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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/1R6hTOO8pa8vXoXSoBAa4mI7bxBHk_oD0Ysn9I0g7bv0/edit#bookmark=kix.1tx6i3ka0ej8)
4. **General Order:** PVMNT

* Presented their mobile app as an alternative to flyering. They also presented their user statistics, which is about 1000 unique web users and they have not had a hard launch yet. They also explained what their next steps are, which include: creating user and cub profiles, confining it to Northwestern users, add self-moderation, etc. Additionally, the android app is under development. They want to be Northwestern’s go to place for event discovery when students are trying to get involved. They also encouraged Senate to give them any feedback they have.

1. **General Order:** Funding Overview

* Andrew: We are just trying to get some feedback right now from you.
* Isaac: I think that funding has a tendency to give more money to people who have historically gotten more money, which creates cycles.
* Wendy: There is a negative vibe about favorites and groups that get more. I think that’s an issue about transparency.
* Moira: Compared to other schools that don’t have a delineation between A-status and B-status, recognized student groups were generally able to get more programming. Whereas B-status groups here do not have access to much money.
* Tom: I’ve always wondered what kind of metrics are used. Do you use quantitative measures?
* Mackenzie: There are a lot of metrics that go along with it, but it’s not just quantitative using attendance.
* Jonathan: Some events are not intended for all of campus and the way funding is focused now is for events that benefit the whole campu.
* Mackenzie: The reasoning in the past has been we don’t want to spend student money on something they are not allowed to attend.
* Ruba: We need to have a bigger B-status pool. Also the rule for not funding food, we hear a lot of complaints about that. Some groups food really is essential.
* Moira: The type of events that get funded I think are geared to big name speakers and panels that people fly in for. That’s the majority of the events and I would like to see things moving in the direction of being more specific to Northwestern.
* Isaac: Over-programming.
* Ruba: Having to plan super far in advance limits creativity.
* Tom: I think ASG could link up with other methods of funding.
* Moira: Why do we fund things the administration is already willing to fund? It limits money to groups that aren’t connected to the administration.

Emergency Legislation:

* Will: We are upset about not getting our seats.
* Isaac: This is a resolution not legislation, right?
* Will: Yes.
* Isaac: If it’s a resolution that makes a statement, why does it matter when it is made?
* Will: We want to talk about it while it is a hot topic and then we want to see what Senators think before starting the new term.
* Lauren: If it is put on the agenda tonight we vote on it next week?
* Noah: Yes.
* Moira: What is preventing dialogue or voicing concerns before you are able to introduce a formal piece of legislation.
* Will: We want to do it tonight so we can make a decision next week without having to hurriedly push it through.
* Andrew: Just to quickly outline in the code how we evaluate groups. With regards to this decision the committee had a tough year and did not feel like including these groups would allow Northwestern to be more representative than the ones we chose. We spent over ten hours on the process so it was definitely thoughtful.
* Isaac: What are the potential actionables that this would produce.
* Will: If we knew exactly the action we were going to take, then it wouldn’t be a resolution.
* Isaac: Is it not true that most potential actionables would need to go through Senate anyways?
* Will: Yes and we are trying to see if we have support before then.
* Olivia: Some of the senators who received their seats are not able to talk about this yet.
* Will: We are not saying that we deserve it more than other people.
* Moira: So I think that it is extremely important to remember this is a resolution and any actionable items would not be able to happen until next term when the seats who want to push this through don’t have seats anymore. Even presenting this now won’t give them the leverage that they want. It would be different if this was emergency legislation to add more seats that would make sense, but there is no reason to pass a resolution of support right now. Since those seats are already not going to exist after next week, the only point of pushing this through immediately would be in the name of future legislation.
* Alec: I think it is pertinent now because if they came to us in two weeks I would wonder why they didn’t bring it up when it happened.
* Isaac: I don’t think that this is an emergency. Your justification for wanting to get the Senate’s opinions before you want to introduce something with teeth is unnecessary. That’s not even to talk about the content, that’s just the principle. I think Olivia’s question is pertinent, because a lot of the stakeholders are not in the room. Saying you were unfairly wronged is saying that the people who are not here are not deserving.
* Nick: I think the argument is a bit hypocritical. Because certain seats are not here, they deserve to have a vote. You’re saying that once they lose their seats they don’t get that respect. The fairest thing to do is to allow people to speak from both sides.
* PQ
* Passes. It is now on the agenda as new business. 22-10-5

1. **New Business:** [B-Status Funding](https://docs.google.com/a/u.northwestern.edu/spreadsheets/d/1uF2iZerUwmxG9b0JBKGo-HVycQRQOJxAiv9Dl_nU9k4/edit#gid=0)

* [Funding presentation.](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/?ui=2&view=btop&ver=r0dakj6jr541#attid%253Datt_14be2c971db28026_0.2)
* Parag: What is the amendment pool?
* Kenny: About 800. Doesn’t mean you have to use it all.
* Tom: Was any group denied funds completely?
* Kenny: Only one who turned it in late.

1. **New Business:** [Emergency Legislation for College Democrats/Republicans](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1R6hTOO8pa8vXoXSoBAa4mI7bxBHk_oD0Ysn9I0g7bv0/edit#bookmark=id.ovoujg51uvrn)

* Domonic: Quentin, President of College Democracts could not be here tonight. We found out later after 20 years of having a seat that our seat was taken away. There is a complete lack of a political voice on this campus. When you have groups like the College Democrats and College Republicans you lose students who are politcally minded. By cutting our political groups you are saying those who might see themselves as a republican or democrat as being ignored. The SGAC says that voice does not matter and we will silence that voice. Our resolution calls for Senate to say the political cross section of this student body does deserve to be heard.
* Noah: Aren’t the constituencies you represent large enough that they could be represented by students in the residential caucus?
* Domonic: Everyone is already represented once.
* Jo Ann: Is the resolution only about College Democrats and Republicans?
* Domonic: It is not specific to us, but it was written by their presidents.
* Isaac: Do you think the other groups do not have political voices?
* Domonic: It is not their priority. Ours actually are political voices.
* Noah: Why is it important to have specific seats rather than just having people who identify as democrats or republicans?
* Domonic: We are the only groups who will always have a political opinion. This isn’t a question of politics it is a question of representations. Should people with political interests have a voice?
* Kevin: The college democrats have over 800 people on our listserv and so it is clear there are students who are politically active.
* Isaac: Do you think political parties are relevant to the student senate?
* Domonic: No I do not, but sometimes senate does comment on things like that.
* Olivia: Do you think in most legislation we argue along party lines? I guess I’m asking the senators.
* Will: I can get 100 responses if I send a vote over our listserv, because political students are very politically active.
* Kevin: Why wouldn’t you apply as a joint group like any other coalitions? Why would you not just have one political seat?
* That is something we would consider.
* Moira: Do you feel there was some kind of misconduct on the part on the apportionment committee?
* Domonic: I wouldn’t say there was purposeful wrongdoing, but maybe an oversight.
* Kevin: The previous dems senator did not do a good job so that might have been part of the decision. I wouldn’t like to see one bad apple spoil the whole bunch. I think Will and I can both contribute well to this body and so can our groups.
* Isaac: Motion to commit this to the SGAC. We have a committee for this for a reason. I think that it’s a no-brainer in saying you put it to the committee who is in charge of this.
* Ariel: They just decided so would this be like an appeal process. Doesn’t make much sense to me if there is not an appeal process.
* Isaac: Were there attendance issues?
* Dana: Yes.
* Effectively this would mean a conversation with the SGAC and the groups involved.
* Isaac: Committees are allowed to write legislation to change things.
* If this motion is passed the resolution would not be voted on.
* Nicholas: Is there any reason to suggest the decision would change because of the resolution?
* Andrew: It’s a six person committee and I don’t think that it’s appropriate for us to say.
* Ruba: If we pass this resolution and then legislation, won’t it just go back to the SGAC?
* Noah: We would open up applications again if more seats were added.
* Ruba: Ultimately, the SGAC would have a lot of say in this process anyways. So a conversation with this committee would probably be recommended?
* Noah: The SGAC would have to take action unless there is a constitutional and code amendment.
* Moira: I feel like there are a lot of important things that should be said here and we are jumping to conclusions. Right now there is a resolution brought up to the Senators that the College Dems and Repubs should have a seat and that they don’t have one, but they also said they don’t think there has been a misconduct by the committee. We have trusted the SGAC and the authors have said they don’t think there is misconduct. It would be appropriate to remedy the decision if there was an unfair process, but that is not what is bringing up. I think this resolution being brought up to senate is really inappropriate. It should be brought to the committee.
* Alec: Yes we have these people who are our representatives, but Noah didn’t campaign on Senate Seat collection, so I don’t think our voices are really heard in this process. We trust the funding committee to make decisions, but we ultimately make decisions.
* PQ
* Passes. 15-13-8

1. **Old Business:** [SR1415-10: Supporting Higher Education Affordability and Illinois MAP Grants](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1R6hTOO8pa8vXoXSoBAa4mI7bxBHk_oD0Ysn9I0g7bv0/edit#bookmark=id.o93w6e7un16i)

* Erik: The current Illinois budget has significantly cut funding even though interest has only increased. Other Illinois schools have also passed things like this. This would put it on our docket to lobby when we go to Springfield.
* Alec: What do you mean by not much support?
* Erik: I’m talking monetarily. Higher ed in general has experienced many cuts.
* Noah: Why does this carve out an exception for for-profit universities?
* Erik: Giving this money to for-profit universities is just a way of siphoning money right into business. Also for-profit universities do not necessarily have the interests of their students at heart.
* Alec: Do you think it’s almost hypocritical for students at Northwestern with a huge endowment to be taking this money?
* Erik: I think in general this is to benefit all colleges and universities, particularly public universities.
* Alec: What about Illinois’s general deficit?
* Erik: We are advocating what is best for our constituency, which is the student body, so that’s not necessarily relevant.
* Kevin: What is the current level funding for MAP grants?
* Erik: Before cuts it was at $410 million and it was cut to $370 million.
* In line for debate
* Alec: I definitely support taking funding from for-profit universities, but the current proposal holds it steady and I do not support asking for more when the fiscal situation of Illinois is so poor.
* Noah: 15% increase is a lot, but compared to the deficit it is not large. And the impact it would have on students will be quite significant. I think on net the impact is going to be way more than the slight increase.
* Alec: I absolutely agree with you, but you can say that about anything in the budget.
* Moira: The fact that we are entertaining a sensitivity for the larger budget when we are supposed to help students is laughable. We do not need to tell them everything that they should do with their budget. They don’t have someone advocating for students, so we should do that to the best of our ability.
* Motion to Previous Question.
* Objection.
* Noah: I think we’re good to vote.
* Passes.
* Legislation passes.

1. **Roll Call and Adjournment**