

**Minutes – October 9, 2014**  
**Cornell University Student Assembly**  
**4:45pm – 6:30pm, Willard Straight Hall Memorial Room**

**I. Call to Order/Roll Call**

S. Balik called the meeting to order at 4:50pm.

Members present: S. Ali Khan, B. Bacharach, S. Balik, Y. Bhandari, W. Bitsky, M. Chak, J. Fridman, R. Gademsky, L. Goldman, M. Henderson, E. Johnston, V. Kejariwal, D. Li, E. Liu, L. Liu, R. Raglin, M. Stefanko, S. Tayal, P. Titcomb, D. Vakili, L. Wershaw, F. Yang, A. Zhou

Members excused: J. Batista, B. Brown, G. Kaufman

Members unexcused: M. Masson

**II. Approval of the October 2, 2014 Minutes**

Minutes approved by unanimous consent

**III. Open Microphone**

None

**IV. Announcements/Reports**

**United Student Body Update – S. Tayal**

International students have been receiving calls from a 607 number asking that they submit a tax of about \$1500, threatening to report non-payers to the police. Some students have lost money to this and he is in communication with the university about it.

Regarding United Student Body, a task force will be created to look over submitted DIPs.

**University Assembly Update – E. Johnston**

At the UA meeting earlier in the week, they discussed how the UA can open up to more civil discourse

**Community Life Committee Announcement – E. Johnston**

Will be creating an open forum

**Dining Announcement – R.Gademsky**

4 out of 5 dining halls have posted nutritional information online

**Slope Media Group and Big Red Bikes Reports – M. Stefanko**

AC is looking to continue seeing improvement from BRB regarding an electronic system and they were concerned about unique ridership. Regarding Slope Media, the AC was looking for their long term plan and also looking for them to consider where they fit in in the Cornell community as there are other media related groups.

**V. Business of the Day**

### **R.17: 2014 SAFC Allocation Appeals – M. Stefanko**

Cornell Progressive: AC believed the SAFC did not err in their funding decision. The organization had received an email from OrgSync saying their registration was approved. When the treasurer received an email reminder for providing electronic signatures for approval, it was ignored that the organization was not registered upon the deadline.

From organization president: He received two emails saying that the organization's registration status was approved and no emails stating that further action needed to be taken.

Film Club: AC believed the SAFC did not err in their funding decision. The organization requested funding for an event they claimed SAFC had funded in the past, which was not true, and they requested funds for 100 movie tickets but were not clear about their purpose.

Y. Bhandari asked Film Club for clarification on the movie tickets they requested. Response: The tickets are for members of the organization. In the past tickets have gone towards events on campus and they are looking to expand outside.

S.Tayal asked the SAFC co-chairs if they explicitly state anywhere that it is the responsibility of the organization to check their registration status on their OrgSync profile. He also asked for confirmation on the claim that the SAFC has funded the ticket event before. Response: Yes checking registration status is in multiple locations. The SAFC had funded \$150 in the previous semester and \$100 the semester before, but those events were on campus. This semester, they are requested over 5x previous amounts for off-campus events that are not expressly open to the entire Cornell community.

M. Henderson stated in regards to Cornell Progressive that even though they received an email, it does not relieve them of the underlying responsibility to follow the guidelines.

M. Stefanko brought up that at the AC meeting, a representative of the Film Club explained the ticket awarding process: members that show up to more meetings received more 'points' making them more eligible for tickets. Given that information, the AC felt they were safe in assuming that those tickets would not be equally available.

C. Cheng brought attention to Club Golf. They did not have their registration status approved by the deadline, but the AC voted that the SAFC erred in denying them funding. It's important to maintain the SAFC rules as has been done in the past for organization with the same situation. Response: An error that was on the SAFC's part was that at office hours, a co-chair said the organization's budget looked sound.

President of Film Club asked that the SA make their decision based on the resolution in front of them – additional arguments regarding the specific sections of the guidelines outlined in the resolution are the first the Film Club has heard of and is not what should be voted on.

**Call to question, seconded, approved by a vote of 18-2-0.**

### **R.18: Special Projects Funding: Ivy Leadership Summit – M. Stefanko**

\$1500 was requested for the Summit, to be held 11/14-11/16, but the Appropriations Committee felt some expenses were excessive (giveaways, etc.) and also reduced funding due to the amount of impact they expect from the event and ultimately granted \$340 for a guaranteed speaker's hotel stay.

L. Liu mentioned that the budget for hosting the summit was about \$6800, an appropriate number compared to other universities that have hosted Ivy Leadership events.

F. Yang asked how much is left in the fund and what would happen if more speakers were confirmed regarding hotel payments. He also recommends booking space now, as rates can change in a very short time span, and commented that the break rooms are beautiful, but expensive. Response: There is \$1500 in the fund and no other requests on the table, and the budget would be adjusted at the end of the semester to distribute any excess. L. Liu mentioned that they do have confirmed funding from other sources which could assist in covering additional costs.

S. Tayal was disappointed that EzRoots did not publicize SA sponsorship for their event and asks that the Summit does.

L. Wershaw asked about the \$30 registration fee and whether or not that would deter participants, especially Cornellians. Response: They did discuss that concern a lot, but they believe that it is only fair to have every participant pay the stated fee.

Y. Bhandari asked about inclusion of the Cornell community and if the summit would function financially since they are not receiving what they requested from the fund. Response: Usually Ivy Leadership events are closed, but they will be making the speaker a public event and in this way opening up to the community in a non-traditional way. Regarding finances, they will still be applying for funding elsewhere on campus.

L. Goldman asked what the Ivy Council usually does with its budget, and when they found out about hosting the Summit since if they found out earlier, funds should have been allocated in their budget at the onset. Response: The Ivy Council was founded 3 years ago and had been receiving \$400 per year to cover transportation costs to Ivy Leadership events. They did not find out about the Summit early enough to add that to the budget, otherwise they definitely would have.

**Call to question, seconded, approved by a vote of 18-0-0.**

## **VI. New Business**

### **R. 19: Improve Lighting & Fix Walkway on Libe Slope – S. Ali Khan**

Libe Slope is lit by the War Memorial flood light, but does not provide visibility to the northwestern side, which is a physical danger to students. They have discussed lighting with different departments and everyone has been receptive.

Y. Bhandari asked if any additional action would be taken regarding other poorly lit areas on campus. Response: This resolution represents a student concern regarding a specific area of concern.

P. Titcomb mentioned that the university might be concerned about the aesthetics on the slope. Response: The resolution is phrased in such a way that illumination can be provided in any way that is seen best.

M. Chak asked if Blue Light would be implemented on the slope. Response: no.

S. Balik adjourned the meeting at 6:35pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Chelsea Cheng