



- I. Updates and announcements: Zarnab and Chitra (5 mins)
 - A. Student Health Plan
 1. Complementary Health care services for graduate students
 - a) Added back in
 - B. CPUC Meeting Tomorrow
 1. Let Zarnab know if there is anything you think she should address in her speech
 2. Let Zarnab know if you want anything to be put up on the website
 - C. Task Force
 1. Should have met by now
 2. Fill out update form
- II. Referendum Approval for Clear and Concise Language: Jonah Hyman '20 and Laura Zecca '20 (1.5 hours)
 - A. Procedural Matters
 1. Jonah, Laura, and sponsors have spent the last 2 weeks working on the language
 2. Neutral wording and clarity
 3. Sponsors present and senate may suggest amendments
 - a) Then senate will vote on whether to approve the language
 4. Referendum must not imply anything that is not within the powers of the senate to do.
 5. Senate may approve, disapprove, or vote that referendum is frivolous
 - a) If the senate decides that the referendum is frivolous then
 - (1) The sponsors may still collect signatures from the student body but now the referendum requires 30% of the student body's support (as opposed to 10% for referendum not deemed frivolous)
 - (2) Sponsors now have 14 days (as opposed to the traditional 7 days) to secure these signatures
 6. In this meeting, the Senate should focus on the language of a particular referendum rather than the content of said referendum
 7. After the Language of the referendum is approved, Sponsors will need to collect signatures for the referendum in order for it to be placed on the ballot

8. Condensation (i.e. Ballot question) is the only language students will see on the ballot
 - a) The explanation behind the referendum will be linked. The explanation is to help students to understand why the referendum was proposed (why the sponsors think that it is necessary)
 - (1) The explanation cannot be amended because it includes the sponsors opinion and thereby does not need to be worded neutrally
 9. Throughout the course of the meeting, Jonah will give procedural advice
- B. Sibley Referendum
1. A.J's explains his personal experience with the effects of computer brightness on eyesight and his motivation for the referendum
 2. Condensation
 - a) Add question mark to the end of the ballot question
 - b) Capitalization of "Princeton University"
 - c) Spelling errors corrected
 - d) Should *ad hoc* be inserted into condensation?
 - (1) Doesn't need to be but would hurt
 - e) Should funding be specified in the referendum
 - f) Question as to the desirability of the phrase "If desired"
 - (1) Anyone using the computers
 3. Motion to Vote
 - a) For: 13
 - b) Opposed: 0
 - c) Abstain: 0
- C. Umanzor Referendum
1. Honor committee composition
 2. Sponsors believe that since the Honor COmmittee is a committee for the students run by the students, the elected student representatives should be selecting the members
 3. Currently, the Senate COnstitution and the Honor COmmittee constitution have different selection processes for this
 4. Selection process
 - a) Current
 - (1) First Year members of the Honor Committee are selected in the Fall
 - (2) Selection sub committee: 4 members of honor committee and USG president

- (i) In practice, however, USG president and academics chair select 3 members of senate

b) Change

- (1) Honor committee chair, senior class member of the honor c, 1-3 members of the senate, 2 longest serving elected members of the honor committee
- (2) Why USG Executive Committee members opposed to U-Councillors or Senate representatives?
 - (a) Generally more experienced
- (3) When will it be implemented?
- (4) Past Selections
- (5) In case of no senior class member on the honor committee, add clause that says honor committee may select member

Motion to extend time by 7 mins

- (6) Condensation
 - (a) Inconsistent language (“Additional senior member” and “senior class member”)
 - (b) Suggestion to make it more evident the gravity of the change
 - (i) Reduces the role of the Clerk in the selection process
 - (c) Addition of semicolons
- (7) Question as to the benefits of reducing the role of the clerk
 - (a) The clerk is adequately represented by other members of the honor committee and reducing the role would make the committee more representative of the student body
 - (b) Not reduced as significantly as suggested
 - (i) Clerk may serve in place of chair if chair is unable to serve

Motion to extend time by 5 mins

5. Motion to Vote

- a) For: 11
- b) Opposed: 0
- c) Abstain: 1

D. Macedonian Association Referendum

- 1. Goal of reducing barrier to entry to USG by renaming it “Government Club”
 - a) Encourage students who otherwise wouldn’t have joined to join

2. Motivation for the Macedonian Society to propose this referendum
 - a) Parallels Macedonia changing their name
 - b) In hopes that this will be the first step in more procedural change to make the USG more accessible
3. The referendum would only change the name of USG not its function
4. Why focus on USG as using an acronym ?
 - a) Running for a position in USG is similar to applying for clubs and some clubs are even less accessible so why USG
 - (1) USG is supposed to be representative of the student body
5. The use of the word “club”
 - a) Concern that this doesn’t accurately reflect the role of the USG as having jurisdiction over club approval
 - b) Concern that the “Government Club” will be interpreted as a club to, say, celebrate governments
6. Question as to whether the referendum aims to focus on the abbreviation USG or about the actual name (Undergraduate Student Government)
7. Because officers must run for USG, entry is still difficult and the name of the club does not change this
8. Is this a pressing issue?
 - a) Not so much that students believe that it is not accessible but because of the time commitment
 - b) Being brought up as a referendum because it is a concern that needs to be addressed, not because it is already being addressed by the student body
9. Condensation
 - a) Concern that the referendum only changes the name provision of the Senate constitution, not the use of the acronym in the following clauses
 - (1) The entirety of the Senate constitution would be amended

Motion to extend time by 4 mins

E. Motion to mark the referendum as frivolous

1. Requires 5% vote and abstaining does not count for or against the vote
2. Vote
 - a) For: 12
 - b) Opposed: 1
 - c) Abstain: 0
3. Any objections to wording? Sponsors may still collect signatures

F. Haile Referendum

1. Penalty Changes associated with Academic integrity
2. 3 penalty recommendations
 - a) Eliminate standard penalty system
 - (1) Precedent for what infraction gets what penalty
 - b) Addition of new penalties in Rights, Rules, and Responsibilities
 - (1) Addition of a reprimand for first offense as defined more serious than a warning but less serious than it showing up on your permanent record
 - c) Widening of penalties available to recommend for an infraction
 - (1) Addition of 1 semester suspension (as opposed to a full year, which is the only penalty available now)
 - (a) This 1 semester suspension would be followed by a leave of absence because most academic departments will not allow students to just be gone for a semester
 - (i) Allows for exceptions to be made for departments that don't require this
 - (ii) The year would be standard with the student having the option to file a petition to return after 1 semester
 - (a) For example, in the case of advanced standing
 - (b) Concern that this change is superficial as the student remains required to take a year off anyway (in most cases)
 - (i) Referendum is beneficial in that students will only have it marked on their disciplinary record as 1 semester of suspension
 - d) Condensation
 - (1) Change of the word "duration" to "range"
 - (2) Risk of students changing majors or change class years for advanced standing
 - (a) Not the disciplinary system responsibility to account for this
 - e) Procedural concerns
 - (1) Addition of planned implementation date to referendum: fall 2019
 - (2) Interpretation of "disciplinary probation"

- (a) Interpreted as until graduation
- (b) Concern as to why does the amendment supercede the original provision in the constitution
 - (i) Clarifying point to prior use of the term
- (c) Change resolution to include more specific definition
 - (i) Is this necessary given that we are referring to standard system
 - (ii) Without phrase “remove standard penalty”
 - (a) Result of internal policy and not constitutional requirement
 - (i) Can recommend probation of suspension for 2 or 3 years
 - (b) Speculation of what the honor committee will do in extending penalties
 - (iii) Reasons to keep it
 - (a) Could argue that this is removing standard penalty
 - (iv) Opposition: this is the language that is being used by the student body in light of the honor code referendum so could be beneficial in using language that is familiar to the student body
 - (v) Suggestion to remove standard penalty in the first sentence but include it later

Motion to extend time by 7 mins

- 3. Summary of the Referendum’s Goals
 - a) Expanding range of penalties
 - b) Removing current norm of standard penalty system
 - (1) Range of options opposed to one penalty for specific infraction
 - (a) Suggestion to make this clearer in the condensation

Motion to extend time by 5 mins

- 4. Further discussion on the condensation
 - a) Confusion that condensation may suggest that they are trying to increase the penalty time
 - b) Suggestion to define term “standard Penalty”

Motion to extend time by 8 mins

5. Motion to Vote
 - a) For: 13
 - b) Opposed: 0
 - c) Abstain: 0

G. Wayner Referendum

1. Accelerate University actions in becoming a carbon neutral campus
 - a) In collaboration with office of sustainability
2. 3 Goals for the referendum
 - a) Increase emission tracking
 - (1) The University currently does not track scope 3 emissions
 - (a) Such as flights for study abroad and food transport
 - b) Increase transparency on carbon neutrality efforts
 - (1) Goal to reach this by 2046
 - (2) Not set with climate goals but rather University goals
 - (3) Better student engagements: emails and meetings about how we can move faster on climate change
 - c) Establish benchmark dates
3. Condensation
 - a) Add step format to question
 - b) "Bordening emission assessments" specificity to Scope three emissions
 - c) Suggestion to remove the requirement that previous task force members must be involved in the new initiative
 - (1) Members may not be available
 - d) Annual report and online survey form
 - (1) Restrictions on emails university wide? Is it feasible?
 - e) Ballot question should reflect the explanation
4. Work with sustainability office
 - a) Is this referendum meant to pressure the office to move faster?
 - (1) To show undergraduate support
 - (a) This should be reflected in the language of the condensation
5. Position Paper
 - a) If referendum passes, a paper must be written, according to referendum handbook
 - b) Due date is very optimistic, suggestion to move due date
 - (1) Would be preferable to do before the end of the year
6. Motion to Vote

- a) For: 13
 - b) Opposed: 0
 - c) Abstained: 0
-

III. Consent Agenda

A. Graphic Designer Confirmation

a. Raya Ward '21

- i. My name is Raya, and I am a sophomore from Atlanta, GA. I am an Independent Concentrator in Human-Computer Interaction and Design which combines computer-science, design, and sociology in a study of technology's effects on us as both individuals and as a society and how to mindfully design and engineer technologies. Additionally, I will be getting a certificate in visual arts. On campus, I am heavily involved with the Art Museum and club swim. My hobbies include visual art, outdoor activities, and keeping up current tech and design trends.