Introduction

1. President’s Report (5 minutes)
   a. Week in Review
      i. Thursday: Senate Meeting, CS-ICC Dinner
      ii. Friday: Farewell Bonfire
      iii. Saturday: Meeting with Tori and Alex about Sexual Misconduct in Eating Clubs
      iv. Sunday: Senate Meeting
   b. Looking Ahead
      i. Nate and Rachel will be meeting one on one with people on the 18th, 23rd and 24th. E-mail Rachel if you are not here.

New Business

1. Honor Committee Confirmations: Liz Haile and Olivia Ott (10 minutes)
   a. Candidates
      i. Alan Wong
      ii. Michael Wang
      iii. Apria Pinkett
      iv. Dina Kuttab
      v. Scott Aravena
      vi. Wesley Johnson
      vii. Elise Wong
   b. Process
      i. There will be deliberation in open meeting.
      ii. There will be a motion to enter Executive Session.
      iii. Confirmation vote will take place in executive session.
   c. All of these individuals are re-appointments. Four of them were confirmed in the spring. They are all currently on the Honor Committee. There were re-appointment interviews. The Honor Committee selection committee consisted of USG representatives, class presidents, and Honor Committee members.
   d. Interviews consisted of reflecting on their HC experiences, any challenges they have, and any suggestions they had moving forward.
   e. Four members being appointed are STEM. Apria is a philosophy major. Wesley and Elise are juniors and have been very committed in the past.
f. Motion to Move Into Executive Session (with new U-Councilors):
   i. Yes: 20
   ii. No: 0
   iii. Abstain: 0

g. Members are confirmed with 20 in favor, 0 opposing and 0 abstentions.

2. U-Council Chair Elections: Jonah Hyman (25 minutes)
   a. Procedure
      i. Candidates can nominate themselves.
      ii. All candidates will be asked to leave the room.
      iii. One at a time, each candidate will come in and speak to the Senate. These speeches should be 2 minutes maximum, and the Senate will not be allowed to ask questions during this time.
      iv. The Senate will then deliberate and vote. Incoming U-Councilors may not vote; incumbent U-Councilors may vote.
   b. Candidates
      i. Ben Press
      ii. Rachel Hazan
      iii. Yousef Elzalabany
   c. Two U-Council members will serve on the Executive Committee of the CPUC. One will be the U-Council Chair, and the other will the CPUC Executive Committee representative.
   d. Motion to Approve Procedure (2 minutes of speeches, in the sequence of nomination)
      i. Yes: 21
      ii. No: 0
      iii. Abstain: 0
   e. Motion to Enter Executive Session with Zhan/Jonah/Chitra/Incoming U-Councilors and without Candidates
      i. Yes: 21
      ii. No: 0
      iii. Abstain: 0
   f. A single transferable vote will be used in order to determine the winner.
   g. With 21 voting members present, the quota to elect is 8 votes.
   h. Responsibilities of a U-Council Chair
      i. Going to every ExComm meeting of USG and ExComm meetings of CPUC, handling all CPUC-related efforts, etc.
   i. Motion to Leave Executive Session
      i. Yes: 21
      ii. No: 0
3. **Treasurer Update: Alison Shim (10 minutes)**
   a. The materials start with the Projects Board allocation; we only have 50$ left of the allocation. Their average grant is $400.
   b. After that is our spending. The last spending report was April 4th. Anything from April 4th to today is shown. It includes Lawnparties, etc. There are a couple items missing which will be added soon. The major portion missing is the Dean’s Date assignment.
   c. We have a large surplus which is something to keep in mind.
   d. Question: Is there a reason why it is bigger this year than past years?
      i. Not that we know of.
   e. With the surplus, we can discuss using the money for office renovation.
   f. The fact that USG will reduce its budget if we don’t use all of the money is a myth. The USG budget is set every year.
   g. Question: Why couldn’t the surplus have been used for a Lawnparties act?
      i. The Social budget is run so that a rough amount (70k) is allocated per semester. Based on what Liam says, the number is then adjusted. This year, it was 117k.
      ii. Suggestion: Perhaps in the fall, we can allocate more. This is a discussion we can have in the near future.
   h. Question: Is the Dean’s Date budget smaller because Lawnparties is larger?
      i. The Dean’s Date is the same as it has been in the fall for spring. 
         Allocations are done based on the event. We are going to have a giveaway for this Dean’s Date because of gear that was ordered previously.

4. **Final Update: Diego Negrón-Reichard (5 minutes)**
   a. Financial Reform Team
      i. Achieved a 29% of USG funding increase for Projects Board.
      ii. Created a new funding mechanism for Preview.
   b. U-Councilor Business
      i. Sponsored many resolutions this semester.
      ii. Worked on HC Reform, Project 50, etc.
   c. Work to be done
      i. Student Fees
         1. Diego has outlined a framework for whoever wants to take on the project. We need to do data collection on campus with surveys, the next step is to figure out what is done with the extra money, and lastly, the most important step is to make sure that a pitch to the Provost is within the strategic framework of the campus in the next ten years.
ii. Project 50
   1. We need to continue addressing encouraging students vote.

iii. Projects to Consider
   1. Making Campus Inclusive
      a. PTL Pictures
      b. Thesis Funding
      c. Cost of Graduation
   2. Relationship with Administration
      a. Coffee Chats and Lunches
      b. USG Award

5. Send-Off: Rachel Yee (5 minutes)
   a. Outgoing members were recognized by current Senate members.

6. Projects Board Charter Update: Eliot Chen and Nick Fernandez (15 minutes)
   a. Part of the requirement for increasing the budget for the spring for Projects Board was to have the charter revised by the end of the semester.
   b. Olivia mentioned last time that given that we are re-looking at USG over the semester, if this is something you want to postpone, we can have that specified formally in writing.
   c. Changes
      i. The name will be changed to Projects Board instead of Students Group Projects Board.
      ii. Now, the number of students will be at a maximum of 12.
      iii. The number of required representatives for class representation has been removed. Projects Board will still maintain an effort to keep it balanced.
      iv. Duration of Office: The terms were revised to become renewable one-year terms at the discretion of the co-chairs. The co-chairs would be confirmed at the beginning of each new USG administration.
      v. There are now Director Roles that the general members can fill such as Audit, Compliance, Marketing/Outreach.
      vi. Access to the storage of equipment in the USG office (capital expenditure) has been removed.
      vii. In terms of accountability, the accountability process has been formalized. The conditions under which Projects Board can suspend funding to groups has been expanded.
   d. Feedback: There is a concern about changes to the duration of office. Why should there be a lifetime appointment to the Projects Board?
      i. The rational is that Projects Board depends on institutional memory because of events that occur every single year. Compared to other Senate committees which have projects controlled by USG, institutional memory
is more important to ensure consistency in how decisions are made. Decisions in terms of the amount allocated can change from year to year.

ii. Tangible examples about why institutional memory has been useful can be broken down into compliance and quality control. Sometimes, there are organizations who promise to buy from certain vendors about food, for example, and then ask for more money. This is something that Projects Board generally disproves of. In terms of quality control, there was a request for money for the annual banquet. The amount of money that they asked for was especially low and not sustainable, and Projects Board was able to help them ensure that they were able to host the event to the same scale as past years.

iii. Follow Up: Why can’t these items be upheld with the renewable term? This brings up the issue of a U-Councilor who may not be re-elected but will still have a spot on the Projects Board.

1. People can have an advisory role on Projects Board. The U-Councilor representative can be replaced.

e. Question: Can there be a written record for institutional memory instead?
   i. Projects Board has that already. It just helps to have the people who wrote that in the blog to offer more insight.

f. Question: Why can’t administrators help with institutional memory?
   i. Dean Dunne does not necessarily attend every meeting.

h. Feedback: To Eliot’s point about institutional structure, this should be something that we do in our attempt to re-look at USG structure. We should take these into advisement and postpone into the fall.

i. Question: Would you be open to amending section 304?
   i. Yes, they are.

j. We should propose the amendment right now. These are included in the large overhaul of how we want to operate, but this is a great opportunity to establish this precedent. It would be a testament to two seniors who have worked on these changes to adopt these changes today; it would be a disservice to postpone this to the fall.

k. Question: Are we working with somebody from Projects Board over the summer to include them in the conversation?
   i. Currently, we don’t have the project teams established.

l. The connections to the constitution are rather minimal in terms of Projects Board responsibilities. Nick believes that this could be approved and it would not require any changes to the Constitution.
m. If we do pass this Charter now, and we look at the USG structure over the summer, we might have to accept that we may have to make changes we can’t anticipate.
   i. Eliot would be happy to come back after the summer.

n. Motion to Vote with amendment to Section 304
   i. Yes: 21
   ii. No: 0
   iii. Abstain: 0
   iv. The amendment reads as follows: Members will be eligible to serve renewable, one-year terms unless dismissed by the Co-Chairs.

o. Historically, in the Senate resolution to approve members to the committee, the resolution would include a specification about how long the member would serve.

Consent Agenda (APPROVED)

1. CCA Confirmations
   a. Bobo Stankovikj ’20
      i. Bozhidar (Bobo) Stankovikj is a Macedonian sophomore in the Woodrow Wilson School. His interests revolve around community building -- from presenting life at Princeton on one of his tours, to catering for the international students at the Davis IC, to tutoring in incarceration facilities with the Petey Greene Program. He's excited to use his experience and work with the CCA to strengthen our ties with the broader Princeton community.
   b. Aisha Tahir ’21
      i. Aisha Tahir is an undecided member of the Class of 2021 from Alexandria, Virginia. She's motivated to make Princeton a more inclusive place for people from all backgrounds by initiating discourse about racial and gender inequality. She hopes to help Princeton student body engage with the community outside in order to highlight the responsibility we, as Princetonians, have. She volunteers for El Centro, writes for campus publications, contributes to WBRP and has a student job at the Center of Jewish Life.