

MINUTES
Student Assembly
Thursday, March 13, 2014
4:45PM-6:30PM
Willard Straight Hall Memorial Room

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by U. Smith at 4:48pm.

Members Present: S. Ali Khan, S. Balik, J. Batista, Y. Bhandari, G. Block, E. Bonatti, I. Chen, R. Gademsky, I. Harris, M. Henderson, T. Hittinger, J. Hutson, F. Jimenez, L. Liu, M. Lukasiewicz, S. Lutsic, Y. Ma, N. Mileti, U. Smith, M. Stefanko, T. Talbot, B. Thompson, N. Tulsy, L. Wershaw, A. Zhou

Members Absent (Unexcused): T. Drucker, N. Vasko

Also Present: J. Berger, A. Mulgia, R. Gitlin

II. Open Mic

No items presented.

III. Announcements and Reports

Elections Committee Update – A. Muglia

- Election results have been announced. There were no rules violated. Record number of clubs endorsing.

Financial Aid Review Committee Update – M. Henderson

- Met last Friday, considering changing the by-laws to increase the amount of people on the committee.

AAP Update – A. Zhou

- Looking for feedback from other colleges about.

SADAC Update – N. Tulsy

- Next meeting will be on Wednesday.

CLC Update – M. Stefanko

- Working on mental health blurb in syllabi initiative and the food and security initiative.

SACIDI Update – L. Liu

- DIP evaluation process beginning this Sunday, meeting with Staff for the evaluation process going to talk about the evaluation process and the future of USB.

IV. Appropriations Committee Appeals

There are four appeals that were argued before the Appropriations Committee.

- Last Call A Capella: denied funding (treasurer did not approve on time)

- Big Red Bears: approved funding (dry cleaning for durable good), vote required. **Motion to Vote.** 23-0-0, motion passes.
- Water Polo Team: were funded, but not in the desired tear. SAFC will work to resolve issues of semester funding need imbalance in the future. Denied.
- Club Swimming: Vice President approved the budget as the acting President; Appropriations Committee voted 5-4-1 in favor of funding them, via accepting the VP's sign-off as an acceptable approval. **Motion to Vote.** 22-0-1.

V. Business of the Day

R. 56, R. 57, R. 58: Student Assembly Judicial Commission (By-Laws Change, Commission Charter and By-Laws, and Standing Rules change) – U. Smith, J. Berger

- Discussion is continued from the last meeting.
- A. Muglia: Concerned by how much power the President now has in appointing the Parliamentarian, which is supposed to be a neutral party. *Response:* Very similar to Director of Elections. Appointed and then usually approved by at least the Executive Committee. This isn't more power, rather a new function.
- S. Ali Khan: It says the Executive Committee prepares the slate of commissioners. How will it do that? Publicity? *Reponses:* There will be certainly be marketing efforts and there will be an application process.
- B. Henderson: Talk about the SAJC reviewing all SA resolutions. *Response:* Ensure that resolutions don't break the rules established in the charter/by-laws. Answer questions of jurisdiction before reaching the President's desk.
- I. Harris: What groups have you spoken to about the SAJC's power to revoke fund? *Response:* This is a power the SA already has, so it's not new.
- G. Block: In R. 58, I don't think the President and EVP should be ex-officio members on everything, including SAFC. *Response:* We didn't add that, we just added an exception for SAJC.
- G. Block: Concerns with By-Line funding groups and SAFC Groups. *Response:* This doesn't affect funding or anything to do with that process, except for withholding funds when there is demonstrated harm. I. Harris: Can we clarify this issue? *Response:* We could add an addendum.
- M. Lukasiewicz: Why does the student body not elect the Parliamentarian in this structure? SAFC commissioners follow written rules and check boxes. *Response:* It will become to politicize. Also, SAFC commissioners aren't elected and the SAJC commissioners will follow the rules as written as well.
- Y. Bhandari: Why are the SAFC commissioners serving two terms? *Response:* Institutional knowledge is important when dealing with a lot of documents.
- L. Liu: Attendance policy for SAJC charter, no clause for excused absences. *Response:* In the standing rules, there can be guidelines for exceptions. Decided as a group and should be left to the commissioners to write. Also, all University accepted excuses automatically apply
- G. Block: Proposing an amendment that provides an exception to R. 56 so that the SAJC does not review resolutions pertaining to the Student Activity Fee. Also, around line 43, should add text that explicitly states the SAJC will not have any review power over funding decisions. *Response:* By review, we mean: is the resolution

classified correctly? Does it fall within our authority? Not looking at substance.

Motion to Amend. No dissent. Discussion of proposed amendment.

- **Motion to Vote.** Dissent. Return to discussion of amendment.
- U. Smith: We have been through these questions, and this is the recommendation of University Counsel. The types of matters being adjudicated are very clearly laid out. We are not in funding processes at all. I don't see the need for this amendment. This job already exists for the Parliamentarian.
- T. Talbot: Please explain the current review process. *Response:* Ensuring everything within the resolution is allowed and is within SA jurisdiction. Also classification of resolutions (i.e. sense of the body, legislation, etc.).
- **Motion to Vote.** Dissent. 15-4-4. Amendment adopted.
- E. Bonatti: Will the SAJC members be required to sit in on SA meetings? *Response:* No. Parliamentarian does, however, so there is a connection. Can use the DOE and the Office of the Assemblies to advertise the positions.
- M. Lukasiewicz: Have you spoke with other Assemblies? And what does other University entities mean? *Response:* Consulted the Scheinman Institute, Office of the Ombudsman, Office of the President, Office of the Vice President for Student and Academic Services, and UA Codes and Judicial Committee.
- I. Harris: Is there a limit to how back issues can go? *Response:* Needs to be applicable to the current time.
- G. Block **Motion to Vote.** Dissent.
- J. Batista: How does the SAJC interact with the USB? *Response:* Violations of USB are spelt out in USB documents. Groups could be castigated via funding privileges revoked.
- **Motion to Vote.** Dissent.
- E. Bonatti: How does this compare to the US Court system? Is there an appeals process? *Response:* This isn't a court. Ultimately the President has final say over everything. The SAJC will make a recommendation on how things should be followed and applied. SAJC can send things to other entities for final recommendation.
- **Motion to Vote.** Dissent. Requiring a vote to vote. 18-2-1
- Vote. **All resolution were adopted.** See voting sheet for breakdown.

VI. New Business

R. 63: Improving Transparency and Increasing Publicity of Towards New Destinations Progress and Campus Climate Research – N. Tulsy

- Trying to make sure what the University is doing with Towards New Destinations is transparent to the study body and that the University can be held accountable for their progress. Very similar to the resolution created by the UA Campus Welfare Committee.
- **Motion to move to Business of the Day.** No dissent. Now open for general discussion.
- J. Batista: How do you plan to disseminate the information received by Towards New Destinations to the student body? *Response:* Perhaps an email to the whole student body. If the information is displayed in a place where it can be found by the

people who want to find it, that might be enough.

- **Call to Question.** Dissent expressed. Vote to vote. 12-7-2. Motion fails.
- L. Liu: What roles do SADAC and SACIDI have in monitoring the progress of this resolution? What role do they play? *Response:* As announcements come they will be passed along to the various groups.
- **Call to Question.** No dissent.
- Vote 21-1-0, **Resolution Adopted.**

R. 64: We the Cornellians Petitions Platform – J. Batista, M. Stefanko, R. Gitlin

- This petition comes from whitehouse.gov. How can the SA become more transparent and better receive student input? Set up a process for allowing people to petition the Administration. A new way to interact with students, brings the SA closer to the student body. We can measure student interest and support in different initiatives.
- Community Members Max Weisberg '16: This might create barriers because it sets a minimum for support. *Response:* Creates weight for movements, demonstrate student support.
- **Motion to move to Business of the Day.** No dissent. Item is now open for general discussion.
- S. Ali Khan: Don't want this to be a political platform. Should be amended to exclude sitting SA members.
- S. Balik: Look at the flowchart.
- **Discussion tabled** until the next meeting.

U. Smith adjourned the meeting at 6:29:30pm.

Please note: due to technical difficulties of the room sound system, there is no audio recording available for this meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Murphy
Clerk, Office of the Assemblies

Student Assembly Meeting - March 13, 2014

	Roll Call	R56			R57			R58			R63			
		IN FAVOR	OPPOSED	ABSTAIN	IN FAVOR	OPPOSED	ABSTAIN	IN FAVOR	OPPOSED	ABSTAIN	IN FAVOR	OPPOSED	ABSTAIN	
S. Ali Khan		1			1			1			1			
S. Balik		1									1			
J. Batista		1	1			1		1			1			
Y. Bhandari		1	1			1		1			1			
G. Block		1	1				1			1			1	
E. Bonatti		1	1					1	1		1			
I. Chen		1	1			1		1			1			
T. Drucker	UX													
R. Gademsky		1	1			1		1			1			
I. Harris		1	1			1				1				
M. Henderson		1	1			1		1			1			
T. Hittinger	Left													
J. Hutson		1	1			1		1			1			
F. Jimenez		1	1			1				1	1			
L. Liu		1	1			1		1			1			
M. Lukasiewicz		1				1			1		1			
S. Lutsic		1	1			1		1			1			
Y. Ma		1	1				1	1			1			
N. Miletic		1	1			1				1	1			
U. Smith		1	1			1		1						
M. Stefanko		1				1			1		1			
T. Talbot		1	1			1		1			1			
B. Thompson		1	1			1		1			1			
N. Tulsy		1	1					1	1		1			
N. Vasko	UX													
L. Wershaw		1	1			1				1	1			
A. Zhou		1	1			1					1	1		
(27)		24	20	0	3	17	2	4	16	6	1	21	1	0