



Cornell University Student Assembly

Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, January 24, 2019 Meeting
4:49pm-6:03pm in Memorial Room, Willard Straight Hall

I. Call to Order & Roll Call

- a. V. Devatha called the meeting to order at 4:49 pm.
- b. Roll Call:
 - i. *Present:* J. Anderson [0], D. Barbaria [0], V. Devatha [0], O. Din [2.5], J. Dominguez [0], O. Egharevba [2], S. Harshvardhan [2], C. Huang [0], S. Iruvanti [1], K. Kebbeh [1], S. Lim [0.5], N. Matolka [0], G. Park [1.5], I. Pavlov [0.25], E. Shapiro [0], M. Shovik [1.25], J. Sim [0], M. Stefanko [1], F. Uribe-Rheinbolt [0], B. Weintraub [0], V. Xu [0.75]
 - ii. *Absent:* U. Mustafa [1], M. Smith [0]
 - iii. *Arrived After Roll Call:* A. Jain [0]

II. Presentations

- a. VP Mary Opperman and VP Ryan Lombardi (4:45pm-5:30pm)
 - i. R. Lombardi said that one of the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force in Fall 2018 was for Cornell to clearly state what its core values are, and that the administration would like to start a conversation that will lead to codifying what Cornell's core values are so that everyone knows them and that they can be hearkened back to when making decisions. He added that this will be a chance for him and M. Opperman to listen and get feedback and input toward this goal.
 - ii. M. Opperman went through the presentation.
 - iii. R. Lombardi said that they would like to hear the things that the SA thinks should be represented.
 - iv. B. Weintraub said that he thinks it is important in codifying Cornell's values is finding a way to ensure that they're followed and held, and asked what the administration expects in this regard.
 - v. M. Opperman said that she and R. Lombardi have been getting suggestions and that they want everyone to be able to come in and talk about what they would like the core values to be, and that they would love feedback on that.
 - vi. G. Park said that she would like to see integrity be represented as a core value, and that integrity, particularly academic integrity at Cornell is taken very seriously at the University and in the real world.
 - vii. D. Barbaria said that he believes that it is President Pollack's intention to have these core values included somewhere in the Campus Code of Conduct and that they would go into effect in this way. He asked how the individuals

- working on this are going to make sure that everything is being considered, and if there will be a chance for a clear way for the community to contribute.
- viii. M. Opperman said that they hadn't thought about assigning things to the assemblies, but that the assemblies' ideas will become the basis for their draft. She added that they would like to have some more conversations after the draft, and to use the draft to have conversations at the colleges or in the departments once it is ready. She also said that the current stage is the hardest one, and that the easiest way to see if something is missing is to have something to see to start with.
 - ix. D. Barbara asked if these conversations would be open to the whole community.
 - x. M. Opperman replied in the affirmative, and said that in addition to the physical meetings, there would be an online opportunity for people to share opinions.
 - xi. J. Dominguez asked how these values would be applied to disciplinary systems, and asked how this would change things such as the JA.
 - xii. M. Opperman said that the core values would not be operating principles, and that they would instead be guiding values that guide decisions. She added that the idea of the core values is for them to overarch everything, rather than specifically drive an operating decision.
 - xiii. J. Anderson said that he thinks that the core values that Harvard espouses are good core values to have, in particular the values regarding respect and accountability.
 - xiv. K. Kebbeh said that she is on the CJC, and that they have been discussing values for a while at this point. She added that she has done some research about core values, and that she found that the most common threads were integrity, respect, accountability, responsibility, community building, service, and education.
 - xv. C. Huang asked a question.
 - xvi. I. Pavlov said that she likes the point regarding respect, and that she thinks that it should be emphasized that Cornell started as a nondenominational campus, and that respect for other people's spirituality should be emphasized.
 - xvii. G. Park said that she believes that the "any person, any study" motto is very applicable to what was just said, and that either before or after the first draft is written, she would suggest that there be a public discussion or event specifically for people to participate and give their input in this regard.
 - xviii. M. Opperman said that the current thought is to have that discussion after the draft stage so that people have something to react to and improve.
 - xix. G. Park said that she thinks it would be good for Cornell in particular would be to emphasize knowledge for its own sake, rather than for the consequences of a class.
 - xx. J. Anderson said that he also thinks that since Cornell is now becoming more global and international, something emphasizing global responsibility would be a positive addition.
 - xxi. J. Dominguez said that he thinks that a good value would be leadership in the classroom and beyond, as well as being comfortable with intellectual challenge.

- xxii. D. Barbaria said that he thinks something important would be emphasizing that no college be placed over another, and ensuring that each of the colleges is the best that it can be.
- xxiii. V. Xu said that, based on people she's interacted with, she would suggest students and professors helping other students is important and a great thing that Cornell has.
- xxiv. S. Lim said that she thinks that respect and dignity are important inclusions, and that she would like to see a commitment to emphasizing diversity, as well as a commitment to the New York or the world community rather than just the Ithaca or Cornell community. She added that she has noticed that a lot of people are concerned about a turning away from the liberal arts and holistic approaches to learning in favor of a preprofessional track.
- xxv. M. Stefanko said that he believes that helping each other as much as possible is important.
- xxvi. B. Weintraub said that he thinks experiences, friendships, and nonacademic aspects of life at Cornell are just as important as academic aspects, and that he thinks there should be a commitment to creating a community at the University beyond the classroom.
- xxvii. S. Harshvardhan said that she would like to see a focus on mental and physical wellbeing.
- xxviii. D. Barbaria said that he thinks that the ethos of "freedom and responsibility" would be a good inclusion.
- xxix. G. Park asked when the administration plans on finishing the first draft.
- xxx. M. Opperman said that their goal is to finish by the end of this semester, and that a lot of that depends on what they hear following the release of the first draft.
- xxxi. I. Pavlov said that she doesn't think that leadership was mentioned yet, and that in applying to the School of Industrial and Labor Relations, she noticed that leadership was stressed in that school, and that she thinks an inclusion of that sort in the core values would be good.

III. New Business I & Business of the Day I

- a. Resolution 23: Providing Cornellians with Disabilities Better Representation by Establishing an Organizational Liaison to the Student Assembly
 - i. J. Sim presented the resolution.
 - ii. Conan Gillis said that the biggest problem is people not knowing that there is an issue, and that people with disabilities are underserved.
 - iii. J. Sim said that he thinks that adding an ex-officio position is a good start to fixing many of the problems that this community faces.
 - iv. J. Dominguez said that 19% of Americans have disabilities according to the 2010 census, and that being a college freshman is already hard enough, but that being a freshman with a disability can be even harder due to the necessity of self-sufficiency.
 - v. There was a motion to move this resolution to Business of the Day – **approved.**
 - vi. V. Devatha said that this resolution cannot be passed today since it is a bylaw change.

- vii. S. Lim said that this is a great idea, and asked whether the person filling the position would be chosen by an organization à la the Veterans' Liaison position.
- viii. V. Devatha replied in the affirmative, and said that the assumption is that the Cornell Union for Disability Awareness (henceforth CUDA) would put this in their governing documents and create some sort of method to nominate a liaison.
- ix. C. Gillis said that CUDA would definitely do this.
- x. Motion to table the resolution – **tabled**.

IV. Open Microphone

- a. No speakers at the open microphone.

V. Announcements and Reports

- a. K. Kebbeh: CUTonight Oversight Committee
 - i. K. Kebbeh said that the application is open at this time for anyone who wants to seek funding through CUTonight.
 - ii. C. Huang asked if this will be advertised.
 - iii. K. Kebbeh said that she did not know if it had been advertised yet.
 - iv. D. Barbaria asked how the organization is looking long-term for quality of members.
 - v. K. Kebbeh said that that is what they are looking at right now.
- b. M. Stefanko: SAIFC
 - i. M. Stefanko said that the bike repair stands that SAIFC approved are about \$3500, and that they'd be used for people to repair their bikes. He added that the recommendation was that they be placed near Appel Commons and Uris Library.
 - ii. E. Shapiro asked what would be included at the bike repair stand.
 - iii. M. Stefanko said that he was not sure.
 - iv. C. Huang said that the individual proposal called for three stands near RPCC, Noyes, and Olin Library, and asked why that changed.
 - v. G. Park said that the original vote was between two and three bike stands, and that the vote went in favor of there being two bike stands.
- c. G. Park: AAP Dean
 - i. G. Park said that the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning is welcoming a new dean, and that she is trying to schedule a meeting with her and the AAP community. She added that anyone interested in such a meeting reach out to her.

VI. New Business II & Business of the Day II

- a. Resolution 22: Approval of the Standing Rules for Spring 2019
 - i. J. Anderson said that there are no substantial changes to the standing rules, and that everything in blue in the resolution is updates to the standing rules from Special Projects Funding. He added that the way that the Appropriations Committee (henceforth AppsCom) has been operating in the past few years will now be codified.
 - ii. J. Anderson moved to amend the resolution in the following ways.
 - 1. Lines 58-64 of the resolution will be struck.

2. Line 46 will read “greater than \$400 and up to \$1500”.
 3. Line 48 will read “Requests of greater than \$1500”.
- iii. O. Din asked why lines 58-64 are to be struck.
 - iv. D. Barbaria said that the language in those lines does not reflect the way that AppsCom currently accepts applications.
 - v. Motion to amend – **amended**.
 - vi. O. Din said that there is a typo on line 53, and moved to amend the resolution to remove the extraneous “48” at the end of line 53 – **amended**.
 - vii. O. Din said that he thinks that the two-thirds majority necessary to overturn an AppsCom decision is a high bar, and that he is of the opinion that AppsCom should be making decisions that the SA acts upon, and that it should therefore be able to be overturned via a simple majority.
 - viii. D. Barbaria said that he doesn’t have much of an idea if either way is correct, but that AppsCom currently has 8 SA members which makes up about one third of the voting body, and that the idea is that the other two thirds would be able to overturn them. He added that the entire standing rules are under review at this time, and that members are welcome to propose any changes.
 - ix. J. Sim said that he thinks that the two-thirds majority should be kept, and that he knows that AppsCom members take a lot of time to make these decisions, and that the SA doesn’t spend as much time to review it, so he thinks that it shouldn’t be that easy to overturn those decisions.
 - x. J. Dominguez said that AppsCom’s purpose is to give them a certain degree of autonomy, and that changing the overturn vote to a simple majority strips away some of that autonomy.
 - xi. O. Din said that he appreciates hearing the dialogue, and that he has sat on AppsCom for a while now. He asked the assembly whether they would like to add a note to the effect of “except with the discretion of the VP for Finance” to Rule 17.
 1. Rule 17 concerns Special Projects Funding for events that have already happened; at the time of O. Din’s statement, Rule 17 did not allow funding for events that already happened.
 - xiii. J. Sim said that if the event has already happened, the money has clearly come from somewhere, and the place that the money came from should be the source of funding instead. He added that he thinks such a change would weigh too heavily in how AppsCom makes its decisions.
 - xiii. C. Huang said that she agrees with O. Din in that a lot of organizations end up paying out of pocket for events.
 - xiv. B. Weintraub said that he agrees with O. Din, and that he thinks it would be valuable to have a route to fund an organization retroactively. He added that such a mechanism shouldn’t be used frequently, since that defeats the point, but that things out of the control of organizers will sometimes happen.
 - xv. J. Anderson said that this would help a lot of organizations who are SAFC funded who might have to do a religious event or something of that sort, and that he thinks that this mechanism calls into question whether it would be the VP for Finance making that decision by themselves.
 - xvi. D. Barbaria said that he doesn’t agree with this being in Rule 17, and that the Special Projects Fund is for special circumstances in the first place, and that people who have come to expect this funding apply well in advance to have

their events funded. He added that he doesn't think that this is what this should be used for, and that the assembly should not always expect to have the surplus that it does at this time.

- xvii. B. Weintraub moved to amend the resolution such that Rule 17 is removed.
 - 1. D. Barbaria dissented
- xviii. J. Sim said that he has some concerns about how this could be misused
- xix. V. Devatha said that he would recommend not removing the rule completely since the intent is not for organizations to consistently come to the SA after an event, and in the same spirit he would advise that there be an addition that the VP for Finance or the President can overturn Rule 17.
- xx. O. Din moved to amend the resolution such that Rule 17 would now read "Special Projects does not grant funding for events or projects that have already happened, except with the consent of the Vice President for Finance".
- xxi. D. Barbaria moved to amend the resolution such that Rule 17 would now read "Special Projects does not grant funding for events or projects that have already happened, except with the consent of the SA President and Vice President for Finance".
- xxii. E. Shapiro said that removing Rule 17 would set a bad precedent.
- xxiii. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt said that Special Projects Funding is never guaranteed and that many organizations are denied every semester. He asked a question.
- xxiv. V. Devatha said that Special Projects Funding doesn't have to exclusively take the form of a reimbursement.
- xxv. O. Din asked if the amendment to the amendment has to be approved or if it can just be voted on.
- xxvi. V. Devatha said that it can just be voted on.
- xxvii. Motion to amend the resolution – **amended**.
- xxviii. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt said that he thinks that a problem with AppsCom is that there isn't a clear definition of Special Projects in the standing rules, and that he would propose that they construct a definition of Special Projects.
- xxix. J. Anderson said that they're going to work, hopefully along with AppsCom, on that definition throughout the semester, and that this is just incorporating all language that was already passed. He added that there will hopefully be a definition by the end of the semester.
- xxx. O. Din moved that the resolution be moved to Business of the Day – **approved**.
- xxxi. Motion to vote on the resolution – **approved** 21-0-1.

VII. Business of the Day III

- a. Resolution 20: Establishing a Student Health Advisory Committee
 - i. V. Devatha asked if anyone had any questions regarding this resolution.
 - ii. S. Iruvanti asked a question regarding the inclusion of one member from Cornell Health on the committee.
 - iii. V. Devatha said that they intend to amend that. He moved to amend lines 33 through 36, in the following ways.
 - 1. Line 33's language will be changed from "It shall be chaired by one member from the SA, one member from the GPSA, and one

- member from Cornell Health” to “It shall be chaired by one member from the SA and one member from the GPSA”.
2. Following the above changes, the sentence “Cornell Health will retain three standing members”.
 3. The sentence that begins on line 36 will be changed from “Staff from Cornell Health...” to read “Additional staff from Cornell Health...”
- iv. S. Iruvanti said that the inclusion of three members is still vague since there are so many parts to Cornell Health.
 - v. J. Anderson said that the proponents of the resolution have been in contact with Cornell Health, and that the three members will be representative.
 - vi. V. Devatha said that they spoke with the director of Cornell Health, and that he is fine with maintaining the resolution the way it is, but that he is also fine with putting this information in.
 - vii. J. Anderson said that including the titles of representatives might not be the best, since positional titles have been reassigned recently and that Cornell Health is good with being public about these kinds of things.
 - viii. Motion to amend – **amended**.
 - ix. There was a motion to vote on the resolution.
 - x. D. Barbaria said that the resolution cannot be voted on this week.
 - xi. J. Anderson said that the resolution can be voted on this week.
 - xii. S. Iruvanti asked if the “with” on line 31 is there on purpose.
 - xiii. J. Anderson said that it is not, and moved to amend that it be removed – **amended**.
 - xiv. Motion to vote on the resolution – **approved** 19-0-0.

VIII. Adjournment

- a. V. Devatha adjourned the meeting at 6:03 pm.

IX. Executive Session

Respectfully Submitted,
John Hannan
Clerk of the Assembly