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1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**
2. **Approval of the Journal:** Available at [bit.ly/ASG-Senate-Minutes](http://bit.ly/ASG-Senate-Minutes).
3. [**Executive Board Reports**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HSi6hPxSTaTfHFt863zGqEqBTIhoL35PrkvJVcwFyq0/edit#bookmark=kix.1tx6i3ka0ej8)
4. **General Order**: Wild Ideas Proposal for Take Time and Minichefz

* Andrew: Minichefz is a T-status group that teaches kids to make meals for themselves and then for the Take Care campaign we funded cotton candy and popcorn machines.

1. **General Order:** [Student Groups Vice President Application](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fakoXAosRI179nP7m8zauczSz_sB6Bl5V5a3c5xIV2g/edit?usp=sharing) and Selection

* Andrew: The application is open starting today and due January 4th. The application is linked in the agenda and reach out to Alex or me with any questions.
* Noah: Since the application is due on the 4th, we need to pick the member of the student body that will serve on the selection committee.
* Alec: I’d like to nominate Ariel.
* Ariel: I accept.
* Bella: I’d like to nominate Isaac.
* Isaac: I accept.
* Jaime: I’d like to nominate Eliza.
* Eliza: I accept.
* Joji: I’d like to nominate Ruba.
* Ruba: I respectfully decline.
* Johnny: I nominate Kevin.
* Kevin: I decline.
* Ariel: First of all I’ve been a GE for awhile. This year I’ve been able to work really closely with Alex and I feel like I have a good idea of how the committee functions and what the person should be like. If I wasn’t a senior, I’d probably run for the position.
* Isaac: I’m running because I’ve never been on a selection committee. I think I have a lot of knowledge of ASG as a whole and I think that it is an asset that I am not a GE. I think it would be good to have someone who has that perspective on how we can do funding better.
* Eliza: I was a Senator last year and joined SGC and SAFC. I’ve got to work with groups and work closely with Alex. I think I really understand what is needed and there is a lot of potential for the group.
* Sam: What would your ideal candidate look like?
* Isaac: I’m looking for someone who is flexible and is open to change. I want someone who will work well on an exec board. They have to be able to cooperate with new people, especially the FVP and the SAVP. I also want someone who can manage a committee well. I’m on two committees so I have seen different leaderships.
* Eliza: It is a group that interacts with a lot of student groups, so you need someone who wants to form a relationship with those groups. Obviously the person needs to be a good leader, but for this position specifically, you need someone who can look beyond just funding.   
  Ariel: First, experience. I think there is a lot of internal information, so it is hard for someone without SGC experience to come in. But I also think personality might be more important, because they aren’t just working with the exec board and the committee, but also over 100 groups.
* Bella: What are words you’d use to describe your ideal leader?
* Eliza: Excitement, Enthusiasm, Leadership, Collaboration.
* Ariel: Passion, Commitment, Leader, Empathy, Organized.
* Isaac: Empathetic, Visionary, Critical, Kind, Helpful.

1. **General Order:** A-Status Funding Reminder

* Noah: We’re going to do a-status funding now. McKenzie is going to give an overarching view, I’m going to talk about debate procedure
* McKenzie: I emailed noah a randomized list of all groups. we’ll read through them, and if you want more $ speak up and we’ll have a 3 round debate period. Then we’ll have a cut round, then we’ll have another add round
* That 13K figure is for all the money in the senate amendment pool. the amount that doesn’t get spent goes into supplemental funding.
* Isaac: Is there a ruberic to evaluate events?
* McKenzie: We have an event evaluation sheet. And funding is tiered.
* Moira: In terms of deciding how you value events and considering the money is coming from students, why do you think it is more important behind the scenes than what the students see (like attendance)?
* Jason: It really varies on the group. We can’t take attendance too much into account, because some groups will always pull bigger numbers. All the different guidelines we use have been used for a long time and we revise them each year.
* Sean: We fund based on what we can see and how consistent things are and attendance doesn’t always reflect that.

1. **Old Business**: [A-Status Funding](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BzTvAjjhLEjGaF9CS2NnTDdkd0tfNkxyMzRDLUZacTFJSFVF/view?usp=sharing)

* Add Round.
* SASA: Motion to add. Adding $1400 to honorarium.
* Parag: I was a former Senator and currently the president of SASA.
* Naveen: And I am currently the senator of SASA.
* Parag: I understand that attendance is only one small factor, but it went up by 1000%, which I think reflects that the event was successful. The main reason they cut us was because of poor planning. We only had one month to plan, because of a new executive board and because we did not have access to funding. With a new executive board it is definitely going to be difficult, but we stayed in contact with our AE. There were contract issues, but we will avoid those issues, because we are starting the contract process now. The problems won’t happen again, because we are starting 6 months in advance this time.
* Sean/SAFC: I think something that is important to understand is historical knowledge. In the winter, SASA and MCSA do a cospon together. That cospon did not happen, because of a breakdown in communication and those funds weren’t used. That is a misconduct. Then in the spring they told us the spring concert would not happen if they didn’t take the funding from the winter concert. We said the event was a failure, because they would not have been successful without the first failure. It sounds like your exec board is taking a lot of steps, which is great and they are required to do so because of their misconduct. We cannot fund based on hope or confidence, that can be rewarded in the next funding cycle. Once they implement this stuff, that is when they should be rewarded. Giving an increase to this event would be a slap in the face to all Northwestern students, because you are using their money.
* Isaac: When you agreed to their transfer request, did you say there would be a misconduct involved?
* Sean: No, because they already had a misconduct from the event failing. We didn’t give them an extra one, since the event did happen.
* Isaac: Was it an extension or just no extra penalty?
* McKenzie: For a misconduct, groups are called in and we hear their side of the story. From there the SAFC can vote to misconduct and then there are different kinds of misconducts. MCSA/SASA now has planning guidances, because a lot of their communication issues were about what kind of speaker they wanted. They don’t have a specific misconduct that affects funding, but they could if they don’t take the rest of the planning guidelines into account.
* Sean: Also they cancelled one of their events for the past year to put their money into the Spring speaker, so the actual funding is higher than what is reflected in the funding packet.
* Noah read a statement from SASA’s advisor.
* Parag: The Spring concert would have happened even if the petition had not been approved, it just would have been a different speaker. We agreed about the misconduct from the cospon and thought it would be better to transfer the money to the Spring concert. That is partly to blame on the new board, but also the old board. My main point is we would not have received a misconduct on the Spring concert, it just would have been a different event. I don’t think the misconduct for the cospon should affect the Spring concert, but just the cospon. The petition to move the funds was approved, so I urge you not to look at the separate misconduct.
* Jason: During every petition process, groups can submit for petitions. We ask at the end of the process what would happen if the petition was not approved and in our notes it says that it would not happen. Also we look at groups as a whole.
* Isaac: I want to speak in favor of adding the number. It feels like they are being punished on the cospon and that’s fine, but that is a separate account according to SAFC, so it should affect the SASA funding. I also don’t think that the funding packet should say the event was unsuccessful, because it was not. As Senate we are not limited in how this money should be allotted. SAFC is a really important body, but they are not the last word - we are.
* Ariel: Is the misconduct limited to the event or to the group?
* To the group.
* McKenzie: Part of what we do is relying on the groups and on advisors. This group would not have been put on without the Norris Production Staff. They were running around on the day. From a planning perspective, Norris Production Staff should not have to salvage an event.
* Wendy: Was this submitted in time for Norris’s team?
* Parag: A lot about them running around was because the artist was late, which is something we tried to control and couldn’t. Other than that, the event ran smoothly. I understand that SAFC has to look at that specific event but as Senators you can take more things into consideration.
* Noah: We are now going to hear from people with extra information,
* Judy: I’m Judy and I am the Business Manager for Norris and I advise the SAFC. I usually don’t say anything, because this is your business, however, one of the things I advocate is reflecting on what has happened, but you do have to consider other people’s standards. In that vein, there was an awful lot of things that were not considered before the event was to take place. It was not just the artist, but also the group didn’t communicate with the Norris people who were going to be there. At the very last minute, the entire production needed to be altered. The contract was given to the production staff three days before, even though they had it earlier. They need to learn from this. The SAFC decided they weren’t going to cut them off, but they weren’t going to reward them. That’s the context - it isn’t just the numbers.
* Natalie: Part of what Norris and CSI does is that we want to have successful events. If we have already signed a contract,w e had not choice but to run around to make this happen. We signed the contract and it had to happen. There was a lot of miscommunication and we can take some ownership as administrators also. I’m just the signature, so I trust that the group has organized the event. We are then bound by that contract legally.
* Alec: Is there a time limit?
* Noah: Yes, and we are in the third and final round.
* Sean: As Senate, you technically can do whatever you want and I was not trying to suggest otherwise. But you do not exist in the vacuum and you have higher responsibilities. Once they put on a kick ass - great event, then they will be rewarded, because that will be fair. We fund by success of event, but we also take into account the broad context of the group - like the cospon.
* Motion to extend by two rounds.
* Second.
* Alex: Object. I think we’ve heard enough and I’m tired of bickering. If you haven’t decided by now, you should just abstain.
* Noah: Let’s not patronize people. We are in line for a pro.
* Moira: I know I have things to say and other people probably do.
* PQ
* It passes.
* Moira: I would like to point out that - I think some of the things SAFC has been saying is trying to intimidate us into voting one way or another. Saying if you vote against the SAFC is not fair to students, I think that is a ridiculous and unfounded claim. I think you should go on the basis of what is fair for students and what students want. What was the value of this event to the student body? They have reiterated many times why they only had one month and that is what happens when you only have a month. The most successful events are things that are constantly changing even at the last minute. When things are planned in a bureaucratic way, that is not necessarily what the students want.
* Wendy: Yes we have the power, but we elected the SAFC members. It is not fair if we overlook some rules, because it affects all the groups that turned their contracts in in time.
* Jason: We spend about 40 hours on funding each time and review all the information - there is a lot that goes into the funding process, which is why we get a little bit passionate. You do have the final say and we were elected by you.
* Parag: I think it comes down to whether you think this event will be successful. I understand that SAFC can’t look at our planning process, but you guys can.
* Sean: That idea completely goes against guidelines we establish to ensure the money of the students is spent well. We can’t look to the future and that is what they are asking. The SAFC operates on precedent and you guys are too. It wouldn’t make sense to say no to future groups that say they are going to put on a good event if you let SASA have extra funding. There is nothing unique going on here and there is no need for a unique exception like this.
* 7-12-7, the motion fails.
* Noah read the rest of the A status names.
* Cut round.
* Add round.
* SASA: Motion to add $470 to honorarium.
* Parag: I understand that you don’t want to give us an increase, but I think SASA should have the same money we got last year. I don’t think we should be punished twice for the failure of the cospon.
* Ariel: What about the extra money?
* Parag: We decided to combine the money from our Winter Speaker with the Spring Concert, but I think that should be separate. Including the extra money, our total is $20,300 with the events combined.
* Bella: How does the petition process interact with funding by event?
* Sean: That’s why the petition process exists, to sort out the changes in event by event funding. I can’t say why, but it was convincing.
* Parag: We wanted to reduce overprogramming and improve the events.
* Sean: The money from the petition was already allotted to them, so we didn’t mind them switching it.
* Noah: The numbers for the various changes are now on the board.
* Isaac: To what level does the SAFC take into account the line items versus the total?
* Jason: The fact that they rolled over money did not affect the recommendation we made for the line item of the event. For the decrease we took into account only the spring funding from the previous year.
* McKenzie: We don’t think we are putting the group in double jeopardy. The cospon didn’t fail, SASA failed. And $470 might look nominal compared to the rest of the funding, but it really isn’t.
* Moira: I think we should be focusing on the specific line item and the numbers we just went over is irrelevant. We are not giving them a reward if we give them this, it would just be the same. There may have been a problem with the planning, but that is offset by the success of the events. You could say it is just symbolic, but they could use the $470 dollars. It is only bringing it back to the funding
* Parag: Quick motion, I would like to cut it to 400.
* PQ
* Objection
* Withdrawn
* Sean: It is of the upmost importance to recognize that this decision does not exist in a vacuum, it has implications. An increase, decrease, and staying the same mean something. THe nominal difference is relatively not important, but we need to treat all groups the same.
* PQ
* Objection
* Rescinded.
* Bella: Obviously this conversation is getting pretty heated. I think that we need to show flexibility within Senate. We are all students, mistakes happen, and student groups improve. Ultimately, they are just trying to do their job and do a good job for campus.
* Sean: I 100% agree with that and that’s where you are coming from. We are not anti-student groups - we love Northwestern programming and student groups. We are just trying to look out for the rights of all student groups. We do allow that flexibility for failure, that is why the limits and stipulations of misconducts are flexible and are not all financial. Think about what makes this event unique? Why should they get this over any other student group that had issues with an event?
* 12-8-7, passes.
* Concludes funding.

1. **New Business:** [SR1415-05: Make Election Day Voter Registration Permanent in Illinois](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HSi6hPxSTaTfHFt863zGqEqBTIhoL35PrkvJVcwFyq0/edit#bookmark=id.ir02cq2s7h31)

* Kevin: Politics falls under what CRC does.
* Archie: Just to reiterate our resolution is to make same day registration permanent in Illinois. Historically, Illinois has the lowest voter turnout in the midwest. One solution is to allow people to register on the same day at the polls. Three other states, Wisconsin, Iowa and Minnesota have same day and 10% of their votes go. 5,900 people registered on the same day in Illinois’s same day pilot program.
* Simran: In the last election cycle it boosted turnout rates. There is currently a bill that just passed in the House today and it is now in the Senate. It would be great if Northwestern could show student support since it is relevant to students.
* Motion to move to old business.
* Passes.
* Moira: What exactly is the resolution’s purpose?
* Archie: It’s a collective voice of Northwestern students that we are supporting the same day registration. It’s showing support to the state legislature.
* Wendy: Were there any mishaps?
* Kevin: Mainly demand, but that could be corrected in the next cycle by adding more locations.
* Will: From what I’ve heard from people who voted in Chicago, it was a disaster in terms of the application. I’m not saying it couldn’t happen in the future, but I don’t think it increased voter turnout that much. It feels very partisan to me. There are tons of opportunities to register to vote.
* Lauren: What was the number of people who registered and what was total turnout?
* Kevin: The program was just 6000, but it was also only in Cook County.
* Daniel: Students who were registered during Wildcat Welcome were often registered wrong and they could not have voted if they had not been able to re-register on the day.
* Passes

1. **Old Business:** [SR1415-04 Flyering: Not So Fly](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HSi6hPxSTaTfHFt863zGqEqBTIhoL35PrkvJVcwFyq0/edit#bookmark=id.mdjzm4ik1zlr)

* Ground flyering is wasteful and not very effective.
* Alec: We are supporting the ASG exec board’s decision and encourages Northwestern’s student groups to do the same.
* Lauren: Jaime, what do you think about this as PR Chair?
* Jaime: In general I have been trying to move away from ground flyering and it is not intrinsic to PR.
* Moira: Why did you decide to make in not binding?
* Alec: The exec board already made the decision and as a committee we are still looking into alternatives. We may take that step when we have a good alternative to present to student groups.
* Unanimously passes.

1. **Old Business**: [SL1415-08 Off-Campus Elections](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HSi6hPxSTaTfHFt863zGqEqBTIhoL35PrkvJVcwFyq0/edit#bookmark=id.vydc46eqgq7a)

* This is changing the election process to align it with the presidential election.
* Korri: Will there be an option for people who don’t have a preference?
* Yes there can be.
* Motion to amend.
* Changing the first be it enacted clause to 20 signatures. And also adding an option for studying abroad or co-opping students.
* Chris: I’d like to motion to make it more catch all.
* Passes.
* PQ
* Passes unanimously.

1. **Good of the Order & Announcements**
2. **Roll Call and Adjournment**