

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION



UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CONGRESS  
Session XCIX

General Body Meeting  
7:00 pm, Tuesday, March 6, 2018  
Devon Hall 120

Session XCIX

**Roll Call -**

**Flag Salute – Representative Williams**

**Approval of Minutes**

**Representative Behara seconded by Representative Mazeitis**

**Chair's Report-** good to see you all, I missed you last week! I was in D.C. with some of The President and Vice President, the CAC Chair, and the GSS Chair to meet with our Representatives. Some of those meetings went well, and others were surprising. While there, we lobbied for things like DACA, higher education, Title IX, and some other things. Some Representatives were really perceptive, but some were not. I'd be happy to talk about my experience with you all! Also, applications for Superior Court are out now. They are due Tuesday, March 19. The Superior Court is our official Judicial Branch that oversees all things elections. Most are law students, but we do accept some undergrads. For those of you that are graduating seniors in May or December of 2018, we are ordering cords. You can venmo me or give me cash for those. They are going to be \$10 and the money is due to me by March 31<sup>st</sup>. It'll come out of my personal account, so no if I don't receive the money from you, I can't order you a cord. Also, senior dinner is April 13<sup>th</sup>, which Sanah will talk more about. Also, if you didn't file for election, please come talk to me. I sent out emails and made lots of announcements, but if for some reason you didn't know about filing, come talk to me after the meeting. Those elections will be April 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>. If you have questions, come talk to any of the three of us or Corey, the Election Chair. Lastly, if you're interested in doing things with Congress, a month from today are nominations for the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary positions. If you're planning to run, you have to be nominated by a representative at that meeting to be officially in the running. If you plan to run, you also MUST come talk to us about our positions and the details about them. There's a lot more that goes into them behind the scenes that you should know about before running.

**Vice Chair's Report-** Just 2 things. First, about the senior dinner, if you're a senior like Kaylee said, come see Kaylee and I to talk about a day and reservations. Also, if you're interested in running for the Vice Chair position, PLEASE come talk to me. I do a lot behind the scenes that I would love to show you.

**Secretary's Report-** Hi all! Like I say every month, a new month means new constituent service and office hours! Make sure you record that office hour on my office window- just sign in when you get here and out when you leave. Then, record your constituent service hour on the Orgsync form. If you're a new associate or representative who was confused about the submission process for either of those requirements this past month, please come talk to me after the meeting because I want to give credit where credit is due. However, if will need proof that you actually completed the retirement, so please keep that in mind. But, if you ever have any questions regarding office hours or constituent service, please come talk to me. Also, if you are an

associate, your attendance is still online this month. There is a form on Orgsync that says “Associate Attendance March”, so make sure to fill that out when you go to a meeting. For all of you here tonight, remember that I need a picture of you at the meeting! Take this time to quick snap a selfie or a picture of me talking and go fill out the Orgsync form. Doesn’t have to be cute, just has to be there. For those of you that haven’t completed your Member Biography, I am extended the deadline to this Friday. You will not get credit, but please still go fill it out so our wonderful webmaster, Kim Bishop, can upload all your information onto the website. We only had about 38 people fill it out from all our representatives and associates, so that’s pretty low. Please go do it! Also, like Kaylee and Sanah said, if you’re interested in being Secretary, please come talk to me. I do a lot of work behind the scenes outside of just taking minutes on Tuesdays, and I would love to show you. Someone has to do this job next year! If you’re interested, my office hours are M - 2:30-4:30, Tu – 3:00-4:15, W – 11:00-12:00 and 2:30-4:00, Th – 3:00-4:15, and I’m there throughout the day on Sunday for committee meetings.

### **Committee Reports-**

- **Communications:** Hello. Three big things tonight. First, The Big Event registration closes in 10 days, so please sign up with us! We are with O.I.L. because there is so much overlap. Second, we have another event at the end of this month, most likely on the 26<sup>th</sup>, but details to come on that. It’ll be a Cookies and Congress event in the Union courtyard, and I will send out a signup link soon. Last thing, we are starting to do a promotional Meet Your Reps on our Instagram, so if you’re interested, please come talk to us. However, if you’re running for a seat right now, we cannot post you because we cannot support a campaign.
- **Congressional Administration:** We had a really productive meeting this week. 990102 is a bill that relates to ConAd’s internal interviews process. We’ve seen that for a couple weeks now, and changed it a lot, so we are very happy to give it a rec of do pass. 990507 is a simple change to when Primary funding applications are due and we also gave that a rec of do pass. Lastly, 990613 amended committee membership, which we also gave a rec of do pass.
- **External Affairs:** Thanks Ananya for hosting our meeting this week since I couldn’t be there. We have 2 thank-you cards to pass around for Mike Hunter and Representative Jadine Nollan, who talked at Higher Education Day. Sign those as they get passed around and I will collect them at the end of the meeting. This Thursday there is a Voter Registration drive, and those will be held bi-weekly on the South Oval and the Union. If you’re looking for a service hour, that’s a chance!
- **Human Diversity:** We have 3 main projects going on. First, we are working on a world religions forum to promote underrepresented religions on campus. Second, we are working on Stick it to Stigma Week, and ADA compliance as well. We are also combatting the white nationalist posters that have resurfaced. And, we are working on improving relationships with the Campus Climate Board.
- **Problems and Projects:** we saw our IB Credit resolution this week and that got a rec of do pass. That’ll be seen next week when the author can be here. Other projects we have going on are setting up Problems, Projects, and Puppies - details to come on that, but we’re thinking maybe April 10<sup>th</sup>. We also have meetings for Turn Up for Transit, expanding ASL programs, the fine arts building issues, and a few other little things. Really stoked.
- **Sustainability:** we talked about the idea of moving back the movie night, so that it falls before the upcoming elections. Also, Joey and I roll out the recycling sustainability fliers in the Conoco tomorrow! Keep in mind that the 16<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> of April is Green Week. Like and share their Facebook posts, and go to their events. Also, like and share any other sustainability and RSO sustainability events.
- **University Policy:** we had our first meeting on Wednesday. At our meeting we finalized projects and we had a research info session. I just want to let everyone know that if you have any UPol project ideas for upcoming semesters, let me know.
- **Ways and Means:** we saw aux this week, which you will all see tonight. Also, ConAd saw the bill Tom mentioned about changing the Primary due date. We’re also talking about non-allowable and allowable items on Sunday at 4pm in the Conoco, so come to that meeting if you want to hear those

discussions. Also, the week after the top 3 positions in Congress are elected, committee chairs are as well, so if you're interested in being WAM Chair next year, please come talk to me and let me know!

### **Liaison Reports**

Scimeca: the OU Lacrosse team this past weekend went 1-1. They play Arizona in Dallas this weekend to compete for being a top 5 team.

Rojas: Columbia Night was a huge success! Thank you to everyone who came!

Kabrick: HCSA will host the Spring Carnival this Sunday from 3-5pm. There will be a lot of little kids there to experience the carnival. We do one program for them every semester, and if you're interested in making children smile, please come to me to be a volunteer.

Liu: Engineer's Club is having officer elections next Tuesday. If you're an engineering representative, please come and vote. It's open to all students who are engineering majors. I'm running for President btw. Tuesday from 7-9 REPF 200. That's the building with all the racecars and rockets in it.

### **Special Orders**

- Campus Climate Board of Advisors: Rehan Sefar

Sefar: I'm the CCBA Coordinator. The Campus Climate Board of Advisors is an independent board in SGA made up of representative from minority RSOs on campus. They provide evaluation and feedback about how SGA conducts initiatives and legislation. Our first meeting was last week, and what I'm going to talk about is very serious. I am not calling anyone out, but we talked about the perception of diversity on campus, specifically within student government. These members, being from many multicultural groups on campus, provide a very varying perspective. We came to the conclusion that a lot of SGA people are social justice advocates, which is great. But, there is a difference between being a verbal person and a person that takes action. What the board realized is that a lot of SGA people are saying things about activism, but have little backup knowledge about those issues. For example, how many of you know the number of DACA students at OU? A good amount of you. However, how many of you know the number of DACA students in Oklahoma or even nationally? Much less. It's the difference between being an advocate and being knowledgeable about those groups. We want you to know the history, the cultures, and the reasons behind these issues you're advocating for. A lot of you are very passionate advocates, which is amazing, but we also need you to be knowledgeable of what you're talking about. If you are talking about homophobia, you should know terms like gender non-conforming, transgender, and other basic terms, but a lot of people don't. These students express a lot of things, and I take the students expressing these concerns as law. We want their voices to be heard and taken seriously. This is basically the issue that they brought up was. I'm wanting this to be a reminder for you that if you're passionate about social justice, I need you all to be willing to educate yourselves on these things. Also, you don't have to be just on HD to talk about these issues. We don't only evaluate legislation in HD, we do so across all committees. We know what you're doing in your projects, and we talk about those things. I want to relay that you need to educate yourselves on these issues. If it means understanding more about the culture or the history, then that's what it means. A lot of you write legislation that affirms your support, but you need to know the knowledge and experience of those people. If you're still voting for these issues, you need to know these things. I do take whatever the advisors tell me very seriously.

Bonic: I definitely agree, but I'm wondering in what way did the people on this board receive the message that we don't know this information and really how many of them?

Sefar: there's resolutions passed in congress for supporting certain things. Based on legislation from that and personal stories/attitudes towards these pieces of legislation and issues, they've also told me. The board is there for relaying their personal experiences and attitudes to us. When it comes to issues that are human issues, I don't think quantifying them is necessary.

Blank: I know that there are sources that give you incorrect information. Any recommendations for how to get the best or most accurate information?

Sefar: on this board, these advisors give practical suggestions and advice on legislation and I can bring those to Kaylee or others. For this issue, I felt I needed to come directly to you. What we now

are going to do is compile a list of resources about hot issues. Right now, if you have questions about gaining knowledge on issues, I would come to myself, Julie your HD Chair, Destinee the Director of Inclusivity in Cabinet, or Vanessa Meraz. All 4 of us basically have the same job, so you can come to any of us. We'll get a list of resources out soon.

Coen: I completely understand what you're saying. Is there specific legislation that the board objects to?

Sefar: no. It's just a general attitude and perception of SGA.

Rojas: what exactly is that attitude?

Sefar: the idea of when someone is a vocal advocate about an issue vs. them knowing the knowledge about that issue. I know this is general, but I'm trying to figure out a way to voice this to you. An example for you would be, on social media people will change their profile pictures to support a certain issue. That person should be vocal, but should also be knowledgeable about the issue they're supporting.

Bhaktaram: so is a large part of the perception coming from the disconnect between the representatives and the body that we represent? Like that if we're not knowledgeable about this, we're not accurately representing all these people?

Sefar: yes

McClintic: would it be alright if we had a pamphlet of the actual issues you're discussing listed out?

Sefar: yes, that's what we're working on right now. I know that these issues will be talked about as we go on, and so they will come up again. We will need to reaffirm our support for these things in the future I'm sure.

Rains-Saucedo: we will also help you with this because it is not all their job. We need to be doing the same work

Sefar: one thing about the board is that they only provide advice and practical feedback to SGA, they won't do any of these things themselves. We created a board so that the minority and underrepresented voices have oversight over SGA. These are representatives from organizations that collectively decided that these were problems that they saw. Also, I don't reveal identities of the board members.

Rains-Saucedo: if there is something that you want to know more about, there are probably others wanting to know the same things. Come talk to us! This is not required of you, but if you're passionate about some issues, you should be educated on them and we are more than happy to help you with that.

OI Blank: regardless of your beliefs, isn't it important to the process of representing student body that we do this?

Rains-Saucedo: yes, in my opinion.

OI Rojas: how do we know if what we're learning is what is true?

Rains-Saucedo: I think everyone is facing that problem right now. Please just check a source that is reliable. If you have questions, go talk to experts on campus like professors about these things!

OI Rojas: will help be provided through SGA as far as getting in touch with these people, like the teachers?

Rains-Saucedo: yes, if we know someone, we can bring information to you all.

OI Rojas: could a form be created to help out with this? To learn more about these things that is.

Rains-Saucedo: if you wanted to, we could make a congress google form about what issues you want to know about. If it's something you're passionate about, I would just encourage you to do it on your own.

OI Mazeitis: is the Chair aware that I turned the lights off, and have been delighted

Rains-Saucedo: now aware and I am also delighted

### **Student Concerns**

Williams: recently there has been a lot of activity concerning the secrecy around the Presidential Selection Committee. There was supposed to be a list of candidates released at the beginning of March, and a lot of people are dissatisfied with the secrecy.

OI Bhaktaram: is the chair aware that the OU Board of Regents is meeting tomorrow in the Dunham college and it is public?

Rains-Saucedo: I am aware and will be attending.

Fees: I had a coworker talk to me about starting an RSO, but I realized that while I know about funding, I don't really know about that process. I was wondering if we could get more information about how to do that?

Rains-Saucedo: the SGA website has a section about student organizations and has a list of steps to take. If you want more info, we can connect you.

OI Bishop: is the Chair aware that President Shurbaji and I are revamping the webpage, and the new homepage will have a whole portion dedicated to how to start an RSO?

Rains-Saucedo: the Chair is now aware.

OI Chism: is the Chair aware that under files on orgsync there is information about following the rules of being an RSO, which is maybe more important?

Rains-Saucedo: I am now aware of that section.

Blank: I have a friend who is trying to live in Traditions East and is trying to live with a female and male, but that is not allowed. The communication was very poor in that information process.

Rains-Saucedo: I know that Representative Chen and HD are working on gender neutral housing on campus. Talk to Julie

Scimeca: a student talked to me about the crimson cruiser bikes and how when people ride them to the library rack, they leave them in entrances and it gets clogged.

OI Bonic: is the Chair aware that Rosa is working on that project and can talk to joey?

Rains-Saucedo: yes. I would also talk to Brynn Daves about that.

OI George: I would actually talk to Parking and Transit. I can also help you with that.

OI Sanroman: is the Chair aware that I will meet with Transit and Brynn next week about those issues?

Rains-Saucedo: now aware.

## **Old Business**

### **Items to Be Considered**

990112 - The Interview Specification Act of 2018 (Mazeitis) (ConAd – rec of do pass)

#### **Representative Behara seconded by Representative Scimeca**

Mazeitis: I've been on ConAd since forever and have gone through roughly 5 interview panels. It's arguably ConAd's most important job, but there are not a lot of rules about how we do what we do in that process. While I think that a degree of autonomy is good, we still need stipulations to help reduce bias during the interview process. The first section of this bill says that we should create an evaluation rubric in the session before we do interviews. Tom, Mackenzie, and myself would begin that process now for the upcoming interviews in Fall 2018. This just gives us a standard to score candidates on, which we already pretty much do. Also, the ConAd chair needs to create some sort of bias training for all interviewers to go through. Because we don't have an in-house one, I didn't want to restrict too much. It is ultimately up to the ConAd chair to choose and carry out this training. Also, the final deliberations on the appointment bill can only be completed by those people that have sat in on all the interviews. So many times people only see some applicants as they leave throughout the day, but you can't adjudicate applicants you haven't seen. The last part of this bill gives the ConAd chair the power to decide bias training and the expectation to hold a bias training in the future.

McClintic: what sort of ideas do you have for a rubric?

Mazeitis: we'll be making one soon. However, maybe some things like experience and leadership in general, fit with congress, but it is really up to ConAd exec.

*Rains-Saucedo: seeing as Congress Exec is involved with setting expectations for the kind of applicants we are looking for, would you accept a friendly amendment in Section 4 to add Congress Exec to the approval process of that rubric?*

*Mazeitis: no, because the exec committee has never had a role in deciding the applicants we take on. I would like to hear a rationale about that.*

OC Rains-Saucedo: by Exec, I mean the top 3 – Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.

Mazeitis: I understand, but still no.

OI McClintic: every semester when we vote in new representatives and associates, everyone sort of does have a say. Correct?

Rains-Saucedo: yes, in the sense that you can vote yes or no on committees and appointed individuals. But those that win their seats you don't vote on.

Scimeca: if this rubric hasn't existed, how have candidates been judged in the past?

Mazeitis: ConAd will create an informal rubric the day of that values things like leadership and service, but at the end of the day that kind of gets thrown out the window. There hasn't really been a rubric for everyone, everyone kind of just decides what to do and then compares some subjective things at the end of the day.

Scimeca: do you have a specific vision of what you think selection bias training should do?

Mazeitis: CAC does them, Kathy Fahl does it with the GEC, and I envision it modeling those. It's essentially just making sure that if you know someone or other things, you need to recognize the biases you may have.

Blank: I understand the need to be objective, but the way that people vote and things isn't necessarily. How will this not eliminate applicants that haven't had as much experience compared to people who already were in the organization?

Mazeitis: I thought about this because one of the strengths of congress is the variety of people we have. All applicants will just be adjudicated based on that rubric, but not all applicants need to be decided on based on that criteria. It's a guide for the committee.

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

Bhaktaram: is the rubric an outline rather than a structured template?

Mazeitis: I see it being like we give certain points for certain qualities in the applicants. And then we'll use that to kind of guide our decision based on that and other opinions from the interviews. There will be discussion, so it's just a guide for the committee.

Hedgcorth: has there been any research on what exactly the purpose and success of bias training is?

Mazeitis: face-to-face bias is a researched phenomenon. There has been no specific ConAd research, but I can assure you that that face-to-face bias is real. Also, seeing so many of these interviews, that bias seeps into the process. I'd like to eliminate/reduce it as best as we can.

*Rains-Saucedo: seeing as the Congress Secretary and Vice Chair both sit on ConAd and Chair helps with the creation of the application, would you accept a friendly to add the 3 of us to the rubric approval?*

*Mazeitis: yes*

Duechting: if you interview somebody, you'll be looking at their application and interview. But say it is someone you have seen in action, like you have gone to one of their organizations and seen them doing their job. If you've seen them in their involvement, will you cut that out of your decision process or take it into consideration?

Mazeitis: I think that that's really up to the person doing the interviewing. To what extent do we let our outside knowledge of a candidate impact the decision? Even though we're including a rubric, there is no solidified process for our final decisions. There isn't a perfect solution in this bill to that question.

Bonic: when I interviewed, I remember that the rooms were split, so different interviewers saw different people. If everyone has to attend all day to make final decisions, how many people will interview applicants?

Mazeitis: if that happens again, we hope all kinds of one applicant will be together in certain rooms. That doesn't perfectly solve the problem, but this is a far better standard. It's really up to the ConAd chair to ensure that the spirit of this bill is implemented.

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

Coen: it seems to me that the rubric would be the best for grading the application. I don't see it carrying over to the interview process. Could you explain?

Mazeitis: the interview part of the rubric can be social, a comparative scale. This rubric is not destiny, the decisions we reach are not entirely based on these scores an applicant receives, they are a guide for us. We just need to have a reason for giving a position to one person over another.

Bishop: considering the bill as amended, don't the Bylaws stipulate that ConAd solely does appointments and applications? How strongly do you feel about having congress exec be a part of that process?

Mazeitis: I would actually be open to a friendly amendment striking that part and debating later on it.

OI Cassidy: did your final friendly include the top 3 exec members?

Rains-Saucedo: yes

McClintic: all of congress actually got to vote on the WAM change like this. Why would it be a bad idea to have at least the 3 exec get to see the rubric?

Mazeitis: that WAM bill was not about the standards of how we allocate money, so I don't see why congress should decide ConAd's standard if it is their job.

Bhaktaram: regarding the part of the rubric about fit to congress, if you want to be objective, how do we measure that?

Mazeitis: it's again the concept of destiny as opposed to no destiny. With selection bias, I'm hoping we will be open to diverse applicants. My point here is that if someone is really nervous or not outgoing, can we trust them to sit in a body and make a point if they have a point? If you're not active like that, maybe this isn't the best place for you. This bill isn't about how the rubric should look, it's about should we have a rubric?

Blank: what measures will you use to help evaluate in a way that a resume cannot? Also, what gives the ConAd committee the exclusive power to decide what qualifies someone to be in Congress?

Mazeitis: first, the applications process involves the reading of experience, so we can measure it in that way. I don't believe we require them to submit a resume, so we need to get information somehow.

OC Blank: if you're going to get that leadership information, what does a rubric add to your ability to analyze that info?

Mazeitis: it adds a standard by which we can all agree. There are traits we want to see in people and we need a way to standardize those. On the second question you asked, we don't approve every WAM stipulation, we approve their allocations. The reason we have committees is to locate certain tasks in certain place. We don't expect the reasons for making those decisions to always be brought before congress. The rubric is available for people to see, but if you don't like our decisions, vote no on the bills.

Holt: you kind of touched on this, but I'm still a little confused about the enforcement that backs it up? If there were to be bias, what's the enforcement that this adds?

Mazeitis: it's really the line about all applicants will be adjudicated on these requirements. It forces the committee to have a score on every applicant. There isn't a choice on these requirements despite the time of day or who the applicant is. The rubric would be an objective standard for experience and a reason for our scores.

Holt: regarding the part about people only being able to make the final decisions if they've been there all day. How can you ensure that every committee member can be there, especially if they're an applicant?

Mazeitis: we've had people, but we just might not have the full committee, and that's fine. It's really just like 2-3 people who come and go. It's far better to have an objective panel at the end of the day than to have a ton of interviewers.

*Hedgorth: would you accept a friendly amendment striking the earlier friendly?*

*Mazeitis: yes. Not because I disagree, I just want to hear everyone's arguments for it*

OI Hedgorth: it is highly probable that we have more than one issue to discuss in debate. How do we have both debates?

Rains-Saucedo: when you go into debate, you can debate any issue about the bill that you would like

## **Debate – Representative Fees**

**Motion to recess for the purpose of forming Debate lists**

**Secretary Cordova seconded by Representative Scimeca**

## **Proponency**

Representative Behara

Representative Chism

Representative Cassidy

## **Opponency**

Representative Blank

Representative Hedgcorth

Representative Kalvacherla

Chair Rains-Saucedo

## **Motion to move a hostile amendment**

### **Representative Cassidy seconded by Representative Bishop**

Cassidy: this bill as a whole is doing things that codify ConAd's current procedures. What happened earlier was that there was confusion about those 3 Exec members having veto power over the rubric, which is not what we wanted. This amendment puts those 3 members at the front of the process where they will draft the rubric with ConAd Exec, and then ConAd alone can approve the rubric or not. The 3 exec members have no veto power; it is ConAd that has approval or disapproval power. Also, this has approval of the bill author, the 3 elected exec, and ConAd exec.

Bishop: they necessarily would have a veto power as the bill would have stood with the original amendment, or the ConAd committee would have to come back and compromise. They now have input on the front end and ConAd has the power to approve the rubric or not.

Scimeca: why not just codify a rubric itself?

Cassidy: I sat in on interviews, but after every round, we talked about the process and what we could change. Our informal rubric has changed every time. When I first came in, we said we wanted to seek leaders, but then it changed to extroverted leaders, then it became a broader definition of leadership. We amend our rubric all the time with the input of the committee. We need the ability to always be able to re-evaluate our process and approving it as we go on to be inclusive.

Bishop: that happened last semester a lot. This semester, we talked about how the shy people may be nervous in interviews, and that might not mean that they are unfit for congress. We want to be continually evolving this process so that the body is represented accurately. To codify a specific rubric and then have to amend it anytime someone wants to change an aspect of it would be unnecessary

Ball: is this amendment allowing the 3 exec members to help make requirements?

Cassidy: to help draft the rubric. The ConAd exec and 3 exec members will come together to create a draft proposal, but it does not give the elected members the right to sit in on interviews. That will still remain ConAd's job.

Hoefke: if the 3 elected positions submit a recommendation proposal and ConAd doesn't approve it, is it sent back to them?

Cassidy: as it currently worded, it wouldn't get sent back, the decision would lay with ConAd.

Bishop: those 3 exec members are in addition to the ConAd leaders, so while there could be a member of the ConAd that had a problem, the ConAd perspective has been represented.

Rains-Saucedo: is the author aware that this is an accurate reflection of the current process that happens?

Cassidy: yes, we've been doing this informally. Our hope is to formalize this process and make it more official

Rains-Saucedo: are you also aware that this was the original intent of the original friendly to the bill?

Cassidy: aware and able to talk about it more now.

Holt: since this is what's been done, but this is still informal per say, what is codifying this doing?

Bishop: in the bylaws it says that ConAd has the duty to do appointments, write the applications, and do interviews. On the back end, if they wanted to change it, this doesn't stop them. But, this lets the leaders create a rubric that most ConAd members will not have an objection to.

Cassidy: as we're formalizing our interview process, we want to make sure those that have been consulted in the past aren't not consulted anymore.



**Motion to move to a roll call vote on the amendment**  
**Representative Hedgorth seconded by Representative Behara**  
**32-0-0 hostile amendment passes**

**Motion to move a hostile amendment**  
**Representative Hedgorth seconded by Representative Blank**

Blank: I think that this bill lays out important things, but the part that I struggle with is that we talk about it as informal and that changes each session. If we pass this legislation and the rubric doesn't come back to congress, I feel like it will be informally done by ConAd anyway. We shouldn't be approving something that we as a body will not see each session. If we're going to vote that this rubric is a part of the process, we should be able to see it each session.

Hedgorth: ConAd will now have a more limited view of what they're doing. Now they're expected to be formal, but that is restricted in certain ways still. I feel that this bill is trying to do something larger. The alternative is to ask should we restrict ConAd to do something other than just trusting them? This is not restrictive enough to be purposeful, but too restrictive to have much of a value anyway.

Lobaugh: the purpose of ConAd is to deal with the interworking's of congress, to which we give the duty of the selection of new members. Opening it up to the whole body would be too extensive. Why do you think we should delegate this to the body rather than trust ConAd?

OI Coen: the current hostile amendment does not provide for anything relating to congress approving this correct?

Vice Chair: I can only say that this strikes section 4 since that is how the amendment is written.

Blank: we're not suggesting to open the entire process up to congress, but in the process of creating this rubric, to formalize it from this perspective feels unnecessary. If they use an informal rubric already and no one else is familiar with the interview process, it should be left to ConAd.

Bishop: are you aware that this section is literally just codifying something we already do and a due date to make sure that it is done beforehand? It's just a standard to have something ahead of time.

Hedgorth: yes. If we were just restraining ourselves, but we're suggesting informally restraining ourselves. We mentioned that in past times, rubrics have not been formal, they get into a flow. We were saying why are we blowing up something that works rather than making it a strict formality?

Bishop: why is your amendment striking it then and going back to the completely informal process when we just want to formalize a due date?

Hedgorth: I would actually be open to accepting a friendly amendment including the due date and nothing else.

Blank: that was not how I interpreted this section. If it's simply a due date, that's not what I thought

Hedgorth: if there is something you want to put to at a certain date, I don't see the reason for not throwing you a bone.

Mazeitis: are you aware that the creation of a due date necessitates a rubric creation?

Hedgorth: yes

Mazeitis: as the longest sitting member of Congress and the ConAd committee, are you aware that I think that this guideline would be excellent?

Hedgorth: aware

Coen: regarding the two conversations you're having here. Are you aware that your hostile strikes section 4, not adding any clause that would allow for congress to review a rubric? But also that this section was about a date? So, essentially you're having two different conversations.

**Motion to extend time for questions to end of the list**  
**Representative Holt seconded by Representative Behara**

Blank: what I was saying was that I did not understand this was just a deadline. If we just strike it, congress doesn't approve the rubric, but also that we don't need to formalize the process.

Fees: are you of the opinion that it is good practice to codify something good that has been working?

Blank: I think it makes sense. But then in that case, this section is not formalizing it, it just formalizes the fact that the rubric should be created. If we wanted to formalize the creation, we need to formalize the content.

Cassidy: are you aware that the bylaws say that the ConAd committee has to create an applications, but the body does not vote on that?

Blank: now aware

Chism: are you of the opinion that every other committee of congress has the autonomy that not everything they do has to be checked by the body?

Blank: yes

Coen: if you are aware of that questions, why does it not apply to ConAd?

Blank: I believe that everyone is capable of doing that job. I'm struggling with how one committee is qualified to decide what qualifies someone to be in congress. The point of being a representative is to represent a large group of people. The rubric seems like a way to score applicants. I just don't think that it goes along with representing the entire body if one committee is deciding on an objective score that qualifies someone to be in congress.

### **Motion to table this hostile amendment indefinitely**

#### **Representative Ball seconded by Representative Chism**

OI Rains-Saucedo: Parliamentarian, can we do this?

Cassidy: we could also just vote down the amendment?

#### **Objection – Representative Scimeca**

#### **Hostile amendment is tabled indefinitely by a majority hand vote**

### **Motion to rise from Debate**

#### **Representative Bishop seconded by Representative Hedgorth**

Mazeitis: you can adopt this bill to give ConAd more structure, or reject and let everyone on the committee make up our own rules. We allocate \$800,000 a year without approving the stipulations WAM uses, we can trust ConAd in the same way. You can reject the bill when it comes to the floor. If you don't like the rubric, reject it.

### **Passed by a roll call vote of 28-3-1**

990507 - Primary Funding Application Due Date Change Act (Chism) (ConAd – rec of do pass)

#### **Representative Behara seconded by Representative Khan**

Chism: this bill is chill. The Code says that Primary is due the Thursday of the 6<sup>th</sup> week of the spring semester. I think it should be due on Friday.

Kabruck: do we have any idea why it is Thursday?

Chism: I wasn't a student when the Code was created

### **Consent – Representative Hedgorth**

### **Passed by unanimous consent**

990508 – Auxiliary Funding 18 Act of 2017-2018 (Chism) (WAM – rec of do pass)

#### **Representative Mazeitis seconded by Representative Hammond**

Chism: This is Auxiliary Funding 18. First, Public Relations Student Society of America was funded \$500 for food and beverages for meetings. Crimson Choreography was funded \$40 for fliers. American Constitutional Society was funded \$1400 for lunch and learns. Omani Students Association was funded \$350 for Omani Night. Organization for the Advancement of Women in Law was funded \$850 for a panel speech and breakfast with attorneys. Alpha Kappa Delta Phi was funded \$760 for Invasion. Another applications for

Alpha Kappa Delta Phi was funded \$750 for conference registration. Latinx Association of Science and Health was funded \$679.75 for general meetings and panel events. Iranian Student Association was funded \$4000 for Iranian Student Cultural Night. Need friendly to change the bill number to 990509.

*McClintic: would you accept a friendly changing the bill number 990509?*

*Chism: yes*

Bishop: what is Crimson Choreography?

Chism: they are a dance club that has lots of fun doing dances that involve choreography. I will tell you other things like: they are an RSO, they are full of students who attend OU, they also want to create an informal dance group. And the description they gave me was: I would like to create a club for non-dance majors to practice and perform pieces for the university. As of right now students can take dance classes, but have no way of actually performing for the university. I would like to create a fun club that promotes equality, fitness, performance, and fun! Join if you love to dance! No prior experience is required! Choreographers will be the leaders of the group and we will change choreographers just about every semester. I want to give everyone the chance to perform both on stage and in flash mobs! Please let this happen and enjoy the result!!

Hedgorth: was anyone rejected?

Chism: no. We did have a group that was tabled, but we have questions to ask them

Hedgorth: how much is left in the aux budget after this?

Chism: Curt gave me the sticky note, but I don't know where I put it. I will get back to you.

Scimeca: is there a way in the future to just put how much is left on the bill?

Chism: no, because we can't legislate how much is left in the budget.

### **Motion to move to a roll call vote**

**Representative Behara seconded by Representative Khan**

**Passed by a roll call vote of 32-0-0**

990613 – An Act Amending Committee Membership for Session 99 (Rains-Saucedo/Lalani/Cordova)  
(ConAd – rec of do pass)

**Representative Behara seconded by Representative Williams**

Rains-Saucedo: we just had our first rolling application appointment last week by ConAd. Alan Lee could not be here, but he is going to the sustainability committee. Also, a few members from HD couldn't make their meetings, but actually they now want to stay. Taylor Kelling still wants to stay on WAM, though. I will need a friendly amendment moving Hailey Thomas from University Policy to Human Diversity, and Taylor Crossley to Problems and Projects.

*Fees: would you accept those friendlies?*

*Rains-Saucedo: yes*

*Chism: for a scrivener's error, Karla is listed twice under University Policy*

*Secretary: thanks, got it.*

**Consent – Representative Hedgorth**

**Passed by unanimous consent**

### **New Business**

#### **Follow-Up Reports**

#### **Items for Future Agenda**

990510 - Auxiliary Funding 19 (Chism) → WAM

990906 - A Resolution Supporting the Teachers Strike (Williams) → EA

990907 – A Resolution Calling on the OU State Regents to Publicize List of Presidential Candidates  
(Mazeitis) → EA

990113 – An Act Amending Stipends and Salaries (Chism) → ConAd and WAM

## **Announcements and Comments**

Rains-Saucedo: based on a few things I noticed sitting in the body, I want to remind everyone to be respectful at all times. This is not a large room; we can hear what you're saying. There is a line you need to draw to respect other people. You don't know what somebody is going through that day or always their intentions, so keep that in mind. Great job on the ParliPro Conundrum stuff today, though!

OI Fees: in the purist of alliteration, could it be the ParliPro Pickle?

Mazeitis: First, there is an event hosted by the Honors College and Kathleen Tipler called "When Fundamental Values Conflict: The Supreme Court, Constitutional Enrichment, and Masterpiece Cakeshop."

That will be March 8<sup>th</sup> from 6-7pm in room 180 in the Honors College. Also, if any of you have LGBTQ+ specific questions, please come chat with me. You don't need to compensate me. Lastly, if you want to be a part of my resolution, the Regents have the list and are meeting, I think it's important to get it released

Cordova: reminder if you're an associate to snap a quick picture for your attendance form!

Lobaugh: the student film fest is this Thursday from 6-8. Food and raffle! The films are so cool!

Fees: the steps in the union courtyard are very slippery when wet, and I fell. But because I fell, we are now working with Facilities Management, and they are getting tread on those!

Kabrick: hit me up if you want to make children smile

Bishop: I went through and updated the Representatives page on the website with what I had. If you haven't filled out your member biography, please go fill it out! EVEN IF YOU DID IT LAST SEMESTER, just fill it out because there is a section about initiatives for congress and I bet those might have changed for you.

Rains-Saucedo: if you're interested in being in the public service announcement about mental health, come talk to me after the meeting to nail down details. OSU is coming this Friday or the Friday after spring break to do filming for that. There will only be 4 in the first PSA, but all stories will be shared eventually.

## **Motion to skip final roll call and adjourn**

**Representative Chism seconded by Representative Khan**

## **Final Roll Call**

Chair: Kaylee Rains-Saucedo

Vice-Chair: Sanah Lalani

Secretary: Mackenzie Cordova

<b>Session 99</b>	<b>General 2/27</b>
Ball, Carson	x
Behera, Pranoy	x
Bhaktaram, Ananya	x
Bishop, Kimberley	x
Blank, Faith	x
Bonic, Karla	x
Bray, Matthew	x
Bridwell, Trey	x
Cassidy, Thomas	x
Chen, Julianna	x
Chism, Hennessey	x
Coen, Noah	x
Cordova, Mackenzie	x
DeAngeli, Emma	ex
Duechting, Donald	x
Fees, Elaina	x
Hammond, Rabina	x
Hedgorth, Joseph	x
Hoefke, Madeleine	x
Holt, Richard	x
Kalvacherla, Vinay	x
Keefer, Braden	abs
Khan, Adam	x
Lee, Alan	ex
Liu, Shihui	x
Lobaugh, Rachel	x
Mazeitis, Jake	x
McClintic, Alexander	x
Manohar, Kanjan	abs
Rojas, Julio	x

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

<b>Session 99</b>	<b>990112</b>	<b>990507</b>	<b>990509</b>	<b>990613</b>	<b>hostile on 990112</b>
Ball, Carson	y		y		y
Behara, Pranoy	y		y		y
Bhaktaram, Ananya	y		y		y
Bishop, Kimberley	y		y		y
Blank, Faith	y		y		y
Bonic, Karla	y		y		y
Bray, Matthew	y		y		y
Bridwell, Trey	y		y		y
Cassidy, Thomas	y		y		y
Chen, Julianna	y		y		y
Chism, Hennessey	y		y		y
Coen, Noah	y		y		y
Cordova, Mackenzie	y		y		y
DeAngeli, Emma					
Duechting, Donald	y		y		y
Fees, Elaina	y		y		y
Hammond, Rabina	y		y		y
Hedgcorth, Joseph	n		y		y
Hoefke, Madeleine	y		y		y
Holt, Richard	n		y		y
Kalvacherla, Vinay	a		y		y
Keefer, Braden					
Khan, Adam	y		y		y
Lee, Alan					
Liu, Shihui	y		y		y
Lobaugh, Rachel	y		y		y
Mazeitis, Jake	y		y		y
McClintic, Alexander	y		y		y
Monohar, Kanjan					
Rojas, Julio					y

Sanroman, Rosa	y		y		y
Scimeca, Joey	n		y		y
Thomas, Hailey	y		y		y
Thompson, Gabi	y		y		
Waddell, Turner					
Walton, Jonathan	y		y		y
Williams, Dan	y		y		y
Wilson, Taylor	y		y		y
<b>Yes</b>	28	0	32	0	32
<b>No</b>	3	0	0	0	0
<b>Abstain</b>	1	0	0	0	0