



## Cornell University Student Assembly

### Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, November 29, 2018 Meeting  
4:46pm-8:53pm in Memorial Room, Willard Straight Hall

#### I. Call to Order & Roll Call

- a. V. Devatha called the meeting to order at 4:46 pm.
- b. Roll Call:
  - i. *Present*: J. Anderson [0], D. Barbaria [0], V. Devatha [0], J. Dominguez [0], O. Egharevba [0], C. Huang [0], S. Iruvanti [1], A. Jain [0], K Kebbeh [1], N. Matolka [0], U. Mustafa [0], D. Nyakaru [0], I. Pavlov [0.25], E. Shapiro [0], J. Sim [0], M. Stefanko [1], F. Uribe-Rheinbolt [0], I. Wallace [0]
  - ii. *Absent*: A. Hailu [1], S. Harshvardhan [2], N. Hernandez [1], M. Peralta-Ochoa [3.5]
  - iii. *Arrived After Roll Call*: O. Din [2.5], M. Shovik [1.25]
  - iv. *Left Meeting Early*: S. Lim [0.5], G. Park [1.5], B. Weintraub [0], V. Xu [0.75]

#### II. Presentations & Business of the Day I

- a. Sorority and Fraternity Accountability Review Committee
  - i. J. Anderson said that this is an in-depth analysis of where the Greek judicial and accountability system might be falling short. He went through the presentation.
  - ii. N. Matolka asked whether MGFC having recently left the Tri-Council would affect the restructuring.
  - iii. Mary Beth Grant said that it shouldn't.
  - iv. D. Nyakaru asked if there is a way this information can be accessible to the Cornell community.
  - v. Christina Liang said that [hazing.cornell.edu](http://hazing.cornell.edu) includes all the relevant information at this time, and that it is currently publicly available despite needing some updates. She added that actual investigating materials are not available, but things such as results and allegations are available.
  - vi. S. Lim asked how it can be ensured that this won't be punitive when there are clear sanctions present.
  - vii. C. Liang said that they are thinking about educational sanctions that are for groups as opposed to individuals, and that it is important to understand why the behavior happened, as well as how people can proceed without violating the Code of Conduct.
  - viii. M. Grant said that the other component of being an educational process is the system that's used in the first place. She added that people think about a system of justice or accountability as being a criminal process which they are

not looking to create, and that they would not recommend anything that seems close to a criminal process.

- ix. J. Dominguez said that the scorecard is a great idea, and asked if there was a timeline regarding when it would be implemented. He added that it would be very important for students, especially those who intend to rush.
  - x. J. Anderson said that they do not have purview over that, and that it's just mentioned because it is coming and is part of their understanding of transparency throughout this process.
  - xi. V. Devatha asked what relationship the professional fraternity community has to this.
  - xii. J. Anderson said that they are registered organizations and therefore fall under the JA.
  - xiii. D. Barbaria said that it's good to see the presentation again in a different environment, and that SA representatives hold no direct power over the judicial process. He asked what is expected from the SA in regard to input or response.
  - xiv. M. Grant said that they want to make sure that they're not just thirteen people making these recommendations. She added that the SA is the elected body for undergraduates, Greek or otherwise, and that they want to make sure the SA is given that opportunity.
  - xv. D. Barbaria asked who people should email with questions.
  - xvi. M. Grant said that people should email her.
  - xvii. V. Devatha asked why student organizations are being included in the same methodology, especially when there is consideration of bringing this under the code.
  - xviii. C. Liang said that there was a resolution from the Board of Trustees years ago that carved out Greek organizations as being recognized as opposed to registered, and that until that is amended, that is where the separation will lie.
  - xix. J. Anderson said that the Code of Conduct has jurisdiction over individuals, such as if one individual is considered the primary player in making an environment of hazing. He added that they are finding the differentiation between individual and organization, as opposed to an individual in a registered organization.
  - xx. J. Sim asked if there are any plans to increase educational programs to prevent people from breaking the Code of Conduct and informing people of the stipulations of the Code.
  - xxi. J. Anderson said that this committee has no purview in that regard, and that that's a question for people like him, D. Barbaria, or Matthew Battaglia in their University Assembly capacities.
  - xxii. I. Pavlov asked if there is a risk that people presiding over the cases might have a lack of information on fraternity or sorority life.
  - xxiii. J. Anderson said that that is something they are trying to combat, and that there is architecture for this in the training regarding the Code of Conduct, and that there could be something similar here.
- b. Cornell Health Survey Results & Resolution 21: In Support of Cornell Health Survey Results

- i. V. Devatha said that the Student Health Benefits Advisory Committee (henceforth SHBAC) recommends any changes to the Student Health Fee (henceforth SHF) in the fall semester.
- ii. J. Anderson said that he has been a member of SHBAC for three years, and that it looks at a variety of things such as coverage requirements for a private insurer, what the plan looks at in totality, and the SHF. He added that individuals that have insurance that meets all the requirements pay a health fee to make sure everyone gets the same benefits and that copays remain the same.
- iii. V. Devatha said that in order to meet the demand of what Cornell Health sees for the next year, they are asking for a 10% increase, which will in turn go to VP Lombardi. He moved to move Resolution 21 to Business of the Day – **approved**.
- iv. V. Devatha moved to amend Resolution 21 such that line 35 would be edited to remove mention of President Martha Pollack and instead reference “VP of Student and Campus Life Ryan Lombardi” – **amended**.
- v. V. Devatha said that the goal of Cornell Health is to meet the demand at a net neutral profit, and to maintain a near-zero or slightly positive reserve in case certain things come up. He then went through the survey process, and asked whether assembly members would prefer discussing the funding increase in isolation or in conjunction with what it would go toward.
- vi. O. Egharevba asked why both could not be discussed.
- vii. V. Devatha said that both could be discussed. He added that it is intuitive to say that there should be more mental health providers or Sunday operating hours, but that these are downstream solutions, in comparison to an upstream solution of creating the advisory partnership. He also said that the two questions going forward are what is recommended for the increase and what the money should go toward.
- viii. D. Barbaria asked how much the SA’s decision would affect the final decision when the fee is set. He also asked why the resolution specifies that it be forwarded to President Pollack.
- ix. V. Devatha said that the mention of President Pollack had been removed by an amendment.
- x. J. Anderson said that this will be discussed at SHBAC tomorrow, and that this resolution is important because as the undergraduate representatives, they are saying that the research has been done and that there is undergraduate support for whatever amount is decided on.
- xi. D. Barbaria said that an incredible amount of work has been done, and asked how they know that all this work won’t have to be put in the next time they look to make changes.
- xii. J. Anderson said that this information is only relevant right now.
- xiii. A representative of SHBAC said that this is the first time in the history of the health fee in which they’ve had a survey, and that they would expect that a lot of these data would inform how the health fee evolves over time, and that they would have to determine when to pull this data back and when to re-survey. He added that he thinks that they learned a lot from these data.
- xiv. D. Barbaria asked how they know that major changes won’t be coming in the future.

- xv. The SHBAC representative said that there is no guarantee with long-term financial models, and that they can forecast next year but everything else will be based on models. He added that there aren't any costs in healthcare on a downward cycle, and that they've seen a sharper growth due to lack of supply for several years. He also said that that seems to be leveling out, but that the bigger variable is the utilization of services.
- xvi. J. Anderson said that assembly members should get off of their laptops and cellphones, and that this presentation is important.
- xvii. Ashwin Viswanathan said that he wants to get a better idea of what an academic-public health partnership would look like.
- xviii. The SHBAC representative said that there is macroevidence that upstream solutions work, but that there is not a lot of evidence regarding college campuses. He added that many of the initiatives that have been put in place have evidence showing they've moved the needle, and that regarding a partnership there has been something similar implemented in a university in Canada and a pilot program in Arizona. He also said that there is not enough data at this time in that regard, but that they know that a good academic support environment would be protective in nature.
- xix. V. Xu said that she thinks this lacks some reasoning behind the numbers of the survey, such as the reasoning behind a desire for more mental health professionals. She asked whether this is the case due to a lack of supply or unsatisfactory work.
- xx. J. Anderson said that the predominant issue is availability, rather than quality, and that there is a system in place to address quality. He added that the common question is why students have to wait weeks or months for an appointment.
- xxi. V. Xu said that the hiring of more mental health professionals and the development of online mental health resources would be tackling the same problem, and asked whether J. Anderson would rather spend more hiring more professionals, developing an app, or both.
- xxii. J. Anderson said that that is the conversation at hand right now, and that if you ask him, students said that it is a high priority to hire more professionals, and that's where the resources should be put.
- xxiii. V. Devatha said that providers in the larger Ithaca area are so few in number that off-campus solutions are barely an option.
- xxiv. V. Xu referenced non-university health services already in place such as Let's Talk and EARS, and asked whether those people could be trained to be more professional.
- xxv. J. Anderson said that Let's Talk is through Cornell Health, and that EARS gets a lot of great training.
- xxvi. J. Sim said that everyone would be limited to one question at this time due to the size of the speakers list.
- xxvii. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt said that there are two different fees, each with or without an eligible mental health plan, and asked if both fees would increase.
- xxviii. J. Anderson replied in the affirmative.
- xxix. The SHBAC representative said that financial aid covers the health fee, and that if a student is already grant aid eligible, they would receive more grant aid to cover the health fee.

- xxx. V. Devatha said that it is important to consider going forward that the most vulnerable communities on campus won't be severely impacted by the assembly's decisions since financial aid covers it.
- xxxi. I. Pavlov said that the work put into this report is impressive, and that she thinks that a \$20-30 increase would be satisfactory. She added that she has talked to a lot of freshmen and that their main concern is a lack of support and resources. She also said that she thinks the main focus should be strategy 1, and asked whether that would be possible with an increase of \$20-30.
- xxxii. The SHBAC representative said that Cornell Health makes an independent recommendation about a fee increase, SHBAC weighs in and makes additional recommendations, and that VP Lombardi receives these and makes additional recommendations. He added that following this, there would be some dialogue about what is to be done with that increase, and that with a \$20-30 increase, Cornell Health projects an increase of 5 to 6 additional professionals across various resources.
- xxxiii. B. Weintraub said that it is important to keep in mind that the response rate to this survey doesn't even begin to come close to full enrollment, and that people who don't use Cornell Health are less likely to submit a response. He asked if everything possible is being done to utilize all possible money from insurance companies.
- xxxiv. The SHBAC representative said that he would be happy to come back to talk about this in more detail, and that insurance billing in New York State is complicated, and that in New York, you cannot both bill and subsidize access. He added that students have a highly variable level of cost-sharing, and that it becomes a very complex policy decision to bill insurance because they can then no longer choose things to keep access level.
- xxxv. S. Lim asked if they plan to send out another survey, or a survey that would poll approval rates of a plan with revised additions.
- xxxvi. J. Anderson replied in the negative.
- xxxvii. S. Lim asked whether the decision made would automatically be what happens.
- xxxviii. V. Devatha replied in the affirmative.
- xxxix. O. Egharevba asked for clarification regarding the pie charts on the presentation.
  - xl. V. Devatha clarified.
  - xli. A. Jain said that she thinks that strategy 1 is most important, and that quality is most important for her community, since there is little diversity and that many people in her community do not feel comfortable around the current mental health professionals.
  - xlii. J. Anderson said that such feedback would be perfect in SHBAC, and that there is an avenue for that.
  - xliii. The SHBAC representative said that they are continuing to focus on diversity in all of their hires.
  - xliv. A. Viswanathan moved to amend the resolution such that line 30 would now include the language "with a focus on broadening identity groups represented within the provider team" – **amended**.
  - xlvi. I. Wallace said that the proponents of the resolution should make clearer in the future what the included pie charts are referring to, and moved to vote.

1. V. Devatha dissented, saying that I. Pavlov had brought up Sunday hours earlier, and that he would like to go back to that conversation.
- xlvi. M. Shovik said that 60% of the 3000 students involved mark improved mental health services as being of high priority, and asked if an increase of five to six mental health professionals would be able to help with that amount of demand.
- xlvii. The SHBAC representative said that one professional can handle about 150 students with standard counseling.
- xlvi. M. Stefanko asked what an ideal and achievable target for wait times would look like.
- xlix. The SHBAC representative said that the current stated goal is to connect them in a few days if there is an urgent concern, and within two weeks for a more routine concern. He added that it will be hard to achieve those goals before they know they have seen a stabilization of per-capita demand.
  1. D. Nyakaru asked if the increase in the SHF would involve moving some things that are currently outsourced to be in-house.
  - li. The SHBAC representative said that approximately 40-45% of lab tests are in-house already, as well as x-rays. He added that MRIs are always outsourced due to the cost of the infrastructure involved, and that they have recently brought ultrasounds in-house, but that the infrastructure is very new.
  - lii. D. Nyakaru said that when people are sent out-of-house, it is a burden on students, especially low-income students, and that she would recommend bringing more and more of the diagnostic tests in-house.
  - liii. The SHBAC representative said that he would love to talk to D. Nyakaru about this at another time.
  - liv. C. Huang asked if the cost of opening Cornell Health on Sundays relate to hiring more mental health professionals.
  - lv. The SHBAC representative said that those are two distinct proposals.
  - lvi. A. Viswanathan said that he thinks that they should keep Sunday operating hours on the list of recommendations, since that would add time for visits.
  - lvii. D. Barbaria said that the current recommendation is a \$20-\$30 increase, and asked a question.
  - lviii. V. Devatha said that the assembly would have to balance that recommendation out.
  - lix. J. Dominguez asked if the debate is between operating hours on Sundays and improved mental health capacity.
  - lx. J. Anderson said that the two recommendations are not competing, and that the improved mental health recommendation is seemingly unanimous. He added that the question at hand right now is whether the assembly wants to recommend adding Sunday operating hours.
  - lxi. J. Dominguez said that he thinks there is more utility gained from more mental health professionals, and that he thinks it's a better use of assembly and student resources to invest in more mental health professionals.
  - lxii. A. Viswanathan said that Saturday hours are limited, and asked if Saturday mental health visits are walk-ins only, or can also be arranged by appointment.
  - lxiii. The SHBAC representative said that there are only walk-ins for mental health visits on Saturdays.

- lxiv. I. Pavlov asked if the proponents think that Strategy 1 is the primary strategy that should be undertaken.
- lxv. The SHBAC representative said that Cornell Health's recommendation is to go as far upstream as possible, and that if they can reduce the need for services, resources can be redirected to meet other demands. He added that the partnership is what Cornell Health would recommend first, and that he recognizes that the survey does not recommend that.
- lxvi. A. Jain asked how many mental health providers there are at this time.
- lxvii. The SHBAC representative said that there are currently 33 individuals.
- lxviii. A. Jain asked if investing in the mobile app and having pharmacy-only hours on Sundays would be a cheaper option than having all of Cornell Health open on Sundays, since someone could use the mental health resources on the app.
- lxix. The SHBAC representative said that that is a complicated thing to do, and that keeping only the pharmacy open on Sundays would probably have fairly limited value. He added that he would recommend A. Jain bring this forward for next year.
- lxx. V. Devatha moved to amend the resolution such that the line "and opening Cornell Health on Sundays" would be removed – **amended**.
- lxxi. There was a motion to vote on the resolution – **approved** 21-0-1.
- c. Mental Health Task Force
  - i. Chelsea Kiely and Joanna Hua went through the presentation.
  - ii. V. Devatha said that the assembly would be discussing a Student Health Advisory Committee (henceforth SHAC) later in the evening, and asked the presenters to expand on Objective 7 of the presentation.
  - iii. J. Hua said that they wanted to emphasize that mental health is not put on the backburner, and that regarding Objective 7, they wanted to focus on making sure course grading schemes are released during pre-enroll
  - iv. C. Kiely said that they do not want students to be in the dark regarding their performance relative to other students.
  - v. S. Iruvanti asked if the presenters have contacted anyone on West Campus regarding working with RAs, and that he feels like many people forget about West Campus in many initiatives. He added that there are many issues regarding mental health on West Campus, and asked if the presenters would be able to reach out to people there.
  - vi. J. Hua said that they did not want to make it seem like they were excluding West Campus, and that when talking about incoming students, the majority of them are freshmen, but that they do not want to exclude West Campus in that either.
  - vii. S. Iruvanti asked if this presentation has yet been given or is planned to be given to the Faculty Senate.
  - viii. J. Hua replied in the negative, and said that they have met with VP Ryan Lombardi, and that they will be meeting with him again tomorrow morning to give the formal list of recommendations, but that a Faculty Senate presentation is an excellent suggestion.
  - ix. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt said that, in regard to leaves of absence, he would suggest that there not just be a mental health counselor involved, but also an academic advisor such that students can talk about their overall goals and

actions, both in relation to their health and to their academics. He also asked what the implementation process for what has just been presented is, and how the SA can help in that regard.

- x. J. Hua said that they view the standing committee on mental health as something that would jumpstart communications with the administration, but that they also want to make sure that student voices are being heard.
- xi. C. Kiely thanked F. Uribe-Rheinbolt for his suggestion.
- xii. V. Devatha said that one reason for this presentation is for the assembly to see if they would like to sign on as the assembly, and that individual members can sign on as themselves independent of the assembly.
- xiii. V. Xu said that she has noticed that freshmen often don't know about the resources, and said that better publicization might be better in this regard.
- xiv. C. Kiely said that that is definitely something they are looking at.
- xv. A. Viswanathan said that, in regard to Objective 10, the JA mentioned something about a suspension reintegration program, and that it might be worth the presenters looking into.
- xvi. J. Hua thanked A. Viswanathan for the suggestion, and said that the structure is there, but not applied correctly.
- xvii. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt said that he feels like certain classes have very standardized grading systems that don't leave much space for needed exemptions, and that something to possibly consider could be the standardization of classes to best serve the mental health of students.
- xviii. J. Hua said that that is something that they looked at, and that being able to see how to make up work is important, since some classes do not allow it. She added that it is definitely something that needs to be considered, especially in STEM classes.
- xix. D. Barbaria moved to vote on affirming the Mental Health Task Force's recommendations – approved 23-0-1.
- xx. V. Devatha temporarily adjourned the meeting for dinner at 6:40 pm
- xxi. The assembly reconvened at 7:00 pm.

### **III. Approval of the Minutes**

- a. November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018
  - i. Motion to approve the November 15<sup>th</sup> minutes – approved.

### **IV. Open Microphone**

- a. No speakers at the open microphone.

### **V. Announcements and Reports**

- a. Transfer Student Housing
  - i. C. Huang said that housing issues at Cornell and in Ithaca are not exclusive to transfers, and that they affect everyone at Cornell. She went through her presentation.
  - ii. One of the presenters said that he is a transfer from Oregon State, and that his experience is similar to many others. He added that the main crux of being put through this process is that it basically effects every different aspect of student life. He also said that, living in Schuyler House, it is hard to learn bus schedules, the TCAT has delays and cancellations that are not always



clear, and that transportation as a whole is hard to figure out and that there are no resources offered to make it easier. He added that extracurriculars are hard to participate in due to the distance from campus, and that Schuyler residents pay for a meal plan despite living nowhere near any dining halls.

- iii. Another presenter said that the sense of community for transfers needs to be improved, and that something that could possibly be done would be to allow for Cornell students to cancel their housing contracts early if they find better housing options.
- iv. A third presenter said that he met a transfer student yesterday who is planning on transferring back to her old institution, and while that is an anomaly, he has spoken with at least four other students who have said the same thing.
- v. C. Huang said that she hoped this presentation had been enlightening, and said that some broad things she would like to talk about are pushing for guaranteed housing, moving all transfers to West Campus (and splitting them equally between North and West Campuses).
- vi. D. Nyakaru said that some of the presenters spoke about tiered housing as an option, and that multiple administrators have said that their biggest concern with that is that the housing process is supposed to be blind. She added that in a tiered housing system, it frequently turns out that all of the upper-income students end up living in nicer housing than lower-income students, and this makes lower-income students less connected to everything. She also said that there are big consequences to that particular idea, but that the presenters' ideas are extremely valid.
- vii. J. Anderson said that, regarding transfer housing, he has seen two transfer student representatives in the past try unsuccessfully to accomplish something without a presentation, and that C. Huang is therefore already ahead of them due to this presentation. He added that he will be talking to the Schuyler House RAs since they are on his RA staff.
- viii. One of the presenters said that it is not the RAs' faults, since they are doing the best they can with what limited resources they have.
- ix. J. Anderson said that the experience of transfers on campus is that of many setbacks that start with housing, and that the assembly can hopefully start a community for transfers after their first year at Cornell.
- x. J. Dominguez said that he was a transfer student last fall, and that the University takes in a lot of freshmen because they bring a lot of tuition revenue. He asked what the SA can do to assist the presenters' efforts.
- xi. One of the presenters said that the SA should do whatever it can to try and convince the administration to allow transfer students to get priority for housing on West Campus, and that they should also push for transfers to be able to terminate their housing contract and find better off-campus housing during the first semester at Cornell.
- xii. Another presenter added that even allowing transfers to move to West would be an acceptable option, since many students leave for study abroad and therefore leave their rooms. He added that he understands the issues with stratified housing, but that guaranteed housing in general would go a long way.

- xiii. A third presenter said that West Campus priority for transfer students is important, especially considering what transfers are concerned with that other students at Cornell aren't, such as credits transferring.
    - xiv. C. Huang said that she will be meeting in this regard with R. Lombardi whenever she can.
  - b. Appropriations Committee
    - i. D. Barbaria said that AppsCom met with the Orientation Steering Committee and voted to maintain their funding 0-11-1-1.
    - ii. D. Barbaria said that AppsCom met with the Welcome Weekend and voted to maintain their funding 0-12-0-1.
    - iii. D. Barbaria said that AppsCom met with the Student Assembly and voted to maintain their funding 0-6-4-1.
  - c. Student Legal Services & Lobbying
    - i. J. Anderson said that many assembly members probably read the Cornell Daily Sun article regarding students' negative experience with a landlord, and that he found a brief on what founding student legal services on campus would entail. He added that it would advise on various types of things in addition to tenant-landlord dealings, and that this is something that he is deeply interested in. He asked SA members who are interested in this regard to reach out to him, and said that it would involve a SA buy-in which means that next year during byline funding would be the optimal time to explore this option.
    - ii. J. Anderson said that 15 or so students will be heading to Albany to lobby on behalf of GENDA, and that transgender and gender nonconforming students are protected by executive order, but that GENDA would solidify this into law. He added that there's an upcoming event in March for a different law, and that he is meeting with federal services soon to explore what a trip to Washington, D.C. would look like. He asked interested assembly members to reach out to him.

## **VI. New Business I & Business of the Day II**

- a. Resolution 17: Approval of Spring 2018 Election Rules
  - i. Shashank Vura said that the changes in this resolution are not drastic, but that he believes that they are necessary to clarify some of the rules. He went through the proposed election rules changes.
  - ii. J. Anderson moved to move this resolution to Business of the Day – **approved.**
  - iii. J. Sim moved to amend the resolution.
    - 1. This amendment would strike from the rules line 321 from the word “using” up until the end of line 322.
  - iv. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt said that it should be specified who would decide in regard to line 282 of the rules.
  - v. D. Barbaria said that the assembly is currently in discussion on J. Sim's amendment.
  - vi. Motion to amend – **amended.**
  - vii. Discussion ensued regarding the language in relation to the updating of the rules.

- viii. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt asked if it should be specified who decides if the election rules were properly followed.
- ix. S. Vura said that his understanding is that, following the first appeal, if the candidate disqualified has a legitimate reason for appealing to the JCC with some contention, then they would go to the JCC. He added that if the JCC rules that that is the case, they have the power to overturn the disqualification, but that it does not allow for frivolous claims.
- x. K. Kebbeh asked about the history of challenge deadlines in relation to lines 338 and 339.
- xi. S. Vura said that his understanding is that if wrongdoing did occur and was filed, they would still want to rule on it even if the challenger decided they didn't want to bring it forward anymore.
- xii. J. Dominguez said that this is a topic that he has discussed in the past and has considered for a long time, and that he would be in favor of initial and secondary candidate enrollment, in which incumbents would be required to enroll by the initial deadline, and non-incumbents would be welcome to apply at either deadline. He added that this would provide a better mechanism for accountability on the SA. He also said that this would not extend the campaign period, and is about providing information about who is running so they can make informed decisions about running. He added that the assembly currently has a lot of uncontested elections, and that he himself ran unopposed which is ridiculous. He also said that if no one enrolled by the initial deadline, people would have a chance for the secondary deadline, and that this would enhance accountability of the system and competition. He moved to amend line 273 of the rules in the resolution such that these implications would be added.
- xiii. D. Nyakaru asked how having a contested or uncontested election would change how people act once they are seated. She added that the assembly's biggest problem is people not doing work once they've been elected, and that there are a lot of uncontested people who have done a lot of good work. She also said that this creates a lot of politicking that won't amount to a lot.
- xiv. I. Wallace said that he foresees this causing a lot of confusion during election season and people not knowing what means what. He asked whether or not a person who is seated on the assembly now but is running for a different seat would be considered an incumbent.
- xv. N. Matolka said that he thinks this could create a toxic culture, and that if people want to go forward with this, they should be careful as to how it is presented so they do not create an aggressive elections cycle.
- xvi. J. Anderson said that he does not think that this truly promotes the idea that anyone can run for any seat, and that he thinks it does the opposite. As an example, he said that if he can see that an incumbent such as I. Wallace is running and he is afraid of running against him, that could ultimately harm a lot of candidates, in particular with many of the identity seats. He added that this is the same assembly that said that biweekly reports are too frequent, and that if the assembly wanted to improve accountability, that was a mechanism to have done so. He also said that he thinks that this actively dissuades people from running, and that barriers to entry should be lowered if the

assembly would like to change elections, and that elections are just an arm of the assembly.

- xvii. S. Vura said that many of his concerns have already been stated, and that he encourages the members of the SA to vote this amendment down. He added that he would like to impress upon the assembly that elections are not referenda on member performance, and that for every student that wants to run against an incumbent for something they did, there will be ten others who will be disinclined to run because they are an incumbent. He also said that he does not think that incumbents should be held to a different standard, and that he knows of no electoral system in the world that does so. He added that competition is a real problem and that he is glad that J. Dominguez started this discussion, but that he thinks there can be different solutions.
- xviii. J. Dominguez said that there is remarkably low turnout for special elections and that anyone currently seated on the assembly would be considered an incumbent, but that he does not think that there is anything inherently bureaucratic about this amendment. He added that this would give an edge to the challenger because they know who is running, and they have the power of information.
- xix. There was a motion to vote on the amendment.
- xx. D. Barbaria said that a big part of the current election rules is that no one campaigns until the designated period, but that J. Dominguez's amendment gives a big advantage to the incumbent by allowing them to put their name out there early.
- xxi. J. Dominguez said that anyone can register for the initial period.
- xxii. Discussion continued regarding J. Dominguez's amendment.
- xxiii. There was a motion to vote on the amendment – **failed**.
- xxiv. There was a motion to vote on the resolution – **approved** 17-1-1.
- b. Resolution 18: Reinstating the Publication of Median Grades
  - i. O. Egharevba gave the context for this resolution.
  - ii. J. Anderson said that this conversation has gone back and forth in the past, and that in his freshman spring there was a referendum to eliminate median grades from transcripts entirely. He asked if O. Egharevba had spoken to the dean of faculty.
  - iii. There was a motion to table the resolution.
    - 1. There was a dissent.
  - iv. O. Egharevba said that he has been sitting on this resolution for a month and has been thinking about it for a very long time, and that he would like for the assembly to vote on it.
  - v. D. Barbaria said that he would abstain if this came to a vote today, and that he would like time to research this. He added that he has been in classes with low median grades, and that there are positives and negatives to this, but that if it passed today, the Faculty Senate wouldn't be able to review it until spring anyway. He also said that the Faculty Senate prefers if we send this kind of thing to them while it is being reviewed and not afterward, and that there is no problem with pushing this to the spring.

- vi. V. Devatha said that he would recommend either doing internal research within the student body or external research regarding publishing or removing median grades.
- vii. O. Egharevba said that that would be a good strategy to get more concrete thoughts.
- viii. J. Sim said that he would be willing to help O. Egharevba if he wanted to make a survey in this regard.
- ix. Discussion continued in this regard.
- x. N. Matolka said that, when he gets a transcript now, he sees a median grade, and asked what that represented.
- xi. O. Egharevba said that that is the median grade.
- xii. N. Matolka asked what this resolution would do.
- xiii. Discussion continued in this regard, with the eventual conclusion that the median grades are not published at this time.
- xiv. N. Matolka said that he is working with the associate dean of the College of Human Ecology, and that she is publishing something that would include median grades, and that he would recommend that O. Egharevba get in touch with her.
- xv. J. Anderson moved to strawpoll in support of a positive conversation between the SA and the Faculty Senate.
- xvi. O. Egharevba said that he thinks that this resolution should be part of the discussion.
- xvii. J. Anderson said that it would be part of the discussion, but the current vote is on having the conversation, not voting on the resolution.
- xviii. E. Shapiro said that he would like to clarify what this resolution is saying because he doesn't think that everyone understands, and that this resolution just gives the grade publicly.
- xix. D. Nyakaru said that in the past, responses to similar resolutions have been that the faculty doesn't want students shying away from their classes because of a low median grade, and that she thinks that the bigger issue is the rigor of some of the classes which the Mental Health Task Force spoke about. She added that, at least for next semester, O. Egharevba should be fostering a discussion about students handling the rigor of their courseload, and that that would be a better way to leave the conversation.
- xx. O. Egharevba said that there are very few, if any, courses with medians of C or C+, and that most of them as of the last report have been around B or B+, which he does not think is necessarily low.
- xxi. V. Devatha said that he thinks that people have expressed their thoughts, and that he would recommend that O. Egharevba reach out to the Dean of Faculty, as well as to the Mental Health Task Force, since his resolution is similar to one of their proposals.
- xxii. O. Egharevba said that this has been good feedback, and that he will continue to work with the Academic Policy Committee and with the Dean of Faculty. He added that he just wanted to make sure that this will be eventually voted on, and moved to table the resolution – **tabled**.
- c. Resolution 19: In Opposition to the Department of Education's Proposed Title IX Changes
  - i. J. Anderson presented the resolution.

- ii. M. Battaglia asked if the things in bullet points on the resolution are things that the resolution opposes.
- iii. J. Anderson replied in the affirmative.
- iv. J. Dominguez asked what line 22 entails, and how that is different from the current system.
- v. J. Anderson said that there is currently an individual decision-maker, and that this change would make it more like a courtroom.
- vi. J. Dominguez said that he has a problem with denouncing some of the things in this resolution, and that he thinks it is vital for our judicial system to cross-examine witnesses. He added that, in regard to the latter two points, he thinks it is very important that there be an appeals process. He also said that he disagrees with denouncing these three things since they are core parts of the American judicial system, and that the assembly needs to protect students' civil rights.
- vii. J. Anderson said that he highly disagrees, and that the cross-examination is grossly misused for survivor intimidation during this process, and that is one of the major things that survivors' rights advocates oppose. He added that if a person feels like they were treated unfairly, then there is a route to take it to court, but the appeals process detailed here would be internal.
- viii. V. Devatha asked if it would be internal.
- ix. J. Anderson said that he believed so, and asked M. Battaglia for clarification.
- x. M. Battaglia said that he has looked at the changes, but that he cannot speak authoritatively in this regard.
- xi. V. Devatha asked if the system is currently external.
- xii. J. Anderson said that he does not believe that there is anything right now, and that the current route would be to sue Cornell for subverting due process. He added that regarding choosing the higher evidentiary standard, there is a standard held by survivors' rights advocates because higher standards are so hard to achieve.
- xiii. O. Egharevba said that he has a few concerns about this resolution, and that he has a problem opposing cross-examination and the appeals process. He added that he knows that this was discussed earlier, but that he encourages the assembly to talk about this and participate in the commenting period as mandated.
- xiv. D. Barbaria said that he will be abstaining in this vote since he is part of the CJC, and that he does not think that it is appropriate for him to vote on this.
- xv. There was a motion to move this resolution to Business of the Day – approved.
- xvi. There was a motion to vote on the resolution.
- xvii. J. Dominguez moved to amend the resolution such that lines 23, 25, and 26 would be struck.
- xviii. D. Barbaria said that the vote on the resolution should happen first since it was called for before the amendment.
- xix. V. Devatha said that he would maintain his decision to vote on the amendment first.
- xx. J. Anderson moved to vote on the amendment.

- xxi. J. Dominguez said that he thinks that it is very important that the assembly not vote away people's civil rights, and that people can get better lawyers but that doesn't mean that cross-examination should be removed.
- xxii. Motion to amend the resolution – failed.
- xxiii. Motion to vote on the resolution – approved 15-0-4.
- d. Resolution 20: Establishing a Student Health Advisory Committee
  - i. J. Anderson presented the resolution.
  - ii. There was a motion to move this resolution to Business of the Day – approved.
  - iii. D. Barbaria said that this resolution cannot be passed today since it is a byline change.
  - iv. J. Sim asked whether there was any concern as to whether 15 members is too many and whether the logistics of staffing it would be too troublesome.
  - v. J. Anderson said that, when talking to the SHBAC representative, 15 felt good to Cornell Health since everyone will likely have fairly divergent interests, and that the scope of interests will allow for there to be good member engagement. He added that if the number has to be changed at the end of the semester, then it can be changed then.
  - vi. J. Sim said that there should maybe be a maximum of 15 members, and that the chairs should be given discretion as to the precise number of members within that range.
  - vii. V. Devatha said that a system like that could lead to confusion.
  - viii. O. Din said that he is fully in support of this resolution, and that he is curious about the interplay between undergraduate and graduate students here. He asked if anything coming out of the committee would have to be passed by both the SA and the GPSA, and if there is a process that would allow for this resolution to be voted on this week.
  - ix. J. Anderson said that, on the note of joint staffing, it has been done a couple of times, such as with SHBAC, and that the SA is responsible for SA membership. He added that the GPSA will put this into its bylaws, and that this is functionally an invitation for the GPSA. He also said that during byline years, they encourage the use of their conference committees, and that FARC used to be a joint committee. He also said that he thinks that, logistically, the SA is responsible for itself and the GPSA is responsible for itself.
  - x. O. Din moved to suspend the bylaws.
  - xi. A short discussion ensued in this regard.
  - xii. J. Sim said that, as chair, his verdict is that they cannot overrule the bylaws.
  - xiii. J. Anderson said that he appreciates the sentiment, but putting this resolution on the agenda next semester changes nothing.
  - xiv. Motion to table the resolution – tabled.

## VII. Adjournment

- a. V. Devatha adjourned the meeting at 8:53 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,  
*John Hannan*  
Clerk of the Assembly