<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to Order</td>
<td>• Welcome</td>
<td>Daniel Qian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Elections Cycle Appeal</td>
<td>• Present appeal</td>
<td>Eli Schechner</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Answer any questions from the Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Session</td>
<td>• Executive Session</td>
<td>Daniel Qian</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Report</td>
<td>• Go over President’s Report</td>
<td>Myesha Jemison</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Code Reform Concern</td>
<td>• Presentation</td>
<td>Louis Tambellini</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Answer any questions from the Senate and take feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Committee Budget Request</td>
<td>• Present internal funding request</td>
<td>Lavinia Liang</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Answer any questions from the Senate and take feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRV Mockup Presentation</td>
<td>• Presentation</td>
<td>Jonah Hyman</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Answer any questions from the Senate and take feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Leader: Senator Eli Schechner ‘18
Project Team Members: U-Councilor Ethan Marcus ‘18, Vice President Daniel Qian ’19, Treasurer Alison Shim ‘19
Date: December 6, 2017

Appeal

I. Appeal Process
- §10 Appeals (Referenda and Candidates) of the USG Elections Handbook for Princeton Undergraduate Elections establishes the process for appealing a decision of the Elections Manager(s).
- Pursuant with §10.2 Sponsors for Appeal, this appeal is sponsored by:
  - Senator Eli Schechner ‘18
  - U-Councilor Ethan Marcus ‘18
  - Vice President Daniel Qian ‘19
  - Treasurer Alison Shim ‘19
- This document shall constitute “intent to appeal” as required by §10.2 of the USG Elections Handbook.

II. Nature of the Appeal
- Article VI – Amending the Constitution. § A of the Constitution of the Honor System reads:
  A. “The Constitution may be amended in the following ways:
     1. “Upon the initiative of thirteen of the fifteen members of the Committee, followed by a three-fourths vote of the Undergraduate Student Government members present at a meeting of the Undergraduate Student Government; or
     2. “Upon the initiative by petition of 200 members of the undergraduate body, followed by a three-fourths vote in a student referendum as conducted by the Elections Committee of the Undergraduate Student Government. Article VI can be amended only by such a student referendum.”
- §5 Sponsors and Opposition of the USG Referenda Handbook for Princeton Undergraduate Elections reads, in part:
  o “Petitions for referenda must have exactly one official sponsor that shall serve as official representative of the petition and referenda in all cases.
  - “This sponsor may be an individual or an ODUS-recognized student organization, but should accurately represent the effort to bring the referenda to election.”
On November 28, 2017, the undergraduate student body received an official USG email with the text of the four proposed referenda and a form for students to express interest in forming official opposition parties for the referenda, in accordance with §5 Sponsors and Opposition of the USG Referenda Handbook.

These four referenda have been approved as “Sponsored by USG Academics Subcommittee on the Honor System” (bold in original).

The “USG Academics Subcommittee on the Honor System” is neither an “individual” nor an “ODUS-recognized student organization.”

- A search of the ODUS database of recognized student organizations for this Subcommittee returns zero results.
  - Conversation with Dean Dunne on December 3, 2017 confirmed this.
- On November 28, 2017, Senator Eli Schechner ’18 asked Chief Elections Manager Laura Hausman ’20 for clarification. She responded that the USG Academics Subcommittee on the Honor Code is part of the Academics Committee, which is part of USG, which is an ODUS-recognized student organization.
  - If this is the reasoning for permitting sponsorship, then it logically follows that the sponsoring student group must, in fact, be “USG.” (The other acceptable type of sponsor would be an individual, and no individual has claimed sponsorship of any of these referenda).
  - The only logical defense of listing the Subcommittee as the sponsor was its position within a larger ODUS-recognized student group (namely, USG). This does not solve the issue in §5 of the Referenda Handbook (as, following this logic, the sponsor would have to be listed as “USG,” not the Subcommittee). This raises issues of its own.
  - Equating the “USG Academics Subcommittee on the Honor System” with USG generally is concerning for five reasons:
    1. Per §5 Sponsors and Opposition of the Referenda Handbook, the designation of the referendum sponsor “should accurately reflect the effort to bring the referenda to election.”
      - This criterion is not met by these referenda because USG as a whole was not responsible for authoring, initiating, or sponsoring any of the referenda.
    2. To ensure fairness between opposing campaigns and that USG—as the body administering the election—remain neutral, according to §7 Expenses of the Referenda Handbook, “Referendum campaign spending will NOT be reimbursed by USG under any circumstances.”
• An unjust imbalance is created by Treasury-appropriated funds being available to the sponsors alone, eroding USG’s impartiality and legitimacy in this election.

3. The finding of Parliamentarian Jonah Hyman ’20 in Advisory Opinion C-2017 would suggest that broad USG sponsorship of referenda would eliminate the possibility for an appellate system.

4. Listing “USG” as the sponsors of these referenda is further disingenuous because neither the Senate nor any other entity that has the authority to speak for USG as a whole was ever given an opportunity to vote (or even discuss) sponsorship of these referenda.
   • The only opportunity to raise concerns about the referenda existed during the Senate review of referenda wording. However, this phase was conducted online, preventing a debate in an open Senate meeting.
   • This deprives the Senate the chance to consider whether or not to sponsor any of the referenda and denies the ability for University students and community members to participate in public debate about these referenda and the changes they seek to make.

5. Bypassing the rules in order to present these referenda as sponsored internally by USG erodes the impartiality of USG as the body administering the election.
   • To be clear, this is not to say that no USG-sponsored referenda could ever be appropriate.
   • However, given how much the Senate has modified its own elections rules as pertaining to only this cycle (and after the cycle had begun), if it becomes apparent to the student body that these changes were conducted in order to pass four internally-driven (i.e. USG-sponsored) referenda through suspect means, the legitimacy of these USG elections is severely undermined.

- Because of this, we appeal the decision of the Chief Elections Manager to approve the request of the “USG Academics Subcommittee on the Honor System” for sponsorship of each of the four referenda.
President’s Report  
December 10th, 2017

❖ Meetings
➢ Meeting with Dean Dunne
   ■ Elections
   ■ Referenda
➢ Admissions
   ■ Class of 2022 FB Page
   ■ Outreach and information
➢ CPUC Committee on Naming
   ■ currently taking more submissions

❖ Updates
➢ University Committee (undergraduate nominations)
   ■ Woodrow Wilson School Commissioned artwork “Double Consciousness”
   ■ Executive Director for Career Services

❖ Request for Feedback
➢ New feedback mechanism:
   ■ Use the form at this link:
     https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSe10K1QKw8QyoZ-to8yZmzSLz_OYPL7StiwYMxNs8WTMP4MA/viewform?usp=sf_link
Honor Code Reform Concerns

 Completely regardless of the morality behind the Honor Code referenda, there are deeply troubling concerns on how USG manipulated its own rules to create an unfair referenda process, as well as unexpected consequences regarding implementation of the referenda: including lawsuits, faculty strife, and potential elimination of the Honor Committee altogether.

 Concerns on the Creation and Election of the Referenda

 USG actively voted to delay the election calendar, giving the USG subcommittee extra leniency that allowed them to complete their proposals, and more importantly, reduce the time the opposition party can work by 1 week.

 USG subcommittee had closed, unannounced meetings open only to the students Patrick Flanigan chose. I personally emailed Patrick asking to attend a meeting, and he would not allow me to. At a later time, Patrick was asked by Jonah to publish the meeting times, and he responded by saying they're closed. According to the USG constitution, they are all supposed to be open to the public.

 The referenda rules specify that the referenda sponsor must be an individual or an ODUS group, neither of which this subcommittee is.

 The referenda were created by a USG subcommittee created 2 months ago. The USG subcommittee has 8 members, all of which are students individually selected by Patrick Flanigan.

 In creating the referenda, the USG subcommittee had minimal to no dialogue with the faculty, administration, Honor Committee leadership, legal counsel, or CPS. The failure to use these sources has created poorly thought out proposals with potentially devastating consequences.

 I have personally spoken with VP Calhoun and Dean Dunne, and they both agree that these referenda will not necessarily be immediately implemented. Due to the risks they pose, and the lack of consent from the faculty, they could be delayed or outright refused by the faculty. This, at a minimum, could result in great tension because students will get upset if the faculty delays or modifies the implementation. Mere disciplinary probation could result in the administration and faculty reclaiming their power to manage discipline for in-class cheating, taking power away from the students. Remember, this could eventually cause proctors to monitor tests, and a decrease in trust between students, faculty, and alumni.

 Concerns on the Unforeseen Consequences of the Referenda

 Referendum #1 creates circumstances that could enable students to sue and win cases against the university, based on legal precedent. If Referendum #1 passes, and one student is suspended by the Committee on Discipline for cheating on a take-home exam, and another is given disciplinary probation by the Honor Committee for a very similar act of cheating, the
suspended student has grounds to sue the university due to the unequal punishment for near equal offenses. Legal counsel should have been involved to help the USG subcommittee make a reasonable proposal.

The language of Referendum #2 is extremely difficult for the Honor Committee and its liaison, Dean Shueh, to understand and implement. The phrasing, “each of which indicates that a violation occurred” is problematic because it arguably requires the evidence-gatherers to make a pre-hearing judgment on whether the evidence constitutes a violation. Honor Committee leadership had no opportunity to comment on the proposals until they were already on the ballot.

Referendum #3 grants faculty members the unchecked power to acquit a student. This not only allows faculty members to undermine the system of student-to-student accountability, it fundamentally changes the terms of this student-faculty contract without the faculty’s consent. Faculty had no opportunity to comment on the referendum, or consent to it, until it was already on the ballot.

Most troubling, Referendum #4 mandates the Honor Committee to inform a student they contact if they are accused or a witness over the phone on initial contact, rather than at the office when they arrive. Imagine a psychologically at-risk student, alone in her/his room, being informed they are accused of an Honor Code violation. Whereas the offices of the Honor Committee have the capability to carefully connect students with the resources she/he may need, the health and well-being of the student can not be supported during a phone call. If the USG subcommittee had asked CPS for input while writing Referendum #4, this concern could have been addressed.

**Responsible Reform**

The Honor Committee has repeatedly stated it is open to reform and input from all parties on campus. However, these hasty referenda did not involve any cooperation from anyone other than the 8 members of the USG subcommittee itself. Remember, there has been significant reform, such as in 2013 when overtime violation penalties were changed to academic probation. Also, before this semester, there have been no official Honor Committee Task Forces or Review Committees.

A faculty-student task force was recently created (and in fact it had been scheduled to be created in this month since last semester) and it can work hard to create responsible, necessary reform. This task force can use cooperation between students, faculty, administration, CPS, and legal counsel to create informed, consensual proposals. I urge the USG to appeal the decision to put these referenda on the ballot, and fully support the new task-force to create safe, responsible, logical reform.
USG Social Committee – INTERNAL FUNDING REQUEST

Project Leader: Lavinia Liang
Project Members: Social Committee
Date: Sunday December 10, 2017

INTERNAL REQUEST FOR FUNDING

EVENT TITLE:
Dean’s Date Celebration (January 16, 2018)
Location: Dillon Gym

AMOUNT REQUESTED:
$25,000

BACKGROUND & DESCRIPTION:
Dean’s Date this year is being based on the 2013 Dean’s Date operation (a total of $47,043, with a headliner costing $22,500, during which USG contributed $23,500 and AI $10,000) to decrease high-risk drinking and provide a fun and safe alternative for students to celebrate their night.
Dean’s Date this year would consist of two parts:

1. 5 PM – 7 PM: the usual celebration with food featuring student DJs and the classic Princeton University Band, in McCosh Courtyard
2. 10 PM – 1 AM: an up-and-coming pop DJ with giveaway and food items spaced out throughout the night, in Dillon Gym

AS WE MOVE FORWARD, UNUSED USG FUNDS WILL BE RE-OPENED FOR RE-ALLOCATION.
## COSTS BREAKDOWN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artist/Entertainment</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giveaway</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (space, equipm, permits, staff, publicity)</td>
<td>$19,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,275</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FUNDING BREAKDOWN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI (projected)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG (additional)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG (additional, projected)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is an instant-runoff vote ballot. You will be asked to vote for all three candidates in order of preference, from your first choice to your third choice.

Whichever candidate receives a majority of first-choice votes will be elected. If no candidate gets a majority (more than half) of first-choice votes, the candidate with the lowest number of first-choice votes will be excluded from the election. If your first-choice candidate is excluded in this way, your vote will go to your second-choice candidate. Whichever non-excluded candidate gets a majority of votes will be elected.

The selection of your second-choice candidate cannot hurt the chances of your first-choice candidate being elected.

Question 1. In order of preference (from your first choice to your third choice), rank the three candidates for USG President.

(a) First choice: Matt Miller
   Second choice: Ryan Ozminkowski
   Third choice: Rachel Yee

(b) First choice: Matt Miller
   Second choice: Rachel Yee
   Third choice: Ryan Ozminkowski

(c) First choice: Ryan Ozminkowski
   Second choice: Matt Miller
   Third choice: Rachel Yee

(d) First choice: Ryan Ozminkowski
   Second choice: Rachel Yee
   Third choice: Matt Miller

(e) First choice: Rachel Yee
   Second choice: Matt Miller
   Third choice: Ryan Ozminkowski

(f) First choice: Rachel Yee
   Second choice: Ryan Ozminkowski
   Third choice: Matt Miller
USG WINTER 2017 ELECTIONS: SAMPLE INSTANT-RUNOFF VOTE BALLOT RESULTS

Candidate X, Candidate Y, Candidate Z: 74 (7.2%)
Candidate X, Candidate Z, Candidate Y: 245 (23.9%)
Candidate Y, Candidate X, Candidate Z: 202 (19.7%)
Candidate Y, Candidate Z, Candidate X: 122 (11.9%)
Candidate Z, Candidate X, Candidate Y: 276 (27.0%)
Candidate Z, Candidate Y, Candidate X: 104 (10.2%)
Total: 1023 (100%)

First round: Only first-choice votes considered

First-choice votes for Candidate X
  = “X, Y, Z” votes + “X, Z, Y” votes
  = 74 + 245
  = 319 (31.2%)

First-choice votes for Candidate Y
  = “Y, X, Z” votes + “Y, Z, X” votes
  = 202 + 122
  = 324 (31.7%)

First-choice votes for Candidate Z
  = “Z, X, Y” votes + “Z, Y, X” votes
  = 276 + 104
  = 380 (37.1%)

No candidate has won a majority of votes (more than half), so the tabulation proceeds into a second round. Candidate X has the fewest first-choice votes and is therefore excluded from the election.

Second round: Some second-choice votes considered

The ballots now look like this (with the exclusion of Candidate X):
Candidate X, Candidate Y, Candidate Z: 74 (7.2%)
Candidate X, Candidate Z, Candidate Y: 245 (23.9%)
Candidate Y, Candidate X, Candidate Z: 202 (19.7%)
Candidate Y, Candidate Z, Candidate X: 122 (11.9%)
Candidate Z, Candidate X, Candidate Y: 276 (27.0%)
Candidate Z, Candidate Y, Candidate X: 104 (10.2%)
Total: 1023 (100%)

All “X, Y, Z” votes now go to Candidate Y, while all “X, Z, Y” votes go to Candidate Z. All other votes go to the first-choice candidate (either Candidate Y or Candidate Z).

Second-round votes for Candidate Y
  = “Y, X, Z” votes + “Y, Z, X” votes + “X, Y, Z” votes
  = 202 + 122 + 72
  = 396 (38.7%)
Second-round votes for Candidate Z
= “Z, X, Y” votes + “Z, Y, X” votes + “X, Z, Y” votes
= 276 + 104 + 245
= 625 (61.1%)

Candidate Z has now won a majority of votes and is elected.
Advisory Opinion C-2017
December 5, 2017

The following is an advisory opinion. It has no binding force and does not necessarily represent the position of the USG Senate, President, Vice President, or Chief Elections Manager.

The following represents my opinion on whether Section 10 of the Elections Handbook permits voting members of the USG Senate who are also referendum sponsors, opposition parties, or members of groups serving as referendum sponsors or opposition parties (a) to sponsor appeals pertaining to the referendum they are sponsoring or opposing and (b) to be present during the Executive Session in which the Senate hears an appeal pertaining to the referendum they are sponsoring or opposing.

Section 10 of the Elections Handbook states that “Three voting members of the USG Senate must sponsor any appeal...Any candidate affected by the contested decision cannot be among the appeal’s three sponsors.” Similarly, when discussing the procedure for hearing appeals, the Elections Handbook states that “Any USG Senate member who is a candidate for a position whose election is in question may not vote during the appeals process for that position, and must not be present during executive session.”

At first glance, these provisions do not seem to affect referenda sponsors or opposing parties. However, Section 6 of the Referenda Handbook states that “Both the official sponsors and opponents of the referendum, as well as all ODUS-sponsored groups involved in the support or opposition of a referendum, shall comply with all candidate campaign rules as outlined in Section 1-10 of the Elections Handbook and Rights, Rules, Responsibilities” (italics mine). This is a clear statement that referendum sponsors and opponents are to be taken as “candidates” for the purposes of interpreting the Elections Handbook.

The language of “candidates” is used throughout the Elections Handbook, including when describing rules involving campaigning via email, reimbursements, and Penalty Points. If “candidate” were interpreted narrowly, almost none of the Elections Handbook would apply to referenda sponsors and opponents. It is therefore necessary that we interpret the term “candidate” broadly to include referenda sponsors and opponents, and Section 10 is no exception.

It is my opinion that Section 10 of the Elections Handbook does not permit voting members of the USG Senate who are also referendum sponsors, opposition parties, or members of groups serving as referendum sponsors or opposition parties to sponsor appeals pertaining to the referendum they are sponsoring or opposing. In my opinion, Section 10 of the Elections Handbook also does not permit these individuals to be present during the Executive Session in which the Senate hears an appeal pertaining to the referendum they are sponsoring or opposing.

Jonah Hyman—USG Senate Parliamentarian
The following represents my opinion on (1) whether Section 10 of the Elections Handbook allows an “aggrieved party” presenting an elections or referenda appeal before the Senate who is a voting Senate member but not a “candidate for a position whose election is in question” to be present during the Executive Session for that appeal and (2) whether and how the Senate may decline to enter Executive Session during an appeal, or decline to vote on an appeal.

Section 10 of the Elections Handbook allows a “candidate or aggrieved party wishing to...appeal a decision of the Elections Managers” to file an appeal before the USG Senate. Subsection 10.5 explains how the Senate meeting at which this appeal is heard will run:

During the USG Senate meeting, the candidate or aggrieved party may present his or her argument. The Senate shall then, by a 2/3 majority vote, move itself into Executive Session, during which all non-voting persons must leave the room. In Executive Session, the Senate may overturn a ruling of the Elections Managers by a 2/3 majority vote of all members present. Any USG Senate member who is a candidate for a position whose election is in question may not vote during the appeals process for that position, and must not be present during Executive Session.

It is clear that non-voting Senate members and all “non-voting members” must leave the room during the Executive Session. In the case I’m considering, the “aggrieved party” is a voting Senate member and is not excluded by this provision. Moreover, in this case, the “aggrieved party” is not “a candidate for a position whose election is in question” and is not excluded by this provision either. There is therefore no provision in Section 10 that requires the “aggrieved party” presenting an appeal to leave the room during the Executive Session where the appeal is decided.

However, Section 403 (b)(1)(C) of the USG Senate Constitution states that by a 2/3 vote, the Senate may “determine any individual, including a voting Senate member, who must leave if the nature of sensitive business or personnel matters warrants that the individual leave” (italics mine). Section 10 of the Elections Handbook does not state that voting Senate members are required to stay in the room. Therefore, the Senate may also opt to exclude a voting Senate member acting as the “aggrieved party” in an appeal by a 2/3 vote. (Section 10 of the Elections Handbook automatically excludes such a member if he or she is a “candidate for a position whose election is in question.”)

1 In my opinion, when a matter related to a referendum is appealed, this language should be interpreted to include individual referendum sponsors, members of referendum-sponsoring organizations, and members of referendum opposition parties. See Advisory Opinion C-2017 (December 5, 2017).
Section 10.5 of the Elections Handbook states that in an appeal, “The Senate shall..., by a 2/3 majority vote, move itself into Executive Session...” (italics mine). This clause exhibits an obvious contradiction: If the vote does not pass, the Senate cannot move into Executive Session. Because the Elections Handbook is supplementary to the Senate Constitution and does not overrule it (S. Const. § 802(3)), this clause cannot force the Senate to enter Executive Session during an appeal.

However, in order to interpret the clause as close to the plain meaning of the words as possible, it is my opinion that a member of the Senate must at least make a motion to enter Executive Session after the appellant is given the right to present a defense. If the motion fails, the Senate cannot enter Executive Session. If the Senate does not enter Executive Session, it may not overrule the decision of the Elections Managers, because the Handbook clearly states that “In Executive Session, the Senate may overturn a ruling of the Elections Managers...” (italics mine).

Once the Senate has entered Executive Session, it is not required to hold a vote to overturn the decision of the Elections Manger because the language of the operative clause (“the Senate may overturn a ruling of the Elections Managers by a 2/3 majority vote of all members present”) contains the word “may.” It does not require the Senate to hold any vote during Executive Session. It simply gives the Senate the option to do so.

My opinion is that

(1) Section 10 of the Elections Handbook does allow an “aggrieved party” presenting an elections or referenda appeal before the Senate who is a voting Senate member but not a “candidate for a position whose election is in question” to be present during the Executive Session for that appeal. However, Section 10 does not require such an aggrieved party to be present, and the Senate can still opt to exclude that party from Executive Session under S. Const. § 403 (b)(1)(C).

(2) The Senate may not decline to motion to enter Executive Session during an appeal, but the Senate is not required to pass this motion. If the motion fails, the Senate cannot vote to overturn a decision of the Elections Manager. If Executive Session is entered, the Senate is not required to vote to overturn a decision of the Elections Manager.

Jonah Hyman
USG Senate Parliamentarian
Amendment 1

Senate Resolution 9-2017
Senate Constitution Amendment No. 6
Submitted by PATRICK FLANIGAN ‘18, Academics Committee Chair (on behalf of the USG Senate)

Resolution
Amending the Senate Constitution to allow for the use of Instant Runoff Voting in the 2017 Winter Elections.

Summary
Currently, the USG Constitution stipulates that the Winter Elections must conclude by the beginning of the winter recess. Given the current elections timeline, it would be impossible for a runoff to occur in the time remaining before winter recess while also following the rules set out in the elections handbook and the Constitution.

This amendment would allow the Elections Manager to implement a system of Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) to be used for the 2017 Winter Elections in order to follow the Constitution’s prohibition on elections being held after the winter recess. It would only apply to the 2017 Winter Elections.

Digest

• Section 1: This amendment lays out a specific case for the 2017 Presidential election. It requires the Elections Manager to use IRV and students to rank their choices 1-3. If a candidate wins a majority of first choice votes with all three candidates in the race, then they win outright. If not, then the third place candidate is eliminated and the voters for whom they were first choice have their votes reassigned to their second choice. The candidate with a majority of votes then wins.

Resolved by the Senate of the Undergraduate Student Government (two-thirds of the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. Article VIII, Section 804 of the Senate Constitution is amended to read as follows:

§ 804. Voting; Runoffs

(a) IN GENERAL.—
(1) EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND CLASS OFFICER.—

EXPLANATION—Matter in bolded italics is new; matter with strikethrough is material to be omitted.
The following paragraph does not apply to the Winter 2017 election cycle.

(A) EACH UNDERGRADUATE HAS ONE VOTE.—For the election of an Executive Officer or a Class Officer, each eligible undergraduate may cast 1 vote per office.

(B) ELECTION.—Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (C), the candidate for an Executive Officer office or a Class Government office who obtains a majority of votes cast shall be elected.

(C) FRESHMAN CLASS GOVERNMENT.—The 5 candidates for Freshman Class Government who obtain the most approval votes cast shall be elected.

(2) SENATOR, U-COUNCILOR, AND FRESHMAN CLASS GOVERNMENT.

(A) APPROVAL VOTING.—The election for a Senator, a U-Councilor, and the Freshman Class Government shall be by approval voting.

(B) ELECTION OF SENATOR.—The 2 candidates for Senator who obtain the most approval votes cast shall be elected.

(C) ELECTION OF U-COUNCILOR.—The 10 candidates for U-Councilor who obtain the most approval votes cast shall be elected.

(3) ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE.

(A) EXECUTIVE OFFICER; U-COUNCILOR.—Each undergraduate may vote in the election of an Executive Officer or a U-Councilor.

(B) SENATOR; CLASS OFFICER.—Each undergraduate in the corresponding class may vote in the election of a Senator or a Class Officer.

(4) EXECUTIVE OFFICER—WINTER 2017 EXCEPTION: The following paragraph applies only to the Winter 2017 elections cycle.

(A) INSTANT RUNOFF VOTING.—The election for an Executive Officer shall be by instant runoff voting.

(B) TABULATION—FIRST ROUND.—

(i) If a candidate for an Executive Officer office obtains a majority of first-choice votes cast, that candidate shall be elected.

(ii) If no candidate for an Executive Officer office obtains a majority of first-choice votes cast and one candidate receives the least number of first-choice votes cast, that candidate will be eliminated from the election.

(iii) If no candidate for an Executive Officer office obtains a majority of first-choice votes cast and more than one candidate receives the least number of first-choice votes cast, whichever of the tied candidates was ranked lower than the
other on the majority of ballots will be eliminated from the election.

(iv) If no candidate is elected after the conclusion of this process, the tabulation proceeds into a subsequent round.

(C) TABULATION—SUBSEQUENT ROUNDS.—

(i) For the purposes of this subparagraph, a “modified first-choice vote” is defined as “the highest-ranked vote given to a non-eliminated candidate in a given round.”

(ii) If a candidate for an Executive Officer office obtains a majority of modified first-choice votes, that candidate shall be elected.

(iii) If no candidate for an Executive Officer office obtains a majority of modified first-choice votes and one candidate receives the least number of modified first-choice votes, that candidate will be eliminated from the election.

(iv) If no candidate for an Executive Officer office obtains a majority of modified first-choice votes cast and more than one candidate receives the least number of modified first-choice votes cast, whichever of the tied candidates was ranked lower than the other on the majority of ballots will be eliminated from the election.

(v) If no candidate is elected after the conclusion of this process, the tabulation proceeds into a subsequent round.

(vi) The tabulation process ends once a candidate has been elected.

(b) RUNOFFS.—

(1) EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND CLASS OFFICER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), if no candidate for an Executive Officer office or a Class Government office obtains a majority of votes cast, the 2 candidates who obtained the most votes cast shall enter a runoff election.

(B) TIED CANDIDATES IF NO CANDIDATE OBTAINS MAJORITY.—If no candidate for an Executive Officer office or a Class Government office obtains a majority of votes cast, and:

(i) TIE FOR MOST VOTES.—There is a tie between the candidates who obtained the most votes, then those tied candidates shall enter a runoff election.

(ii) TIE FOR SECOND-MOST VOTES.—There is 1 candidate who obtained the most votes and a tie between the candidates who obtained the second most votes, then those tied candidates and the candidate who obtained the most votes shall enter a runoff election.
(2) SENATOR, U-COUNCILOR, AND FRESHMAN CLASS OFFICER.—If there is a tie for the final office of Senator, U-Councilor, or Freshman Class Officer, the tied candidates shall enter a runoff election.
Amendment 1

Senate Resolution 7-2017
Senate Constitution Amendment No. 6
Submitted by PATRICK FLANIGAN ’18, Academics Committee Chair (on behalf of the USG Senate)

Resolution
Amending the Senate Constitution to allow for a runoff election in the 2017 Winter Elections

Summary
Currently, the USG Constitution stipulates that the Winter Elections must conclude by the beginning of the winter recess. Given the current elections timeline, it would be impossible for a runoff to occur in the time remaining before winter recess while also following the rules set out in the elections handbook and the Constitution. Therefore, this amendment would allow runoff voting to occur during Winter Recess

Digest
- **Section 1:** This amendment lays out a specific case for the 2017 Presidential election. It allows for this specific election to conduct a runoff during Winter Break.

EXPLANATION—Matter in **bolded italics** is new; matter with *strikethrough* is material to be omitted.

Resolved by the Senate of the Undergraduate Student Government (two-thirds of the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. Article VIII, Section 804 of the Senate Constitution is amended to read as follows:

§ 803. Election Dates

(a) IN GENERAL.— Subject to subsection (b) and the election rules established under section 802, the Chief Elections Manager shall set the date of each election.
(b) TIME OF ELECTION—IN GENERAL. 
_the following subsection does not apply to the Winter 2017 elections cycle._

(1) SENATOR AND EXECUTIVE OFFICER. The election for each Senator and each Executive Officer shall be in November or December before winter recess.
(2) CLASS OFFICER; U-COUNCILOR.

(A) IN GENERAL. Except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), the election for each Class Officer and each U-Councilor shall be in April.

(B) FRESHMAN CLASS OFFICER. The election for each Freshman Class Officer shall be in the Fall Semester before October 31st.

(c) TIME OF ELECTION—WINTER 2017 EXCEPTION. For the Winter 2017 elections cycle only, the election for each Senator and each Executive Officer shall be in December.

[Art. VII, § C]