**Agenda**

**Tuesday, September 17, 2019**

**Present:** Donna, Jessie, Caitlin, Colin, Tyler, Braden, Molly, Adam Bergh (Andrew PROXY), Neetu, Kylie, Kristyn, Kieran, Michele,

**Not Present:** N/A

1. **Call to Order:** 6:50 p.m.
2. **Reflection**
	1. Kylie Kenedy, School of Pharmacy and Health Professions
3. **Roll Call/Attendance**
4. **Approval of Minutes**
	1. 8.27.2019
		1. Motion: Kylie
		2. Second: Braden
			1. 8-0-0
				1. This motion passes
5. **Old Business**
6. **New Business**
	1. CSU August Budget
		1. Tyler: Do you remember the total budget for supplies for the whole year?
			1. Colin: I can look at it
			2. Donna: It is at $5000
		2. Braden: What was the misc supplies?
			1. Donna: Those were for the reusable bags and straws
		3. Motion: Tyler
		4. Second: Neetu
			1. 8-0-0
				1. This motion passes
	2. Standards Committee Representative from Cabinet
		1. Previously: John Morelli, School of Medicine President 2018
			1. Kylie will serve on standards committee
	3. Bylaw Changes
	4. Referendum #19-01
		1. Braden: What is your expectation from us?
			1. Donna: We are only to be talking about what is in the Referendum
				1. There should be no “what ifs” or potentials
			2. Braden: Can we propose new things?
				1. Donna: Unfortunately you cannot because it already passed through the Board
		2. \*Mike, Hugh, Aidan, Donna, Emily proceed to give presentation\*
		3. Motion to forego the reading
			1. Motion: Braden
			2. Second: Kylie
				1. 8-0-0

This motion passes

* + 1. Motion to discuss
			1. Motion: Braden
			2. Second: Kylie
				1. 8-0-0

This motion passes

* + 1. Andrew: In your research, are fossil fuel companies investing in positive efforts?
			1. Hugh: The burning of fossil fuels is an insane amount and these companies are constantly looking for more ways
			2. Aidan: These companies will not make a full transition to renewable energy
			3. Mike: Divestment can act as a signal towards a positive step
				1. Shifting the market towards a more equitable world is not a bad thing
		2. Braden: My concern comes from certain arguments in the referendum. Some of the writing is very emotional cliché… These writings will be passed on to the board of trustees and father Hendrickson and I think they are very “young”
			1. There is not a lot of seriousness in certain whereas statement
				1. We want people to take our age seriously and I think there are some things in this referendum that are not very professional

Mike: There are a lot of metaphors used

Braden: There are some examples in here that do not follow exactly what the citations are saying. My argument is not whether divestment should or should not happen but I think we can correct every single piece of information that is in this legislation

Mike: Can you reiterate the IPCC citation?

Braden: In the article there are 67 citations in regard to poverty and only 20 correlate. There is no evidence that it will actually occur

Aidan: I think there is physical evidence in the article

Adam: Then put that in the legislation. There should be no reason to let administration question our intentions

Braden: We want them to take this seriously in regard to our credibility. This is pressing and something that people will read. There are just some arguments that I cannot get behind because of the way that they are framed.

Mike: Can you cite another one?

Tyler: We are having an argument that is not needed. We need to look at how this will affect our future students and our endowment. We need to focus on this and the endowment. How is the endowment going to affect the future students of Creighton?

Aidan: I was talking about the sea level rise because Braden was asking about that.

Tyler: We need to focus on our students and how we will continue to build our facilities this campus. The conversation should be held right now.

Hugh: Let’s talk about the financial argument.

Hugh: There is word that there is a risk that divesting will affect student scholarships. We have studies that show that we will have higher returns.

Tyler: The entire California university system divested .16. We are asking for 2%.

Colin: If we are asking to divest this money, where will we put all this money in our portfolio?

Mike: The article was given because a financial argument was made in support of divestment

Colin: There are not many to compare it to. There is only one other Jesuit institution that passed this. Why are we the only ones doing this?

Mike: Someone must step up and be a leader. The economy does not exist in a vacuum. We need to look at the effects the climate and the weather. Creighton students are not the only ones impacted by the endowment.

Tyler: You are being a hypocrite.

Donna: We need to move back to the Q & A portion.

Michele: Let’s speak in a respectful tone.

Tyler: We are still using carbon fuels.

Mike: Our proposal is to stop investing in fossil fuels when we are carbon neutral.

Aidan: If you look at the stock market, the energy sector was in the bottom two. Most of the easily accessible oil reserves have been tapped and burned.

Mike: We are not saying divest tomorrow. WE are saying gradually divest because the market is shifting.

Braden: what made you choose to take this big step instead of writing referendum on other steps?

Mike: This is a very severe issue. This should not prevent us from making micro changes in our own lives. At the root of this issue is power. You and I can make our own life choices but that will not change anything. WE need to supplement this with the power structures and the larger macro issues. We can longer pretend that things will be changed. We cannot act like things are going to change. People are passionate about this. If this is going to make people mad, I think we are taking the right stride. We are focusing on the root of the problem

Aidan: Keep in mind that the Vatican has divested.

Mike: I do believe rational language is viable.

Kylie: Motion to end discussion

No Second

Tyler: Do you know who is on the board of trustees? If yes, then who?

Tyler: Gale warner, james (ceo of MOO), the largest contributor is Berkshire Hathaway, Mike mccarthy (founder of mccarthy capital), mark walters (investor in NY)

Hugh: there are also Jesuits and many others that are passionate about this issue as well.

Mike: we are here to talk about the referendum. Not the board of trustees.

Donna: Please let your students express for themselves their own opinions and their own voice. This should come from the 9000, not the 9 people in this room.

Hugh: Our education at Creighton calls us to speak truth to power. There is a lot of power on the board of trustees. But we are also using our voice

Donna: Referendums msut be passed through all three bodies- voting should be decided by the student body

Kristyn: The wording is a little “iffy.” The more flowery you make your language, the less impact it makes. Would you go to the different grad schools to talk about this

Hugh: We would love to do that.

Braden: Whether or not I agree with this or not, my stipulation is how will education work?

Donna: WE want students to vote authentically. We do not want to make it look like we are “brainwashing” the student body.

Braden: I disagree. I do not think a week is long enough for education. 40% said yes and 60% said no towards divestment. Students do not know about this issue. What would be the education that we would have?

Donna: That is a “what if” question.

Braden: I just want to be sure that we have enough education.

Colin: I do appreciate your efforts. I want the students to have their voice heard. We do not have any actual data. The 10.6% is not final or proven. Why couldn’t we get this data?

Donna: I will say a year ago, the reason that this failed last year was because there was not enough data. These people here have done research and had meetings.

Tyler: I do not think there is enough data for students. Where is the data to support that we can still give scholarships to students? We don’t invest in tobacco, pornography, etc. So you are already tying up their own hands to a small sector. The market is getting smaller. We should not risk investing in a smaller avenue. I just don’t think there is enough data to prove this in front of students.

Donna: We have the ability to propose objectives to present to the student body. We can provide the official language

Mike: We purposefully left it open. I think we are giving the people who make important decisions to do their own research.

Braden: What happens when the money does not go back to scholarships?

Tyler: if we cannot provide the answers, then we should not present this to the students.

Colin: why cannot we have father and the financial people come in and tell us why they haven’t approached this subject. There have not been clear answers. What is the hold up on their end.

Donna: I think father is waiting for us to call them to action.

Colin: I would want father to come in and tell us why steps have not already been taken. I thought father was opposed to divesting, so why is he opposed?

Mike: And if they choose not to pass this, they we urge them to make a public announcement about why they are not investing.

Mike: Creighton exists more than financial institutions. Part of our mission is to be social justice.

Adam: I am worried about the misrepresentation of information and evidence. I would not want to pass this to the students.

Donna: Is there a motion to limit discussion for 5 minutes

Motion: Kristyn

Second: Kylie

Braden: \*reads a portion of referendum\*

Again, I aplogozie because I don’t have the specific numbers. But a majority of students do not agree with divestment.

Mike: there are 45% of students that WOULD support this.

Braden: We should not be vauge.

Neetu: if we divest, what would yoy tell students if we do not get the money where it needs to be.

Braden: The reason why we are talking about students so much is because there are student’s way smarter than us that will question this. This referendum is great but I think there are other students that may catch this

Motion to end: Krsityn

Second: Adam

Motion to ask presentors to leave: Adam

Second: Tyler

* + - 1. Adam: Is this something we can present to our students?
				1. Kristyn: my students do not know what is going on
				2. Tyler: my concern is that people the only people that will vote will vote yes.
				3. Donna: So we should not give students the option because they will not vote?

Braden: Some things matter to more people than others. Nelly Nelson said this is a great thing to vote on but this legislation is not set to Creighton standards.

Tyler: this is weird because it doesn’t effect us but the future students.

Colin: If this is serious, we should get it out to the students. But we do not have any financial information.

Donna: We are allowing them to take a look at this. Not telling them to do it

Braden: I want to produce a document that make us look like we have a brain in our heads.

Colin: This may affect 25 full ride scholarships. I am worried about the future of the students

Braden: Let’s bring it back to let the students vote.

Donna: My point is because I am advocating for the 300 students.

Braden: the point of this is I want students to be taken seriously. There are some things in here that I cannot get behind. Let’s pretend the board of trustees do care… is this the document that we want them to see?

Tyler: How do we define fossil fuel companies?

Donna: we are asking them to divest from the top 200 companies on this list (provided in the referendum)

Colin: We need to classify what are fossil fuel companies

Kristyn: I think this should go to the students regardless. I am worried about the wording. I just ask that we have education provided to the students.

Braden: I have an issue with the wording and I am not even in the law program.

Donna: Motion to extend debate for 5 minute?

Motion: Braden

Second: Tyler

Adam: I would hope people would vote with what is right and wrong.

Braden: I think we need to talk about the strength of the referendum. We are basing it off of the argument on the referendum. If a student comes to ask and say its poorly written, what would you say?

Donna: Then they should vote no.

Tyler: No one is going to go through and read the whole referendum.

Donna: Is this another thing that students come to us and say that they weren’t heard.

Braden: Is this a well written document?

Neetu: How will this be presented?

There will be a cover with the exact numbers with how many people said yes and how many said no.

Adam: I think the counterargument is more nuanced.

Motion to extend debate for 5 min

Braden

Second: Adam

Colin: There is no real counterarguments. This is very one sided

Motion to end discussion: Kristyn

Second: Neetu

Point of information: Braden

Are we going to be telling students why this did not get passed?

Point of information: Tyler

Do you [Donna] have a vote?

Donna: No

Point of Information: Kristyn

Can we edit this and then pass it?

Donna: No, this cannot be brought up again. There must be red line edits brought to us.

Point of Information: Adam

Can we edit and bring this back?

Donna: You would have to bring recommendations to the author, they will edit it.

Tyler: is it a conflict of interest that Donna is still in the room?

Point of Information: Kristyn

Can we call an emergency meeting and vote then?

Motion to continue discussion

Adam

Second: Braden

Motion to end discussion

Adam

Motion for recess

Tyler

Second: Braden

Motion to open discussion

Braden

Second: Adam

Molly: I know you worked on this for a year. Let’s say there is a chance that the board of trustees looks at this, we should fix the writing

Braden: Let’s not be the ones to say the Board of Trustees will not take it seriously. This is good. But is it good enough?

Colin: Let’s write down some suggestions.

Donna: The whole point that I sent this early was for you to edit it.

Adam: Would the HCOB dean be willing to present a counterargument

Donna: the president of Harvard wrote an article on why divestment is bad. My team wrote a response on why the president’s response was not viable.

Motion to open discussion

Motion to extend debate by 5 minutes

Braden

Second: Tyler

Braden: The counterargument provides a rebuttal.

Donna: Referendum is stemmed from the rebuttal.

Braden: So we can strike it down and then send edits.

Colin: If we provided education sessions, who would even attend these sessions?

Braden: If there were counterarguments, it would also make it look credible

Motion to vote:

Kristyn

Second:

Motion for thought period

Braden

Second: Adam

Motion to end thought period

Braden

Second: Kylie

Motion to vote

Braden

Second: Adam

0-8-0

This referendum fails

Motion to open discussion

Adam

Second: Braden

Adam: Can we think of three things to make sure we don’t call an emergency meeting to bicker with them.

Include counter arguments + rebuttal

More academic language and less emotional language

More financial data

Relook at sources

Summary/abstract for students as unbiased as possible, within reason

Reclassification of what “fossil fuel” means and provide more Operational definitions

Say that this is based on information we do not have, Say we cannot project the consequences. Tell them that the school is not giving the information

Add the Harvard rebuttles

\*Presentors were called back into the meeting and were told the edits that Cabinet would like to see made\*

Braden: I was thoroughly impressed. This referendum was great, let’s make it AMAZING.

Donna: This is up to you guys and you may choose not to make changes.

Donna: This will come back to Cabinet on October 8th

Emergency meeting will be called on Monday, September 23rd @ 8:30-9:30 p.m.

1. Executive Updates (will be sent out through email)
	1. President: Donna Shahbazi
		1. Sustainability
			1. Reusable bag + container distribution
		2. Night Owl Initiative
		3. Student Health Clinic Concerns
		4. Super Cabinet Feedback
	2. Executive Vice President: Jessie Lee
		1. The Jesuit Classic
	3. Vice President for Programming: Caitlin Mills
		1. Graduate + professional student passes
		2. Fallapalooza
		3. Dear World
		4. Homecoming
	4. Vice President for Finance: Colin Lakeman
		1. Rollover + Final Enrollment Numbers
2. **Cabinet Updates**
	1. Kristyn Wong, Student Bar Association President
		1. Interdisciplinary Funding
	2. Upcoming Events
3. **Advisors Updates**
	1. Ms. Molly Salisbury, CSU Program Board Advisor
		1. The Student Organization Review Committee is in need of a grad/professional representative to review new student organization applications. This commitment would be for interviews in the evening from October 21 – November 8 (scheduled as available).
4. **Announcements**
5. **Adjourn:** 9:18 p.m.