



MINUTES

Campus Welfare Committee

November 8, 2016

1:00pm – 2:00pm

Day Hall 316

I. Call to Order

1. Committees members in attendance: Joseph Anderson, Linda Copman, Ulysses Smith, Natalie Hofmeister, Aravind Natarajan, Sarah Park, Jeramy Kruser
2. Guests in attendance: Beth McKinney, Ted Schiele, Daniel Olbrych

II. Review of Web Accessibility Resolution

1. Draft of Web Accessibility Policy (2009)
 - i. Jeremy: make campus websites more accessible to folks with disabilities (and by extension everyone)
 - ii. Implement Section 508 standards
 - iii. Often wrapped in with other accessibility issues
 - iv. Previously did not have resources to provide training and correct 1000s of sites connected to Cornell domain
 - v. Goal: start somewhere
 - vi. How can we begin to make progress towards allowing anyone access to Cornell's biggest outreach to the public and largest tool used by faculty and staff?
 - vii. Resolution will set a standard across campus such that anything connected to cornell.edu follows Section 508 standards (will not correct existing sites but will apply to any future sites)
 - viii. To track and reward these efforts, scan all of cornell.edu and report back to CIT with compliance at each school
 - ix. Information will be provided to assemblies to track improvement over time
 - x. Can then reward assemblies that are making websites more accessible
2. Understanding Section 508
 - i. Does not actually apply to Cornell since not federal, but sets clear goals for website accessibility
 - ii. Developed to not exclude people with disabilities
 - iii. Part of a larger law (Rehabilitation Act of 1973) that is action behind ADA
 - iv. This is how to not discriminate against people with disabilities and
Cornell is not following this

We strive to make all meetings inclusive. If you are in need of accommodations for full participation, please contact the Office of the Assemblies at assembly@cornell.edu.



3. Discussion

- i. What resources do we have to make a new, compliant website?
 1. Team at CIT for custom web development (all trained in 508 standards)
 2. Current role of team is not training others to follow standards
 3. How to expand out this training? Online resources?
 4. Those who are administrators for sites should be responsible for educating themselves to meet Section 508 standards
 5. Training is not the focus of this resolution
- ii. What is a reasonable timeline for setting goals of compliance? When should cornell.edu be fully accessible? Why no deadline to write the standard?
 1. Intentionally avoiding setting a date in this resolution, and prioritizing a starting point
 2. All that's needed is for Cornell to comply with Section 508, since this standard already exists. Approval process may take time, but action itself is simple
 3. If resolution passed by UA, will go through president, trustees (although may not go to trustees)
 4. Expect that this process may take one semester to a full year. Trustees meet in December, so likely that standard could be approved by the end of spring semester
- iii. Currently no requirement for websites to meet Section 508 (either existing or future)
 1. However, SUNY institutions are required to make their sites accessible
 2. Section 503 does apply to Cornell: this focuses on hiring process for individuals with disabilities, but there is one line on making ICT (information, technology) accessible
 3. Section 503 does not extend to all websites
 4. Note that some institutions are being sued by the government because online resources are not compliant — making all sites accessible is critical

We strive to make all meetings inclusive. If you are in need of accommodations for full participation, please contact the Office of the Assemblies at assembly@cornell.edu.



- iv. Wendy Tarlow (counsel): Section 508 currently does not apply to Cornell, and only applies to federal agencies
 - 1. Just because it is legal for us to discriminate does NOT mean that we should do so
- v. Edits to resolution
 - 1. Remove WCAG in first resolution? Could take a much longer time to approve WCAG
 - 2. Line 42: add “by May 1” to set baseline standard since CWC will all still be here at this time
 - 3. To set tone of urgency, potentially reference lawsuits in a Whereas clause?
 - 4. Deadlines important in this legislative process, even though allowing space for developing accessibility is understandable

III. Tobacco-Free Campus Referendum

- 1. Referendum Process Outline
 - i. Brian addressing process of SA
 - 1. First, petition for a referendum (Student Assembly Referenda Tracker website) – any student can start, if 10% of student body signs a referendum, then that will be on the ballot for the next SA meeting
 - 2. Next, referendum is on ballot – include question with answers to vote on. Also, SA provides a list of all statements for the informative process.
 - a. Example: SA Referendum #30 on tampons and pads in bathrooms. Students voted in favor of this referendum.
 - 3. Campus-wide referenda using this secure election system are possible.
 - a. Hard to define who would be include
 - b. 2009 was the last time a UA referendum was held (UA Charter), no results from previous Rosewood Parking lot
 - c. Will outcome of referendum determine policy? Depends on question asked in referendum.
 - 4. Questions about process

We strive to make all meetings inclusive. If you are in need of accommodations for full participation, please contact the Office of the Assemblies at assembly@cornell.edu.



- a. Number of voters? 30,000 if all campus members included (faculty, staff, students) What about affiliates?
 - i. 50% +1 is yes? Nothing written in UA charter
 - ii. Write a resolution calling for referendum and specify what steps would be taken depending on outcome
- b. Referendum is information-gathering, not outcome-driven
 - i. Use information from referendum to guide resolution writing
 - ii. Question is should we start a health initiative to guide process, not should we ban tobacco
- c. What about writing something into charter to make rules of referendum clear?
 - i. Putting language on the process before doing the referendum is wise to clarify what will happen
 - ii. SA has language around process
 - 1. Roles of individuals in assemblies
 - 2. What is the voting period?
 - 3. Who can vote?
 - 4. There is a threshold check?
- d. What can questions be? Single question or a survey?
 - i. Survey is not a referendum (something like this would go through IRB)
 - ii. Office of Assemblies cannot share leading questions
 - iii. Question must be single yes-no question where yes is a call for action
 - iv. Voters can add statements that are linked to ballot
- e. Looking for support, not a decision

2. Referendum Language & Scenario Outline

- i. Linda Copman – draft of referendum
 - 1. Is there a consensus, and what would this process entail?
 - 2. Help people to understand why this process might not be so onerous
- ii. Ted Schiele — referendum with some information

We strive to make all meetings inclusive. If you are in need of accommodations for full participation, please contact the Office of the Assemblies at assembly@cornell.edu.



1. distill resolution from IC, list research, wording of resolution and two questions:
 - a. Shall the current policy be amended?
 - b. Shall the campus become tobacco-free, effective no sooner than January 1, 2018?

iii. Questions

1. Include current tobacco policy on ballot? Can include links when click “yes” or “no” to provide more information
2. How to start: referendum to get a feel for will of community, then use text from Ted’s resolution to move forward. UA can then vote on resolution that spells out steps of policy change.
3. End result: do you want a smoke-free campus or not? Before this, must explain what this would mean for Cornell
 - a. Pro could look something like Ted’s resolution (related to educational campaign)
 - b. Do some of this education before referendum is released
4. How do Ithaca policies apply to Cornell (point 10 in Ted’s resolution)? Don’t necessarily apply, but the city law makes Commons and other areas (incl. 25 feet around parks, mobile vendors) smoke-free.
5. Why does this need to be a referendum instead of call to action? See minutes from last meeting (10-25-16). Outcome of referendum will be included in resolution for future action (better than coming from top-down).

iv. Adjusting language of referendum

1. Linda: “Do you support a two-year initiative at Cornell to become a tobacco-free campus? The goal is to create a healthier university community and foster a campus culture in which tobacco uses are supported in their efforts to quit through awareness events, smoking cessation support programs, and community engagement?”
 - a. Question is neutral and yes is action-oriented

We strive to make all meetings inclusive. If you are in need of accommodations for full participation, please contact the Office of the Assemblies at assembly@cornell.edu.



- b. Don't want to imply that "yes" means Cornell will be smoke-free immediately (Brian). Could specify "no sooner than January 2018"
- c. No negative in questions since this is an aspirational referendum. However, tricky if it's not clear. How can we make it clear that this is a process?
- d. Use normative language?
 - i. "should the university adopt an initiative to become a tobacco-free campus in the next two years?" or "progress towards"
 - ii. "Should Cornell launch a two-year initiative...?"
- e. Second statement under the question: some community members choose to smoke despite awareness, and this statement may be too harsh
 - i. Go back to wellness question
 - ii. Want this process to be inclusive
 - iii. "adapt or quit" instead of just "quit" – hard to get through the day without smoking for those who are addicted
 - iv. information before referendum will help in clarifying
 - v. Avoid word quit? Instead use "tobacco reduction is supported"
 - 1. This is not talking about the users, which is important
 - 2. Must keep the person in mind
 - vi. "change behavior" is aggressive language
 - vii. "adapt" is a good word because implies adapting behavior to serve community
- f. Majority of voters in referendum, there will be no consequence since only 18% of population smokes
 - i. In description, ask those for whom there is no consequence to consider something

We strive to make all meetings inclusive. If you are in need of accommodations for full participation, please contact the Office of the Assemblies at assembly@cornell.edu.



- ii. However there IS a consequence via secondhand smoke that can be as severe as asthma attacks, affects health of those allergic for the rest of the day
- iii. Perhaps highlight the fact that everyone suffers for smoking on campus
- iv. There is a consequence but not necessarily a behavior change
- v. Referendum will spark conversation like this!
- g. California provides information in a mailed booklet, could disseminate pro and con arguments (covered in Step 4 which is a call for pro and con statements in the referendum process)

3. Educational Campaign Design

- i. Not discussed directly in this meeting.

IV. DDD (Deadlines, Dates, Deliverables)

1. Action items

- i. Jeramy Kruser will be adjusting Web Accessibility Resolution for approval by committee in Spring Semester
 - 1. Note that committee can vote via email
- ii. Ulysses will be emailing out 4 different options of referenda, and committee will vote

V. Questions

VI. Adjournment

- 1. **Next Meeting: Spring Semester (see Doodle poll)**

We strive to make all meetings inclusive. If you are in need of accommodations for full participation, please contact the Office of the Assemblies at assembly@cornell.edu.