I. Call to Order/Roll-Call/Quorum
The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. Quorum was met with 21 representatives present.

II. Swearing in of Representatives
None

III. Singing of the Alma Mater
Representative Brantley: I move to forgo singing the alma mater.
Representative Alvarez: Second
Representative Van Bossuyt: Normally I would like to sing it but considering we don’t have copies it would be in the best interest of the alma mater to not sing it.
A voice vote was taken to forgo singing the Alma Mater. The motion passed.

IV. Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, October 5, 2011
Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to table the minutes until next week so the full house has time to review them.
Speaker Pro-Tempore: Second
Representative Van Bossuyt: Considering the weight of what we discussed last week it would be in everyone’s best interest to review them at a later time.
A voice vote to table the approval of the minutes. The motion passed.

V. Standing Committee Reports
Ways and Means
Representative Van Bossuyt: Yes, we met last week to discuss funding a new position in the office of legal advocacy, it is a graduate student position. The amount of money in question we didn’t think we would take out of contingency. At this time we sent the request to SIFC with the recommendation that it be funded by their funds with the expectation to ask for additional funding in the future.
Speaker Pro-Tempore: How much funding would it require?
Representative Van Bossuyt: Roughly $31,000 dollars for a .49 GTA position. That’s a full burden.
Representative Swalko: Where would the funding come from?
Representative Van Bossuyt: Student fees.

**Educational Activities**

Speaker Hatlen: We’re still looking for a chair for the Educational Activities committee. Please come talk to me if you are interested.

**Appropriations and Budgets**

Representative Robb: Appropriations and Budgets committee will hold their first meeting at 1pm in Snell 114. By the congressional offices. We will be approving our bylaws and voting on our vice chair and the progress of the committee.

Representative Thomas: Can you say when and where again?

Representative Robb: It will be tomorrow in Snell 114.

Speaker Hatlen: Uh, 149?

Agustin Vega Peters: Appropriations and Budgets Committee? What is that?

Representative Robb: It overlooks SIFC and really they’re the ones that when the SIFC budget comes to both houses of congress they’re the ones that have the recommendation to both bodies of whether to pass or fail any of the budgets. And give rationales for either.

VI. Joint Committee Reports

**Joint Committee on Congressional Correspondence**

Representative Robb: The senate yesterday, the bulk of the meeting consisted of the procedures for the impeachment trial and it was set and will be happening two weeks from yesterday in a location to be determined in MU or possibly the international forum. They passed the first bill from the house that we passed last meeting for sending representation to OSA however they tabled the other bill for the reinstatement of funds to OSA pending possibly having a representative from OSA come to the senate meeting to answer questions.

Chris Van Drimmelen: Senate didn’t table it they just left it at first readings.

Representative Robb: Oh also they spoke about the current process of the student bill of rights committee. It has passed and was given a pocket approval so now it’s a bill and we’re hearing that today.

**Delegate reports**

Yuhana Abraham: I sent you all an email about the event set up by the BCC about the impeachment of Tonga. A lot of students are out of the loop. I’m asking you to come and discuss. Did everybody get my email? It’s 7 p.m. I welcome you all to come and see what the students have to say.

Speaker Hatlen: If anyone from the house wants to come and speak can they?
Yuhana Abrahams: If you want to speak I can put you in on the agenda.
Representative Alvarez: The agenda wasn’t attached to the email. Just letting you know.
Yuhana Abraham: What’s your name?
Representative Alvarez: Brad Alvarez.
Yuhana Abraham: I’ll let you know.

VII. Old Business
None

VIII. New Business
Impeachment trial
Speaker Hatlen: It will take place on November 1. It’s come to my attention I will represent the house in the trial itself as the prosecutor. I’d like to know from you as a body what kind of reprimands you are seeking. Since we’re the house that impeached the president. When I bring in my opening statement I will give a brief about what you’d like as reprimands. I’ll open the floor to suggestions.
Representative Alvarez: What are the options?
Chris Van Drimmelen: So I’m going to come to the front of the room. So there are several remedies that could be prescribed. The first of which lets say the least to most severe. The first thing would be acquittal where 2/3 of the senate finds the impeached party guilty. That would mean there’s no judgement. The senate could convict but take no action. They could find that the crime does not merit a punishment at this time. They could issue a censure. It’s a formal reprimand basically the equivalent of telling the president you violated the statutes so don’t do it again. Injunction there are two types. A temporary injunction that is 10 days and full injunction that lasts until the end of the academic term. Putting an employee on probation. It would stipulate condition where the wrong could be made right, cooperation in the investigation with OSA and potentially helping congress understand what was going on. Basically telling the president what needs to be done to make it right. The most severe which is removal from office. Questions? Death threats?
Representative Alvarez: I move for straw poll for our opinions on this.
Speaker Hatlen: It has to be directed towards something if you want to say how many in the house want to move for an acquittal. We’ll take a straw poll on that.
Representative Alvarez: I move for a straw poll on a censure.
Representative Tran: Second
Representative Van Bossuyt: Is that only censure nothing beyond that?
Representative Alvarez: What I want is people to voice what they think if it should be a censure, injunction, acquittal, or removal. Am I able to do that?

Speaker Hatlen: We can go one at a time. Or I can just ask. Would you still like the second Tran?

Representative Tran: Yes.

Representative Alvarez: I think it would be good to see what our preliminary options are and then discuss after that the merit of what we think. Just more of a discussion.

Chris Van Drimmelen: If you want to take a straw poll I can go to the flip chart and take down where people are at so people can see that.

Agustin Vega Peters: Are we allowed to ask questions? Has there been another case of impeachment process before? What did they do?

Representative Struthers: correct me if I'm wrong but the closest is president McCarthy but that was a different system because he had gotten a DUI.

Representative Van Bossuyt: In recent memory there hasn't been any impeachment but I can't speak past 2002.

Representative Struthers: It was the 05-06 school year.

Agustin Vega Peters: So censure for a DUI.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Question

A voice vote to do a straw poll to find where the House of Representatives stand with the reprimands took place. The motion passed.

Speaker Hatlen: We’ll start off with those that would be comfortable with acquittal and those in favor of censure and then some sort of injunction and those in favor of removal of office. You can vote for more than one.

Representative Struthers: There has been questions on what injunction is. Could you explain a little more about that?

Speaker Hatlen: An injunction is a set of stipulations that prohibit future behavior like a probationary period. Or a set of requirements in a time frame that might warrant further action.

Representative Stuart: What is the difference between a conviction with no action?

Chris Van Drimmelen: Conviction with no action find the defendant guilty but don’t find sufficient cause to punish her. It’s a possible outcome conviction with no action would be an unlikely outcome it would be more likely If they didn’t want to punish her to acquit her. Censure is a formal reprimand that is documentation that she violated the statutes and you're telling her that is unacceptable and if it happens again we have documented evidence.
Representative Stuart: Conviction with no action won't be able to be brought up in court again?
Chris Van Drimmelen: It would be able to be brought up she wouldn't be tried for the same thing again. It would have to be a new instance of that behavior. It could establish a pattern.
Representative Stuart: With a censure she wouldn't have to do it again?
Chris Van Drimmelen: You couldn't be tried twice for the same instance of a behavior.
Speaker Hatlen: Basically conviction with no action, they agreed the charges in the impeachment were warranted but no further reprimands necessary. Censure says yes you were responsible for the charges but we also think that such and such and such where you fill in the blank. The senate fills in the blank.
Nicole Perez: Which ever gets the most vote has to be cleared by 2/3 vote correct?
Speaker Hatlen: Correct this is just an informal straw vote. We won't make any consensus.
Chris Van Drimmelen: The house doesn't get to decide what the punishment will be. The plaintiff can ask for a certain resolution to the problem but the senate is no way obligated to listen to that. This would be a recommendation.
Speaker Hatlen: We'll move on to a vote.
Representative Thomas: Can we add to the injunction temporary or full?
Chris Van Drimmelen: Sure if you want to split that out.
Speaker Hatlen: The difference is 10 days and academic term. You can vote for more than one it's what ever you'd be comfortable with. All those for an acquittal? 0. Conviction with no action? 0. Conviction with some sort of censure? 12. Temporary injunction? 7. Full injunction? 8. A conviction with a removal from office? 0. We'll move into discussion about some sort of censure with language to be determined or some sort of injunction.
Representative Robb: The main thing I see is that we can agree on a censure the injunction is a censure without stipulations. Debating about a censure if a waste of time when we should focus on if we should have an injunction and if it should be temporary or full.
Representative Tran: With the censure is where we tell her yes that she takes responsibility for going against the Constitution and we just give her a warning to not go do it again?
Speaker Hatlen: It's like a formal slap on the wrist.
Representative Tran: What you were saying with a censure though instead of giving her probation for the full 10 days or term we passed the bill for the reinstating representation to OSA. So I mean we've taken some action in kind of resolving or reversing the action she did. A censure would be a warning an injunction would be unnecessary.
Representative Alvarez: What we decide here is that what you'll be asking for or just take into considerations and do what you think is best at the prosecutor.
Speaker Hatlen: I'll take forward what you decide.
Agustin Vega Peters: If she gets an injunction by the end of that time period she has to have the conflict resolved and if not it goes to a court again?

Speaker Hatlen: You have to go do a set of requirements or you have to fulfill as set of requirement and those are either abridged or followed it might warrant further disciplinary actions.

Agustin Vega Peters: I’m guessing if it is to fulfill a certian things its to go get back with OSA.

Speaker Hatlen: Correct it could be working with house of congress or even remaining a constant dialogue with congress.

Agustin Vega Peters: Who determines that?

Speaker Hatlen: It would ultimately be up to senate.

Representative Alvarez: I feel like an injunction isn’t necessary. It creates further tention. The censure is enough that she had a very well written appology in the Barometer and I’d like to take into account by the time the trial happens she’ll go through 3 week wihtout pay. It’s almost like a censure. Without the three weeks of pay would be sufficient enough.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Point of Clarification on the temporary injunction, the time is up to 10 days but could be less.

Speaker Hatlen: The teperature is mandatory 10 days.

Representative Van Bossuyt: There’s no way to add stipulations between censure and injunction.

Speaker Hatlen: You could say certain thing has to be done by a date an the decision would be at the end of that time.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I would recommend something along those lines that she and the executive branch develop a menthod that things don’t happen in the future like this. Something between censure an injunction that she develop a plan that things don’t happen in the future. Not just for this administration but those in the future. Personally I don’t think she needs to be withheld pay anymore but we should also require some formal method in conjunction with us that we are stronger moving forward and things don’t happen again as long as our Constitution stands.

Chris Van Drimmelen: Point of Clarification. An injunction isnt a suspension it doesn’t remove anyone from office she would be reinstated as president.

Representative Robb: I believe representative Van Bossuyt hit the nail on the head there. Really with this the important thing is to get a way forward ana ASOSU can grow from this situation and this wont happen again. I would say it would be best to have a full injunction but the stipulation of that injunction be one of more broad language instead of strict guidleniens. Such as maintain communication with both houses of congress by having question and anwer time and making plans that this won’t happen in the future.
Representative Fosdick: I was basically hitting off the same points. Along with the same lines if we have something in the injunction that she can re-establish relationships. It would be really important and in the end she’ll look like a stronger president that if she successfully completes these.

Representative Stuart: I agree with the injunction all but I’m not sure it should stipulate with our relationship with OSA if we’re having an investigation anyway.

Representative Van Bossuyt: The injunction could read that the president would participate in deciding that relationship and decide how we want to move forward.

Representative Robb: With this I would like to have a straw poll on what we’ve said with a full injunction but the stipulations be what we’ve previously said.

Representative Alvarez: Second

Representative Robb: I move for a straw poll on whether to have a full injunction with the stipulations stating maintain communication with congress and ensuring a way this doesn’t happen in the future inclusion in the discussion on the future of ASOSU and OSA.

Speaker Hatlen: This is an informal straw poll.

Representative Alvarez: Should we have an option for censure?

Speaker Pro-Tempore: I think this is yes or no.

Representative Robb: What my understanding injunction is censure with stipulations.

Chris Van Drimmelen: It’s like a censure but has stipulations so it has teeth essentially if the president doesn’t abide by the points. Second.

Representative Van Bossuyt: If we find the straw poll in favor of this I suggest we take a 5 minutes recess to write it down.

Agustin Vega Peters: Could you put one more option on there for temporary injunction?

Representative Robb: Its to see if this it the majority or not. Its just a straw poll.

Representative Struthers: Call to question.

Speaker Hatlen: We will do a straw poll. All in favor of the injunction with the listed stipulations raise your right hand- 14. All those opposed raise your right hand- 5. And 2 abstentions.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move for 5 minutes recess.

Representative Robb: Second.

Representative Stuart: I would like to hear from the members that didn’t want it. That’s valid before we take a break.

Representative Alvarez: Arent we going to discuss this after?

Speaker Hatlen: Since there was dissention we’re going to move to a vote. I want to recognize Stuart’s recommendation. Are there any representatives that want to discuss?

Representative Tran: I didn’t think a full injunction was necessary a temporary would be good option.
Representative Fosdick: I would like to add this repair relationships to make ASOSU stronger just in general.

Representative Walters: I don’t think it’s necessary I’m pretty sure she’s been through enough and has a good concept. It’s not necessary at all the steps taken has made the OSA thing visible to our body as a whole and the steps that need to be taken in the future.

Anderson DuBoise III: As an organization they haven’t been that good to us and we’re not the first to back out. I’m wondering if it’s a systematical error or if it’s just to us. I know there are some gaps with communication with senate and house you’re finding out about stuff the last second which isn’t professional. What do you do to repair that?

Van I almost think a temporary injunction would be harsher because with full you’d have more time. A temporary would only be 10 days. I think a full injunction would be the lesser punishment.

Speaker Pro-Tempore: To echo that statement, I think to put it harshly a temporary injunction is useless. Another thought I think a full injunction is a little pointless because regardless if we censure Tonga or not or have injunction she’s going to be involved in the investigation with OSA anyway.

Representative Alvarez: I really don’t feel an injunction is necessary. It creates requirements I think she understands and fully intends to have better communication with the houses. I think we know how to go about this now and we don’t need the unnecessary tension.

Representative Struthers: Point of Order. Is this discussion on the injunction or recess?

Speaker Hatlen: This is about the recess but also to see all voices heard.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I believe that understanding intentions is one thing but doing something is another. I move to close discussion.

Representative Vanderwall: Second.

A voice vote to close discussion took place. The motion passed.

A voice vote was taken to take a five minutes recess. The motion passed.

A five minute recess took place.

Recess ended at 8:00 p.m.

Representative Robb: the senate doesn’t have to follow this, its up to their prerogative. It states, “The house of representatives recommends to the senat that a full injunction be issued containing the following stipulations:

1. Maintain communications with both houses of Congress
   1A. Maintain a monthly question time with both houses of Congress

2. Fully participate in the ongoing legislative investigation of the relationship between OSA and ASOSU.
3. Develop a rigorous method to prevent such actions as were cited in the articles of impeachment in the future for both the current administration and all future administrations. This will occur with input from both chambers of congress.

4. Continue the good work that the administration has been performing to engage a broad cross-section of the student body in ASOSU.

Speaker Hatlen: That is what folks came up with during the recess we’re still in discussion about this. I’ll entertain a motion to approve.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to approve.

Representative Fosdick: Second

Representative Van Bossuyt: I think pretty much what we wrote is going to happen anyways its a part of the process we have to follow here. I believe we should follow it this case with these stipulations. A full injunction gives more time to perform these actions.

Representative Fosdick: He covered it.

Speaker Pro-Tempore: I disagree with the sentiments of Representative Van Bossuyt and Fosdick. Personally I feel like Tonga has been impeached which is in itself a large punishment and I feel like a censure is a slap on the wrist and all these things will happen without an injunction. An injunction would be a misuse of our power if they’re going to happen already. I don’t think we should chain down the president and burden her further but I think she needs to be censured and the gravity of breaching the Constitution in such a manner needs to be expressed.

Representative Alvarez: I think I agree with that the third one that was read to develop a rigorous way that this won’t happen again. I don’t foresee anything more needs to be developed to prevent something like this. It was hopefully a one-time thing we can easily have communication with Tonga it shouldn’t, an injunction isn’t necessary.

Representative Tran: I agree with that as well and point three is redundant because everything was stated in the Constitution all these requirements. A censure would be enough.

Representative Walters: I agree with Representative Dunn pretty passionately.

Representative Stuart: I think both sides have valid points. My problem with your point Representative Tran is she felt cornered, she felt she was making the right decision because she could get ahold of the right people that was her option. If we work with her so that a future president can go to and say these known routes are here for me what else can we do. I think its valid it wouldn’t be more bureaucratic garbage to dig through.

Representative Robb: Yes really these injunction are one actual stipulations on permanent actions the president must take are quite minimal to have monthly question time. It has been done the past two years but have that as a requirement. The grounds of the impeach was the
disconnect between congress. This will ensure this wont happen in the future and give a path where both congress and executive can move forward from this point and grow as an organization and work together successfully.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I feel also that with an injunction the president will come out looking much better when she meets and achieves the goals when she acheives them. We’ll make a stronger presidency. I believe for ASOSU it’s a better way forward and positive group in the end. If I was in her shoes well, I’d be mad right now but in the end it will be a better course of action.

Anderson DuiBoise III: As far as these stipulations may look better if it’s a full injunction. I’m wondering who its going to look better to? You know where a majority of the students already stand. At the same time she’s already as Mr. Kevin Dunn has said she’s already being punished. How are you going through these hoops? Why would we add on more?

Representative Van Bossuyt: At least in my opinion I think its not so much students I’m concerned about it’s more about future employers and where she’ll go in life afterward. Try to understand I’ve been in other groups before and these things can become very positive on a resume its something I’ve hired for before. It creates an interesting narrative.

Representative Struthers: I’d like to add that I’ve sat on committees that ask how do you deal with conflict and I’m not saying I agree with the censure or injunction but its how you deal with the conflict. I see where Van Bossuyt is coming from. It helps with conflict type questions in an interview.

Patricia: I want to clarify I thought that the last two points are being based on Tonga’s future employment I thought we were here to represent the students and the student body here right now. I’m confused why we’re talking about future employment.

Amelia Harris: I’m shocked we’re talking about her future right now. I’m not concerned where I’m going with my position but with what we’re going right now and I’m appauled.

Representative Brantley: Just in response to the comments we’ve heard. We’re speaking in general terms the idea is that we’re trying to make it an environment where we can all grow from this situation and make a better system.

Representative Robb: Speaking specifically on the last comment, the third one is very specific to ASOSU and student government itself. To set up a rigorous plan so this won’t happen again. What we’ve said about future employment was additional. Its cherry on top when trying to explain this thing. The main focus isn’t future employment. It’s about ASOSU and this is what its about.

Patricia: I think out of respect to each other as member of the house and your consituents, you’re representing. I think its great to add cherries on top but be respectful that we’re talk about things that deal with the students. I know a lot of the students here are waiting to go to
midterms or study for midterms we should keep in mind for the student here to talk about business.

Representative Stuart: Reaching an environment that positive things can come from is the best interest to all students involved. If we’re divided and corner her and leave her with a semblence of resentment she won’t act in the best for the students. Well that is not true, she may act out of self interest instead of regards to everyone.

Chris Van Drimmelen: As a point of parliamentary procedure, debate should be confined to the body. The house shouldn’t engage in debate with the gallery.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to close discussion.

Representative Brantley: Second

A voice vote was taken to close discussion. The motion passed.

Representative Struthers: So this is to adopt that as the recommendation to senate?

Speaker Hatlen: Correct.

Agustin: Can you repeat that?

Clerk Wolff: “The house of representatives recommends to the senat that a full injunction be issued containing the following stipulations:

5. Maintain communications with both houses of Congress
   1A. Maintain a monthly question time with both houses of Congress

6. Fully participate in the ongoing legislative investigation of the relationship between OSA and ASOSU.

7. Develop a rigorous method to prevent such actions as were cited in the articles of impeachment in the future for both the current administration and all future administrations. This will occur with input form both chambers of congress.

8. Continue the good work that the administration has been performing to engage a broad cross-section of the student body in ASOSU.

Representative Struthers: I ask for a hand vote.

Speaker Hatlen: All those in favor for adopting these that I will bring forth in the trial raise your hand.

The motion failed.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to adopt as the recomendation as this body a censure.

Speaker Pro-Tempore: Second.

Speaker Hatlen: Do you want to add any language to that?
Representative Van Bossuyt: I don't think we can.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Since the first one failed this is what we need to do so let's do it.

Speaker Pro-Tempore: I don’t think they should vote for this because they want to leave or have to get things to do they believe this is what should happen.

Representative Vanderwall: So point of clarification. When you provide say we accept to present a censure as a suggestion can you also with that relay our opinion of what we think the next step should be? Kind of suggest what was said in the injunction but not said as an injunction? I was wondering if the censure is passed if we could instead of just suggest what was said in the injunction as guidelines for the president and congress to correct maybe what the problems were to cause the impeachment.

Chris Van Drimmelen: You absolutely could. That would make it an injunction.

Van This is an informal move but I will take everything into consideration. I will make sure the points will be brought up in discussion.

Representative Alvarez: I call to question.

Speaker Hatlen: Dissention?

A voice vote to bring fourth a censure was taken. The motion passed.

Speaker Hatlen: When I go towards the trial I will request we censure the president.

ASA

Speaker Hatlen: It's been brought to my attention that a student organization that we help sponsor, the ASA has been a student organization that advocates for able bodied and alter able bodied students. They have not been receiving the right respect and cooperation we have asked for from OSU Administration. It looks like the might litigate against the university. There was a request to write a resolution to support this group to create a line of dialogue between the body and administration. I believe Jeffery Evans is the advocate and will compile something to bring forward to congress.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Whoever does write something to those effects be careful with wording because ASOUS cannot be drawn into a lawsuit. We can't be in a lawsuit with the university. So, tread lightly.

Speaker Hatlen: This would be for a show of support for this organization to have dialogue with the university.

Representative Struthers: Will Evans be coming to the house when that resolution is ready?

Representative Brantley: Any idea on the timeline?

Speaker Hatlen: I met with him on Tuesday so I think he is a pretty avid supporter so he’ll be writing that in the near future.

Student Rights Committee
Speaker Hatlen: I need to appoint 4 members of the body to that committee one of which would be a graduate from house or senate. Is there anyone that would like to be apart of that committee?

Representative Stuart: Can you explain what that is?

Speaker Hatlen: The bill we passed the second week of school said we wanted to look into the creation of the student bill of rights. It’s an investigatory working in conjunction with the senate and other organizations on campus. It might be a bit of a time commitment but a great thing to get involved in. Anyone interested in being involved in that? That will be set in stone unless the senate can’t find a graduate student we’ll find one. So I have Kevin Dunn, Andrew Struthers, Samantha Thomas, and Brad Alvarez.

OSA/ASOSU Investigation

Speaker Hatlen: We moved to create a special committee to investigate that relationship. And I need participation. Any volunteers?

Representative Tran: What is the time commitment for that?

Speaker Hatlen: That would be internally decided.

Representative Stuart: What would warrant a decision either way interview with past representatives or administrators or whomever.

Speaker Hatlen: The charge of the committee was pretty broad. It would be how in depth they wanna go.

Representative Struthers: I would say its more interviewing past representatives interviewing OSA have a conversation with OSA and whoever else the committee feels necessary to talk with. Not just one side but getting both sides.

Speaker Hatlen: I’ve got Renee Stuart, Brad Alvarez, Andrew Struthers, Michael Robb, and Haley Jones.

Anderson DuBoise III: Point of Clarification. Will the part of the executive branch be apart of the investigation?

Speaker Hatlen: I think they’d be a vital role. Tonga will work closely with that committee.

Representative Vanderwall: On the student rights committee if you can’t get a graduate student I’ll be on it.

Standing Request- Struthers

Representative Struthers: I had a random thought we’re always talking about students wanting to know what’s going on in the house. We have a standing gallery request that if we have a column that if students want to add their email. So they get all that information. I would ask for discussion before a motion.

Representative Stuart: Aren’t our minutes suppose to be online? Don’t we have a web page meant for that?
Speaker Hatlen: It's been under construction.
Agustin: Today when I was reading through the paper they talked about what they talked about in the paper. So maybe something like that in the Barometer?
Speaker Hatlen: That's maybe something we can talk about with the Barometer and we've been lucky enough to have reporters here.
Amelia Harris: It concerns me that you're talking about accountability but you haven't updated the minutes.
Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to have the original motion re-read.
Clerk Wolff: “I move to table the minutes until next week so the full house has time to review them.”
Speaker Hatlen: Before being approved by us we had a chance to review them.
Representative Van Bossuyt: We only got the minutes to review until about 10 minutes before the meeting. And 27 pages is too much to read in 10 minutes.
Anderson: Why is that? Because I know there are representatives around what the event is about and it's hard to find out what's going on. I didn't know what was going on tonight, neither did other House of Representatives among you.
Speaker Hatlen: That will be a discussion after the meeting. There have been midterms and studying going on. We'll rectify that as soon as possible.
Representative Stuart: Can I ask why the website is under construction?
Speaker Hatlen: The executive branch asked we update the website and reflect what the OSU website looks like. They've been working since it's still under construction the PR team has been looking to update that as quickly as possible.
Representative Stuart: Can I move to get a list for the listserv of gallery members so we can email until the website is going.
Speaker Hatlen: Would you like to help Mr. Struthers with the language?
Representative Struthers: I move to add to the standing gallery request that an optional column be added for emails of students who want to be on the house listserv.
Speaker Hatlen: Is that savvy for you?
Representative Stuart: Savvy.
Speaker Pro-Tempore: Second
Representative Brantley: Call to question.

A voice vote was taken to add an optional column for emails. The motion passed.

IX. Speaker's Announcements

BCC Event
Speaker Hatlen: The BCC event on Monday at 7. I highly encourage you to attend there. It would be a great opportunity to connect with students.
Office Hours

Speaker Hatlen: Even if you aren't going to make it to your scheduled office hours and sign up anywhere, you're required one hour a week.

Reaching out to Students

Speaker Hatlen: This BCC event is a great opportunity. I encourage you to look at the gripefest from previous years to think about legislation. I know we've had an exciting first few weeks but we need new business on the table. If you need help feel free to email me with ideas. I'd love to help you with those ideas. Before you go we have our PR team photographer if you'd like it. If you don't want to represent us on the website I believe your office hours are posted on the wall. Come in when you're ready stop by to take a picture and smile.

X. House Comments

Representative Robb: All members of the standing rules committee please see me after. It's very important that we meet to pass the standing rules. I've sent out a doodle poll I need to talk to everyone to set up a meeting and get this passed before Wednesday.

Representative Stuart: I was wondering how people would feel about starting a monthly meeting for when the minutes look juicy to start a preemptive discussion. Even reading the minutes isn't enough to get a full standing on that. I'd like to chat with the members to see why we're here and what the means to us.

Representative Sandberg: We're having an event Tuesday, it's about a women's event make sure you attend the cultural events we work really hard and it's important you show your support. Dinner will be provided I encourage you to go. Not just to the BCC one but to other centers as well.

Representative Alvarez: I want to point out that some of these gallery comments are picking fights for unnecessary reasons and this is the reason we're having these issues. Some of these things aren't constructive at all.

XI. Gallery Comments

Standing Gallery Request

Patricia: I'm currently serving under the executive branch and I wanted to introduce myself I wanted to echo sentiments I shared with the senate last night. I want us to as one of your fellow colleagues and your peer we should be as inclusive as possible. I haven't heard it tonight but be aware of the language. When you're saying guys you're only identify to the ones that identify as males and I don't identify as a male so you're not talking to me. In terms of accessibility, I think we should have all of the house meetings be as accommodating as possible I identify as an able bodied student but I can't hear what you're saying.
appreciate being here and being apart of the conversation. I wanted to make you aware that the meetings aren’t as inclusive as they could be. If we all have things to work on in legislative branch and executive branch. I wanted to add my support and the directors that served over me. Feel free to come to my office and let me know if you’re interested. I’ve been made aware that representatives don’t receive cultural competency training and I know serving the executive branch that was beneficial to me, I highly recommend it.

Amelia Harris: I’m held accountable with students as well. About accountability and transparency I’ve had students ask me about the minutes but I cannot get them to them. I say this because I have people asking for them personally.

Speaker Hatlen: Is anyone from the executive branch know what our status is with PR?

Patricia: Currently the executive direct of PR is out this week hopefully we can inform him when he gets back and he’ll be on it next week.

Speaker Hatlen: Theres a standing gallery request to leave your name and what organization you’re with and your email to add to our listserv.

XII. Adjournment

Representative Brantley: I move to adjourn.
Representative Van Bossuyt: Second
Speaker Pro-Tempore: Acclamation.
The meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.