



# Cornell University Student Assembly

## Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019 Meeting,  
4:45-7:29 pm in Memorial Room, Willard Straight Hall

### I. Call to Order & Roll Call

- a. J. Anderson called the meeting to order at 4:45 pm.
- b. Roll Call:
  - i. Present: M. Adeghe, J. Anderson, M. Baker, C. Benedict, A. Cass, U. Chukwukere, J. Clancy, O. Egharevba, J. Feit, C. Huang, J. Kroll, Y. Li, G. Martin, N. Matolka, L. Ordonez, I. Pavlov, T. Reuning, L. Smith, P. Solovyeva, S. Sun, N. Watson, B. Weintraub, S. Xu, V. Xu, J. Youngblood, Y. Yuan
  - ii. Absent: K. Wondimu (excused)
  - iii. Arrived After Roll Call: M. Haddad (excused)

### II. Presentation

- a. Title IX Office
  - i. Chantelle Cleary and Theoria Cason introduced themselves and presented.
  - ii. U. Chukwukere asked what steps have been taken to conduct the external review of Title IX at Cornell.
  - iii. C. Cleary said that she is not sure that there has been an external review, and that she has been at this office since June 2018, and that certain standards were adopted in 2016 following the speaking out of the campus community, but that there has not been any external review since that time.
  - iv. T. Reuning asked what training the panelists in the office go through specifically regarding LGBT cases. He also said that New York State recently banned trans-panic defenses, and asked if Cornell would be following suit.
  - v. T. Cason said that people in their office go through quite a bit of training, and that the folks facilitating the interview are trauma-informed, and interviews are conducted in such a way to make the least amount of harm. She added that they are involved in initiatives annually such as attending conferences or lectures, such as understanding allyship and how to be a better ally, and that their panel members are trained by our office in addition to other advisors. She also said that C. Cleary outlined the timeline of facilitating training, and that the next iteration that they're planning will happen in January 2020, with the previous one having been in January 2019 and focusing on making sure that people could hear all the information presented to them in an objective way to evaluate all the facts objectively and offer a determination of responsibility, as well as evaluating internal bias. She added that their future plans involve materials pertaining to but not specific to LGBT people, and that it is their intention to take intersectionality into

consideration, but they must provide information in such a way so as to not unintentionally create a framework that makes panel members favor one person based on their identity, and that they need to make sure that panel members are given objective information.

- vi. T. Reuning asked if T. Cason could answer his second question.
- vii. T. Cason asked what that question was.
- viii. T. Reuning said that it was regarding whether or not Cornell would follow New York State in banning trans-panic defenses.
- ix. T. Cason replied in the affirmative.
- x. M. Haddad asked what would take place if a student decided to pursue action now regarding misconduct from a staff member prior to the change this past June.
- xi. C. Cleary said that it would be a hybrid of the two policies, in that they would follow the procedures passed in June, but the definition used for misconduct would conform with the definition and policy in place at the time of the misconduct, and that this is standard legal practice that would also happen in the case of a crime.
- xii. B. Weintraub asked how the Title IX Office looking at faculty and staff would intersect with EEOC and Title VII.
- xiii. C. Cleary said that their office now oversees Title VII as well.
- xiv. B. Weintraub asked if students with EEOC concerns would go through this office as well.
- xv. C. Cleary said that they do if it is committed by a faculty or staff member, and that those committed by students would do so through other manners.
- xvi. I. Pavlov asked what else the office would do to decrease the stigma around Title IX and spreading the word about what they do.
- xvii. C. Cleary said that they do need to do better in getting out there, and that one step is being at the SA, and that when they started they were particularly focused on building their team and got out as much as they could in that time. She added that they engage with students whenever students want, and that they have partnered with student groups like ConsentEd, and that they always offer to participate in training with student groups and have been involved a lot with RAs. She also said that they hope to get out there more now that they are fully staffed, but that they also need invitation, and that they hoped that this would be the first step in assembly members getting the word out to their constituents.
- xviii. T. Cason said that she would like to urge everyone that if there is an interest in reaching out to their office to simply expand their knowledge capacity around the issue, since there may be students passionate about being agents of change who are not as informed. She added that it is important to understand that they remain an administrative process, and so there are limits to what they can do, and that there is dissonance between what they are able to do and what students would like for them to do.
- xix. J. Clancy asked if the presenters could elaborate on the residential accommodations mentioned in the presentation.
- xx. C. Cleary said that if a student experiences violence off-campus and doesn't feel comfortable where they are living, the office can give them emergency housing for a period of time and help to find housing for them elsewhere.

She added that residence hall students in such a situation can be moved at no cost, and that sometimes students who committed a violation will be moved, but only after the investigation is finished.

- xxi. L. Smith said that C. Cleary said that the office is fully staffed but also mentioned growth, and asked where the presenters see the office growing in the future.
- xxii. C. Cleary said that she would like to withdraw the sentiment that they are fully staffed, and that they need more people, especially to work with T. Cason, as she trained 20,000 people this year, and that some other people in the office helped her out, but that it was mostly her. She added that most of the training that T. Cason did was invitation, and that this has been a barrier to her doing more strategic and preventive work, and that they are advocating for more support in that space. She also said that the Campus Climate Survey indicates that reports are going up which is a good thing, not in the sense that things are happening, but in the sense that they are hearing about it, and that every report is an opportunity for the university to support that person. She added that they want reports if violence is still occurring, which they think it is, so that they can provide resources, and that as reports increase there will need to be more staff. She also said that if they are going to make real change, the office has to be staffed, and that they are constantly making that argument, and that Cornell hears them in this. She added that she comes from the SUNY system, and what she has noticed is that Cornell has one of the most resourced Title IX offices out of all the institutions she has worked with, which is a good thing.
- xxiii. V. Xu said that she was looking at the report system, and asked what the timeline looks like for students after they submit a non-emergency report.
- xxiv. C. Cleary said that a student who experiences something urgent should not contact their office, as they are not emergency response, but to call the police. She added that when someone does use the reporting form, the report comes to them, and the reports are checked during normal business hours, and that they are monitored over the weekend but are not all responded to in that time. She also said that they do not initiate an investigation without talking to the person with the experience beforehand, except in a very few circumstances, and so the first thing they do is reach out to that person, give them their options, and ask them how to proceed.
- xxv. V. Xu asked what the presenters would want students to know as a resource.
- xxvi. C. Cleary said that she thinks that the most important resources for these students are the confidential resources, such as the Cornell Victim Advocate, the Tompkins County Victim Advocate, the Ombudsman, and others, and that students can go to those resources and speak to people without reports being made to the office. She added that they want students to come to them in an informed way, and that students should first be referred to a confidential resource.
- xxvii. J. Anderson said that he wanted to reiterate to the public regarding last week's meeting that it was not his best meeting, and that processes and procedures are something he is still learning, and that this is a growing opportunity for him. He added that he appreciates the forgiveness that the assembly members have been able to give to him, and that expectations of

perfection for students translates to expectations of perfection for assembly members, which isn't necessarily fair, and that he thinks that it is important to recognize that they are all students first and still learning things.

### III. Open Microphone

- a. No speakers at the open microphone.

### IV. Announcements

- a. Special Projects Funding
  - i. M. Adeghe said that Social Enterprise at Cornell just put on an event regarding social involvement in the business sphere, and that they requested \$3900 but were given \$1750, since the event already happened and only 25 people attended, and so they felt that \$3900 for such an event would not be a wise use of their money.
  - ii. M. Adeghe said that Art Beyond Cornell does art projects with incarcerated youth and compile a booklet of all the art done with the prisoners at the end of the semester, and that they requested \$750 which was granted to them in full.
  - iii. There was discussion regarding whether the amount Social Enterprise at Cornell was funded at warrants the passing of a resolution.
  - iv. M. Adeghe said that the Muslim Educational and Cultural Association had an event at the end of September that was a banquet with about 200 students, and it was great for both the Muslim community on campus and the greater Ithaca community, and that they asked for \$1000 and were given \$750, largely because the event had already occurred.
  - v. There was a motion to consider Resolution 10 next – approved.
- b. N. Matolka said that next Wednesday will be the next SHBAC meeting, and that the committee is open to everyone to learn about the student health plan over the course of the semester, as well as to have a say about what the student insurance plan will cover. He added that it is important that they have a lot of people coming to this over the semester, and that it will be on Wednesday from 4:30 to 6:30 pm.

### V. New Business I & Business of the Day I

- a. Resolution 10: Transfer of Funds from SAFC.
  - i. J. Anderson and Daniel Hirsch presented the resolution.
  - ii. There was a motion to move the resolution to Business of the Day – approved.
  - iii. M. Haddad asked how the moving of the surplus will affect what SAFC will be asking for from byline for this coming cycle.
  - iv. D. Hirsch said that they have already put in their request, and that this money is coming out of rollover money that groups haven't spent, and that this would not change their allocation whatsoever.
  - v. M. Haddad asked if this would be able to be used as surplus for the next byline cycle in case this resolution doesn't pass.
  - vi. D. Hirsch replied in the affirmative and said that this is more of a cushion, rather than something that they budget for.
  - vii. Y. Yuan said that he doesn't understand about giving \$30,000 to ALANA, and that he understands the mission of ALANA, and that it does support a lot of marginalized people and groups, but that this sounds unfair for other clubs and groups that represent these people but are not under the ALANA umbrella.

- viii. J. Anderson said that if they look at other similar groups such as Haven, ALANA has historically been using a large surplus, and that there was an expectation for a larger budget, and that this year they are trying to adjust, but that there has been an outpouring of need for organizations funded through ALANA. He added that this is necessary to fund key programs for these groups, and that this year, the \$30,000 from the past surplus isn't there, so this action is necessary, and that it is important to keep one of the largest organization's funding since they help so many people, and that it keeps them at the same level that they were anticipating.
- ix. C. Benedict said that he can highlight the impact that the lack of surplus has had this year for NAISAC, and that when they submitted their budget last year, they did so for \$6000 while counting on a surplus of \$2000. He added that when fall came around and they found they didn't have the surplus, there was some miscommunication and that it turned out their budget got turned down to \$4000, which really hurt them, and is one of the biggest reasons why they submitted a special projects request this semester. He also said that this is necessary for the ALANA organizations who have been negatively impacted by this.
- x. N. Matolka asked what has been done with the surplus in the past, and asked whether or not the surplus would likely appear again.
- xi. D. Hirsch explained the history of the SAFC surplus.
- xii. J. Anderson said that a lot of the work they are doing in the SAFC Transformation Committee is figuring out how loose SAFC was being with guidelines, and that the surplus is now building because the guidelines are becoming more strict, which is why they are addressing it this year.
- xiii. U. Chukwukere said that he would like to reiterate that he does not think that the \$30,000 set aside for ALANA will be enough, but that it is a good step, and that they see that the amount that they need for money is crazy. He added that they've had to slash a lot of the programming for this year and that they have needed to look through other sources for money that normally would have come from ALANA, and that these organizations are now struggling. He also said that Black Students United has normally been able to fund their 35 sub-organizations in the past, and that the sub-organizations of each ALANA organization are hurting.
- xiv. Motion to vote on Resolution 10 – approved 27-0-0.
- xv. P. Solovyeva moved to consider Resolution 9 next, since they were originally lined up for 5:10 pm, and it is now 5:46, and there are speakers waiting – approved.

## VI. Business of the Day II

- a. Resolution 9: Establishing a Representative Voting Member for the Dyson School on the SA.
  - i. P. Solovyeva and five other students began to present the resolution.
  - ii. B. Weintraub moved to have a strawpoll on the resolution.
  - iii. There was discussion on this.
  - iv. P. Solovyeva moved to have the strawpoll be conducted with placards rather than iClickers.
  - v. There was discussion on this.
  - vi. A strawpoll was conducted with placards, and indicated a strong majority in

- favor of the resolution. No official count was taken.
- vii. P. Solovyeva asked if anyone had any clarifying questions.
  - viii. A. Cass said that they support the resolution, and asked if Dyson students would also vote for CALS representatives if Dyson is given a seat.
  - ix. The first presenter said that they would just vote for the Dyson representative.
  - x. G. Martin asked if this is indicated in the resolution.
  - xi. P. Solovyeva said that the resolution states that Dyson will receive a representative seat, and that they will be represented by the Dyson representative.
  - xii. M. Adeghe said that she does have a concern with this, and that it might be from her misunderstanding of the structure, but that if AEM is still part of CALS, then she does not feel comfortable with this. She added that she understands that there is a College of Business, and that she would therefore think that they should create two seats for the College of Business up for grabs either by Hotel School students or by Dyson students.
  - xiii. The first presenter said that when Dyson was created in 2011, they were under CALS, and that they were brought under the Johnson when the Johnson was created. He added that Dyson does not fall underneath CALS, but it falls under Johnson and is identified as a separate school.
  - xiv. D. Nyakaru asked if Dyson students who are New York State residents pay in-state tuition.
  - xv. The first presenter replied in the affirmative.
  - xvi. G. Martin asked how current Dyson and AEM students felt about how they were mis- or underrepresented by the CALS seat.
  - xvii. The first presenter said that he thinks that that is strong wording, and what they all want to see is that there is communication between them and the SA, and that they want to be part of what's going on at the SA. He added that it reinforces what the SA is doing, and that they can acknowledge a voice on campus that wants to be part of what they are doing.
  - xviii. G. Martin asked how many Dyson students in the past few years have run for the CALS seats.
  - xix. The first presenter said that he is unsure that there's been much continuity between CALS and Dyson in the SA in the past.
  - xx. G. Martin asked if he believes that that is because they don't feel an affiliation for CALS, or if it is for some other reason.
  - xxi. The first presenter said that it's partly that, and that not only do they feel like they would not represent CALS, there also hasn't been much advertisement for a Dyson student running for that seat in their college.
  - xxii. The second presenter said that when Dyson was created and then moved into Johnson, there's been a very heavy movement with the social media team to stop referring to them as AEM majors, and that they are members of the Dyson school. She added that they are Dyson students studying AEM, and that incoming students cannot apply to CALS and choose to major in AEM, and must instead apply to Dyson and major in AEM.
  - xxiii. The first presenter said that that is a good distinction, and that they are more than a major, and that they have their own admissions processes, their own administration, and their own programs, among other things.

- xxiv. L. Smith asked whether or not Dyson has a large transfer population.
- xxv. P. Solovyeva replied in the affirmative.
- xxvi. L. Smith asked if this includes internal transfers.
- xxvii. P. Solovyeva replied in the affirmative.
- xxviii. L. Smith asked if a lot of the transfers are coming from CALS, and where the general sources of the internal transfers are coming from.
- xxix. The first presenter said that he does not know what the net gain or loss is, and that most transfers he has spoken to transferred from ILR or from Arts & Sciences, rather than from CALS.
- xxx. I. Pavlov said that she is a little confused, and asked if the presenters foresee Dyson moving entirely out of CALS, and that looking at it right now, AEM is still a major in the school, and AEM majors pay in-state tuition, which means to her that it is part of CALS.
- xxxi. The first presenter said that there's an important distinction to make here, and that students cannot be held accountable for how Cornell wants to view students in trying to attend college affordably.
- xxxii. I. Pavlov asked why it wouldn't be then that they could also vote for the CALS representatives, and asked if they don't feel like they can gain any representation from them.
- xxxiii. The first presenter said that this is absolutely the case.
- xxxiv. I. Pavlov asked if someone could speak to what representation they could get with an SA seat.
- xxxv. The third presenter said that Dyson has its own diversity and inclusion problems since they are a separate school, and that the way life works right now, they do run into different problems, and so Dyson students want their voices to be heard, and this is them asking for a distinct voice.
- xxxvi. M. Haddad asked whether or not both Dyson and SHA are under the Johnson School.
- xxxvii. There was a general reply in the affirmative.
- xxxviii. M. Haddad asked if they could therefore name two seats for the Johnson School, with one being for SHA students and the other being for Dyson. She asked how the presenters would feel about that.
- xxxix. P. Solovyeva said that she would like to respectfully reject that proposal, and that when the college was founded, it was said that each college would continue to have its own identity, and that one of the main benefits stated in this was to encourage the development and better environment of Cornell's business programs. She added that it was emphasized that each school would maintain their autonomy, and so having those two seats would not make sense.
  - xl. V. Xu asked the presenters what some issues they would like to see addressed would be.
  - xli. B. Weintraub said that this question was just answered.
  - xlii. There was discussion in this regard.
  - xliii. The first presenter said that, without them being here today, no one in Dyson would have heard the Title IX discussion, as an example.
  - xliv. T. Reuning said that he supports this resolution, and said that he knows that AEM majors' schedules are selected for them as freshmen to a certain extent, and asked if they are restricted by CALS graduation requirements. He also

asked, if this is the case, whether or not losing that say in CALS representation would hurt them for graduation. He also asked whether or not Dyson has graduation requirements not governed by CALS.

- xliv. The first presenter said that they do have graduation requirements specific to their major, and that there is some overlap with CALS, but it largely wouldn't affect them. He added that he doesn't think that the SA has much control over that sort of thing.
- xlvi. T. Reuning said that there are major requirements and college requirements, and asked if Dyson has its own college requirements.
- xlvii. The first presenter replied in the affirmative.
- xlviii. S. Sun said that 55 of the 120 credits required to graduate must be from CALS.
- xlix. B. Weintraub said that regardless of whether the representatives are called College of Business representatives, Dyson and SHA are very different schools, and that he can say that he is not in Dyson, while the presenters can say they are not in SHA. He added that there are opportunities for collaboration between all the colleges, but that they are two different schools and that's the way it is. He also said that he hopes that it will remain this way, so that there will be no reason to call these representatives College of Business representatives, and that they will remain the SHA representative and Dyson representative. He added that it looks like the SA is mostly in favor of this, and so he would urge the assembly members to vote.
  - 1. B. Weintraub moved to vote on the resolution.
    - 1. P. Solovyeva moved to have the resolution voted on with placards.
    - 2. There was discussion in this regard.
    - 3. The motion to vote was withdrawn.
  - li. M. Adeghe said that she wanted to bring attention to some things that she put in the SA Slack, and that she doesn't want to die on this hill, but that she is seeing too many discrepancies to be comfortable supporting this.
  - lii. P. Solovyeva asked if M. Adeghe could specify these discrepancies.
  - liii. M. Adeghe said that, going back to the structure she opened with, it says that AEM is still in CALS despite being in Dyson, and that she knows that the presenters have said that they are not part of CALS, but the SC Johnson website says they are. She asked why it is that the presenters are saying that that's not the case.
  - liv. The first presenter said that it isn't the case, and that there are discrepancies online because there are some bureaucratic processes above student paygrades. He added that AEM is funded by CALS and by the Johnson, and since Cornell is so siloed it's hard for everyone to get into the same room and match up the information.
  - lv. M. Adeghe said that their information is the same, but it's not the information that the presenters are giving her.
  - lvi. P. Solovyeva said that Dyson has its own separate statistics and enrollment numbers, and that it is a completely separate school that is independently operating under CALS. She added that it has its own culture, and that Dyson is its own entity and not a department.
  - lvii. The first presenter said that his belief in talking to many of the professors in Dyson today as well as the dean is that Dyson's roots came out of the culture



- of CALS, and the reason that this is in here is to get the message out to people into agricultural science but also want to use business.
- lviii. The second presenter said that this is her first time being present at something like this, and that her understanding is that the point is to give fair representation to all students. She added that every class she is in is with Dyson students, and that she does not interact with CALS students in her life.
  - lix. The fourth presenter said that it matters more what the students feel, and that they do feel that they are very disconnected from CALS students and that they want fair representation.
  - lx. The fifth presenter said that CALS is a very large school, and so being in CALS dilutes what they want in fair representation, and it doesn't give a proper voice to them.
  - lxi. J. Feit said that he couldn't have said it better, and that the point of the SA is to make sure that student perspectives are heard, and that this is perhaps a great instance of SA gerrymandering. He added that he is not a Dyson student and yet he represents them, and that this would not have any bearing on change in funding from the state government, and that in-state tuition would remain the same. He also said that this wouldn't create a new school, and that what they're doing is offering representation, all they are doing is allowing a perspective not represented here to be represented here.
  - lxii. P. Solovyeva asked if J. Feit, as a CALS representative, approves of the creation of a Dyson representative.
  - lxiii. J. Feit said that he approves of it 100%.
  - lxiv. J. Youngblood said that he doesn't feel like Dyson students would be in danger of being overrepresented with this.
  - lxv. N. Matolka made a further point.
  - lxvi. G. Martin said that he thinks there becomes an issue on what they base on uniqueness, and that it has been said that Dyson doesn't feel represented by CALS, but Arts & Sciences has the most diverse set of majors.
  - lxvii. The first presenter said that they would like to clarify that Dyson has an admissions process like Arts & Sciences has that is separate from CALS, and that his understanding is that students applying to Arts & Sciences apply to the school itself, rather than to a major.
  - lxviii. T. Reuning said that the students presenting the resolution are speaking to the assembly about advocacy, and that assembly members should not be condescending toward them regardless of what position they hold regarding the issue.
  - lxix. There was a motion to vote.
    - 1. There was a dissent.
    - 2. The motion was **withdrawn**.
  - lxx. I. Pavlov moved to amend the resolution such that line 64 would now read "Be it finally resolved, that the Student Assembly CALS representative no longer represents students in the Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management".
  - lxxi. An assembly member asked when this change would take effect.
  - lxxii. P. Solovyeva said that it would go into effect next semester.
  - lxxiii. Motion to amend Resolution 9 – **amended** 25-0-1.

lxxiv. Motion to vote on Resolution 9 – approved 25-0-1.

**VII. Approval of the Minutes**

- a. October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019
  - i. An assembly member said that P. Solovyeva was late to the October 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, rather than absent, and that this should be reflected in the minutes.
    1. Changes to improve the accuracy of the roll call do not require a formal motion to amend; as such, there was none here.
  - ii. Motion to approve the October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019 minutes – approved 25-0-1.
  - iii. There was a motion to extend the meeting to 6:40 pm – approved.

**VIII. Byline Reports**

- a. Athletics and PE
  - i. M. Adeghe said that Athletics and PE asked for \$9.08 and were given that amount, and that most of that money goes to funding sports passes, with the rest going to marketing.
  - ii. Motion to approve Athletics and PE's byline funding – approved 24-0-1.
- b. CUTonight Commission
  - i. M. Adeghe said that CUTonight has had issues in the past and were out of commission for a while in the spring of 2018 into the fall. She added that they are now back and doing what they are meant to be doing, and that they requested an increase from \$7.82 to \$9.00. She also said that CUTonight is a funding organization for events that happen at night between 8:00 pm and 2:00 or 3:00 am and that provide a non-Greek life alternative to weekend events. She added that the committee felt that they should get \$8.50 while getting back onto their feet after not running for about a semester and a half.
  - ii. G. Martin said that CUTonight funds nighttime events on campus, and that part of this is funding sober events. He asked if this was taken into consideration by the committee in making their decision.
  - iii. M. Adeghe replied in the affirmative, and said that they do acknowledge that they are great for providing non-Greek life and non-alcohol-based events. She added that the times for CUTonight events are prime frat party times, and that this was taken into consideration.
  - iv. U. Chukwukere said that he was in the CUTonight meeting, and that he does want to acknowledge that CUTonight has a large amount of influence on campus and provides options for students, and that he believes that the reason for not wanting to give full funding at \$9.00 was a little unfair and did not take into account their restructuring following past incidents. He added that they will be funding hundreds of events, and that he wants to acknowledge that AppsCom has no real set standard for how these things are evaluated and that it is a very subjective process, which he thinks is rather hypocritical in that they ask for organizations to have very fleshed-out guidelines, but that they themselves have no real guidelines in how that is evaluated. He also said that he wants to acknowledge that there is this nonsensical approach that giving them under their full request for money will allow them to be better with money in the future, and that the committee has a large degree of variability in how they make their decision. He added that he does believe that CUTonight should get their full funding request.
  - v. M. Adeghe said that she hears what U. Chukwukere is saying and believes that a lot of it is valid, and that if those are changes he would like to see

made, that is a larger discussion that doesn't need to be discussed in relation to this since it's the process they have been using all semester. She added that they have never had guidelines and fleshed-out rules, and that can be discussed, but it is not particularly relevant right now, and that they have been doing this all semester.

- vi. U. Chukwukere said that given the past history of AppsCom and the fact that they don't have a set of guidelines, he thinks that it is very relevant in the context of this situation. He moved to overturn AppsCom's recommendation.
- vii. J. Anderson said that when the assembly sees byline reports, they have the final ability to accept or overturn it, and that overturning must be done by a 2/3rds majority. He added that if the recommendation is overturned, then the assembly will go into an AppsCom-like discussion of the funding.
- viii. Motion to overturn CUTonight Commission's byline funding.
  1. J. Clancy dissented, saying that his dissent is based off of the fact that after careful analysis, it was determined in large that the organization was very worthy of operating at the amount that it has been running on even before the restructuring and were running at full capacity, and that they haven't had to turn anybody away, and so that he feels that this amount is the most fitting.
  2. U. Chukwukere maintained his motion.
- ix. There was a motion to recess and reconvene depending on how external conditions improved or deteriorated.
  1. A rainstorm cause water to flow in from the open windows and to drip from the ceiling of the Memorial Room.
- x. The meeting was reconvened at a later time.
- xi. Vote to vote on overturning CUTonight Commission's byline funding – approved 17-0-1.
- xii. Motion to overturn CUTonight Commission's byline funding – approved 12-6-1.
- xiii. M. Haddad said that three people abstained on the first amount suggested in the committee, and that only one person abstained on the second amount, and asked why this was.
- xiv. J. Anderson said that AppsCom votes are secret ballot, and that this is just the way that the vote went.
- xv. G. Martin said that they should not underestimate how much of a need there is for sober events on campus during the nighttime when there are parties taking place on campus, and that they cannot undermine how important it is for recovering alcoholics, addicts, people uncomfortable around alcohol, and others. He added that this is a necessity for upperclassmen and underclassmen, and that he understands the necessity of sober events.
- xvi. U. Chukwukere said that he does not think that the people who voted no on overturning the funding understand the gravity of POC communities being able to have these events, such as It's a Black Affair, which almost fell through.
- xvii. Discussion continued in this regard.
- xviii. M. Adeghe said that she completely understands all of what everyone is saying, and that she does not want this to be seen as defunding, and that the

vote was unanimous. She added that she is most concerned because there are only six people at this meeting who are in AppsCom, and so it is hard for her to trust the assembly to vote on a budget that most members have not seen. She also said that AppsCom was there for that time and they saw what CUTonight wanted them to see, and that she thinks AppsCom's decision should be taken seriously, and that the president of CUTonight was happy to have received the amount that they got after AppsCom extended their report to them. She added that she wants people who are not in AppsCom to keep in mind that they do not know about the budget, and that they are entitled to whatever opinion they hold, but that they were not there and did not see the numbers.

- xix. J. Clancy said that he agrees with everything that has been said, but that he thinks the need really depends on demand, and that so far CUTonight has not needed to turn anyone away. He added that they are expanding, and that's why they increased their funding to \$8.50 such that they would have room for more growth, and that the question for him is whether the organization fills the need it is meant to, and that he feels like it does with \$8.50.
- xx. I. Pavlov said that she sees J. Clancy's point about that, but that she doesn't see any harm in allowing them to get more, and that she sees M. Adeghe's point about not knowing what the budget is. She added that she would like to hear from AppsCom about this.
- xxi. M. Adeghe said that the part about the hypothetical cuts was not a reason for them not getting their full funding, and that it is a requirement that they did not fulfill, and it was included so that they would know about it for the future.
- xxii. I. Pavlov asked if the people who voted for it therefore thought that it would be enough.
- xxiii. M. Adeghe replied in the affirmative.
- xxiv. J. Anderson moved to extend the meeting until 8:00 pm, since that is the time they have the room booked until – approved.
- xxv. B. Weintraub said that the reason he voted no on the change is that he firmly believes that AppsCom and M. Adeghe made the right decision, and that he has full faith in AppsCom, which is why AppsCom exists. He added that he thinks that it is wrong to suggest that these members are voting no because they do not respect people of color, and that he thinks that it's important that people can voice their opinions and support the decisions of AppsCom, who clearly felt that CUTonight deserved \$8.50 and not \$9.00. He also said that those assembly members not on AppsCom don't have the full story, which includes him, but that he trusts the members of AppsCom. He proposed a byline funding amount of \$8.75 for CUTonight Commission.
- xxvi. G. Martin said that these processes exist for a reason, and that to say that the assembly has full support of AppsCom and therefore doing what they say means that they wouldn't be undergoing the process that they're undergoing now.
- xxvii. J. Anderson said that AppsCom always makes recommendations, rather than decisions in finality.
- xxviii. L. Smith said that the decision was purely financial, and not looking at

- anything else.
- xxix. C. Huang said that she wanted to address a couple of points, and that not all SA members are AppsCom members, but the people who moved to overturn the funding are members of AppsCom. She added that he is not an AppsCom member, but she does go to each of their meetings, and that she did not feel at the CUTonight meeting that the justification for funding them only at \$8.50 was very concrete, and that she thinks that someone said that it was based on the financials of it, but there was a lot of talk about guidelines and such rather than the financials. She also said that this is a very important organization, and that she thinks that it is important for students to be able to have this, and that she is fully backing the \$9.00 funding amount.
  - xxx. Discussion continued in this regard.
  - xxxi. There was a motion to vote.
    - 1. The motion was **withdrawn**.
  - xxxii. T. Reuning asked whether or not M. Adeghe said that she has to stand by AppsCom's decision because she is the chair of AppsCom.
  - xxxiii. M. Adeghe said that she thinks that it is typical that the president sticks with AppsCom.
  - xxxiv. J. Anderson said that it is the role of the chair of any body, and that whether or not he agrees with a given decision made by the SA, he still represents the SA when taking a formalized stance.
  - xxxv. There was a motion to vote.
    - 1. J. Clancy dissented, saying that he wanted to make sure that it is clear on the record what has occurred, and that when there is a vote for an increase in funding but not to the level of what the organization asked for, that is a raise, not a reduction. He added that \$8.50 is not the first number that they came up with, but one that came out of discussion, and that he is not a person of color and cannot speak on behalf of people of color, but that he is trying to see their perspectives and settled on \$8.50 as a compromise. He also said that \$8.50 was a compromise that was a raise of \$0.68 based on the presentation of CUTonight, and that he thinks they will do a great job in building this organization. He added that he feels like the need is met with this amount, and that he respects the arguments being made, but that the \$8.50 suggested was not to knock off their funding to be mean, but was a compromise that AppsCom decided on.
    - 2. M. Adeghe maintained her motion.
    - 3. Vote to vote – **approved**.
  - xxxvi. Motion to approve a byline funding amount for CUTonight Commission.
    - 1. The amounts on the docket are \$9.00, \$8.75, \$8.50.
    - 2. J. Anderson said that the vote would begin at the highest amount, and that the highest amount to get a majority of votes will be the final recommendation.
    - 3. Motion to vote on funding CUTonight Commission at \$9.00 – **approved** 13-6-2.
  - c. Collegiate Readership Program
    - i. M. Adeghe said that the Collegiate Readership Program funds Cornell's free

subscriptions to the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, and that they had previously been funded at \$1.00 because there was a large surplus after the cancellation of the USA Today subscription, and that they were given \$3.00 to fund both the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal for all students.

- ii. Motion to approve the Collegiate Readership Program's byline funding – approved 20-0-1.

**IX. Adjournment**

- a. J. Anderson adjourned the meeting at 7:29 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,  
*John Hannan*  
Clerk of the Assembly