

Collin Cox, Kassandra Valles,
Garrison Krotz, Bailee Myers,
Richie Hernandez
Union Referendum Students

April 7, 2017

Petitioners

REQUEST FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

This Request for Appeal of Student Senate Rules and Regulations (hereinafter “SSRR”) Art. V. § 16.4.4 is in relation to Comolli v. Union Referendum. Petitioner asks that the Court reconsider said ruling requiring the Union Referendum initiative “Redo Your U” (hereinafter “RDYU”) to “cease all campaigning” based on a Student Senate Elections Commission (hereinafter “EC”) determination that RDYU conducted an educational campaign in favor of the referendum initiative prior to the EC’s regulated campaign period(s) that are applied to and associated with student government candidates and coalitions during Student Senate Elections. It is the position of the petitioner that the Elections Commission; (1) applied a ruling with no previous precedent, basis, or jurisdiction within the SSRR; (2) that as a result of this determination, rendered the EC itself derelict in their own charge of informing the student electorate about issues facing the students of the university and the institution; and (3) overreached their domain and authority through their interpretation of SSRR. There is no indication within SSRR that the SSRR campaigning limits imposed on student candidates and coalitions apply to any referenda, or any individual, group, or institution that are not seeking elected position(s) within Student Senate. Applying Student Senate election rules and regulations to a referendum item, an individual, a registered student organization, and /or an institution is not in the spirit of the elections code, and sets a dangerous precedent, as the EC cannot and should not regulate any referendum-related education, outreach, or related

referendum activities conducted by a university individual, group, or institution, nor is that clearly defined in their charge.

To be clear, the Union Referendum and the accompanying RDYU outreach campaign are not coalitions as defined by SSRR 7.2.16. The original case brought forth by Comolli refers to RDYU as a coalition – it is not. As specifically indicated by 7.2.16 of SSRR, a coalition “shall be defined as any group of students who unite to campaign for Student Senate positions.” The EC itself did agree that the Union Referendum and its outreach organization do not qualify as such. In their findings, the EC stated that they agreed that RDYU “campaign materials do not apply to referenda” and that “we must discount the evidence presented as materials.” An author of the most recent updates to the SSRR indicates that the spirit of the law is strictly to regulate coalition and candidate campaigning and to place restrictions only on such. For the EC to admit in its findings that campaign materials do not apply to referenda, yet still decide that it was in the EC’s jurisdiction to order RDYU to cease all outreach and education efforts is incongruous at best. However, the most dangerous aspect of the present ruling (as it currently stands) is that it would establish a potentially damaging precedent, whereby the Student Senate EC claims authority and jurisdiction over the content, timing, and control of information, education and outreach activities of referenda, no matter what individual(s), group(s), or institution(s) are attempting said education and outreach.

Further, SSRR indicates that the EC is responsible to inform all parties involved in the election as to their related rules and regulations. This is shown through their requirements of slating (SSRR 7.5), candidate meetings (SSRR 7.5.4.1), advertised election workshops (SSRR 7.3.5.10, SSRR 7.5.7.1.8), required advertisement of all elections events and deadlines (SSRR 7.3.5.8), and testing (SSRR 7.3.5.11, SSRR 7.5.7.1.8.1) over SSRR. Through the EC’s own

enforcement of aforementioned rules, they indicate the importance of such. RDYU members read the SSRR prior to any outreach efforts and understood that the rules regarding campaigning are defined only as they relate to coalitions and candidates, and not to referenda or initiatives.

Referendums at the University of Kansas have historically served as mechanisms designed to place legislative control directly into the hands of the entire student population of the university, traditionally in instances where Student Senate would prefer to let the electorate itself decide on an important issue or initiative (SSRR Article IX). By approving a referendum vote on an issue or initiative, the Student Senate is temporarily transferring the sum of its legislative power directly to the student body, effectively relinquishing Student Senate's responsibility in making a particular legislative decision on behalf of the student body. By the very act of instating a referendum, Student Senate is inherently divesting itself of any aspect of the legislative processes concerning a given initiative, and is thereby divesting itself of any authority governing the education and outreach efforts concerning the initiative itself. Student Senate cannot transfer its legislative power over to the student body while claiming that Student Senate still retains some other regulatory power or jurisdiction to govern the activities, information and discourse surrounding a given referendum initiative.

If the present ruling stands - that referenda and those parties both in favor and against said referenda are subject to the same campaign constraints as student coalitions - it has the potential to create mayhem for all future referenda at the University of Kansas. While referenda are generally thought of as progressive actions, the potential for negative referenda are possible under SSRR. Hypothetically under this new and dangerous EC precedent, a referendum could be introduced in the fall semester to eliminate funding for a service or institution – including Student Senate itself. In this hypothetical scenario, without the benefit of free and available

information, public discourse and polarities could emerge, become complicated over the course of months, and yet the targeted service or institution would be prohibited from mobilizing adequate information or education to defend itself outside of the few weeks in the spring allotted for campaigns. The EC ruling and this new precedent would introduce censorship and chaos to an electoral mechanism that is, by nature, supposed to be directly democratic, education-oriented, and dialog-driven.

Further, because a referendum could be done outside of the general election, and not considered in the purview of the EC, it stands to reason the campaigning rules and regulations only apply to general election coalitions and candidates, thus having no bearing on when RDYU began outreach activities.

It is the belief of the petitioner that the EC levied a sanction with no precedent, little clarification, and no foresight into the possible ramifications of this overreaching decision. The Election Commission's ruling sets a dangerous precedent of censorship and regulation of any individual, group, or institution. As part of the EC's ruling affirmed, RDYU is not a coalition. By halting RDYU's initiative's ability to table, flier, and post to web and social media accounts, Student Senate and EC are asserting that they can regulate the communication of any student, group, or institution. Halting the actions of one referendum entity while allowing another entity (Against Rising Tuition at KU [KUART]) to continue advocating in the negative sets a precedent that the EC can silence one side of an issue while allowing an opposing side to continue its activities. Such action also calls into question compliance with the First Amendment.

While the Petitioner does not believe that the EC may in fact claim jurisdiction over RDYU activities, it is prepared to provide a timeline and appendix of supporting documents in good faith; these documents and evidence therein wholly support two important conclusions; (1)

that Student Senate executives had been previously fully apprised of planned Union Referendum outreach and education activities, both during planning phases of the Union Referendum in May 2016 and on through the actual Student Senate vote to place the Union Referendum on the ballot, and brought no concerns throughout this process, and; (2) that Student Senate itself directed the representatives of the Union Referendum to begin campus outreach and education immediately after Student Senate's approval to place the Union Referendum on the spring 2017 ballot. The Union Referendum plans were presented at multiple KU Memorial Union Corporation Board meetings as shown in Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C of this document. Student Senate members, per SSRR (SSRR 5.1.9, SSRR 5.1.10, 5.2.5, SSRR 6.2.8.4.1), have seven voting seats on the KU Memorial Corporation Board and were in attendance at said meetings as shown in Appendix A. On August 27, 2016, as per Appendix B, the current Union Referendum Chair, Chance Maginness, presented a plan for advertising, to which the Board consented. Additionally, on May 7, 2016, as per Appendix C, the Board approved a plan to move forward with a referendum project. In all cases, the directive from this Board was to begin outreach if and when the bill to put the referendum on the ballot passed Student Senate's general assembly vote. The bill in question, 2017-303, passed on October 19, 2016, as included in Appendix A including Student Senate minutes. As part of that deliberation, as represented in the Full Senate Voting Record, it was clear that a broad outreach effort was needed to assure an informed vote. These interactions with Student Senate were viewed as a directive and mandate to begin such outreach.

In closing, referenda are, by nature, designed to allow for the maximum number of voices to be heard. If the intent of the EC is to assure a fair election, including all rigorous public education and discourse efforts as part of that electoral process, suspending the outreach efforts

associated with a referendum is not consistent with that intent. Through it's ruling, a volatile jurisdictional precedent would be set for future referenda and the countless entities and individuals that they effect. Should further documentation be required by the Appeals Court, we are glad to provide it. Thank you for your time in considering this matter.

Signed 8 April 2017,

Kassandra Valles, Richie Hernandez, Garrison Krotz, Collin Cox, Bailee Myers

APPENDIX A

Timeline of Union Referendum per Memorial Corporation Board and Student Senate Minutes Excerpts

Full documents available upon request

- **February 6, 2016: EXCERPT from Memorial Corporation Board of Directors Meeting Minutes**

Members Present:

Lauren Arney, Garrison Krotz, Jessie Pringle, James Nguyen, Bev Umeh, Rachel Asbury, Kailey Horosz, Adam Moon, Madeline Snizek, Jessica Li, Matthew Burke, Bozenna Pasik-Duncan, Scott Kaiser, Sydnie Kampschroeder, Stephanie Rawe, Joe Day, David Mucci and JJ O'Toole-Curran

VII. New Business

Update & Fee Request Approval: Lisa presented a power point to the Board on the Kansas Union Revitalization proposal. It was moved and seconded for the Union to go forward with the request and recommended that the Union present several fee options for approval to the Senate Fee committee to review. Motion passed.

- **May 7, 2016: EXCERPT from Memorial Corporation Board of Directors Meeting Minutes**

Members Present:

Lauren Arney, Tammara Durham, Katrina Yoakum, Adrian Janowiak, Garrison Krotz, Jessie Pringle, Stephonn Alcorn, James Nguyen, Bev Umeh, Rachel Asbury, Kailey Horosz, Gabby Naylor, Allyssa Castilleja, John Foster, Antonio Lopez, Bozenna Pasik-

Duncan, Bryan Young, Scott Kaiser, Sydnie Kampschroeder, Stephanie Rawe, Joe Day, David Mucci and JJ O'Toole-Curran

VII. New Business

Kansas Union Revitalization Referendum Approval/Start: The Union went through the fee process in February and it was recommended by the Student Senate fee committee that the renovation may need to go to referendum. The packet includes a one page summary of a referendum proposal and summary of discussions from the past three years around the Kansas Union revitalization. Lisa Kring also presented a power pointed on the referendum student questions from the Unions spring survey. Fours scenarios were presented to the board: 1. Not seek a referendum; 2. Seek referendum in fall 2016 with November special election, appoint campaign committee; 3. Seek referendum in spring 2017 in the regular senate elections, appoint campaign committee; 4. Seek referendum, appoint campaign steering committee to decide campaign timing/strategy. For a referendum to be successful there needs to be a minimum 10% students voting and a simple majority in favor of the referendum. After much discussion the board voted as follows: 1) 0, 2) 1, 3) 5, 4) 15, Abstain 1. The board approved proposal number four. Lauren asked board members to let David know if they would be interested in serving on the referendum committee.

- **August 27, 2016: EXCERPT from Memorial Corporation Board of Directors Meeting Minutes**

Members Present:

Tammara Durham, Katrina Yoakum, Garrison Krotz, Stephonn Alcorn, James Nguyen, Gabby Naylor, Bev Umeh, Rachel Asbury, Kailey Horosz, Allyssa Castilleja, John Foster, Antonio Lopez, Matthew Burke, Bozena Pasik-Duncan, Bryan Young, Stephanie Rawe, Joe Day, Marlon Marshall, David Mucci and JJ O'Toole-Curran

VII. New Business

Kansas Union Revitalization Referendum / Committee Referendum: Chance Maginess updated the Board on the referendum committee's efforts; and asked for some general guidance from the group on how to proceed.

Freshman development program

Messaging

Union Campaign – Voting Summary:

Campaign Values: It was moved by Stephanie Rawe to accept the campaign values. The motion was seconded and approved.

Referendum Timeline: It was moved by John Foster for a spring referendum election for an appropriate date set by the committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

Proposed Semester Fee of \$50.00 per semester for 30 years, to begin in Fiscal Year 2020 (Fall 2019): It moved by Rachel Asbury for the proposed fee. The motion seconded and approved.

- **October 19, 2016: EXCERPT from Full Senate Meeting at 6:30 PM in Alderson Auditorium**

**A. 2017-303 AN OFFICIAL ORDER OF THE STUDENT SENATE TO
DIRECT THE ELECTIONS COMMISSION TO PUT FORTH A
QUESTION FOR REFERENDUM**

- a. Ordering elections commission to put this question at the end of the ballot
- b. Marcus: If we pass this and referendum passes, is fee locked in at 50?
 - i. Fee review would have happened, not collected until 2020
 - ii. Marcus: So, does that fee have to stay at 50?
 1. Yes, if that's the question they put on
- c. Tymon: If we were to pass this, would our name be attached to it?
 - i. When they run spring elections they would just be added to it, end result would be tied to student body rather than us
- d. Trinity: Is Student Senate taking responsibility of educating or will Memorial Unions Corp Board?
 - i. Memorial Unions Corp Board will lead communications
 - ii. Trinity: How do we guarantee entire student body is reached?
 1. Defer to Rachel – we have a list of all groups in rock chalk central and plan to go to all of them so we make sure we hit all of those groups
 2. Trinity: Depending on the student organizations?
 - a. Yes
- e. Sophie: Is there a way to include not only on student senate voting ballot but also another method with maybe higher turnout?
 - i. Results from surveys sent to all students led to this
 - ii. Sophie: Could we see those numbers?
 1. Defer to Chance – not just reaching out to student groups, coming to talk to MSG, all sorts of people. Tabling on campus and trying to reach out to every

student. Lots of people working on this, focusing on outreach ways student senate has never done before. Constant surveying to make sure that everybody makes an educated vote. We do have survey results and I can show them to you.

- f. Allyssa: Better alternative than fee review deciding?
 - i. Yes, opens it up to a lot more people. People on fee review are in the union a lot and very involved, need the input of more groups than this.
 - ii. Danny: Most impactful way to reach as many students as possible. Nature of this, putting it to direct vote is normally the most commonplace way to make this as accessible as possible.
- g. Dylan: Was the 10% voter turnout rate mentioned in rules and regs, or could it be amended to a different amount?
 - i. Included in definition of referendum, would need to be a separate bill as rules and regs change.
- h. James: In the event that project goes overbudget, what happens?
 - i. Defer to David – typically can't go over budget, would cut things out and end at the total amount.
- i. Trinity: Why was your answer so different from communication director's?
 - i. Haven't had full communication, just some miscommunication.
- j. Trinity: Has anyone ensured that marginalized groups will be reached out to?
 - i. Great question. Think we serve those more than others because they often lack other resources, trying to time this in the future, gives senate some time to find merit in this project, see how they can accommodate those groups. Need to talk to all those constituencies, look into how can we serve them so they get benefits.
- k. Trinity: Is senate willing to take on that accommodation?
 - i. Yes, to the extent coalitions cite the importance of this and outreach, a lot will come through their outreach.
- l. Brent: Besides seeking student senate support, any other ways this referendum could be called?
 - i. Defer to Chance but senate oversees fees – would need to petition the student body for referendum to avoid senate, no referendum has ever been achieved that way. Made sure no language says senate supports this bill in any way, just that students should have right to have a say on this. No stamp of approval but rather advocating direct democracy.
- m. Dylan: If this goes to referendum and they decide not to pay, will university pursue any other ways to fund this project?
 - i. Funded by private group, so it will not be funded if it does not pass.

- n. Tymon: If we were to not pass this, would it come up again later with same amount?
 - i. Most likely, but if vote was no it would probably come back for a reduced amount
- o. Adam: In bill it says fee will terminate at 2050, if it generates enough revenue to pay off union prior to that, would it end then?
 - i. Yes
- p. Sophia: Entirely funded by student dollars?
 - i. Yes
- q. Sophia: Are we pursuing other dollars?
 - i. Challenge is that there's not that kind of money out there, this is the model for funding these types of operations. Value we bring back to this is because we've invested in the facility to keep operating fee low. Don't have an ongoing financial ability to make these kinds of changes.
- r. Brittney: In the bill it says \$50 per semester but Lisa said \$50 a year?
 - i. No, \$50 per semester
- s. Trinity: If other option is petition the student body to get referendum, wouldn't that help with outreach?
 - i. Chance: We're doing outreach with a listening tour, start process of reaching out to them, make sure we reach out to at least 6% of student body in the process, then more when the referendum comes around. Instead of limiting us to getting signatures so maybe we'll have a referendum, by passing this we get a sure footing to talk to groups which makes them more likely to have concrete input to begin these conversations.
- t. Trinity: Is there a reason endowment is hesitant to allocate to this cause?
 - i. They would be willing to provide small project funding, but they do not typically fund these large-scale projects. We haven't fallen into their campaign. We will continue to pursue that, we do pursue conversation, but that simply has not developed into a viable option.
- u. Chancellor: Projects in the past solely from student funding?
 - i. Primarily student fees. We get income in the building, but not enough to do this whole project. Didn't discover any corporate sponsors.
- v. Danny: Only other alternative would be through fee review?
 - i. Yes, we did go through fee review and they sent us here
- w. Sophia and Jonathan: Negative speech
 - i. Take a second to realize how much money this is. Referendums are through all students in elections. Need to understand that this is not time sensitive right now, renovations are needed but renovations are needed at every campus building. Going to have two fully functional unions soon, will have opportunity later to break this down into phases. This

could hurt students down the road. Must develop more fully the thought behind it. Allocate dollars more effectively in future.

- ii. Almost as if we're creating moral hazard by putting on referendum. Asking people to take risk and spend money that isn't their money. Nobody held accountable here. We want to spend the future's money for our own reasons.
- iii. Marcus: How long can union function without this renovation?
 - 1. Defer to David – longer we wait, the more expensive it will be. Paper thin pipes on 6 that we fear to touch because they could take a lot of things down. We can wait, but interest rates will go up. Costs will go up, expensive repairs will be made instead of solving problems in forward-thinking fashion. Begins to snowball.
 - 2. Has opportunity of phases been thought of?
 - a. Fee review selected this option, advantage is that we're not paying mobilization cost for each phase, save costs doing in an integrated fashion.
- iv. Kellor: What is your opinion/concern if we don't pass the resolution and it going to fee review?
 - 1. Preferred the petition of student body to alleviate some concerns over idea that we're the ones creating the opportunity for moral hazard to happen
- v. Question: Is it possible that next year this could come to fee review and they could accept it without any referendum?
 - 1. Fee review is in the winter, so that committee could just approve it without student input.
- vi. Gabby: When you say you think senate elections have the same people voting, would separate election be better or worse?
 - 1. Asking for 10% voter turnout and already struggle to get that on senate election (got 20% last year, actually) so people voting could be more educated on the matter if it's separate
- x. Brittney, Erika, Tymon and Katie positive speech
 - i. We are putting this on the agenda so that the students will actually have a say instead of committee of 10 passing this
 - ii. Future students paying for things is how fee process works
 - iii. A lot of us use the rec, none of us paid for it, it was constructed because people looked forward. If we set precedent of not voting for anything that requires future money, we will never fund anything
 - iv. A little offended that some people think student body turning out in our elections aren't good enough to decide these issues
 - v. A lot of mobilization has been planned, this will help elections too

- vi. As a student I think it is a terrible idea. As a senator, I believe the student body has the need to be able to vote on this. This should go to referendum but be separate from senate election
- vii. Katie: My father ran in and saved the artwork when there was a fire here. Think that shows the will of KU to save the union. I think the student body should decide if they want to pay or not. Should go back to the students as well.
- viii. Jonathan: Still think a petition would be better, what are your thoughts on that?
 - 1. Defer to Chance
 - a. We want students to have an option on this
- ix. Mattie: If it were to go through, would it force them to vote for candidates or could they just vote for the union?
 - 1. No when you vote you can just pick what you want, they could abstain from everything else
- y. Trinity negative speech
 - i. Our vote here does not represent the student body
 - ii. Voter turnout is highly privileged and highly greek
 - iii. There will always be buildings on KU
 - iv. Senate fee is never set, always changing, we don't need to make a decision now on this
 - v. I'm uncomfortable for students to take on these costs because students already can't pay for college
 - vi. Referendum won't represent student body
- z. **Allyssa motions to call to question, Elizabeth seconds, passes (Vote 6)**

- **December 3, 2016: EXCERPT from Memorial Corporation Board of Directors Meeting Minutes**

Members Present:

Jessie Pringle, Tammara Durham, Katrina Yoakum, Adrian Janowiak, Kailey Horosz, Stephonn Alcorn, Harneet Sanghera, Gabby Naylor, Heather McDonald, Katie Miller, Marcea Say, Allyssa Castilleja, Antonio Lopez, Bozena Pasik-Duncan, Bryan Young, Sydnie Kampschroeder, Stephanie Rawe, Joe Day, David Mucci and JJ O'Toole-Curran

Kansas Union Revitalization Referendum / Committee Referendum:

Chance Maginness updated the Board on the Referendum committee's efforts; and asked for some general guidance from the group on how to proceed on freshman development program and messaging.

The election will be held April 12 and 13. He reviewed the information included in the packets.

- over two dozen volunteers in place now
 - developing 'background' information now, so all in place for student return in January
 - interviewing student groups to discover 'what do you want'
 - thank you to Tom Johnson for developing an awesome website
 - goal is to develop a unified campus
 - students start with involvement at the U, return after graduation
 - acknowledged Rachel and Alyssa for marketing design
- Rachel Asbury thanked the KU Memorial Union staff and students...their support develops leaders.
 - virtual reality experience is being explored
 - investigating ways to use the building itself to present the Referendum outcome
 - other entities will be involved
 - endorsement video possibilities

Sydney complimented Referendum core committee on its professionalism. Queried if there was any 'pushback' from students. Chance responded that after timing was explained, the concept was generally accepted.

Alyssa brought up a question about student/faculty influence/support/impressions. KU Memorial Union is important to all: students, faculty, groups such as SILC, OMA, etc.

Sydney offered that alumni are extremely supportive of this effort. They have a good understanding of how the Union benefits everyone.

Stephonn stated that meeting with the student groups individually to educate them is the plan in place beginning in January, should be extremely effective in its promotion.

Jessie thanked JJ for her leadership in this area, along with all the supporting individuals.

APPENDIX B:

Document titled “Tentative Timeline” presented at August 27, 2016 Memorial Corporation Board of Directors Meeting by Chance Maginness (serving as Union Referendum Chair on August 27). See Appendix A for attendance at this meeting.

August/September – Begin Phase 1 (See Messaging Document)

- External
 - Begin outreach to students to be included in the campaign itself
 - Put out U Can Make A Difference marketing
 - Being phase in of Redo Your U marketing
- Internal
 - Develop freshman/sophomore development and engagement program
 - Meet with any necessary administrative players
 - Develop comprehensive, targeted marketing strategy
 - Get first wave of necessary material items

September/October – Begin rollover from Phase 1 to Phase 2

- External
 - Begin outreach to various student groups about the referendum, focusing on recruiting as well as educating
 - One or two targeted engagement activations (could be things like partnering with an event to table and talk to people, host our own event, hosting giveaways or having a snapchat filter)
 - This focused on continuing to pull people into the project, but also on education
- Internal
 - Begin having meetings with campaign group to excite and educate them about the project; heavy training for outreach side of the campaign
 - Solidify outreach and engagement plan for the next four months

November/December – Phase 2 in full force

- External
 - Begin heavily meeting with key voting constituencies to introduce targeted messages into their cohorts
 - Partner with an election watch party in the union to increase engagement, or one other engagement activation for December
- Internal
 - Monitor messaging and look for gaps, adjust accordingly
 - Put through Referendum bill in Student Senate

- Begin training of engagement side of the campaign for the actual turnout phase

Winter Break

- External
 - Maintain social media presence
- Internal
 - Re-discuss turnout strategy and plan
 - Order second wave of material items, basically what is needed for Phase 3

January – Phase 2 continues again; begin ramp up of Phase 3

- External
 - Follow up outreach with key organizations and players
 - Begin public presence in Union and Wescoe Beach reminding of the upcoming referendum
- Internal
 - Finalize two/three week plan
 - Ensure all people and materials are ready
 - Prep ourselves mentally

February – Phase 3 in full force

- External
 - GOTV (Get Out the Vote) efforts
 - Tabling
 - Direct messaging
 - Final organization visits
- Internal
 - Monitor GOTV efforts and make immediate adjustments

APPENDIX C:

Approved at KU Memorial Corporation Board meeting May 7, 2016. See Appendix A for attendance at this meeting.

KANSAS UNION REVITALIZATION REFERENDUM PROPOSAL

KU Memorial Corporation May 7, 2016, Review and Approval

The Memorial Unions, Corporation Board and Student Senate have for the past three years planned for future needs. The KU Master Plan determined that the Kansas Union program would remain at its current site to meet anticipate needs for the next fifty years. Reinventing and revitalizing the facility is required to meet those future student and campus needs.

Over the past three years, various reviews and multiple discussions have advanced the revitalization:

- 10/13 Workshop Architects **3 day focus group/board planning** effort; **visits to Wisc./NC-State**
- 12/13 Workshop Architects **board half day planning session** w/campus leadership plan effort
- 3/14 **Fee Review concept report** to inform as to developments, position for sunseting fees
- 5/14 Workshop Final **Report presented to board** for refinement; develop of plan continues
- 12/14 Corporation Board establishes Union **Revitalization Steering Committee** to direct efforts
- 3/15 **Fee Review** shown Clark-Hueseman Architects concept presentation for available fees
- 9/15 **Presentation to full senate** on union efforts, renovation project and fee preparation
- 12/15 Clark-Hueseman **final project proposal to Corporation/KU Capital Planning** (1/29/16)
- 2/16 **Board approves campus referendum** as multiple options contingent Fee Review actions
- 3/16 Fee Review proposal sought for range of fees; **Fee Review directs to referendum**
- 4/16 **Union service survey** utilizes referendum questions to assess support

Referendum scenarios for Board Review: (minimum 10% students voting, simple majority needed)

1. Not seek a referendum
2. Seek referendum in fall 2016 with November special election, appoint campaign committee
3. Seek referendum in spring 2017 in the regular senate elections, appoint campaign committee
4. Seek referendum, appoint campaign steering committee to decide campaign timing/strategy

Possible next steps if Board elects to pursue a referendum:

- Spring survey results mined for campus information strategy for possible fall or spring campaign
- Appointment of Kansas Union revitalization referendum campaign steering committee chair
- Activate a steering committee to devise strategy over summer for fall launch of campaign
- Determine language of referendum, means of ballot placement—senate resolution or petition
- Determine messaging themes and communication strategy; deploy spokespeople
- Determine constituent outreach/mobilization effort; manage/direct campaign efforts
- Develop salient description of improvements, attractions and features for presentations
- Approach constituent groups as to benefits of the program (Residential/Scholarship Halls, Senate, Greek Organizations, International/Multicultural/International/Graduate Students, Ambassadors, Student Organizations, SUA, KJHK, Alumni, Parents, Media, etc.