**ASG Senate Minutes**

**01-23-13**

* 1. **Executive Board Reports**
     + Victor: Working on presentation for Board of Trustees. Also working with Student Alumni Alliance. Also working to make a campus-wide music video. Finally, wrapping up Cats care Fundraiser.
       - Ian (question): what happened to the COFHE research project?
         * Still happening, lower on priority
     + Brad: DSTA candidates being narrowed down, 10K initiative is down to 65 ideas. Also working to compile mental health resources into one place online.
     + Ani: I have some extension cords…
     + Alex: Cleaning staff should be cleaning 7 days a week, let me know if they're not.
     + David: Next food truck festival will be happening February 2nd- 15%of proceeds will go to the DM team that has the most attendance.
       - Cab Share is coming to fruition- making tweaks to branding with the cab company. Will gain more momentum toward the end of the quarter
       - Please continue to beta-test bookswap. The site is live, but we're trying to find bugs before we release it
       - Study Abroad Guide data is being formally collected
     + Neil: Meeting with Provost on Friday- let me know if you want me to bring anything to him.
       - Also not going to pursue higher level accounting classes, looking to expand
       - Want to break down large classes, spoke to registrar, changing some schedule stuff for Econ 310.
       - Alex (question): why not expand number of advanced accounting classes
         * Talked to admin and looked at other institutions, found that there's no disadvantage to not offering these classes, and NU admin was generally against this idea anyway
     + David C: Want to thank those who came out and helped with EVJ, all who participated had a great experience. We have our keynote speaker next Monday- show up 30 mins early if you want a seat.
       - Also getting a new printer! Will have officer training sessions going forward.
     + Steven: Housing Fair is February 19- also starting to roll out municipal voting campaign, have candidates visit dorms, general operations to have students get out and vote, etc. Let me know if you want to get involved
     + Carly: Stand up OMs! We'll be starting training at 11 on Sunday and will be doing an abbreviated version of this at open exec next Wednesday. Also planning RHA Senator recruitment will coincide with dorm elections to make the process smoother.
     + Ethan: WHO HATES SPAM EMAILS? Campus Voice has been sending out a lot of emails, check out your profile settings you can change that now. Also, check out the public events and public meetings calendars!
  2. **Caucus Whip Reports**
     + N/A
  3. **General Order:** SGC Confirmations
     + Lauren: Want to move to confirm Danny Kim- a previous GE on the SGC that we need to reconfirm. He's awesome. Also, Alex Lower- met him last quarter and he's expressed a great interest in SGC, which we need. He's a great person and very nice and I'd be glad to have him.
     + Danny: I'm a junior econ/psych- from Carmel, Indiana. I wanted to join SGC because it's fun- had to step away because of other commitments, but happy to be back
     + Alex: I'm a Sophomore studying biomedical engineering & biology- wasn't able to get on in the fall, but happy to finally get on the committee..
     + Paul: Motion to white ballot
       - **Vote- passed unanimously. Both "fine young men" are confirmed to the SGC.**
  4. **General Order:** Service & Community Engagement Grant Selection Committee Election
     + Mike: HEY EVERYBODY!! So today, we want to invite you to join our committee to help evaluate 3 ideas from the Engagement Grant submissions.
     + Chris: We're looking for 3 ASG members to meet with ASG & Evanston committee officials- want to have people to meet a few times to evaluate the submissions we've received.
     + Mike: Sometime this winter quarter, you'd be meeting with Tony Kirchmeier and other NU officials to decide how to appropriate these funds.
     + Ani: Any questions? Then with that, we'll open the nomination floor for these three spots
       - Chris: I nominate Connor Regan.
         * Connor: I accept.
       - Michelle: I nominate myself.
       - Senator: I nominate Jane Gilmore.
         * Jane: I accept.
       - David: I nominate Patrick Leonard.
         * Patrick: I accept.
       - Jane: I withdraw my name.
       - Nalin: I nominate Brad.
         * I respectfully decline.
     + Ani: Great- please come up to the front.
     + Rebecca: Motion to white ballot
       - Senators: Multiple objections
         * Rebecca: Motion withdrawn
     + Ani: Tell us about yourselves.
       - Connor: Freshman in LOC- been in ASG since beginning of year. I'm in a bunch of civic engagement stuff like Best Buddies, it's something I'm interested
       - Michelle: I'm the STUCO Senator and would love to get more involved in helping the community
       - Patrick: I'm not on a committee and I'm supposed to be- so yeah! Let's engage
     + Ani: Questions?
     + Harrison: Motion to white ballot
       - **Vote- passed unanimously. Members are approved.**
  5. **General Order:** Campaign Reform Ad-hoc Committee Election
     + Steven: To give a recap- want a group of people to come together on a committee to reevaluate campaign election protocols. Should be a pretty low time commitment, especially if we fill all the seats. We'll have a handful of meeting between now and February. Looking for people with strong opinions either way- this is your opportunity to get involved.
     + Ani: Now opening the floor for nominations.
       - Ian: I nominate myself.
       - Carly: I nominate myself.
       - Mark: I nominate myself.
       - Henry: I nominate Sarah.
         * Sarah: I accept.
       - Motoki: I nominate Steven.
         * Steven: I accept.
       - Brad: I nominate Henry.
         * Henry: I respectfully decline.
       - Mark: I nominate Motoki.
         * Motoki: I accept.
       - Sarah: I nominate Abby.
         * Abby: I accept.
       - Henry: I nominate Katie.
         * Katie: I respectfully decline.
     + Rebecca: Motion to white ballot.
       - Rebecca: Motion withdrawn.
     + Ani: Introduce yourselves
       - Ian: I've been in ASG for a long time, have strong opinions, really want on this committee.
       - Carly: I'm the Chief of Staff, I also have strong opinions about this.
       - Mark: I've been in ASG a while, also agree this is an important issue.
       - Sarah: reek caucus whip, was on election commission last year, saw election process firsthand.
       - Steven: Been in ASG for a long time, these changes long overdue.
       - Motoki: Been in ASG since freshman year, also on election commission.
       - Abby: Been on ASG since sophomore, also on election commission.
     + Ani: Questions?
       - Patrick: Do any of you intend to participate on an election campaign this year?
         * Various answers.
     + Ian H: Motion to white ballot.
       - **Vote- passed unanimously. Members are approved.**
  6. **Old Business:** [**SL1213-18: Computer Chargers for Rent**](https://docs.google.com/a/u.northwestern.edu/document/d/1T9U-OhKvyZbVTGK9J1g1R4S7DEI2nQFsXIJHTAnb4ic/edit#bookmark=id.te9vo9m991qc)
     + Mark: We spoke about this bill last week- heard some friendly amendments- I encourage you to make them now.
     + Ani: Now opening the floor for question period
       - Abby: Asked Aaron last week if he had any more information about PC chargers
         * Mark: Haven't received any word of that from him.
       - Patrick: How much in project pool?
         * David: *I'll say the amount really quietly so the Parliamentarian can't hear it.*
     + Ian: Motion to amend the number of chargers from 6 to 4 and change the amount of money requested accordingly.
       - Ian: Want to buy some chargers now, but save money and look into buying PC chargers
       - Ani: Questions on the amendment?
         * Ian H (question): Why 4, not 3?

Ian: 10 is a nice number

* + - * + Brad: Project Pool number is slightly off.

Ian: Way to get more accurate number?

Ani: A lot of it has just been allocated, roughly $5900 remaining.

* + - * Paul: Motion to previous question on the amendment
        + **Vote-passed. Amendment is accepted.**
    - Ian: Motion to amend to create an ad-hoc committee to look into the use of chargers and the possibility of purchasing additional chargers.
      * Mike: Motion to amend the amendment to have 5 members of ad-hoc committee to 3
        + Vote- passed. 3 members of ad-hoc appointed to investigate buying PC chargers for one or more libraries selected immediately after passage of legislation
      * Abby (question): Are all chargers we approve going to Main Library?
        + Ian: If not used, chargers will be appropriated to other libraries as fits the need.
      * Senator (question): When will the committee report back to Senate?
        + Ian: Will report 4 weeks from now
      * Mike (question): would it be within the realm of this ad hoc to ensure that they actually circulate these chargers
      * Mike: Motion to amend amendment- want to specify that one provision of the ad hoc is to ensure that these chargers are actually watched and circulated.
        + **Vote- passed. Amendment to amendment is passed.**
      * Paul: Motion to previous question on Ian's amendment
        + **Vote- passed. Amendment is now included in the legislation.**
    - Ani: Moving into pro/con on the legislation itself.
      * Ian (pro): This bill is great, the library would appreciate it
        + Chris: Point of Information- will you be on ad-hoc?

Ian: I could see myself nominating myself for this.

* + - * Mike (semi-con): We're only through a third of the school year- and [laughter] \*motions at daily photag to not take picture of him\* NO!
        + Paul: Point of information- 7500 was start, we're at 5900, we haven't even used half.
    - Ian: Motion to previous question
      * Alex (question): Can we just buy cheaper chargers?
        + Mark: Might ruin someone's computer- don't want to spend ASG's money to do that.
      * **Vote- passed. Legislation is approved**
    - Ani: Moving to nominate the members of this ad-hoc
      * Ian: I nominate myself.
      * Ian: I nominate Mike Morgan.
        + Mike: I respectfully decline… NO I ACCEPT!
      * Motoki: I nominate Brad.
        + Brad: I respectfully decline.
      * Brad: I nominate Neil.
        + Neil: Uhhhhh, ok.
    - Ani: Please come up and introduce yourselves
      * Ian: I'm on the university libraries committee- was indoctrinated in Apple by parents
      * Mike: I have always been passionate about chargers
      * Neil: My name is Neil, I have a Mac, but my dad has a PC….
    - Senator: Motion to white ballot
      * Rebecca: Objection, HOW DOES IT FEEL?
      * Senator: Withdrawn
    - Jane(question): Are any of you on other committees?
      * Ian: I'm on 6 and could step down if you want me to
      * Mike: I'm kind of on a bunch
      * Neil: Technically I'm not…
        + Mike: You're a VP… [laughter]
    - Motion to white ballot
      * **Vote- passed. Members are approved.**
  1. **New Business:** [**SR1213-06: Implementing the Northwestern Strategic Plan: Establishing Northwestern as a Global Leader in Environmental and Financial Sustainability**](https://docs.google.com/a/u.northwestern.edu/document/d/1T9U-OhKvyZbVTGK9J1g1R4S7DEI2nQFsXIJHTAnb4ic/edit#bookmark=id.ib5pnyewqf5d)
     + Ani: going forward, please be respectful, robert's rules tries to ensure everyone gets a chance to speak. Please be respectful and respect that there are other viewpoints.
     + Mark: [Full Transcript] I have five minutes, so I’ll take all of them.

On many occasions I have come to you for support. But today, I ask for your action. Now is the time, as a student government, as a university, and as a nation, to take part in finding a new solution to an enormous challenge.

We have been born into a world that is the product of our ancestors, a world which we will soon inherit, a world for which we have tremendous responsibility. From the battlefields of Normandy to the fights for equality and fairness, with the incalculable sacrifice of our parents and grandparents, our brothers and sisters, we entered this earth with the task unfinished. We have made great progress, but not without great cost. Charlie Chaplin was hauntingly accurate, when he declared in 1940, that the “Machinery that gives abundance has left us in want. Our knowledge has made us cynical. Our cleverness, hard and unkind. We think too much and feel too little. More than machinery we need humanity.” Our measurements of progress, the advancement of technology and our fetish for economic growth, have produced unprecedented and dangerous human and environmental consequences. We have been quick to sacrifice the quality of life for the quantity of wealth.

Global climate change is the greatest challenge our generation faces, and it is indeed the greatest threat that we face as a species. It is a self-inflicted wound, a condition that calls into question the very power of mankind, the consequences of which will not only lead to the heartbreaking death of thousands of plant and animal species, but also destabilize and augment the many tangible, horrible human tragedies we face every day. Famine and disease, long considered curable, will only intensify as our agricultural systems and disease vectors migrate elsewhere. Our centers of trade and culture alike, our shoreline cities, await rising sea levels that will challenge their existence within our lifetimes. Climate change undermines the very objectives of human progress.

If we are to learn anything from history, it is that economies do not operate in isolation. The collapse of our greatest societies often has deep ecological roots. The 10,000 year experiment of settled life will stand or fall by what we do, and don’t do, now. This transition must be from short-term to long-term thinking, from recklessness and excess to moderation and precaution.

These prospects leave many of my colleagues hopeless, even desperate. In a publication earlier this week, Dr. Harvey Young, an Associate Professor at Northwestern, argued that:

“Rather than appealing to a person's good nature and sense of moral responsibility, the campaign to slow down global warming and bring about climate stability might be better served to appeal to their baser instincts.”

I come before you today not only because the realities of climate change demand our action, but also because there exists a strong economic case for our university to act now, to divest from coal, a killer of well over 13,000 American each year, and to put our assets toward the clean, renewable technologies that Northwestern labs have and will continue to bring to market. And lastly, we must face the reality— that the 20% of our university’s endowment predicated on fossil fuels is no longer sustainable in any sense of the word.

On Monday, President Obama acknowledged that “The path towards sustainable energy sources will be long and sometimes difficult. But America cannot resist this transition; we must lead it.”

It was with the same vision that the architects of Northwestern’s strategic plan, the document that is to guide the future of our institution, declared, “we will contribute to the solutions for renewable energy and a sustainable environment and to how public policies and economic incentives promote implementation of new technologies and practices.”

I see no clearer, no more material realization of this mission than the actions we demand here, in this forum. If we are to take seriously the mission at hand, to recognize our duty, not just as students, but as citizens of the world, we must acknowledge the timeless words of Albert Camus, “Man is condemned to be free; because once thrown into the world, he is responsible for everything he does.”

We did not create this world, as students we are barely responsible for its degradation and destruction, but we hold the power to influence it. Our actions alone may not reverse the damage done, but will be a powerful example to our peers and the world alike. I ask you to join me, not only because it is in our best interest, but also because it is right. Three months before his assassination, Senator Robert F. Kennedy spoke to a small crowd at the University of Kansas:

“We cannot measure national spirit by the Dow Jones Average, nor national achievement by the Gross National Product. For the Gross National Product includes air pollution… the destruction of the redwoods, it does not allow for the health of our families, the quality of their education, or the joy of their play. It is indifferent to the decency of our factories and the safety of our streets alike. It measures neither our wit nor our courage, neither our wisdom nor our learning, neither our compassion nor our devotion to our country. It measures everything, in short, except that which makes life worthwhile, and it can tell us everything about America -- except whether we are proud to be Americans."

We stand at a precipice, as a university, and as a country. Our leaders will act, and we must too. Let us work together, as Americans and world citizens, to bring new prosperity to our national economy, and to bring security and safety to the world.

* + - Ani: Moving into question period.
      * David: You detail this in the bill, but can you elaborate on why students should be lobbying for divestment?
        + Mark: This is one step to the top, designed to work in tandem with a faculty senate resolution. Other institutions have taken this route.

David: Were they successful?

Mark: Smaller ones were successful, larger ones are still pending. Need to get ultimate approval from Board of Trustees, but it's all going forward

* + - * Dana: Can you talk about the 2005 divestment movement?
        + Mark: Decision came to end Sudan support- we've done it before and we can do it again
      * Mark: I'd like to introduce those I'm working with one these projects- NU responsible endowment coalition.
      * Patrick: Are you sure that we can divest completely without harming the university?
        + Mark: no, but coal is nonsense, it's not a profitable investment. It's clear that this is a dying industry
      * Rebecca: Are there time constraints to passing this, or can we wait a week?
        + Mark: the quicker we can pass this the better- passing this will make it easier going forward talking with faculty who don't think it's their place to be supporting this.
      * Patrick: Divestment in other energies?
        + Mark: Starting with coal- 20% of our endowment is in coal/oil/gas.
      * Jesse: Isn't this implying you know more about endowment than NU administration?
        + Mark: This is just what we gleaned from our talks with NU admin.

Jesse: Why did they think coal wasn't a good investment and why are they still investing in it

Mark: these are people who want to diversify their portfolio- if there can be a huge PR situation, it'd be a big push for the administration to change

Jesse: You're saying it's an investment of low priority?

Mark: It's not even up to market conditions.

Jesse: What I don't understand is that if they thought it was a bad investment and they want to get rid of it, why would they wait for PR against it

Mark: this is a game theory issue- there's an expectation in the marketplace that maybe it'll catch up to market expectations. These expectations affect the willingness to diversify. Market price doesn't align with actual payoffs

* + - Paul: Motion to move this legislation to old business
      * Rebecca: Objection
      * Paul: We can leave until next Senate, but don't feel that there's much opposition in the room, especially considering there's some time sensitivity.
    - Ani: Moving to pro/con on moving to old business
      * Rebecca (con): I agree with this, but haven't been able to talk to everyone in my organization, and I don't think you all have had a chance to talk to all your constituents. Although you know what you think, doesn't mean everyone believes as you do.
      * Ian (pro): Not easiest thing in the world to garner support from faculty Senate since they're so involved. Once it's old business, we can discuss further and answer questions to make things clearer.
      * Rebecca (con): I really feel uncomfortable about this- you should think about what your constituents believe- it will pass next week, but since the meeting isn't until beginning of February, we should wait.
      * Mike (point of information): Is there a date we need it to be submitted by?
        + ~~Mark: No specific date, but the sooner it gets introduced, the better. Rebecca raises a good point, I will revise my position to ambivalence. You guys can make the right decision.~~

Person: Faculty Senate is on February 5, but agenda has to be set five days in advance

Mark: Strike everything I just said.

* + - * Ian: Motion to move this to old business
        + **Vote- passed. Legislation is now old business.**
    - Jesse: Motion to strike all clauses about performance benefits.
      * Jesse: By saying that it's a bad investment, we're implying that we have more knowledge about how the endowment should be invested than the investors managing the endowment. We have to assume they know better than we do how to allocate the money
      * Ian H (point of personal privilege (but not really)): I suggest my honorable friend retracts his amendment
        + Ani: Not in line.
    - Ani: Moving into pro/con on the amendment
      * Mark (con): I understand your concerns, but I disagree. This legislation is a recommendation based on market trends, not specifically with our endowment. As far as being presumptive- they have no reason to believe things will change, they need some sort of push on this. The economic reasons are there, the resolution speaks for itself
      * Jesse (pro): If the people who run the endowment are telling us it's a bad investment, it makes no sense that the money wouldn't have been taken out already. It will look silly to the investors managing Northwestern's account if we take this approach.
        + David (pro): I agree with the legislation in substance, but also think it's presumptuous to say that we know better than NU investors. We won't win the argument this way, it's better to endorse the more ethical route.
      * Ian (point of information): what passages to strike exactly?
        + Ani: Can you figure that out Jesse?
      * Mike (con): Nowhere does it say explicitly that we know better than NU investors, and Mark's research looks very solid. It's a suggestion for how the endowment can shift it's passage. Even if we are saying we know better, what's the harm?
        + Ian: We're striking facts- the DOW index has gone up and down in the last decade- nothing in that clause saying it's a bad investment.
      * Jesse: [Details what lines he wants to strike]
      * Patrick (pro): The statements in question are not facts at all
        + Jesse: Mark's speech was more opinionated than bill itself and now that I'm reading the bill, I'll concede that the bill isn't outright saying we know better than investors. But still, we shouldn't have lines about Indexes in our bills, not everyone is versed on this industry
      * Mark (con): Authorship speeches are meant to be more candid, I encourage you to read the legislation and see for yourself if it makes these claims.
    - Ani: Moving to a vote on the amendment
      * Rebecca: Motion to suspend rules and table to next week
        + Ani: Not in line, we're moving to a vote on the amendment

Rebecca: But I suspended the rules!

**Vote- fails.** **Amendment is defeated**

* + - Rebecca: Motion to table for a week
      * Rebecca: I'm disappointed when these past 5-10 minutes show that while we generally agree with the idea of this legislation, there are points that clearly need to be revised and discussed with our constituents. Think about this, there's controversy surrounding this.
      * Ani: Moving into pro/con
        + Abby (con): I feel like this would be supported by most constituents, but they did do a good job collecting 55 constituents reaching all parts of campus

Mike (con): We don't have the liberty to wait on this

Steven (con): There's a distinction between representatives and delegates- with initiatives overwhelmingly supported, representatives should be comfortable voting for their constituents.

* + - * + Jesse (pro): Given the economic discussion about endowment, we should wait a week to discuss this- before we suggest the endowment should reinvest in something, we should do further research

Rebecca (pro): Would like to pass this unanimously to show support- but I worry my constituents don't agree with it. I want to convince them so that we can vote unanimously

David (pro): I'm a sponsor on this bill, but there's a lot of information and nuance here that needs to be discussed. It's important that people take the time to think through things like this.

* + - * + Mark (con): Rebecca raises good points- I'm willing to table this for a week if you all agree to actually go out and talk to people on campus, email me with questions, dispute our economics.
      * David: Motion to previous question on tabling for one week
        + **Vote- passed. This bill is tabled for one week.**
  1. **New Business:** [**SR1213-07: Gun Control Resolution**](https://docs.google.com/a/u.northwestern.edu/document/d/1T9U-OhKvyZbVTGK9J1g1R4S7DEI2nQFsXIJHTAnb4ic/edit#bookmark=id.48q9o048dlr9)
     + - Steven: We have done this on a political issue in the past- we convinced the university to reevaluate student protest rights in the past. This is a political act from a political body- nothing in the code limits us from talking about this and it's important that we do talk about it. This hits home for me from my home state, where there was a shooting at my old high school just in the past week. There's no statement of democrats or republicans, just a support for Obama's call for action. Coordinated student action is powerful, and if we deny ourselves to talk about political issues, it will not bode well for our organization and campus. We should not discourage our students from voicing their opinions on these issues. Some may argue that gun violence may not affect our campus, but we can't think short term, we can't think about the here and now and the immediate, we also need to think about the future and being on the right side of history.
       - Ani: Questions?
         * Harrison: Where did you get sources for be it resolved statement?

Steven: Can amend language of this bill

* + - * Ani: This will be old business next week.
  1. **New Business:** [**SR1213-08: Political and Partisan Issues**](https://docs.google.com/a/u.northwestern.edu/document/d/1T9U-OhKvyZbVTGK9J1g1R4S7DEI2nQFsXIJHTAnb4ic/edit#bookmark=id.2phmq4e6brgr)
     + Rebecca: ASG has talked a lot about diversity- missing from these discussions is political diversity. You should consider that there are political majorities and minorities on campus. The mission of ASG is to connect students, and understand that this more so works to divide them. The goal of this is not to prevent free speech, but not to press opinions on other people. It's is not our responsibility to impress our beliefs on other students. Remember that political diversity exists and this resolution exists to prevent a political minority from being ostracized.
     + Ani: Questions?
       - Dana: How do you draw the distinction between political vs. partisan issues?
         * Rebecca: Difficult to draw line, will leave it up to the Senate to decide exactly what issues are tackled.
       - Sarah: Do you think that the break-up senate accurately represents how students feel politically?
         * Rebecca: Yes. As a liberal institution, most people here are probably liberal as well. The fact that this would offend a minority would affect students in a unique way
       - Ian: Political identity vs. political opinion
         * Rebecca: There's definitely a distinction.
       - Mark: I understand your reasoning, but don't understand how we're overpowering someone's opinion?
         * Rebecca: By passing endorsements of national policies, we're neglecting the possibility that other
       - Person: Religious diversity vs. political diversity
         * Rebecca: It exists
       - Sarah: How do you feel that this differs from other resolutions- with most resolutions we state what the Northwestern student body believes.
         * Rebecca: The reason we have a political process that uses majority rules is to circumvent going from person to person and reach decisions in an expedient matter. When you make decisions for the majority, it's meant to reflect majority opinion, no need to use this system for things like this.

Hannah: Does this reference Steven's bill more so?

Rebecca: Want to make general statement on ASG's ability to comment on political issues.

* + - Paul: Motion to extend question period by 5 minutes.
      * **Vote- passed. Question period is extended.**
    - Ani: Further questions?
      * Steven: Any correlations to the group's views and the subject matter of the resolution ?
        + Dane: Wouldn't support ASG making endorsements, but wants to argue matter of precedent by saying that ASG doesn't have a place in discussing such issues
      * Carly: Interested to know why you think these national issues don't affect students?
        + Dane: They do affect Northwestern, however, ASG choosing to support something doesn't affect any policies at Northwestern and makes no tangible change.
        + Rebecca: ASG tabled a resolution 2 years ago supporting Israel

Steven: Why was it tabled?

Ani: Wasn't clear why we should inject ourselves into a binary debate and get stuck in that issue.

* + - * Alex (point of information): Doesn't the fact that we tabled the Israel legislation mean we didn't take an opinion?
    - Victor: Motion to extend question period by 2 minutes.
      * **Vote- passed. Question period is extended.**
    - Ani: More questions?
      * Sarah: My question is language specific- do you think there's a distinction between supporting a law and supporting looking more into a situation
        + Dane:: We'll disagree that, regardless of the specific policy- it should come down to whether or not it affects the lives of students
        + Person: It's direct impact vs. indirect impact
      * Victor: Would a resolution get to floor being debated on how it should be heard?
        + Dane: Ideal structure would be to look if legislation has direct impact or not on students and judge that primarily when deciding to discuss it.
      * Steven: If it affected someone at the university, would it become relevant?
        + Dane: Gun control affects everyone here- but endorsing Obama's action would affect nothing.
      * Sofia: What would register as something relevant to the student body?
        + Dane: If the policy proposal was to increase security guard presence, that has impact, but more political issues are macroscopic policies issues out of our purview
        + Rebecca: Gender neutral bathrooms are a good example of this- sought to change policy here, rather than on a national level.
  1. **New Business:** [**SL1213-20: Student Groups Vice President & Financial Vice President Selection Committees**](https://docs.google.com/a/u.northwestern.edu/document/d/1T9U-OhKvyZbVTGK9J1g1R4S7DEI2nQFsXIJHTAnb4ic/edit#bookmark=id.idx77q7bisix)
     + Victor: This legislation is to change up the code a bit about the selection of the SGVP and FVP. Wanted to combine these two. Given that we have a Chief of Staff, we thought that she should be a co-chair on this selection committee, along with the SGVP. Girish and Lauren are in support of this, would make process more efficient and ensure those who have the relevant expertise to determine who would make a good candidate
     + Motoki: Why does the FVP changes only prescribe that a Senator has to be on the committee
       - Victor: SAFC code more strict than SGC code.
       - Ani: Equal number of senator/non-senators on SAFC, not so with SGC
     + Tori: How to differentiate who is the most senior member when members join at the same time?
       - Victor: Not sure of precedent
       - Ani: Generally decided by the chairs
  2. **New Business:** [**SL1213-21: *Ad-Hoc* Committee on Gun Control**](https://docs.google.com/a/u.northwestern.edu/document/d/1T9U-OhKvyZbVTGK9J1g1R4S7DEI2nQFsXIJHTAnb4ic/edit#bookmark=id.6darnotxj662)
     + Ian: this arose during Rules when I pointed out that there can't be an establishment of an ad-hoc in a resolution. Same principle, would create an ad hoc to take our stance and work with other universities to develop a response to collegiate gun control.
     + Ani: Questions?
       - Alex: Exactly what members of Congress would be contacted? Like, all of them?
         * Ian: Wouldn't send to every member of congress, would be fine with amending to say we'd send it to pertinent Senators
  3. **Special Order:** Financial Vice President [**Application**](https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B4gULrpKf5KHd3hiRVh2dkktRzA/edit) Release
     + **Ani: Financial Vice President application is live, link to it in agenda. Due at noon on february 9th**
  4. **Good of the Order and Announcements**
     + Mike: Part of emerging Arts club- will give out painting supplies to people who need to de-stress (Arts in the community)
     + April: Harambe- kick off of black history month
     + David: NU playing Minnesota, won't say the score because it jinxed us last time I did.
     + Chris: Community engagement grant coming up to be due, please submit more ideas and encourage everyone to submit more ideas
     + Sofia: McSA Big fall winter speaker, inaugurating a global era, panel of 4 speakers, one a director of security council for Afghanistan, Pakistan
     + Mark: please reach out to those who want to give input for the legislation
     + Victor: Veterans Panel tomorrow in Big 10 room; tomorrow at 6pm is MLK keynote; buy a cats care t-shirt; Saturday, February 2nd, having a yoga session in collaboration w/ red cross.
     + Carly: It’s Dave Richards birthday!

**Senate Adjourned**