

Princeton USG Senate
Meeting 8
March 27th, 2022
8:00 pm EST



Introduction

1. Question and Answer Session (5 minutes)
2. President's Report (Mayu Takeuchi, 5 minutes)
 - a. Six total votes
 - b. Language review
 - i. Hannah
 1. The USG Senate is not voting on whether or not they identify with the opinions expressed in a referendum proposal
 2. The purpose of the language review is to assess the clarity of the direct effects of adoption and whether it falls under the power of an undergraduate referendum
 3. Essentially, the main goal is to assess clarity of language and whether or not this is something that a referendum has the power to ask for.
 4. The USG is a neutral facilitator
 5. Any student can sponsor referenda; it is within their power and authority to do so
 6. It is not the role of the USG Senate to evaluate the substance of the proposals
 7. The USG constitution has a scope of review that applies to any sort of referendum a student may sponsor. Our role is to uphold that process; we do not have authority to assess the changes or demands within a referendum, that assessment is to be made by the student body
 8. Any questions, comments, or concerns will be heard during the Community Forum at the end of the meeting. We do not want to stifle any speech or conversation, but during the language review, please try to stick to the procedures the constitution outlines.
 9. Refer to the general guidelines listed in the meeting packet. When speaking, state your role, what section of the documentation that you are referring to when raising issues with the language, and what section of the constitution your comment or question pertains to.

- ii. Kate:
 - 1. *A complete guide to language review can be found in the Elections Handbook, Section 306 on the Senate Referendum Language Review, which is available in this document*
 - 2. Majority vote to approve language
 - 3. Stephen: We have no oversight over the *Explanation*
 - a. It's just the resolution and the ballot question
 - 4. Approved if
 - a. Worded neutrally
 - b. Accurately describes direct effects of the adoption
 - c. Within purview of undergraduate referendum
 - 5. Exception: Not need to be neutrally worded if
 - a. The section is issued under advisory power
 - b. Unambiguously states it's under the advisory power
 - 6. Amendments
 - a. Only the sponsor may amend language
 - b. Before senate votes to approve, the sponsor may amend the language
 - c. Only last possible version is voted on
 - d. Language shall not be amended any more after the vote
 - e. Need 526 signatures by Friday night to get on the ballot, on paper (only student sponsored), if the language is approved
 - f. If Senate approves the language, they may also determine the referendum to be frivolous (5% majority required)
 - i. Can still get on the ballot but now need 1300 signatures to do so
 - 7. Stephen: How can USG interact going forward in terms of more political speech?
 - a. Hannah: Beyond the vote, you can express whatever you'd like but don't speak on behalf of USG. Make it clear when you are voicing your personal opinion.

New Business

- 1. Projects Board Approval (3 minutes, Nelson Dimpter)
 - a. AASA
 - i. In person speaker event/providing bubble tea for first 65 people to show up
 - ii. \$1228 from USG
 - iii. Sean Bradley motions for a vote, Mariam Latif seconds
 - 1. 20 votes in favor, 3 abstaining, 0 against

- 2. *The vote passes*
 - b. Princeton Students for Reproductive Justice
 - i. Free STI testing for about 100 students to be tested
 - ii. \$1500 from USG
 - iii. Stephen Daniels motions for a vote, Sean Bradley seconds
 - 1. Vote: 20 in favor, 3 abstaining, 0 against
 - 2. *The vote passes*
2. SGRC Approval (3 minutes, Derek Nam)
 - a. Approved 6 new clubs
 - i. February 24th, 2022
 - 1. Raising awareness surrounding the conflict in Ukraine
 - ii. Basement
 - 1. Comedy group
 - iii. FACET
 - 1. Food allergy awareness
 - iv. Just Dance Co.
 - 1. Dance group celebrating all dance styles
 - v. Tiger Med EMS Ed
 - 1. Med service education
 - vi. National Alzheimer's Buddies
 - vii. Stephen Daniels motions for a vote, Austin Davis seconds
 - viii. Vote: 20 in favor, 3 abstaining, 0 against
3. USG Movies Update (5 minutes, Cheyenne Zhang)
 - a. Garden Theater
 - i. 50-200 attendees on average
 - ii. Working on increasing engagement; those who register and attend is 53%
 - iii. Spent about \$5000 so far
 - iv. New releases are most popularly attended
 - b. Outdoor Movies
 - i. Kickoff event mid april
 - ii. Held 3 total last semester
 - iii. Want food trucks to increase attendance
 - c. Upcoming
 - i. IB film fest collab
 - ii. Alumni guest speaker
 - iii. Instagram: @princetonusgmovie
 - iv. Student: Are we able to do a screening of a short film?
 - 1. Cheyenne: Yes, we can work with you on that.
4. Mental Health Initiative Update (5 Minutes, Tiffanie Cheng and Noah Luch)
 - a. Mental Health Week is next week

- b. Monday: Decorated dining halls
 - c. Tuesday: Student panel → Frist MPR (7-9 pm)
 - d. Wednesday: Therapy dogs at Frist Lawn (12 pm)
 - e. Thursday: “Just Dance” at Frist MPR (8-9:30 pm)
 - f. Friday: Movie night at discussion at Roma Theater (8-10 pm)
 - g. Saturday: 1 mile walkathon around campus at Cannon Green at (3-5 pm)
5. Mental Health Referendum, Proposal for Senate Sponsorship (5 minutes, Stephen Daniels)
- a. Importance
 - i. Serious step for Senate in terms of Mental Health
 - ii. Signals our support for Mental Health
 - iii. Will require Senate support if it is adopted by the students
 - b. Ned: We talked a while ago about having two referenda, what is happening
 - i. Stephen: It is one referendum together now
 - ii. Carlisle Imperial motions for a vote, Gisell Curbelo seconds
 - 1. Vote: 20 in favor, 3 abstaining, 0 against
 - 2. *The vote passes*
6. Referendum Language Review
- a. DEI Referendum Language Review (10 minutes, Braiden Aaronson)
 - i. Clause 4 of Article II was struck (defining jurisdiction)
 - ii. Sean Bradley motions for a vote, Stephen Daniels seconds
 - iii. Vote: 20 in favor, 3 abstaining, 0 against
 - b. Mental Health Referendum Language Review (10 minutes, Stephen Daniels)
 - i. Walker (‘25 Senator): There is type-o I noticed
 - ii. Kate: I will fix that
 - iii. Mariam Latif motions for a vote, Eric Slanka seconds
 - 1. Vote: 20 in favor, 3 abstaining, 0 against
 - 2. *The vote passes*
 - c. Caterpillar Referendum Language Review (10 minutes, Eric Periman)
 - i. Overview
 - 1. Sponsored by Eric Periman, a member of PCP
 - 2. Concerned use of Caterpillar Construction for campus construction
 - ii. Claims about Caterpillar
 - 1. Caterpillar is contracted by Departments of State and Defense as well as Israel
 - 2. Used by Israel to demolish Palestinian homes
 - 3. Difficult legal history
 - a. Implicated in deaths of protesters
 - 4. Involved in prison industrial complex

- d. Madi Linton (SoComm Chair, comment on ballot question): Violent isn't a neutral term. The description around the word says enough to describe it without using violence to say it.
 - i. Kate: It's under the advisory power
 - ii. Eric: It's plain for students when voting in case they haven't fully researched the issue
- e. Carlisle Imperial (U councilor): Wouldn't you want them to be informed, instead of using charged words to inform them?
 - i. Eric: We want to speak blatantly about these issues and not use neutral language when we don't have to
 - ii. ***Edit denied***
- f. Kanishkh Kanodia ('23 Sen, section 1 and 2 question): The resolution calls on princeton itself, can there be any specificity to who within princeton on who has oversight over this?
 - i. Eric: Section 3 calls for transmittal and that's where we ask that the referendum be submitted to specific people that will be able to handle this better than only the University
- g. Adam Hoffman (Treasurer): I have two things. It's illegal to boycott caterpillar because NJ has anti BDS law so this is beyond the power of what we can call for. Also there is a disconnect between the resolution and the ballot question. It is a fact that for BDS campaigns on campus, there is an uptake of antisemitic acts after the passing of the referendum and BDS boycott. They are trying to sneak in BDS. In this ballot question, it ties this question to the BDS question, but does not mention BDS. The ballot and the resolution do not align. The ballot question does not clearly describe the resolution.
 - i. Eric: Adam would like you to believe this is a BDS referendum, and it is not. The University has complete discretion of what companies they do and do not associate with. It is legal under federal and state law.
 - ii. ***Edit denied***
- h. Adam: What happens if there's factual errors?
 - i. Hannah: Senate members can consider that interpretation when they vote.
- Stephen Daniels motion to extend time by 10 mins, Avi Attar seconds
 - i. Avi Attar (USLC Chair). This is about the direct impact of the resolution. If there was an uptake in antisemitic attacks, that is problematic. There is definitely a dilemma here, so I'm wondering why you went the resolution route?
 - i. Eric: The referendum discussion right now isn't our campaign for the referendum itself. We have denounced anti semitism. In my conversations with President Eisgruber and other groups, it's hard to make changes without having mass consensus, and sometimes it is not enough. I don't

have a personal friendship with the administration and this may be the only way to make this happen.

- Stephen Daniels motions to extend by 10 mins, Ned Dockery seconds
 - j. Sean Bradley ('24 Sen, scope of review for direct effects; Section 1, Part 4): Do you want the construction companies to enforce the referendum if it passes?
 - i. Eric: No, it is the enforcement of University on construction companies.
 - ii. Edit accepted**
 - k. Andrew Zucker (SusComm member, voting for Audrey Zhang): You said this isn't related to a BDS campaign, and BDS has been neglected within the resolution for students to research so I suggest you include it so students can research it. Most Jewish organizations agree that BDS is anti-semitic.
 - i. Eric: The BDS movement is Palestinian movement founded after international law was violated. It does not take a stand in a state solution, it focuses on the right of Palestinians to return to the land they lived on. There is no consensus within Jewish groups or Palestinians groups. Palestinian groups are worried about bad faith accusations against BDS to excuse the actions of the Israeli government. About the usage of language, BDS doesn't have one singular goal. When you say I'm misleading students, I'd say that is not true.
 - ii. Andrew: I never said all Jewish organizations, I said many do, especially on Princeton's campus.
 - iii. Edit denied**
 - l. Ned Dockery ('25 Sen, scope of the resolution): It seems like the referendum in 2015 did have an uptake in attacks. Would you be willing to add anything about this potentially direct effect?
 - i. Eric: The referendum in 2015 was regarding divestment, for those that don't know. In order to do that, it would be to add a clause that would take into account the attacks on PCP members. People have reached out to me saying they were targeted.
- Isabella Shutt motions to extend time by 10 minutes, Stephen Daniels seconds
 - ii. Ned: I think your story has reinforced the importance of adding that clause.
 - iii. Edit denied**
- m. Kanishkh Kanodia ('23 Sen): We understand the implications of the resolutions about attacks on both sides. What has PCP done to create spaces for dialogue?
 - i. Eric: There was a workshop created by the CJL and attended by members of PCP. We are working with Ian in ODUS to create more workshops like that one.
- Stephen Daniels motions to extend time by 10 minutes, Madi Linton seconds
 - ii. Edit denied**

- Walker Penfield motions to vote, no second
- n. Carlisle Imperial (U Councilor): I'd ask we move the community discussion prior to the vote. This calls for a lot of interpretation and we need to clarify what our vote means.
- o. Mayu Takeuchi (President): We are going to continue with the discussion after the vote so as to separate our opinions from the language review process.
- p. Stephen Daniels (U Councilor): The review process requires us to separate every personal opinion and implication of the results. I believe the process is flawed. Taking into the consideration of the implications would be a Constitutional challenge.
- q. Hannah Kapoor (Vice President): If you feel that the process is flawed, the process can be amended but that would have to be in the future. In the present moment, we must operate under the procedures as they presently are. Everything is subject to interpretation
- r. Isabella Shutt (CCA Chair/U Councilor): As the Senate we need to be careful and need to be a neutral facilitator. If we get into what could potentially happen, it is not fair to students who bring up these questions. We have to think about the precedent we set if we are always considering who is offended and asking what language gets put in.
- s. Andrew Zucker ('25 SusComm Member, voting for Audrey Zhang): Walker mentioned that there is a low bar to get this pass, and I disagree. It should be a high bar.
- t. Isabella Shutt (CCA Chair/U Councilor): My point is not that these impacts can't be serious, they would just be indirect effects.
- Isabella Shutt motions to extend my 10 mins, Stephen Daniels seconds
 - u. Riley Martinez (U Council Chair, Ballot question): I am in favor of striking the parenthetical saying 'atrocities', even if the sponsor believes there are atrocities, everything is listed in the bullet point and I don't see what the atrocities cover. It only adds more confusion.
 - i. Edit accepted*
 - v. Adam Hoffman (Treasurer, ballot questions): The ballot question refers to something different than the referendum. Also, for the powers of undergraduates under the referendum, what this calls for is illegal. This is separate from the antisemitism.
 - i. Eric: BDS is in the explanation
 - ii. Adam: The ballot needs to clearly describe the referendum. One refers to BDS, one doesn't so it does not describe the referendum accurately.
 - iii. Eric: BDS is used as a reference for why we take an issue with it. We are not voting on BDS as an organization at all. That is what is on both the ballot and referendum.

iv. Edit denied

- w. Sean Bradley ('24 Sen): Kate, could you go over how our oversight fits into the explanation?
 - i. Kate: I would refer you to the language outline section.
- x. Walker Penfield ('25 Sen): I want to clarify that the low bar is a constitutional phrase. It just refers to us passing the language and not the content.
- Isabella Shutt motions to extend my 10 mins, Stephen Daniels seconds
 - y. Braiden Aaronson (DEI Chair): Could you clarify what frivolous means?
 - i. Kate: I will not define what frivolous means because the first vote is not covering it. If 5/6 of the Senate deems it frivolous, then the content is frivolous. Someone can call a vote on frivolity after the language is approved. If it is voted frivolous, Eric would need 1300 signatures then it can still get on the ballot.
 - z. Adam Hoffman (Treasurer): This vote is on language review but also ballot review.
 - i. Kate: Language review encompasses ballot review.
 - aa. Andrew Zucker (SusComm member, voting for Audrey Zhang, ballot question): You only mention BDS in explanation but in the ballot question it isn't there. You associate BDS with Caterpillar but not having it in all parts it misdirects students
 - i. Eric: We have to use the word boycott, we don't have another word to describe this. It doesn't necessarily entail a link with the BDS movement. We also reference the prison industrial complex, so it is not a BDS referendum.
- Carlisle Imperial motions for a vote, Walker Penfield seconds
 - Vote: 12 in favor, 6 abstaining, 5 against
 - *The vote passes*
- bb. Isabella Shutt (CCA Chair, U Councilor): It is not frivolous because it is legal. We also need to think about what it would mean to tell students their concern is frivolous.
- cc. Adam Hoffman (Treasurer): Because of other laws, it is not legal.
- dd. Kate Liu (Parliamentarian): For a 5% vote they can vote it frivolous and then a referendum needs 1300 signatures.
- ee. Ned Dockery ('25 Sen): The Reform Act of 1976 is to stop US companies and US related companies from engaging in boycotts.
- ff. Isabella Shutt (CCA Chair, U Councilor): Can the people who reference the law send it in the slack? Also, consider what it means to tell them their concern is frivolous. Even if it is not legal, does it prevent us from allowing the students to bring this forward?

- gg. Adam Hoffman (Treasurer): That's just how it works. It can be frivolous if we so choose, even if it was legal.
- hh. Walker Penfield ('25 Sen): You can have language that falls within the Constitution that makes no sense. Frivolous is a high bar.
- ii. Adam Hoffman (Treasurer): We are thinking about if this is a serious question as it relates to the content and also if it is possible or not.
- jj. Ned Dockery ('25 Sen): Did the Senate vote to approve the language?
 - i. Charlotte Selover (Executive Secretary): They did.
- kk. Isabella Shutt (CCA Chair, U Councilor): We should consider that a student body is made of elected and non elected members. We are non representative of the entire student body. Think about who you represent. We know this room does not represent the student body as well as it should.
- ll. Braiden Aaronson (DEI Chair): Cornell provides a definition of frivolous. I don't think that this discussion limits free speech, but using BDS could be considered frivolous.
- Walker Penfield motions for a vote, Isabella Shutt seconds
 - Vote: 5 in favor, 10 abstaining, 5 against
 - *The vote does not pass*

Community Forum

- Space for dialogue about issues that we may not have had space for during the conversation about language

President's Report, March 27
Mayu Takeuchi

From week of Mar 14

- Meeting with VP Calhoun and Dr. Chin, 3/21
 - Established next steps for reviewing/assessing the state of mental health resources on campus, including where the gaps and unmet needs are
 - Planning to meet this coming week for an initial assessment of the data/info available currently, and then to have a larger meeting in mid April to get the review going
- Weekly meeting with Dean Dunne
 - Discussed mental health resources referendum
 - Discussed elements of the USG Reform Project, establishing steps for Dillion and the working group to establish clearer position descriptions
 - Checked in on progress of community dining; we have a meeting on this coming up this week
- CPUC 3/21
 - See CPUC notes in the newsletter!
 - Special thanks to Riley (U-Council Chair) and **all** the U-Councilors for engaging!
 - Topic highlights: fossil fuel dissociation, minors, UHS/CPS
- Meeting with Jed Marsh, Office of Institutional Research, 3/22

- Exciting stuff!
- Thanks to Ned, Carlisle, and Dillion for leading the charge so we as USG can make more informed policy and programming decisions
- Plans in the works for late August to bolster this work in partnership with OIR
- Meeting with Michelle Minter and Shawn Maxam, Office of Institutional Equity & Diversity
 - Thanks Braiden & DEIComm for the thoughtful prep for this meeting!
 - Discussed mechanisms for feedback/accountability, e.g. looking to establish quarterly public reports by the Office of Institutional Equity & Diversity
 - Discussed plans for expanding and diversifying affinity spaces across campus
 - Planning for our next meeting in April
- Meeting with new President of the Inter-Club Council Sophie Singletary
 - ICC priorities: equity/transparency with regard to financial aid, especially for sophomores; DEI; issues pertaining to sexual culture, climate, and conduct
 - ICC planning to bring back TruckFest
 - Opportunities for collaboration: community-building and school spirit-building initiatives (maybe jointly-hosted tailgates?)
 - I will attend the ICC meeting on Monday
- Meeting with Cecily Swanson and Mary Alexander to begin planning Academic Expo for Class of '26
 - Exciting stuff in the works!
 - Austin & I will meet with the Academics Chair who planned Fall 2019 expo to kickstart the planning process
- Meeting with VP Calhoun
 - Discussed mental health, particularly learning more about who's talking about it how:
 - Board of Trustees' Committee on Student Life, Health, and Athletics → from a long-term strategic perspective
 - University Student Life Committee's Subcommittee on Student Health and Wellbeing → from a "let's identify issues and activate the University to solve them" perspective
 - Student/community-building: in-person activities have been in high demand (as opposed to people wanting to stay on Zoom)
 - In the longer term, the building that's now McCosh Health Center will become a student-centered campus life building (sort of like Frist now). There will be opportunities for student input in the near future
- Meeting between USG, Honor Committee, Committee on Discipline, and Peer Reps
 - Thanks Avi for coordinating here!
 - Discussed initial updates on conversations surrounding financial aid implications for students who have to repeat a semester for academic integrity violations

- Assessing levels of student familiarity with different University disciplinary processes
- Viewpoint Diversity Task Force, beginning to review student applications with Adam
- Senate hang out - exploring old USG docs
 - I hope everyone who came by had fun!
 - Let me know if you have suggestions for other activities

Upcoming items for week of Mar 28

- University Student Life Committee, 3/28: I will present on behalf of the USG regarding mental health: what we're doing, and what administrators across the University can do to support undergraduate student mental health
- Inter-Club Council meeting, 3/28: I'll present USG priorities and explore opportunities for collaboration
- Mental Health Resources review, 3/29: meeting with VP Calhoun, Dr. Chin, and Stephen & Hannah

General Guidelines for the Senate Language Review:

1. As the USG Senate will be facilitating this process with the collaboration of members of the student body who do not serve on the USG Senate, let us ensure that the conversation runs smoothly and clearly. When called upon to speak, please:

- Introduce yourself by your name and position on the USG Senate.

2. As the USG Senate will be reviewing numerous pages of documentation, when called upon to speak, please:

- State whether or not you are raising a question or comment.

- State which criteria of the Senate Language Review your question or comment pertains to.

- Which specific section of the documentation your question or comment refers to.

Should you require any clarifications about the Senate language review process, please be in touch with the USG Parliamentarian, Kate Liu.

§ 306. Senate Referendum Language Review

a. PRE-SCHEDULED TIME.—The Senate referendum language review shall occur at a pre-scheduled time.

b. TIMING.—

1. IN GENERAL.—The Senate referendum language review shall occur on a date no earlier than 15 days before the first day of campaigning and no later than 8 days before the first day of campaigning.

2. SENATE MEETING.—The Senate referendum language review shall occur during a Senate meeting.

3. RECESS SCHEDULING PROHIBITED.—The period beginning on the date after the Senate referendum language review and ending on the referendum petition deadline may not overlap with an academic recess.

c. COMPONENTS.—In order for the referendum sponsor to begin petitioning, the Senate must, by majority vote, pass a motion to approve the language of both the referendum resolution and the ballot question.

d. SCOPE OF REVIEW.—

1. REFERENDUM RESOLUTION.—The Senate shall approve the language of the referendum resolution if—

1. the resolution is neutrally worded;

2. the resolution clearly describes the direct effects of its adoption;
and

3. the resolution does not claim to exercise a power that cannot be exercised by an undergraduate referendum.

2. EXCEPTION.—A section of a referendum resolution is exempt from the requirement that the section be neutrally worded if both of the following conditions apply:
 1. The section is issued solely under the advisory power.
 2. The resolution unambiguously states that the section is issued under the advisory power.
 3. BALLOT QUESTION.—The Senate shall approve the language of the ballot question if the ballot question clearly describes the referendum resolution.
- e. AMENDMENTS TO REFERENDUM.—
1. ONLY SPONSORS MAY AMEND.—Only the sponsor may amend the language of the referendum resolution or ballot question.
 2. BEFORE APPROVAL.—Before the Senate approves the language of the referendum resolution and the ballot question, the sponsor may amend the language.
 3. AFTER APPROVAL.—After the Senate approves the language of the referendum resolution and the ballot question, the language shall not be amended.
- f. FRIVOLOUS REFERENDUM DETERMINATION.—If the Senate approves the language of the referendum resolution and the ballot question, the Senate may also determine the referendum to be frivolous in accordance with subsection 1001(c) of the Senate Constitution.

Suggested Practice 3-6.

The “direct effect” of a resolution issued under the advisory power is to take an official position on a question of interest to undergraduates. The Senate should not consider such a resolution to have violated section 306(d)(1)(B) merely because the proposed official position of the undergraduates, as expressed in the resolution, lacks specificity.

Referendum Question No. 1

**Princeton University Undergraduate Student Government Election—Spring
2022** Sponsored by BRAIDEN AARONSON '25, USG DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION CHAIR
SUBMITTED BY THE SENATE OF THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT

[Insert if Senate approves the language].

Condensation (Ballot Question)

In consideration of the USG's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, shall the undergraduates amend the Senate Constitution to establish the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee as a Core Committee bound by the proposed Committee Charter (attached in the complete Senate Resolution) and administered by an elected chair who shall be a member of the Senate Executive Committee and a voting member in the Senate?

Explanation (Submitted by the Sponsor)

The purpose of this referendum is to institutionalize the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (hereinafter DEI) Committee and to ensure its longevity in the work of the USG.

Establishing the DEI Committee as a Core Committee in the Senate Constitution aims to make important and necessary DEI work consistently a key priority of each USG Administration moving forward. As a permanent structure in the USG Senate, more stable relationships between the USG and Administration can be established with a specific focus on DEI work to achieve long term administrative change. Furthermore, codifying the DEI Committee in the Senate Constitution acknowledges the sustained effort and consistent proactivity required to effect change in Princeton's Administration by recognizing that the most meaningful administrative policy changes coming out of USG are from long-term sustained initiatives through its Core Committees.

Moreover, granting the position voting power in the Senate and a seat on the Senate Executive Committee conveys the integral nature and importance of DEI to the USG and the student body. DEI is an essential aspect of fostering a better USG, a better Administration, and a better campus community, so the USG should fully reflect a commitment to and acknowledgement of its importance.

Additionally, it is important to allow the student body the opportunity to choose who facilitates USG DEI work, granting the support and legitimacy of the student body to the position to embolden the elected facilitator and further legitimize the position's work with the Administration and Faculty as being representative of the will of the student body.

**THE UNDERGRADUATES OF PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY** Princeton, New Jersey

Referendum Resolution 1-2022

Referendum Question No. 1 (Spring 2022)

Sponsored by BRAIDEN AARONSON '25, USG DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION
CHAIR SUBMITTED BY THE SENATE OF THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT

Referendum Resolution

Amending the USG Senate Constitution to establish the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee as a Core Committee bound by the attached charter and administered by an elected chair who shall be a member of the Senate Executive Committee and a voting member in the Senate.

Whereas the DEI Chair currently is appointed by the USG President, is not a voting member of the Senate, and does not automatically sit on the Senate Executive Committee;

Whereas the Senate Executive Committee serves a critical role in the overall policy direction and work of the Senate while also fostering enhanced and streamlined collaboration between Senate Executive Committee members;

Whereas the DEI Committee structure had to be re-established at the beginning of the Spring 2022 semester, impeding substantive progress due to necessary internal and administrative setup;

Whereas the presence of this proposed constitutional structure to the DEI Committee would help mitigate future internal impediments to the policy goals of USG DEI efforts;

Whereas the establishment of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee formally as a Core Committee in the Senate Constitution would give the Senate a constitutional mandate to maintain an active committee with a DEI Committee Chair;

Whereas the DEI Committee Chair would be elected by the full undergraduate student body in the USG winter election cycle, would be a voting member of the Senate, and would automatically sit on the Senate Executive Committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the undergraduates of Princeton University,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF USG SENATE §701.

Section 701 of the Senate Constitution is amended to read as follows: **§ 701. Core Committees**

The Core Committees are the—

- (1) USLC;
- (2) Academics Committee;
- (3) Social Committee;
- (4) CCA Committee; ~~and~~
- (5) Sustainability Committee; *and*
- (6) DEI Committee***

SECTION 2. AMENDMENT OF USG SENATE §502

Section 501 of the Senate Constitution is amended to read as follows: **§ 501. Core Committees**

In descending order of seniority, the Executive Officers are the--

- (1) President;
- (2) Vice President;
- (3) Treasurer;
- (4) U-Council Chair;
- (5) CPUC Executive Committee Representative;
- (6) USLC Chair;
- (7) Academics Committee Chair;
- (8) Social Committee Chair;
- (9) CCA Committee Chair; ~~and~~
- (10) Sustainability Committee Chair; *and*
- (11) DEI Committee Chair.***

SECTION 3. AMENDMENT OF USG SENATE §703

Section 703 of the Senate Constitution is amended by adding a new subsection, designated 703(i), to read as follows:

(i) DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE.—

(1) PURPOSES, MEMBERSHIP, AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Senate shall prescribe the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee purposes, membership, and responsibilities in the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee Charter.

SECTION 4. ADOPTION OF A DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE CHARTER

The referendum shall be binding on the Senate to adopt a Diversity, Equity,

and Inclusion Committee Charter, which is attached to this resolution.

SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE

This resolution becomes effective upon approval of the Undergraduates in accordance with Section 1003(b) of the Senate Constitution.

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE CHARTER

ARTICLE I – MISSION

The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (hereinafter the DEI Committee) shall advocate for all students by promoting diversity, pursuing equity, and increasing inclusion in the Undergraduate Student Government (hereinafter the USG) work with student groups, faculty, and administrators. The Committee shall conduct its work with the vision of ensuring that students of diverse backgrounds and experiences are actively celebrated and supported by the USG, Administration, and broader campus community.

ARTICLE II – PURPOSE & RESPONSIBILITIES

The expressed purpose of the DEI Committee is to ensure that principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion (hereinafter DEI) are integral to the work of the USG and its impacts on the broader Princeton community. The core responsibilities of the Committee shall include:

1. Representing and advocating for students to amplify DEI in University policies and processes by:
 - a. establishing, maintaining, and consistently improving relations with administrators relevant to furthering the work of the Committee;
 - b. administering student focus groups to gauge student priorities and perspectives for informing administrative advocacy;
 - c. conducting comprehensive reviews of University DEI initiatives and reports (such as the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Annual Report);
 - d. and encouraging relevant administrative offices and campus organizations to coordinate programming and improve systems of support in order to strengthen institutional commitment and action toward DEI
2. Fostering meaningful and impactful conversations that bridge and elevate students with varied backgrounds, through both University decision-making processes and student-focused events
3. Facilitating and strengthening USG communications between the student body and the Administration regarding University DEI efforts

ARTICLE III – CONTEXTUALIZING DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION In specific reference to Dr. Deborah Son Holoein’s paper “Do Differences Make a Difference? The Effects of Diversity on Learning, Intergroup Outcomes, and Civic Engagement”

(reference APPENDIX I) created under Princeton University's Trustee Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity in September 2013, the USG DEI Committee shall incorporate the following definition, on page two, as a guide to the work of the Committee:

Diversity can manifest in many ways. Differences in race, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, upbringing, and philosophical views are just a few ways in which people can be diverse. ... [D]iversity is defined as 'variation based on any attribute people use to tell themselves that another person is different' (Mannix & Neale, 2005, p. 33)

Furthermore, the Committee shall pursue equitable solutions, with the expressed understanding that appropriate and proper levels of support are not the same for all people

of diverse and intersectional backgrounds. This shall inform a consistent effort to provide fair treatment and access to opportunities, information, and resources for all.

Moreover, the Committee shall abide by the following definition of inclusion: all students should be a part of a welcoming and respectful campus environment truly reflective of the diversity of greater society where all feel valued to pursue their educational, scholarly, and career interests, without unnecessary and harmful barriers to access.

Thus, the Committee shall aim to support all Princeton students by pursuing equitable and inclusive University policy and programming, especially supporting students of varied and underrepresented experiences, backgrounds, perspectives, ideologies, beliefs, affiliations, upbringings, origins, groups, abilities, practices, and identities.

ARTICLE IV – COMMITTEE CHAIR & MEMBERSHIP

The Committee shall be led by the DEI Committee Chair, elected by the student body every winter election.

Members shall be recruited by the Committee Chair at the beginning of each semester, serving renewable one-semester terms. The appropriate size of Committee membership shall be left to the discretion of the Committee Chair.

The Committee Chair and members are expected to:

1. conduct administrative DEI policy advocacy, communications, and outreach,
2. improve USG internal operations relevant to,
3. encourage campus group and organization collaboration,
4. and actively participate in any other work designated a priority for the Committee.

Any member exhibiting a significant failure to participate in the Committee or participating in conduct unbecoming of a USG Representative may be dismissed by the Committee Chair. This decision may be appealed and brought before the USG Executive Committee which will subsequently conduct a review, in consultation with the Committee Chair.

ARTICLE V – MEETINGS

The Committee shall meet on a weekly or bi-weekly basis throughout each semester, at the discretion of the Committee Chair. The Committee Chair and members are expected to attend all Committee meetings.

ARTICLE VI – AMENDMENTS

After the ratification of this Charter, it may be amended or altered by a majority vote of the USG Senate (S. Const. §308).

ARTICLE VII – CHARTER RATIFICATION

Upon the passage of the DEI Committee student referendum in Spring 2022, the DEI Committee shall be considered an established and operational Core Committee bound by this Charter (S. Const §701).

APPENDIX I – “DO DIFFERENCES MAKE A DIFFERENCE?” BY DR.

HOLOIEN “Do Differences Make A Difference? The Effects of Diversity on Learning, Intergroup Outcomes, and Civic Engagement” by Dr. Deborah Son Holoien may be provided per request of the USG Senate Historian or accessed online at the following link:

<https://inclusive.princeton.edu/sites/inclusive/files/pu-report-diversity-outcomes.pdf>

Referendum Question No. 2
Princeton University Undergraduate Student Government Election—Spring
2022 Sponsored by STEPHEN DANIELS '24

[Insert if Senate approves the language].

Condensation (Ballot Question)

Shall the undergraduates call on the Office of the Provost to, in a timely manner, allocate institutional resources to satisfy unmet demand for University-provided mental health care identified by a review, completed by the start of the Fall semester, by the Office of the Vice President for Campus Life in association with USG and other stakeholders including CPS?

Explanation (Submitted by the Sponsor)

The purpose of this referendum is to establish a process that allows for USG to address the current student mental health crisis. This process in particular allows for USG to work directly with senior administrators who have the power to allocate institutional resources to meet unmet demand for University-provided mental health care. The investigation will conclude no later than the start of fall classes on September 6th, 2022, with the expectation that there will be regular public progress updates and that the allocation of resources would begin as soon as this process identifies specific unmet needs. Although this is not an exhaustive list, the investigation would at least provide actionable responses to these questions:

- Does the current number of counselors available at CPS meet student need?
- How many students do not seek out mental health care because of perceived obstacles, wait times, etc.?
- How many students seek out but do not receive adequate mental health care, and why?
- How many students receive but are discontent with University-provided mental health care, and why?
- What is the follow-through rate for referrals by CPS to off-campus care, and, if it is not 100%, what are potential reasons why?
- Is there student demand for an expansion of telehealth counseling services, and, if so, what should this expansion look like?
- Does the number of private spaces on campus for telehealth counseling appointments meet student needs and is their availability adequately communicated to students?
- What is the plan to meet the mental health care needs covered by the outreach counselor program when the TigerWell grant expires?

- Do the current mental health care options provide proper support for people of all backgrounds?

As representatives of the student body, USG must respond to the loud call for more mental health care resources. This referendum is just one part of a much larger response; however, a strong demonstration of student support for this referendum would indicate that this process and the ultimate goal of meeting unmet mental health care demand should be viewed as an institutional priority.

**THE UNDERGRADUATES OF PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY** Princeton, New Jersey

Referendum Resolution 3-2022
Referendum Question No. 3 (Spring 2022)
Sponsored by STEPHEN DANIELS '24

Referendum Resolution

Calling on the Office of the Vice President for Campus Life under the advisory power to promptly satisfy unmet mental health care needs identified by a formal investigation in association with USG and other stakeholders including CPS

Whereas there is an ongoing mental health crisis leading to an increased need for mental health services for college students;

Whereas this crisis has been exacerbated by recent events, including but not limited to the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas the long lasting effects of those crises on mental health may continue to affect student mental health in the future, even though some of those events may be widely understood to have ended;

Whereas there appears to be a feeling amongst the undergraduate student body, expressed through forums like the Daily Princetonian opinion section, that current mental health resources on campus provide inadequate support;

Whereas the Office of the Provost has the ability to influence the allocation of resources and therefore increase mental health support on campus;

Whereas student support for some novel solutions that peer institutions have pursued like expansive digital mental health care may not be fully understood;

Whereas some student concerns about unmet mental health care needs may not have reached administration and thus may not have been fully investigated;

Whereas more funding for mental health resources is necessary to support a growing undergraduate student body;

Resolved by the undergraduates of Princeton University,

SECTION 1. FACULTY, DEPARTMENT HEADS, AND ADMINISTRATION. The

undergraduates call on the Office of the Vice President for Campus Life to:

1. Work with USG and other stakeholders including CPS to investigate unmet demand in University-provided mental health care resources offered to Princeton students and publish the findings no later than September 6th, 2022, while providing regular public progress updates.
 - a. This investigation will address questions including but not limited to
 - i. Does the current number of counselors available at CPS meet student need?
 - ii. How many students do not seek out mental health care because of perceived obstacles, wait times, etc.?
 - iii. How many students seek out but do not receive adequate mental health care, and why?
 - iv. How many students receive but are discontent with University-provided mental health care, and why?
 - v. What is the follow-through rate for referrals by CPS to off campus care, and, if it is not 100%, what are potential reasons why?
 - vi. Is there student demand for an expansion of telehealth counseling services, and, if so, what should this expansion look like?
 - vii. Does the number of private spaces on campus for telehealth counseling appointments meet student needs and is their availability adequately communicated to students?
 - viii. What is the plan to meet the mental health care needs covered by the outreach counselor program when the TigerWell grant expires?
 - ix. Do the current mental health care options provide proper support for people of all backgrounds?
2. After identifying unmet needs, work with the Office of the Provost to allocate the necessary financial resources to make the identified investments in students' mental wellbeing in a timely manner.

SECTION 2. USG SENATE

Section 1 of this referendum is issued solely under the advisory power of an undergraduate referendum.

As per Section 708 of the Elections Handbook, the USG Senate will write a report that explains the official position of the undergraduates as stated in the referendum resolution. The report will include action steps for the Senate and recommendations for the administration to further the undergraduates' official position. The report must be written and sent to the administration by no later than the end of the Spring 2022 semester on May 12, 2022.

SECTION 3. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION

The Executive Secretary of the Senate shall transmit an official copy of this resolution to each of the following university officers:

1. Christopher L. Eisgruber '83, President of the University.
2. Deborah A. Prentice, Provost of the University
3. W. Rochelle Calhoun, Vice President for Campus Life.
4. Dr. John Kolligian, Jr., Executive Director, University Health Services
5. Dr. Calvin R. Chin, Director, Counseling and Psychological Services
6. Jill Dolan, Dean of the College.
7. Kathleen Deignan, Dean of Undergraduate Students.

**Princeton University Undergraduate Student Government
Election—Spring 2022** Sponsored by ERIC PERIMAN '23

[Insert if Senate approves the language].

Condensation (Ballot Question)

Shall the undergraduates call on the Princeton University administration to 1) immediately halt usage of all Caterpillar machinery in all ongoing campus construction projects given the violent role that Caterpillar machinery has played in the mass demolition of Palestinian homes, the murder of Palestinians and other innocent people, and the promotion of the prison-industrial complex, 2) renegotiate or cancel contracts with construction entities who use Caterpillar machinery, 3) prohibit Caterpillar machinery from being used in all future University construction projects and 4) ensure strict oversight and enforcement of this resolution by the University of construction entities who are contracted by the University to carry out University construction projects?

Explanation (Submitted by the Sponsor)

The Princeton Committee on Palestine is a diverse group of students, faculty, and community members who stand in solidarity with the Palestinian people both in historic Palestine as well as around the world. We as an organization are extremely concerned about the University's usage of Caterpillar machinery in the ongoing University construction projects including (but not limited to) the new Lake Campus Development Project in West Windsor, the new Art Museum construction project, the new E-Quad construction project, as well as the recently completed new residential colleges East and West.

Caterpillar is one of the largest construction manufacturing companies in the world and its machinery is routinely used for violent, inhumane, and despicable purposes. Caterpillar is listed as one of the only targeted construction companies in the national Boycott Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement. The BDS movement is a Palestinian-led organization which promotes boycotts, divestments, and sanctions of the State of Israel on the grounds that Israel is violating international law by their treatment of Palestinians in occupied Palestine. BDS explains how Caterpillar is "regularly used in the demolition of Palestinian homes and farms". The Center for Constitutional Rights explains how "[s]ince its occupation of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem following the 1967 war, the Israel Defense Force (IDF) has destroyed more than 18,000 Palestinian homes in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT). Meanwhile, Caterpillar, Inc., a U.S. company, has sold bulldozers to the IDF knowing they would be used to unlawfully demolish homes and put civilians in danger." As recently as May 2021, purchased Caterpillar machinery was used by Israel in the demolitions of Palestinian homes in East Jerusalem.

Furthermore, Caterpillar has been previously sued by the family of a 23 year-old American woman named Rachel Corrie who was crushed to death by a Caterpillar bulldozer in 2003 as she attempted to stop it from demolishing a Palestinian home in the Gaza Strip. Caterpillar never paid any restitution to the family of Rachel Corrie nor the four other Palestinian families who were injured and killed in similar demolitions and joined the lawsuit against Caterpillar.

Caterpillar knowingly contributes to the ongoing demolitions of Palestinian homes in occupied Palestine. In October of 2004, Human Rights Watch sent a letter to Caterpillar demanding that the company immediately cease all sales of its D9 bulldozers to the government of Israel, saying that "Caterpillar betrays its stated values when it sells bulldozers to Israel knowing that they are being used to illegally destroy Palestinian homes."

Additionally, Caterpillar supports the expansion of exploited prison labor. Caterpillar has close ties to the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC). ALEC has helped advance tough sentencing laws like mandatory minimums given to non-violent drug offenders and has worked to legislatively create private for-profit prisons. Caterpillar served as a "Trustee" level sponsor at both the 2013 and 2014 ALEC annual conferences. Corporations are the driving force behind ALEC's actions, and Caterpillar is one of them.

It is for these reasons that we propose that the undergraduates call on the Princeton University administration to immediately and permanently halt usage of Caterpillar manufacturing equipment in every ongoing University construction projects.

**THE UNDERGRADUATES OF PRINCETON
UNIVERSITY** Princeton, New Jersey

Referendum Resolution 2-2022
Referendum Question No. 2 (Spring 2022)
Sponsored by ERIC PERIMAN '23

Referendum Resolution

Calling on the Princeton University administration to immediately halt all usage of Caterpillar machinery in any and all ongoing University construction projects by renegotiating or canceling any and all contracts with construction entities carrying out University construction projects who make use of Caterpillar machinery. Prohibit Caterpillar machinery from being used in any and all future campus construction projects. Institute strict oversight and enforcement of this resolution by the University of all construction entities contracted by the University to carry out University construction projects.

Resolved by the undergraduates of Princeton University,

SECTION 1. FACULTY, DEPARTMENT HEADS, AND ADMINISTRATION.

Given the violent role that Caterpillar machinery has played in the mass demolition of Palestinian homes, the murder of Palestinians and other innocent people, and the promotion of the prison-industrial complex (among other atrocities), the undergraduates call on the Princeton University administration to:

1. Immediately halt usage of all Caterpillar machinery in all ongoing campus construction projects including (but not limited to) the Lake Campus Development Project, the Art Museum construction project, the E-Quad construction project, the construction of New Residential Colleges East and West etc.
2. Renegotiate or cancel contracts with construction entities who make use of Caterpillar machinery.
3. Prohibit Caterpillar machinery from being used in any and all future campus construction projects.
4. Ensure strict oversight and enforcement of this resolution by the University of construction entities who are contracted by the University to carry out University construction projects.

SECTION 2. USG SENATE

Section 1 of this referendum is issued solely under the advisory power of

an undergraduate referendum.

As per Section 708 of the Elections Handbook, the USG Senate will write a report that explains the official position of the undergraduates as stated in the referendum resolution. The report will include action steps for the Senate and recommendations for the administration to further the undergraduates' official position. The report must be written and sent to the administration by no later than the end of the Spring 2022 semester on May 12th, 2022.

SECTION 3. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION

The Executive Secretary of the Senate shall transmit an official copy of this resolution to each of the following university officers:

1. Christopher L. Eisgruber '83, President of the University.
2. Jill Dolan, Dean of the College.
3. W. Rochelle Calhoun, Vice President for Campus Life.
4. Dozie Ibeh, Associate Vice President of the Office of Capital Projects.
5. Kathleen Deignan, Dean of Undergraduate Students.
6. Louise S. Sams '79, Chair of the Board of Trustees of Princeton University.
7. Professor Blair Schoene, Chair, Resources Committee of the Council of the Princeton University Community.