interviews and b) what you mentioned about a bill coming forth to the leg for approval

Mazeitis: the appointment by the President with advice and consent from the Legislature is already codified.

Bishop: was the Election Chair in on the conversations?

Cassidy: this was brought up, but he was not in the final discussions. There was a work group, though, and he is aware of the general ideas.

Bishop: on the idea of the young president, do you not think that the President choosing one person rather than all 5 would not mitigate some of the influence over the Board?

Mazeitis: if we want to address that issue, it's a separate conversation. If the current President chose to run again, I'm down to talk about the issue, but it is not the concern of this bill.

Motion to extend time for questions by 5 minutes

Liu

Amendatory motion to extend time for questions to the end of the list

Representative Fees seconded by Representative McClintic

Motion accepted by Representative Liu

Fees: who was in on the talks about this?

Cassidy: the group was made of of Conad members: Bishop, Williams, Mazeitis, Cordova, Rains-Saucedo, and myself, then the GSS Chair, CAC Chair, President, Chief of Staff, and we talked to Chief Justice Bourland and Election Chair Abernathy

Fees: why did you repeal rule 12 in Section 21?

Cassidy: that's the other bill that will be presented.

Begovic: considering that there is a major aspect of this bill that is a big concern of this body, why should we pass this?

Cassidy: we see the issue, but as we have observed, the more pressing problem is what we see in practice.

Dissent would produce better decisions by the Board. We should discuss the other issue, but we haven't observed it yet and can't fix it through this bill. I think that there should be a system for that, but this is almost the same issue of choice. Because people are concerned, ConAd can talk about that situation, which may or may not happen.

Consent

Objection

Passed by roll call vote of 30-2-0

990118 – Sooner Freshman Council Reform Act of 2018 (Bishop) (ConAd – rec of do pass)

Representative Williams seconded by Representative McClintic

Bishop: this bill is changing some of the requirements for Sooner Freshman Council members. Earlier, ConAd had a discussion about how SFC could be more involved with SGA and align them more with their mission to get members involved in SGA early. We tossed around the idea of an internship in the beginning, but we decided to make it more open. The new requirements are that members must attend one office hour per month of those SGA officers listed. We left off GSS because they're grad students and SFC members would have to come back in 4 years to relate to what GSS does. They also can't go to the same officer 2 times consecutively. They must also attend one meeting of any of the SGA branches (including taskforces). They will then give a report at the last meeting of the month about what the branch and person they visited is up to. The intent is that then they will see first-hand what is going on in SGA. The rest of this bill is just moving some things around and codifying some things not previously codified.

Fees: are you aware that there are numbering issues? Also, in Section 3, 27d subsections, isn't that 2 separate thoughts?

OC Bishop: subsection 2?

Bishop: that is saying that they need to go to one meeting by the end of the semester, but then we clarified that they need to visit each branch.

Mazeitis: are you aware of the scrivener's error in Section 28 in that "old" should be "hold"?

Bishop: got it

Coen: why if we already stipulate that they attend meetings in all 3 branches, that they can't go twice in a row with the same exec member?

Bishop: going to an office hour and a meeting are 2 separate requirements. It's the rules for each one.

Waddell: in Section 28 about selection of the co-chairs, if this is not already how this works for selecting the next year's co-chairs, would this affect that process?

Bishop: I didn't change anything about that. All the same.

Chism: I don't have CAC experience, but are their exec meetings open meetings?

Bishop: couldn't tell you. I know that their GC meetings are open and some event meetings are in the Conoco. That would require coordination.

Ball: in Section 32 under the report it says "At least one of the Co-Chairs shall present a report of the SFC's progress and goals to a minimum of one meeting of the Undergraduate Student Congress per month." Currently, this year, SFC co-chairs have not come to congress at all. Would you accept a friendly amendment adding to the end: "failing to meet this requirement will make the co-chairs go to a review with the Vice President"?

Bishop: I don't like the wording. Where it talks about member meetings and attendance, I would be in favor of mirroring that language as a friendly. Also, I talked to Lucy about this, and she approves it. If they meeting 2 months in a row, then they will meet with the Vice President.

Ball: would you accept a friendly amendment worded: "If co-chairs do not fulfill this requirement for two consecutive months, they shall meet with the SGA Vice President to discuss an action plan for the future"

Bishop: yes

Fees: why is the language "shall" instead of "must"?

Bishop: in the rest of the Code, that's the equivalent for "must"

Fees: in subsection 4 it says: "Failure to fulfill the responsibilities outlined above will result in an unexcused absence." Is that absence per responsibility or if you just don't do any of those?

Motion to extend time for questions by 3 minutes Representative Liu seconded by Representative Bridwell

Bishop: I would say that it means for each thing. If they miss an office hour and a meeting, those are 2 absences.

OC Fees: you're saying that if I don't attend an office hour or a meeting and something else, that would be 2 unexcused absences?

Bishop: 2 things together would be 2 unexcused. If that language needs help, let me know.

McClintic: for the Members section under Responsibilities, if they attend a meeting after their SFC meeting, but before the month actually ends, is that the following month's report?

Bishop: the point is that that is the due date. There's nothing to say that some meetings aren't on Monday, but I would say that they should have done both things before the last meeting of each month.

McClintic: in that case, the members should be told not to go to meetings after the last meeting of each month?

Bishop: this is what the outcome of going to these meetings would be. So as to update the rest of the Council. That could be a matter of 5 days, but they should have done this in the weeks prior.

Motion to extend time for questions to the end of the list and close the list Representative Blank seconded by Representative Fees

Hedgcorth: what exactly is this legislation amending?

Bishop: The Code that talks about SFC

Fees: did you talk to SFC about this?

Bishop: this was a project that has been going on for a few weeks. There was a group that met to talk composed of the Vice President, co-chairs, Amer Begovic, Tom, myself, and Mackenzie. We talked to them about and they liked the changes and understood where we were coming from. It doesn't put too much logistically on the co-chairs, we just want them to keep track of the SFC responsibilities.

Fees: would you accept a friendly amendment amending subsection 4 like we talked about? It would say: "Failure to fulfill any individual responsibility outlined above will result in an unexcused absence"

Bishop: yes

Waddell: in the final section it says this shall take effect immediately. Does that mean I have to do it next month as a current member of SFC?

Bishop: it has to pass GSS and be signed by the President, so no. I also think there is something in here that also says "full month", so this wouldn't count.

Williams: regarding the students, if they feel like they won't have the time to attend one month's meetings, can they make it up the next month?

Bishop: this doesn't have any language that allows for it, nor do I think it should. Also, if they can't go to an office hour or meeting, the co-chairs have the ability to excuse an unexcused absence. If it were explained, the current language allows for some flexibility on absences.

Consent

Passed by unanimous consent

990120 – Session 100 Bill Numbering Act (Cassidy) (ConAd – rec of do pass)

Representative Liu seconded by Representative Keefer

Cassidy: this is a bill that will amend our Bylaws should that previous Bylaws bill pass. It's a small change to the way we number bills in session 100. Our system is really extra for bill numbering, but having to add 4 zeros each time in a Session 100 bill that we can't ever fill, made us think we should change it. Currently we have 9 categories for bills, but some never even get used. In the past year, there were some people that challenged bills with GC based on the numbering of bills. They did not rule with that, but it open up the question of changing our system. Each bill now will have 3 components: 1. Categorized by its nature: bill (CB), resolutions (CR), and appropriation bills (funding bills). Then it would get the session number, then a number of where it gets filed within its category.

Williams: in Section 2, the purpose says "The purpose of this act shall be to reform the composition of and procedures for appointing the Election Chair and Board."

Cassidy: that's an error. I would accept a friendly to add the long title as that.

Williams: would you accept a friendly amendment saying "the purpose of this Act shall be to reform the categorization system of bills in the Undergraduate Student Congress"?

Cassidy: yes

Consent

Passed by unanimous consent

990203 – A Resolution Calling for Early Cost Estimation of Courses (Bridwell) (Upol – rec of do pass)

Representative Bonic seconded by Representative McClintic

Bridwell: I'm going to keep this short. This is a resolution that requires professors to add a syllabus and class cost estimation on Banner and ClassNav. There will now be a section labeled "syllabus" and section labeled "fees" on both sites for students to reference. We also want there to be a link to textbook. It does say that professors who do not have a syllabus by the start of the enrollment period for the semester prior to the start of the class, can use a previous syllabus.

Rojas: isn't it supposed to be the students that find out where textbooks can be found for cheapest?

Bridwell: we've heard complaints of not receiving course information until the course starts. This gives students the information when they're enrolling, which helps retention. If we give it to them when they get to class, they may not be able to afford materials and they could be in debt or drop the class.

Blank: would you accept a friendly amendment adding Aaron Biggs, Executive Director of Technology Advancement to section 11?

Bridwell: yes

Blank: would you accept a friendly amendment adding Kyle Harper, Provost to the Section 11?

Bridwell: yes

Bishop: are you accepting co-sponsors?

Bridwell: yes

Scimeca: would you accept a friendly amendment striking GSS and OU Faculty Senate and adding Carrie Pavlowsky, Graduate Student Senate Chair and Sarah Ellis, Faculty Senate Chair to the list?

Bridwell: yes

Consent

Passed by unanimous consent

OI Hedgcorth: can we dim the room?

Chair: we will try

OI Powers: how many bills left?

Chair: 2 bills left, and 1 bill and nominations in the next session

Motion to see 990105 and 990106 as a block with 5 minutes for authors explanation

990204 – A Resolution Calling for an Addition to Teacher Evaluations (Bridwell/Bonic) (Upol – rec of do pass)

Representative Coen seconded by Representative Liu

Bonic: this is a bill regarding the end of year course evaluations we all fill out. There is nothing on there about whether or not your textbook helped you in the course in any way. That is a very important question to ask for many students. This resolution is adding 2 questions to the end of the course evaluation about textbook usefulness. The first is a Likert scale to rate the usefulness of the book. The second is a free response that asks you to elaborate on that if you would like. People can get out what they feel about the usefulness of their textbook, while helping other students. This is part of an agenda to make textbooks more affordable as whole.

OI Fees: are we seeing 990203 or 990204?

Chair: 990204

Blank: are you aware of the scrivener's error on the 1st page in the footnotes?

Bonic: got it

Bonic: would you accept a friendly amendment striking "office of academic assessment?"

Bonic: yes

Blank: friendly adding both Kyle Harper, Provost and Aaron Biggs, Executive Director of Technology Advancement to Section 4?

Bonic: yes

Blank: would you accept a friendly amendment striking Dr. Felix Wao from Section 4?

Bonic: yes

Begovic: why is Mary Margaret Holt in grey color?

Bridwell: scrivener's error

Cassidy: are you accepting co-sponsors?

Bonic: yes

Scimeca: in section 4, you say Graduate Student Senate. Are you sending to the whole body?

Bonic: the whole senate.

OI Chair: normally it should just be sent to the chair

Fees: did you talk anyone in the office that does these assessments?

Bridwell: I emailed Felix Wao and he directed me to talk to Aaron Biggs who does all these surveys. I wasn't able to reach out to him before this legislation was finalized on Wednesday, though.

Scimeca: would you accept a friendly amendment in Section 4 adding Carrie Pavlowsky, Graduate Student Senate Chair and Sarah Ellis, Faculty Senate Chair?

Bonic: yes

Cassidy: would you accept a friendly amendment to strike the GSS?

Bonic: yes

Motion to move to a roll call vote
Representative Blank seconded by Representative Holt
Passed by a roll call vote of 29-0-0

990307 – A Resolution Calling for the Expansion of Crimson Cruisers (Sanroman) (UPol – rec of do pass)

Representative Waddell seconded by Representative Rojas

Sanroman: this resolution is to address the concern of crimson cruisers being parked in non-designated areas. I spoke to the director of the program and the Vice President of Student Affairs about this issue, and we came up with a solution to the problem. Also, people have been leaving the bikes in areas where they are not accessible to students on campus. The solution would be to reduce the parking radius to 5 feet rather than 10 feet to decreased stranded bikes. Gotcha Bikes also offers an incentive program for riding the bikes a certain amount and parking them in the right place, and the director said that when they were promoting it in the first place, lots took advantage of that. If we could help her out with promoting, they have all these programs that reward you.

Hoefke: would you accept a friendly amendment adding the OU Daily to the list of people this will be sent to?

Sanroman: yes

Fees: why did you feel a resolution was the best way to go about this rather than emailing someone?

Sanroman: I did email Student Affairs, but in my meeting with them, she said that if we enacted it through SGA, it would be better for the students.

Keefer: can you elaborate on what the incentives are?

Sanroman: if you find a bike that's parked somewhere other than a hub and you take it back there, you get a dollar into your account. Those can cover fees that you may be charged.

Kabrick: would you accept a friendly amendment to Section 3 saying "The Office of Student Affairs should decrease..."

Sanroman: yes

Fees: are you aware that the bike share incentive program is not talked about much and people may not understand what it is at all?

Sanroman: since I've talked to transportation services, the Gotcha Bike people, and Student Affairs, I feel like they do know about it. They told me about it.

Waddell: if the goal is to eliminate the amount of bikes outside the zones, how does decreasing the radius help that?

Sanroman: the radius goes outwards. You can park 10 feet away from the zone, not the zone itself

OC Waddell: don't we want the bikes close to the hubs?

Sanroman: we want them to park in the hub. Right now, people can park 10 feet away in areas that then get blocked up with bikes. We just want to ask them to park in the hub.

Waddell: I use these bikes regularly, and I think it's \$5 every time you get the incentive prize. The way to fix this isn't...

Debate

Waddell: should we try to address the incentive program at the same time as decreasing this radius?

Sanroman: we want students to not park on sidewalks and the incentive encourages them to park in designated areas.

Scimeca: is the reason you didn't include the CAC Chair's name in your list of people this is being sent to because of the recent election?

Sanroman: yes

Williams: in Section 5, why have you included the Senate Chair and the CAC chair?

Sanroman: they are on the SAF committee.

Rains-Saucedo: would you accept a friendly amendment to add the SGA President?

Sanroman: yes

Rains-Saucedo: would you accept a friendly amendment adding Evan Rabb's name next to "CAC Chair"?

Sanroman: yes

Rains-Saucedo: are you aware of the scrivener's error adding an "e" after Clarke's name?

Sanroman: yes

Consent
Objection

Motion to extend time for questions to the end of the list
Representative Coen seconded by Representative Bonic

Fees: you've done a lot of great work, but if I made a motion to table this, so it can be talked about a little more and researched more to make it clearer, would you be okay with that?

Sanroman: no. I discussed many potential solutions with students, and talking also to the people in charge, this is what they said was feasible and could be done immediately. The whole thing with the decrease of the radius is that the 10 feet was a trial radius, and so as far as it goes right now with the concerns I was trying to address, maybe you could draft something else to fix the problem of availability of bikes on campus. As of right now, this is what could happen.

McClintic: I'm messaging Tim Crisp, someone instrumental in creating this program, and he has some criticisms. Did you consider how the possibility of decreasing the radius would affect being able to add more bikes?

Sanroman: I talked to the director of the program and she suggested this when I brought up the issue of crowded sidewalks. As far as expanding the bike program, they can still add more hubs, they just need people to park where they're supposed to park.

Begovic: would you accept a friendly amendment adding the SGA President to the list?

Sanroman: that has been accepted already

McClintic: are you aware that decreasing the radius would cause more outside the error hub messages for students who park their bikes in the hub area resulting in more fines even for those within the hub area (according to Tim Crisp)?

OC Sanroman: are you asking if I am aware that decreasing the radius will result in more fines? That's the point. We want you to park where you are supposed to park.

OC McClintic: are you aware that changing the GPS radius would be difficult because of the bike's GPS itself? By decreasing this radius, it would potentially increase fines.

OC McClintic: how many more fines are too many fees given so that you understand that this would increase the number of fines?

Sanroman: fines are applied so you don't do that anymore. Applying fines will prevent students from parking where they're not supposed to. This also allows for Student Affairs to inform students of new policy changes.

OI McClintic: is there a way I could read a really short list of texts from Tim Crisp?

Chair: you have to ask a question

OI Fees: is there a way to make a motion extending time for questions?

Chair: no

OI Hedgcorth: can we suspend the rules to add more questions?

Chair: yes

OI Hedgcorth: can I clarify Alex's question for him?

Chair: no

McClintic: would the decrease of the radius lead to more fines as a result of those false outcomes? To where every time a student parks, they get a fine.

Sanroman: no, I don't think so. On the app for Gotcha Bike, it shows where you can park and allows you to appeal if you get an unjustified fine and the system messes up.

OI Chair: a lot of problem is coming from bikes being left in random areas and then there are no bikes at the hubs. The fines can still be appealed, but this is just so that people will park the bikes in the hubs.

Bishop: I think the point trying to be made here is that 5 feet on a GPS is so tiny that you might not be able to tell the difference.

OI Rojas: is the Chair aware that the margin of error for a GPS for 5 feet is very high?

Chair: now aware.

OI Keefer: you can't tell the difference between 5 and 10 feet on a GPS

Rains-Saucedo: do you have any citations you can use to back up where you're coming from?

Sanroman: I mean I just spoke to Brynn Daves and the director of Gotcha Bike. The director of the bike program says their systems can detect if the U-bar even had the bike railing in it. If they can do that, I think they can distinguish 5 feet.

Motion to table this bill and send it back to committee

Representative Fees seconded by Representative Holt

Objection

Motion carries by a hand vote of 14-10-0

OI Hedgorth: how powerful is the motion to suspend the rules in that could we suspend the rules and just table this bill?

Chair: we are about to adjourn this session, so we cannot put it off. All Session 99 bills must be presented in Session 99

OI Rojas: if legislation dies in one session, can it be reintroduced?

Chair: yes. But we have no official committees right now.

990404 – A Resolution Regarding the Environmental Protection Agency's Rollback of Regulations

(Kuketz/DeAngeli/Bray/Scimeca) (Sus – rec of no rec)

Representative Coen seconded by Representative Liu

Kuketz: this is the EPA resolution we've been talking about. We've drafted this because since January of 2017, over 60 environmental regulations that this committee believes are critical, have been slated for cut. Some of those have already been rolled back. For instance, the provision created that prevents mines from dumping toxic sludge into rivers was repealed. That is now technically allowed. You may have noticed we've included things about Scott Pruitt as well. We've included him because he is the driving factor behind many of these regulations slated for removal. We are appealing to him to reconsider some of these and we are highlighting that we have some concerns with him being in this role. Our committee does not believe he was qualified to be in this role in the first place.

Williams: I love this, but what's the follow-up with it?

Kuketz: as the Sustainability Committee of Congress, it would be us calling out and saying that we do not support the cutbacks of these regulations. This would then be coming from the university as a whole

Rains-Saucedo: you put a lot of work into this. Would you be willing to accept a friendly to include your citations?

Kuketz: yes. We have those and will include them.

Rains-Saucedo: in the 7th whereas clause, you refer to the EPA Demonstrator as just Pruitt. Would you accept a friendly amendment inserting Scott?

Kuketz: yes

Williams: scrivener's in Section 5 because it should be Section 4.

Holt: in the 8th clause, are you sure that's as specific you want to be with "energy companies"?

Kuketz: I will get back to you on that.

Kamatar: would you accept a friendly amendment changing the wording of the 8th to "questionable degree of leniency"?

Kuketz: yes

Waddell: in the whereas clause where Pruitt rented the apartment, that shows a lot of corruption. But, this calls for him to continue the regulations he's set on repealing.

OC Waddell: what is the reasoning behind including his renting of apartment?

Kuketz: that is included to again highlight that we would not have chosen him to be the head of the EPA as he has shown an amount of opposition to the EPA previously. By including the issue with the condo rental in D.C. it further shows that he was quite literally in bed with big oil.

Hoefke: there is a scrivener's error in the 3rd whereas. Can you adjust the format?

Kuketz: yes

Waddell: would you accept a friendly amendment in 6th whereas clause inserting "ties to the industries the EPA regulates"?

Kuketz: Yes

Holt: would you accept a friendly amendment changing the wording of that 8th clause to “questionable leniency towards large unsustainable energy companies?”

DeAngeli: that seems like it’s more like what they’re doing is non-sustainable and not the fact that their entire industry is the worst. I would not accept that.

Motion to extend time for questions by 5 minutes
Representative Coen seconded by Representative Rojas

Bishop: would you accept a friendly amendment saying something in the 8th whereas clause like “towards large energy companies with unsustainable practices”?

Kuketz: yes, I like the wording of that one. This bill is not anti-energy. It is anti-practices that harm health.

Williams: why is Governor Mary Fallin not included?

Kuketz: we were looking for people we could send this resolution to just as a start. We would accept more.

OI Kamatar: did Representative Bishop’s friendly pass?

Chair: yes

McClintic: in the 13th clause and the 2nd sentence, would you accept a friendly amendment to add the word “strong” by evidence?

OC Kuketz: where?

McClintic: right before the word “evidence”

Kuketz: a different word than strong. I can see the need for an adjective, but I wouldn’t personally like the word “strong”.

Consent

Objection

Passed by a roll call vote of 27-1-2

990513 Auxiliary Allocation #21 Act of 2017-2018 (Chism)

Representative McClintic seconded by Representative Williams

Chism: the Academic team was funded \$275 for national conference registration fees. American Constitutional Society was funded \$318.94 for a Lunch and Learn. AASA was funded \$1485 for registration fees for a national conference. Chinese in Business College Association was funded \$500 for guest speakers fees. Delta Sigma Pi was funded \$500 for rentals for a group retreat. Delta Sigma Theta was funded \$300 for rentals for a new member event. Essence Dance Team was funded \$500 for uniforms and meeting snacks. Graphic Design Association was funded \$200 for snacks for meetings. Men’s Glee Club was funded \$300 for a spring banquet. Intercollegiate Legislature was funded \$1000 for costs for session. They were also funded \$700 for registration fees for session. Oklahoma International Law Society was funded \$400 for food and drinks for meetings. OUr Mental Health was funded \$750 for licensing rights for Stick it to Stigma Week. Out Space was funded \$284.10 was funded food and drinks for meetings. Pre-Med Club was funded \$150 for food and drinks for an award banquet. Swipe to Share was funded \$250 for printing and promotion. Student Heroes was funded \$400 for a table cloth, signs, and flyers. One EMS was funded \$1030 for new bikes and accessories.

Motion to move to a roll call vote

Representative Coen seconded by Representative Bonic

Motion fails by a hand vote

Bishop: The Academic Team- how much did they ask for?

Chism: More than \$1000. Academic Team had as of today not been notified about this new notification, so any reference made to a previous allocation was their funding before this allocation.

Kabrck: You mentioned OUr Mental Health, but they are not on the legislation. You also mentioned something about medical professionals, but I do not see them.

Chism: Pre-Med is on here and they got \$150 for a banquet. Mom's weekend was really cool. My mom was chill. It was chill.

OI Ball: How many bills are left?

Chair: 10, after this

Chism: I would accept a friendly amendment adding OUr Mental Health's \$750 allocation and amending the total allocation

Fees: Would you accept that friendly you just proposed?

Chism: Yes

Fees: Would you accept a friendly amendment altering the total allocation?

Chism: yes

Motion to move to a roll call vote

Representative Behara seconded by Representative Khan

Passed by a roll call vote of 29-0-0

Move to recess for 5 minutes

Representative Chism seconded by Representative Thompson

990514 Auxiliary Allocation #22 Act of 2017-2018 (Chism)

Representative Coen seconded by Representative Liu

Chism: We funded Congress \$1,175 for things congress is doing including food for WAM meetings, an OSU Senate visit, the IAC/SGA mixer, and the Sustainability Committee movie night. These events serve all the students, and it's important that they get funded. This is a separate piece of legislation for transparency's sake.

Kabrick: are you aware of scrivener's error on the date?

Chism: we'll change it

Motion to move to a roll call vote

Representative Coen seconded by Representative Khan

Passed by a roll call vote of 30-0-0

990515 Primary Funding Act of 2018 for Governmental Organizations (Chism)

Motion to see bills 990515 and 990516 as a block

Representative Cassidy seconded by Representative Bishop

990516 Primary Allocation Act of 2018 (Chism)

Chism: I explained this earlier. Primary needs to be moved by the body by the 12th week of school, but it needs to be tabled this week because it is blank right now. Please table this bill.

Motion to table these bills for an indefinite amount of time

Representative Bishop seconded by Representative Williams

990707 – Student Parking Appeals Court Appointment Act of 2018 (Ball/Shurbaji) (ConAd – rec of no rec)

Representative Mazeitis seconded by Representative Williams

Shurbaji: congrats to all the new faces! My office is always open to any of you! We had a rank system when we were judging applications for the Parking Appeals Board. We originally had 8 spots available and then we had a waiting list for other members. We then had one person drop, and now Foster is in! He met all the same requirements as the other candidates, but I will let him talk!

Cassidy: would you accept a friendly changing the name on the legislation Foster Becquet?

Shurbaji: yes

Consent

Passed by unanimous consent

New Business

Follow-Up Reports

Williams: thank you for passing Lauren's Law. I don't know if the bill got on the committee's agenda, but I'm trying to find out. As soon as I have an update, I will relay that. Please continue contacting the senator I recommended in the GroupMe

Powers: I'm on the HD ADA project. The director of the disability inclusion and awareness organization wants to let you know that we have sent a letter to the Faculty Senate about ADA compliance. We have taken that step.

Items for Future Agenda

Announcements and Comments

Rains-Saucedo: to all of our representatives leaving in Session 99, thank you for your dedication to congress. You are always welcome and we will miss you so much!

Scimeca: Saturday at noon, OU Lacrosse has their playoff game at the IM fields

Williams: students from the school of social work have created a group: OU Advocates for Trafficking Survivors. There is a petition about this that will be sent out. Also, today I was contacted about a walkout for higher education. It will be a walkout to the Capitol and it is trying to be arranged. I will be releasing a press release from my office co-signed with all my officers about it. Talk to me or EA chair for more details

Lalani: It's On Us Week is next week! We have events every single day, so please go follow us on our social media platform to get all the info, and come out to the events!

Sanroman: next Friday at 12:30 there is a walkout for gun law reform. If you have any questions, please contact me. If you want to speak about it, we still have room along with other speakers.

Final Roll Call

Motion to move to adjourn sine die

Representative Scimeca seconded by Representative Bishop

Adjourn sine die

Chair: Kaylee Rains-Saucedo

Vice-Chair: Sanah Lalani

Secretary: Mackenzie Cordova

Session 99	General 4/10	Final
Ball, Carson	x	ex
Behera, Pranoy	x	ex
Bhaktaram, Ananya	ex	ex
Bishop, Kimberley	x	x
Blank, Faith	x	x
Bonic, Karla	x	x
Bray, Matthew	x	x
Bridwell, Trey	x	x
Cassidy, Thomas	x	x
Chen, Julianna	x	x
Chism, Hennessey	x	x
Coen, Noah	x	x
Cordova, Mackenzie	x	x
DeAngeli, Emma	x	x
Duechting, Donald	ex	ex
Fees, Elaina	x	x
Hammond, Rabina	x	x
Hedgorth, Joseph	x	x
Hoefke, Madeleine	x	x
Holt, Richard	x	x
Kalvacherla, Vinay	x	ex
Keefer, Braden	x	x
Khan, Adam	x	x
Lee, Alan	x	x
Liu, Shihui	x	x
Lobaugh, Rachel	x	x
Mazeitis, Jake	x	ex
McClintic, Alexander	x	x
Manohar, Kanjan	abs	abs
Rojas, Julio	x	x

Sanroman, Rosa	x	x
Scimeca, Joey	ex	x
Thomas, Hailey	abs	abs
Thompson, Gabi	x	x
Waddell, Turner	x	x
Walton, Jonathan	x	ex
Williams, Dan	x	x
Wilson, Taylor	x	x
Present	33	29
Absent	2	2
Excused	3	7

Session 99	990	990	990	Hos	Hos	990	990	990	990	990	990	990	990	990	990	990	990
	105	106	116	tile #1	tile #2	117	118	120	203	204	307	404	513	514	515	516	707
Ball, Carson			y		n	n							y				
Behara, Pranoy			y	n	n	y							y				
Bhaktar am, Ananya																	
Bishop, Kimber ley			y	y	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Blank, Faith			y	n	y	y				y		y	y	y			
Bonic, Karla			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Bray, Matthe w			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Bridwel l, Trey			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Cassidy, Thoma s			y	n	n	y				y		a	y	y			
Chen, Julianna			y	y	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Chism, Hennes sey			y	y	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Coen, Noah			y	n	n	y				y		a	y	y			
Cordov a, Macken zie			y	n	n	y				y		y		y			
DeAng eli, Emma										y		y		y			
Duechti ng, Donald																	

Fees, Elaina			y	y	y	y				y		y	y	y			
Hamm ond, Rabina			y	y	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Hedgco rth, Joseph			y	y	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Hoefke, Madelei ne			y	y	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Holt, Richard			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Kalvac herla, Vinay			y	a	y	y						y	y	y			
Keefer, Braden			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Khan, Adam			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Lee, Alan			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Liu, Shihui			y	a	n	y				y		y		y			
Lobaug h, Rachel			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Mazeiti s, Jake						y											
McClin tic, Alexan der			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Monoh ar, Kanjana																	
Rojas, Julio			a	y	y	y				y		n	y	y			
Sanrom an, Rosa			y	y	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Scimeca ,Joey										y		y	y	y			
Thoma s, Hailey																	

Thompson, Gabi			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Waddell, Turner			y	y	y	n				y		y	y	y			
Walton, Jonathan						y											
Williams, Dan			y	y	y	y				y		y	y	y			
Wilson, Taylor			y	n	n	y				y		y	y	y			
Yes	0	0	29	11	6	30	0	0	0	29	0	27	29	30	0	0	0
No	0	0	0	16	24	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Abstain	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0