**Creighton Students Union Full Board Meeting**

**Monday, September 30, 2019 | 5:15 pm | Hixon-Lied G-04**

**Agenda**

**Present:** Donna Shahbazi, Jessie Lee, Caitlin Mills, Colin Lakeman, Katie Kelsey, Mackenize Allen, Gabby Baker, Michael Galeski, Henry Glynn, Maximo Guerrero, Ayushi Kaul, Michael Linngren, Claire Nachtwey, Huda Mian, Raeef Rahman, Jordan Rivard, Ashley Schutt, Caleb Brickner, William Suh, Binyam Ware, Sukhman Virdi, Lauren Williams, Claire Finken, Lauren Tuch, Shannon Campbell, Khalilah Davis, Danny Poulos, Brenna Maloy, Lily Dolan, Karli Sugar, Bradley Pfiefer, Arianna Dalamaggas, Rachel Head, Peter Johnson, Sydney Borys, Jacquelin Farquhar, Federico Facciolo, Kellie Frost, Charles Altfillisch, Andrew Lane, Jolee Espinosa, Morgan Dobersek, Brittney Kessel

**Not Present:** Abigail Neddo, Emily Leight, Mitchell Leon, Ashley Wynne, Samuel Smith, Madison Harper, Adhm Asfan

1. **Opening Ceremonies**
   1. Call to order (5:15)
   2. Invocation
   3. Roll Call
   4. Approval of Minutes
      1. 09/16/19

Motion to Approve Kaul

Second Guerrero

Approved 30-0-9

1. **Open Discussion**
2. **Old Business**
3. **New Business** 
   1. Referendum #19-02

Edited it based on feedback from cabinet. You have already seen this and read so we will just go over the changes. It is a bit longer now. We added more formal counter arguments. Four of them are new based on discussion we had which were brought up. We made it a bit more professional and academic and less emotional. We added some more data and key studies as well. We also added an abstract to summarize the basic points for those who might not read it all. There are also definitions as well. We went through every source and showed direct causations and correlation. Finally we added a disclaimer at the bottom telling the limits of the document and the basic financial data that is not in the open. We talked about the basic information we do not have. This tells you what all we did and why we are lacking some basic information. Basically it’s the same document but I think it’s a lot better. Is there a motion to open discussion or vote

Motion to discuss- Poulos

Second- Suh

Poulos- has there been a committee put together

Shahbazi- yes but they do not have students on this committee. Yes if you check your email from father you will see the specifics

Farquhar- Do you have information on other Jesuit universities?

Galeski- Yes as of now only one other Jesuit university and divested and we have that information in there.

Motion to vote- Guerrero

Second- Glynn

Approved- 33-1-1

Will go to the student body on November 5th.

* 1. Constitutional Change

Shahbazi- We are coming back to you with the board restructure. It started in the ad hoc committee and went to you. We made some changes and are going to try and help you understand it a bit more.

Lee- We have the executive committee which is made up of us. Then we have the board of reps which is you guys. There is more undergraduate students here but this balances out in cabinet.

Mills- This restructure came from last year’s board which Donna over saw. The ad hoc committee was made up of 6 students. The number of reps in this room is based off of population per school. From an efficiency stand point this structure does not set you up to be successful. Each representative does not know the interests of the 150 students you represent. The students do not know who they can come to. If there is so many reps there is a lack of responsibility.

Shahbazi- The purpose of the restructure is to fix these issues. This is not something that the ad hoc committee made up, we did some research on other Jesuit Universities. Other schools have seen success in this type of structure. It did not come out of no-where.

Lee- The new brake down is a total of 31 members. There are 15 positions based on college and 12 based on affinity groups.

Shahbazi- Any affinity groups will be voted by the groups themselves for three groups. The next is appointed by the CSU executive and will fill out an applications online. These will be recommendations and then approved by cabinet. The next group will be elected by student body vote on CSU general election ballot in November. The 4 at large delegates are for those who may not be in any of these groups. Therefore, your voice will still be heard.

Poulos- One of the concerns we expressed was that it has a growing popularity. More competition will occur. What if there was another way to increase popularity? What if we included the House of Delegates? (Keep what we have and add affinity groups)

Shahbazi: People can discuss it later. These 47 plus 12 plus 4, 60 people in this room, against the whole idea but can work.

Ari- It’s a really good idea and a concern that I held was that by cutting down the size you take away opportunities for leadership. Although it isn’t the most involved, it still would allow people to represent others within their college. Wants to incorporate the amendment because we need the at large reps but also the affinity reps. With solely affinity, you won’t have a direct every student is on this list serve and gets this email.

Shahbazi- They have a hub, CIC, and get this information. Will have an outlet and specific list to give this out to everyone.

Q: Communication won’t be solved unless everyone completes this communication step. We represent works well in the grad and professional schools.

Jessie- Undergraduates don’t know who they represent and can’t specifically state who their 150 are. The affinity group was to give us a list of the members that you represent and report to. It would make it no longer ambiguous.

Linngren- First, I agree with Ari in the sentiment with not everyone being able to have a box or position. The other group that we represent are the ambiguous group of 150 that I represent. It allows us to have a group that we know. We haven’t encompassed everything, but we need to recognize that we have the majority here. Third, adding the affinity groups would defeat the entire purpose of this. Specificity allows us to give a group of people we represent to allow more efficiency.

Galeski- Based off of the size of the delegate body, if you have to pick people to appoint and no one is running, this is not the sign of a healthy organization. If the federal government had to choose this because no one wanted to run, doesn’t make them look that good or that competitive. If someone has stake in a progress, they are more likely to work harder for it. They can manage their time and internalize the importance of the organization. If we have less people and more competition, we will have the cream of the crop, not just solely the people Jessie appoints.

Jaqueline- It goes from going to 150 to 600. If we don’t know who those 150 were and now 600, how are we able to represent them. As a first-year law student, I don’t know as many people as are required for this representation. One representative for all of our needs is a little ridiculous

Williams- We created these affinity groups based off of the student handbook. Added the commuter, international, grouped others together.

Shahbazi- Every group has to register under a certain tag, like these, to promote and distinguish your group.

Williams- Gives more representation across the board instead of just solely representing one of those groups because one of the 17 of us might not do that.

Charles- If you give each group a delegate, those people that are not given a group cannot and will not be represented. Gives the graduate schools a different perspective and is not fair to represent 600 plus students who have different interests and clubs.

Shahbazi- At large reps cannot represent everyone fairly. The 9000 that I represent, I cannot think solely about us as a board but also the sports groups, other schools, etc. The at large is to catch everyone else but allows other groups to have a position. Your cabinet is more than half of cabinet. There will be equal balance, and this will help represent those adverse needs and opinions. University wide, we are supposed to represent all of them, and the do overlap in certain instances.  
Pfeifer- Marquette did not create a perfect system, but the talent does not automatically fix this. We need to find the right person to fix this problem.

Shahbazi- Jessie appointing people against 4 exec and cabinet makes it more distinct.

Pfeifer- Graduate and professional schools have adopted other meetings, not solely housed within CSU. These undergrads should adopt these things. It works for us to represent others better which would allow others to improve it. Side note, I have worked for graduate organization you cannot be pushed to vote yes or no. These could be changed to allow others to use zoom, electronically, etc. The restructuring might work but so could the use of technology.

Morgan- I did my undergraduate here. I don’t have an issue with the affinity groups but for the graduate schools, there is no way that any one person can represent all of them. I don’t know everyone, and I am not opposed to the undergraduate restructuring but the graduate one, yes.

Shahbazi- If it was different ratio between yours and they went 1/ 600, how would that go?

Ari- We already have a good set up for the grads and I can’t represent everyone with 4 people.

Shahbazi- We like what is going on but like addition of affinity. Morgan wants the ratio to be different for undergrad and grad.

Lily- With this, what if we created a competitiveness between affinity groups. What if someone believes they can represent multiple. What if we make the at large bigger to have more representation? 4 isn’t big enough for that.

Shahbazi- Another idea is to include more at large reps. Like the affinity groups and the restructure, but we want to make sure we do this together.

Kaul- If they stay 1/150, they could represent a cultural group, that is ridiculous because they don’t know what undergrads are doing. Could they be kept out of these affinity groups?

Shahbazi- They could represent both ways, either in the grad and professional students or the affinity group.

Pfeifer- They would probably not apply for these seats.

Poulos- On the topic of undergrad representation, there already isn’t enough undergrad representation. I have seen or met them but there isn’t a cohesiveness. I would not know who to turn to if I wanted to represent myself. We are pretty stretched thin. Reducing that would make us do less.

Guerrerro- Your senate appoints you. We aren’t appointed, we are voted in. Grad schools do it differently, but we are proposing this.

Charles- We think this is a good idea for the undergrads, but our system works well, and we don’t want it to change. We don’t want our representation to be undercut.

Pfeifer- We represent all of the med school because they all vote us in. This model might work well but the focus for the last months has shown that this might not be working well for you, but it is for us.

Shahbazi- If we do the 1/600, we would do what the grad and professional schools are doing. You would have to go to multiple meetings, including the senate, to understand what is going on so that we can bridge the gap like the grad/prof are doing it. Would be elected by the students but you would have to go to CAS students. We are trying to meet others where they are at.

Galeski- The grad students are really interacting. From my perspective, that is great because everyone is interested in talking with you for perspective.

Motion to exhaust the speakers list: Guerrero

Linngren- Seconded

Shahbazi- Can you all come next week for an additional meeting? Can you vote electronically?

Linngren- Keep option 1.

Shahbazi- 1/150 for grad/ prof. 1/600 for undergrad. Affinity groups (12)🡪one from Phoenix. At-large (4). We are going to vote on this and will fix this to reflect this.

Sugar- This will not balance out the structure. There will be fewer undergrad than grad/ prof.

Motion to vote- Linngren

Seconded- Kaul

30-5-1

* 1. Bylaw Change
  2. Funding Requests
     1. Everything approved

1. **Executive Reports:**
   1. President: Ms. Donna Shahbazi
      1. AVP Interviews
      2. Election Information
   2. Executive Vice President: Mr. Jessie Lee
   3. Vice President for Finance: Mr. Colin Lakeman
      1. Appropriation Approval
   4. Vice President for Programming: Ms. Caitlin Mills
      1. Late night Ping Pong
   5. Speaker of the Board: Karli Sugar
      1. Speaker of the Board Application
2. **Student Organization Announcements**
   1. Committee Time
   2. Committee Report
3. **Announcements**
   1. Advisor’s Update
   2. Upcoming Funded Events
4. **Adjournment** (6:18)