



Cornell University Student Assembly

Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, March 7, 2019 Meeting
4:49pm-7:27pm in Memorial Room, Willard Straight Hall

I. Call to Order & Roll Call

- a. V. Devatha called the meeting to order at 4:49 pm.
- b. Roll Call:
 - i. *Present:* M. Adeghe [0], J. Anderson [0], D. Barbaria [0], C. Benedict [0], U. Chukwukere [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. Stefanko [1], F. Uribe-Rheinbolt [0], B. Weintraub [1], K. Wondimu [0], V. Xu [0.75]
 - ii. *Absent:* M. Smith [0]

II. Approval of the Minutes

- a. There was a motion to amend the February 28th minutes such that “URMIC” reads as “URMC,” and ISSA would be added as a listed organization in New Business section a, clause vii – **amended**.
- b. Motion to approve the February 28th minutes – **approved**.

III. Presentation from the Dean of Faculty Charles Van Loan

- a. C. Van Loan thanked the SA for having him, and said that he works on lots of things that concern faculty and students, and that he wants to talk about three things and get SA feedback on them. He added that the three things are the windchill event of January 30th, class meeting times, and student reservations.
- b. C. Van Loan said that, regarding meeting times, there has been a heightened interest in active learning, as well as interest in teaching for 75 minutes rather than 50, which creates some scheduling concerns that he would like to hear feedback about from the SA. He added that there are problems with morning classes in that many people don't show up to them, and that there is also the question of the 4:30-7:30 “free zone,” which they do intend to keep but with questions surrounding what can be put in the free zone, such as a study session. He also said that faculty like flexibility but they do need guidelines. He asked the Assembly if the free zone is being respected in their experience, and how it can be used in more careful ways.
- c. J. Anderson said that he thinks that the free zone needs to stay, and that they are in it at that moment. He added that he thinks that it provides holistic education for students to take a break before night classes start, and that it's especially important for student athletes who have rigorous schedules.

- d. C. Van Loan asked if J. Anderson thinks it would be okay if people decide to get together and teach a small class in that time if it were anonymous.
- e. J. Anderson replied in the affirmative, and said that if it turns out that one student can't make it in that time, the person responsible for organizing the class should say that multiple students have conflicts, such that one person doesn't feel singled out.
- f. I. Pavlov said that she would like to reiterate J. Anderson's point, and that as a student athlete she spends most of her time in the free zone at practice. She added that it is important for student health, since many students won't have lunch during the week and so having the free zone available for eating dinner is important.
- g. D. Barbaria said that he thinks that there would be times where some activities like standardized review sessions would be good, and that he thinks that the free zone is a good thing, and that moving official classes to that timeslot would not be a good idea.
- h. C. Van Loan asked if it would be okay to have a review session in that timeslot so long as there was an alternative timeslot available.
- i. D. Barbaria replied in the affirmative, and said that students deserve a time in the day where they don't need to do anything academic.
- j. C. Van Loan said that, regarding the windchill event, there is a group that decides if an event warrants the closing of the University, and that the group consists of about a dozen people including him and Ryan Lombardi. He added that each event is different, and that they've never had a windchill event, and that upon looking up how many days the temperature was 0°F or below since 1975, he found that there were 300. He questioned why this event was therefore the first time that the concern came up, and said that in retrospect there were some things that could have been done, such as the better distribution of resources regarding warm clothing. He also said that he collected comments primarily from students, and that some people don't have the clothing to handle these situations, and that he did hear about the petition to close the University for the day that got over 10,000 signatures. He asked the SA how they think things such as that should feed into these decisions, and said that there was a 12-hour period in which the windchill was between -20°F and -30°F, which happens two or three times every year considering the last thirty years.
- k. Tirenolu Onabajo said that her point was regarding the previous conversation, and that the free zone should be enforced, but that it's difficult to schedule a review session during the daytime. She added that they should stress that review sessions are okay in the free zone as long as there are available alternatives, and that they should be okay and doable at that time.
- l. M. Adeghe said that, regarding the weather, many people have long commutes in the morning, and that people can walk 15 to 30 minutes in -20°F to -30°F weather, but that Cornell said that people should stay inside for longer than that time. She added that the fact that Cornell students asked for a close and did not receive it seems wrong, in that the petition had 11,000 signatures, and 11,000 out of 14,000 undergraduate students is a significant number.
- m. C. Van Loan asked how it can be confirmed that everyone who signed the petition is a Cornell student.
- n. M. Adeghe said that she doesn't know that 100% of the signatures were from Cornell students, but that she'd have to assume that a lot of them were, and that she

doesn't know what the issue would be considering that it was only for one day off, and that maybe she just doesn't understand how the process works.

- o. C. Van Loan said that it is a judgment of safety, and that windchill is trickier than snow, in that there is an amount of snow that facilities staff cannot keep up with, but wind is not constant. He added that the commute distance is pretty serious, and that there are guidelines about a certain degree of windchill creating problems in a certain amount of time, and that it was a judgment call, but that he can see how it could go both ways. He also said that he looked at how many health center visits there were for frostbite, and that there was no uptick for that, but that he is not saying that this was pleasant.
- p. V. Devatha said that, regarding the legitimacy of petition signatures, there could be a more vetted venue for future scenarios which would be invaluable. He added that when there are significantly detrimental weather effects on campus, and classes remain open, there should be a relaxation of attendance policies on those days.
- q. C. Van Loan said that he sent multiple emails to that effect on the day of the event, and that another factor to consider is that there are lung concerns with windchill in addition to skin concerns, and that part of their messaging in the future should be to call attention to that. He added that he hears stories about professors that still play hardball with their requirements, so he's rethinking how to address this in the future, and that this can be a medical situation for some people, so he hopes there can be some accommodations in the future.
- r. N. Matolka said that he is going to reiterate a point that M. Adeghe made earlier, and said that, going forward, they would like to see more of the student voice incorporated in these kinds of decisions.
- s. B. Weintraub said that he thinks that this is something that they're all glad they can discuss, and that physical and mental health are both a concern here, and that walking outside for an extended period of time in these conditions does take a toll mentally. He added that on that day, he was outside for 5 minutes which is well under the medical limit, but that it felt like Cornell didn't value his feeling comfortable walking on campus. He also said that the medical information isn't the only thing at hand here, and that they also need to think about student mental health in events like this.
- t. C. Huang said that the Diversity & Inclusion Committee (henceforth D&I) spoke directly about this issue earlier in the week, and that many students said that this disproportionately harmed low-income students who cannot afford warmer clothing. She added that there were concerns regarding the 11,000 students whose concerns were not heard, and that the student body should have a voice in this process.
- u. C. Van Loan asked if there is something comparable to food insecurity that could be done for warm clothing insecurity.
- v. C. Huang said that beyond closing school, she knows that the SA is working on some things, but that she does not know what exactly could be done beyond that. She recommended that C. Van Loan look into it.
- w. Adam Klier said that he thinks they've discussed one of the potential miscommunications regarding clothing security, and that most faculty and staff commute by private vehicle, whereas most students commute by walking or by bicycle, which has more exposure. He added that that might have been what was communicated by the petition, and that they are trying to highlight the discrepancy.

- x. V. Devatha said that the discussion regarding 75-minute classes has not yet begun, as well as other topics that C. Van Loan mentioned, and that he is cutting off this conversation. He added that anyone who wants to reach out to C. Van Loan in this regard can do so.
- y. C. Van Loan said that accommodations are a very important and broad area, and that he is hungry for ways for students to approach faculty early on and talk to them about accommodations they might need later on. He added that if anyone has any thoughts on how to do that, he thinks that this is the number one thing they can do to improve that situation.
- z. S. Lim said that she thinks that not having to go to a professor at the beginning of the course is a kind of privilege, and that as an example, O. Din was working on exams during Ramadan last spring, and that she thinks that if the professors at the beginning of the semester had a message regarding that kind of thing it would be better, but that even then that is another burden for the student.
 - aa. V. Devatha asked if anyone else would like to discuss student accommodations.
 - bb. O. Egharevba said that religious accommodations were discussed in the Academic Policy Committee, and that the Cornell policy is modeled after New York State law, which is rather vague. He asked if there are any plans to solidify that.
 - cc. C. Van Loan said that the NYS policy isn't vague, and that it is a very strong message that accommodations have to be made. He added that they highlight these things to faculty and try to get people to understand the big picture, and that he thinks that it's pretty airtight for NYS that the accommodations must be met for religious purposes.

IV. Open Microphone

- a. No speakers at the open microphone.

V. Teach-Ins

- a. Presentations
 - i. V. Devatha said that there will be up to 20 minutes for the presentation, and that once that is complete, they will have 9 minutes for questioning. He added that there will therefore be six questions, each of them being from assembly members, with a 30-second asking time and a one-minute response time.
 - ii. D. Barbaria asked if ex-officio members who are not liaisons would be able to ask questions.
 - iii. V. Devatha replied in the affirmative.
 - iv. J. Sim said that anyone who wants to sign in regarding SA elections can see Dustin Liu, who has the sheet.
 - v. There was a coin flip to determine who went first; the coin landed on tails, which meant that the representatives of Cornell Students for Justice in Palestine (henceforth SJP) went first.
 - vi. The representatives of SJP made their presentation.
 - vii. V. Devatha said that everyone should be respectful during questions and answers, including SA members.
 - viii. D. Barbaria said that the other presentation should happen now, and questions and answers should happen after both presentations end, so that the chimes don't conflict with the presentation.
 - ix. There was agreement in this regard.

- x. The representatives of Cornellians for Israel (henceforth CFI) made their presentation.
- b. Q&A
- i. M. Shovik asked the representatives of CFI how they can explain the lack of infrastructure and development in areas that Israel has responsibility for, such as the West Bank, and highways that Palestinians are barred from using. She asked how an entire population can be barred from using those things.
 - ii. A representative of CFI said that the actions of the few have affected the many, and that they do believe that ideally in a Palestinian state, they should have access, but that in terms of security, the reality is that Israel cannot allow a lone terrorist or terrorist cell to move closer to the border. She added that this method has been deemed effective in doing so.
 - iii. G. Park asked a question regarding one of SJP's slides, and said that she is not understanding how the points of Boycott, Divest, and Sanction are related.
 - iv. A representative of SJP said that that is a fair question and an important clarification, and that the two are connected because at the end of the day, BDSing a country is a form of protest, and protest happens because of specific desired foals, and a way that the student body can do that is having Cornell divest from companies profiting off of this. He added that these companies would then not feel comfortable engaging in apartheid, and affects whether these practices can continue.
 - v. D. Barbaria asked the representatives of CFI what they think is the right way for them to proceed as individuals, since they have made it abundantly clear that BDS is not the best way to go about these changes.
 - vi. A representative of CFI said that they think it is not the solution because it addresses something apart from them, and that they would like to foster coexistence projects with peace and dialogue. She added that SJP asked its members not to come to this, which they find very hurtful because they would like everyone in the room together to hear both sides.
 - vii. A representative of SJP said that that is factually incorrect, and that the point of this conversation is not a fight, but a dialogue to teach the Student Assembly, since each of them will be biased in their own ways. He added that this is not a boycott of their own boycott, but that they want this to be the best space for the SA to learn both sides of this equally.
 - viii. K. Wondimu asked if BDS would inadvertently abolish the state of Israel, and asked who would be in charge if this were the case.
 - ix. A representative of SJP said that BDS isn't supporting a political solution to the conflict, but that it is a call for civil society to BDS the state of Israel. He added that this would not destroy the state of Israel, and that it endorses a more diverse and democratic Israel, where everyone there is given the same human rights. He also said that no person should be under the subjugation or occupation of another person.
 - x. S. Lim yielded.
 - xi. S. Iruvanti asked the representatives of CFI what kind of events they would be willing to work with SJP on, since they spoke about being willing to work with SJP to promote information on this topic.

- xii. A representative of CFI said that there could be an open table where they would discuss policy positions topic by topic, wherein they could move together and possibly even create a joint project together to show and make Cornell the emblem of a campus that works together.
- xiii. E. Shapiro said that CFI mentioned that SJP called for the destruction of Israel, and asked the representatives of SJP what their stance is on Israel and its right to exist. He asked what an ideal solution would be.
- xiv. A representative of SJP said that that is an important question, and that they first and foremost do not call for the destruction of the state of Israel. He added that they talk about the occupied lands such as Gaza which have no agency and are controlled by an outside power, and that the post that was addressed as a threat was not a threat.
- xv. Another representative of SJP said that the post was referring to businesses partaking in and profiting from occupation.
- xvi. T. Onabajo asked, regarding BDS as an exclusionary movement, why critiquing the Israeli state's activities implies critiquing a person. She asked why the representatives of CFI are conflating the idea of a state's activities and an individual's. She asked how BDS is an exclusionary conversation when there are Jews supporting it, as well as many other organizations.
- xvii. A representative of CFI said that she wants to make it clear that Israel is the only Jewish state, so when they put pressure on it, they put pressure on Jewish people. She added that they have Israeli people as fellow students, and that BDS presents a conversation of identity and is an exclusionary policy. She also said that they are trying to bring something onto this campus that hurts people.
- xviii. Another representative of CFI said that the third point of BDS is the full right of return for members of the Palestinian diaspora, which gets rid of the possibility of Israel being a majority-Jewish state, and that if this path were taken, it would be eliminating the only majority-Jewish state.
- xix. U. Mustafa asked who was responsible for the failure of the Camp David summits.
- xx. A representative of SJP said that these negotiation processes are long and are a power dynamic between two uneven people, and that they failed because assaults continue yearly. He added that just last summer, the nation-state law passed, and that Israel is not complying with any kind of peaceful actions with the question of Palestine.
- xxi. Another representative of SJP said that, as they mentioned, while these negotiations happened, they happened without any preconditions, and that because Israel continues to build settlements in this time, this conversation can't happen while this is happening.
- xxii. A representative of CFI said that the creation of the Palestinian Authority was a sign of peace, but that in 2005, a terrorist organization took it over which is hardly a sign for peace. He added that there are other improper brokers for peace, and that there is no partner on the side of Hamas and a weak partner in Mahmoud Abbas.
- xxiii. M. Adeghe said that she saw on the CFI slides that Israel is not an apartheid state, but that she did see on the SJP slides that by the UN's definition, Israel

is an apartheid state. She asked the representatives of CFI what their response is to that.

- xxiv. A representative of CFI said that an apartheid state implies the application of law on people, and that Arabs in Israel maintain all the rights of other Israelis. He added that many Palestinians want re-entry into Israel but are not granted this, and that this is to maintain Israel's self-determination, but that those in Israel are subject to the same laws as other Israelis.
- xxv. S. Harshvardhan asked how the representatives of SJP reconcile the fact that Cornell is an academic institution and that BDS includes academic boycotting.
- xxvi. A representative of SJP said that they are not here representing BDS, but that they are representing an upcoming resolution, and that they do not advocate for academic boycotts. He added that they do advocate for Cornell's \$6 billion endowment in that it carries political weight, and that it enables companies that profit from apartheid when it is invested in that way.
- xxvii. C. Huang said that the representatives of CFI said in their presentation that BDS is a false choice, but that they also said that if they support BDS, they do not support Jewish students, and asked how the representatives of CFI can reconcile these extremes.
- xxviii. A representative of CFI said that they are saying that BDS is suggesting that if someone supports Palestinian rights, they should vote yes on this resolution, but that this is not what that vote is. He added that there are other ways to support Palestinian rights without BDS.
- xxix. Another representative of CFI said that she wants to make a point that this conversation has so much nuance, and that the SA asked for this, but that this is not enough time to make a full decision. She asked that the SA hold off on a resolution that excludes a population on this campus.
- xxx. V. Devatha said that the meeting would recess until 6:30 pm.
- xxxi. The recess actually ended at 6:34 pm.

VI. Announcements and Reports

- a. I. Pavlov said that there would be a Town Hall on March 12th from 7-8pm in EHUB in Collegetown on a variety of topics, and said that assembly members should come.
- b. D. Barbaria moved to amend the agenda to include Resolution 31 now and to subsequently move it to Business of the Day – **amended**.
- c. D. Barbaria said that the Appropriations Committee (henceforth AppsCom) approved an allocation of \$1500 for Cornell Bhangra (henceforth Bhangra).
- d. K. Kebbeh asked if Bhangra asked for \$1500.
- e. D. Barbaria said that they asked for \$4000.
- f. K. Kebbeh asked why they only got \$1500 if they asked for \$4000.
- g. D. Barbaria said that there was a long debate about whether Bhangra should be given any funding at all, and that they were denied SAFC funding due to a clerical error. He added that AppsCom typically does not hear funding requests in response to clerical errors due to fairness, but that they decided with a small majority in this case that it was necessary due to the size of the event to give them some amount of funding.

- h. E. Shapiro said that he objected to the funding, and that it is extremely irresponsible for them to fund this. He added that SAFC has its own sets of rules, and that if organizations don't comply with those rules, they shouldn't be able to ask them.
- i. J. Anderson said that this is misleading because they are funding Pao Bhangra, and that he doesn't believe that this is part of their operations, but rather an exhibition. He added that it would be dumb not to sponsor this because the SA needs good PR, and that this shows how they support the community.
- j. D. Barbaria said that J. Anderson is not wrong in that this allocation is supporting the event, rather than the organization itself, but that the event usually consumes all of Bhangra's spring funding, and that it is therefore functionally part of their operations.
- k. V. Devatha asked if D. Barbaria could speak to the precedent that this sets.
- l. D. Barbaria said that the precedent is clear, and that it may be willing to fund organizations when they are denied SAFC funding. He added that this isn't a large precedent because it still requires a trip to AppsCom, and that he is required to defend the decision of AppsCom regardless of his own opinions.
- m. V. Devatha asked if this was subjective.
- n. D. Barbaria said that he would agree.
- o. O. Din said that he would reiterate J. Anderson's point that this is an event, and that in the past, some organizations have come to them asking for their entire budget after being rejected by SAFC.
- p. Discussion continued in this regard.
- q. D. Barbaria said that the intricacies of this are a little different because Pao Bhangra usually receives their lump sum in the spring, but that they didn't do that this year, so they only lost out on \$7500.
- r. V. Devatha asked why their budget wasn't approved.
- s. D. Barbaria said that it was due to a missing signature.
- t. S. Iruvanti asked how not funding Bhangra at all would affect Pao Bhangra.
- u. D. Barbaria said that the event will almost definitely happen, and that this is the second year they intend to use Pao Bhangra as a charity event, in which 100% of the proceeds will go to Cornell Welcomes Refugees. He added that this would potentially change if they are unable to find complete funding before the event.
- v. M. Adeghe said that they're down \$5000 but would probably get around \$8000 from their ticket revenue, and it could essentially amount to the SA paying their charity, and that she doesn't know if she is comfortable with paying for their charity.
- w. T. Onabajo said that if a single signature is the reason they aren't getting funding, this is a completely different story from an organization that didn't turn in their paperwork. She added that she doesn't think that this is setting a precedent if this is the singular reason they didn't receive SAFC funding.
- x. V. Devatha said that he would let Michael Jeong explain this, and that SA members should pay attention because this conversation is very similar to one they had last semester.
- y. M. Jeong said that this conversation happens literally every semester, and that there are about 100 groups per semester that get zero-funded because they miss a signature.
- z. D. Barbaria said that this would set a precedent for dozens of signatures every semester.

- aa. T. Onabajo said that there is so much more that goes into the budget process, and asked why there isn't more of a push to revise that system rather than continuing to penalize organizations.
- bb. D. Barbaria said that there is an effort in terms of education for higher-tier organizations, which get less funding. He added that typically when an organization misses a signature, they don't do it again for at least four years, and that the education is generally successful. He also said that there are individuals like O. Din who are looking to revise the signature method, but the question right now is for funding Pao Bhangra.
- cc. Discussion continued in this regard.
- dd. D. Barbaria called the question on E. Shapiro's amendment, but then withdrew it.
- ee. E. Shapiro said that this is the same event that happens every year, and that this is only the second charity year. He added that it is unfortunate that they missed an advisor signature, and that he has no problem with Bhangra, and that he met with them yesterday in his capacity as a member of CUPB and gave them funding, but that it is extremely irresponsible for the SAF to be funding this.
- ff. V. Devatha said that he thinks that it is inappropriate to fund an event in this regard, and that he thinks that this sets a dangerous precedent and unrealistic expectations. He added that there are around 100 organizations that fail to get the signatures every year, and that they had this conversation last semester, and that SAFC isn't properly funded to fulfill all the funding requests, which is why the appeals process isn't as friendly as they might like it to be. He also said that he has talked to D. Barbaria about two resolutions in this regard, and that neither have been passed, but that he hopes that this brings the conversation back to changing SAFC for the better. He added that, outside of that, they can't do this just for one organization, and that it could lead to every organization that gets zero-funded coming to them with the same request, and that they could not fund all of those, and so it would be unfair to fund only one.
- gg. J. Anderson said that he highly disagrees with V. Devatha's assertion, and said that this is an event, which is different. He added that they talk about the SAFC issue all the time, and that this is \$1500 for just one event. He also said that they deserve to have this money, and that they always talk about the precedent issue, but that precedent changes every year because the SA changes every year.
- hh. Discussion continued in this regard.
 - ii. J. Anderson moved to vote.
 - i. There was a discussion on what was to be voted on.
 - ii. There was a dissent.
 - jj. O. Din said that he agrees with what J. Anderson is saying, and that they talk about precedent a lot, but that what they talk about in meetings doesn't quite permeate outside of the meetings. He added that he thinks that it's important to mention that this conversation happened in AppsCom, and that they talk about special projects in AppsCom, which he defines as things that they think are important for the student body and that the SA should be involved with. He also said that over 1000 students go to Pao Bhangra, and that it is a salient way to use their money that creates a wide-reaching impact.
 - kk. D. Barbaria said that he will be voting in favor of this resolution because he has to so as to represent AppsCom, but that this is about promising to the student body that they can fund some events that are denied by SAFC. He added that assembly

- members should think about what they would say to organizations that come for similar funding that you would deny, and that Pao Bhangra cannot be special, and that it shouldn't be said that this doesn't set a precedent.
- ll. J. Sim said that as elected representatives, there are ways that assembly members can get points across without breaching decorum.
 - mm. J. Anderson said that if J. Sim would like to address his conduct after the meeting, that he should do so.
 - nn. J. Sim said that the precedent really matters, and that they shouldn't disregard precedent just because new members can be elected, and that as elected representatives right now, it is up to them to set precedent and not tell the student body that they don't care, but that they don't have enough money to fund everything.
 - oo. J. Dominguez said that he would like to tone this conversation down, and that this event is happening, and that they can all agree that they want it to happen, and that the question they are debating now is whether or not they want to give money so that Pao Bhangra can give money to charity. He added that this passed in AppsCom by only one vote, and that when assembly members vote on this, they shouldn't be scared that the event won't happen.
 - pp. There was a motion to vote.
 - i. There was a dissent.
 - ii. The member who made the motion to vote maintained their motion.
 - iii. There was a vote to vote – **moving into voting**.
 - qq. Motion to vote on overturning AppsCom's decision to fund Bhangra at \$1500 – **overturned** 14-12-1.
 - rr. D. Barbaria introduced the funding for B.O.S.S., which was funded at \$1020.
 - i. The funding was not overturned.
 - ss. D. Barbaria introduced the funding for the Pre-Medical Minority Mentorship Program.
 - i. The funding was not overturned.
 - tt. Resolution 31: Approving Special Projects Request for the Spring 2019 Ivy Native Conference
 - i. Motion to vote on Resolution 31 – **approved** 23-0-2.

VII. Business of the Day

- a. J. Sim moved to amend the agenda such that Resolution 29 would be discussed before Resolution 28 – approved.
- b. Resolution 29: Ensuring Student Representation in the IT Governance Process at Cornell Through the Establishment of a Standing Committee
 - i. J. Sim moved to amend the resolution as listed below – **amended**.
 - 1. Line 63 would now read “7 voting members” where it previously read “5 voting members”
 - 2. The clause “voting members” would be removed from lines 66 and 71.
 - 3. Language would be added at line 74 that reads “Two Student Assembly representatives – appointed by the voting members of the Student Assembly from among the said voting members
 - ii. Motion to vote on Resolution 29 – **approved** 25-0-1.
- c. Resolution 28: Amendment to the Spring 2019 Election Rules

- i. V. Devatha said that they have language based on the intent that was voted on last week by over two-thirds of the members present at the last meeting, and that over two-thirds thought it was important to engage in determining this language. He asked if everyone knows why they were doing this.
- ii. There was a general sense of a reply in the affirmative.
- iii. V. Devatha went through the new language, and then moved to amend the resolution such that instances of the word “fall” would be replaced with “spring”.
- iv. D. Liu said that he wanted to apologize for any conflict or bad blood from the prior week, and that this shouldn’t be an SA or TNC issue, since the SA has control of its own charter. He then discussed the TNC’s position on the issue.
- v. Manisha Munasinghe said that it is important to recognize that the eligible voters are different for each election, and that it is impossible for them to disentangle undergraduate and graduate voters from the trustee race, and that the voter base for each election is different.
- vi. Discussion continued in this regard.
- vii. D. Liu said that, in a situation in which a TNC candidate could not run for the SA due to the SA’s rules, they would automatically become the student-elected trustee (henceforth SET) because all the other candidates would be disqualified.
- viii. J. Anderson said that D. Liu’s assertion is true.
- ix. D. Barbaria said that he wanted to give a quick explanation as to what is going on, and that all twelve at-large seats are elected for the coming school year, of which six are undesignated. He added that people running for the undesignated seat (henceforth undes) are split into four categories: one for the President, one for the EVP, two for undes candidates, and two for undes candidates, losers of the President race, and losers of the EVP race. He continued to explain the situation.
- x. There was a motion to extend the meeting to 7:30 pm – approved.
- xi. E. Shapiro said that they can’t vote on this this week since it is New Business.
- xii. V. Devatha said that it is Business of the Day.
- xiii. J. Anderson said that the charter change involved is new, and therefore necessitates waiting a week to vote.
- xiv. M. Adeghe asked for clarification regarding the point that there is a TNC candidate who cannot run for the SA.
- xv. M. Munasinghe said that there is a candidate who vacated their SA seat, which means that they cannot run for a 2019-2020 SA seat.
- xvi. D. Liu said that this person would automatically be named SET because everyone else on the TNC ballot would be disqualified for also being on the SA ballot.
- xvii. D. Barbaria said that this charter change refers to the idea of an undergraduate-elected SET, which does not exist, and that undergraduates and graduates vote on the SETs, one of whom is an undergraduate student.
- xviii. O. Din said that D. Liu had mentioned that only a few SA people are running, but that he would argue that this underscores the issue that they are

talking about, in that SA members are actively disincentivized to run for this position due to the current rules.

- xix. V. Devatha said that the voter turnout point was included because the case was made by the TNC at the last meeting that voter turnout has decreased, and that that is an argument that can be made, but that it is one without any evidence. He added that the claim that this unfairly benefits SA representatives is ludicrous, and that the fact is that SA representatives and Class Councils representatives are being directly targeted, in that a candidate doesn't have to give up a position in BSU or ALANA or anything like that to run for SET, and that it is ridiculous that you do have to give up your SA position to run for SET. He also said that regarding it being too late to do this, he will be gone next year, and that he wants to do this because he thinks it is in the best interest for the SA for this to happen, and that he is fine with waiting another week so that they can pass this to start in 2019-2020 since there is no undergraduate SET race at that time, and that it is important to do this going forward.
- xx. O. Din said that the point of this is as a pseudo-bargaining chip so that the TNC sets their race so as not to conflict with the SA's, and that if the rules become irrelevant, then the SA should vote to remove them.
- xxi. M. Shovik said that they are trying to say that the schedule change is only for this year, and that they have no idea what is going to happen two years from now, and that she doesn't think that the charter change now is a good idea.
- xxii. M. Munasinghe said that she would recommend reaching out to non-SA members running for trustee, and that they have spoken to people who have said that they don't want to run for the SA.
- xxiii. D. Liu said that going forward, there will be a working group between the SA and the TNC to avoid this problem in the future, and that he doesn't think that this is necessary to put together a charter change, especially considering how it would be a late charter change.
- xxiv. There was a motion to table the resolution.
- xxv. There was a motion to table the resolution indefinitely.
- xxvi. Neither of the above motions were maintained.
- xxvii. V. Devatha said that the SA's memory is ephemeral, and that people didn't remember the problems with SAFC even though it happened last semester, and that it could happen in two years that this conflict happens again and people forget these conversations from today. He added that he doesn't trust the TNC as much as he wants to, and that they can phrase the language in the charter amendment should the resolution be brought back next week, such that it would detail the process in the case of a concurrent election and in the case of non-concurrent elections.
- xxviii. J. Anderson said that he would look favorably upon a motion to table once O. Din makes his point.
- xxix. O. Din said that he agrees that they don't know what things will look like in the future, which is why they are doing this now.
- xxx. Motion to table Resolution 28 – tabled.

VIII. Adjournment

- a. V. Devatha adjourned the meeting at 7:27 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
John Hannan
Clerk of the Assembly