



Cornell University Student Assembly

Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, October 29, 2015 Meeting
4:45pm-6:30pm in Willard Straight Hall Memorial Room

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. Batistia [0]; L. Bushner [2.5]; M. Chak [1.5]; S. Chadhary [2]; J. Chessin [0.5]; V. Devatha [1]; R. Dunbar [1.5]; M. Ghandour [3.5]; E. Johnston [0.5]; S. Karnavat [2]; M. Kasher [0]; G. Kaufman [0]; D. Li [3.5]; D. Liu [0]; E. Liu [3]; M. McBride [0]; V. Michel [1]; P. Russell [0]; J. Selig [2.5]; S. Tayal [3]; P. Titcomb [3];
- *Not Present at the Roll Call:* R. Gupta (Unexcused) [2.5]; C. Li (Unexcused) [2.5]; M. Stefanko (Unexcused) [3]; R. Uttamchandani (Unexcused) [3.5]; K. Zhu (Unexcused) [2]

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

- The minutes of October 22, 2015 were approved by unanimous consent.

III. Open Microphone (E. Johnston)

IV. Announcements and Reports

- Halloween at Southside Community Center – M. Chak announced this Friday, October 30th, ALANA would be hosting a Halloween event for kids. This event counted as outreach.
- Elections Update – Ex-Officio M. Henderson announced the Assembly's Elections Committee begun meeting on a weekly basis. He wished to receive feedback on how to elections for spring should be run.
- Resolution 8, Faculty Senate Meeting, and Codes and Judicial Committee – G. Kaufman shared with the Assembly that Chemistry 2070 would no longer make study groups mandatory. He also updated the Assembly that during the Faculty Senate meeting Dean Burns of University Faculty indicated Cornell did not have enough money to continue funding financial aid at the same level or enough money to entice and hire the best faculty. G. Kaufman concluded his statements with a notice that the Codes and Judicial Committee would be meeting to discuss the Campus Code of Conduct.

- There was a motion to amend the agenda and move the Anabel's Grocery Question & Answer Session to the top of the agenda. The Assembly adopted the motion by unanimous consent.

V. Anabel's Grocery Question & Answer Session:

- E. Johnston stated community members and Assembly representatives would not have an opportunity to ask questions to the executive board of the student-run grocery store proposal.
- E. Johnston further stated the Assembly's Financial Aid Review Committee would vote on the current plan for the grocery store this Friday, October 30th.

VI. Business of the Day

- Byline Report: Welcome Weekend
 - B. Bacharach proxied for M. Stefanko.
 - B. Bacharach stated that Welcome Weekend requested \$2.78. The Appropriations Committee decided to fund at \$2.32, requesting the organization cut smaller events. B. Bacharach stated that it seemed money was being wasted, and that the Committee further recommended Welcome Weekend no longer charge organizations for attending Clubfest.
 - M. Henderson asked how large the revenue Welcome Weekend received from Clubfest was, and if the Committee accounted for this in their funding.
 - B. Bacharach stated the revenue was around \$6,000, and that they did take account for this number.
 - There was a Point of Information on the number of clubs attending Clubfest.
 - J. Battista stated there were around 500 that attended this year.
 - There was a motion to Call the Question. The Byline Funding was adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 21-0-0.
- Byline Report: CUTonight Commission
 - B. Bacharach stated that CUTonight asked for \$9.50. The Appropriations Committee believed that this was a large amount, and that the club is currently not held accountable enough. The appropriations committee voted to approve \$8.55, due to the belief that the excess funds were being used as a buffer.
 - There was a motion to Call the Question. The Byline Funding was adopted by the Assembly by a vote of 21-0-0.
- Resolution 12: Establishment of Cornell in China Programming Board (E. Liu, M. McBride)

- E. Liu stated this resolution's goal was to give current students the opportunity to host their own events internationally. She stated they hoped to start in China, because a global committee would be difficult to manage.
- M. McBride agreed with this assessment and requested the assembly's opinion on the resolution and specifically line 47.
- R. Dunbar asked what approving the use of the Assembly's logo would grant this board.
- E. Liu stated events needed legitimacy to entice students and secure donors.
- J. Chessin asked that these events be open to the public and advertised.
- E. Liu stated this would be probable given her previous program was done openly and publicized.
- Y. Bhandari asked what the role of the Student Assembly was and requested that the board work with Cornell's alumni offices.
- E. Liu stated that although there are already events for international students, she wanted to create a more particular board created by students for students.
- Y. Bhandari asked what the future of the board might look like. She further asked about the election of the board's chair, and how the chair would be selected if it would not be E. Liu.
- M. McBride stated the chair would be an open position that any member of the Assembly could run for. He believed the role of the Assembly was to bring events internationally.
- S. Tayal stated this resolution was created because E. Liu is a proactive member of the Chinese Cornell community. S. Tayal wanted to address certain issues. He believed this would add more bureaucracy and issues would rise if a member on the Assembly were not from China in the future. Additionally S. Tayal stated there already exist international groups around campus like the International Alumni's Office, which has more funding. He requested more discussion this with the vice provost of international affairs.
- M. McBride stated this wasn't a committee for E. Liu but for students. To get the board off the ground the sponsors requested in the first year a member of the Assembly chair the board. M. McBride concluded a new office for Cornell would be opening in Shanghai, and this board would be a great addition.
- P. Titcomb expressed concern over what the role of the Assembly is over international events.
- E. Liu stated the alumni boards focus on students who have already graduated, but this board would be more for perspective and current students.

- M. Battaglia stated that the board was classified as an Ad-Hoc committee, which was irrelevant for its goals. He was worried about the chair having too much power being granted sole discretion over member approval.
- M. McBride stated this was a precedent on other boards.
- J. Berger recommended this committee look into helping other organizations gain validity by using the Student Assembly logo.
- There was a motion to amend line 33 and 34 to read, “Whereas, the appointment of members on this committee will be conducted by the Student Assembly Staffing Committee by current staffing.”
- G. Kaufman stated he was not in support of this amendment. He believed it would add more to the Assembly’s bureaucracy.
- D. Li stated as a committee chair herself, she wanted to see greater details about how this committee would be staffed. She wanted members from every college.
- There was a **Point of Information** on the definition of an Ad-Hoc committee.
- J. Battista stated Ad-Hoc committee rules and precedents are established and maintained at the discretion of the chair.
- V. Devatha disagreed with D. Li in her belief that members should be from every college.
- There was a motion to vote on the amendment.
- The amendment **failed** by a vote of 2-10-4.
- G. Kaufman stated a new committee is not necessary in order to hold events in China. He believed E. Liu could do everything without the existence of a board.
- E. Liu stated that the role of the Assembly is to “Stay Informed. Get Involved. Make a Difference.” She mentioned that with a board, there would be greater encouragement for students to get involved.
- M. McBride stated there would not be much confusion or bureaucracy.
- M. Ghandour stated there was no need for a board given the role of the Assembly. She noted the Executive Committee could sponsor any event in need of Student Assembly support.
- There was a motion to **Call the Question**.
- There was dissent.
- M. McBride wanted to discuss more potential amendments.
- The motion to vote **failed** by a vote of 12-8-0.
- E. Liu mentioned that this board would bring people together.
- There was a motion to **Call the Question**. The Resolution **failed** by the Assembly by a vote of 6-7-8.

J. Battista requested that Assembly members not abstain during future votes unless they have a direct conflict of interest.

- Resolution 13: Enhancing Duffield Hall (E. Liu, J. Selig)
 - J. Selig recommended for the College of Engineering to increase and improve the current condition of chairs and tables in Duffield Atrium.
 - E. Liu stated she reached out to the facilities department of Duffield to create new infrastructure, but has been slow to get a response.
 - P. Titcomb stated the Infrastructure Fund Committee and facilities have money but often don't know where to spend their funds. He gave his support for this resolution in addressing this issue.
 - J. Chessin asked what purpose the Student Assembly's approval would serve.
 - E. Liu stated she reached out independently to the facilities. If this passed it would grant her more leverage and set a more detailed plan in motion.
 - J. Selig stated this resolution, because the Assembly represents students, would stamp the entire student bodies approval of new Duffield Atrium facilities.
 - M. Battaglia acknowledged that round tables are better for group dynamics than the rectangular ones proposed. He yielded to G. Kaufman.
 - G. Kaufman requested more research on the tables. He stated that if these changes were going to occur anyways the assembly should pass the resolution.
 - There was a motion to vote.
 - There was dissent.
 - S. Karnavat requested that there be more time given to discuss tables.
 - The motion failed.
 - D. Li stated that the discussion should be around the Assembly making choices about the campus. She yielded time to P. Titcomb.
 - P. Titcomb stated the space is mostly used for individual work. He argued that rectangular tables would be better for smaller working groups.
 - There was a motion to Call the Question.
 - The motion was adopted by a vote of 23-0-0 with two community votes in the affirmative.
- Resolution 14: Collecting LGBTQ+ Demographic Data (P. Titcomb)
 - P. Titcomb stated the goal of this resolution was to find a greater number of LGBTQ+ students, and to analyze the retention rates of those students.
 - S. Chadhaury asked why actions were not taken through last year's resolution.

- P. Titcomb stated last years resolution was vague and the lack of technology made it difficult to find all LGBTQ+ students.
- M. Chak asked who would be conducting the survey and what the costs of the survey would be.
- P. Titcomb stated this would be adding questions to Cornell’s common application, and the costs would be minimal.
- R. Dunbar asked if this data would only be used to collect demographics, and if so, why this data is going to be collected on the common application. R. Dunbar asked about the possibility of using the financial aid application for this purpose. As well, R. Dunbar asked if this data would be used for affirmative action.
- P. Titcomb stated that the data would not be used as an application factor, but instead is collected through the Common Application because this is the only form all Cornell Students must sign.
- There was a motion to vote.
- There was dissent.
- P. Titcomb wanted to make a number of amendments.
- The motion was **withdrawn**.
- There was a motion to amend line 21 to read, “...regardless of *sexual orientation*, gender identity, and/or expression”. There was a motion to amend line 55 to read, “*Cis man*”. There was a motion to amend line 59 to read, “*Cis woman*”.
- The resolution was **amended** by a vote of 18-2-0.
- There was a motion to **Call the Question**. The resolution was **adopted** by a vote of 18-0-3 with 2 community votes allocated in the affirmative.
- Resolution 15: Celebrating the 25th Anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act
 - J. Berger stated this resolution portrays the Cornell community in favor of making the university more accessible to everyone. She summarized that this resolution requests new practices to make the campus more inclusive: web accessibility will be addressed, student groups will be asked to label their foods, and the general accessibility of campus buildings is mentioned.
 - P. Titcomb stated Cornell should go above the requirements of the Students with Disabilities Act.
 - G. Kaufman stated that this recommendation is fairly straightforward.
 - E. Liu wanted further explanation of line 44.
 - J. Berger stated that audits on buildings have not yet been completed.

- R. Dunbar asked if professors have knowledge of disabilities when they receive class rosters.
 - J. Berger stated these recommendations are useful for students who haven't disclosed a disability. They would generally benefit students who prefer not to share their issues, such as students with hearing problems who would gain a better understanding if professors included closed captioning.
 - M. McBride wanted to clarify line 57.
 - There was a motion to amend line 57 to strike “*should*”.
 - E. Johnston requested the line be amended to “*must*”.
 - R. Dunbar requested that the resolution retain grammatical structure. He clarified that the resolution stays the same with the initial amendment.
 - There was a motion to vote on the amendment.
 - The resolution was amended by a vote of 14-5-1.
 - There was a motion to Call the Question.
 - There was dissent.
 - M. Chak requested that there be more points added to the resolution.
 - The motion to vote was approved by a vote of 12-9-0.
 - The resolution was adopted by a vote of 24-0-0 with the two community votes in the affirmative.
- There was a motion to Suspend the Agenda. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.
 - There was a motion to move Resolution 17 & 18 to the end of the agenda. The motion was adopted by unanimous consent.
 - Resolution 19: Transfer Option Newsletter (J. Chessin)
 - J. Chessin stated colleges don't communicate well enough with guaranteed transfer students, and this is a way of getting more information to them.
 - V. Devatha requested that new First Year Spring Admit students be included in this resolution.
 - D. Li asked why the Cornell Chronicle was chosen out of all newsletters around campus.
 - J. Chessin stated that The Daily Sun was too frequent, and it seemed the most relevant.
 - M. McBride requested that better language be used on line 21.
 - There was a motion to amend line 21 to read, “...are sent out to *transfer and first year spring admits* as soon as possible.”

- There was dissent.
- D. Li wanted clarification on the amendment.
- There was a vote to vote on the amendment.
- The motion to vote was approved by a vote of 19-2-0.
- The resolution was amended by a vote of 20-1-0.
- R. Dunbar addressed concerns of choosing Cornell Chronicle by stating it is a non-political and very pro-Cornell publication.
- There was a motion to table.
- The resolution was tabled by unanimous consent.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Biedenweg

Assembly Clerk, Office of the Assemblies