



**UNDERGRADUATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
MINUTES**

Tuesday, January 26, 2021

[\[Meeting recording\]](#)

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **SGA Mission Statement**
- III. **Open Forum**
- IV. **Presentations**
 - a. “SGA Partnership with GTSC” - **Gabrielle Lonsberry (she/her)** with an introduction by **Tolga Ustuner (he/him)** [\[deck\]](#)
 - b. COB Restructuring - **Joyce Karanouh-Schuler (she/her)** [\[deck\]](#)
- V. **Officer Reports**
 - **Report of the Vice President of Student Life**, Mykala Sinclair *(she/her)*
 - **Report of the Vice President of External Affairs**, Samuel Ellis *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Vice President of Internal Affairs**, Alton Stovall *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Vice President of Communications**, Grace Swift *(she/her)*
 - **Report of the Vice President of Campus Services**, Emmett Miskell *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Vice President of Academic Affairs**, Jackson Caruso *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Joint Vice President of Information Technology**, Cy Heffley *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Joint Vice President of Campus Organizations**, Joyce Karanouh-Schuler *(she/her)*
 - **Report of the Joint Vice President of Finance**, Josh Eastwood *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Chief of Staff**, Caleb Torres *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Executive Vice President**, Kyle Smith *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the President**, Brielle Lonsberry *(she/her)*
 - **Report of the Advisor**, Dean John Stein *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Secretary**, Angad “AJ” Joshi *(they/them)*
 - **Report of the Membership Chair**, Suvan Paturi *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Treasurer**, Mason Favro *(he/him)*
 - **Report of the Speaker**, Tolga Ustuner *(he/him)*
- VI. **Roll Call**

<https://forms.gle/N6RNRJYUduuGSKOD8>
- VII. **Fast Track**
- VIII. **Old Business**
 - a. [Bill 21J092](#) Enactment of the Joint Governance Policy - **Author: Gabrielle Lonsberry**
 - i. **President:** I yield to JVP of Finance.

- ii. **JVPF:** This was presented last semester with some sort of caveats about it. It's meant to replace an outdated joint bill of policy that doesn't reflect how joint resolutions occur. That's only one part of the document but takes up most of the document. A more tangible aspect is the joint standing committees (including Board of Campus Organizations, IT board, JSVAC, and Joint Sustainability Committee.) Some of these aren't in the bill as there was a mass removal from the graduate bylaws. In order to stay in compliance, they were removed from the joint governance policy. There are amendments to add them back into joint governance after GSS confirms their existence. As Sen. Walker mentioned, senate Chief of Staff Mark Muehlberg stated that when the graduate senate removed joint boards in response to RSO policy they had originally created a committee in the spring to go through governing documents over the summer. When the RSO policy occurred, Mark moved some things around to remove the enactment ratio from the bylaws. GSS usually sees bills in new business and votes on the bill in the following week. This is still being understood as it relates to the bylaws regarding the enactment ratio. There is a strong correlation that the enactment ratio, while removed, doesn't necessarily violate bylaws but requires a bolstering of majority support. I recommend to table this a week to gain understanding of the enactment ratio. This will remedy the issue of extending the executive order surrounding JFC. Once this is passed, then we will move forward with adjusting other governing documents, like the bylaws, to accept this in perpetuity.
- iii. **Rep So:** Does the total number of graduate students include online master students?
- iv. **JVPF:** Yes.
- v. **Rep So:** What is the reasoning behind this? Online master students usually have less of an involvement in the university and are less affected by policy. It seems that counting them would cause a disproportionality in representation.
- vi. **JVPF:** The original enactment ratio was based on the Student Activity Fee. The legislative body no longer reviews financial obligations, but the enactment ratio no longer reflected the actions being taken within the legislative body. The representation therefore wasn't in line with governance as the GSS. On a more personal basis, while policies of the university may not reflect that they are identical students, I believe SGA as an all-inclusive organization should be representing students regardless of location. The basis of including all students was moving away from students who paid the Student Activity Fee (SAF) and it opens up more representative seats in the House and the Senate.
- vii. **Sen. Walker [report per GSS]:** Just as Josh (JVPF) was saying, GSS just got a preliminary introduction to this. Any more substantial discussion and a vote is going to happen at a later date. When this bill was presented earlier today, a member of our executive (Mark Muehlberg, Chief of Staff) noted there might be potential conflict between bylaws and the passage of this bill. There are essentially two conflicts to be covered: the first is that the previous framework for enactment ratio was based more on SAF allocation and financial bills. Since undergrads paid the majority of the SAF, if the senate and the house disagreed, the house had the ability to overrule the senate. However, the GSS bylaws and constitution still reference the enactment ratio. The suggestion from Mark was to revise the bylaws and constitution to remove the enactment ratio. Constitutional amendments take a while. The second conflict related to the joint standing committee appointment. Essentially, the proposed policy says that we can establish or dissolve a chair appointment based on ratio vote as defined by that document. However the senate constitution says it has to be approved by both houses, so the recommendation by Mark was to amend the constitution first. There was just some question if the same conflicts extended to the UHR bylaws and constitution but that is up to the discretion of the house. Next week we will be having the discussion of whether to modify the constitution and bylaws before voting on the bill.

- viii. **Rep Rege [report per RULES]:** In the third line of the supplementary amendments section, there is a grammatical error (“underraduate” should read as “undergraduate.”) In the policy document, an extra “and” was removed. There was discussion if other committees besides JFC needed to be added. Committee members felt that a vote on this should be tabled a week as GSS has done.
 - ix. **Speaker:** Moving into discussion.
 - x. **Rep Shirk:** This is a huge piece of legislation, I probably spent 10 hours looking at it and I’m going to re-read it to make sure I understand it. The main problem was that we were trying to reconcile the undergraduate and graduate bylaws and constitution, but the Joint Policy Committee did a great time of fixing that. I yield the rest of my time to Josh Eastwood (JVPF).
 - xi. **JVPF:** I want to provide some clarification- this was a large undertaking which is why it took so long to bring it to the floor. We’re trying to bring together two docs that have diverged drastically. One of the things that I hope comes forward in this discussion is what UHR is looking for in enactment ratio. One of the simplest solution is to remove the enactment ratio and default to majority. This can be applied in most cases besides the joint standing committees chairs and the establishment of joint standing committees- entirely because of the undergraduate constitution. If that is the direction UHR would like to go, I have already prepared a nearly identical joint governance document that only differs in the enactment ratio portion and even attempts to address joint standing committees by requiring a majority approval in both bodys but staying in compliance with undergrgraduate constitution. The option is on the table. JPRC has looked over this for a while, it is now up to UHR to decide how legislative approval works between enactment ratio and majority approval.
 - xii. **Rep Kandarpa:** I have a question for JVPF. In the graduate bylaws there’s a list of joint governing boards, does that need to be in the joint governance policy?
 - xiii. **JVPF:** There are several boards and committees that don’t exist in graduate governance documents, some JPRC senators wanted to make sure that there was discussion within GSS surrounding the origin or influence of graduate representation in those bodies.
 - xiv. **Rep Alexander:** I just wanted to ask Josh to confirm if we’re trying to remove the enactment policy.
 - xv. **JVPF:** I can’t answer that, it’s based on the body’s decision to move away from enactment ratios or to move towards majority vote.
 - xvi. **Rep Shirk:** Make sure you read this, make sure it doesn’t affect some part of SGA in some unanticipated way. With that, I motion to table for 1 week
 - xvii. **TABLED FOR 1 WEEK**
- b. **[Bill 21U019](#) Spring 2021 Elections Committee Members - Author: Mihir Kandarpa**
- i. **Rep Kandarpa:** I yield to Jack Crawford (JC), the elections committee chair.
 - ii. **JC:** In accordance with article 3 of the bylaws, these following individuals have been selected to be voting members. There was an application process in the fall. In the nature of trying to get a variety of voices to ensure impartiality, I approved candidates that seemed qualified and competent. Then, there are 3 or 4 justices that were nominated to sit on this committee by the Chief Justice.
 - iii. **Rep Rege [report per RULES]:** Kirby Criswell’s last name begins with a C.
 - iv. **Rep Shirk:** What’s the greek/non-greek split of this group?
 - v. **JC:** I do not know, that’s not something that we have not looked at historically. That’s something that I could pass on to future elections chairs.
 - vi. **Rep Joshi:** What are the roles and responsibilities of the elections committee.
 - vii. **JC:** It’s pretty narrow in scope, officially this body reviews and suggests changes to election code in the fall. Functionally, the committee sits to hear and decide any violation of election code by campaign teams or by candidates specifically. It sets up the application process for candidacy and creates the election schedule.

- viii. **Rep O'Neal:** What steps did you take to ensure a diverse board that was best representative of SGA and the general campus?
 - ix. **JC:** In the selection process it was difficult to gain attention. In terms of marketing, it was posted on SGA social media, and shared with as many organizations as possible. Previous election committee members were also consulted on the reach of marketing. There are 9 people, 4 were appointed from UJC because there were only 6 applicants for the committee in total.
 - x. **Rep Shirk:** Just from a quick glance of the bylaws- are any of these members from UHR or from House Leadership?
 - xi. **JC:** To my knowledge, no.
 - xii. **Speaker:** Move into discussion
 - xiii. **Rep Joshi:** Motion to adopt changes per RULES. [Passes.]
 - xiv. **Rep Shirk:** My earlier question was based on an incorrect version of the bylaws. Of the names I recognize on here I see some great people and I know that the elections committee is tasked with some hard tasks.
 - xv. **Rep O'Neal:** The people I see on here will do a great job., hats off to the committee for assembling this board.
 - xvi. **Rep Kandarpa:** I move to adopt per unanimous consent.
 - xvii. **MOTION ADOPTED PER UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**
- c. **Bill 21U020** Spring 2021 Elections Schedule - **Author: Mihir Kandarpa**
- i. **Rep Kandarpa:** I yield to Jack Crawford (JC), the elections committee chair.
 - ii. **JC:** This schedule is pretty typical, almost the same dates as last year's schedule. There's no spring break this year, which we don't have to factor in to this schedule.
 - iii. **Rep Rege [report per RULES]:** No changes to recommend
 - iv. **Speaker:** Moving into discussion.
 - v. **Rep Shirk:** If we did ranked choice voting or instant runoff we wouldn't have to have runoff.
 - vi. **Rep Rege:** I thought we had implemented ranked choice last year and had the runoff election schedule just in case.
 - vii. **Rep Kandarpa:** I move to adopt per unanimous consent.
 - viii. **MOTION ADOPTED PER UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**
- d. **Bill 21U018** Creation of the Well-being Investigative committee - **Author: Mihir Kandarpa**
- i. **Rep Kandarpa:** To preface this, I've been talking with members of House Leadership, executive cabinet, and other members of SGA on restructuring on how to make real advocacy for the student body. An idea came up to come up with congressional select committees that focus on specific advocacy areas. We wanted to test them out this semester. We want to look into issues that are not being addressed well enough. They would essentially function as ad hoc committees to look into and would exclusively consist of UHR members. The hope and expective is that members would work with Executive branch counterparts to foster the collaboration between branches to focus on issues that really matter. The Well-being Investigative Committee mentioned in this bill would have to work with the VP of Student Life, the Health and Well-being Chair, the chair of JSVAC, and the chair of CDAC. This specific committee came about through discussion that was concerned that issues were falling through the cracks. I also think we should table this bill for a week so I can continue to work on this bill and have continued discussion with Executive branch leaders mentioned.
 - ii. **Rep Rege [report per RULES]:** In the charter of the committee, specify that advisory members don't have voting rights. Rules also recommended that this bill be tabled for a week.
 - iii. **Rep O'Neal:** How would this committee work and not conflict with the executive Health and Well-being committee?
 - iv. **Rep Kandarpa:** I'm hoping that the investigative committee would focus on talking to specific student groups. The executive committee hasn't been able to do that- besides

round-table discussions. There would be coordination, however, between the investigative and executive committee as well as the Mental Health Network (MHN) and all other advocacy groups to ensure we're not talking to the same groups. In the extra week I'll focus on the finer details so there's no duplication of responsibilities.

- v. **Rep O'Neal:** Could you go more into detail of what you do as chair of Health and Well-being so people have more perspective?
 - vi. **Rep Kandarpa:** I speak to leaders concerned with health and wellbeing, primarily MHN which includes Mental Health Coalition and Healthy Jackets. Charlie Wood heads that committee and also chair of the Mental Health joint allocations committee. We have discussions every few weeks on how we can support our organizations. I work alongside my public health lead with the Student Health Committee to focus on campus and public health issues, especially with COVID but including pandemic fatigue and screen fatigue. Another function of the committee is to partner with other committees- we've raised over 600 dollars to donate directly to a homeless shelter.
 - vii. **Speaker:** Moving into discussion.
 - viii. **Rep Joshi:** I think this idea of having special committees is very interesting to pilot. I think that executive committees only have so much power, but legislative committees have the potential to translate the work done in those committees into legislation.
 - ix. **President:** I'm in full support of anything mental health related. Looking through the charter, the JED committee has been working on some of this stuff. I say that just so the committee doesn't redo work that hasn't been done. Also, JAC hears a lot about mental health, having a liaison between the two would be helpful. My last point, Mihir as you were talking about there was a lot of groups, having this committee focus on SGA's next steps to give a target to move towards and to leverage the network of groups already working on this.
 - x. **Rep O'Neal:** I fully agree with the previously stated. SGA tends to go for initiatives that people are already working on. This organization would be well suited targeted towards SGA. A lot of students who experience mental health concerns aren't as involved in leadership. If this stays fully UHR, we need to be cognizant of outreach to the student body.
 - xi. **Rep Joshi:** I move to table this bill for a week
 - xii. **TABLED FOR 1 WEEK.**
- e. **[Bill 21U021](#)** Appointment of an Undergraduate JFC Member [Divyesh Gutta] - **Author: Gabrielle Lonsberry**
- i. **President:** I yield to JVPF.
 - ii. **JVPF:** This is essentially the last undergrad appointment to be made to JFC for this fiscal year unless someone steps down. We were doing okay with our subject matter experts, but as budget season starts, the work has started ramping up. Divyesh has previously served as JVPF.
 - iii. **Speaker:** Moving into discussion.
 - iv. **Rep Goel:** I just wanted to add that Divyesh would be a great addition to JFC.
 - v. **Rep Joshi:** I'll echo the sentiments of the previously stated, Divyesh was a great JVPF last year.
 - vi. **Rep So:** Move to adopt per unanimous consent.
 - vii. **MOTION IS ADOPTED PER UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**
- f. **[Bill 21U022](#)** USGA Constitutional Amendment to the Amendment Process - **Author: Mihir Kandarpa**
- i. **Rep Kandarpa:** This would mirror our amendment process to the graduate amendment process. Currently, amendments are brought out by a vote of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the body or by 10% petition of the student body. Then amendments are voted on by $\frac{2}{3}$ majority of the student body. The proposal I'm recommending creates two paths to ratifying an amendment, one where the student body votes in a $\frac{2}{3}$ student body or by a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote in UHR. There should be a significant amount of time between voting and ratifying. Based on conversations with the president, there should be clarification on when to use each path. When it's a major change should go through

the student body. The undergraduate student body should be well engaged in the amendment, we should have townhalls and ensure UHR members advertise office hours to allow students to give feedback and gain information on what amendments are. Changes to the constitution should be in the best interest of the association. The changes shouldn't be excessive, as the constitution should be above the bylaws.

- ii. **Rep Rege [report per RULES]:** There was discussion to change the timeline to mirror the general elections timeline to increase voter turnout. There was also a suggestion to add language to the amendment that time be given to constituents to discuss amendments with their representatives. There was discussion on adding language about which ratification process to use, but it was decided that this would best be given to UHR representatives and not put in the constitution.
- iii. **Speaker:** Moving into discussion
- iv. **Rep Shirk:** I like to coordinate the election date to match the general election timeline.
- v. **President:** I definitely want to emphasize that this change would be a fundamental change to the constitution. This wouldn't just affect this semester but as far as 100 years out. I definitely agree to add this to the election cycle because turn out is already hard to get up and additionally we do not make students feel like we're sneaking in a major change. It would also be prudent to come up with a marketing plan to get feedback and allow students space to come and talk about it. I know there is a lot of good to this, but am cautious because this is a big change to the constitution. There should be a lot of discussion on this bill.
- vi. **Rep O'Neal:** I agree with all of the previously stated. A lot of constitutional amendments that were proposed last spring did not move forward. I think it's difficult to make amendments for a reason, but I am comforted by the numbers required. Students used to be required to read the technique every week and amendments would be posted there. It's hard to mimic making those announcements. I like the idea of having a town hall, and I think it would be a good idea to have a town hall before passing this bill as well.
- vii. **Rep Paturi:** I echo the sentiments of the previously stated. There might be concerned that this might be a drastic change but I think it's needed. We don't want to be rigid or archaic, and calling an entire referendum seems excessive. A change like this is long overdue.
- viii. **Rep Shirk:** It's the same rule the Graduate senate has. I'm going to move to make the dates in this bill to match the Spring Election Cycle. [Motion passed.]
- ix. **Rep Kandarpa:** We should make clear guidance on which method to take between the two to make it clear.
- x. **Rep O'Neal:** And, of course, we still want to post these changes to the technique.
- xi. **President:** I think we still have to notify these changes to the student body, so that they have a chance to engage (which is a good thing.)
- xii. **Rep Kandarpa:** I move to table this bill a week
- xiii. **MOTION TABLED BY A WEEK**

IX. New Business

X. Special Topics

XI. Announcements

XII. Presidential Review

XIII. Adjournment