



# Cornell University Student Assembly

## Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, October 4, 2018 Meeting  
4:48pm-6:08pm in Willard Straight Hall Memorial Room

### I. Call to Order & Roll Call

- a. V. Devatha called the meeting to order at 4:48 pm.
- b. Roll Call:
  - i. *Present:* J. Anderson [0], D. Barbaria [0], V. Devatha [0], O. Din [2.5], J. Dominguez [0], O. Egharevba [1], A. Hailu [1], N. Hernandez [0], C. Huang [0], A. Jain [0], K. Kebbeh [1], S. Lim [0], N. Matolka [0], U. Mustafa [0], D. Nyakaru [0], G. Park [0], I. Pavlov [0], M. Peralta-Ochoa [1.25], E. Shapiro [0], J. Sim [0], F. Uribe-Rheinbolt [0], I. Wallace [0], V. Xu [0]
  - ii. *Absent:* S. Harshvardhan [1], S. Iruvanti [0], M. Shovik [0], M. Stefanko [1], B. Weintraub [1]

### II. Oath of Office

- a. New members C. Huang, I. Pavlov, and V. Xu were sworn in using the Oath of Office at 4:53 pm.

### III. Approval of the Minutes

- a. Motion to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2018 meeting – **approved**.

### IV. Open Microphone

- a. No speakers at the open microphone.

### V. Announcements and Reports

- a. J. Anderson said that he sent out the application links to join the City Commission of Ithaca, and that the student voice is lacking on this body, which is important because Collegetown represents the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> wards of the commission. He also said that program house applications are now live for the next academic year, including the new Loving House and Equity Engagement Center.
- b. I. Wallace made an announcement regarding SAIFC.
- c. D. Barbaria said that Cornell Minds Matter was funded a certain amount of money, and that any SA member can vote to overturn this decision. He added that he and V. Devatha are able to make any allocation of the Special Projects Fund that is \$400 or under.
- d. V. Devatha asked if there was any motion to overturn this decision.
  - i. There was no response.

### VI. Business of the Day

- a. Resolution 10: Approving Revisions to Appendix C
  - i. I. Wallace said that the version of the resolution that is in the meeting packet is not the redlined version, and that the Assembly members should view the redlined version via their email. He also said that there have been no new changes to the resolution, but that he knew that V. Devatha had some ideas for changes regarding issues of the university endowment. He added that it would be great if V. Devatha and D. Barbaria led the charge in this regard.
  - ii. J. Anderson asked if he would like to add D. Barbaria as a sponsor of the resolution.
  - iii. I. Wallace replied in the affirmative.
  - iv. There was a motion to add D. Barbaria as a sponsor on the resolution – **amended**.
  - v. There was a motion to table the resolution – **tabled**.

## VII. New Business

- a. Resolution 11: Establishing an Investigative Ad-Hoc Committee on Cornell University's Campus Printing System and Stewardship in IT Governance
  - i. J. Sim said that this resolution would renew the task force created in this regard last year, and that SA bylaws state that all ad hoc committees must be reapproved once the new assembly is fully staffed. He added that they have had multiple talks with the administration, and that they have acknowledged that Cornell's printing system is abnormal and must be fixed.
  - ii. I. Wallace asked about last year's task force's findings.
  - iii. J. Sim said that most of the task force's findings are documented in lines 15-49 of the resolution, and that they basically got the acknowledgement that Cornell is unusual in that printing allocation is not freely provided to all students, and that they are in talks to change the system.
  - iv. D. Barbaria said that, once the resolution is made Business of the Day, he will amend to change the abstract such that it reads that the task force is being renewed, not created.
  - v. N. Hernandez moved to move the resolution to Business of the Day – **approved**.
  - vi. D. Barbaria moved to amend the words "establishes an" in the abstract to read "renewing the" – **amended**.
  - vii. O. Din moved to vote on the resolution.
    - 1. I. Wallace dissented, and asked whether the title should be amended such that it matches the name of last year's ad hoc committee.
  - viii. J. Sim said that the name was changed because the proponents of the resolution want to expand the investigation, and that last year significant evidence was found that the university isn't being very transparent in its IT governance practices. He added that there is a lack of student involvement in this regard, and that it is very secluded and not very effective.
  - ix. O. Din maintained his motion.
  - x. V. Devatha said that there is no more dissent to maintain against.
  - xi. Motion to vote on the resolution – **approved** 22-0-1.
- b. Resolution 12: Instituting Bi-Weekly Reports for Representatives
  - i. J. Anderson said that there will be one clarifying change made to this resolution when it is moved to Business of the Day, namely that missing a bi-

weekly report would no longer impact the attendance of an SA member. He then further explained the resolution.

- ii. D. Barbaria asked J. Anderson to discuss more broadly why this resolution would be beneficial.
- iii. J. Anderson said that it is helpful because it shows publicly what every member of the SA does, and that it can sometimes be hard to explain that in a liaison capacity. He added that a member would be able to say what initiatives they are working on, and more senior members could take a look at the initiatives being pursued and help improve collaboration among members. He also said that this would allow the community to see what each member is working on.
- iv. J. Sim said that he has two major concerns, the first being that part of the resolution goes against charter, and that he was not contacted at all in the creation of this resolution.
- v. J. Anderson said that the part that would go against charter is being eliminated.
- vi. J. Sim said that he does not see why this resolution needs to be passed.
- vii. J. Anderson said that this is a long-term plan, and that since the EVP is the person that puts out the call for agenda items at the beginning of the week, this is in correspondence with them. He added that the functional process is pretty standard, and that he appreciates the work of the executive archivist, but that it just makes workflow sense to do it this way such that representatives are not inundated for biweekly reports.
- viii. V. Devatha said that, as president, he would not personally want to receive these reports, and that the historical absence of the executive archivist should not be taken into consideration in the future, since the person sitting in this seat in the future will appoint one. He added that he believes this should not be an email that is sent out, but rather a form that is filled out online. He also said that this would be added to the minutes, but not included in the agenda.
- ix. E. Shapiro asked how long the reports should be.
- x. J. Anderson said that they should be as long as necessary for someone to read it and be able to understand what the assembly member has done.
- xi. A. Jain said that, in her position, reporting might be irrelevant since she is already reporting to the person who needs the information, and that it seems redundant to report this to the SA, rather than to committees that need the information.
- xii. J. Anderson said that nothing would preclude A. Jain from reporting to those people as well, and that they are not two opposite things. He added that information from confidential meetings would not have to be reported. He also said that this is less relevant for identity representatives since they have all been doing a very good job in regard to keeping the connection alive with their respective organizations.
- xiii. J. Dominguez said that he feels like the timeframe is too frequent, and whether J. Anderson would be open to relaxing the frequency to a monthly or semesterly report. He also asked whether “biweekly” means “twice a week” or “once every two weeks”.
- xiv. J. Anderson said that the biweekly reports would occur once every two weeks.

- xv. J. Dominguez asked what a person could report on every two weeks, and said that the timeframe could be relaxed.
- xvi. J. Anderson said that he originally wanted to make the reports weekly, and that he believes that biweekly reports work the best. He added that he has many meetings every two weeks, and that many people on the Executive Committee (henceforth Exec) would want to make sure that the reports are not too infrequent so that people can remember everything that they've done. He also said that biweekly reports can get a lot of consolidated information that isn't too far apart, which should spur individuals to think of more meetings to attend or projects.
- xvii. J. Dominguez asked if the reports would be uploaded to the SA website.
- xviii. J. Anderson replied in the affirmative, and said that it would be included in the agenda, but likely not printed since it would be a waste of paper.
- xix. J. Dominguez asked what inspired J. Anderson to make this resolution, and asked whether or not people could just theoretically come up to him and ask what is going on in the SA.
- xx. J. Anderson said that there are varying levels of comfortability coming up to an SA rep in general, and that there is the aspect of transparency to consider. He added that other universities do this in their shared governments, and that he has wanted to implement this system for a while. He also said that this could be good for people who want to get involved to find out who is working on what in the assembly.
- xxi. I. Wallace said that he thinks that this is a very good idea for close collaboration between members, and that he doesn't know what particular members are working on, but that this can make members more apt to collaborate.
- xxii. U. Mustafa asked if this is a form of performance assessment for Exec, or if it is just an accountability measure.
- xxiii. J. Anderson said that it is just for transparency, and that it provides more accountability for Exec, but also for individual members. He added that around election season, people could go back and see what everyone has or hasn't been working on. He also said that Exec has no business judging what members are working on, and that is the sole purview of the people who elect assembly members.
- xxiv. V. Devatha said that people can always review what goes on at Exec in its agenda, as well as by attending its meetings.
- xxv. Tirenolu Onabajo said that she supports the resolution, and that it would be to voting members' benefit to have constant documents on their computers keeping track of what has been done. She added that she thinks it is very important for this to be biweekly, and that a lot can get done in two weeks, and that this benefits accountability and productivity.
- xxvi. J. Anderson said that SAIFC has a form for their projects that involves filling out a survey that auto-populates a form that can be accessed later, and that this report system could take a form similar to that.
- xxvii. T. Onabajo asked whether the identity representatives, such as the former ISU representative, have been historically the most effective representatives.
- xxviii. J. Anderson replied in the affirmative.

- xxix. D. Barbaria said that the Vice President of Internal Operations does communicate with the clerk weekly regarding attendance, so they should be involved. He added that he objects to the statements that this resolution is in violation of charter, and explained his reasoning.
  - xxx. There was a motion to table the resolution – **tabled**.
  - xxxi. J. Anderson moved to amend the agenda such that Resolution 14 would be discussed before Resolution 13 – **amended**.
- c. Resolution 14: Increasing the Minimum LEED Certification
- i. Julie Kapuvari explained the implications of the resolution.
  - ii. G. Park said that the Environmental Committee jointly decided to include the last clause that involves the administration hosting a panel to help transparency regarding the process. She added that if the budget increases, it might be more of a burden on low-income students depending on how financial aid can bear this cost.
  - iii. Jenny Xie further explained the resolution.
  - iv. J. Anderson said that there is a great deal of background context with this resolution that many people probably do not know, and that there is a lot of infighting regarding the impact the North Campus housing project would have on the environment. He added that if anyone is interested in attending an Ithaca City Planning Board meeting, the big meeting will be on October 30<sup>th</sup>.
  - v. J. Kapuvari said that LEED as a metric generally is not comprehensive, and that it cuts out a lot of the accountability afterward. She added that it is a very superficial way of doing this, and that this resolution will make a big difference in the long run.
  - vi. D. Barbaria said that at the University Assembly meeting on the previous Tuesday, he heard that Professor Bob Howarth was mistreated or that there was miscommunication. He asked whether a graph that was brought up in this regard could be added to the resolution as an appendix.
  - vii. J. Kapuvari said that the graph is not very relevant in this regard.
  - viii. J. Xie said that because of the competing numbers from B. Howarth and the Cornell architects, it is almost impossible for the proponents of the resolution to figure out what is right. She added that she believes they are at least trying to be committed to their goal of sustainability, and that if the design itself can be made as energy-efficient as possible, it would be optimal.
  - ix. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt asked whether any of the buildings on campus created more recently had been certified as LEED Gold.
  - x. J. Xie said that there are some buildings on campus that she believes are higher than LEED Silver, and that the way she had heard it is that any building that costs over a certain amount to build must be at least LEED Silver.
  - xi. There was a motion to table the resolution – **tabled**.
- d. Resolution 13: Creating the Advocacy Agenda ad-hoc Committee
- i. J. Anderson said that the intent of this resolution is not for it to be voted on today, and that there are key things that he would like to talk about with certain individuals that he thinks would like to be involved. He added that the committee would have three SA members, one of whom is the chair, and that this group of three would reach out to other members to figure out

- pillars that the SA is working toward. He also said that he thinks the SA can agree that mental health on campus needs fixing, and that this could be a pillar, and that there is a lot that the assembly can agree upon, and that focusing on at least three key things a year could help the assembly out a lot.
- ii. D. Nyakaru asked how the long-term goals would be set, and that her biggest concern is that as each assembly changes, the focus could change drastically, and that continuity might not exist. She also said that whatever the committee decides to focus on might not be what the community wants or needs.
  - iii. J. Anderson said that he thinks that this is a very important concern, and that the Advocacy Agenda's final product would be presented to the assembly as a whole and would require unanimous consent. He added that representatives of the ad hoc would make it their concern to reach out to the members of the SA, and that this is something that the assembly has lacked entirely, but also something that the administration would recognize and support. He referenced the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly's GPCI document.
  - iv. D. Nyakaru asked if J. Anderson could speak more as to how the initiatives would be implemented.
  - v. A representative of the GPSA said that they treat the GPCI as a living document, and that the GPSA spends the entire year working on it. She said that right now the GPSA is working on subcommittees for each area, and that the biggest part of the document is trying to find feasible ways of doing as much research on our topics as possible so that the administration knows that these are things that can be done in five years.
  - vi. J. Anderson said that he wants to have conversations offline when this is tabled to make sure that there is desire for this to be passed.
  - vii. J. Dominguez asked whether or not Exec could do this at the beginning of the year, and said that he feels like this adds more bureaucracy.
  - viii. J. Anderson said that he respects J. Dominguez's opinion, and that he believes that this year's Exec would be in favor of that, but that he does not know if past Execs would. He added that he sometimes feels as though non-Exec members of the SA are closer to the proverbial ground in terms of what is wanted or needed, and that if the body feels that Exec can take on this task, that he is all for it, but that if you feel that Exec cannot do this, then that is okay too.
  - ix. J. Dominguez asked whether this would imply a charter change.
  - x. J. Anderson said that this could be put into the standing rules when they are changed every year, and that this is a concern for later.
  - xi. J. Sim said that he wanted to apologize if he came off as too aggressive earlier in the meeting, and that his concerns were with the way these resolutions were being handled. He said that he does not know how this committee would be very different from Exec, and that for example this committee would promote the executive archivist to an ex-officio member in it, and that Exec does this as well. He further stated his concerns.
  - xii. J. Anderson asked whether J. Sim agrees or disagrees with J. Dominguez.

- xiii. J. Sim said that he believes that this should be the purview of Exec, and that he does not see why this should be a committee, since it would be easy to lose sight over what the committee is doing.
- xiv. J. Anderson said that he agrees in regard to losing sight, and that the dates are wonky due to the fact that goals set in fall would be implemented in spring, such that more people can be involved in the long-term planning of the Agenda.
- xv. A. Hailu asked why only three members of the SA would be on the committee. She also said that she likes the idea, but that a committee might not be the best way to go about this, and asked whether it should be opened up wider to improve diversity and add ideas.
- xvi. J. Anderson said that he chose for there to be three members since he did not know how many people would want to work on it, and that if the assembly decides to go through with the ad hoc, then he would recommend that some check for diversity be included. He added that he wants this document to be a statement of goals and values for the assembly as a whole, and for it to be extremely living, open to the public, and amendable over the year. He also said that the assembly very much lacks in this regard, and that he thinks they can have more of a conversation outside of the assembly in this regard.
- xvii. D. Barbaria said that he thinks they should talk more about making it clearer what the requirements of this would be. He added that he is fully in favor of the resolution, and that something that one realized when on the SA for more than one year is that every assembly is different, and that new assemblies can certainly disregard what has gone on in the past, but many do not know what has happened in the past. He also said that its function is less of a “what you have to do,” than it is a “here’s what we’ve worked on in the past,” and that this would be helpful for future assemblies.
- xxviii. Shashank Vura asked what role the GPSA and the UA would have in relation to this committee.
- xix. J. Anderson said that they would have none, and that this is an undergraduate-focused document.
- xx. S. Vura asked why they were here to testify if this is the case.
- xxi. J. Anderson said that the GPSA representative was present because she normally comes to SA meetings, and that her presence was not planned.
- xxii. The GPSA representative said that anyone can see the current GPCI on the graduate school website, as well as the work being put into it.
- xxiii. S. Vura asked how it is different from the role of the executive archivist.
- xxiv. The GPSA representative said that the administration takes it seriously because of the extensive research and conversations with the administration in this regard.
- xxv. K. Kebbeh said that the GPSA representative mentioned that the GPSA reviews the document every five years, and that she believes that such a timeframe is too long. She asked what timeline J. Anderson was thinking of for the Advocacy Agenda.
- xxvi. J. Anderson said that his intention is for there to be a yearly review, and that it would be okay for it to be done every two years instead.
- xxvii. K. Kebbeh asked what the process for changing the document would be.

- xxviii. J. Anderson said that, if the document was placed under the purview of Exec, then Exec would change it amongst themselves. He also said that if the ad hoc committee works and does well, then it would be a summer standing committee that could work on it in tandem with Exec, and that it comes down to who the SA would be comfortable with holding it.
- xxix. K. Kebbeh asked whether the committee would have some sort of action plan.
- xxx. J. Anderson said that any enumeration of an action plan would come down to the authors, but that it might be a bit redundant.
- xxxi. N. Hernandez said that she believes that this is a good thing, and that there seems to be many different ideas in this regard, and that she would advise that a Slack channel be created in this regard.
- xxxii. N. Hernandez moved to table the resolution – **tabled**.

### **VIII. Adjournment**

- a. V. Devatha adjourned the meeting at 6:08 pm.

### **IX. Executive Session**

Respectfully Submitted,  
*John Hannan*  
Clerk of the Assembly