



# Cornell University Student Assembly

## Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, February 28, 2019 Meeting  
4:48pm-7:00pm in Memorial Room, Willard Straight Hall

### I. Call to Order & Roll Call

- a. V. Devatha called the meeting to order at 4:48 pm.
- b. Roll Call:
  - i. *Present:* M. Adeghe [0], J. Anderson [0], D. Barbaria [0], C. Benedict [0], V. Devatha [0], O. Din [2.5], J. Dominguez [0], O. Egharevba [2], S. Harshvardhan [2], C. Huang [0], S. Iruvanti [1], A. Jain [0], K. Kebbeh [1], S. Lim [0.5], N. Matolka [0], U. Mustafa [2], G. Park [1.5], I. Pavlov [0.25], E. Shapiro [0], M. Shovik [2.25], J. Sim [0], M. Smith [0], M. Stefanko [1], F. Uribe-Rheinbolt [0], B. Weintraub [1], K. Wondimu [0], V. Xu [0.75]
  - ii. *Absent:* None.
  - iii. *Arrived After Roll Call:* U. Chukwukere [0]

### II. Approval of the Minutes

- a. Motion to approve the February 21, 2019 minutes – **approved.**

### III. Announcements and Reports

- a. V. Devatha said that Sprint Planning would happen this coming Sunday, and that Anushka Haldar would be running the planning in his absence.
- b. Shashank Vura said that he was at the meeting to notify the assembly of some changes made to the debate terms. He added that the President and EVP debate was moved up one day to the 18<sup>th</sup> of March so that students who have prelims on Tuesday night will still be able to attend. He also said that the information session that was formerly on March 5<sup>th</sup> was moved to March 4<sup>th</sup>, and that anything else regarding the functioning of the elections has not changed.
- c. Pravir Samtani said that he was at the meeting to make the following announcements regarding Slope Day:
  - i. Ticket sales will begin March 19<sup>th</sup>.
  - ii. The Slope Day Programming Board (henceforth SDPB) has met with other organizations in the interest of improving SlopeFest.
  - iii. SDPB intends to work with Cornell Dining to look at better options for food so that everyone has the best time possible.
  - iv. SDPB is meeting with people so as to be better prepared in the case of inclement weather, as happened at Slope Day 2018.
  - v. Slope Day will be on May 8<sup>th</sup> this year.
  - vi. SDPB is working with people to ensure that all volunteers are properly trained.

- vii. Alternative Slope Day and breakfast are things that SDPB has worked on because the SA has funded them to do so, and that they have been very successful in the past.
- viii. Gates will open and SlopeFest will begin at 11 am, and music will commence at 12 pm.
- ix. The headliner for Slope Day will be Steve Aoki; Cousin Stizz and Ezi will also perform.

#### **IV. Open Microphone**

- a. O. Din said that he wanted to provide some context for the feelings in the room, and that he heard very late today about a meeting that happened last night between some SA members regarding the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement (henceforth BDS). He added that he feels the need to address this because he had heard that there had been some talk about the SA condemning the Cornell University Students for Justice in Palestine (henceforth SJP) and BDS, and that such behavior is entirely inappropriate. He also said that it is inappropriate to condemn a resolution that has not yet been published, and that such an act undermines the assembly as a whole. He added that any conversation such as that which happened the prior night where some SA members are expressly kept out undermines him and others as members, as well as their movement as a whole.
- b. D. Barbaria said that they are in no way taking stances as an assembly and a lot of this was discussed last night. He added that people did say that this was inappropriate last night, and that everyone is here to listen without taking stances yet.
- c. Community member Barbara Cruz introduced herself, and said that what she had heard about the situation is messed up. She added that she doesn't think that condemning BDS before any resolution comes out is appropriate and that it is corrupt and smacks of backroom deals. She also said that it is important that this is discussed, and that Ben Shapiro said that disagreement is what this country is built upon.
- d. G. Park said that she thinks that there is a huge misunderstanding regarding what conversation happened yesterday, and that no statement against BDS was crafted. She added that they agreed that they are not comfortable writing a statement against BDS, but that they are concerned with the racism that comes with it. She also said that they want to make this very clear, and that they don't want to talk about anything that goes against BDS. She added that D. Barbaria clarified that there is no statement, and that she does not know why it is still being brought up that there is a statement against BDS.
- e. Community member Sylvia said that she thinks that it is important that G. Park articulate what happened at the meeting, especially since she is conflating BDS with racism. She added that they want to know what the SA is thinking.
- f. G. Park said that a member reached out to her during February break about a Jewish body at Cornell being fearful and anxious about the current situation and sentiments going on, and that she helped him reach out to SA members to talk about it. She added that they decided to sit down and have an open conversation, and that it was not their plan to talk about a statement. She also said that they sat down together and spoke about his stance on the situation, and that they wanted to set a tone that no one goes overboard with this. She added that she wanted to say that the conversation happened because they wanted to listen to one stance, not to craft a statement to go

directly against a movement, and that they are continuing to look forward to hearing various perspectives.

- g. D. Barbaria said that on top of G. Park's comments, one of the reasons they met with the students is that most SA members who went to the meeting were unaware that other SA members would be at that meeting, and that all SA members are free to act in a way that they think is in the best interest of their constituents. He added that it was their understanding that many students felt unsafe, and that they want to make sure that everyone who wants to discuss this is able to feel safe on campus as students and as individuals in pursuing a goal that they think is in the best interest of campus and the world at large.
- h. Community member Samir Salih introduced himself and said that, as a member of SJP, he takes claims of anti-Semitism very seriously. He added that he found the aforementioned meeting to be very insulting, and that it shows that the SA is willing to be decisive in regard to one community but not the whole community at large, and that the claims of an open conversation are not true because some people were put out. He also said that he doesn't know if he trusts the SA because now they feel threatened, and that they have received threats for some of their events. He added that he feels like it's very problematic when clearly a good number of people are very anxious, and that he has yet to hear an apology.
- i. C. Benedict said that he was recently elected, and that he would like to point out the community that a large number of SA members were not part of this conversation. He added that coming into this position, he had heard that there is a lot of mistrust, and that he is trying to put an end to that mistrust, but that it looks bad when members of the SA do something like this without including the entire SA. He also said that it makes his job harder, and that if someone wanted to bring this to the SA, it should be brought to everyone in the SA, and that these decisions are made as a group, rather than with only 15 members. He added that next time, people should come to an SA meeting to voice their concerns.
- j. Community member Adam introduced himself and said that it is insane that the meeting last night happened, especially considering the amount of members in attendance counted for quorum. He added that this shows that the SA lacks transparency, shared governance, and the principles that the assembly espouses, and that the idea that divestment divides the community is insane. He also said that they have 22 sponsoring organization, and that he can't explain how good it feels to see the true solidarity that he sees now in regard to BDS. He added that in talking about the Israeli-Palestinian situation, they are also talking about global issues such as the Mexican-American border.
- k. O. Din said that, as a representative of SJP, one thing that needs to happen would be for SJP to come to an SA meeting and do a public teach-in about what BDS is, because there is a lot of misinformation that their organization or their movement is anti-Semitic, which is not true. He added that he hopes that within the coming weeks, they can do a teach-in where these issues can be debated before a resolution happens.
- l. V. Devatha said that Exec met with the administration to see if they can bring in more neutral parties, which is difficult with a topic like this. He added that they discussed bringing in Russell Rickford or Ross Brann, and that they also discussed having one week with a Hillel teach-in and another week with an SJP teach-in.
- m. O. Din said that he'd be more than happy with that.

- n. Community member Shivani Parikh introduced herself, and said that many in attendance might not be aware that some student organizations that are signatories of this have been receiving various attempts to understand what was happening in various closed-door meetings. She added that this is inappropriate, and that these organizations are under no obligation to disclose this information.
- o. G. Park said that she is 100% in favor of the teach-in, and that members of the SA are not experts on this subject.
- p. Community member Adam said that no one needs to be an expert to reject apartheid.
- q. G. Park said that in the aforementioned meeting, they wanted to learn about one perspective, and that they did not reach a collective conclusion. She added that she's completely for a teach-in to learn more, and that people should reach out in this regard.
- r. D. Barbaria said that fundamentally, BDS was not discussed in the previous night's meeting, and that a lot of the facts of the situation on campus were discussed, but that in a lot of different ways they hadn't learned about BDS. He added that he would like to apologize, and that they didn't want to do anything that makes people feel uncomfortable, and that they all have a lot of learning to do.
- s. V. Devatha said that this would be an appropriate time to move into the next discussion that O. Din brought up regarding a teach-in. He added that the topic would be which style of teach-in to have, whether that be the SJP and Hillel teach-ins or the neutral party teach-in. He also said that members are willing to bring up other options should they so choose.
- t. O. Din said that he thinks that the best way forward would be to have SJP come in to do a teach-in, and that many organizations come in to do teach-ins without being impeded, and that it would be inappropriate to impede SJP in this regard.
- u. K. Wondimu said that he would first appreciate if someone from the SA would talk to him after the meeting since he doesn't understand the context of what's going on. He added that he had heard that a meeting went on and there were some acts that might have been offensive to some groups on campus, but that furthermore he would support a teach-in from both sides rather than a neutral entity, and that it is important for people to hear both sides and make up their mind.
- v. S. Lim said that she wanted to say that it is unprofessional that some people had a meeting last night and got together and pre-crafted a preemptive and unnecessary statement. She added that it was very inappropriate and is not in solidarity with a lot of the communities that they'd like to think that they work with.
- w. V. Devatha said that this conversation was parsed out because a decision needs to be made in this regard, and that the earlier discussion can be returned to, but the discussion at this time should be left to the question of the teach-in if people want to have that discussion.
- x. D. Barbaria said that he thinks that in order for the assembly to have this, there should be conversations with both sides to make sure that both sides agree on this.
- y. V. Devatha said that he would especially encourage students from the other side of this to discuss this.
- z. Community member Jillian Shapiro said that they have had less time to think about this as a topic, and that they need more time to discuss this since Hillel is not a political organization.

- aa. S. Salih said that there are many sides here, and that this is a multifaceted issue in which separating it into two sides is divisive. He added that Hillel does get money from political organizations and is not apolitical, and asked for clarification in this regard from Hillel's body.
- bb. V. Devatha said that many sides will be able to present if they would like.
- cc. S. Lim said that this is a multifaceted issue and it is dividing the assembly further, but that she thinks a teach-in would be beneficial. She said that if other assembly members, particularly those at the previous night's meeting, would like to comment on this, they should feel free to.
- dd. B. Weintraub said that one of the big takeaways last night was that the SA is not the venue to discuss BDS, and that they are not in a position to solve geopolitical crises. He added that this is an important issue but not one to be discussed at the SA, and that there are other issues that have more impact on the Cornell campus. He also said that President Pollack has said that BDS won't happen regardless, and that he would encourage the SA not to discuss this in the first place and to discuss things that they can affect and change in the Cornell community.
- ee. V. Devatha said that he's going to scratch the teach-in conversation because it seems that no one wants to talk about it.
- ff. O. Din said that the issue is one of Cornell's participation in human rights violations, and that the SA is the perfect body to talk about this, and that if B. Weintraub disagrees with that then there are bigger problems. He added that their job is to decide what students want, regardless of whether the administration will agree.
- gg. M. Shovik said that it is not fair for B. Weintraub to say that they came to a conclusion at the previous night's meeting, since only 15 members were there, and that if he wants the SA to come to any kind of consensus, a public meeting is the proper venue to do so.
- hh. V. Devatha said that B. Weintraub said that the group in attendance came to a conclusion, not the SA as a whole.
- ii. G. Park said that she disagrees with B. Weintraub, and that as student representatives, they feel the responsibility to be as informed as possible, and that she's 100% in favor of a teach-in in an academic setting to foster this conversation in a healthy way. She added that the SA can be a very useful venue to learn more about this.
- jj. D. Barbaria said that there was no consensus, and that there were many SA members present but that this was not planned. He added that no one expected other members to be there, and that they were just as divided last night as they are now, and that he does not know if this is the best way to discuss this issue but that they might as well continue.
- kk. Community member Steve Tarcan said that he would like to address B. Weintraub's point, and said that this is a student issue for all students within marginalized communities, and that this is an injustice that they face every day. He added that extreme border control and separated families are not just a Palestinian issue, and that they need to pay attention to this if they want to empower marginalized students, which cannot happen if this conversation is shut down.
- ll. Community member Sylvia said that, regarding B. Weintraub's comment, that she is hearing that he does not think that this is an appropriate venue because this isn't solvable, which tells her that he is unaware of how many political issues affect so many students here, and it speaks to how badly they do not have shared governance

- on campus if they think that only simple things can happen. She added that they set a bad precedent by saying that this conversation can't happen, in that it prevents conversations such as divestment from fossil fuels and the like from happening, and that the assembly is not willing to put in the work and stand up for the student body.
- mm. B. Cruz said that she thinks that the implication that BDS is not under the purview of the SA is factually incorrect, especially considering the various peer institutions that have passed BDS resolutions, and that it is intellectually dishonest.
- nn. J. Dominguez said that he appreciates everyone's concerns, and that this is a good first step for everyone to have had their voices heard, and that all sides feel like they had a voice in the process. He added that he thinks that the teach-in solution is a good way to preserve academic freedom on campus, and that he thinks that it is very important that the SA maintains a constructive and peaceful dialogue where everyone feels safe.
- oo. O. Din said that he would like to add a formal motion for an SJP teach-in to be added to the agenda for next week.
- pp. E. Shapiro said that he thinks that Hillel should be given the same amount of time on the same day.
- qq. J. Shapiro said that if SJP is doing a teach-in then Hillel would like the same amount of time on the same topic.
- rr. O. Din said that he amends his motion to include both organizations, and asked J. Shapiro if having a teach-in next week is too short notice.
- ss. Discussion continued in this regard.
- tt. The motion became such that both SJP and Hillel would come in at the next meeting and have a 20-minute timeslot to discuss the issue at hand.
- uu. Tirenolu Onabajo asked if Hillel is now comfortable with acting as a political organization since they said that they weren't political earlier.
- vv. J. Shapiro said that they are not a political organization, but that they do partner with organizations that do ally with Israel and with students that are passionate about Israel.
- ww. Community member Sasha Chanko said that he thinks that that is a good question, and that right now the members of the Jewish community in the room happen to be from Hillel, but that there are other Jewish organizations on campus. He added that the SJP vs. Hillel dynamic is unfair, and that there are other organizations like Chabad that they would be working with.
- xx. T. Onabajo said that she agrees and that she thinks that is more appropriate, but that she is just making sure that they have the politics correct when they come in because they'll be answering questions from political organizations.
- yy. S. Chanko said that they can have discussions about what arguments they'll make by themselves.
- zz. Community member Ezra Stein said that he would like to challenge the previous statement that Hillel represents Jewish students, and said that Hillel does not speak for all Jews. He added that there are plenty of Jews on this campus who condemn Israel, and that Hillel does not speak for all Jews and that it does not speak for him.
- aaa. J. Shapiro said that she would never try to articulate for every Jew on campus, and asked if there will be a resolution that the SA would vote on next week regarding BDS.
- bbb. O. Din said he has no intention of bringing a resolution to the floor next week.

- ccc.D. Barbaria said that there will not be one as far as he knows.
- ddd. G. Park said that she wants to ensure that there will be a healthy conversation next week, and that they do not want any misinformation. She added that she would like everyone to come with clear facts and for the conversation to be kept healthy.
- eee.Motion to have two teach-ins of twenty minutes each next week – approved.
- fff. V. Devatha asked what the order of presentation would be.
- ggg. Discussion continued in this regard, and resulted in the conclusion that there would be a coin flip to determine the order of presentation.
- hhh. D. Barbaria said that anyone who feels like their student government is not representing them should consider running for the SA, and that there is an information session in that regard tonight at 6:45 pm.
- iii. S. Salih said that he would still like an apology for the actions of last night.
- jjj. G. Park said that, as one of the people in attendance last night who invited other SA members, she apologizes if their actions offended people in any way, and that it was not their intention to be secretive, and that they just wanted to hear from one side. She added that she is open to talk about it with any perspective, and that she apologizes if this seems like a scheme for that they wanted to surprise anyone with a statement. She also said that people should feel free to reach out to her if they'd like to discuss anything further, and that she would be completely transparent.
- kkk. S. Salih said that that should be done at a meeting in front of everyone.
- lll. G. Park asked if SJP can promise that all conversation with SA members will be public.
- mmm. S. Salih and O. Din said that they haven't been hiding anything.
- nnn. G. Park said that she is not trying to hide things, and that it was originally planned for the meeting to be in Libe, but that there were some call-ins that necessitated moving to a room to hear the conversation better, and that this was the sole reason that the meeting was moved to a room.
- ooo. J. Sim moved to amend the agenda such that Resolution 29 would be discussed ahead of Resolution 28, since the former's sponsors were present at this time – amended.

## V. New Business

- a. Resolution 29: Ensuring Student Representation in the IT Governance Process at Cornell Through the Establishment of a Standing Committee
- i. J. Sim went through the specifications of the resolution.
  - ii. O. Egharevba said that he thinks that this is a great idea, and that he was trying to work with IT on trying to improve this and no one got back to him. He added that he wants to be more involved with the technological aspect, and that he was on the assembly when this passed last year, but that he feels like they were in the dark about knowing the progress that had been made. He asked if any progress had been made on the ethics side, and he asked how the community would ensure that their progress is being communicated.
  - iii. J. Sim said that they value transparency and that none of the proceedings will be made confidential unless they are for some reason required to be. He added that they haven't been able to share Net-Print changes due to the confidential information shared by third-party actors and the fact that they signed an NDA. He also said that the assembly will hear next week about the

changes being made, and that the assembly cannot vote on this today due to it being a bylaw amendment. He added that it has been hard for them to reach out to IT due to its college-based structure.

- iv. O. Din asked why the committee currently would only have five members.
- v. J. Sim said that smaller committees work more efficiently, especially considering the issues that this committee would be dealing with, and that this committee is trying to have a fair representation of the CIS community.
- vi. M. Shovik asked why J. Sim chose the CIS organizations that he did for membership in the committee.
- vii. J. Sim said that they reached out to many organizations, and that URMC and ISSA were unable to send a representative due to their structure, which is why the provision was added about general members. He added that it will be made sure during staffing that these communities are represented.
- viii. N. Matolka said that he thinks this is great, and asked how J. Sim is making sure that IT will be accountable and have conversations with the committee. He also asked how the committee will be made transparent if the relevant information is confidential.
- ix. J. Sim said that none of the proceedings of the meetings will be confidential, but that anything beyond that might require an NDA depending on IT's requirements. He added that before his term on the SA ends, he will make sure that the relationship he has with IT will be transferred to the committee leadership.
- x. V. Devatha asked if this relationship could be institutionalized, and that it would make sense for this to happen now since this is being established as a whole at this time.
- xi. J. Sim said that this would be ideal once the resolution is formally approved, and that they would be in favor of a relationship similar to that between Cornell Dining and the Dining Committee.
- xii. V. Devatha said that this should be in the SA bylaws.
- xiii. J. Sim said that he is hesitant to say what can be in the bylaws since the conversation is not yet over.
- xiv. N. Matolka asked if there would be an onboarding process for future representatives if this won't be put in the bylaws.
- xv. J. Sim said that that would make sense, and that assembly members should notice that this is different from other bylaw clauses. He added that he thinks that the information here is important for the function of a committee.
- xvi. D. Barbaria said that he has a few amendments that he wants to make next week, and that they cannot be made this week since the resolution is not Business of the Day.
- xvii. Discussion continued in regard to the proposed amendment, and the requirement and amount of SA members on the committee.
- xviii. O. Egharevba said that he understands the concern about SA members, and that he thinks that a good compromise would for there to be an internal election for these positions, and that this would allow people who would be qualified to have a better chance of being integrated effectively in the committee.
- xix. J. Sim said that he would be against that because the aim of this is to reduce bureaucracy, and that going forward, the chair would preferably have served



in the past and be involved with CIS, and that it will be their responsibility to make sure everyone on the board is knowledgeable.

- xx. Motion to table the resolution – **tabled**.
- xxi. Julian Kroll said that new member training for new SA members will be happening this weekend.

## **VI. Business of the Day**

- a. Resolution 28: Amendment to the Spring 2019 Election Rules
  - i. S. Vura said that they have received confirmation from the TNC that candidates seeking the position of student-elected trustee (henceforth SET) cannot run simultaneously for an SA position.
  - ii. A member asked if this affects all positions, or just executive positions.
  - iii. S. Vura said that it affects all positions. He added that considering the information that they have, he thinks that this is unnecessary, and would be in favor of tabling it.
  - iv. G. Park moved to table the resolution.
    - 1. There was a dissent.
    - 2. There was a reminder that a motion to table cannot be dissented against.
    - 3. V. Devatha requested that G. Park withdraw her motion.
    - 4. G. Park **did so**.
  - v. S. Vura said that the current version of the resolution does not contain the words “acting on their behalf,” and that their presence in the meeting packet is a mistake.
  - vi. There was a recess to discuss language for an amendment to the resolution.
  - vii. D. Barbaria moved to amend the end time of the meeting to 6:35 pm – **approved**.
  - viii. V. Devatha introduced the amendment.
  - ix. D. Barbaria said that the Undesignated race is separated for six seats in three categories, and that this change would not be allowed.
    - x. O. Din asked what part of charter the amendment contradicts.
    - xi. D. Barbaria said that it contradicts lines 184-205 of charter.
    - xii. O. Din said that he doesn’t think that it goes in opposition of that section.
    - xiii. J. Anderson said that O. Din’s assertion is not true.
  - xiv. V. Devatha said that they’ll talk about the intent, and that the intent is so that an individual running for SET would also be slated in the Undesignated race, similar to the President or Executive Vice President (henceforth EVP), which means that one person would win the SET race, leaving a pool of worthy candidates that under the current rules have no method of recourse and could not be a part of shared governance. He added the framers of charter understood that people running for positions such as President and EVP are an asset to the SA, so that they can continue to participate if they lose, and that they want to add the same provision here. He also said that the second-highest amount of votes in the SET race would be dropped into the Undesignated race, and that individual at that point in time can drop the Undesignated election if they don’t want the position, and then it would proceed as normal.

- xv. D. Barbaria said that the election rules don't dictate slating, and that the language that allows for the President and EVP to run for the Undesignated seats are on lines 201-205. He added that two of the seats are taken by the winner of the President and EVP races, and after that there are four remaining seats. He also said that two of those seats are to be contested by those who lost the President and EVP race, as well as those just running for an Undesignated seat, and that the remaining two are reserved only for those candidates running for an Undesignated seat. He added that this change would be disingenuous to the way that charter is written, and the way to go about this change would be to add the SET to line 203, such that they understand theseats that they have the avenue to contest.
- xvi. Manisha Munasinghe said that the elections change was incorporated because there were lots of ramifications for the trustee election last year when it happened after the SA elections. She added that whatever election goes second has fewer votes, and that their intent was to join them together to increase voter turnout. She added that as it stands, she doesn't understand how running for Undesignated would work, but that it is her understanding that they would still be running for an SA position.
- xvii. J. Anderson said that M. Munasinghe's understanding is correct.
- xviii. M. Munasinghe said that they would therefore be in conflict with the TNC's rules and be disqualified.
- xix. V. Devatha said that the method for this would be that a student couldn't opt out until after the election occurred, and that an opt-out clause would allow the TNC to disqualify any member that did not choose to opt out. He added that any candidate who loses the SET election and does not want to be on the SA has the right to opt out at that point.
- xx. D. Barbaria moved to amend the meeting's ending time to 6:40 pm – approved.
- xxi. Dustin Liu asked if the proposed amendment says that if a certain candidate were to lose the SET election, that if they had a critical amount of votes, they would be dropped down into the Undesignated race. He also asked how that process would go.
- xxii. M. Munasinghe said that this biases the Undesignated race so that students running for SET will win because they will inevitably have more votes.
- xxiii. V. Devatha said that the process is logistically the same as it is for President and EVP, and that they can work on the language but that they are proposing that there be one slot for President candidates that lose, and one slot for EVP candidates that lose.
- xxiv. D. Barbaria said that V. Devatha's assertion is incorrect.
- xxv. V. Devatha asked D. Barbaria to elaborate.
- xxvi. D. Barbaria said that there are two seats to be contested by losing candidates from the Presidential race, the EVP race, and the other candidates of the Undesignated race.
- xxvii. O. Din said that even if this does bias the Undesignated race a little bit, there is still ranked-choice voting. He added that good students who would otherwise run can still get the change to run and the student body would be able to still see these students in at some level of shared governance that they would like to see them at.

- xxviii. J. Anderson said that any biasing of candidates in any election is inappropriate, and that it is also inappropriate to enforce this rule now when there are trustee candidates getting signatures who are unaware of these potential changes. He added that this conflates two election rules that place a burden on candidates of multiple races, and that this might not even be in line with SA charter.
- xxix. K. Wondimu said that he somewhat agrees with V. Devatha, and that he sees the problem that the student-elected trustees brought up, and that he agrees with D. Barbaria in that the trustees leached onto the SA election.
- xxx. D. Barbaria said that he did not say that.
- xxxi. K. Wondimu asked if they can say that, regardless of anything else that happens, that the second-place SET candidate gets an Undesignated seat if no one else runs.
- xxxii. J. Anderson said that that would be in violation of SA charter.
- xxxiii. O. Din said that if they do not want to follow both sets of rules, they do not have to, and that they just want to give them more opportunities to enter shared governance. He added that this does not bias candidates in the Undesignated race, and that the votes for them will still be taken into account. He also said that TNC put the SA into this position, and that this is the best way forward. He added that voter turnout doesn't matter as much as quality candidates.
- xxxiv. M. Munasinghe provided information regarding voter turnout in the SET election.
- xxxv. J. Anderson said that the raw number is different because the GPSA pool is larger than the SA pool.
- xxxvi. D. Liu said that he wanted to explain why the TNC made this decision, and that he apologized if anyone felt personally targeted by the TNC's decision, but that it was not personal at all. He added that a collaborative decision was made that voter turnout would already be lower due to the special election that occurred earlier in the semester, and that they figured that having both races on the same ballot would mitigate this. He also said that SET does not require students to have prior assembly experience, and that other candidates have opted out of other leadership positions to run for SET. He added that, by allowing SA students to not opt out, the SA is writing the rules to benefit the SA. He also said that even if someone is not on the SA, they can make change on campus, and that it is preposterous to say that the SA is the only place to make change.
- xxxvii. M. Munasinghe said that a lot of work is done in committees, and that someone does not have to be a voting member of the SA to make change.
- xxxviii. J. Anderson said that the information session for SA candidates should begin at 6:45 pm, and asked how this could be ameliorated considering that the SA meeting was still going on.
- xxxix. S. Vura said that he informed the candidates that they might run a bit behind schedule, but that this discussion should be wrapped up.
- xl. Discussion continued in this regard.
- xli. M. Adeghe asked if D. Liu said that there were leadership roles that he did not take in order to run for SET.

- xlii. D. Liu said that some people who are running for trustee have intentionally opted out of leadership positions so that they could run for this position.
- xlili. M. Adeghe said that she thought D. Liu was saying that it looks bad to have had previous leadership.
- xliv. D. Liu said that this was not the case, and that the point was that other people have made this decision, and that the SA should not be exempt from this decision.
- xlv. B. Weintraub said that the change has already been made, and that he thinks that it is irresponsible and not the right course of action to make this change for this year. He added that he would be in favor of this discussion in regard to the future, but that it is not appropriate to make this change now.
- xlvi. E. Shapiro said that petitions need to be confirmed by the SA which would invalidate them in the TNC race, and moved to vote on the resolution.
  - 1. There was a dissent.
  - 2. E. Shapiro maintained his motion.
  - 3. There was a vote to move into voting – failed.
- xlvii. D. Barbaria moved to table the resolution – failed.
- xlviii. S. Vura said that he would prefer that the SA not pursue this course of action, and that he has no opinion on the discussion, but that if a change is made next Thursday it would still be before campaigning begins. He added that it could still be put into place if passed next Thursday, but that it would not be ideal.
- xlix. V. Devatha said that, regarding D. Liu’s statement of benefitting SA members, he does not believe that that is an appropriate assumption because the TNC rules do not explicitly state that TNC members can’t run for a specific organization, and that the provision is only for the SA and Class Councils. He added that D. Liu perceived them as saying that they are above every organization, but that the TNC treats the SA as a different organization.
  - l. O. Din said that he does not believe that the idea that the process has already been put in place holds water, and that this can be done. He added that the logistical issues can be figured out, and that informal votes can happen over Slack if need be, but that this does need to be voted on specifically right now.
  - li. J. Anderson said that he would end the meeting at 7:00 pm regardless of what happens.
  - lii. D. Liu said that this rule is in effect because they’re on the same ballot, and the reason for that originally was because there was a thought that there would be voter fatigue. He added that this was not done because they are placing the SA on a different level, but that this course of action does say to him that SA members are on a different level.
  - liii. S. Vura said that if the elections are to be had concurrently, then they should be on the same ballot.
  - liv. D. Barbaria said that the amendment and actual language in it has to do with the language of the charter, and that the proponents of the resolution are trying to extend this to someone who is not in the election, and that the language here is unclear.
  - lv. V. Devatha said that there seems to be a high-level discussion and a nitty-gritty discussion at hand at this time, and asked if the discussion can be

limited to the high-level discussion. He also asked how the SA wants to go about this moving forward, and if they would like to determine the intent of the body this week and then vote on language next week.

- lvi. J. Anderson asked what the proponents would say that the intent is.
- lvii. V. Devatha said that, to him, the intent is to include representatives in the SET race in the SA pool, just as they would for President or EVP candidates.
- lviii. J. Anderson said that this notion would be considered for the next four minutes, and then voted upon.
- lix. V. Devatha said that if the intent is voted upon in the affirmative, then there will be specific language at the next meeting.
- lx. K. Wondimu asked if someone who lost the SET race would now be in the race for an Undesignated seat.
- lxi. J. Anderson replied in the affirmative.
- lxii. K. Wondimu asked if this violates any rules.
- lxiii. V. Devatha said that it does according to D. Barbaria.
- lxiv. K. Wondimu said that the SA is between a rock and a hard place to consider this at this time.
- lxv. E. Shapiro said that he is in favor of the intent, but that it isn't feasible for this change to be enacted now.
- lxvi. V. Devatha said that that is an appropriate concern.
- lxvii. There was a motion to vote.
- lxviii. J. Anderson said that D. Liu can respond quickly, and then they will move into voting.
- lxix. M. Munasinghe said that the SA can do this, but that it would be in conflict with the TNC's rules.
- lxx. D. Liu said SA rules are the SA's, TNC rules are the TNC's, and that this isn't supposed to be combative.
- lxxi. Discussion continued in this regard.
- lxxii. J. Anderson said that the assembly would now be voting on the intent of the resolution, and that a vote in favor is in favor of the intent that V. Devatha specified a few minutes ago.
- lxxiii. V. Devatha reiterated the intent.
- lxxiv. A member asked if this would apply to all losing candidates of the SET election, or just one.
- lxxv. V. Devatha said that all would be considered, but only one could get a seat.
- lxxvi. Motion to vote on the intent of Resolution 28 – **intent concurred upon** 17-4-4.

## **VII. Adjournment**

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,  
*John Hannan*  
Clerk of the Assembly