GENERAL BODY SENATE MEETING

ASCSU SENATE CHAMBERS

SIXTH SESSION, SPRING SEMESTER

2 MARCH 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER (7:00pm)
2. ROLL CALL

Agenda: Zarah; Devin

Minutes: Logan; Zarah

1. HALL COUNCIL REPORTS
   1. Academic Village
      1. Starting to get materials for hydro flask event
   2. Allison
      1. N/A
   3. Braiden
      1. Nothing
   4. Corbett
      1. N/A
   5. Edwards
      1. March Madness event. 70% or higher there is a prize.
   6. Ingersoll
      1. Successful event.
   7. Laurel Village
      1. Board game night next Tuesday
   8. Newsom
      1. Working on event for April that is yoga and destressing.
   9. Parmelee
      1. Selflove event
   10. Summit
       1. Nothing
   11. Towers
       1. Planning alcohol Education
2. NEW BUSINESS
   1. L1902 – Constitutional Edits

Owen: yield to Emery

Emery: yield to Madi

\*PREPARE FOR MINUTES TO GET AGRESSIVLEY WORSE\*

Emery: moving into a reading of the legislation

Dovic: motion to wave the reading of the legislation

Sheron: second

Emery: any dissent?

Devin: yes

2nd retracted: yes

Motion retracted: no

Devin: this should save time during discussion

Dovic: motion retracted

Emery: yield reading to Owen

Owen: \*reads the legislation changes\*

Emery: time for a presentation

Owen: im only going to talk about the things I changed. First, this may impact senators wanting to join, we already do that, this isn’t a replacement for RA. I added the election packet should include a question on previous rha work and communication styles because it was requested by many. During q&a there was a lot of talk about not feeling like they were voting on a person, so I added a place for them to give a narrative and a platform piece. To make sure the president isn’t biased I added in the advisor so that the president cannot be biased. Devin asked for a specific length for answers and so I added that so that the president and cabinet could decide before elecitons each year. For follow up questions the president or advisor can go out and ask.other things I saw I would like to clarify. This will not eliminate bias, and that’s not what im tryihng to do. This is supposed to e.imitnate some bias that we have seen. That’s why there are also already evaluation methods in the sumer and next year. I don’t think it could hurt to try

Owen: I didn’t mention it lst time by I want the candidates to at least be required to interact with their bylaws before running. Third, specific answers of bias so I asked old cabinet to come and I will yield my time to them. They aren’t here to advocate for me, just talk about things that happened.

George: hi Im goerge, I was senator and NCC

Maggie: im Maggie, I was director of business administration and president and an ra and a cdm, I haven’t read the legislation but I just wanted to share experiences. I am here because everyone is here to make their community better. A lot of bias comes in on accident based on learned experiences. Bias I saw was personality based voting, like people voting on their speaking ability. There were people judged for their lack of English abilities

George: a lot of the time people would recc

Joaquin

Julia

Q&a extended by 30 minutes

George: we have to think about how the person will fulfill their position, not how much we like them and how they speak. We need to solely focus on their merits and ideas for the positions

James: when you said people were judged off how they spoke, how do you know that happened?

Maggie: one things that’s good is that people are trying to be open about their experiences, so sometimes in discussion people would mention the possibility of a problem with the ability to relate and discuss the purpose of the organization to others.

James: can we hear the written response

Owen: yes; Lauren Rodgers: I have been there for 3 elections and they were all biased. First year as drd there was the most bias based on someone advocating for the candidates but there. Outside information and no confidence was used even though there was no reason. The last election we tried to have elections all in one dat. We voted on personality and ability to present and senators had bias on positive or not positive personality traits. There was a lot of outside information which we weren’t supposed to use anyways.

Maggie: to add, something that happens is that rha exists to be leadership development so we want to see certain abilities but we also need to look at the growth they show and how they can involve themselves. Some people come lots of e3xperiences

George: Maddie: theres no way we can totally get rid of bias but we need to focus on the merits of the person and what they want to do in the position

James: someone mentioned no confidence, whats that?

Owen: when you vote you can vote no confidence, which mean you don’t think any one is capable of doing the job. What happened in the first year. The senators didn’t think no confidence but one certain cabinet member moved for it agressivley and

George: not everyone agreed with that cabinet member but we tried to look unified which hurt us. Also cabinet shouldn’t be the ones deciding, its up to yall

Zara: does we still have roll down elections if the packet has job specific questions

Owen: yes youd fill out the bylaws section for all the positions youd like to run for. Also I want to hear all of your thoughts

Alex; would you know if you were running against

Owen: I don’t have something prepared for that, but does it change how youd vote?

Dovic: candidates leave the room together, so are they all together

Owen: ya you all go into the hall

James: if theres a limit to how much they can write wont that limit what they can put

Owen: that’s why there is a spot for added credentials

Ally: with this theres still no q&a

Owne: just clarifying question, q&a exists to get objective information and to see how people answer questions which we cant vote on anyways

Elsie: do you think this would have impacted the elections you were a part of

Maggie: I think that becoming president was a biased election, so yse.

George: although we didn’t take minutes people told me about the conversations in the space based on how I did which biased the space

Maggie: its hard as well to feel like a public speaker and not a candidate

Harper: if they run out of room they can put it in the open space

Owne: yes

Harper: but that cant be oconsidered

Owne: no, that’s the platform piece

Madi: yield to Maggie: have you brought this to anyone else in IACURH

Owen: not yet

Zara: motion to end q&a with additions

Jackson: second

Owen: plwase ask questions

Joaquin: how many years were the returners here for?

George: 2 ish because I was on the regional board but stepped down

Maggie: 2 years

Joaquin: has cabinet influenced elections

Maggie: yes very much so

George: absolutely, for the no confidence vote especially

Emma: im hearing a lot of cabinet influencing elections, does this change with this legislation

Owen: no that’s not why I wrote this but theres a much easier line with outside information

Maggie: it doesn’t and it isn’t the intent, there are two different conversations happening (YALL SHOULD WRITE LEGISLATION FOR THAT), this is other bias

Dovic: Article 16 section d part 1, Is that saying theyd meet with the advisor insteadof president

Owen: no, if theres a clarifying question, because the president cant vote, they would be able to

Dovic: for those questions does the advisor go out into the hall too?

Owen: they can, that’s open for inturrpretation

James: this is to address bias

Ownen: that’s one

James; whats the other

Owen: so they think more critically about the job

James: so we keep talking abou t cabinet bias, does this legislation help cabinet change

Owen: I think this is a bigger problem, not being objective about the position when you were running. This is to reduce identity and outside inside information bias. This is creating change for things that are happening but shouldn’t be.

James: so about the roll down procedure- how does that work

Owen: nothing is changing about that, you can only run for four so you chose the four

George: people from outside the organization are biased against because they haven’t been seen in the space

Maggie: this is also much less scary, so this makes a more comfortable running process

Emery: Q&A is over

Zara: motion to caucus

James: seconed

Emery: be back at 8:10

Owen: im going home

Emery: hey were back now, cool, initial speakers list?

Devin: we talked about changes and how this micgh help the voting process

Logan: we appreciate owens work to change this to what we want and drop bias as much as possible

Zara; I was adamant about not liking it but I like the changes and think it will benefit years to come

Emma: yield to morgan: I think this is a cool opportunity and theres never going to be a perfect system and the interns can change it over the summer if we need

Ally: I like whtat owen said about being able to call out outside information and how its not able to come up

James: point of information: will elections still happen after spring break

Emery: yes

Elsie: I think these chang3es will come as close as possible to eliminationg bias and make for a better cabinet. I think though that the cabinet portion is still very importance

Joaquin: I noted in q&a we talked about cabinet influence so I think were focusing on the wrong thing

James: as this is an elected position, this is a job, I cant wrap my mind around the way hiring processes happen, like an interview. They all have face to face interaction and that interaction is important. Im very in the middle about this

Dovic: there aren’t many other jobs where youre not hired by the people that are paying you

Devin: the section that talks about communication skills still addresses their ability to communicate and not how they present

Joaquin: someone in discussion mentioned that the election system is a step of learning how other positions operate, but there is no type of election that doesn’t make you show up? Ithink that this will increase bias and outside information will still happen

Alex: in a normal job thye base their hiring off of who they want representing them

Dovic: I cant imagine a person being up there and not being a part of bias

Devin: this addresses that because were not supposed to vote on that

Ally: we all have bias even if we cant see it

James: how do we then prevent not trying to find out who candidate a,b,c are

Dovic: I don’t think you can stop people from thinking about who they are, this still forces you to think about merits

James: people wont focus on the written answers, even if its not on purpose there will be thinking ab9out who the candidates are

Devin: motion for 30 more minutes

Joquain: second

Devin: yield

Dovic: people still have to see the answers to match them to a person so we cnat fix that

Devin; if someone wants to investigate who the candidates they can but it is outside information they cant use anywats

James: good point, but it doesn’t remove bias like it should because outside information is already not allowed

Rafael: I wasn’t here last week so sorry about that, but ive read it over, I thknk that what james is saying if we have to bring up the fact that people are trying to find who the candidates are means it will happen. That means this legislation doesn’t accomplish whtat it intends to. We need to think about the merits of having a q&a

Jonas: I want to remind everyone that elections now cannot take presentation skills, so what does the old way of doing it not have that this one does

Harper: we couldn’t find the “no voting on presentation” rule

Riley: yield to Jack: this is supposed to resolve bias but does this procedure do that

Alex: when the answers are written you can say what you did but if you can explain out loud what and how you did the job its more beneficial

Dovic: although its not in the constitution we should still not vote on that and when we look at net bias any change is positive

Elsie: yield

Emery: speakers list is open

Ally: not judging on presentations is in Roberts rules, bias is always going to happen and its easy to get around anonymity. But that’s not all that does, its also to vet candidates better

James: yield

Zara: it cant get rid of all bias but it will hwlp keep us accountable, how the presentors talked about people with a different first language.

James: yield

Jonas: I think I found it. Outside information constitutes how they hold themselves.

Joquain: motion to caucus for three minutes

Sheron: second

Zara: ya if you tried to you could probably find out who people are but recognize that that is wrong so you should thik about your motives

Logan: I agree, if you want to figure out you can but you need to realize that this is trying to do better

Harper: retroactive point of order

Elsie: seeing a person is inevitanble going to create bias, this only gives you the space to judge answers

Owen: this bill is about keeping outside information out and focusing on the responses. This includes questions on the bylaws and the answers to the questions are right there so its much easier to point of order

Joquain: this legislation only reduces outside information and presentation skills, we will know who the candidate is

Devin: attempting this new form is beneficial and trying it is worth it. It eliminates more than it would add.

James: with the questions laid out by bylaws, I see the benefit of that but I think that people would see what they need to say to get the job, instead of looking into the position on their own and learning what they need to and the normal presentation style is better for finding people who are passionate.  
Devin: I agree and that’s a big drawback but they have the open space section to do what they want with.

Dovic: I agree, but they could also not take the initiative and be bad for the position

Elsie: a person can write about their public speaking skills still in the open forum, if they really think it matters

James: doesn’t the questionnaire motivate the people that wouldn’t know what is asked of them in the position

Zara; I didn’t like the packet idea at first because it felt like more time. Having the packet would force you to go through the actual requirements of the job.

Ally: if you see bylaws in a presentation that’s good because you know they researched

Devin: do we always ask the same questions to each candidate, even if we are supposed to.

Joquin: the follow up questions take up time during the election, if they have the questions when you go out in the hall?

Dovic: while it is a good skill to answer questions on the spot, I like hard thought out anwaers

James: wouldn’t it be more beneficial if the candidate could elaborate on their own

Zara: people would to that this year because we thought about it but theres a good chance people may not do that in the future

Dovic: we all agree elections are bad now and it seems to be a good idea to at least try and fix it

James: both forms aren’t perfect but I don’t think we should change it if we’re not all the way certain now. We cannot end all bias. Without having a complete system the elections wont run well

Zara: theres a reason we can still amend it and if it passes it if it doesn’t work well

Devin: in addition experimentation is good so that we can feel out a good possible solution

Dovic: I believe that even if someone started it that they have the best ideas and we need to at least try to fix what we can

Devin: motion to previous question

Madi: dissent so we can do closed ballot vote

Emma: second

James: dissent

Devin: this could definitely be a sensitive topic and just to make sure we are having the most confident vote

Moving in to previous question

1. EXISTING BUSINESS
   1. 1930 – PRISM Drag Show: Game Over
      1. Zarah: Edwards thinks this a good event and shows we are welcoming while bringing people together.
      2. Joaquin: Braiden thinks this is a great bill for our residents; we cannot wait for this event!
      3. Alex: LV thinks this resonates with the values of CSU.
      4. Ally: Move to end discussion.
      5. Owen: Do not accept that motion.
      6. Anna: AV is in full support of this bill and how inclusive the drag show is.
      7. Sharon: Ingersoll thinks this is a good event.
      8. Zarah: PQ; Ally seconds
      9. Vote: 21-0-1
   2. 1931 – 2020-2021 Newsom Hall Pride T-shirts
      1. Julia: Ingersoll believes current hall council should not spend money on next years students.
      2. Devin: Summit believes that while the shirts are being distributed in the fall, it could not happen if it is not funded now.
      3. Logan: Good event for a hall that does not get a lot of pride these days.
      4. James: LV thinks it is good if it is set up for current residents.
      5. Joaquin: Move to caucus for three minutes; Ally seconds.
      6. Zarah: Edwards still feels this is helpful for early community building. This can build pride in Newsom.
      7. Devin: Our caucus discussed the social benefits of having a unique t-shirt to identify hall mates.
      8. Julia: Ingersoll still thinks it is not a good idea.
      9. Joaquin: Braiden believes this is a good idea for RLP recruitment.
      10. James: LV thinks this is not the best idea.
      11. Jonas: Lemme lay it out for you. If this was a bill for event that happened in October, that wouldn’t make sense. This happens before anything else. The ARDs and RAs give them out. There is no way around this idea. The same bill passed last year, even though it was five thousand dollars.
      12. Cassidy: During RamWelcome students get a Forever Green T-Shirt. I would like to see Hall Council interact with their residents now.
      13. Harper: It comes down to how this is marketed. As long as they believe the shirts are not for them, it should be great.
      14. Joaquin: Point of Information, did you make change to the design?
      15. Raman: It was changed, the quote is now “The Adventure Begins Here.”
      16. Joaquin: PQ; Zarah seconds.
      17. 7-11-3
2. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Funding Board: we had a bill presented about a snow cone event in Aggie Village, it passed

1. CABINET REPORTS
   1. President
      1. Elections nominations will open next week
   2. Director of Advocacy and Administration
      1. nothing
   3. Director of Finance
      1. nothing
   4. Director of Residential Development
      1. nothing
   5. Director of Residential Events and Programming
      1. nothing
   6. Director of Marketing and Promotions
      1. nothing
   7. National Communications Coordinator
      1. nothing
   8. IACURH RBD Member
      1. RBC happened, come talk to me if you want
   9. NRHH
      1. Member applications open
2. ADVISOR REPORT
   1. NRHH has an event on Friday for free CPR/AED training
3. OPEN FORUM AND GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS
4. RECOGNITION
   1. Rambo
   2. Cam
      1. Given by DREP to
   3. Birthdays
   4. Snaps
5. ROLL CALL
6. ADJOURNMENT