



Introduction

1. President's Report (5 minutes)

- a. Member Highlights
 - i. Shoutout to Liam for the Lawnparties reveal!
 - ii. Shoutout to Laura and Jonah for doing a great job with elections!
 - iii. Thank you to Caleb for coordinating the second open house and TruckFest!
- b. Week in Review
 - i. Monday: Preview Open House
 - ii. Wednesday: Final Push for Voting
 - iii. Thursday: Meeting with Dean Dunne and Chitra
 - iv. Saturday: TruckFest
- c. Looking Ahead
 - i. Diversity training slides will be sent out to those who were unable to make it, and there will be a short follow-up quiz.
 - ii. The calendar reform faculty vote is on Monday.
 - iii. Rachel is meeting with President Eisgruber on Tuesday.
 - iv. On Wednesday, there is a USLC meeting. There will be a focus on mental health and dining hall plans. The meeting is at 4:30-6:30 in JRR 300.
 - v. On Friday, the CPUC ExComm is meeting.
 - vi. On Saturday, we will have a leadership training at 9 AM.
 - vii. On Sunday, we have Communiversity. Communiversity is the biggest collaboration between the campus and the community. CCA is doing the campus side of the event. We will have a USG table. If you are in a student group that wants a table, reach out to Caleb!
 - viii. **The meeting will be pushed back to 6 next week.**

2. Event Reminders: Chitra Parikh (1 minute)

- a. Please stay out of the USG office on Monday and Tuesday from 7 PM to midnight because the COD is doing selections.
- b. Leadership training on Saturday, the 28th at 9 AM!

New Business

1. USG Office Space Scheduling and Office Makeover Feedback Discussion (15 minutes)

- a. Currently, the project manager for the USG Office Makeover is looking for feedback. She is waiting on talking with Dean Zeltner who is coordinating with the campus' interior designer.
- b. Feedback: It is important that we retain function over form. If we go for some of these models where it is very open, we would likely lose the function of an office space, too. Perhaps we should move away from an open floor plan towards something that is built around the purpose it is meant to serve (i.e. facilitating discussion and conversation).
- c. Feedback: Perhaps the space could serve two functions: meeting space and social space.
- d. Clarification: This project is about furniture and design. We can talk about furniture configurations, but construction changes are not in the scope of the project. From a funding standpoint, this depends on what USG prioritizes.
 - i. ODUS feels that some of the furniture can be updated because it was put in in 2001.
 - ii. The extensive file systems (the metal cabinets) are largely outdated now, and ODUS can say they want to surplus those.
 - iii. USG would fund the purely aesthetic aspects of the office.
- e. Feedback: Storage is a large problem in terms of the USG Office.
- f. Conversation about Function
 - i. We do need to have a meeting space.
 - ii. Rachel envisions the coffee area to be a community space.
- g. Feedback: The office as it stands feels cold and is inaccessible to the general student population. There should be movement towards making the office more accessible and brighter.
- h. Feedback: The Pace Center is a great model for how a space can serve as a community space and a meeting space.
- i. Feedback: The design should start with the hallway.
- j. Feedback: Having the coffee just at the entrance implies that the space is not accessible beyond the entrance.
- k. The space between the meeting room and beyond the coffee should be turned into more of a "hang out" space.
- l. Feedback: The space where all of the file cabinets are can also be a place to put the coffee. This will make the office accessible because people will have to go in further in order to access the coffee.
- m. Feedback: Perhaps we could have USG landmarks or wall decals in the hallway.
- n. Feedback: One of the things that we could do easily is so that the student worker desk is facing the door so it is more of a welcoming role.

- o. Feedback: The group should give opinions on color and cite furniture that exists on campus. This is helpful for the designers.
- p. In terms of timeline, it would be easier for this to be feasible to do during the summer if the group had a solid set of preferences to share with the designers.
- q. The Senate can also work on this during the training.
- r. There needs to be a project manager for the Frist bulletin board. Brad can take point on that along with Kade.
- s. Office Space Culture
 - i. Please be respectful of the office managers. You need to give the office managers proper respect and kindness, and how you treat the office manager reflects on how you are perceived by the student body too and how you treat the rest of the student body.
 - ii. How can USG better facilitate this conversation with Office Managers?
 - 1. Rachel will draft an e-mail to all USG representatives to make this clear.
- t. Feedback: We should come up with our expectations for Office Managers.
- u. Question: What are office managers' hours?
 - i. Sunday - Thursday: 4:30-9:30
 - ii. Friday and Saturday: Slightly different hours.
- v. Moving forward, we will introduce USG members to office managers ahead of time to facilitate better communication.

2. Community Plan Discussions: Board Review Plan Co-Chairs (15 minutes)

- a. Dean Avens and Smitha Haneef are co-chairs of the Board Plan Review. They have been doing quantitative and qualitative work in order to understand the landscape of dining at Princeton.
- b. The draft of a set of recommendations were distributed to students. The co-chairs have heard and respect the opinion that what is on the draft does not agree with student preferences. The draft is not mandated to be set in stone and to go into place right away.
- c. Many students have voiced concerns over this past week. The focus groups have been informative and constructive criticisms.
- d. The co-chairs would like to provide insight into the reasonings behind this plan:
 - i. The Board is thinking in terms of the long run.
 - ii. In the last several years, the Princeton student population has become more and more diversified. We now have more students on the Pell grant.
 - 1. However, we are looking to diversify even more.
 - iii. The Board Plan Review thinking is keeping in mind the perspectives of students who may not even be at Princeton yet (such as a junior in high school).

- iv. One issue about applying to Princeton is that, as an upperclassmen, you don't know how you're going to be able to eat. People hear about the competition to get into a club, the cost of clubs, etc.
- v. With this, admissions can tell the student that they are guaranteed a meal plan all four years - regardless of whether they join an eating club. If you are on financial aid, this plan is basically free. It is provided as part of the upperclassmen financial aid package. You will still have ~\$6,000 left to use on dining, meaning students can still have money leftover to spend on the method of dining they choose.
- vi. The purpose of the plan is to change the mindset of the classes that will be entering Princeton in the future. If we attract more low-income, first generation students who might not have come here otherwise, then the board will consider this plan successful. This will also help Princeton lose its perception as a "country club" university.
- vii. Refer to this article about the eating club scene:
<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/03/29/upshot/college-marriage-class-differences.html>.
- e. Question: Who comprises the Review Board Committee? Are there any current students?
 - i. The committee members can be found at boardplan.princeton.edu.
- f. Question: How would you measure success of the plan in terms of attracting more low income, first generation students?
 - i. There are no hard metrics about the college discussion. However, based on Dean Avens' breakfasts and lunches with FSI students over the year, there are many perceptions about the eating clubs that do affect the decision to come to Princeton.
- g. Feedback: Many students expressed that this plan would actually incentivize joining an eating club because of the stigma associated with a mandated dining plan.
 - i. When the committee started, they looked at the options available to students currently. Those four are eating club, dining hall, independent or co-op.
 - ii. If students choose not to join eating clubs and they end up in the dining hall, it is hard to say whether there would be stigma. If you look at the current figures of students in dining halls, it is true that a slightly higher percentage of high needs students take the dining hall plan. However, the overall number is lower among the entire student population.
- h. Feedback: If we are responding to people who had a negative experience with eating clubs, could we find people like that to spread that publicity? There are

many students that enjoy the independent lifestyle. Could we focus on changing the perception and maintaining the culture?

- i. At this time, the co-chairs will just take this as input.
- i. Feedback: Have you received access to the responses that students provided? There were 440 total.
 - i. Yes.
- j. Question: Has the committee considered taking a stance on considering ways to institutionally supporting independents and co-ops better? Has the committee considered stronger stances institutionally against eating clubs? Perhaps similar to Harvard's stance on final clubs. Do you have data on the number of students who take out private loans to pay for eating club?
 - i. The University does not track who specifically takes out loans. Dean Avens has had parents coming up to him at Preview and asking about eating club dues. From an administration perspective, this is a hard conversation to have.
 - ii. Regarding the other questions, Dean Avens has a whole set of notes to address these concerns. The committee is still developing hopefully what will be the co-op version of this plan after careful conversation.
 - iii. With independents, there has been a lot of conversation about supporting independents. For instance, the committee would really like to see a grocery store being built on campus.
 - iv. Last year, the University invested in Scully co-op. This summer, the University will be looking at Brown co-op and improving their infrastructure.
- k. Feedback: Students have a perception that this proposal would get rid of the "independent experience." Why not just let the students opt out of the meal plan proposal and just get the extra \$2,500 for their own dining needs? Is that an option?
 - i. At this point, the committee will receive this as input. They may look into this.
- l. Question: Would this plan functionally not work unless all students have to have this meal plan? Is that an arrangement that has been made with dining halls?
 - i. This was looked at from more of an institutional lens. Price did come up, but it was not the only variable or determinant in coming up with this plan.
 - ii. Each of the features in the plan has a price tag. Opening residential housing has a price tag, the physical meals have a price, etc.
- m. Question: What is the process going forward from here? What are the deliverables? What is the timeline?

- i. It is hard for the committee to give a timeline because there is no mandate to launch something by a given date. They do, however, have a mandate to conduct qualitative and quantitative analysis.
 - ii. In terms of the process, the committee is trying to be as transparent as possible. They are working closely with USLC and USG and the Prince to make sure that the committee is open to feedback and transparent.
 - iii. In the future, the committee wants this to be something that Admissions can share with prospective students as an option about their dining during their undergraduate years.
- n. Question: Who are the executive sponsors for this project?
 - i. VP Calhoun, Dean Dolan and Chad Klaus
- o. Question: Would students have to take their meals at the residential college (home colleges)? Will late meal be eliminated?
 - i. Late meal will still exist, but late meal swipes will be eliminated. Residential college dining hall hours will be extended. The home college meals would only be for eating club members. Eating club members would have 5 swipes for the whole semester instead of 2 a week.
- p. Question: If this plan can happen without full buy-in from all independents students, why is it required?
 - i. No one said this plan can happen without full buy-in.
- q. Question: Were most of the concerns from the student body because students thought this would affect them?
 - i. Even though students know this will not affect them, many students still care.
- r. Question: One important underclassmen change is the mandated unlimited meal plan. Could you speak to this decision?
 - i. The thinking was that during the spring semester of sophomore year, students are looking at social fees for eating clubs. In the current model, there are too many choices but not much of a difference in prices. If there is only one option, this would narrow the difficulty of choices.
- s. Feedback: Late meal is a large part of the underclassmen social experience because it is equitable in terms of the swipes.
- t. Question: How many people showed up to the focus group sessions?
 - i. At the first one, 7 people showed up.
 - ii. At the second session at 2-D, that had 30 people attending.
 - iii. The session at Forbes had about 25-30 people.
 - iv. The session at Rocky had 55 people attending.
 - v. The session at Whitman was approximately 40 people.

3. Senator Engagement Resolution: Kade McCorvy, Kevin Zheng and Elizabeth Bailey (15 minutes)

- a. This resolution voting will be tabled so that we can feedback for class government feedback.
- b. The Class Senators would like allocation of funds for study breaks to held by Class Senators. The idea is to hold study breaks in a cafe setting in order to facilitate conversation. In terms of funding, they have consulted the freshman class officers to find out how much study breaks usually cost.
- c. The 2021 Senators are hoping to try this out once.
- d. The proposal is for a one time amount of money.
- e. Feedback: Passing this resolution would not allow us to utilize our funds to reach the entire student body. Would you be open to having U-Councilors?
 - i. U-Councilors would change the dynamic of the nature of this.
- f. Question: Have you talked to Alison about this?
 - i. Alison would rather see specific proposals for specific events rather than a general proposal. It's not that each class should not get \$1,500, but the activities should be planned.
- g. USG has a mandate to serve the whole student body as opposed to Class Government (which serves only their respective class). It could be nice to have U-Councilors to be involved because it also a lot of pressure to just have 2 people attend to the whole class during the study break.
- h. Constitutionally, you need to consult with the appropriate class government before taking action.
- i. Feedback: There is no compelling reason to do this because we do have class government, which has a substantial amount of money. Perhaps class government could invite you to participate in their events.
- j. Feedback: Class government funds are meant to facilitate class unity. This might create some confusion among the classes. Class government is willing to chat about a joint venture.
- k. Feedback: If we are focusing on engagement for USG, it is unfair to allocate our funds only for a specific issue.
- l. Feedback: This proposal should be for a one time event. A \$1,000 is a decent chunk of money, so people would feel more comfortable voting on more of a solidified plan.
- m. Feedback: From a financial perspective, an itemized budget proposal would allow people to feel more comfortable to vote.

4. Senate Office Refreshments and Office Hours Resolution: Kade McCorvy, Kevin Zheng and Elizabeth Bailey (15 minutes)

- a. This resolution is solely about office space.

- b. This allows us to create a culture where we can have conversations. This helps us avoid the perception that USG members are doing things “secretly.”
- c. This helps us dispel USG’s reputation as a “government club.”
- d. This resolution helps us allow people to be more comfortable in the space.
- e. The resolution text has changed slightly since last week.
- f. The senate would book the USG office every Sunday afternoon for the rest of the academic year. The time and refreshments will be determined by the President and Excomm in solution with the Senate. The time would be consecutive. There would be at least one senate, one U-Councilor and one ExComm member present every week. The budget has been approved by Alison already.
- g. This would be publicized in the weekly USG newsletter.
- h. This is a good first step to inviting people in the space and for us to exist without there being any distinct reason.
- i. Question: What informed the choice to make this a resolution vs. a Senate project? Who will be held accountable?
 - i. This was made a resolution because it increases the level of accountability. Nate will hold people accountable in News with Nate.
- j. Question: Why would this be \$200?
 - i. This is a good distribution based on past events. It is a ballpark estimates, and we do not necessarily have to meet the budget.
- k. Question: Why not have the refreshments out all the time?
 - i. This creates incentive for people to come at a time when we will be present for sure. If we do something is cold or is perishable, this would allow us to do so.
- l. Question: Stipulation 4 says office workers are in charge of getting the refreshments. Shouldn’t the USG members be doing this? This would be putting the office managers in a position where they have to leave work. Would you be willing to scratch stipulation 4?
 - i. The reason that the office managers were selected to do this is because the office managers are paid for this work. The biggest fall out with this in terms of accountability if USG members do it. The office managers would not need to walk to Nassau or anything.
- m. Clarification: This would end on May 20th. This is a trial run. It would start this coming Sunday.
- n. Question: Would you want to consider different models? Some things that might work would be holding larger events to engage a larger group. Is that something you would consider in the future if this doesn’t work? How do we retain flexibility next year?

- i. This model is just to get us off the ground. The office hours have been advertised, but they are really non-existent. The key thing about this resolution is it is consistent.
- o. Clarification: The resolution does not provide a specific day or time that is mandated.
- p. Question: Would you be open to having this as a trial period without us voting on it? It makes more sense for us to do this as a trial period assuming that we are all going to be accountable.
 - i. We should still vote on it because if people are in support, this is what would happen anyway.
 - ii. There's no danger in voting on this. Yes, this could have been a Senate project.
- q. Voting (RESOLUTION APPROVED)
 - i. Yes: 18
 - ii. Abstain: 1 (Brad Spicher)
 - iii. No: 0
 - 1. Note: 20 voting members were present; however, 1 member had to leave before voting occurred.

Consent Agenda

- 1. USLC Confirmations:
 - a. Charles Copeland
 - i. Hello my name is Charles Copeland and I am apart of the class off 2019 and majoring in Geosciences. I decided to join the USLC to improve bonds between the broader co-op and independent students community. I have seen individual sporadic social initiatives in this regard work to great success, and I want to create something more lasting that can solicit the help and support of the administration and the undergraduate student government. I have a lot of concerns, experience and expertise regarding the co-op community in particular. I currently have administrative duties within the 2 Dickinson Street Co-op. I'm also currently president of the Princeton Student Climate Initiative.

Action Items

- 1. Fill out RSVP form for transition training.
- 2. Spread the word about student performers for Lawnparties. The form closes April 27th.