Princeton USG Senate
Meeting 4
March 4, 2018
4:30 Lewis Library 134

Attendance
- Olivia Grah
- Tania Bore
- Chris Umanzor: Ruby Guo
- Traci Mathieu: Pooja Patel
- Caleb Visser
- Jonah Hyman
- Tori Gorton
- Laura Zecca
- Patrick Flanigan: Preeti Iyer
- Nick Sileo: Ben Press
- Nick Fernandez: Samuel Vilchez
- Todd Gilman: Miranda Rosen
- Kade McCorry
- Nick Wu
- Michael Asparrin
- Isabella and Elliot
- Olivia Ott
- Wendy Zhao
- Kevin Zheng
- Elizabeth Bailey
- Nate Lambert
- Rachel Yee
- Chitra Parikh
- Liam Glass
- Alison Shim

Introduction

1. President’s Report (5 minutes)
   a. Harvard UC Video Update (2 minutes) - Tabled
      https://www.facebook.com/harvarduc/videos/10156569659193968/?notif_id=1519679952323417&notif_t=feedback_reaction_generic_tagged

2. Thank you!
   a. Thank you to Brad for helping to arrange headshots with Vincent! The website will be launched on Monday!
   b. Thank you to Nate for taking care of the rest of the applications!
   c. Thank you to Olivia Ott and Samuel for their input in Honor Committee deliberations!

3. This Week
   a. Monday: Kade and Rachel talked to Joyce in the Office of Governmental Affairs.
   b. Tuesday: Olivia, Samuel and Rachel took part in Honor Committee case studies.
   c. Wednesday: Whig-Clio congressional caucus on Gun Reform.
   d. Thursday: Weekly meeting with Dean Dunne. Talked about the importance of encouraging people to run.
   e. Friday: Ivy League Mental Health Conference. The Princeton delegation will present next week. The Ivy League Mental Health Coalition will be formed.

4. Looking Ahead
a. Princeton delegation will present on mental health.
b. There will be bi-weekly join check-ins with Harvard’s president and vice president.
c. The first ExComm meeting will be on Thursday at 8.

5. Feedback
a. Was the mental health training rescheduled?
   i. Not yet. We will reschedule ASAP.

New Business

1. Projects Board Co-Chairs (Elliot and Isabella): Budget Requests (5 minutes)
a. Everytime USG needs to fund events with more than $1,000, the Senate must vote.
   i. Colosseum Club’s Dodgeball Tournament
      1. USG: $3,000
      2. ODUS: $2,500
   ii. Service in Style
      1. USG: $2,000
   iii. Voting (Projects Board Funding)
      1. Yes: 21
      2. Abstain: 1 (Tania Bore)
      3. No: 0

2. CCA Committee Update: Caleb Visser (5 minutes)
a. The CCA will follow up on this with a resolution based on the feedback.
b. This year is the first year that the Pace Center is offering one-time service opportunities. USG would love to be involved with this and see how we can help out.
c. This project would be an opportunity for us to correspond with the needs of Pace’s community partners and do one service event/project with them.
d. CCA is looking at starting this as an initiative that can be done once or twice a semester.
e. Should this be done as a study break? Get to know USG through service!
f. Question: What is the difference between this and SVC/Breakout Local?
   i. SVC is weekly and you apply at the beginning of the year.
   ii. This would be a solely one-time commitment.
g. Question: Pace has a service model with preparation, service and reflection. Would we still do this?
   i. Caleb is meeting with Eliza this week. Caleb would be the coordinator and would help facilitate that process for the one-time service event. Caleb is on a Pace council.
h. Feedback: This does fit into our mission and Princeton’s mission of service. It’s a good place for us to start by living out this mission.

i. Question: Would this be just as the Senate or would the student body be participating as well?
   i. Currently, CCA is thinking to pilot it with just the Senate but later have it be more open (i.e. people sign up to do service with the Senate).

3. **Women’s Leadership Task Force Update: Olivia Grah (5 minutes)**
   a. This past week, Elizabeth met with Amenda from the Women*s Center. There’s been a little bit of tension between Women*s Center and USG due to a past resolution.
   b. We are working on rebuilding this relationship.
   c. One of the biggest challenges the Women*s Center has is getting people to show up to their programming.
      i. Is this a lack of student interest or a lack of proper publicity?
   d. Ideas to Resolve
      i. Women*s Center Board of Students
         1. She has tried to make a council in the past, but that was not well attended. There is a new group of students in charge of planning the 50th anniversary of women on campus.
   e. There are other groups on campus that are not part of the Women*s Center.
      Amanda expressed frustration that USG will sponsor organizations such as SWE, WICS, etc. As independent of Women*s Center. She suggested that the Projects Board send the Women*s Center more events from groups such as this.
      i. Feedback from Nick Fernandez: Usually, groups approach Projects Board because they were unable to receive funding from Women*s Center.
   f. Question: Is the #WomenLead campaign a national campaign?
      i. The campaign was discussed as a means of promoting women leadership on campus. This is not coordinating with any national movement, but within the task force, there will be discussion about a timeline for the #WomenLead campaign.
   g. Feedback: Three Points
      i. Tori should also be part of the discussion, especially regarding the #WomenLead campaign.
      ii. In terms of cancellation, accountability is a large issue on this campus. It’s not just a Women*s Center problem.
      iii. In terms of an opportunity to promote Women’s Leadership, 9 out of 11 eating club presidents are women as well as many Senate members. We should celebrate this!

4. **Standing Rules Amendment: Brad Spicher (10 minutes)**
a. Currently, the Resolution process makes voting members quasi-anonymous. The USG does not provide information about who votes.

b. This is not ideal because we are elected representatives, and we should be held accountable for the ways that we are voting.

c. One concern would be that people’s votes can be misinterpreted. This is why point 6 of the resolution is important.

d. Subs would be noted as well. Their name would be included.

e. **Voting (Standing Rules Amendments)**
   
   i. Yes: 21
   
   ii. Abstain: 0
   
   iii. No: 0

5. **Honor Committee Confirmations: Rachel Yee (10 minutes)**

a. Four Confirmations
   
   i. Michael Wang
   
   ii. Apria Pinkett
   
   iii. Scott Aravena
   
   iv. Alan Wong

b. The Honor Committee recently had clerk selections. The clerk becomes chair the year following their service as clerk. Camille is a sophomore who is the new clerk of the Honor Committee. She is a sophomore intending to concentrate in sociology on the pre-med track. She is involved with club field hockey and club lacrosse, Princeton Pre-Medical Society, and PURJ.

c. The second set of selections were for new members. These are the individuals noted in the packet. The process involved application outreach to groups on campus and individuals. All residential colleges were contacted. Teaching staff, Writing Center, freshman seminars, varsity teams and affinity groups were also contacted. The deadline was extended one week because there was a need for more outreach. Samuel, Angela, Caroline, Camille, Liz, Olivia, and Rachel were part of the group who selected the new members of the Honor Committee.

d. There were 3 USG members involved in the selection process. Extending the deadline was also helpful.

e. In terms of the candidates selected, the USG members collectively felt the 4 selected would be a great fit for the Honor Committee. They all bring very diverse perspectives to the committee.

f. With these 4 new individuals, the Honor Committee would be back to full capacity at 15.

g. Question: If the sophomore class president loses re-election, would there be enough seniors graduating such that the numbers work out? There is concern that we might appoint 1 person too many.
i. The Honor Committee will get back to the USG Senate about this. There is also no guarantee that each members will re-apply. Also, there are re-appointments of Honor Committee members in April.

h. Question: What was the process of recruitment in more detail?
   i. Essentially, affinity groups were contacted. Chris reached out to affinity groups. Caroline did STEM courses for first-years (MOL214, CHM202, COS126, etc.). Liz reached out to residential colleges, the HUM teaching staff, the Writing Center, varsity athletics, and first-year seminars. There were 10 applicants total (which is comparable to usual selection processes). This was a particularly strong and diverse candidate pool.
   ii. Chris was able to set up phone conversations with various students who were interested. Some applied; some did not apply. Implementation of this much earlier in the future could be helpful.
   iii. Another potential partnership would be between the Honor Committee and the Committee on Diversity and Equity.

i. Question: How did the referendum affect this cycle?
   i. Applicants were not asked about the referenda. It did come up in interviews. Many applicants explained that they became interested by the larger campus discussion about the referenda. Michael, for example, had gone to a Whig-Clio debate about the referenda and realized how important the honor code is to the Princeton community.
   ii. It was made clear that one’s opinion on the referendum was not a basis for selection.

j. Feedback: In terms of diversity, there is great socioeconomic diversity in the new confirmations. However, with people such as Brandon no longer on the committee, this seems like lateral movement. There’s more that can be done in bringing diverse applications.
   i. The pool that is admitted does bring diversity to the committee. This isn’t necessarily why they were appointed, but they do bring diversity. The committee is on great trajectory in achieving the goal of being completely representative of the student body.

k. Vote (Entering Executive Session)
   i. Yes: 21
   ii. Abstain: 0
   iii. No: 0

l. Vote (Honor Committee Confirmations)
   i. All four members have been confirmed! Congratulations!

m. Spring Elections Timeline Proposal: Laura Zecca and Jonah Hyman (5 minutes)
i. Spring elections for USG consist of elections of class alumni government, U-Councilors, and class governments. There is also another referendum cycle.

ii. The referendum process starts earlier. It would technically start tomorrow with an announcement that interested individuals should submit a referendum.

iii. The spring recess does not count as a week in terms of the cycle. At the end of spring break, the Senate would need to vote on the drafted resolution.

iv. Question: In the week between the deadline for expressing interest and the Senate approving language, can groups work with campus partners?
   1. Jonah does not make elections decisions as Parliamentarian.
   2. The language should be specific such that it does not imply any power that the referendum does not provide.

v. Feedback: USG should publicize voting on the referendum.

vi. Question: How can USG help publicize this schedule?
   1. Laura will also appoint Elections Managers, one of whom will focus on publicity.
   2. Social media can also be helpful.

vii. Suggestion: If you are planning to have USG help publicize, it would be helpful to provide templates by Wednesday. Also, people should be made aware that it is just an interest form.

viii. In regards to candidate recruitment, informally, we should have those who are not running for re-election in the spring to help advertise. The same applies for the fall.

ix. We will also be reaching out to ODUS who has been working on voter engagement.

x. Feel free to e-mail Laura and Jonah if you have any questions or concerns about either of the two schedules.

______________________________________________________________________________

Action Items
1. Prepare for ExComm meeting!
2. Jonah and Laura should see Rachel after the meeting.
3. Todd, Tania, Wendy, Chris, Liam and Allison should all have 5 minute meetings with Rachel after the meeting in that order.