



Cornell University Student Assembly

Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, October 22, 2015 Meeting
4:45pm-6:30pm in Physical Science Building Room 401

I. Call to Order (J. Batista)

- J. Batista called the meeting to order at 4:47pm
- *Present at the Roll Call:* B. Bacharach [2]; J. Batista [0]; L. Bushner [1]; M. Chak [0.5]; S. Chadhary [2]; J. Chessin [0]; V. Devatha [0]; R. Dunbar [1.5]; R. Gupta [0]; E. Johnston [0]; S. Karnavat [1]; M. Kasher [0]; G. Kaufman [0]; C. Li [1]; D. Li [2.5]; D. Liu [0]; E. Liu [2]; M. McBride [0]; P. Russell [0]; J. Selig [1]; M. Stefanko [1.5]; S. Tayal [2.5]; P. Titcomb [1]; K. Zhu [0.5]
- *Not Present at the Roll Call:* M. Ghandour (Excused) [2]; V. Michel (Unexcused) [0]; R. Uttamchandani (Unexcused) [1]

II. Approval of the Meeting Minutes (J. Batista)

- The minutes of October 8, 2015 were approved by unanimous consent.
- The minutes of October 15, 2015 were approved by unanimous consent.

III. Open Microphone (E. Johnston)

IV. Announcements and Reports

- Mental Health Awareness Week – UA Representative M. Indimine announced that events for Mental Health Awareness Week were going well. He acknowledged Dining with Diverse Minds would be occurring tomorrow, Friday 23rd.
- Outreach Requirements – M. Chak stated that representatives must attend two outreach events every two weeks. She announced she will begin tracking outreach events, and if there are any questions to follow up with her.
- Minimum Requirements of Representatives – M. McBride stated missing more than three meetings in a row, or six in total will mean the possibility of expulsion from the Student Assembly. He further noted late arrival or early departure counts as a half absence. McBride requested members email him their committee assignments, and continue to attend their liaison positions.

- Do the Right Thing – E. Johnston mentioned that while attendance policy is definitely hard to pay attention to, that it is important. She also mentioned that Food Days were October 27th through October 29th, with an open dinner at Oakenshields Tuesday.
- B. Bachrach stated that there would be a sober house on campus starting next year.
 - Ex-Officio M. Battaglia asked about how the housing selection process will occur.
 - B. Bacharach stated Sober@Cornell would be mainly involved, also that he would send out contact information.

V. Business of the Day

- Presentation and Discussion Concerning Changes to University Policy 6.4 and Title IX Adjudication (Ulysses Smith, Carol Grumbach).
 - Ulysses Smith, who serves as the Title IX Coordinator for Analytics & Reporting and Chair of the Welfare Committee, along with Carol Grumbach, Associate Dean for New Student Programs and Director of the Carol Tatkon Center presented on behalf of proposed changes to Cornell's Policy 6.4.
 - U. Smith stated policy drafting began last year and is still occurring. The University needed to stay in compliance with New York's Enough is Enough (1.29-B) law, which went into affect October 5th, 2015. This law changed consent requirements to involve a notion of affirmation, and added new transcript notations, which make offenses visible for multiple years.
 - Cornell's new policy may allow all effected parties to appeal interim policies, which will be decided by a board. Policy changes further include a new Student Bill of Rights, new Alcohol/Drug Amnesty procedures, updated mandated definitions, new investigations procedures, and updated language around sexual assault.
 - There was an attempt to make the new policy template easy to read and accessible, and by July 2016, the certificate of compliance should be issued to Cornell University.
 - Carol Grumbach stated John Siliciano, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and herself were overseeing the revision process for Policy 6.4. They looked at colleges with the most cases of sexual misconduct with hopes of understanding how to better address these issues locally. C. Grumbach stated the old Campus Code of Conduct led to investigate procedures, which dismissed the need of hearing boards. Under the new system she hoped to create a well-functioning board and process. Changes to 6.4 would be made to help students who are charged with sexual assault, stalking, harassment, dating

- violence, and domestic violence, and would involve new investigatory procedures. An investigator would create a report by gathering evidence, and also serve as a witness, helping the board make an ultimate decision.
- C. Grumbach further acknowledged during new hearings, complainants and respondents would be in separate rooms. Both parties would be afforded assistance, but could provide their own personal advisors. Additionally, there could be an option for stakeholders to reach an Alternative Resolution - allowing cases to be settled outside of the hearings.
 - At this time, a Hearing Chair, and three faculty or staff panelists would be involved in making the decisions. C. Grumbach welcomed comments or questions to her email cg47@cornell.edu.
 - G. Kaufman asked about not having students on the board. He wanted students to provide input and saw this as an integral part of the reviews. He also commented that not having face-to-face interactions between complainants and respondents during hearings might create problems.
 - C. Grumbach stated that she would bring the idea of face-to-face involvement up with others. She stated also that students were considered initially for the board, but there was concern over students knowing each other.
 - G. Kaufman stated at such a large university it would most likely be the case that students would not know each other.
 - E. Johnston asked about the statute of limitation only being one year at Cornell University compared to other colleges. She mentioned that considering dorm living it would make sense that complainants would wait until they had moved to file a case.
 - C. Grumbach mentioned tolling provisions, where circumstantial cases are allowed extra time, would be discussed further while creating this policy.
 - M. McBride asked multiple questions about transcript notations, who the investigators report to, how board member's questions are screened by the chair, and if there would formal training for the advisors.
 - C. Grumbach answered that similarly to Judicial Codes Counselors, there would be a course or seminar for advisors.
 - U. Smith stated institutions are required to make notations on transcripts after finding students in violation of a universities code of conduct. They are required to write "withdrew with conduct charges pending," or, "suspended/expelled after finding of a code of conduct violation."
 - C. Grumbach stated investigators currently report to the Judicial Administrator, but they were considering other possibilities.

- U. Smith stated that there are still grey areas, which needs to be addressed, and that people would still have the option to file actions outside of the university.
 - D. Liu recommended statutes of limitations go through the entire time of the complainant's attendance at Cornell University.
 - M. Battaglia cautioned against a Chair having power over the other members. He also requested that "Victim Advocate" be changed to a new name.
 - D. Li asked about where RA's, Professors, TA's, and Master Students would fall under this new policy
 - C. Grumbach stated if someone is serving as a Cornell employee they they would be brought up as such.
 - D. Li further requested that a student be on the board, given they sign a non-disclosure agreement.
 - S. Tayal stated there were issues with reporting bias incidents, and that the group misconduct website could be more informative. He asked about how these issues could be incorporated in making policy 6.4 better.
 - U. Smith stated that new descriptions of incidents would be included, and the status and outcome would be published. He stated there was a report on the aggregate data, but New York has laws on what can be disclosed.
 - Ex-Officio Welling asked about how policy 6.4 would be publicized once it was established.
 - C. Grumbach stated website links would direct people to the correct areas. She recognized new titles could be more detailed and organized in terms of chronological order. She further mentioned using Speak About It would teach students where to go.
 - U. Smith stated that making policies available in other languages and for those with disabilities would also be addressed.
 - M. Chak mentioned that it should be important that students involved in the review board be given options over how they serve on the board.
 - C. Grumbach stated that having someone on the panel would not be possible to have other students on the panel. Having a student pool might be an option.
- Byline Report: Slope Media
 - M. Stefanko stated that Slope Media requested \$1.25. The Appropriation Committee decided to fund at \$1.15, or if at the end of the year there is a surplus, such as there was for the last three years, the Committee voted to grant them \$0.85.
 - M. McBride asked about when the Committee would know the surplus value.

- M. Stefanko stated that they would most likely know by next week. He stated this is a recommendation until the formal vote in December.
- S. Tayal requested that there be a vote today.
- M. Chak asked about why they were choosing to keep them at such a high level.
- M. Stefanko mentioned that they are a newer group and that the content and member numbers were going up.
- M. Henderson mentioned that tabling it for a week would be a good option due to the missing information on the organization's surplus.
- J. Chessin stated he was concerned over the miscalculation, and asked why there was a possible surplus.
- M. Stefanko stated the relationship between the Appropriations Committee and Cornell Accounting needs to be better maintained.
- There was a motion to table indefinitely. The Byline Funding was **tabled indefinitely** by the Assembly by a vote of 17-5-0.
- Byline Report: Orientation Steering Committee
 - M. Stefanko stated that the Orientation Steering Committee asked for \$10.22. The Appropriations Committee believed \$0.25 for additional events was not necessary. Due to this, the Appropriation Committee approved \$9.98.
 - G. Kaufman asked about shared governance playing a larger role in the Orientation.
 - There was a motion to **Call the Question**. The Byline Funding was **approved** by the Assembly by a vote of 22-0-0.
- Byline Report: Convocation Committee
 - M. Stefanko stated that Convocation Committee requested \$14.50. The Appropriation Committee believed that the organization played an important role in supporting the University. M. Stefanko stated there will be further discussion over why Cornell which is granted the opportunity to gain publicity from a speaker, is not paying for this organization.
 - There was a motion to **Call the Question**. The Byline Funding was **approved** by the Assembly by a vote of 22-0-0.

J. Batista adjourned the meeting to Executive Session at 6:31pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
 Peter Biedenweg
 Assembly Clerk, Office of the Assemblies