



# Cornell University Student Assembly

## Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, April 19, 2018 Meeting  
4:49pm-6:41pm in Memorial Room, WSH

### I. Call to Order & Roll Call

- a. J. Kim called the meeting to order at 4:49 pm.
- b. Roll Call:
  - i. *Present:* T. Ball [0.75], D. Barbaria [0], A. Chowdhury [2], O. Corn [1], R. Cornell [2.5], V. Devatha [1], O. Din [2], J. Dominguez [0], D. Engelson [0.25], O. Egharevba [1], H. Hassan [3], N. Hernandez [0], R. Herz [5], M. Indimine [1.5], S. Iruvanti [0], G. Kaufman [0], J. Kim [1], S. Lim [0], L. Lipschutz [4.75], D. Nyakaru [1], G. Park [0], M. Peralta-Ochoa [2], E. Shapiro [1], M. Valadez [1], I. Wallace [1]
  - ii. *Arrived After Roll Call:* C. Schott (*Excused*) [1.25], J. Sim (*Excused*) [1]
  - iii. *Absent:* S. Park (*Unexcused*) [3.75]

### II. Open Microphone

- a. No speakers at the open microphone.

### III. Oath of Office

- a. School of Industrial & Labor Relations Representative J. Dominguez was sworn in using the Oath of Office
- b. G. Kaufman moved to amend the agenda such that Resolution 47 would be discussed before Presentations – **amended**.

### IV. Approval of the Minutes

- a. April 12<sup>th</sup> Minutes
  - i. Motion to approve the April 12<sup>th</sup> minutes – **approved**.
- b. There was a motion to amend the agenda such that Resolution 45 would be discussed after Announcements & Reports (and therefore before Resolution 47) – **amended**.

### V. Announcements & Reports

- a. Shivani Parikh said that she has been tolerating a great deal of implicit anti-South Asian bias throughout the elections process, and that it is disgusting that she must explain that saying that a person of color is not “POC enough” is uncalled for. She also said that people of South Asian descent all make different decisions in regard to how to navigate white spaces in a post-9/11 world, and that she will hold accountable anyone who tries to criticize their skin color rather than their platforms.

- b. V. Devatha said that Holi will be occurring on May 5<sup>th</sup> on the Arts Quad, and that anyone who wishes to purchase tickets should speak with him to be connected to the relevant parties.

## VI. New Business I

- a. Resolution 45: In Support of GPSA Resolution 13
  - i. Ekarina Winarto said that the public-private partnership that has given control of the Maplewood Apartments to an organization other than Cornell is stripping international students of the ability to be leaders in that community, and that the GPSA has been trying to find creative solutions to this issue. She added that C. Schott wrote this resolution in his capacity as International Student Liaison, but could not be here today to speak on the resolution's behalf.
    - 1. E. Winarto is the President of the GPSA.
  - ii. G. Kaufman said that he thinks that the resolution is great, but that it is the height of bureaucracy to pass a resolution that only supports another body's resolution, and that it would be a bad habit for the shared governance bodies to sponsor each others' resolutions.
  - iii. Zachary Schmetterer asked if any undergraduate students are living in the Maplewood Apartments. He also asked a clarifying question regarding the nature of the public-private partnership model.
  - iv. E. Winarto said that after fifty years, Cornell will gain the property back from EdR. She also said that Maplewood is currently primarily reserved for graduate and professional students, but that there are potential plans to open the space to a wider demographic. She also said that she believes that solidarity is a good thing, especially since the International Student Union represents all international students and not just undergraduates.
  - v. E. Shapiro moved to amend line 5 of the resolution such that the word "housing" is spelled correctly – **amended** by unanimous consent.
  - vi. There was a motion to move Resolution 45 to Business of the Day – **approved**.
  - vii. G. Kaufman asked whether or not GPSA Resolution 13 had passed yet.
  - viii. E. Winarto said that it will pass on Monday.
  - ix. G. Kaufman said that, as a general rule, resolutions shouldn't pass through multiple bodies, and that resolutions that affect multiple constituencies should go through the University Assembly.
  - x. E. Winarto said that she still believes that the resolution is important to pass in the SA.
  - xi. D. Barbaria said that it is important to hear C. Schott's input, and that it might be beneficial to see undergraduates pass the resolution. He also recommended tabling the resolution until C. Schott can speak on its behalf.
  - xii. There was a motion to table Resolution 47 – **tabled**.
- b. M. Peralta-Ochoa read a statement from a community member.
- c. Resolution 47: Approving New SAFC Guidelines
  - i. A representative of SAFC said that the guidelines for the organization have been outdated for a few years.
  - ii. G. Kaufman said that this is a routine procedure to ensure that guidelines are up to date.

- iii. Z. Schmetterer said that one complaint that he has heard from community members is that when they are trying to get reimbursed in regard to travel fees, reimbursements will be denied if not using Mapquest as opposed to other programs such as Google Maps.
- iv. A representative of SAFC said that she was unfamiliar with the incident, but that SAFC does accept Google Maps.
- v. D. Barbaria said that the Assembly did not get to have a full discussion on SAFC last semester, and that this resolution is a good first step to make sure that organizational costs don't keep growing in the future.
- vi. D. Barbaria moved to move Resolution 47 to Business of the Day – **approved**.
- vii. O. Din moved to vote on Resolution 47 – **approved** 21-0-1.

## VII. Business of the Day I

- a. Resolution 38: Reinstating Statement Policy
  - i. N. Hernandez said that Resolution 38 has been on the agenda for at least a month, and said that the Assembly should just vote on it.
  - ii. There was a motion to vote on Resolution 38 – **approved** 21-0-1.

## VIII. New Business II

- a. Resolution 48: Approving Special Projects Request for Collective X
  - i. G. Kaufman said that this resolution is required by standing rules since it allocates a sum of money greater than \$500.
  - ii. O. Corn said that Collective X is one of the organizations affected by CUTonight's funding decisions, and that it is unfair that Collective X has had its funding up in the air for so long and that the SA should pass the resolution.
  - iii. O. Din moved to move Resolution 48 to Business of the Day – **approved**.
  - iv. There was a motion to vote.
    - 1. D. Barbaria dissented.
  - v. D. Barbaria asked G. Kaufman why over a third of Appropriations Committee representatives voted no on the resolution.
  - vi. G. Kaufman said that there was concern among some committee members since Collective X had already released a magazine earlier in the year, and that there were too many release parties. He added that the majority of the committee was not swayed in this regard.
  - vii. Motion to vote on Resolution 48 – **approved** 23-0-1.
    - 1. J. Kim asked why the number of members voting each time keeps changing.
- b. Consensual Relationships Policy Vote
  - i. O. Din asked how the chair will be voting on the ballot.
  - ii. J. Kim said that he will not disclose this information.
  - iii. V. Devatha said that this vote is technically considered a roll-call vote.
  - iv. J. Kim said that members will not be standing up and announcing their vote, but that each member will write their name on the ballot.
  - v. O. Corn asked what the difference is between plan CRP-A and CRP-B.
  - vi. Joseph Anderson said that it is not a significant difference for undergraduate students. He also asked whether or not there was a CRP-C option.

- vii. J. Kim said that he did not receive a C option.
- viii. G. Kaufman asked who would see how individual members vote.
- ix. J. Anderson said that the Consensual Relationships Policy Committee (henceforth CRPC) would be the only body to see, and that the committee would then send the results to President Pollack.
- x. G. Kaufman asked why Assembly members have to write their names on the ballot if the CRPC would be the only body to see the results.
- xi. J. Kim said that Dean Van Loan requested a roll-call vote.
- xii. G. Kaufman moved to call for a roll-call vote.
  - 1. O. Din dissented, saying that such an endeavor would be unimportant.
  - 2. G. Kaufman maintained his motion.
  - 3. V. Devatha asked whether or not the Assembly members felt uncomfortable having their names on the ballot.
  - 4. There was a general consensus among the body in the negative.
  - 5. G. Kaufman **withdrew** his motion.
- xiii. J. Kim said that members should give their ballots to John Hannan once they have finished them.
  - 1. J. Hannan is the Clerk of the Student Assembly.
- xiv. V. Devatha asked a clarifying question.
- xv. J. Anderson said that proposal CRP-A says that graduate students cannot have intimate relationships with faculty members in their own department, and that CRP-B does not include that clause.
- xvi. G. Kaufman said that CRP-B does require professors and graduate students in the same degree field to report their relationship to the administration, and that making people report to the University in this regard is not a good thing for the University to do.
- xvii. D. Barbaria said that voting for either CRP-A or CRP-B means that you are endorsing that particular policy, and that you can elect to vote for neither of them.
- xviii. V. Devatha asked E. Winarto what the general sentiment regarding these policies is on the GPSA.
- xix. E. Winarto said that sentiments are split roughly 50/50, with no clear prevailing opinion on either side.
- xx. R. Herz said that both proposals ban undergraduate relationships with graduate students.
- xxi. M. Valadez said that she would like to hear the sentiments of members of the CRPC present at the Assembly meeting.
- xxii. J. Anderson said that the policy regarding undergraduates and faculty is standard across most of Cornell's peer institutions, and that this policy is important.
- xxiii. R. Herz asked what the actual consequences of breaking the ban are.
- xxiv. G. Park said that it would end in suspension for the student and unpaid leave for the faculty member.
- xxv. Z. Schmetterer asked a clarifying question regarding relationships between undergraduate TAs and other undergraduate students.
- xxvi. J. Anderson said that not every relationship would have to be disclosed, only those where there would be academic authority.

## IX. Presentations

- a. Co-Chairs from the Committee on Organizational Structures in the Social Sciences
  - i. Ted O'Donoghue said that this is part of the review on social sciences, and that community feedback has told him and his peers that the social sciences at Cornell need further investment.
  - ii. A community member said that one large advantage of a potential merger between the College of Human Ecology (henceforth CHE) and the School of Industrial & Labor Relations (henceforth ILR) that was listed earlier would be bringing together a lot of the social sciences at the university, and asked why the proposed Center for the Social Sciences is not the focus if this is the case.
  - iii. Judy Appleton said that the Center for the Social Sciences is intended to be for research, and that the merger of CHE and ILR would be bringing together academic programs.
  - iv. T. O'Donoghue said that the ideas proposed are not mutually exclusive, and that there is no focus on one idea over any others.
  - v. A community member said that the proposal has no mention of the disastrous effects a merger would have on particular areas of organizational structures.
  - vi. J. Appleton said that when creating ideas, one parameter was that potential obstacles were to be ignored since they would inhibit creative thought, and that the community member's concerns are legitimate.
  - vii. J. Dominguez asked if this was the only proposal. He also asked if the College of Business yet had a dean.
  - viii. J. Appleton said that it currently has an interim dean.
  - ix. J. Dominguez said that there was not much support of the College of Business merger from faculty of the School of Hotel Administration.
  - x. J. Kim said that this is not a trial and that J. Dominguez can ask one question.
  - xi. J. Dominguez said he spoke to his constituents, and that ILR does not want this merger. He added that only 8 out of more than 50 ILR faculty were opposed to the merger, and that faculty support is critical for a merger to work.
  - xii. A community member asked the Committee members what their understanding of social sciences was.
  - xiii. T. O'Donoghue said that they cover a broad spectrum of disciplines and problems, and that it is hard to give an exact definition.
  - xiv. The community member asked T. O'Donoghue for his definition.
  - xv. J. Appleton said that the report on structures is a very concise report, and that the internal report addresses the community member's concerns.
  - xvi. The community member said that the internal report was not made public.
  - xvii. J. Appleton said that she is not sure that there is a reason she could not see it, and that the faculty of the departments listed in the internal report as social sciences were okay with being on that list.
  - xviii. The community member asked why it took a year before people came to get student input. She also asked why only two ILR faculty members were on the

committee, and why student and staff input seems to have been an afterthought.

- xix. J. Appleton said that the committee is a small faculty committee, and that the proposed ideas are ideas. She also said that the committee is now soliciting input broadly, and that the President and Provost are interested in what people have to say.
- xx. The community member asked whether or not J. Appleton and T. O'Donoghue speak as representatives of the committee.
- xxi. J. Appleton said that they can only ask questions posed to them.
- xxii. The community member asked whether the co-chairs would be opposed to a public declaration by the President and the Provost that the merger be abandoned.
- xxiii. J. Appleton said that the community has been dissolved, and that she and T. O'Donoghue are on a listening tour to collect feedback. She added that the President and the Provost can express their opinions as they wish.
- xxiv. J. Kim said that this discussion will be capped at 6:15 pm.
- xxv. Dustin Liu said that, as an ILR, he obviously does not agree with the merger. He also asked what the process would look like going forward.
- xxvi. T. O'Donoghue said that the process will evolve depending on how things go, and that many meetings are currently scheduled while feedback is being collected.
- xxvii. O. Din said that through conversations with CHE and ILR members, students have heard from their faculty members that the merger is rather far along and is pretty much set at this point. He asked if the merger would still happen even though students and faculty are so unified as being against it.
- xxviii. J. Appleton said that no decision has been made, and that it is not a done deal. She also said that this is a time to discuss ideas, and that she cannot be in the mind of the President or the Provost.
- xxix. A PhD student of ILR said that his research would have been impossible without the identity of ILR opening up opportunities for him. He also asked what internal review had been done with previous mergers.
- xxx. A PhD student of ILR said that if the merger continues to move ahead, the students, faculty, and alumni of ILR would continue to fight and mobilize publicly to ensure that the merger does not happen. He also referenced an earlier statement and asked what programs are on the metaphorical chopping block.
  1. The statement referenced was as follows: "...consider that areas of excellence today might not be focus areas of the future".
- xxxi. T. O'Donoghue said that no programs are at risk of being cut, and that it was not even a discussion. He added that the administration wants to have the flexibility to move with the frontier.

## **X. New Business III**

- a. Resolution 46: Opposing the Merger of the College of Human Ecology and ILR School
  - i. N. Hernandez moved to move Resolution 46 to Business of the Day.
  - ii. J. Kim requested that discussion happen before such a motion is made.

- iii. J. Anderson said that it is his belief that everyone agrees that the possibility of a merger is totally off the table, and expressed his disappointment that the Assembly could not receive an answer from the President or the Provost in regard to this initiative.
- iv. O. Din said that CHE overwhelmingly does not support the merger, and asked the Assembly to support this resolution.
- v. S. Parikh said that there are historical reasons why the majors of Development Sociology and Communications are in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and that she is against the merger.
- vi. O. Corn said that it is ridiculous that the merger is even being considered, and that the merger would destroy the individual brands of each college like the College of Business merger destroyed the brand of the School of Hotel Administration.
- vii. Z. Schmetterer said that he would like to offer a different take on the merger since opinions have so far been overwhelmingly negative, and that the public and applicants to the college do not necessarily understand the individual brands of each college. He added that, as a Policy Analysis and Management major, he almost did not apply to Cornell because he did not understand the concept of “human ecology”.
- viii. J. Anderson said that Z. Schmetterer’s point makes sense in some instances, but in regard to ILR, the brand would disappear if it were integrated into a college of social sciences.
- ix. Alexis Pollitto said that she also came to ILR because of its brand, and that she heard that the merger is in part due to widely reported college rankings. She added that Cornell will never be Harvard, and that student that are interested in taking ILR courses are able to since students can take courses across the undergraduate colleges.
- x. T. Ball said that he supports this resolution, but that there is no way there will be a merger because the student body and faculty will not let there be a merger. He also said that the Assembly should trust those assigned by the University to speak in the future.
- xi. O. Din said that the point of Resolution 46 is to continue that discussion.
- xii. A community member said that the moment where one assumes the administration has the best interest at heart is the moment where activism dies, and that she does not have an obligation to assume that two people who she has never met know her best interest.
- xiii. Nathanael Cheng said that this resolution is how the community shows that they are against the merger.
- xiv. A community member requested that anyone in attendance at the meeting who is in CHE or ILR raise their hand, and then requested that anyone who agreed with the merger put their hand down.
  1. Of those who raised their hands, no one put their hands down.
- xv. J. Anderson moved to amend the resolution such that “reconsider” in line 47 now reads as “oppose the idea of”.
  1. G. Kaufman dissented.
  2. G. Kaufman **withdrew** his dissent.
  3. J. Dominguez dissented, saying that the Assembly must be strong on the resolution.

- xvi. R. Herz said that the resolution should be concise, and that she opposes the merger.
- xvii. There was a motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes – approved.
- xviii. V. Devatha moved to amend the amendment such that “reconsider” in line 47 will now read “adopt the opinion of the Student Assembly on” – amended.
- xix. S. Iruvanti asked if there is support of the merger by graduate students.
- xx. A graduate student said that there was a meeting in which this was discussed, and everyone in attendance was against the merger on all levels.
- xxi. G. Kaufman said that the resolution has a lot of resolved clauses that won’t achieve the Assembly’s goal, and that the administration might be more open to the resolution if the resolution also stated the Assembly’s preference for a Center for the Social Sciences.
- xxii. J. Anderson said that everyone would prefer something other than the merger, and that the goal is to take this idea off the table, not to stop the dialogue.
- xxiii. D. Nyakaru moved to move this resolution to Business of the Day.
  - 1. N. Hernandez dissented.
  - 2. N. Hernandez withdrew her dissent.
- xxiv. N. Hernandez recommended that the resolution be amended such that it expresses opposition to this specific merger and any other potential merger.
- xxv. O. Din said that this was already established in the amendment.
- xxvi. L. Lipschutz said that this resolution is incredibly important since the administration has opened discussion in regard to the merger unlike the College of Business merger, and moved to vote.
  - 1. G. Kaufman dissented.
  - 2. L. Lipschutz withdrew his motion.
- xxvii. O. Din moved to extend the meeting by five minutes – approved.
- xxviii. G. Kaufman moved to amend Resolution 46 – failed.
  - 1. O. Din dissented.
- xxix. Motion to vote on Resolution 46 – approved 21-1-2.

**XI. Adjournment**

- a. J. Kim adjourned the meeting at 6:41 pm.

**XII. Executive Session**

Respectfully Submitted,  
*John Hannan*  
 Clerk of the Assembly