



Cornell University
University Assembly

Cornell University University Assembly

Minutes of the Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 Meeting

4:45pm-6:30pm in Physical Science Building 401

- Attendance:
 - *Present:* J. Batista, M. Battaglia, M. Hatch, K. Herleman, M. Indimine, G. Kaufman, M. McBride, N. La Celle, R. Howarth, U. Smith, P. Thompson. A. Thomson, R. Walroth
 - *Absent:* E. Baptist, J. Burns, E. Loew, M. de Roos, BJ Siasoco,
 - *Others present:* P. Biedenweg, K. Bullis, J. Corson-Rikert, G. Giambattista

I. Call to Order

- M. Battaglia called the meeting to order at 4:31pm

II. Approval of Minutes

- There was a motion to table the Minutes from February 9th 2016; they were tabled by unanimous consent.

III. Reports From Assemblies

- Student Assembly
 - G. Kaufman said that the SA discussed a resolution pertaining to relaxing attendance requirements at SA meetings, as well as a resolution that dealt with adding a First-Generation Representative to the SA.
- Graduate & Professional Student Assembly
 - R. Walroth was not present at the UA Meeting. K. Herleman was not present at the GPSA Meeting, but heard that there was an extensive discussion about the Maplewood development.
- Employee Assembly
 - BJ Siasoco was absent, but they were working to speak to Mrs. Opperman and to create a real election this coming year and an increased size for the Assembly.
- Faculty Senate
 - The main item on the Agenda was a vote of no confidence in the College of Business. They requested all 13,000 faculty members to vote, but the motion was withdrawn in lieu of President Garrett's passing.

IV. Committee and Working Group Updates

- Executive Committee
Minutes of the March 8 Meeting of the Cornell University University Assembly

- The UA would be meeting with the Board of Trustees was moved until next Tuesday.
- Campus Infrastructure Committee
 - E. Loew was not present.
- Campus Welfare Committee
 - U. Smith was not present.
- Codes and Judicial Committee
 - G. Kaufman stated the committee met last week to discuss the Good Samaritan Policy.
 - They also discussed the OSWG presentation by Jim Blaire.
 - They were hoping to meet this week or next week. The process of staffing of the University Hearing and Review Board began last Monday. G. Kaufman suggested the members of the UA request students to apply. He wanted to ask the Assembly about tracking the number of applicants in the process.
 - G. Giambattista wanted to address concerns to the University Assembly requested to have the CJC being aware of the status of the UHRB. The code does not disprove of requesting information.
- Textbook Price Working Group
 - The Textbook Pricing Working Group was in the process of drafting a resolution for the UA. The resolution would recommend ways to lower costs to the Administration.

V. Liaison Updates

- Council for Sexual Violence and Prevention
 - No updates.
- Campus Planning Committee
 - R. Howarth would not able to attend.
- Policy Advisory Group
 - No updates.
- Student Health Fee Advisory Committee Liaison
 - A. Thompson said the first meeting was on the 29th. The SHFAC was looking for a new member to serve the liaison position.
- Student Insurance Advisory Committee
 - M. Indimine had no updates.

VI. Business of the Day

- Gannett Update
 - Dr. Corson-Rikert spoke on the creation of the new Cornell Health. She discussed their

scope, vision, and goals. She wanted to stress health as an important aspect of life for students, faculty, and staff. The new building would be a way to maintain and support students learning. They were honored to be in charge. They wanted to combine their work with others, collaborating. Working with VP Murphy and VP Lombardi were great ways to achieve their goals. They discussed together the best ways to reach out to students and serve the community in all the ways they could.

- They now provided medical services up to 7pm from Mon-Thurs. They would be continuing to discuss how to best use their resources to support the community. They have had a long commitment to increasing access, and the help of Cornell funding to serve mental health staff.
- Whole Person Integrated Care was one of the best ways to offer health care to students. She stated that it was rarely implemented, and they hoped to continue to utilize it. Over the past year they worked with physical therapy, and students with chronic pain, and hoped to do better.
- The Medical Health Provider would help students be seen in the same first visit. This would help students who were not open to go directly to mental health first.
- Black Students United were also being addressed. They were working to increase the diversity of staff, but the timeline was difficult to meet. They hoped to take seriously the issues presented. They hoped to provide better care for the group, and continue to work. They have difficult creating pools of primary care providers especially with a national shortage.
- Individual health, group health, and university health were large issues. Given the international travel of students they had to work with Ebola and now Zika. They watched Measles and Mumps. They worked on vaccinations.
- They set up online appointments. which has meant a significant increase in use. They had a pilot for the last two years to develop a plan for student Medicaid; 325 students who now had more access to the student health plan rather than the health plan of Medicare. The Student Health fee had looked to increase coverage to students. They were thrilled to have the costs covered by financial aid. All need-based financial aid students would now receive the fee in their cost of tuition.
- They were looking to continue to increase the access to healthcare. With deductibles too high, students could still pay a majority out of pocket for care. Particularly, students without the Cornell health care of low income were not using services. They saw an almost 2:1 ratio between wealthy and poor students using Gannett.
- The new Gannett would be built by the summer. They would be operating in a new space that was meant for three separate services, but they would have to use it for everything else in the first Phase. The second part would involve rebuilding the original building which would be completed by the summer of 2017. The benefits of such an action would involve a shared waiting room. There would be a more private route for students to be able to get off site help. They would have specialists arriving at certain times to address more diverse concerns. They would have group space for group counseling. There would be a bigger pharmacy, and a large conference room for use by anyone. They would have a disability service center with more support. Students were not charged for costs relating to the fee.

- K. Bullis stated that one challenge was the parking, which would be diminished with the new building. There was a desire to limit campus traffic, but he thought that bringing students with transportation who were sick was important. He wanted to make sure all students felt there was adequate parking.
- M. Battaglia also asked about the relations to construction and if there would be any delays or areas that would not be open. He also hoped to stay engaged with students and involve them in the processes of making health choices. He hoped a group of students would be able to stay involved through many years on campus.
- Dr. Corson-Rikert stated that most of the spots near the health center were for faculty. The new lot would have a similar number of spots for patients. It would cost the health center to buy additional spots.
- A. Thomson did not realize that Gannett would have to buy extra spots. He saw this as a barrier to university health, especially for veterinary and off-campus students. He also asked about surveying students. Dr. Corson-Rikert stated that not all students who visit the center receive a survey. This was also a concern of Black Students United, and the health center would be meeting later this week to discuss surveys.
- K. Bullis stated that missed appointments were reviewed to find out if it was important to reach out to the student. If a student cancels an appointment they are not tracked due to the diverse number of reasons to cancel. They also were trying to be thoughtful about the degree of surveying students facing illnesses.
- A Thomson also asked about getting appointments in a timely manner. He asked about the tracking of wait times. K. Bullis said the industry standard was to track the third available appointment. They currently track this at every noon. They would do this for urgent walk in patients: 45 min-2 hrs. For routine appointments the third next available would run between 5 hrs-72 hrs (calendar hours). They used this data to adjust staffing levels, and to request more from the university. When the wait time was more, they would try to request students reach out to the community. A. Thomson stated that students were seen, but their problem was not addressed until days later. There were issues with getting referrals to specialists, both inside and outside the building.
- K. Bullis stated that all professionals were often meant to be used for their highest levels of care. This practice was changed in November and December 2016. It was difficult to make sure that all students were getting the most relevant care. There pilot went through three phases. The first phase had satisfaction scores of 97-99%, and he had yet to see other results.
- Dr. Corson-Rikert stated that the demands fluctuated constantly which meant that staffing was a difficult issue.
- G. Kaufman asked how many more students had enrolled in SHIP since the health fee. Dr. Corson-Rikert stated that there were no major shifts in the number of students. It was still close to 50% of students. She stated that there would be some disruption during the building process. They would not be running radiology services for a period of time, during renovation. The direct clinical services would continue running.
- K. Herleman stated that she and others had concerns about the use of urine specimens having to be walked across an open area. Kent stated that stool samples were brought

with brown bags, but he would think about additional ways to grant students more privacy.

- K. Herleman also asked about common issues between undergraduate students and graduate students. Dr. Corson-Rikert stated that graduate students used the services more on all ends. The graduate students would use more family related services.
- K. Herleman asked about preventative measures for anxiety and depression. She wondered if the Gannett center would work to provide access to helpful measures (walks, message therapy, etc.). Dr. Corson-Rikert stated that in those groups and complimentary medicine they could certainly be doing more, but it was difficult given the space. The Dean of Students area was being reanalyzed to discuss the possibility of including access to group therapy and group activities on campus.
- K. Bullis stated that last year they developed a committee to find out about complimentary medicine. They received survey responses - many of which involved negative feedback about non-scientific medicines. The NatureRX was a way to prescribe students to spend certain amounts of time in nature. They started the program only a short time ago and hoped to expand on the effort. They chose not to get involved in yoga and walks because other groups already had the area covered.
- A. Thomson stated that the veterinary students had created a wellness committee in charge of such activities. They had reached out to Gannett to collaborate, and believed it was a good model that could be followed.
- P. Thompson asked about international students and said that they missed their pets. She would get a large number of requests to have students spending time with animals in the vet school. Dr. Corson was in favor of students reaching out. They had Cornell Companions but were in favor of a greater number of ideas.
- G. Giambattista stated that there was a new Health and Wellness Advisory committee. They were already faculty and staff members that were involved. Dr. Corson was in favor of continuing to collaborating.
- For Vote: UA Resolution #7: Requesting Information on the Cost of Carbon Neutrality
 - G. Kaufman requested that the clause about President and Acting President be removed.
 - R. Howarth stated there was also a request to remove the first two Whereas clauses.
 - K. Herleman stated that the specific data might be too much. She hoped to pass the resolution as a way of simply requesting more information not showing their approval of carbon neutrality. She wanted to see a clause or statement about being a land grant institute and the cost of carbon change on agriculture.
 - G. Kaufman was in favor of having a separate entity find out the cost of carbon neutrality. Another way was to have students, faculty determine the cost, the third was to have the Exec. Committee oversee the unit that made the final statement so that they could do so with integrity.
 - A. Thomson requested line 23 be amended to change the word “benefit” to “benefit”.
 - R. Howarth stated that there was already a committee in charge of this problem. They

were unsure how to best go about making decisions. It would have to be done building by building. Deep geothermal to natural gas would have to be looked at. He believed that the university itself would have to be in charge of the project.

- K. Herleman stated that a district heating system would have to be implemented. A research group would have to drill a well that would cost between \$1.5 and \$3 million to create. This would be more about a cost.
- R. Howarth stated the number at now was \$500,000,000. They believed it might have to be created through a thorough investigation. which he was in favor of.
- M. Battaglia stated that he was sponsoring Resolution 8. He was requesting a mail vote, so that he could send the resolution to Acting President Kotlikoff.

M. Battaglia adjourned the meeting at 6:03pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Vishal Bhaya & Peter Biedenweg
Assembly Clerks, *Office of the Assembles*
