Call to Order: 6:30 pm

Pledge of Allegiance: Batchelder

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Batchelder, Blake-Hedges, Burns, Forsman, Hirsch, Lehn, O’Neill, Scriven, Solano, Sorribes, Stewart, Swanson, Uttermark, Zhang

REPRESENTATIVES LEFT EARLY, EXCUSED: Hirsch

REPRESENTATIVES LEFT EARLY, UNEXCUSED: NONE

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT, EXCUSED: Hernandez, Oloye

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT, UNEXCUSED: Polischuk

REPRESENTATIVE LATE, EXCUSED: NONE

REPRESENTATIVE LATE, UNEXCUSED: NONE

Reading and Approval of Minutes: Approved. Uttermark 2nd.

Petitions into the Assembly: NONE

Special Introductions and Student Comments: NONE

Messages from Student Government: NONE

Funding Requests: NONE

Unfinished Business: NONE

New Business:

- Resolution 3 Sponsored by Vice Chair Burns and the Student Advocacy Committee: Opposition to Legislation that Forces Unions to Recertify if Total Dues-Paying Membership Falls Below 50% of Eligible Workers

  Vice Chair Burns explains that the legislation has attempted to recertify unions at universities if the graduate assistant’s participation is less than 50%. Vice Chair Burns further explains the benefits of the union bargaining on behalf of the assistants for wage increases, health care insurance and broad options. Burns notes the possible consequences of not having a union bargaining on behalf of graduate assistants. The resolution is intended to inform the legislation that graduate students are aware of the issue and do not want the union for graduate assistants to decertify. Representatives inquire about the recertification process, and the cost of membership. FIRST PRO: O’Neill understands the importance of being affiliated with the
graduate student voice and supports the resolution. Deputy Speaker Lehn believes that the resolution’s message is valuable to the university and graduate student body. Stewart notes the importance of the graduate student’s voice and would like to see the resolution passed. **FIRST CON:** O’Neill would like to change the title of the resolution. Representatives recess to make amendments. Motion to amend to change title. Submitted in writing. Motion passed. Motion to amend submitted in writing. Motion passed. Motion to amend (Batchelder) submitted in writing. Motion Passed. Return to the resolution with amendments. Motion to call to question. **2nd.** Resolution passed 12-0-0-0.

- **Authorization for OB/GYN Interest Group to Use funds for Travel Reimbursement**
  The organization is requesting to use funds that were allocated by the Medical School Council after the travel concluded. On a conference call with the RSO’s president who was attending a conference, the representative explains the events that led to the organization to COGS to request to spend funds previously allocated. Representatives inquire what was supposed to be covered by the $600 allocation, if the officers are financially certified, the reason for not being aware of the financial policies, who are the other officers of the RSO and were any of the officers present at the MSC meetings designed to help with the funding process. Representatives also inquire how the organization plans to move forward in the coming year as it relates to the funding process. Representatives share their thoughts in favor and against funding the organization. **FIRST PRO:** Representatives state that they are not comfortable leaving 3 students without funds although the organization’s officers did not follow the process to be reimbursed. Representatives also share that they would rather work with RSOs then condemn and that it is an unfortunate situation and should focus on the individuals. **FIRST CON:** Other representatives state the since the RSO was allocated the funds, RSO is responsible for the funds and there should be a conversation between the organization and MSC not between COGs and the RSO. Representatives also state that there are no repercussions to uphold if allowed to receive funds after not following the rules and accountability should be held by the President and Treasurer. Lastly, representatives note that they should think about the consequences of allowing one RSO to be approved which may allow other RSOs to feel as if they can make the same errors and be approved through COGS. Vote to approve or deny the organization from using funding without prior approval. **Vote by hand raise 3-9-0. Authorization denied.**

**Round Table:** Batchelder, Blake-Hedges, Burns, Forsman, Lehn, O’Neill, Scriven, Solano, Sorribes, Stewart, Swanson, Uttermark, Zhang

**Adjournment:** 8:19pm

**Next Meeting:** June 4th, 2018