I. Roll Call (19:06)

Present: 54
Absent: 16
Quorum: was met

II. Call to Order (19:12)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:12 pm

I. Chair Address (19:13)
   a. Executive Vice President – Suchira Sharma
      i. Updates:
         1. Last Week:
            a. Prepared for meeting with Admin of Fri 2/3 to discuss the Student Experience Townhall
            b. Published referenda information and materials on website
            c. Wrote statement with President Horen and EDoC Gilbert re: Trump EO from Friday 1/27
         2. The Week Ahead:
            a. Publishing Q4 Reports
            b. Drafting some changes to Constitution/Bylaws, working with SAID members and President Horen
            c. THIS FRIDAY: Meeting with Administrators (Asst. VP Macomber, and VP Estabrook, and other members from Student Affairs) to discuss next steps regarding the "Student Experience Town Hall" (student advocacy proposal from last semester -- we keep pushing!)

II. Executive Addresses (19:14)
   a. President – Elliot Horen
      i. Updates:
         1. Last Week:
            a. Continued work on Budget Priorities Survey Presentation
            b. Published statement on President Trump’s executive order
            c. Organizational responsibilities (met with advisor, project management meetings, etc)
         2. The Week Ahead:
            a. Finish Budget Priorities Survey Presentation
            b. Attend University Scholar’s Town Hall on Program Termination
   b. Comptroller – Draken DuBose (not present)
   c. Vice President for Academic Affairs – Zachary Waggoner
      i. Updates:
         1. Met with provost’s office to discuss the professional advancement network and double counting
   d. Vice President for Student Affairs – Alex Bender
i. **Updates:**
   1. "Husky to Husky" - Mental Peer Education Program-Starting tabling and events with new members
   2. Diversity and Inclusion
      a. Last committee we committed responsibilities to a diversity and inclusion sub-committee
      b. Starting talking to as many perspectives as possible to establish direction
   3. Community Engagement
      a. Asset mapping project
   4. Club Sports Advisory Board
      a. AKA Club Sports Council
      b. Actually a thing! First meeting last Thursday
   5. Community Arts Day/block pARTy
   6. -Starting to plan for even
   7. Logistics

e. **Vice President for Student Involvement** – Nick Haberli
   i. **Updates:**
      1. Working with new student organizations to arrange their constitution structure
      2. Working on implementing new changes to Board governing documents.
      3. Organizing Student Involvement Board liaison workshop

f. **Vice President for Student Services** – Paulina Ruiz
   i. **Updates:**
      1. Continuing to hold 1:1 meeting with Committee members to check-in during the new semester!
      2. Attended the first FAB of the new semester. The next one will be held on 2/22 at 7:00 am on the 17th floor of EV!
      3. Helped recruit members for a trayless dining focus group to narrow down implementation strategy.
      4. Scheduled a meeting with NUPD to determine final steps before the first Campus Safety Advisory Board.
      5. Brainstorming next steps for Wind Energy project

g. **Chief of Staff** – Becca Raffo
   i. **Updates:**
      1. Working on Mid-Year Spending Report
      2. New Senator Deadline is February 13th
      3. STEP starts February 27th
      4. Retreat for 2017 will be October 28th-29th! Get pumped!
      5. If you are not getting our emails or have an issue with the roster, let me know!

h. **Executive Director of Communications** – Akiera Gilbert

### III. Special Addresses(19:19)

a. **Parliamentarian** – Alex Carlin

b. **Elections Committee Chair** – Samuel Gugliemotto and Steph Beja
   i. **Updates:**
      1. Candidate forms are live on the SGA website and due on February 20th
      2. Referenda forms are live on OrgSync
Elections Committee Chair Gugliemotto yields the floor to President Horen
1. 
   Elections Chair Gugliemotto: When the referenda due?
2. 
   President Horen: I think February 13th.
3. 
   Executive VP Sharma: The referenda are due on February 5th.

IV. Question Time (19:19)
   a. 
      Senator Makhijani: When does STEP start?
   i. 
      Chief of Staff Raffo: February 27th.
   b. 
      Senator: You said that you were going to make sure that any students who felt threatened by Donald Trump’s recent policies were going to feel secure. In order to make sure for students who do follow Trump’s policies, do you have any ideas or way that you are going to make sure that they don’t feel threatened either?
   i. 
      Executive VP Sharma: I think it goes both ways with ensuring that every space on campus is as inclusive as can be. Our senate is a really great example of that where we always strive to be non-partisan, not just bi-partisan, and I think that’s a really big part of it. When we do say that we want to advocate for our students who feel threatened on campus, that’s just promoting the fact that we do have all these spaces and resources for them, like working with WeCare and the Office of Global Services, as well as reiterating a lot of the themes that President Aoun also mentioned in his email to the university.
   ii. 
      President Horen: As EVP Sharma said, we want to ensure that there is respect from both sides – from all sides. More importantly, the statement we made was specific to the act that President Trump signed that effects Northeastern students – that’s why we were compelled to make our statement. I know people personally who are not to leave or enter the country for the next 120 days, that’s what that statement was about, not about the election of President Trump.
   c. 
      Senator Kotler: You called his policy unacceptable to us as leaders and human beings. 62 million people voted for this man, are you saying all of them are unacceptable human beings?
   i. 
      Executive VP Sharma: I’d like to echo what President Horen said: I think we are speaking about a very specific order that called for a religious declaration, and travel being restricted from people legally holding Green Cards, which, to us, is unacceptable. We stand by our statement.
   ii. 
      Senator Kotler: But the religious test already existed.
   iii. 
      Senator Kalantar: Point of personal privilege: is this appropriate for question time? Statements are not questions.
   iv. 
      Executive VP Sharma: Senator, do you have a question?
   v. 
      Senator Kotler: No.
   vi. 
      Executive VP Sharma: I think I should clarify that President Horen and I made that statement on behalf of the two of us as elected members of the student body – elected and tasked to represent the larger student body and, as he mentioned, that statement reflected individuals we know who are affected by this policy, and we’re tasked to represent them as well. When statements go on our page, they are specifically signed just by the two of us.
   d. 
      EDoC Gilbert: Point of privilege: would you be able to highlight, just for the new senators in the room, the process of SGA as a whole making a statement?
   i. 
      Executive VP Sharma: Yes. The process, if SGA were to go about doing so, would be to submit a formal piece of legislation entitled “A Sense of the Senate”. Any senator can propose a legislation either on the floor in New Business, and they can also submit...
legislation to be formally placed on the agenda by submitting it to the cabinet before Thursday at 6 PM. If you would like to do so, please feel free to reach out to President Horen or myself.

V. New Business (10:25)
   a. FY 18 Budget
      Presentation and Approval
         i. Executive VP Sharma yields the floor to President Horen and Chief of Staff Raffo
            1. President Horen: Ever since I was Chief of Staff two years ago, I’ve been way too intimately acquainted with the Student Government budget, I know too much about the line items of the Northeastern Budgeting Code, but that’s a good thing this year, because I’ve had experience with looking at the numbers fluctuate over the course of a couple years and seeing how we actually spend our money. This year, we had two goals: to cut waste on the first part, to look at the parts of our budget that have kind of just been there for years that we haven’t been spending or that haven’t gone towards activities that are productive for SGA or the student body, but not just to make cuts, but also to double-down on the things that make a bigger commitment to the activities and funding areas that we’ve seen a lot of success with this year – in a year when we have done more than SGA has done in a long time. But I want to start with talking about some of the cuts that we have.
            a. Cuts:
               i. Office Supplies ($600 → $500): The first is office supplies. It’s not a big cut, just a hundred dollars, and it brings us into reality – we don’t spend 600, we spend more like 500.
              b. Business cards ($510.44 → $0): We’ve spent $510 on business cards ever since I joined SGA. I don’t know how many of you have business cards, I suspect there not that many, I don’t know how many of you have kept business cards that you’ve received in any sort of organized fashion like a binder or something. I have not, I throw most of them out, I don’t even give most of them out. The minimum we can order here at Northeastern is 250 business cards, for something like $60 each. I’ve given out two. Let’s just get rid of it. If people want to find you, they can go on your LinkedIn.
              c. Husky takeover ($6,000 → $4,000): We’ve budgeted $6,000. We don’t spend that much. These are two events per year. This is for utter entertainment, so the bouncy house, the face painting, the photo booth, it just doesn’t cost $6,000, it ends up costing more like $4,000, so we want to bring the budget into reality.
              d. Office phones ($522 → #150): We spent $522 on office phones. Why? I don’t know. This is true, they have rung like 8 times in the last 4 months, 7 have been wrong numbers. I have a cell phone, I think everyone has a cell phone, and they know where our office is. When I was chief of staff, three years ago, I asked to cut this, I was told “No, it’s just the way we do business, we have to have it.” I asked again last year, was told the same thing. Finally, I said come on, let us cut this, and finally got permission. We have to have 3, as a cost of doing business in the office, but this saves us a lot of money.
e. Printer maintenance ($3,984 → $0): Next is printer maintenance. Wow! that’s a lot of money, for the SGA printer. Holy cow! I think we shouldn’t be paying for it, if we’re not the ones getting the primary use out of it. The ones getting the primary use out of it is CUP, the Council for University Programs, which uses it to print all of their posters that you see around campus, for the various acts and shows that they bring to campus. So I worked with their co-presidents to get them to agree to put it in their budget request, given that they use it more than we do, and they agreed, so let’s get that out of the SGA budget entirely.

f. Printing ($920 → $500): And finally, we have $920 from last year for printing outside of that printer, this is if we need to do a larger poster, if we need to get a table cloth, if we need to kind of do those kinds of things. We don’t spend 920, we spend more like 500, which is why we made that cut.

g. That’s a total of $7,386 cut from the SGA budget without a negative impact to any of our programming. That’s pretty significant, if you ask me.

2. What works:

a. Food ($3,550 → $6,400): But I’m not only for cutting on our spending, but for increasing it as well. At least when it works. So this is one that I think we all intuitively know works: food. You put food at the events, people will show. It’s amazing. I will show. I would probably be there to eat about $3500 worth. We know and we’ve seen this year, that when, you have events, whether its Northeastern votes or anything else, if you have food there, you basically double or triple attendance. So we want to do a large increase. And the reason for this, is that it’s hard to get people to come out to things, and we want them to come out to things, and there’s no better way to do it, than to offer people something they want the most in college. This is a way to kind of feed students, and give directly back to them, while encouraging them to show up. It’s important for most in school, and a one that leads to a lot of happy students.

b. Giveaways ($8,500 → $10,500): Same thing for giveaways. We want to do a $2000 increase for giveaways. Because again, these are one of the most effective tools that we have in our repertory in order to both spread the message of SGA and encourage people to do activities at events. That’s another thing I would speak to for giveaways. It’s one thing to get someone to go somewhere, and it’s another to get them to fill out a survey or a digital conversation about what they think needs to change at Northeastern. A giveaway is an important promotional tool to achieve that. We’ve seen a lot of success with giveaways we’ve done so far. I kind of made it a mission, and Parliamentarian Carlin forgive me, I hope “crap” is allowed to be said, we have stocks buying useless crap this year. Previously, we bought a bunch of stuff for like 99 cents and like a dollar, and it just goes straight to the trash can, so, we don’t want to do that, we want to be able to buy slightly nicer things, like the water bottles we’ve had, and the chargers, and the reusable grocery bags, so that people actually use them and hold onto them, and
that people see the SGA name around campus, to spread awareness about what our organization does, and who we are.

c. Inflation (~1.01988% increase): Finally, for the elements of the budget that we want to stay the same, we want to make just inflation increases, we don’t think that they should decrease, which is why we’ve adjusted them just for whatever the federal government reports inflation was in this last year. And now I will turn it over to Chief of Staff Raffo to talk about stipends.

3. Chief of Staff Raffo:

   a. Cabinet members ($2,000 → $2,500): Currently members of congress are compensated $2000 per person per year for the work they do for this organization, and we are looking to increase that next year mainly because this year we have seen just how much of a time commitment, and how work really goes into these roles, and it’s a lot. I know from personal experience being in office there are cabinet members from 7 AM to midnight or 1 AM or 2 AM, even staying overnight to work on really amazing projects, it averages out currently to $1-$2 per hour, which is not a lot of money in the grand scheme of things, but, it is a financial compensation, so this opens an opportunity for students who may be struggling between joining an organization like SGA or getting a part time job. So this opens up cabinets’ applicant pool to a much more diverse and broad student body.

   b. Parliamentarian & Elections Chair ($0 → $500): In addition, Parliamentarian and Elections Chair who are not part of cabinet, they also get stipends. This is not even an increase, this money is already allocated to those positions, we’re just thinking of moving it from our cash account to the SAF account, the reason being that it makes more sense for all the statements to be coming out of the same account instead of two different ones.

   c. Old to New ($54,486.44 → $57,686.60): We are proposing a grand total of $3200.16 increase for next year’s budget and President Horen and I have been monitoring the budget, and we’ve seen what works and what doesn’t work and the proposal we’ve put forth is really necessary to help the organization for next year, and provide a good foundation for years to come. Thank you.

4. Senator Hamp: Do you feel that increasing food and giveaways at events will increase attendance at the expense of having people that will show up that actually care about things, or will they show up because of the food?

   a. President Horen: That’s a possibility, anytime you offer an incentive for anything you might get some conflicting reasons, What I care about is getting people to show up so that we can hear what they have to say and they can hear what we have to say, that we could attract people that would never come to an SGA event otherwise, it’s fine as long as we can ask them about their experiences in the five minutes they stick around to get food.
The intent of food is not “hey, come get food, do nothing, leave”, its be enticed, let us talk to you, participate in the activity that we have.

5. **Senator Driesman:** I’m just curious as to whether you left any sort of buffer just in case prices fluctuated over the next few years or what have you.
   a. **President Horen:** Looking at historical trends as well as tracking mid-year spending, yes we left a buffer, this budget is only for next year. As far as future year trends, we will have to deal with that when the next year budget is submitted, I am confident, and I think **Chief of Staff Raffo** is as well, that this will be sufficient.

6. **Senator Agyare:** The new money for the stipend, is that for each cabinet member?
   a. **Chief of Staff Raffo:** Yes.

7. **Senator Walter:** Would you mind just clarifying for new members what the difference between the cash account and SAF fund is?
   a. **President Horen:** The cash account is an external account that is not subject SAF rules so that means, how much you can spend on Facebook advertising, how much you can spend on giveaways, whether you can do an event that doesn’t target the entirety of Northeastern’s student population, that money have to come out of the cash account, rather than the Student Activity Fee (SAF), which is shared by everyone, and so the cash account is used for things like Passing of the Gavel, Winter Party, things we can’t use the SAF money for, and its variable. So we need to get the SAF money, that’s the budget we’re submitting, the cash account involves our fund raising independently and money that we get from other sources, so this is the SAF request. If you look at other advocacy organizations, the Resident Student Association, which represents fewer students than the SGA does, receives a stipend over double what we are proposing, even after the increase, RSA makes twice as much for their leadership. This is a minimal request, replacing a part-time job, what we are doing is a part-time job but feels like a full-time job.

ii. **Senator Morris** motions to extend question time to the end of the speaker’s list
   1. **Senator Quinn** seconds
   2. Motion passes
   3. **Senator Agyare:** Putting into consideration that with more food there is more waste, how does handling our current budget more responsibly come into play before we consider increasing it?
      a. **Chief of Staff Raffo:** For example, Northeastern Votes on election party night, we got much better food and it disappeared, which means better food and less waste, also draws a greater crowd.
      b. **President Horen:** Agree, get more and better food for more to show up, it’s not perfect but we are not being inefficient with our current budget. It’s important to give us the ability to buy more and buy better.

4. **Senator Hamp:** This is the second time in three years for a proposal to increase stipend. Is this going to be a semi-regular event out-stripping the capacity that we have to pay our cabinet members?
a. **President Horen:** That’s definitely a concern. I obviously can’t speak for next year. I would trust the senate to decide when that limit is reached. Looking at history, people were receiving $6,000 stipends. This position should be enough for a student to get a part-time job, I wanted to propose for more than $2,500, the work load I see requires more. We were told by our advisors to ask for a small increase at a time, because you can only do 2-3% increase every year.

iii. **Senator Hostert** motions for a 5-minute moderated caucus with a 30-second speaking time
   1. **Senator Morris** seconds
   2. Motion passes
   3. **Senator Morris:** Speaking directly to the food waste, I know I had a similar concern – not only monetarily, but also environmentally. We did not have enough burgers and a very long line, so I admit that the spending SGA is proposing is very strategic. I don’t think that’s a concern that I have, given my first-hand accounts and experience with food.

iv. **Senator Hamp** motions to go into voting procedure by placard vote
   1. **Senator Baek** seconds
   2. Motion passes
   3. Placard vote:
      a. For: 32
      b. Against: 0
      c. Abstain: 4

v. FY 18 Budget passes
b. **Student Involvement Board Manual Approval**
   i. **Executive VP Sharma** yields the floor to **VP Haberli**
      1. **VP Haberli:** This is essentially the rules and Protocols, the powers invested in the Student Involvement Board. This is just a rough skeleton for the next item I will be presenting. The main purpose for these changes is to bring these documents up to
date. Last time they were updated was 5 years ago in 2012, which is a long time.

Changes:

a. Making sure that CSI titles are accurate. I essentially report to the assistant dean for Student Involvements with anything pertaining to the Student Involvement Board, and I believe it was Center for Student Activities, so just making sure it says Center for Student Involvements.

b. One of the major changes that I did address is in Section 1.3, providing tasks to the Finance Board. Originally, it said we are reviewing and improving the student manual, SIB was not in the approval body, I don’t know why that was in there. I changed it to something more reasonable, and hopefully it will be accepted and turned into the policy. SIB was originally made to provide some sort of oversight to the Finance Board, and so in keeping with those checks and balances, I suggested to changing to review and approve amendments to the Student Activity Fee manual. I think that is fair. That will be a protocol that myself and Comptroller Dubose will talk about as the year progresses.

c. In article 2, it’s pretty much the exact same thing – bringing everything up to date. That pretty much encompasses my changes to the Student Involvement Board manual.

2. Senator Driesman: *inaudible*
   a. VP Haberli: It would be the finance board and senate I believe, but definitely not Student Involvement.

ii. Senator Agyare motions to adopt by unanimous consent
   1. Senator Kadakia seconds
   2. Parliamentarian Carlin: Point of order: First you have to make a motion to close, after which, someone can make a motion adopt by unanimous consent, then you don’t need to vote on whether or not it happens; upon a second, it immediately starts.

3. Senator Mariutsa: Can you explain that further?
   a. Executive VP Sharma: I would like to ask Senator Agyare to amend his motions to close debate. He can’t make that motion, he must close debate, then someone has to second it, we have to vote on whether we’re done debating. If we are, then he can make the motion to adopt by unanimous consent. Once that motion is made, someone has to second it, then I get to say “by acclamation” three times, and if anybody objects, it isn’t adopted.

4. Senator Agyare amends motion to close debate
   a. Senator Kalantar seconds
   b. Motion passes

iii. Senator Hamp motions to adopt by unanimous consent
   1. Senator Driesman seconds
   2. Motion passes

c. Student Organization Approval and Revision manual approval
   i. Executive VP Sharma yields the floor to VP Haberli
      1. VP Haberli: The purpose of changing the SOAR Manual was essentially wanting to bring it up to date to close deficiencies. In section 1.2.1.1, essentially the way SIB
works is when a tentative organization of students comes to us, we assign two board members to work with that group to develop their constitution and prepare them to present to the board to get full recognition. I wanted to amend that process slightly, where as in the past the chair would be able to be assigned as a liaison. While I like to think that the vice president for Student Involvement has certain expertise in certain situations that might want themselves with complicated groups, essentially, if a group gets rejected and there is an appeal, and if the vice president worked with that group, that group has an unfair image, if the vice president had good or negative interactions with them. This is trying to make the vice president for Student Involvement more of a neutral third party and give more of the power to the board’s decision. The vice president can be involved if the board members vote so. In 1.2.2, each board representative had to communicate within a certain number of business days. I didn’t see a point in the liaison tapping on an additional message saying “hey”, when they are essentially tasked with working on the constitution, and then the liaison coming into work. Because the SOAR Manual is sent out to student groups who are potentially appealing, I wanted to make this manual as clear and easy to read as possible. Quorum was listed in the SIB manual – I essentially copy-pasted it into the SOAR Manual – again, more transparency; easier to read. In 1.3.2, it essentially goes over for our protocol for a group presenting to us. We limit 15 minutes of presenting in total, including questions, due to the volume of those coming to us. In 1.4, we made it easier to read. We can deny a student group if the constitution has conflicting items, originally it was if the constitution had too many items. I didn’t want to deny a student the amount of items in their constitution. In 1.4.1.6, we could deny a group because it was unnecessarily competitive with the existing student groups and organizations, some of the more complicated groups that come before us start overlapping into campus resources, and there is a place for a student offered alternative to some for campus resources. But say the resources are, for example, GEO, you start getting into the realm of ‘let the school do what the school does.’ We added 1.4.1.8, organization possesses excessive limitations to student participation in its general membership. The CSI has a general policy, making it so that they want student groups to be as hoping as possible to anyone who wants to join, but you don’t expect everyone to join an acapella group, or a competitive student organization, where that might bring down the quality of the organization – so there is some leeway in there. 1.4.3, decisions made by the student involvement board will not have precedent on future decisions regarding full recognition; all organizations will be considered dependent. This came up over the summer, especially with one particular appeal we were working on. Essentially, it was holding this iteration of the board to a standard that was set by a board about five years ago. I don’t feel that’s a proper comparison. Policies change, tendencies of students change, so holding the board to previous standard I feel isn’t just, and essentially allowing the board to have its member do what they’re embedded to do is the best path to move forward. Pretty much the exact same thing, constitutional amendments, putting in quorum, just rewording how each amendment is proposed. The same sentiments in 2.4, decisions made by the Student Involvement Board for amendments and
constitutions will more have precedence on further actions, bringing the appeals process up to date, changing one of the standard for appeal, which was previously arbitrary or capricious, changing it to arbitrary and capricious, defining what arbitrary and capricious means so that there is no confusion, and again, just outlining the approval or appeals process that is in the SGA constitution. Article 4 previously didn’t exist, but we’re sort of bringing it back. Every year the CSI recreates an organization resource guide, which the board previously had an editorial capacity on implementing those changes, it fell and I want to bring that back. Essentially the vice president for Student Involvement meets with the CSI, they go over changes they want to make to the student organization resource guide, those changes after the meeting are brought back to the board, the board discusses their opinions on it, and those opinions are shared with the CSI, and the conversations essentially go from there. If anyone has any questions on that process I would be more than happy to answer them and then any new reference, that’s pretty much it, and the changing the word memo to Leonard to make it more readable to those to who we send it out to.

2. **President Horen:** In section 3.7, why is it the student body president presenting the rational for the appeal board rather than the parliamentarian or the chair?
   a. **VP Haberli:** I chose the student body president because of the symbolic purpose of them receiving the memo in the first place, or the PMO in the first place, as they are a non-voting member. It could have been either them or the parliamentarian, they ultimately decided that they wanted the student body president.

3. **VP Waggoner:** Does your decision to replace the presidents portion of the manual have precedence in other parts?
   a. **VP Haberli:** Yes, if memory serves correctly the finance board operates on similar events.

4. **VP Ruiz:** I was just curious; what was the previously allotted time for presenting – it’s now 15 minutes, what was it before?
   a. **VP Haberli:** It was previously indefinite, but in keeping with our schedules and with the amount of things we have to go through we chose 15.

ii. **Senator Driesman** motions to extend question time to the end of the speaker’s list
   1. **Senator Morris** seconds
   2. Motion passes
   3. **Senator Driesman:** I sort of related to this earlier, but not in detail how the board has clarified the changes to the manual.
      a. **VP Haberli:** I propose many changes to the board, being the primary approval body of this document. Some changes were scrapped and some were added. So this one was essentially collaboration between myself and the rest of the board.

iii. **Senator Kadakia** motions to adopt by unanimous consent
   1. **Senator Kadakia** amends motion to close debate
      a. **Senator Baek** seconds
      b. Motion passes
   
iv. **EDoC Gilbert** motions to adopt by unanimous consent
1. *Senator Hostert* seconds
2. Motion passes
d. Budget Priorities Survey presentation feedback
   i. *Executive VP Sharma* yields the floor to *President Horen* and *Senator Driesman*
   1. *President Horen*: So for those who are new, there is a budget survey we send out to the entire student body in December to get their feedback on where they want the University to spend money, and in 2 weeks we (*EVP Sharma, DDIM Driesman,* and myself) will present this to the senior leadership team. As I mentioned, this is a very ugly rough draft, so understand that this is a very rough draft this is subject to change based on your feedback. I’m happy to answer any questions about the existing presentation or about data itself. Starting with demographics, 1,500 people responded, it ran for just over 10 days on social media, it had a pretty fair distribution across all year, across all majors, this is about what we expected this year they’re a little less interested in fill out surveys, three colleges are represented proportionally. The degree program people are in are mostly 5 year programs. The university wanted to take it down to 4 years 5 years ago, big movement called the “Fight for Five”, it won and we still have about 70% of students enrolled in 5 year programs. And we are hopeful that that will continue. I want to talk about people’s priorities. Two questions: What is your top priority, what is the most important thing to you, if you were in charge of the university’s budget, what is the first thing you’d spend money on? And what is the last thing you would spend money on? What do you not care about at all? So the results we got in, in order of top priority: 31% say Instructor quality is where I would spend the money now. Only 4% say that is their lowest priority. That’s really significant, people really care about the quality of teaching at Northeastern and believe more funding should go to it. You have a contingent 19% that care about sustainability, and an almost equally large percent that really don’t want to spend money on that, and I would really like to hear you all on how you feel about that. I’m also happy to report that the UHCS priority which is significant because 15% are not going to UHCS. So there is a sense on this campus that we need to do better, yet only 6% say that they don’t care. Housing - 13% moved off campus, and there are the rest which I won’t go over individually, you can see here where smaller priorities for everyone is. And these surprise me, I thought more people would want to spend more like on a library, though that’s not the case, people seem to have negative feelings towards things like library. Instructor Quality: most are happy with quality of instructors in their majors-vast agree that those qualities are high, saying that their instructors are good communicators.
2. *Senator Driesman*: We ask questions about the instructors outside your major – very similar results. We ask if our instructors are helpful during office hours – similar results, etc. Generally, instructors seem to be making people pretty happy.
3. *President Horen*: Some are not satisfied with text book, most disagree and feel text book prices are fairly reasonable, we’re going to insert a cross tech slide, which allows us to see by college who responded that their text books were priced
unfairly, so we suspect that some of the major colleges with notoriously expensive text books will be in that somewhat and strongly disagree, and that will allow us to better tailor the response. Online homework codes, the provost didn’t even know this was going on, but 85% did not know that they had to buy access codes to turn in their homework, which seems incredibly unfair. Some people find these not very helpful and expensive, about 37% say they disagree on that and 70% say they’re not reasonably priced at all, so we’re going to be making a case to cut back on these extra fees, they are particularly insidious and you cannot resell codes. We want to focus on diversity - more females and professors of color, we obviously do not have enough at this school. We want to continue the TRACE program that expand CATLR, which stands for Center for Advanced Teaching and Learning Through Research, where they teach professors to become better teachers. We’re also going to ask for help on text book prices, we’ve been doing this for 5 years, we need to see more of an effort from the Provost office and each of the individual colleges on temping down on some of these prices and encouraging professors to choose text books that are less expensive. That’s something we will expect. Next is UHCS – here we’re going to just run through some statistics. People generally think it’s easy to make an appointment, but we have a large number (36%) saying that it’s really not. People who have appointments are seen reasonably quickly, people with walk-ins are not as much, more to be improved there, but to me it doesn’t seem to be a crisis at all. Regarding Health issues, we will break those down to Physical health and Mental health, we don’t have the cross tech yet to see which are mental and which are physical, that will tell us more when we do have that. But we still have a really large percentage that are not feeling satisfied – just about 30%. So if 1 in 3 students that come visit you are not happy, that’s not a good thing. Being treated with disrespect when visiting a clinician or physician. I would not want to see anyone be treated with disrespect when going to visit a clinician or physician. About referrals, adequate referrals, we still have a large number saying they don’t agree in physical health, but really where you see the problem is mental health. Because we are not equipped to be a long-term mental health provider, we refer out at a very high rate. So if this system is broken, the mental health care system at Northeaster is broken. We have 45% disagreeing that there is adequate support – and these are folks who really need that support. I haven’t yet built the takeaways for this because I want to see the data that divides up the mental health care and the physical health care, but you can imagine what they will be - increased funding, more clinicians, I know they just hired someone to manage referrals, but I would want to see more resources in general directed toward UHCS. I’m going to add in a little bit more about advising – which we got some questions on. People reported being happy with financial aid advising, academic advising, co-op advising, and GEO advising. Lastly, we asked about National Newspaper subscriptions. 76% do not subscribe, 83% would like the university offer one.

4. **Elections Chair Gugliemotto:** Can you clarify how the question about priorities was recorded?
a. **President Horen**: We tried something new – previously we asked people to write a list, but doesn’t really capture the stuff you don’t care about, so we asked people “What’s the thing you care about most?” and “-least?”

b. **Elections Chair Gugliemotto**: I just think there’s a difference between not wanting to prioritize more funding and *inaudible* people may have ranked it least, but it wouldn’t encourage you to frame sustainability.

c. **President Horen**: The attention I don’t think is to frame it negatively, I think it’s to reflect reality, which is that about 20% of the school feels like you need to be focused on this, and almost an equal number say to stop focusing on this, which is alarming to me for someone who cares so much about sustainability, but it is reflective of the school, so I want to accurately carry forward that data.

5. **Parliamentarian Carlin**: Full disclosure: I did not do the Budget Priorities survey, but I no longer think these numbers are representative if I can only pick the thing that I am most and least interested in. I believe that the top priority is underinflated more than it should be. Could you address this concern?

a. **President Horen**: I think that that’s totally valid feedback, but we are seeking to do something different and to highlight the thing that really matter to people. If we did this again, we probably wouldn’t frame it the same way. We tried something different and I didn’t know that we would get results quite like this, but I think it’s still relevant to talk about the things that people care most about for this process, and I think that’s how we’ll frame it. And I do think it’s relevant when people identify something as their least priority.

6. **Senator Walter**: Do you think that means that 16% of students want to stop funding sustainability, or do they just don’t care?

a. **President Horen**: We asked “What is your lowest priority?” and that’s how we can phrase it – that it’s their lowest priority.

7. **Senator Chowdhury**: What if they see it as there is enough funding going into sustainability, and because we are a school, they want to see more go into structures, housing, etc.

a. **President Horen**: I like that framing, that sounds good.

8. **Senator Park**: Is there any way that we could get alongside a percentage of what does go towards sustainability so that when they are faced with this question they can engage on whether this is enough?

a. **President Horen**: I have never seen that financial data – I don’t even know if they break it up like that, but I will ask, but I suspect the answer will be not – just being totally honest. I would love to see how much they spend on all these things, but I don’t think they’ll tell us.

9. **Senator Hostert**: Can we get the finalized version of this presentation in the point of information?

a. **President Horen**: Yes.

10. **Chief of Staff Raffo**: In terms of the textbooks and online homework stuff, is that instructor quality that you’re categorizing as? Because I don’t know if that
necessarily is the quality of the professors or more like the academic policies that the school has.

a. President Horen: It is instructor quality because the instructors choose the textbooks. So if your professors choose a $300 textbook, please talk to them. I think this is a question we should be asking in the TRACE surveys.

11. Chief of Staff Raffo: In terms of the visual for the top priority and least priority, I think it would look better if you put it into a pie chart – a top priority pie chart and least priority pie chart, because a bar graph is kind of hard to read.

a. President Horen:

12. Senator Park: Are there any current policies that would prohibit your instructor from going to the textbook company and making an agreement to receive a cut from the company for having their students buy the access codes?

a. President Horen: I don’t know if we have a policy against that, but I suspect based on VP Waggoner’s excited opening of his book that we will be looking into that. We’ll look into it and make sure that we express that students want instructors to at least disclose from meeting with textbook publishers.

VI. Open Discussion (20:32)

a. Executive VP Sharma: I have an announcement to make that was given to me by Colleges Against Cancer. It’s the American Cancer Society Student Government Club under the Northeastern’s campus. They work with American Cancer Society, focused on advocacy, communication, survivorship, and, of course, Relay For Life. These four directions guide them as well as events that have the cancer advocacy and fundraising aspect. This semester they’ll be hosting a variety of concerts, acapella groups, a visit from Christopher Hayden, a trivia night, which was tonight, and Thursday the 12th there’s the volunteer meeting for anybody who’s volunteering at Relay For Life. They’re super open for suggestions and looking for the club to grow, so if you have any individuals in either yourselves or your constituencies who would like to have more information, feel free to email them.

b. Senator Beja: Going off of that, don’t forget to sign up for Relay For Life. Starting Wednesday, it’s going to be $20 instead of $15, so sign up today.

c. VP Ruiz: I didn’t mention this in my address, but tomorrow there will be *inaudible* where we will be meeting with Dr. Klein of UHCS, so if there’s anything pressing that you would like me to bring up or post a discussion to *inaudible*.

d. Senator Teodorescu: I’d just like to talk about the what was written about the Muslim ban. I know it’s really controversial, but I think that we should talk about it, because it hits a lot of people, and it hit me really hard as well, but then I did more research and I actually learned what this entails, and I think that it’s important to know that the countries on the list are Iraq, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Sudan, Somalia, and Libya. There is no evidence whatsoever in this ban that says that it is an actually a Muslim ban. A quote from the executive order, it says pursuing to Section 12-F, I hereby reclaim national *inaudible*, and also there is an individual, case-by-case religions that are being persecuted. Now, there is no religious test whatsoever here, and I can read it to you again it’s online. The countries with the highest Muslim populations currently are Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Nigeria – none of which are on the list. So, all that Trump did here was basically say “look, there is a terror problem in the Middle East, ISIS has announced repeatedly that it wants to send their own people in to start attacking people in Western countries and in Europe, and until we figure out what’s going on, we need a temporary ban. That’s not saying that Muslims are
banned, but just that until we have a plan and a way to tackle ISIS, which, by the way, Trump also issued another executive order saying that he’s going to give the general chiefs 30 days to figure out a plan to defeat ISIS immediately, I don’t think that it’s fair for you guys to come out with an article or a statement that says a Muslim test and that it’s unacceptable to us as leaders and human beings – that never happened. I think it’s important also not to attack the people who support Trump’s policy, because I know it was brought up and I know it’s very controversial, and as someone who was actually in DC for both the inauguration and the woman’s march, two blocks over pedestrians were literally smashing buildings and attacking people - 100 were arrested because these people were literally getting violent. I think it’s also important to know that this “ban” actually started from Obama when he passed in 2015. In December 2015, the Visa-Waiver program and Terrorist Travel Prevention app would ban people from Iran, Syria, Sudan, and Iraq. On February 2016, he extended that to Libya, Somalia, and Yemen, and I didn’t see any of you guys protesting that – I never saw anyone in the United States protesting that whatsoever. In fact, in 2016 Obama dropped 27,000 bombs in the Middle East, killing thousands of people at least, and I never saw anyone protest that either. What Trump has done is try to address the issue again and save people from more terrorist attacks. And yes, there are exceptions, like last night in Quebec when one guy – a lone wolf – shot up people in a mosque. No one is saying that’s a good thing either, and I hope everyone can just stand together in support of pole in Quebec. But to call Trump a racist and also just to say that everything he’s doing it “islamaphobic”, I think he’s just trying to identify an issue at hand, and try to tackle it in the best way possible. People have been addressing this and saying “Who does it affect? What is he trying to do?” There are plenty of things I disagree about him too, like I don’t think green card holders should be affected. If you look at the refugee crisis right now in Europe, they are actually with a UN statistic basically shows that 75% of people who came in in 2015 were actually military males. Those people who are creating many problems in Europe right now – do we want to help them? Absolutely! But many Syrians actually want their problems helped at home; they don’t want to have to leave Syria – which is why Trump came up with this plan in 30 days to attack ISIS head-on. If you look at things like the woman’s march where people were advocating for woman’s rights just as we are right now. The leader, Linda Sarou is actually tied to Sharia law, which states that woman who are raped should be stoned to death and that being gay is illegal. Now that’s not woman’s rights. Everyone is protesting woman’s rights, and I think that Northeastern in general should stand for everyone’s because that’s who we are. We pride ourselves on being a diverse and inclusive school, which is great, but I think for some reason that’s starting to stop, and that people with different ideas are being shut down just for having those ideas with statements like the ones that were just written, and I don’t believe that’s okay at all. I understand why people are upset with that, but we need to look at things very objectively and weigh the facts, because in the end, this is based on alternative facts.

i. Executive VP Sharma: I would just like to comment and say that we do pride ourselves in being a diverse and inclusive campus, and that’s what Open Discussion is for, so thank you for your comments today, and I hope you find senate as diverse and inclusive as we try to make it to be.

ii. Senator Hostert: I don’t think we should dive into the specifics of the Muslim ban, I don’t think this is the place to have such a politic discussion, I think everybody is entitled to their political views, and I appreciate your ability to have that opinion. I know that a lot of people in this room completely disagree with you, just sticking up for what President Horen and EVP Sharma did, I think their statement was largely because the actions of this
administration have the ability to affect Northeastern students, and then as you said, green card holders are affected by this, and so I think at that point when something is affecting our student body and it could possibly prevent students from attending Northeastern, it is our duty as a senate, as SGA, to say something sticking up for our students.

iii. EDoC Gilbert: I think that this past semester, this year especially, has brought out a lot of ideas, and I think that’s a good thing. With that being said, I think that in the statement made, they did also say that the Student Government office is a place that where you can comfortably express any ideas you may have. So if you would like to come to any one of us to discuss any ideas, please do.

iv. Parliamentarian Carlin: Point of inquiry: can I ask what the topic is?

1. VP Bender: The diversity and inclusion sub-committee.

e. VP Bender: It seems as though we’re a body that’s very passionate about diversity and inclusion on all sides of the issue, and that’s exactly why we’re establishing this diversity and inclusion sub-committee, and we need perspectives. So please come talk to me or a member of the Student Affairs committee if you have an invested interest in diversity and inclusion.

f. Executive VP Sharma: The question of the week is “How do you find community at Northeastern?” Make sure you’re bringing this question back to your constituents and collecting feedback. We’ll see everyone next week right here in the Senate Chambers. Until then, have a great week, and GO PATS!

VII. Adjournment (20:43)

Adjourned at 8:43 pm