

Cornell University's Student Assembly

Minutes of the September 14th, 2023 Meeting 4:45 pm – 6:30 pm Memorial Room Willard Straight Hall | Zoom

I. Call to Order

- a. P. Kuehl called the meeting to order at 4:47 pm.
 - Members Present (17): M. Bakri, L. Balestrieri, L. Barrett, A. Barry, R. DeLorenzo, K. Everett, N. Hite, C. Lederman, E. Ononye, S. Parikh, I. Rezaka, A. Richmond, A. Talone, C. Ting, A. Vinson, A. Wang, P. Kuehl
 - ii. Members Absent (3): C. Platkin, S. Son, B. Terhaar
 - iii. Also Present (6): A. Bangura, A. Coleman, N. Courtney, E. Kalweit, N. Maggard, J. Zhang

II. Reading of the Land Acknowledgement

a. P. Kuehl stated the SA's acknowledgment of the Cayuga Nation.

III. Open Microphone

a. There were no speakers.

IV. Approval of the Minutes

- a. Approval of the September 7, 2023 meeting minutes
 - i. The motion to approve the minutes **passed** through unanimous consent.

V. Consent Calendar

a. There were no new items.

VI. Announcements

a. R. Verma motioned to suspend rules and move up discussion on Resolution 19. The motion passed through unanimous consent.

VII. Reports of Officers, Committees, and Liaisons

- a. Executive Board
 - i. P. Kuehl noted the attendance of President Pollack on the 9/28 meeting and asked for submission of questions.
 - ii. M. Wallen questioned if Ex-Officio members could submit questions.
 - iii. P. Kuehl affirmed. P. Kuehl noted the recent crime reports.



- iv. C. Ting noted upcoming Google Forms for byline and committee reports being sent out.
- v. C. Lederman stated that an amendment to the charter resolution would be made. C. Lederman noted that amendments can be always made and are almost always debatable, but that motions to end debate cannot be debatable.
- vi. S. Parikh stated that work on External Communications is being done to make an Instagram, start a bi-weekly newsletter, and revamp outreach.
- vii. A. Barry stated that Resolutions from the Diversity and Inclusion Committee would be coming in further weeks.

b. Committee Chairs

- i. N. Hite stated discussion on removal for median grades on transcripts and further communication with the Faculty Senate to discuss this.
- ii. A. Vinson stated that the Environmental Committee has not met yet.
- iii. E. Ononye stated that the Financial Aid Review Committee has not met yet.
- iv. N. Maggard stated that the SAIFC has current initiatives in the works.
- v. A. Wang stated that the Student Health Advisory Committee had discussions.
- vi. R. DeLorenzo stated that the upcoming Appropriations Committee meeting will host organizations such as CUTonight and the club sports committee.

 R. DeLorenzo noted current committee members.

VIII. Presentations

- a. Presentation on SAF Applications
 - i. R. DeLorenzo stated that all SAF Applications were reviewed, and current statuses were noted. R. DeLorenzo noted the status of Alternative Breaks and asked that requirement be waived. R. DeLorenzo noted the status of Minds Matter and stated that they are in contact. R. DeLorenzo noted the status of the Tatkon Center and recommended that the requirement be waived and asked for input.
 - ii. C. Lederman stated his support of this recommendation and questioned the statuses of 11 and 12, Cornell departments which have not yet submitted.
 - iii. R. DeLorenzo stated that submissions are currently in process. R. DeLorenzo stated that the athletics and physical education department missed multiple requirements.
 - iv. The motion to recess for 5 minutes was approved unanimously.

IX. Old Business Calendar



- a. Resolution 17: Creating a Student Assembly Advisory Board
 - i. C. Lederman motioned for the Resolution to be tabled indefinitely.
 - ii. The motion to table the Resolution passed through unanimous consent.
- b. Resolution 18: Rollover Funds
 - i. R. DeLorenzo introduced the Resolution to create a process for reallocation of funds.
 - ii. C. Lederman motioned to amend lines 28-30. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
 - iii. R. DeLorenzo motioned to amend line 32. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
 - iv. The motion to approve the resolution **passed** through a vote of 14-0-0.

X. Resolutions Calendar

- a. Resolution 19: Election Rules
 - i. R. Verma outlined changes to election rules for the upcoming election year such as the return of petitions to paper form and changes to social media policies, conduct policies, and allocations to campaign finances. R. Verma noted the implementation of a form to outline campaign spending, as well as the role of the Office of Ethics for any challenges, etc.
 - ii. M. Wallen questioned constituencies that wouldn't require signatures from students they represent and questioned if identity-based liaisons would need signatures from specific groups.
 - iii. R. Verma stated that any college specific, freshman, or transfer roles would need signatures from their specific constituent groups.
 - iv. P. Kuehl noted his lack of favor for the petition process for reducing engagement and stated his belief that petitions are anti-democratic. P. Kuehl motioned to amend the election rules to strike the need for petitions. R. DeLorenzo seconded the motion.
 - v. K. Everett dissented. K. Everett stated her hope for further discussion.
 - vi. S. Parikh questioned the reasoning for the changes in petitions such as the return to paper petitions.
 - vii. R. Verma stated that the Elections Committee found that the paper petition process returned much higher levels of engagement, and that having the petitioner themselves find signatures increased engagement with the constituencies they hope to represent. R. Verma noted that the amount of petitions necessary was reduced to ensure this would not be a specific burden.
 - viii. N. Courtney clarified that the amount of petition signatures was 25.



- ix. R. Verma stated the breakdown of counts for different seats.
- x. N. Courtney stated his belief that the purpose of having candidates actively engage with the community doesn't align with the small number of 25 signatures. N. Courtney stated that the petition process seems unnecessary and like an extra step.
- xi. R. Verma stated that multiple alternatives to petitioning were tested. R. Verma noted that the threshold is not intended to be significant, but rather to encourage nominee engagement with the student body.
- xii. A. Bangra questioned what removing petitions would look like logistically for elections and the Office of the Assemblies.
- xiii. R. Verma prefaced that there were issues with finalizing election rules that interfered with election timelines. R. Verma noted that any changes to the election calendar would require further voting and noted further barriers but noted his willingness to workshop solutions to refine election rules.
- xiv. P. Kuehl stated his belief that the way of improving involvement would be to have competitive races through the campaigning of fellow peers that would open through the lack of this petition barrier.
- xv. R. Verma stated that the petition process and prior Spring elections were unconventional and not working like they should have, making it not the best example to point to.
- xvi. A. Richmond stated his opinion that petitions should not be removed and noted his belief that the task of gaining petition signatures is a natural barrier to vetting candidates that have good intentions.
- xvii. R. Verma stated his lack of support for the removal of the petition process.
- xviii. R. DeLorenzo stated his own conflicted opinion, noting his own difficulties in engaging but also noting the learned importance of engaging with the student body. R. DeLorenzo noted the high susceptibility of in-person paper petitions to be compromised.
- xix. R. Verma noted that in terms of signature manipulation, there is a validation process through the Office of the Assembly to analyze signatures.
- xx. A. Barry stated lack of support for an amendment but stated her malleability to an alternative to having candidates vetted before entering further candidacy.
- xxi. R. Verma stated willingness to continue workshopping solutions during the semester.
- xxii. L. Barrett questioned what the traditionally unfilled seats on the body were.
- xxiii. C. Ting stated that traditionally, at-large issue specific seats are not often filled.



- xxiv. R. Verma stated that elections engagement is a wholehearted priority.
- xxv. P. Kuehl stated his belief that the best vetting process of candidates will be the elections.
- xxvi. R. Verma stated belief that the Spring elections be taken as a learning experience, rather than evidence to remove the petition process.
- xxvii. C. Lederman stated his belief that the barrier to entry to join the Assembly should be removed to help remove the reputation of the Assembly as an insular organization.
- xxviii. R. Verma stated belief that the primary cause behind barriers to entry is not the petition process.
- xxix. A. Wang stated belief that the number of petition signatures being asked for are not a barrier to entry and highlighted the necessities of an engaged, involved member.
- xxx. N. Hite questioned whether signatures would be checked thoroughly.
- xxxi. R. Verma stated that a separate period not previously existing to validate signatures was implemented for the current period.
- xxxii. K. Everett stated belief that enough passion should override shyness to approach a group of constituents, and that the petition process is not a true barrier to entry.
- xxxiii. I. Rezaka questioned how it could be ensured that student signatures were legitimate during validation.
- xxxiv. R. Verma stated that NetId lookup is implemented, and that a challenge process is implemented if any part of a candidacy is seen as morally questionable.
- xxxv. S. Parikh noted.
- xxxvi. P. Kuehl stated belief that should a change be workshopped, it should be implemented in the current semester rather than the Spring where all seats would be up for re-election.
- xxxvii. A. Vinson motioned to end debate.
- xxxviii. A. Barry dissented. A. Barry questioned if a temporary amendment could be made for the current election for the semester.
- xxxix. K. Everett dissented.
 - xl. The motion to end debate failed through a vote of 4-7-6.
 - xli. P. Kuehl noted that election rules must be passed every Spring and that changes could be implemented in the next semester.
 - xlii. K. Everett questioned if the amendment could be tabled and if there could be further community input.



- xliii. A speaker stated belief in the necessity of the petition. The speaker proposed a solution for elections without any candidates.
- xliv. K. Everett questioned if the amendment could be tabled.
- xlv. N. Maggard stated that amendments couldn't be made retroactively, and a current decision would need to be made.
- xlvi. A. Wang questioned if it might be possible to implement petitions, but for any seats without candidates removed the petition process. A. Wang questioned if, for the validation process, the 7-number student ID could be included.
- xlvii. The motion to pass the amendment **failed** through a vote of 4-7-6.
- xlviii. The motion to approve the resolution **passed** through a vote of 10-1-6.
- b. Resolution 20: Charter Article IV Amendment
 - i. C. Lederman stated an overview on the Resolution.
 - ii. A. Bangura noted changes to standardize and streamline how to handle vacancies.
 - iii. N. Maggard noted the introduction of more undesignated at-large assembly seats from 2 to 5 due to the increases in student body during recent years.
 - iv. C. Lederman noted changes to define what a voting member would be and define what a semester not on campus would be as absence from the Ithaca campus for over 3 weeks.
 - v. A. Coleman stated that rank choice voting would continue to be implemented during elections, and that the defined term for the year was adjusted.
 - vi. C. Lederman noted the definition of a Student Assembly Advisory Board and the composition of members that would be implemented. C. Lederman noted changes to attendance rules.
 - vii. N. Maggard stated the importance of the balance of Assembly continuity and student voice for the Assembly. N. Maggard stated the new vacancy processes, particularly noting this application for executive Vice President or President to remove the possibility of succession for existing Assembly members.
 - viii. R. DeLorenzo motioned to extend the meeting time by 15 minutes. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
 - ix. J. Kalinski asked for more elaboration on the rules for presence on campus, noting the need for some students to represent Cornell on an official capacity for over 3 weeks.
 - x. C. Lederman stated that these changes could be further discussed for next week.



- xi. N. Courtney noted the growing veteran presence on campus since 2015. N. Courtney motioned to amend the definition for the seat for a Veteran member. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
- xii. C. Ting motioned to amend the spelling for the LGBTQIA+ representative. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
- xiii. S. Parikh motioned to amend the resolution to include representation for student employment. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
- xiv. C. Ting motioned to amend the number of representatives at-large from 7 to 6. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
- xv. C. Lederman motioned to amend the total number of representatives. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
- c. Resolution 21: Solidarity with Cornell Graduate Students United
 - i. J. Kalinski motioned to postpone the resolution. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
- d. Resolution 22: Amending the Community Sponsorship Standing Rules
 - i. J. Kalinski motioned to postpone the resolution. The motion **passed** through unanimous consent.
- XI. Appointments and Vacancies Calendar
 - a. Appropriations Committee
 - i. Item was postponed for next meeting.
 - b. Dining Committee
 - i. Item was postponed for next meeting.

XII. Adjournment

a. This meeting was adjourned at 6:38pm.

Respectfully Submitted, Jenny Zhang Clerk of the Assembly