

Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the May 11, 2023 Meeting 11am – 12:15pm Zoom

I. Call to Order

a. Chair C. Ting called the meeting to order at 11:10am

II. Roll Call

- a. Members Present [11]: S. Parikh, L. Balestrieri, B. Terhaar, A. Vinson, A. Wang, K. Everett, C. Platkin, O. Moini, E. Ononye, C. Ting, R. DeLorenzo, P. Kuehl,
- b. Members Excused: A. Barry, D. Nachman, M. Bakri, N. Son, J.P. Swenson

III. Land Acknowledgment of the Gayogohó:no (Cayuga Nation)

a. Chair C. Ting stated the land acknowledgment

IV. Late Additions to the Agenda

a. None

V. Consent Agenda

a. None

VI. Open Microphone

- a. J. Kalinski urges the SA to better communicate meetings and meeting times as SA meetings are open to the public
 - i. C. Ting responds there was a very short turnaround time, but they will make sure his name is on the list-serv going forward

VII. Announcements and Reports

a. None

VIII. Initiatives

a. None

IX. Presentation and Forums

a. None

X. Business of the Day



- a. R. DeLorenzo motions to postpone Resolution 1 and appoint C. Taylor as the parliament for the meeting, passed by unanimous consent
- b. S. Parikh motions to move into debate on Resolution 1, passed by unanimous consent
 - i. P. Kuehl motions to add N. Wilson and the other organizers as sponsors to the Resolution, passed by unanimous consent
 - ii. C. Taylor motions to recess for three minutes, so that organizers can get on the call to present, passed by unanimous consent
 - iii. Resolution 1 is presented by S. Parikh
 - iv. R. DeLorenzo states that ending the "We Proudly Serve" partnership with Starbucks would not affect Starbucks, but Nestle and Pepsi co
 - v. K. Everett states we should consult with the student body maybe before making a move such as this
 - vi. N. Wilson responds that the Resolution is written in such a way that it will not affect Pepsi co
 - vii. N. Wilson and the other organizers provide background on the Resolution and why it is important to support it
 - viii. P. Kuehl asks if there are any financial ties between Starbucks and Cornell that do not involve Nestle or Pepsi?
 - ix. N. Wilson responds that there are two contracts to serve Starbucks. The Nestle "Proudly serving" contract and Pepsi co deal. They are targeting the "Proudly serving" program right now
 - x. C. Platkin asks how Starbucks profits from the "Proudly serving" program?
 - xi. G. Moravec responds that have reason to believe that Starbucks and Cornell are making a lot of money off of this partnership, but their Resolution and strategies to see the contract will let them know the exact details
 - xii. R. DeLorenzo states the contract is between Starbucks and Nestle, so even if the contracts were canceled that is not how Nestle makes it money and would make a very small impact for them
 - xiii. E. Sunshine states that Cornell students and the community is being affected by this issue, so we shouldn't be focusing on how much money Nestle will lose, but how it effects the community
 - xiv. S. Parikh responds the point of this Resolution is not the financial impact it'll have, but to stand up for the labor movement and against a company that has done so many bad things for our people
 - xv. E. Ononye asks how this would affect students monetarily?



- xvi. D. Donovan states they are not offering an alternative company, so they do not know how much it would cost. The purpose of this Resolution is to elicit student input on what they want.
- xvii. G. Moravec responds there are plenty of vendors who could provide coffee at a reasonable price, while treating their workers better
- xviii. A. Vinson motions to cut lines 18-19, passed by unanimous consent
- xix. K. Everett asks if the type of action for this should be legislation or a recommendation?
- xx. C. Taylor states it is listed as legislation because the goal was to enact action over Student and Campus Life, so this is legislation rather than a recommendation to administration
- xxi. K. Everett motions for a straw poll on changing the Resolution from legislation to recommendation
- xxii. P. Kuehl states it might be more powerful to make this a statement
- xxiii. E. Sunshine states that no company should be making a profit off of this, so doing something about this would be more powerful than a statement
- xxiv. N. Wilson states that this will send a message to other corporations that Starbucks is a toxic entity and not to be supported
- xxv. N. Wilson motions to vote, in a vote of 2-5 the motion fails
- xxvi. P. Kuehl motions to extend time by 15 minutes, passed by unanimous consent
- xxvii. A. Vinson states if they pass legislation, it will probably be vetoed, but if they do a recommendation, it might also just be cast aside
- xxviii. R. DeLorenzo states we do not need a Resolution to make an impact
- xxix. R. DeLorenzo motions to adjourn, P. Kuehl dissents so that other members can make their comments, R. De Lorenzo withdraws the motion
- xxx. S. Parikh states having this as legislation is the best option because it is a show of force and demonstrates that the SA stands with workers and Resolution 2 addresses most of the concerns about us not doing our homework
- xxxi. C. Platkin states there appears to be immense benefits to cutting this partnership off and it sends a message to other corporations. Making Cornell veto it also draws media attention to the issue
- xxxii. A. Vinson mentions that he has another piece of legislation related to this that he'd like to pass before the 21st
- xxxiii. A. Wang states she agrees with C. Platkin and it's important that Cornell takes a stand on this on an ideological basis because we have the school of ILR

- xxxiv. C. Ting clarifies that it takes 2-3 weeks to receive acceptances, rejections, and acknowledgments from the President and that historically they have gotten a lot of acknowledgments
- xxxv. P. Kuehl states he is concerned that we are doing everything we can to main the legitimacy of the SA
- xxxvi. P. Kuehl motions to amend the final clause to say "Starbucks-branded products" and in the first clause change "terminate" to "reassess," passed by unanimous consent
- xxxvii. R. DeLorenzo states that Pepsi co and Nestle do great things for Cornell from donations to on campus recruiting and targeting these products doesn't really target Starbucks
- xxxviii. A. Vinson states it might be important to find out who these people are that serve as connections between Nestle, Starbucks, and Cornell
- xxxix. A. Vinson motions to end debate, passed by unanimous consent
 - xl. In a vote of 10-1-0, Resolution 1 passes

c. S. Parikh presents Resolution 2

- i. S. Parikh explains the Resolution
- ii. P. Kuehl states we need to get our internal stuff figured out before we vote on any more Resolutions. This does not need to happen today and can happen when everything else is sorted out
- iii. C. Ting states that when requesting such documents, it is important that we cite the lines that allow us to access these documents and to not act with haste
- iv. C. Platkin states it is difficult to uphold Resolution 1 without having Resolution 2 as well
- v. S. Parikh states there is no reason we can't pass this Resolution today
- vi. S. Parikh motions to amend the final be it therefore resolved clause to say, "publicly release the full terms of any ongoing contracts and agreements with Starbucks Coffee Company and all contracts and agreements involving Starbucks branded products sold at Cornell University," passed by unanimous consent
- vii. A. Vinson motions to end debate, passed by unanimous consent
- viii. In a vote of 6-4-0, Resolution 2 passes

XI. New Business

a. None



XII. Adjournment

- a. P. Kuehl motions to adjourn, passed by unanimous consent
 - i. The meeting was adjourned at 12:14pm

Respectfully Submitted, Megan Birmingham Clerk of the Assembly