Introduction

1. President’s Report (5 minutes)
   a. Thank you Chitra for room scheduling!
   b. Thank you to Laura and Jonah for working with the sponsors!
   c. Thank you to ExComm for working over spring break!

2. Week Ahead
   a. CPUC Meeting: Tomorrow in Andlinger Center
      i. Rachel will be presenting.
      ii. HSRC’s findings will be discussed in addition to calendar reform.
   b. USLC Meeting: Wednesday
      i. Mental health will be discussed.
   c. PDAR with Dr. Calvin Chin: Friday
      i. If you have religious conflicts, please let us know ahead of time.

3. Next to Next Week
   a. Diversity Training (3:45 on Sunday, April 1): Shawn Maxam
   b. Senate Meeting: Sunday
   c. Preview Open House: Monday, April 9

4. Moving Forward
   a. All committees and project teams will provide updates on meeting packets from now on. Meeting packets will be posted on the front page of the website.
   b. We will table Preview discussion until next week to wait for Caleb.
   c. Please stay after the meeting if you are interested in recruitment for Spring elections.
   d. Liz, Kevin and Ruby plan to have the housing video done by the end of the week.
   e. We will have a training after spring spring elections which will probably be on Saturday, April 21st or Saturday, April 28th. We will also be going through two different leadership styles/project management. This training will also have a Skype in for past USG president, Michael Yaro.

5. Action Items
   a. E-mail Chitra any conflicts for spring semester ASAP.
   b. E-mail a calendar with upcoming events for your committees to Tori.
   c. E-mail committee member names to Rachel and Brad for the website.
   d. Can someone volunteer to find out how language tables are run?
      i. Let’s get a USG table at all of the dining hall tables.
e. Can someone find out when the next ICC meeting is?
   i. Olivia Grah will reach out.

New Business
1. Referenda Proposals: Referendum Sponsors (20 minutes)
   a. Explanation of Process
      i. The referenda text is to be reviewed by the USG senate for clarity and wording.
      ii. Two sponsors are present today, and the third sponsor can be reached by phone.
      iii. We will review one referendum at a time. We may make changes such as typo.
      iv. The main attributes that you are looking for clarity on are the condensation. The explanations can be modified between now and Tuesday, April 10th. The condensation and the resolution cannot be altered once they are approved tonight.
      v. You can approve of the text or disapprove of the text. The third option is to declare the referendum frivolous.
      vi. For Honor Constitution referenda, it is 200 signature.
      vii. If the language is approved, sponsors can start collecting signatures tomorrow. If they collect enough signatures, the referendum will then go onto the ballot.
      viii. Question: Can we amend the proposals right now in the presence of the sponsors?
            1. Yes, we are supposed to work with the sponsors.
      ix. Question: Does “neutral wording and clarity” include feasibility?
          1. A condensation or resolution that claims to be doing something that the Senate does not have the power to do would be unclear.
      x. Question: Were any of the 4 Honor Code referenda “unclear” by this definition?
         1. In the past, feasibility was not included in the vote during the Senate.
         2. It is also important to note the difference between what the Senate can’t do and what the Senate can’t do without faculty support.
      xi. Clarification:
          1. The answers should be ignored. Those are there for clarification.

2. Referendum Proposal #3
a. Last semester, there was a movement to change the rules of the Honor Constitution. Without faculty support, this was not possible. However, internally, we can hold the leadership of the Honor Committee accountable.

b. The reason this referendum is being proposed is because currently, there is no measure for any recourse if any disagreements occur. There is very little oversight within the Honor Committee.

c. The referendum provides a linear pathway with two outcomes. The first outcome in this review process is that a person can take a statement outlining their grievances with the leadership and bring it to the USG. The USG can then do what it seems fit. The USG can invite the Chair to a meeting, it can hold a discussion, etc. The second outcome is that the student can then submit their own candidacy for the Clerkship or the Chairship. The student would then go before an independent committee of 9 members (3 of whom must have served on the Honor Committee for at least one semester and 6 of whom would be elected members). Should a switch in leadership occur, the switch would occur in the next semester.

d. This is meant to be a common sense reform to promote accountability.

e. Currently, if there is a complaint, you go to the Chair or the Clerk themselves. However, once students have exhausted this option, then they would go through this process.

3. Questions

a. With regards to the phrasing of the ballot question, could a word such as “performance” be added before the word review?
   i. On the ballot, there will be a link to the rest of the language as well as an explanation. This is something that could go into the explanation!
   ii. Follow Up: Chris is happy to add that word to the question.

b. It is important that students are making an informed decision. It is important that we specify this term review because it is misleading to the student body. Can it be changed to “petition to replace”? 
   i. The reservation with doing so is that there are two outcomes-- the first of which is an official review.

c. Can it be written as “review and petition to replace”? 
   i. Chris would be happy to amend the question to include this.

d. What happens when someone has a complaint but the matter of the complaint is confidential?
   i. There are items that can be disclosed without endangering confidentiality. There have been past actions taken by Chairs that are questionable in terms of professionalism, and those would be welcomed in this review process.
   ii. In terms of issues with confidentiality, it is possible to bring upon a complaint that is general enough to not reveal any confidential details.
1. Specific questions about general topics (diversity of thought, for example) can lead to conclusions as well.

iii. Clarification: There is a pretty high bar for an actual change to happen. There is \( \frac{2}{3} \) approval required from a committee that has representation on the Honor Committee and USG.

e. How does the Honor Committee feel about this?
   i. Internally, in terms of the question of whether the Honor Committee is interested in accountability, that’s something that the Honor Committee is already talking about. This has been particularly discussed in terms of investigators.
   
   ii. Liz is happy to discuss bringing in leadership accountability to that discussion as well.

f. Clarification: With the sponsor’s approval, the content can be changed.

g. In the condensation, it says the committee will have a majority vote. This is a mistake. It should say \( \frac{2}{3} \) vote.

h. Question: Does the referendum have the power to do what you want it to do?
   i. If it is not feasible for this referendum to be put in place, we can’t speak for the administration. It is purely an internal change to the Honor Committee, so there is belief that it will not be blocked in terms of implementation.

i. Question to Liz: If students vote in favor of the referendum, is the Honor Committee held to this change?
   i. The Honor Committee is required to uphold the Constitution, so if the Constitution is amended, then the Honor Committee is required to honor it. Unless the administration blocks it, the Honor Committee has to follow the changes in the referendum.

j. Beyond the Constitution, the Honor Committee is a pact between the students and the faculty. There are some things the students have jurisdiction over, and there are some things that require agreement between the students and the faculty. Last semester, three of the four needed to be dealt in accordance with the faculty.

k. Question: Would these reviews include no evidence from specific hearings? Is there any way that evidence from hearings could be included?
   i. An Honor Committee member is welcome to say what one has experienced in their time of the Committee. It’s for the independent committee to decide between “he said” and “she said.” The review will primarily be based on value questions (not necessarily specific pieces of evidence).

l. Questions: What is the process with the review? Does the independent committee investigate discrepancies between the two interviews?
i. The wording of the referendum mirrors the Constitution. For example, selection specifics are not outlined but the Honor Committee still asks about items such as diversity of thought, etc.

ii. As for the specific details, just like there are no specific details about the selections process, the independent committee is given liberty.

iii. Other Honor Committee members outside of the student voicing the concern will not be consulted.

m. Values is a vague concept. It is not fair to the leadership of the Honor Committee if they do not know the criteria they are being asked to uphold.

n. Concern: This will become a “he said” and “she said.”
   i. The purpose of this is not to settle a mere “he said, she said.” There must be significant concern for a person to bring this review into place.

o. Question/Concern: The Senate does not have enough knowledge about the Honor Committee. There is concern about the composition numbers of the Honor Committee.

p. Question: Is there any situation in which a referendum can be implemented regardless of what the administration says?
   i. This is not relevant.

q. Question: Have you considered bringing an outside Dean who can be a recipient about these confidential issues? This would help with contextualization.
   i. We should move away from the “he said, she said” because this is only meant for serious issues.
   ii. It is difficult to talk about specific occasions. It’s probably more useful to provide scenarios and ask the leadership to go through how they handle the situation.

r. Feedback: There is concern that only 1 member has been on the Committee under the leaders in question. That one member on the independent committee might have too much influence. People might just listen to that person because they are the only one currently on the HC.
   i. This review is not meant to figure out what is true and false.
   ii. Follow Up: The concern is that 1 of the 9 member of the independent committee might have too much authority.
      1. Would you feel more comfortable if there were at least 2 people currently on the committee?
         a. Chris is willing to consider the 2 members.

s. Concern: This seems like a review of the leadership’s values, not necessarily about them doing their job.

t. We need to consider whether this is feasible, not necessarily whether we agree with the content. The Chair has 2 responsibilities: formal ones (as outlined in the
Constitution) and the normatively conducted (ensuring sound facilitation, training individuals, etc.).

u. It is possible/probable that we have a Chair that is doing the formal responsibilities well but not necessarily conducting the informal responsibilities as well. We need to hold them accountable as well.

v. Regarding the membership of the independent committee, constitutionally by this referendum, the USG President appoints members. The USG president is more than welcome to include more than 1 member from the current Honor Committee (up to 3).

w. Regarding the confidentiality, there are ways to disclose why one candidate is better at leading than another. This is a feasible change that can be made.

x. Question: Would you ever go through this process if you don’t want to replace the current leadership?
   i. Yes. This decision informs the students and is still a step that the person has the option to take.

y. Concern: How the leadership discusses a case during an investigation cannot be fully evaluated.
   i. There is a feasible way to do so. You can’t discuss what has been done in the past, but you can identify what can be done in the future.
   ii. Follow Up: review implies looking at past behavior. Would it be more fitting to say re-interview?
      1. Chris would be willing to say re-interview. Evaluate might be better.

z. Question: Could “potentially” also be added before “petition to replace”?

aa. Concern: It is not clear how these decisions will be made. It is not clear what the solution is.
   i. When it comes to policy making, there should be some leeway.
   ii. Feedback: This is quite clear already.

bb. Amendments:
   i. Changing majority vote to ⅔ vote for the independent committee to determine who will serve as the leadership for the HC.
   ii. Condensation: review to evaluate and potentially petitioning replace the Clerkship or the Chairship
   iii. Review has been changed to evaluate/evaluation throughout the language
   iv. Added to the language: The independent committee will release a statement outlining the criteria upon which the outcome was decided, regardless of whether there was a change. This will be done with due confidentiality for all those involved in the process.
v. Suggestion from Liz: Please consider the ambiguity of this language regarding the investigation and the review.
vi. Question: Should we add an appeals process?
vii. Chris believes this reads clearly as it stands.
viii. An appeals process also might undermine the principle upon which this change is being proposed.
cc. Question for Laura and Jonah: Is this condensed enough?
i. We need to include however much information is necessary for the student body to be properly informed.

dd. Clarification: It is good to describe the process. Everyone should try to envision a voter who has never heard about any of this. In terms of condensation, this is the voter we should consider.

ee. Follow up to the addition of “The independent committee will release a statement outlining the criteria upon which the decision was made.” Should we add something regarding confidentiality?
i. Yes, we will add a clarification.

ff. Voting (Referendum Proposal #3 as amended): APPROVED
i. Yes: 11
ii. No: 1 (Kade)
iii. Abstain: 4 (Ruby Guo, Olivia Grah, Liam Glass, Nate Lambert)

4. Referendum Proposal #1
   a. The purpose of this referendum is to reconsider the purpose of the 4:30 to 6:30 block during the day.
   b. In three parts, this block of time is re-contextualized so that people involved in athletics, certain certificate programs, extracurriculars, etc. are not forced to miss academic programming.
   c. For instance, one department only offers independent work workshops during 4:30 to 6:30. There is no JP guidance offered if you have conflicts during this time.
   d. Question: The principle of this is for anyone who has extracurriculars. As the wording stands, it does specify a divide between athletes and non-athletes. Can this be removed from the condensation?
      i. Yes, it can be removed from the condensation.
      ii. There should still be 1 athlete on the committee, thought.
   e. Currently, the referendum asks for additional opportunities (at 4:30-6:30 and outside of that). Can it be amended so that faculty should offer programming outside of 4:30 to 6:30?
      i. Yes.
   f. Question: Can we tell the faculty to do something?
i. From Shea’s understanding, this is non-binding. This is why Shea has included who the information will be sent to (i.e. department heads).
ii. It is as binding as we can make it.
g. The answers will only be Yes and No (the explanations will not be on the ballot).
h. The size of the committee is left to the discretion of the Senate.
i. For the elected spots, should we specify when the elections will take place?
   i. Shea feels that this should be privy to the President’s agenda.
j. Question: Can the two elected spots be amended so that the positions can be application-based?
   i. Yes.
k. Question: Under Section 3, when these referenda are voted on, the school year ends a month after that. Is it feasible to expect a progress report by the end of the year?
   i. Yes, we should keep this date. Even if the progress report states a committee is formed and speakers were contacted, that is still meaningful. The student body will stay be informed.
l. The referenda handbook requires the USG Senate to write a formal position paper to detail the student position and action items that the USG recommends. The paper will be forwarded to the administration, and USG will wait for a response.
m. Voting (Referendum Proposal #1 as amended): APPROVED
   i. Yes: 16
   ii. No: 0
   iii. Abstain: 0

5. Referendum Proposal #2
   a. Based on Dean Dunne’s explanation of a frivolous referendum, it might seem that we should deem this frivolous because there is no justification for why this power should be taken away.
b. Question to Jonah: Could we retroactively pass something that looks similar?
   i. The Senate has the power to amend its constitution by a ⅔ vote in two consecutive meetings.
c. Question: If this referendum passes, we can still vote against the language if the wording is not clear, correct?
   i. Yes. We just cannot declare referenda frivolous.
d. Discussion: It is a flawed point to say that the language is unclear because we don’t know what frivolous means because USG came up with the word to begin with.
e. Given that there were initially only 7 referenda proposed and we are only discussing 3, if someone makes a seriously concerning referendum, they likely will not get signatures anyway.
f. Given that the only justification would be doing this is that the Senate is overusing their power with this power to deem a referendum frivolous, that is why it is reasonable for us to deem this referendum frivolous.
g. If anyone wants to amend the condensation, Akiva needs to be consulted as well.
h. Question: Would Akiva be open to an amendment of time (more time for more signatures) or lowering the threshold for signatures?
   i. It is important to note that this reflects a significant change to the question as it is worded. We would need to call Akiva.
i. Question: In the answers, it says the power should be repealed. Does that mean that anytime in the future that the Senate cannot ever do this again? I.e. Can it be a unanimous vote instead of a \( \frac{2}{3} \) vote.
   i. The Senate has the power to amend its constitution by a \( \frac{2}{3} \) vote in two consecutive meetings.
 j. Question: Does this seem like an opinion poll based on the answers?
   i. The purpose of the explanations in the questions is to be clear on what option repeals the power and what option does not.
k. Call with Akiva
   i. The reason that Akiva is proposing this is because currently, the Senate has the power to conduct a “functional veto” that could be potentially dangerous.
   ii. Would you be willing a system to explicitly define frivolous?
      1. Frivolous should be defined by a vote of the student body, not a vote of the Senate.
   iii. It is inherently problematic for a referendum to be deemed frivolous.
   iv. Would you be open to calling for a lower amount of signatures needed if the referendum is called frivolous?
      1. The way that it could work is that a frivolous referendum could be denoted as frivolous (as deemed by the Senate). That functionally lets the people decide if the referendum is actually frivolous.
   v. If the referendum passes, would you want to work with the Senate to draft an amendment that accommodates the changes that you are suggesting?
      1. Currently, Akiva would like to keep the language as it stands now. The change suggested above with writing a referendum as frivolous on the ballot itself can be saved for a future election cycle.
   vi. The power as it stands now is “too vague and too risky.”
      1. The word frivolous can be used to apply to whatever they want.
vii. If you would like to add that the Senate reserves the right to designate (and only designate without any caveats) the referendum as frivolous, Akiva is okay with that.

1. Yes, this will be the amendment added to the language.

i. Amended Sentence (that was added):
   
   The Senate reserves the right to designate referenda as frivolous on the ballot by a \( \frac{6}{8} \) vote but with no extra requirements on signatures petitioned.

m. Voting (Referendum Proposal #2 as amended): APPROVED

   i. Yes: 9
   ii. No: 1 (Diego)
   iii. Abstain: 6 (Rachel Yee, Brad Spicher, Elizabeth Bailey, Kevin, Kade, Liam Glass)

n. The referenda handbook does not specify about whether it needs to be a majority vote.

o. This represents a majority vote in approval of the referendum proposal.

Consent Agenda (Approved Unanimously)

1. Notice of Technical & Conforming Changes to the Senate Constitution
2. Alumni Affairs Committee Confirmations
   a. Jessica Ma ’21
      i. My name is Jessica and I am a freshman hoping to pursue an Economics degree. By being a part of the Alumni Affairs committee, I hope to assist in the process of the committee's goal of strengthening the relationship between alumni and undergraduate students. The networks between the two sides will further connect the Princeton community both in the university and out. I'm extremely excited to be on the committee and to work with everyone at USG.
   b. Jake Mayer ’21
      i. I am from Scotch Plains, New Jersey and a member of the class of 2021. Also a member of the Varsity Men’s Golf Team. My goals for the Alumni Affairs Committee are twofold. First, I would like to keep young alumni connected to current students through networking events in NYC and Philadelphia. Second, I would like to increase contact between all alumni and the current students at events that draw a lot of alumni, such as homecoming and reunions. This would include holding more events that invite both current students and alumni to allow them to connect and share school spirit together. The goal of both of these measures is to strengthen and grow the bond alumni have with the university, and allow students to connect to fellow Princetonians.
3. Academics Committee Confirmations
   a. Ben Press '20
      i. Ben Press '20 is a prospective history major from Vienna, Virginia and a U-Councilor on the Undergraduate Student Government. Outside of USG, Ben is involved with Butler College Council, Model UN, and Orange Key, and looks to bring those experiences to the Academics Committee in a way to help facilitate its work in the Senate and with the administration.
   b. Ling Ritter '19
      i. Ling Ritter is a junior from Salt Lake City, UT majoring in Politics with a certificate in French. On campus, Ling works to represent her fellow students on the faculty-student Honor System Review Committee and the USG Diversity & Equity Committee. She looks forward to becoming a part of the Academics Committee team, where she hopes to help expand dialogue about and implement solutions to academic issues and structures at the heart of students' day-to-day lives.
   c. Dina Kuttab '21
      i. My name is Dina Kuttab, and I am first-year from Jordan, hoping to major in Molecular Biology. In high school, I was involved in setting up a student government so I am excited to be part of an established one through USG. On campus, I'm involved with the Model UN team, the Forbes College Council, and the Honor Committee. I'm hoping to use those experiences to help the Academics Committee work better with administrators in general, and am especially hoping to work on projects relating to Calendar reform.
   d. Anna Yang '21
      i. Anna Yang ('21) is a prospective English major from Vancouver, Canada. On campus, she is an active member of the Princeton Debate Panel. She believes in the importance of student involvement in shaping the academic experience, and is excited to bring her unique perspective as an international student to the Academic Committee. Anna hopes to remain vigilant in the assessment and re-assessment of various academic policies, and vouch for student interests in the continued effort to create an equitable educational environment. She is excited to work with the Committee in the upcoming year.

4. Social Committee Confirmations
   a. Erin Boateng
      i. My name is Erin Boateng and I'm a sophomore concentrating in Economics with a certificate in Linguistics. I am a member of Business Today and I am also involved with Fashion Speaks. I have loved attending
the amazing events that Social Committee has put on throughout my time at Princeton and I'm looking forward to making the Social Committee the best that it can be. For 2018, I want to make sure that the Social Committee represents the interests of the undergraduate student body, and I hope to bring the school together for many different music and artistic based events throughout the year.

b. Christian Maines
   i. My name is Christian Maines, and I am a freshman from Houston likely concentrating in History or Politics. On campus, I am a member of the Princeton Undergraduate Research Journal, the Princeton Perspective Project, the Princeton LP, and the Texans Club. I am excited to have the opportunity to serve on the Social Committee because I want to help inspire and share with the rest of campus my personal passion for music and entertainment. This year, I look forward to doing whatever I can to support the Committee and to further its mission going forward.

c. Anson Jones
   i. Hi, my name is Anson Jones, I’m a Freshman planning on majoring in Architecture and getting certificates in Jazz Studies and Finance. I sing and play piano, am part of the jazz department’s Creative Large Ensemble and Small Group A, and I am in Roaring 20. One thing I would be interested in is finding newer musicians and bands from the NYC/Philly areas for a larger number of acts through the year. I can’t wait to help the social committee find great artists to bring in!

d. Tim Frawley
   i. My name is Tim Frawley and I am a freshman from Princeton, New Jersey currently in the BSE program and planning on declaring for the computer science department. Outside of class, I play on the club rugby team and am involved with club climbing on campus. I am excited to get more involved with student life on campus by taking an active role and learning with the social committee. I hope to put on music events that are enjoyable and accessible for the student body.

e. Jena Yun
   i. My name is Jena Yun and I'm a freshman from New York City. I am a prospective Molecular Biology major. On campus, I am also involved in Club Tennis and the Whitman College Council. I am so enthusiastic to get involved with Social Committee and learn the ropes in order to help coordinate and plan events around campus. I hope to also be able to reach out to the student body and listen to their opinions on what we should be looking to plan next
f. Jacob Rob  
  i. My name is Jacob Rob, I am currently a freshman and plan to Major in the Woodrow Wilson School with an ENV certificate. I am from a small town in central Pennsylvania called Boiling Springs. On campus I am involved in ROTC and look forward to participating with the USG social committee. I am very passionate about music and as such would love to help plan and coordinate for lawn parties, but more importantly, I am very interested in organizing a smaller concert or two during the spring before the semester ends.

g. Heavyn Jennings  
  i. I am Heavyn Jennings. I am from Saint Louis, Missouri. As a current sophomore, I plan to declare Psychology as my concentration this semester. I plan to get certificates in African American Studies and Arabic Language and Culture. Currently, I am a SHARE peer and the project leader for CONTACT Suicide hotline. I'm thrilled to become a part of social committee. Over my two years, I have enjoyed all the events put on by the committee and hope to learn more about the behind the scenes process while enhancing everyone's musical experiences on campus.

h. Apria Pinkett  
  i. My name is Apria Pinkett and I'm a sophomore from Mays Landing, NJ, concentrating in philosophy. On campus, I'm involved with SIFP, Matriculate, Club Tennis, the Honor Committee, and now, the Social Committee. I'm really looking forward to planning fun events for the student body and I hope to make them appealing to a wider range of people, which is why I joined.

i. Akash Samant  
  i. My name is Akash Samant, and I'm a Freshman from Scottsdale potentially concentrating in Economics and pursuing certificates in Application of Computing. On campus, I'm a member of the Princeton Debate Panel and Princeton University Energy Association. I'm super excited to start working on the Social Committee and bring a diverse range of musical, artistic, and cultural events to the Princeton Campus. I'm really looking forward to making sure everyone in the Princeton community feels included and happy in each of our events.

j. Sophie Torres  
  i. My name is Sophie Torres and I am a freshman from New York City. On campus I am involved with the Student Design Agency and help with design for The Princetonian and have had the pleasure of serving on Social Committee during last semester. I have always loved art, both creating and
observing it, and I am looking forward to increasing the impact that both
the art and the music scene have on campus and being able to share my
own artistic opinion with this Committee.

k. Nicholas Veo
   i. Hi, my name is Nick Veo and I’m a junior in the Operations Research and
      Financial Engineering department. Furthermore, I am pursuing certificates
      in Finance and Statistics and Machine Learning. I was on Social
      Committee in the Spring of 2017 and I am excited to pickup my career
      where I left off. Some of my favorite experiences interacting with the
      greater Princeton community exist because of the opportunity I was given
      to curate food vendors for Lawn Parties. I am excited to do this in more in
      the upcoming year.