The meeting was called to order by President Joe Mazurek at 7:15 p.m., in the Montana Rooms of the University Center.

Mazurek said that the regular order of business would be dismissed so that the board could discuss the representative system.

Thogersen said that the main reasons for the reconsideration of the representative system were: 1) recommendation of Central Board, and 2) off-campus representatives would be too many (3-9 for one group). Hanson wanted to know what the board was trying to do that is not already in affect. Gorton said that the student government people would be involved no matter where they lived. He said that the representative system passed last spring by Central Board and that this meeting was to decide whether the system should be amended or discussed or done away with. He reminded the board that it was already accepted last spring quarter. STRONG MOVED THAT THE BOARD RESCIND THE CENTRAL BOARD'S VOTE ON ARTICLE V, SECTION IV OF LAST SPRING QUARTER. HANSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. STRONG SAID THAT THE BOARD COULD NOW ADD OR SUBTRACT SO THAT THEY WOULD HAVE SOMETHING TO WORK WITH. There was a discussion of the different ways of representation:
1) class theory 2) representation based on where a person lives; on campus or off.
Mazurek said that the representative system was part of the Briscoe-Gray platform and that it was a good idea with a better cross section of the campus and that the class system was not working at the present time. Cunniff said that the proposed representative system would cause more upper classmen not to run and that the board would consist mostly sophomores. He said that the class system is better for knowing the problems in the class that you would be representing. Hanson said that the proposed representative system would be forcing people in the dorms to run for the positions and that the board would end up to be largely of the freshman class. Hanson said that there are class ties at the University. Strong said that he would propose the following compromise solution: "... THAT THE METHOD OF CHOOSING DELEGATES WOULD BE 1) RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT. 1) FRESHMAN DORMS, 2) FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES, 3) OFF CAMPUS 4) MARRIED STUDENT HOUSING 5) UPPER CLASS DORMS. DORM PEOPLE SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO LIVE IN THE DORM FROM WHICH HE IS RUNNING OR CHOOSE ONE DORM AND RUN IN ONE. FRESHMAN INTERED IN A PARTIAL DISTRICT, WOULD RUN IN ONE AND VOTE IN THE DISTRICT IN WHICH THEY LIVE. Wicks said that the board is trying to come up with an election system which would represent the student body so that they do get things done in their best interests and still feel that student government is representing them. The system has to be workable and it can not be one that the board has to reelect a person every time someone moves out of his district. He said that the system has to be workable and there would be a problem of no experience members of Central Board so then Central Board would have to promote experience.
People would be allowed to vote in any district they want to, and let people who are interested in student government, run it. Strong said that the representative system could be made up of different things: could be based on single member, geographical district on campus, at large by class, at large by major, at large by living group-class, or at large period. McEwen said that there would be chaos in voting in different districts and that voters would be limited to where he lived. Strong asked how a person would be made to vote in the district in which he lived, he said that a group of people would be faced with one set of candidates and that they would vote for those. Wicks said that it would be hard to determine who lives in what district and that a person will probably not live in the same place this spring as he will next year. Gorton asked how this is different from the present system. He said that the only difference would be the outlining of the specific districts, and that the students could vote for anyone regardless of the district that they belonged to. Strong said that the compromise is flexible because it is closer to the students, and that going to the students where they live is the only benefit of the proposed constitution. Present system is minor for getting dynamic
interest in student government. Wicks said that the students have the power to impeach a representative if he is not representing his district well. Hanson questioned if living in one district would have problems different to another district. He said that Central board handles major problems that pertain to the entire student body. Thogersen said that he would like to know the number of people that would make up each district. Gray said that there would be more freshman off campus than on campus makes the representative system based on a student's major not workable. Eastman asked how people would vote in districts. Swanberg said that the administration would put a strip on the ID's. Mortens asked if a person could choose the district from which he wanted to run in. Strong said that the problem lies in the four main objections to the proposed constitution: 1. date of the election, 2. feel residential districts a problem, 3. experience on Central Board, and 4. no interest representation will not solve the lack of interest. McKee said that the district would tend to divide Central board. Hanson said that freshmen are not qualified and that Central board needs experience. Strong asked if there were any plans other than the class system, the representative system or the compromise. Hanson said that the board should not vote just for a change. Hanson moved that Central board accept the proposed constitution as it was written last spring. The motion was seconded by Mcewen. Mortens suggested taking all three proposals to the students and having them decide. Wicks moved to table the motion. The motion was seconded by Strong. The motion was defeated. The original motion was defeated. Thogersen said that the students elect Central board and they should have a say in the policy they are electing by. Wicks stated that a motion is not in order that conflicts with a resolution previously adopted by an assembly at the same session. Mazurek ruled the motion out of order. Strong moved to retain the class system of representation as it is in the constitution under which we are now operating. The motion was seconded by Gorton. Swanberg said that the class system has no tie for the group he said that the board should define the constituency of a delegate so the delegate knows who he is suppose to represent. The motion failed with Strong, Wicks, Bahr, Eastman, Martin, Mcewen, Gray and Mortens opposed and McKee, Webb, Hanson, Cunniff, and Peterson in favor and Thogersen abstaining. Thogersen moved that the board submit the representation system changes to the students and let them decide on what system they want. The motion was seconded by Mortens. The motion failed with Gorton, Thogersen in favor and Hanson abstaining. Eastman moved that representation shall be based upon the number of activity fee paying students as set forth in ___________ of the bylaws. Representation shall be further apportioned among the following districts: (1) dormitories, other than those designated as freshman dorms, (2) freshman dorms, (3) married student housing, (4) fraternity and sorority housing, (5) off campus housing. Representation shall be elected from districts (1), (3), (4) and (5) in the spring election as provided in the bylaws. Representatives shall be elected from district (2) in the fall as provided for in the bylaws. The total number of representatives will be specified in the bylaws. The number will be apportioned among the several districts according to the number of fee paying students in each district at the close of registration during the winter quarter prior to each election. The motion was seconded by Wicks.
Gorton moved to amend the motion that students live and vote within the area in which he is elected. The amendment was seconded by Mertens. Strong moved to amend the motion by substitution to read: Delegates may stand for an election in any district; voters must vote in the district in which they reside, except that voters in District 2 may vote in any other district of their choice in the spring election. The substitute motion was seconded by Wicks. All the motions were defeated. Mazurek questioned why all the motions were defeated. Strong moved that in the new constitution, the class representative system be included. The motion was seconded by Hanson. Gorton moved to amend the motion to read that there be three at-large delegates; two of which would be off campus delegates that do not live in a Greek house, or don't live in dorms and one on campus delegate to be elected in the fall. The amendment was seconded by Bahr. The amendment failed with Webb, Strong, Hicks, Eastman, Mertens and Thogersen opposed and Hanson, Cuniff, Bahr, Gorton and Martin in favor and McKee, Peterson, McEwen, and Gray abstaining. The motion passed with Wicks, Bahr, Eastman, McEwen, Gray opposed and Hanson, Cuniff, Gorton, Martin, Webb, Strong, Mertens, McKee, and Peterson in favor with Thogersen abstaining. Mazurek said that the old system of class representation will be reinstated (Article V, section 4).

Bahr moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Gorton. The motion passed unanimously.

Mazurek reminded the board that the new budget procedure and the judicial system will be discussed at the next meeting.

Attendance: Mazurek, Thogersen, Mertens, Hanson, Cuniff, Bahr, Gorton, Martin, Webb, Strong, Wicks, Eastman, McKee, Peterson, McEwen, and Gray.

Respectfully submitted

Rayne Schaffer
ASUM Secretary