3rd ASOSU House of Representatives  
Seventeenth Meeting  
Wednesday, April 25th, 2012  
MU 211

I. Call to Order/Roll-Call/Quorum  
Quorum was met and the meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

II. Swearing in of Representatives  
Speaker Hatlen: It’s good to see all your faces again.
Representative Setzler: I move to put HR-03.11 to special orders.
Representative Alvarez: Second
Representative Davis and Representative Stuart arrived at 7:04 p.m.
Representative Setzler: Seeing as the election is starting tonight it would be ineffective to pass it next week.
Representative Alvarez: That sounds good.
A hand vote to move HR-03.11 to special orders was taken. The motion passed 9-0-1
Speaker Hatlen: That’ll be after delegate reports.

III. Singing of the OSU Alma Mater  
Everyone present sang the Alma Mater.
Speaker Hatlen: Well done I saw a few that didn’t need to words well done.

IV. Approval of Minutes from Wednesday April 11, 2012  
Representative Setzler: I move to approve the minutes from April 11th.
Representative Robb: Second
Representative Setzler: You said from the last meeting you mean last week?
Speaker Hatlen: The last week we had quorum.
Representative Bhatt arrived at 7:08 p.m.
A voice vote to approve the minutes. The motion passed.

V. Standing Committee Reports  
Representative Struthers: Ways and means met last week after the not so house meeting. We discussed with the executive, the assistant Nick Martinez and the executive director Conrad. We moved funding out of our index MGV 315 that’s the current administration and logistics account. Chris Van Drimmelen is getting paid from Larry Roper’s office this year and we’re going to back pay this $26,000.
Representative Alvarez: Do we know in the past?
Representative Struthers: Not on the top of my head I can ask Conrad.
Speaker Hatlen: I don’t know if appropriations and budgets is meeting?
Representative Robb: No, we are not.

VI. Joint Committee Reports

Joint Committee of Congressional Correspondence

Representative Robb: Yesterday senate met and heard SR-71.01 the accessibility resource center. This was moved to the student academic and activities committee. The second bill was SB-71.05 the outreach committee. This is a changes the request of what student outreach within the senate would do it would place them in charge of the student town halls which was passed that bill a little bit ago. And that one was just in first reading.

VII. Delegate Reports

Jeffery Evans: Extend an invite to anyone to go on the accessibility tour. I went well probably not this Friday but next Friday I’d like to schedule no more than 5 at a time some of you in the wheel chairs get crazy.
Speaker Hatlen: It’s a very enlightening tour. If you want to see the campus from a different perspective I encourage you to take the tour.
Representative Tran: so may is going to be Asian and cpacxifici heritage mounth. Look out for many diff events the first is ion may 1 in the quad it’s the kick off. Everything is free.

VIII. Special Order

HR-03.11 “Reinstate Brett Deedon”

Clerk Wolff:

WHEREAS Senator Brett Deedon is running for the Speaker of the House for the 2012-2013 school year.
WHEREAS Sen. Deedon and Senator Jacob Vandever had a very competitive showing in the primaries, with the difference being fewer than 20 votes.
WHEREAS Because Sen. Deedon missed most of the mandatory candidate orientation meeting on April 14th, due to an OSU club baseball tournament, the Elections Committee disqualified him from the general election.
WHEREAS According to the Election Committee guidelines, which are located inside the ASOSU Statutes, Title XI, Section 26, Part G states, “The Election Committee may disqualify a candidate for any Major Offense, gross violations of the University policies, or actions that cause great harm to the student body.” Therefore Sen. Deedon must have been charged with a Major Offense on the grounds of not attending the candidate orientation meeting on April 14th.
WHEREAS Furthermore, Title XI, Section 26 Part E states, “Candidates accused of committing a major offense will receive a hearing by the Elections Committee. Candidates will receive a 48 hour notice of their hearing time.”
WHEREAS Sen. Deedon never got any sort of formal notification from the Committee about a hearing, or the formal charge of a Major Offense violation. Nor did the Committee ever have a hearing.

WHEREAS The Election Committee blatantly disregarded their own guidelines in this matter.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT:
The House of Representatives believes that the Elections Committee failed to follow their own guidelines in this matter, and violated the ASOSU statutes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT:
The House of Representatives believes that the Election Committee should reinstate Sen. Deedon as a qualified candidate and place his name back on the ballot in time for the general election.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT:
If the above resolution fails to occur, than the House of Representatives might take further action as they see fit against the Elections Committee.

Speaker Hatlen: As we don’t have second readings we’ll go into discussion.
Representative Alvarez: First I’d like to move to amend it. I’d like to strike the third further resolved and in this third whereas I’d say the elections committee removed him from the ballot for the general election not disqualified.
Representative Robb: Second
Representative Alvarez: I realized the third resolved was a little inappropriate after having a talk to Van Drimmelen behind me and its officially removed from the ballot not a disqualification.
Representative Bhatt: I want to say I’m part of the club baseball team it said Brett didn’t know about the mandatory meeting and if he had I’m sure he would be here.
Speaker Hatlen: Try to keep discussion germane to the amendment.
Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Will this amendment make the fourth whereas no longer applicable?
Representative Alvarez: No. It’s still applicable.
A voice vote on the amendment to change the third whereas and strike the last be it further resolved was taken. The motion passed.
Representative Alvarez: Basically Senator Deedon got removed from the ballot from failing to attend a mandatory orientation which was the grounds for the fine but the process in which it happened was not correct there was no hearing for Brett on the matter. Brett was not notified that he was being charge by the committee, there was no email from the committee saying
this might happen to you because of what you did the only formal email he received about the matter was on Thursday when the committee emailed him and said he had been removed from the ballot. In the statutes there’s only two forms of offense minor and major. A major offense requires a hearing and that never occurred and in my opinion they disregarded their own guidelines. Which are in that statutes. That’s why I decided to write the bill basically state our opinion.

**Representative Robb:** I was wondering if vice president Sokho Eath if he would like to come up as he was chair of the elections committee to speak on this to get the perspective from the committee.

**Vice President Eath:** Hello everyone again. The committee following the mandatory meeting decided that he would be removed from the ballot that doesn’t mean he’s disqualified he can run as a write in campaign. To appear on the ballot you have to follow the committee rules and to appear on the ballot by following those rules. They’re stated in the different meetings we had you had to attend the meeting which was stated you all went there and follow the guidelines for the election rules. Granted Brett didn’t attend the committee ruled he would not be on the ballot.

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** The votes were on Thursday April 19 and the candidate was noted shortly after due to the fact that he notified the committee before the candidate orientation that he wouldn’t be at the orientation.

**Representative Setzler:** So I think the issue is whether statues say they have to have hearing to be on the ballot vs disqualified. It looks like it says they need a hearing to be disqualified which he wasn’t. He wasn’t disqualified if he’s a write in.

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** The elections guidelines for any major offense the candidate must be given a hearing and any further offense the candidate can be disqualified. So the accusation of a major offense is what requires a hearing for the candidate not disqualification. There are 10 or 12 major offenses listed in the guidelines. The specific one here would be failure to comply with the elections committee. The candidate was reminded him he needed to be at the candidate orientation he told the committee because of the baseball game and the election committee mandatory means mandatory. The election committee made a ruling. It was major offense and a major offense necessitates a hearing he was removed from the ballot not disqualified. It was stated that he can stay as a write in.

**Speaker Hatlen:** So is the missing the mandatory candidate orientation was that considered a major violation?

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** Indirectly, yes. The major violation would be to fail to comply with the election committee. And failing to comply with the guidelines of the election committee. Yes and no is the answer.

**Representative Alvarez:** That’s what the issue is I don’t have an issue from the removal form ballot it as a major offense there was no hearing, no notification given for Brett.
Chris Van Drimmelen: There was notification just no hearing.

Representative Alvarez: There was no notification of the major charge.

Chris Van Drimmelen: He was notified of the decision of the committee.

Representative Alvarez: That’s my issue and that’s why I made the resolution. It’s not if he should the decision of the removal. There was not enough communication with Brett. He could have gone to the hearing if he knew about it. He could have told the committee in the first place and there was no hearing.

Representative Rosoff: Was not having a hearing a violation of the statues and constitution?


Representative Setzler: Basically Brett is irrelevant to the problem here. It’s that the election committee did not follow the statutes. You’re sitting here as a representative of the elections committee right now, you removed him from the ballot because you qualified it as a major offense and the statutes say you have to have a hearing. So the committee didn’t act according to the statutes.

Representative Vanderwall: I was curious what was the date? It was on the 14? What occurred during the meeting?

Chris Van Drimmelen: It was a 7 hour long orientation. Putting together something like that is a very lengthy thing it was immediately necessary information for the candidates if they were to be elected. How to hire people ethically and in the bounds of OSU. President, vice president, and speaker of the house could be president of ASOSU at any time. Although it may not seem important, they could find themselves very quickly in charge of 60 employees. Things like most of it was hiring some supervision once you hire people you have to supervise them. We try to cram a lot of information in but we did get to the most important pieces. It would be hard to replicate again for one person.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Can the election committee remove someone as a minor offense?

Chris Van Drimmelen: There’s no revisions for a minor offense. If it’s a minor offense, once you commit 5 minor offenses it becomes a major offense. The tickets get minor violations and once they’ve passed a certain point it becomes major. There are certain things outlined that are major offense straight off the bat. Anything off the violation we have the minor offense of not being at the orientation and the major offense to not comply with the elections committee ruling. Technically it’s both.

Representative Vanderwall: Does a candidate have to commit a minor or major offense to be removed from the ballot or can the elections committee remove someone from the ballot without an offense?

Chris Van Drimmelen: They would have to commit some sort of offense. So a candidate wouldn’t be removed just for a minor offense or no reason at all that’s not provided for in the
The guidelines don’t give the committee free reign to remove someone for no reason.

**Representative Robb:** What was the vote for the removal from ballot?

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** I believe 5 for removal 1 against and 3 abstain.

**Representative Stuart:** Would it be inappropriate to question Senator Deedon for more knowledge of this. Maybe he had more experience to grasp the information?

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** The elections committee determined that was not relevant in this. The fact that this information is not necessarily something that Senator Deedon would have as senate pro-tempore this is training to those who advance to the general election given they are running for president, vice president, and speaker of the house. Given he hasn’t run for those before he wouldn’t have a lot of the information that was presented anyways.

**Representative Struthers:** Not necessarily to this resolution. If we pass this what would be the process? Since the election is 3 hours away if they follow the resolution can they put him on the ballot?

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** Here’s the thing the elections committee would technically put Senator Deedon on the ballot before 10 tonight. What neither Sokho nor I can speak to is whether or not the members would be able to get together to vote on this. I don’t know what your opinion of this is but I don’t think that’s likely. You’re all students here. The other alternative would be an email vote and neither of us would get a sufficient number of the members would vote on this tonight. I’m not going to rule it outside of the realm of possibilities but those are the two options. In order to fix this this would require one of those two things.

**Representative Struthers:** We happened to have the election rule and guidelines you wouldn’t be able to fall under section 13 you wouldn’t be able to choose a new date?

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** I believe that is the failure of the electronic version. I don’t know if that would apply but you might be able to stretch it. That would be up to Sokho.

**Representative Struthers:** It says nothing about the committee being able to meet.

**Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy):** Is there a reason this bill is coming up the night of the election?

**Representative Alvarez:** I became fully aware of the situation within the last two days that’s why I took these steps.

**Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy):** It seems conceivable for Senator Deedon to put this off.

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** I want to state that it’s possible for Senator Deedon to appeal the decision. He sent a letter to the committee, the committee made a decision. There’s an appeal process in the election there was no appeal from Senator Deedon this is the first that the committee is getting desire for process.

**Representative Alvarez:** That’s irrelevant because the fact that there was no hearing in the first place that’s really the issue of the whole thing.
Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): I agree that’s the issue but that doesn’t justify that he should be put back on the ballot.

Representative Alvarez: I don’t see how that makes sense because it’s clearly a blatant violation of the statutes and how they’re supposed to operate I would like to move to amend to strike it from having Colton Swearingen as a co-sponsor.

Speaker Hatlen: Is that something we need to strike?

Chris Van Drimmelen: Representative Alvarez could ask for an amendment for unanimous consent and if there isn’t any dissent it’s ok.

Representative Alvarez: I’d like to ask the body for unanimous consent to remove Colton Swearingen as a co-sponsor.

Representative Setzler: Can I yield to Senator Deedon about the questions about why he did not appeal the decision?

Senator Deedon: I will bring it up that I received the email being removed last Thursday. None of those were really brought up. As far as what I understood was send in an email to the election committee, any other process I was not aware of that to see what I could do I showed up to the meeting. Then having to leave for the game I showed up late anyway to get to the meeting it was this last week Brad was nice enough to put this in here but it seemed self-absorbed to write a bill like this for myself.

Representative Setzler: Did anything like this go through senate?

Senator Deedon: No, nothing of this nature.

Representative Robb: I was wondering with the talk about reinstating Deedon to the ballot has Deedon received a candidate orientation or information relevant in that orientation?

Chris Van Drimmelen: I will confirm what Senator Deedon said he showed up before the orientation started to collect the flyers but he wasn’t present for the orientation part of the day. No he has not received that. The appeals process is detailed in section 26 of the elections guidelines part F. So even with the notification date of last Thursday we’re outside of the appeal window.

Senator Deedon: My thinking on that was the appeal was to be within two working days of the meeting. And so I submitted that to the committee thinking that was the appeal for whatever the violation I received.

Chris Van Drimmelen: Then you misunderstood what the committee told you. They said there wouldn’t be a problem if you showed up to the orientation.

Representative Struthers: I’m going to ask Chris if he could put his advisor hat back on. This committee can they act on this however they want?

Representative Vanderwall: Seeing as this resolution is mainly about how he was not received a hearing if he was back on the ballot could he still be removed post-election if he received a hearing after.
Chris Van Drimmelen: There are guidelines as to when a hearing is to occur. The long and short of it is we’re outside the time window for which a hearing could occur. The committee could decide to have a hearing but that would violate our own processes. So yeah. Theoretically if a hearing were to occur you can’t remove someone after a ballot has been put out there I guess the choice would be to disqualify the candidate for taking that office if there’s a hearing after the fact. Those are your only options.

Representative Setzler: As the appeal process goes how could he file an appeal when there was never a formal charge given? It says in the whereases that he wasn’t issued a formal hearing.

Chris Van Drimmelen: He was notified that he was being removed from the ballot and the 48 hour clock started.

Representative Setzler: Wouldn’t that be the decision of the committee?

Chris Van Drimmelen: An appeal is to a decision not a charge.

Representative Setzler: But how could you appeal when you don’t know the charges against you on top of the decision. You’re saying he was removed from the ballot because he had a major offense of the elections guidelines so the committee chose to remove him from the ballot.

Chris Van Drimmelen: He was told what the charges against him were. The only thing missing were the words major offense.

Representative Struthers: I feel like we’re no longer discussion the resolution we’re discussing the process the senator could’ve taken. I move to end discussion.

Representative Davis: Second

Representative Struthers: We’re no longer discussing the resolution.

Representative Davis: We’ve been going in circles for quite a while if this was brought up earlier we don’t have much time.

A voice vote was taken to end debate. The motion passed.

Speaker Hatlen: Clarification because it’s under special orders does it need a motion to approve?

Chris Van Drimmelen: The motion is the bill that you’re considering.

A roll call vote was taken on HR-03.11. The motion passed 7-2-4

Representative Struthers: I move to table HR-03.05, HR-03.06, HR-03.08, HR-03.09, and HR-03.10 for two weeks.

Representative Davis: Second

Representative Struthers: I’ve been approached by Mr. Evans and he would like to talk about this but he has to leave.

Representative Davis: Next week he can’t be here because of elections two weeks would be plenty of time to answer questions.
Representative Setzler: There were people based off prior motions that need to be contacted.

Jeffery Evans: I’d like to be here and I apologize I wasn’t able to be here a couple weeks ago I was in a conference in LA.

A voice vote was taken to table HR-03.05, HR-03.06, HR-03.08, HR-03.09, and HR-03.10 for two weeks. The motion passed

Representative Setzler: For papers sake can we put those in the front of the room so we don’t kill a small forest?

Speaker Hatlen: If someone would organize the back table. If you could grab those and give those to Mr. Bhatt as he’s so excited about doing that. I don’t know how or why but right on.

IX. Old Business & Second Readings

HR-03.07 “ASOSU/HSRC Separation”

Representative Struthers: I move to forgo second reading

Representative Vanderwall: Second

Speaker Hatlen: Is there dissention?

Representative Struthers: I’m going to recap since it’s been 2 weeks. Resolution is to separate the HSRC for the remaining of this year and next year they’ll be separate but not report to the executive. They will report to the ways and means chair on various things. The other thing is if they don’t get approved by SIFC to be their own budgeting board. This will be the current administration and future and it can only be overturned by congress.

Representative Rosoff: Can we foresee the possibility of extra cost than the hiring of maybe some new student employees.

Claire: The hiring of the student employees we did a reorganization of the current budget of next year that will allow us to hire someone without adding to our current cost.

Representative Rosoff: No cost associated?

Claire: We’ll have the page within ASOSU budget. We have a number of budget items in the greater ASOSU budget. We chose to not separate out this year it will take time. Our intention is unless we feel that cost incurred will benefit more to our student that we serve keeping the fee the same we won’t increase the student fees that are outside the limits of projected enrollment.

Representative Rosoff: Once you’ve separated the cost if it turns out student fees will go up would you cancel the idea?

Claire: I don’t know how they would is what I’m trying to say. If 1500 is the current ASOSU budget is not in our index we’ll ask that that money goes into the index. We’ll use that money accordingly what did we spend and if that’s the case that’s what
we’ll continue to spend and our increase will stay forever example our budget we increased 2% but that won’t raise student fees as at all.

Representative Rosoff: I’m asking as hypothetical.

Claire: For us it would be trying to determine how we won’t raise student fees. Even a small raise will effect students receiving $40 in their mailbox is a big difference.

Representative Struthers: Speaking to the representatives one thing that’s required is that executive work with HSRC and ways and means and that’s something they’re all there looking at to make sure the transition goes smoothly. But I’d hope that all three entities would make sure that student fees don’t go up you don’t know what the cost is going to be like next year or what projects will be going. I would expect so see no increase.

Representative Rosoff: If it did would the idea be nixed?

Representative Struthers: I would hope that the three branches would look at it to see if the benefit outweighs the cost. One benefit is that HSRC doesn’t have to go through the ASOSU signing but that’s one thing holding them up right now to do their job effectively the director of finance next year will do a cost benefit analysis to see if the cost is up. A minimal increase if we’re taking 5-6 cents but if it’s going to effect the fees by 10 dollars that outweighs the cost by the separation and next year they would say it’s not worth it. ASOSU has support when it comes to the budget. Another thing just went out this year.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Should we amend the next to last hereby statement. If it’s deemed not beneficial

Representative Struthers: Ways and means won’t have that authority because it states that to be an act of congress.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): You say should talk to the ways and means will verify if this is a beneficial thing.

Representative Struthers: No I think it’s fine the way it is if ways and means sees it’s not. This is an act of congress you don’t want a committee overturning the entire act of congress.

Speaker Hatlen: As a point of personal privilege and you speak to the legation with HSRC will have with ASOSU.

Claire: We’re hoping to have a strong relationship. One thing to amend out guidelines to have an ASOSU representative to serve on our board to continue to have that strong partnership the populations we serve are often overlapping and we have to work with the task force director in the past the veterans affairs.

Speaker Hatlen: Would it make sense for the director of services?
Claire: It could makes sense but somebody who’s interested in serving the upper level cabinet positions have weight. I would prefer that mandating this person ends to do this it would be someone dedicated to the issue.

Representative Struthers: Some committee members are say that appointed by the president of ASOSU it would be a circumstance to see who has an interest. Some committees have it some the president or vice president appoint someone to sit on the committee on behalf of ASOSU who has that interest and want to be there. I don’t know if that’s the best way to do it.

Claire: It’s not a decision for me to make we’re talking about putting someone on our board. In order to make that decision I’d have to take that recommendation to the board.

A roll call vote was taken on HR-03.07. The motion passed unanimously.

Speaker Hatlen: Thank you for being here the past 6-7 weeks.

HB-03.02 "Proxy Responsibility Bill"

Representative Setzler: I move to forgo second readings.

Representative Vanderwall: Second

Speaker Hatlen: Any dissent?

Representative Struthers: Question is I’m trying to read through the first be it enacted does it allow a simple email?

Speaker Hatlen: I think in the third to last be it hereby enacted.

Representative Setzler: Essentially they need to have written and signed agreement. There’s an appendix with a mutual agreement with the proxy and the person. The third to last be it hereby enacted that’s currently how it is in senate. The president of the senate needs to be notified 15 minutes before the meeting. It could be text, phone call whatever.

Representative Struthers: I want to get interest I think we should table this and the form in there. I don’t want to confirm a form without reading it. I just want to gauge interest.

Representative Setzler: The form isn’t required. It just needs to be written agreement it could be written on a cocktail napkin this is to make it easier. You can read the form it should’ve been attached to the email that was sent out with this it ready that your proxy understands your positions and if you know the votes going on if you want a vote to go anyway there are two spots for signatures it’s not required that you sign this document. It’s just a quick and ready contract.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Can we re-word the first hereby enacted to say an example form?

Representative Struthers: The way it read is a form with the basic agreement.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): The second sentence begins by reading an example from rather than a form.
Representative Alvarez: Yeah.
Speaker Hatlen: Can you word that for me so it will be unanimous consent?
Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): I’m looking for unanimous consent to reword the first hereby enacted to read an example form rather than a form.
Speaker Hatlen: Dissent? Hearing none so moved.
Representative Struthers: Point of order. Why is this a full ASOSU bill when it says amending to the standing rules.
Chris Van Drimmelen: It should be a bill because it’s altering the standing rules but the statues if the bill effects the standing rules of one house it only has to be passed by that one house if it has all the signature line it shouldn’t.
Representative Setzler: It’s only going through house. I talked to a couple in senate and said they could use this as template. I’m happy to work with them on that.
Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): What’s exactly implied in the last enacted statement. Is that the total body or present body?
Representative Setzler: I think it would be present body.
Speaker Hatlen: I don’t think by saying half of the body is composed of proxies they’re not in standing long standing member of the house.
Chris Van Drimmelen: A bill is a motion.
Speaker Hatlen: So we’ll talk later.
A voice vote was taken on HB-03.02.
Representative Vanderwall: Division
Representative Struthers: Point of Order. The vote was not proper.
Speaker Hatlen: Let’s do a roll call vote.
A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed. 11-1-0

X. Other Old Business

Representative Phou: Can I request my name to be called at the end because I don’t like being called Le Phou
Chris Van Drimmelen: Point of Order. It’s in the senate standing rules that the legislation must be done by a roll call. As your advisor I recommend you take a roll call vote on all your legislation.
Representative Vanderwall: I’d like to stay last.
Representative Alvarez: I move for a straw poll for some sort of legislation that would require members to if they’re going to miss to tell the speaker or the pro tempore on advance within an hour and if not then by the second time of the term they could suffer serious consequences.
Speaker Hatlen: What to think I hear you want a straw poll to find if people wasn’t to penalized.
Representative Alvarez: See if they’re receptive to some sort of legislation that’s more strict on people.

Speaker Hatlen: That would be an unexcused absence and that’s the four I have. When people tell me they’re going to miss a meeting that’s excused.

Representative Alvarez: I thought that was four a term not four unexcused absences.

Speaker Hatlen: If you had a legitimate reason.

Chris Van Drimmelen: The speaker can determine what’s excused and unexcused.

Speaker Hatlen: I’m lenient if people tell me in advance.

Representative Alvarez: I move for a straw poll to make that legislation to make it more strict for unexcused the person is not telling the speaker of the pro tempore the day of. And then make it more lenient for missing meetings in general.

Speaker Hatlen: Your straw poll is to ask whether we should be more strict on folks that’s aren’t notifying on their absences. This is no way binding what so ever. Those who think we should be more harsh. Seems pretty well favored.

Representative Stuart: Some things just kind of come up chaotically without reason or plan where it hasn’t happened often but there have been times when I have your class before this and would we like to have anything that extenuates those circumstances. The ones that aren’t told to you might be more drastic.

Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Can the speaker retroactively excuse an absence?

Representative Robb: If you’re walking to ASOSU meetings and a car hits you and you’re sent to the hospital you can’t do this and you emailed the speaker and say you were hit by a car you really would have to have the most heartless person on the planet to not excuse that.

Speaker Hatlen: That’s not me.

Representative Stuart: If it’s an automatic excuse.

Representative Robb: The big thing is send the speaker something even if it’s after the fact.

Representative Alvarez: It seems like it’s not that hard unless you get hit by a car to send a quick text to Drew or the speaker tempore if you don’t have their number just get it that’s something good to have. How many people are absent today told you they would miss. Do you think the rest of the people got hit by a car? When I missed yesterday I told Drew and that’s kind of annoying especially when the Barometer is on our asses about it.

Speaker Hatlen: If it annoys you it really annoys me.

Representative Rosoff: If it becomes more strict to rule within the house and we already have a fairly low amount of people getting into the house wouldn’t that be less competitive elections?

Representative Setzler: If we have the ability to retroactively excuse could you make a limitation of time so you can’t get something excused one month later you have to go within two weeks and you know understandable if you’re in the hospital if no one has heard from you in two week there’s a bit of a problem.
Representative Robb: I wanted to speak to the last comment about this being harsher standards could have used a smaller house I don’t see that as a problem I’d rather have as many people in the house that are dedicated with the positions being open for more people that are dedicated than people who don’t take it seriously and don’t show up.

Representative Vanderwall: Seeing as it’s 8:30 and we’re just having conversation about nothing at the moment I’d like to advise we move on.

XI. New Business & First Readings
None

XII. Other New Business

XIII. Speaker’s Announcements
Speaker Hatlen: It’s good to be back I’ve missed you all thank you for being here. Continue your commitment to the students its important and keep up your studies. It’s important don’t let ASOSU rule your life you’re students first.

XIV. House Comments
Representative Struthers: Quick comment Representative Van Bossuyt hasn’t been her for a couple weeks now. He’s getting ready to defend for his PhD tomorrow at 1. There’s a live feed if you want to watch it online. There’s a Facebook event I’ll send it on Facebook I would recommend supporting one of our own there’s been a member for about 10 years now since he was here for his bachelors. If you get a chance tomorrow at 1 I don’t know the location.

Speaker Hatlen: Bye Don. Paint us in a nice light please.

Speaker Hatlen: There’s a known your rights forum for the one of the task force director asked me to let you all know it’s on Tuesday for more details contact Dubie Joseph Dubie. And he’s organizing it. For more information I’ll end something on the listerv.

Representative Setzler: As there was bill passed to go and attend events we don’t usually go to last week I went to a program between the AAPC which way home it was really good to see it was about children from countries like Guatemala. Who try to immigrate to the united states and followed a group of kids and it was interesting to see they had to ride on a top of a train and the train tracks and stuff but getting across the border and smugglers and what that means when you know there’s this thing about immigration from Latin America to the United States they address Asian immigration that can be expensive and harder because of the whole crossing an ocean thing.

Representative Phou: Its true.

Representative Setzler: Anyways it was a really good event I encourage people to go to the events they’re supposed to go to.

Representative Vanderwall: I withdraw my comment.

Representative Stuart: I got a certification in a mediation training it was headed by SSI mediations of the borders that was an event I went to.
Representative Rosoff: For those who are voting in the Benton county this election cycle there will be resolution to confirm that the people of Corvallis don’t consider corporations people. I encourage people voting for that.

Representative Bhatt: I also went to an event it was India night lots of fun lots of cultural diversity being from India I can relate to that. The food was also really nice. I haven’t been here to the last couple of meetings and I’m considering resigning I just want to throw that out there.

Representative Setzler: We’ll miss you.

Representative Phou: I’m saying this to help you think of this a different way when Jeffery Evans said there might be a lawsuit against the university to take that seriously. Whatever we pass in here can be used as litigations in that lawsuit. Make sure we think that through I don’t want it to come back as evidence and see that wasn’t well thought out. I encourage people to seek out autif is another organization with disabled individuals of the community as well as OSU facility UHDS because I’ll double check. I met with someone who was CASP certified with different things about the campus. And also it’s not that I disagree with Jeffery Evans but it’s good to hear another side other than his on the issue.

Chris Van Drimmelen: Council for the Advancement of Standards

Representative Phou: CASP. Certified Assisted something I forget.

Representative Alvarez: Certified access specialist.

Representative Phou: There are only two states that have that, Texas and California. That’s really huge to have that.

Representative Alvarez: Is the autif. Is that the one that was under contention. The task force.

Representative Setzler: That was COSID.

Representative Struthers: There are two separate committee autif is under COSID.

Representative Phou: OK I think it’s a good idea to reach individuals on there that know their stuff.

Representative Alvarez: There’s a lot of controversy behind that. Talk to Van Bossuyt once he’s done with his dissertation.

Speaker Hatlen: It’s good to get multiple perspectives.

Representative Alvarez: It’s good to have that and invite them to speak.

Representative Alvarez: I’d like to speak to the abstentions when you abstain it’s because you have a conflict of interest if you abstain why did you vote yes because you have a personal stake in it it’s not for if you don’t want to vote don’t feel like you’re informed enough to vote you can use it but it’s a sign you should get more informed about it if you’re confused about the vote you should ask more questions that’s why you’re elected so not so you can abstain.

Chris Van Drimmelen: What can happen is if you had a body of 11 people and 10 chose to abstain that technically a unanimous vote yes that’s the majority of those voting. That’s what it looks like when you abstain. No one can make you vote or not vote. The generally
accepted legitimate abstention is if you have conflict of interest or don’t have enough information.

Speaker Hatlen: There’s no mechanism to hold people to abstaining.
Representative Alvarez: I’ll be working on that.
Speaker Hatlen: Talk to me I’ll help you.

XV. Gallery Comments
Representative Van Bossuyt (by proxy): Does the proxy come into enact next week?
Chris Van Drimmelen: Standing rules are effective immediately.
Representative Struthers: Statutes are end of legislative session.
Chris Van Drimmelen: So I don’t know if you were aware but you should vote in the ASOSU elections they open up tonight the link will be the same as last time. There will be blackboard announcement. Hopefully an all student email tomorrow I don’t care who you vote for but you should vote.
Speaker Hatlen: Vote early vote often.
Chris Van Drimmelen: You can only vote once but vote early yes. I would encourage that.
Representative Setzler: Can the elections committee see the votes as they happen?
Chris Van Drimmelen: No they cannot.

XVI. Adjournment
Representative Struthers: I move to adjourn.
Representative Setzler: Second
Acclamation occurred and the meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.