I. Call to Order

II. Land Acknowledgement of the Gayogoḥóꞌnǫ̱ (Cayuga Nation)

III. Announcements and Presentations
   a. President Huang
   b. Vice President of Finance Uchenna Chukwukere

IV. Open Microphone

V. Approval of the Minutes
   a. November 19, 2020 Minutes
   b. December 3, 2020 Minutes
   c. December 10, 2020 Minutes

VI. Business of the Day
   a. Resolution #17: Reduction of Convocation Committee’s Student Activity Fee Allocation

VII. New Business
   a. Resolution #22: Creating an ad-hoc Taskforce on Harassment, Bias, and Discrimination
   b. Resolution #24: Creating a Diversity and Inclusion Scholarship
   c. Resolution #25: Including Pronouns and Phonetic Name Pronunciations in Class Rosters
   d. Resolution #26: Encouraging Diversity in Professional Organizations
   e. Resolution #27: Final Exam Policy Extension to Thirty Hours
   f. Resolution #28: Campus Policing Reform

VIII. Adjournment
I. Call to Order & Roll Call
   a. C. Huang called the meeting to order at 4:48pm (EST).
   b. Roll Call
      i. Members Present: L. Abd Elmagid, D. Anadkat, M. Baker, J. Bansah, K.
         Bentley, K. Butler, C. Castillo, U. Chukwukere, L. Contreras, A.
         Gleiberman, S. Kapoor, A. Lampert, S. Lim, A. Miramontes Serrano, E.
         Moy, E. Perez, T. Reuning, K. Santacruz, M. Sharrow, L. Smith, C.
         Tempelman, V. Valencia, N. Watson, S. Woldai, V. Xu, Y. Yuan, R. Zohar,
         L. Zumpano, S. Zverev, C. Huang
      ii. Members Absent: All members present.

II. Land Acknowledgement of the Gayogohó:nꞌ (Cayuga Nation)
   a. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogohó:nꞌ (the
      Cayuga Nation). The Gayogohó:nꞌ are members of the Haudenosaunee
      Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary
      presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell
      University, New York State, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the
      painful history of Gayogohó:nꞌ dispossession, and honor the ongoing connection
      of the Gayogohó:nꞌ people, past and present, to these lands and waters.

III. Announcements and Presentations
   a. C. Huang explained that there is currently a vacant position for the College of
      Architecture, Art, & Planning Representative. According to the standing rules, the
      chair is required to appoint an interim member until a new representative is elected.
      C. Huang announced she has decided to appoint Savanna Lim, who is an
      Architecture, Art, & Planning student and previously served on the Student
      Assembly as a voting member. The appointment needed to be approved by a
      majority of Student Assembly members.
      i. A. Miramontes Serrano asked for clarification on what the appointment
         meant.
         1. C. Huang explained that, according to rule 10 of the standing rules, if
            a seat is vacant, an interim representative shall be appointed by the
            President and confirmed with the majority of student assembly
            members. The interim representative will have full voting privileges
associated with membership on the SA. It would be terminated immediately once a new representative is elected.

ii. Motion to appoint S. Lim – approved 23-0-5

b. C. Huang asked for those in attendance to refrain from using the chat and to keep yourself muted unless recognized by the chair.

c. Office of Student Government Relations Presentation by A. Kulkarni ’22, director of the OSGR.

i. The OSGR is an arm of the Student Assembly with the mission to advocate on the behalf of current and future students of Cornell University for the accessibility, affordability, and quality of their education. In practice, this breaks down into two particular things. First, the OSGR takes what is going on on a federal, state, and local levels of government and translate it back to students. On the other hand, the OSGR takes the voices that are heard from students, whether it’s from financial aid to sexual assaults prevention, and translate these issues to elected officials at a variety of levels. The OSGR has been around for a year and have had a lot of serious accomplishments. Recently, the OSGR has hosted a town hall panel that included Mayor Svante Myrick of Ithaca, the Public Health Director, and the President of the Chamber of Commerce for Ithaca. Additionally, the OSGR has send a letter that resulted in a hearing with the New York State Higher Ed Committee, and both the Assembly and the Senate were able to testify, along with peers at SUNY and CUNY. Finally, the OSGR passed a letter that included support from more than 50 Higher Ed institutions. There is more analysis and research that can be found on the OSGR website. The OSGR has spoken with 12 Senate offices, 3 House of Representative offices, ranging from Sen. Marco Rubio’s office to Sen. Chuck Schumer’s office. The OSGR believes there is an opportunity to expand paid academic internships, extend student protections from COVID-19, continuing the progress for reinstating higher education funding for incarcerated and formerly incarcerated students, and supporting international students on a variety of issues. The OSGR strongly encourage and support students getting more involved in the community and improving the University’s relationship with the Ithaca community.

ii. C. Huang expressed her appreciation to A. Kulkarni and the OSGR for the presentation and the work that the office does. As there are two resolutions
that pertain to the OSGR, C. Huang encouraged the assembly to amend the agenda to discuss those resolutions now.

1. Motion to amend agenda – amended 26-0-3

IV. New Business

a. Statement of the Agenda of the Office of Student Government Relations.
   i. The purpose of this statement is to formally endorse the 2020-2021 Agenda for the Office of Student Government Relations.
   ii. Motion to vote – approved 22-0-7

b. SA R14: Amendment to 2019-2020 S.A. Resolution 14 (Establishing the Office of Student Government Relations): Creation of Bylaws
   i. Abstract: These amendments to the Student Assembly Bylaws seek to establish the bylaws for the Office of Student Government Relations.
   ii. A. Kulkarni stated that is essentially internal government documents laying out how the Office of Student Government will structure and its relationship with the Student Assembly.
   iii. Motion to approve Resolution #14 – approved 25-0-4

V. Announcements and Presentations (Cont.)

a. Presentation by Cornell University Police Chief David Honan
   i. The mission of the Cornell Police Service is to enhance the quality of life of Cornell by contributions that foster a safe and secure environment. The CUPD believes that justice is a foundation for peace and the belief that community service and crime prevention that respects and preserves human dignity is important to peace. Without that peace, there cannot be education. This year, the Public Safety Advisory Committee has been reimagined and it is composed of students, staff, and faculty appointed through the shared governance to advise the department of issues of public safety, victim advocacy, and in accordance with New York State education law, any other issues that pertain to the safety of the Cornell campus. In July 2020, President Pollack charged the PSA with reimagining public safety at Cornell and wants a submission of a report of its recommendation to the Executive Vice President by the end of the semester. Traditionally, the PSA met once or twice a semester. At the first meeting this year, the committee itself decided to move to twice a month meetings. More information regarding the PSA meetings can be found on the CUPD website. Regarding disarming CUPD officers and its effect on campus safety, CUPD officers cannot do their jobs unarmed, as officers respond to very dynamic situations that can change on a moment’s notice. In the cases that CUPD responds to, seconds count and officers need to have access to all the tools to them, not only to protect themselves, but to protect the members of the Cornell community. Officers are well trained to deescalate and defuse situations where force does not have to be used. Fortunately, these skills have paid off and there has not been an incidence of excessive force by CUPD officers. However, one cannot predict human behavior, nor the future, so there could be unknown information or threats that could threaten the community. If CUPD were to be disarmed, they would no longer be able to respond to any calls of armed individuals, felonies, traffic enforcement. CUPD responds to hundreds of panic and burglar alarms on campus, which they would not be able to respond to if disarmed. If CUPD was unarmed and unable to respond to
violent felonies, according to New York State law, Cornell would be forced to enter into a relationship with a local law enforcement agency that can handle the vast geography of Cornell. These outside agencies do not know the buildings and the community on the same level of CUPD. CUPD officers are committed to anti-bias and anti-racist policing and pledge to be partners that ensure everybody is treated with dignity and respect. The department hires and retains people who not only have the technical skills needed to be a police officer, but the cultural skills to be a police officer at Cornell to take care of the community. CUPD policies are mandated by state law and university policy and the mission of service to protect the community to provide a clear framework and expectations for the officers. CUPD is an accredited agency where all officers are trained in de-escalation implicit bias, procedural justice, mental health crisis response, critical incident management, victim advocacy trauma, informed response, and interviewing skills. CUPD’s firearm safety and train standard exceed all state standards, and most importantly, CUPD holds all people accountable if they do not follow policies and practices. The internal affair summary, which includes all complaints received, a daily crime log, and an annual security report is located on the CUPD website. An internal investigation analysis overall shows a downward trend over the past five years and for 2019, none of allegations were based in special categories of racial profiling, bias policing, excessive force, and sexual harassment.

ii. C. Huang stated, that as chair, she has permission to prioritize Student Assembly members, but due to the abundance of community members, C. Huang will alternate between SA member and community member.

1. M. Adeghe asked it was possible for C. Huang to prioritize marginalized folks from the speaker’s list.
2. C. Huang stated that as chair, she is allowed to do so and is happy to.
3. E. Moy asked for clarification on what counts as a marginalized individual.
4. C. Huang stated she should not like to make judgements about people’s identities and if people are okay with it, to privately message her about their identity.
5. M. Adeghe explained that for black and brown folks, it is not too hard to discern. As this resolution directly impacts black and brown folks, M. Adeghe stated it is important to amplify their voices.
6. U. Chukwukere reaffirmed that marginalized folks need to be prioritized, as they are the most affect by institutional policing.
7. Y. Yuan stated that Asian international students should also be prioritized on the speaker’s list.
8. C. Huang stated that she does not want to make these judgement calls and cannot discern everyone’s identities from a Zoom screen or
name. C. Huang explained she will follow the order of the hands and those that feel they should be prioritized to privately message her.

iii. T. Reuning asked Chief Honan, in the last 25 years he has been CUPD, how many times he had personally discharged his weapon.
   1. Chief Honan stated he had never.
   2. T. Reuning replied that shows it is possible to successfully do the job without using a lethal weapon.

iv. L. Davis-Frost asked how CUPD can have anti-bias and anti-racist policing when policing is inherently racist and biased.
   1. Chief Honan answered that officers participate in training that focuses on de-escalation skills and addressing unconscious biases. They take proactive measures to remove from the police department.
   2. L. Davis-Frost for an example of what anti-bias training looks like.
   3. Chief Honan stated that they bring in various speakers to speak about implicit bias and unconscious biases to be aware of them. Additionally, there are reality-based training through video stimulation, where they can see if there are differences in the officers’ actions based on the person within the video. Officers for 17 weeks are rated daily on their interactions with the diverse community.

v. M. Adeghe asked for clarification for why Chief Honan is so adamant to have weapons when in 25 years he had never to discharge his.
   1. Chief Honan stated that he was asked on his opinion on being armed, and even though he had never used it doesn’t apply to situations for other officers. During his career, Chief Honan has responded to several armed persons and his officers have responded to very volatile and dangerous situations at times. Through their training and their de-escalation skills, they can sometimes bring somebody into custody and get them connected with services. However, this is the best-case scenario.
   2. M. Adeghe stated her confusion over the need for weapons if the officers are focused on de-escalation.
   3. Chief Honan explained that officers still respond to dangerous calls that could be lethal. They may need weapons to not just protect themselves but members of the community.

vi. E. Moy asked for clarification of the requirement for memorandum and if CUPD were to disarm completely, would it mean there is still an armed presence on campus.
   1. Chief Honan explained that the university would be required to enter into a memorandum of understanding with a police department that can respond to and investigate violent felonies and missing persons.

vii. Y. Kalmyka questioned why the community does not have access to the budget for CUPD.
   1. Chief Honan answered that the department wants to be more transparent, but traditionally never posted the budget or past policies on the website. After hearing feedback from the community, they are working to build a page on the website. 90% of the budget foes
towards salaries, while the remained goes towards maintaining systems like the emergency alert system, computers, and vehicles.

viii. V. Xu asked if Chief Honan could share more on details on reports by the PSA and if President Pollack had responded to any of it.
   1. Chief Honan clarified the report is going to be generated by the Public Safety Advisory Committee by the end of the school year. The process has just begun and there have been meetings every two weeks.
   2. V. Xu asked if Chief Honan could share any ideas discussed so far.
   3. Chief Honan stated that the work of a police department is really complex. The presentation at this meeting was the basic and right now, the committee is receiving details on statistics, policies, and procedures.

ix. G. Millette asked why the police need guns for traffic enforcement and burglaries.
   1. Chief Honan stated that you don’t need a gun to a traffic stop. You need the gun if somebody threatens you with a treat to your life. It is impossible to predict human behavior and officers need to come prepared to respond to any emergency that may threaten their own life or any member of the community.

x. M. Shardow asked how many instances of violent crimes have been under CUPD jurisdiction in the last five years.
   1. Chief Honan answered all crime stats are listed in the annual security report available on the CUPD website. CUPD has been fortunate lately that they have not had to send out many crime alerts related to violent crimes, but it does happen. Cornell Is a very safe place and has low crime, but it does not have no crime.
   2. M. Shardow asked how much weapon upkeep costs each year.
   3. Chief Honan stated he does not have those numbers. Weapons are not replaced annually, usually ever five to seven years. The only upkeep is the ammunition that is used in practice twice a year.

xi. N. Noctyrna asked how police can be held accountable when they investigate themselves with the power to say that they do nothing wrong.
   1. Chief Honan stated this is a challenge for police departments. Departments have to be hair and honest in their investigation. CUPD thoroughly investigate any allegations of wrongdoing by their officers and have found officers accountable and removed them.
   2. N. Noctyrna expressed concern over how when the community can trust CUPD to listen to them. If the community is stating concern over lethal weapons and CUPD is not listening to them, can the
community trust CUPD to listen about accounts of police misconduct.

3. Chief Honan stated that CUPD does listen to the community but are also professionals who have experience in this area.

xii. There was a motion to end this presentation.
   1. K. Butler dissented and stated that a majority of community members and SA members have not able to speak yet.
   2. M. Adeghe explained that similar debates will take place with later resolutions on the agenda, but there are still many things to get through.
   3. L. Abd Elmagid stated that a majority of the SA did not know this presentation was happening until the day before the meeting and would like more time to discuss later things on the agenda.
   4. Motion to end the presentation – approved 14-13-1

VI. Open Microphone
   a. H. Bin Sabir asked will there be an opportunity to discuss anything that is in the agenda
      i. N. Watson answered that there will be a speaker’s list on each agenda item.
   b. R. Matthews invited any people from Cornell to join the Ithaca Panthers.

VII. Approval of Minutes
   a. November 5, 2020
      i. E. Moy stated that the Nov. 5th minutes record him as being absent from the meeting, but he was in attendance.
      ii. Motion to amend the November 5th, 2020 Minutes to mark E. Moy as present – amended 23-0-6
      iii. Motion to approve the November 5th minutes – approved 22-0-7
   b. November 12, 2020
      i. Motion to approve the November 12th minutes – approved 22-0-7

VIII. Business of the Day
   a. M. Adeghe asked if it would be possible to move Resolution #11 to be discussed now, as it was already a topic being debated during the presentation.
      i. Motion to amend the agenda – amended 25-0-4
   b. SA R11: Calling For the Disarmament of the Cornell University Police Department
      i. Abstract: This resolution is calling for the disarmament of the Cornell University Police Department.
      ii. U. Chukwukere stated that it was an act of violence to have brought CUPD to this meeting. It was absolutely tone deaf and irresponsible to have invited them into this space knowing the implications and horrendous history that the institution of policing has had on black, brown, and indigenous people of color, as well as students with low socioeconomic status and other marginalized students. U. Chukwukere urged SA members to think beyond themselves and to vote on the direct reflection of the students. Every single member has black, brown, and indigenous people of color as their constituents.
      iii. Elizaveta P. stated that there have been repeated comments that community members are asking for this to happen. Elizaveta P. has spoken with many people and believes this is not the case. It is a very divided issue and it is misinformation to suggest otherwise. Finally, Elizaveta P. stated that many
people have also been saying that people shouldn’t have access to weapons because they have never had to use them is not a good reason. It is an act of violence to put a police officer in danger and just assume they will be able to get out of the situation without having to use lethal force.

1. T. Reuning explained that the people have stated this resolution is an accurate representation of the needs of the community.

2. S. Farmer stated that there has been widespread support for this resolution from multiple organizations present on this meeting and there has also been several testimonials through social media and email.

iv. K. Butler stated that this conversation has been problematic. As a black woman and victim of police brutality, K. Butler voiced her concern over this resolution. This resolution places students in danger and excludes black and brown people who don’t agree. K. Butler asked that more amendments that allow actual discussion and inclusion before jumping onto a bill that might cause more harm.

1. U. Chukwukere expressed their disappointment that K. Butler still held this viewpoint after all the organizing and teachings from other black and indigenous people of color. The organizers that put this resolution together have been trying to educate people. U. Chukwukere stated they are not here to invalidate anybody’s experiences.

v. A. Gleiberman stated that in the previous meeting, she had been told the resolution is not taking amendments. A. Gleiberman and other SA members have some proposed amendments they would like the co-sponsors to consider in order to make a bill that is representative of the entire student body.

vi. Z. Sherin asked for C. Huang to step down as chair, as she has demonstrated clear support of the resolution.

1. C. Huang stated that according to Robert’s Rules she does not have to step down as chair. In Robert’s Rules it states that no member can be compelled to refrain from voting or stepping down unless they have a funerary direct personal opportunity in the motion. C. Huang affirmed she does not have a pecuniary connection. Similarly, section 4 lines 1 through 3 of the standing rules state that only a corporate interest or financial conflict can force a chair to step down. C. Huang stated her appreciation of Z. Sherin’s comment to ensure the integrity of the meeting is being held and offer to ask members to vote on whether or not she should step down, which meant C. Huang was unfit to chair and have been remarkably biased and had been influencing the meeting in a way that is inappropriate.

2. Y. Yuan stated that it would be in good practice for C. Huang to step down as chair as she is a co-sponsor on the resolution.

3. C. Huang explained she had been a co-sponsor on Resolution #14 earlier on in the meeting and no one had asked her to step down then. If a member could in no case vote on a question affecting
himself, it would be impossible for society to vote ever. The rules do not require C. Huang to step down just because she is a co-sponsor.

4. M. Adeghe expressed concern that this discussion became very gendered and that there is not one person in the assembly that does not have an opinion on the resolution. There is not anyone who could step in the role to chair who isn’t also bias. M. Adeghe asked that no one disrespect C. Huang’s leadership.

5. N. Watson seconded M. Adeghe’s words and stated that C. Huang has been doing a fantastic job chairing the meeting and being as unbiased as possible.

6. D. Anadkat stated that not everyone has made an opinion on the resolution yet. Because C. Huang is a co-sponsor on the resolution, D. Anadkat stated this is a clear bias.

7. C. Huang reviewed the rules for Student Assembly which explains that even if someone’s name is on a resolution does not mean that they have to recuse themselves.

8. S. Lim stated this is included in the bylaws and it is ridiculous people are arguing about something clear in writing. This is the first time in four years of working with the SA that the chair had been asked to step down.

9. U. Chukwukere stated that those asking C. Huang to step down display misogyny and sexism. C. Huang is very capable of running this meeting and ensuring its integrity.

vii. There is a motion to extend the meeting by 30 minutes.

   1. L. Smith dissented and stated that it is semi-finals week and mental health is being compromised. There are many things on the agenda, and it might be best to postpone this resolution.

   2. Vote to vote – **approved** 18-10-1

viii. Motion to extend the meeting by 30 minutes – **approved** 15-11-4

ix. U. Chukwukere explained the several amendments made to the resolution. Amendments included adding L. Bagayoko, N. Nwankpa, M. Shardow, and J. Bansah as co-sponsors to the resolution, providing a definition for lethal weapon on lines 131 and 132, adding a section discussing alternative mechanisms hoped to be put in place starting at line 134, and adding a list of the student organizations that support this resolution.

   1. A. Gleiberman asked if it would be possible to upload the resolution with the amendments to the Box so SA members can look over the resolution.

   2. S. Farmer stated that many members are using the tactics to delay voting. This has been a topic of discussion for over three weeks and
there are many community members who want to know if this resolution will pass

3. Motion to amend – **amended** 23-0-3

x. There is a motion to vote on Resolution #11.
   1. U. Chukwukere and T. Reuning dissented, as several constituents have come to this meeting and deserve the chance to speak.
   2. M. Baker withdrew the motion.

xi. T. Reuning stated that the Chief of Police spent most of his time talking about accountability yet left the meeting as soon as people were trying to hold the police accountable. T. Reuning ceded the rest of their time to G. Defendini the president of La Asociación Latina at Cornell.

xii. G. Defendini stated, that as co-president of La Asociación Latina and the co-founder of Cornell Progressive, it is their job to advocate for their interests. Many of G. Defendini's community members are subject to profiling and violence by police aimlessly and the presence of arms on campus only heightened anxiety and the possibility of tragedy. G. Defendini urged SA members to vote yes on the resolution and the community will remember those supported the community in the next election.

xiii. C. Smith discussed the different crimes and their rate of occurrence at Cornell. In total, there have only been 44 mentions of crime that may involve the need to be armed. This is an extremely negligible amount of crime to show that police need weapons.

xiv. C. Templeman expressed concern over the New York State law that would require Cornell to enter into an agreement with another policing force and asked how whatever extra policing force that would enter into the Cornell campus be held accountable.
   1. C. Contreras clarified that if this resolution passes, that it does not mean that the very next day CUPD would be disarmed. The administration is going to look at this and make a decision of what to implement if they want to implement parts of this legislation.
   2. U. Chukwukere stated that if Cornell were into a memorandum, outside police will only be responsible for responding to violent felonies and investigating missing persons.

xv. Y. Kaymyka expressed their disdain over a proposed resolution that was a product of closed meetings with CUPD. As student elected representatives, it is not acceptable that SA members went to see CUPD instead of students to create that resolution. Additionally, Y. Kaymyka stated it was disgusting that some representatives invited Chief Honan after black and brown students at previous meetings said they did not feel safe with armed agents at a white supremacist institution.
   1. Z. Sherin stated the other resolution started by reaching out to several students from different political spectrums and backgrounds. They did believe it was essential to ask police about their system because calling for reform to ensure it would be accurate.
   2. U. Chukwukere stated that what the co-sponsors of the other resolution did was absolutely disrespectful and disgusting especially to black, brown, and indigenous people of color who are in this meeting. Additionally, U. Chukwukere stated that they did not do the
due diligence in reaching out to student organizations, because the co-sponsors of Resolution #11 reached out to student organizations who stated they have had no correspondences with other SA members. The other version of the resolution was extremely disrespectful and used the work of all the organizers and co-sponsors of Resolution #11

xvi. There is a motion to vote on Resolution #11,
   1. U. Chukwukere dissented and stated that there is still a lot of community members and leaders who have taken to time out of their day to come to meeting and the SA should not be trying to silence the community.
   2. Vote to vote – failed 13-15-1

xvii. There is a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes.
   1. A. Miramontes Serrano dissented and expressed concerns over semi-finals.
   2. L. Smith dissented and stated that it may be beneficial to set up a separate meeting to block out a substantial amount of time to discuss strictly this resolution.
   3. Vote to vote – approved 16-11-2

xviii. Motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes – approved 15-11-3

xix. L. Contreras stated they have gathered testimonials form the community and shared these with SA members.

xx. R. Matthews urged SA members to think of the marginalized when casting their vote.

xxi. L. Smith stated Tompkins County is currently soliciting feedback regarding their public safety campaign and encouraged those interested to look at the Tompkins County website. L. Smith explained it might make sense to change this resolution to a sense of body which allows the SA to allocate to community votes.

xxii. S. Halabe stated that most of the crimes CUPD respond to do not need a weapon. A majority of the crimes they are responding to are rape, fondling, stalking, and campus burglaries.

xxiii. Melissa D. countered the point that disarming the police puts the officers in danger. Melissa D. stated it is not a police officer’s job to shoot any civilian, even in the case that they’re guilty.

xxiv. G. Millette stated that CUPD hasn’t used their guns at all in 25 years and that money could have been spent on literally anything else.

xxv. There is a motion to vote on Resolution #11.
   1. U. Chukwukere dissented and stated there are still 180 people in attendance who want to voice their opinion.
   2. Vote to vote – failed 9-15-4

xxvi. M. Stefankoro clarified that a sense of body vote needs to be through a Qualtrics survey and then can be administered to the student body.

xxvii. A. Gyasi expressed their appreciation for the organizers and co-sponsors for this resolution. So many black, brown, and indigenous people have shared
their experiences with the police, and it is very telling of those who do not support this resolution.

xxviii. Motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes – approved 18-5-1

xxix. U. Chukwukere asked what the process of changing this resolution to a sense of body would look like.

1. G. Giambattista stated it would be a Qualtrics survey and recommended the website Mentimeter, which would allow everybody to vote anonymously and then could give the results of that.

2. M. Adeghe believed the survey would have to open for an extended period of time and sent to the entire student body.

3. M. Haddad stated the change would be have to be made at this meeting, and then tabled for a week to allow the student body to look at the resolution and vote on it.

xxx. D. Alderman expressed concern over immaturity throughout the early parts of the meeting and stated this resolution is a very heated topic, but everyone is being very rude and immature with their approach to the conversation.

xxxi. A. Ononye addressed the Public Safety Committee and stated all four members of the committee are on the call today. Three members have spoken in favor of this resolution and one student is a co-sponsor of the resolution.

xxxii. C. Benedict, as the external relations chair for Native American Indigenous Students at Cornell, explained that Nation Americans are killed at a higher rate than any other racial demographic and experience acts of domestic terrorism that have been led by police. Police forces should be disarmed across the United States to prevent further acts of violence against indigenous communities.

xxxiii. B. Gana stated that no one on the SA is above this issue. Black and brown organizers have been working hard on this for weeks and have to deal with
the trauma of unpacking these emotions every week. B. Gana informed SA members that the community is watching how they vote.

xxxiv. There is a motion to roll call vote.
   1. Y. Yuan dissented and stated that the roll call vote is used to sway voters.
   2. Vote to vote – approved 13-12-2

xxxv. Motion to extend the meeting by 5 minutes – approved 14-4-10

xxxvi. Motion to approve Resolution #11 – ruled 14-15-1
   1. L. Abd Elmagid – yes.
   5. K. Bentley – yes.
   7. U. Chukwukere – yes.
   8. E. Perez – yes.
  10. A. Gleiberman – no.
  13. S. Lim – yes.
  17. C. Templeman – no.
  18. V. Valencia – yes.
  21. V. Xu – no.
  22. Y. Yuan – no.
  25. E. Moy – no.
  27. L. Zumpano – no.

xxxvii. U. Chukwukere expressed concerns about the fact there is 30 votes when there are only 29 voting members.

xxxviii. There is a motion to revote due to lack of clarity of what happened during voting.

xxxix. Motion to approve Resolution #11 – ruled 14-15-1
   1. L. Abd Elmagid – yes.
   5. K. Bentley – yes.
7. C. Castillo – no.
10. A. Gleiberman – no.
13. S. Lim – yes.
15. E. Moy – no.
17. T. Reuning – yes.
20. L. Smith – no.
22. V. Valencia – yes.
25. V. Xu – no.
27. R. Zohar – no.

IX. Adjournment
   a. C. Huang adjourned the meeting at 7:48pm (EST).

Respectfully Submitted,
Ciara Shanahan
Clerk of the Student Assembly
I. Call to Order & Roll Call
   a. C. Huang called the meeting to order at 4:48pm (EST).
   b. Roll Call
      ii. Members Absent: C. Castillo (excused)

II. Land Acknowledgement of the Gayogó:ñọ́ (Cayuga Nation)
   a. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogó:ñọ́ (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogó:ñọ́ are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York State, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogó:ñọ́ dispossession, and honor the ongoing connection of the Gayogó:ñọ́ people, past and present, to these lands and waters.

III. Announcements and Presentations
   a. Title IX Policy 6.4 Presentation by Student Advocate Anuli Ononye and Associate Vice President of the Office of Institutional Equity and Title IX Coordinator Laura Rugless
      i. Policy 6.4 is the university policy addressing prohibited bias, discrimination, harassment, sexual and related misconduct, currently at an interim status due to changes made because of Title IX regulations. New requirements apply to sexual harassment defined in the regulations. To meet these legal requirements, Cornell University created two hearing panel processes for student cases when a student is accused of misconduct. One process is called Hearing Panel Process A which includes real-time oral cross-examination conducted by party's advisor. Hearing Panel B involves written submission of cross-examination by party. If the student case involves Title IX and/or suspension or dismissal is a potential sanction, Hearing Panel Process A is used. If the student case does not involve Title IX and suspension of dismissal is not a potential sanction, Hearing Panel Process B is used. Policy 6.4 Stakeholder Review Group purpose is to review the policy changes and gather input from the University community in order finalize the policy through the University process. The main discussion of this group related to
policy is the Evidentiary Standard, which remains unchanged, and the Designated Reporters (DRs), which changed broad duty to consult for all non-confidential employees to list of DRs. The main discussion of the group related to procedure is changes to Alternation Resolution, an addition of informal as well as formal means of alternate resolution, Hearing Panel Process, an addition of oral-cross-examination led by parties’ advisors. Additionally, unrelated to the Title IX changes, some members have interest in the bias process and protected status definitions. The Policy 6.4 Stakeholder Review Group is asking for feedback on what to consider as the policy changes are being finalized. To ensure consideration, email input to titleix@cornell.edu by December 8, 2020.

ii. C. Huang asked how long this interim status will last.
   1. L. Rugless stated that typically be six months or less. The changes being discussed went into effect as required on August 14, 2020, so until mid-February. This can be extended as needed. L. Rugless anticipates by February 22 for it be at the executive policy review group.

iii. T. Reuning asked if RAs would still be mandatory reporters with the changes.
   1. L. Rugless answered that RAs would remain mandatory reporters.

b. Announcement from Dyson Presentation Mardiya Shardow
   i. M. Shardow stated that one of their initiatives for the semester is to bring gender-neutral bathrooms to Warren Hall. There is actually a gender-neutral bathroom in the building, however it does not have the proper signage and there is confusion on whether it is a gender-neutral bathroom. M. Shardow asked if any representatives are interested in this initiative to reach out via Slack.

c. Announcement from Director of Elections Moriah Adeghe
   i. Over the past week, people who have opposed Resolution 11 have claimed to be victims of harassment and cyberbullying. M. Adeghe stated that constituents holding their representatives accountable and making their displeasure known is a cornerstone of democracy. If one is not ready to be held accountable for their actions made at the assembly, one should not be serving on the SA. Furthermore, it is insensitive in the face of the villainization of the organizers of Resolution, specifically U. Chukwukere who has been aggressively harassed this past week. M. Adeghe urged all representatives to speak out against the anti-black discrimination and homophobic behavior that occurred this past week.

d. Announcement from Dining Chair Bryan Weintraub
   i. B. Weintraub acknowledged that people have been less than thrilled with the food at Cornell Dining this year. In the spring, Cornell Dining will be making several changes. If you are interested in hearing about the changes, please reach out to B. Weintraub. There will be a Cornell Dining leadership team meeting on December 8 that will be discussing meal planning, sustainability, operating hours and other items for the spring.

e. L. Smith stated that Annabel's Groceries has a survey regarding food insecurity and access to food. L. Smith encouraged members to fill out the survey.

f. A. Miramontes Serrano stated that they have met with the Office of Cornell Dining several times throughout the semester and has made several changes throughout the
semester. Cornell Dining has changed from plastic Tupperware to cardboard and has worked to add variety in the different dining halls. There have also been many petitions for more vegan options, which is currently being worked on improving. A. Miramontes Serrano encouraged members to message them any recommendations or suggestions before the Cornell Dining Leadership meeting on December 8.

IV. Open Microphone
a. L. Kenney stated that the Board of Trustees will be voting on the Code of Conduct on December 11 at a special meeting. L. Kenney urged the SA to discuss jurisdiction at this meeting, as moving jurisdiction away from the University Assembly to the Vice President of Student and Campus Life is being considered.
b. E. Moy confirmed that the Board of Trustees will be voting on the Code of Conduct that includes sweeping changes to the judicial process that will affect Cornell students for generations. The new Code was allegedly written in full by this assembly last semester and was passed in April with little debate, as Resolution 65 last academic year. Resolution 65 was very unorthodox, as typically changes are proposed and handled from the Student Judiciary Committee, which is part of the University Assembly. From discussions with the UA, E. Moy discovered Resolution 65 was not written by the assembly, as is often stated. Rather, it was most likely written by a University Console. The resolution was used to subvert to the authority of the CJC and E. Moy stated that this relationship of shared governance should not be eroded for the convenience of the administration. E. Moy motioned to amend the agenda to include two new resolution.
   i. C. Huang stated that a motion cannot be made during open microphone, but once open microphone ends, E. Moy should promptly do so.
   ii. E. Moy withdrew their motion.
c. B. Sherr added a point of clarification that Resolution 65 was put forward by university representatives in an effort to subvert UA authority. It was rejected by the Code and Judicial Committees. The actual body in charge of handling alterations to the code rejected this proposal and it is still being used.
d. K. Restrepo stated that C. Castillo, who recently made a statement to the Cornell Sun calling for a revote to Resolution 11, cannot attend the current SA meeting due to a family emergency. K. Restrepo urged members who voted no on the resolution to call for a revote on behalf of him, in light of current circumstances.

V. New Business
a. E. Moy asked for the agenda to be amended to include the Resolution 19: Maintaining the University Assembly’s Jurisdiction Over the Code of Conduct and Resolution 20: On the Proposed Changes to the Student Code of Conduct.
   i. Motion to amend – amended 16-12-1
b. SA R15: Demanding Cornell to Support the Black Lives Matter Movement
   i. Abstract: The purpose of this resolution is to have Cornell University and the Student Assembly to be in solidarity with the Black Lives Matter Movement.
   ii. S. Woldai stated that this resolution includes statistics provided about black life on campus, black students dissatisfaction on campus, and representation throughout the University. It also includes different aspects of systemic racism and the Black Lives Matter movement, especially over the summer.
The Student Assembly has yet to make a stance on the Black Lives Matter Movement.

iii. Motion to vote on Resolution #15 – passed 26-0-2

c. SA R16: In Support of the Cornell University Caribbean Students’ Association’s Demands

i. Abstract: This resolution asks for the Student Assembly to support the demands of the Cornell University Caribbean Students’ Association (CSA).

ii. L. Farquharson stated that the CSA was founded in February of 2019 with five members, but now has over 200 members. The CSA is committed to providing an open and safe place for the entire Cornell community, but specifically Caribbean students to embrace their culture and history.

iii. S. Brownie explained that the perception of the Caribbean as Cuba, Haiti, and Jamaica is incorrect, as the Caribbean includes parts of South and Central America. This lack of representation extends into the teaching the Caribbean culture.

iv. S. Lawrence reaffirmed that we need to be more inclusive of what we understand the Caribbean to be. The CSA thinks of the Caribbean as product of the labor experience of the mixing pot of many histories and many global histories. The CSA represents over 25 countries internationally and almost 50 different languages. The CSA surveyed students as to what it means to be Caribbean on campus, where at times it can feel a bit isolating. Other students shared sentiments of dispelling stereotypes about their culture and proving what it isn’t or is and having to sit through difficult discussions. It is important to remember no one story can be summed up, there are many different complex stories.

v. S. Brownie stated that even in one culture, there can be several different cultures.

vi. A. McKenzie stated that the CSA began writing their demands in the summer through discussion with members of the CSA. The main discussions focused on amplifying the student voice, stopping academic segregation based on language, and the history and culture of the Caribbean, considering the contributions worldwide. When it comes to the Cornell Campus, it is a decentralized community based on where one came from, one’s skin tones, etc. The CSA wants to increased Cornell’s cultural competence and support international students and their academic path as they get to Cornell, and also not to erase their past.

vii. Motion to vote on Resolution #16 – passed 27-0-1

d. SA R17: Reduction of Convocation Committee’s Student Activity Fee Allocation

i. Abstract: This resolution is putting in place a temporary reduction of Convocation Committee's SAF allocation due to their violation of Appendix B of the Student Assembly Charter.

ii. U. Chukwukere asked this resolution to be tabled.

iii. Motion to table Resolution #17 – tabled 26-0-2

e. SA R18: In Recognition and Appreciation of Cornell Employees and Staff

i. Abstract: This resolution formally recognizes and thanks Cornell employees and staff for their invaluable work in keeping the campus community safe
and supporting students through reopening and a successful in personal residential semester.

ii. L. Smith explained this resolution is thank Cornell employees and staff that have continued to work tirelessly throughout the pandemic.

iii. Motion to vote on Resolution #18 - passed 27-0-1

f. SA R19: Maintaining the University Assembly’s Jurisdiction Over the Code of Conduct

i. L. Kenney stated they have brought this resolution before the University Assembly this past Tuesday. Before the 1970s, the Campus Code of Conduct was with the faculty. The Henderson Law requires the Board of Trustees of each college in New York State adopt regulations for the maintenance of public order. At Cornell, the Board of Trustees acted with strong community support and delegated the University Senate, now known as the University Assembly, jurisdiction over the Campus Code of Conduct. The charter has held that members examine standards of conduct and have one calendar month to review and respond to proposed changes in policies. The Codes and Judicial Committee (the CJC) is the committee created to handle changes to the Campus Code of Conduct. The current draft of the Code of Conduct removes jurisdiction from the UA and providing jurisdiction to the hands of the Vice President of Student and Campus Life. L. Kenney expressed concern over this change, as the UA has always been an unbiased group filled with all constituent parties. It is pertinent that it remains with the UA to prevent bias.

ii. M. Adeghe expressed confusion over who would be making the revisions.
   1. E. Moy stated that jurisdiction currently belongs to the CJC. If this resolution passes, jurisdiction would not move to the Offices of Student Campus Life.
   2. L. Kenney stated there is still no clear answer as what the definition of advisory consultation and input means.

iii. T. Reuning clarified that currently the CJC has representatives from all Cornell community with voting power. The proposed change would give any final decisions to the Vice President of Student and Campus Life with no obligation to listen to input from members of the community.

iv. B. Sherr emphasized the importance of this resolution. There is nothing in the code as it is currently written to stop VP Lombardi from unilaterally
making adjustments to the Campus Code of Conduct and that has grave repercussions for all students.

v. L. Smith expressed concern over the fact that the Board of Trustees has been frustrated with the full code revisions and this resolution does not change the current situation.

1. L. Kenney stated that the Code does have to be with one assembly. The UA has the least opportunity for a power grabbed.

vi. B. Fortenberry provided clarification to the amendment process of the Code of Conduct.

vii. T. Reuning stated that having input from faculty can be extremely valuable.

viii. E. Moy motioned to amend Resolution #19 to change L. Kenney to UA Representative instead of GPSA Representative in the conclusion.

1. Motion to amend – amended 24-0-3


1. Motion to amend – amended General Consent

x. L. Kenney asked if any members had input as to what consultation from the SA and GPSA means in the resolution.

1. A. Miramontes stated that it would be nice for members of the community to attend CJC meetings.
2. M. Adeghe stated the CJC could provide formal updates the SA about the process.
3. L. Kenney stated that one method of consultation would be having amendments immediately going to the SA for input.

xi. T. Reuning motioned to amend Resolution #19 to define consultation as periodical formal updates from the UA to the Student Assembly and Graduate & Professional Student Assembly and having amendments immediately sent to these bodies, whose recommendations and concerns be seriously considered by the CJC.

1. Motion to amend – amended 24-0-3

xii. A. Miramontes Serrano asked if members could attend University Assembly meetings.

1. L. Kenney explained that meetings are open to the public. Due to the pandemic, email the Office of the Assemblies for the Zoom link.

xiii. Motion to vote on Resolution #19 – passed 24-0-3

g. SA R20: On the Proposed Changes to the Student Code of Conduct

i. Abstract: The Student Assembly expresses its dissatisfaction with the procedures in changing the Code of Conduct. The SA makes demands of the university to share information and delay the Board of Trustees vote.

ii. E. Moy explained that currently the final draft of proposed changes that the Board of Trustees is voting on is not public information. Certain bodies do have it, but it is not public information and the SA does not have it. This resolution formally requests this final version to be public information and
asks the Board of Trustees to delay the vote indefinitely to give time for the SA to comment on these changes.


1. Motion to amend – amended General Consent

iv. C. Huang asked for clarification for the length of time for indefinitely.

1. E. Moy stated the SA needs time to process and review the changes of the current draft of proposed changes.

2. A. Gleiberman asked if would be possible to hold an impromptu meeting to discuss the changes to the code.

   a. N. Watson asked that someone reach up to them to set up a time to schedule an informal meeting for all members.

v. B. Sherr proposed having the Board of Trustees hold their meeting next semester, as it is equally important for the general student body to have access to and be able to comment on the revised code.

vi. E. Moy motioned to amend lines 25 to 27 of Resolution #20 to include “…delay until the first Board of Trustees meeting of the spring semester, once the constituencies, organizations…”.

1. Motion to amend – amended General Consent

vii. Motion to vote on Resolution #20 – passed 22-0-3

h. M. Adeghe asked if it would be possible to have an informal discussion of police disarmament with people currently present.

i. C. Huang stated they are working with the Office of Assemblies to coordinate a town hall for the upcoming week where everyone will be able to have proper notice to speak on the issue.

VI. Adjournment

a. C. Huang adjourned the meeting at 6:48pm (EST).

Respectfully Submitted,

Ciara Shanahan
Clerk of the Student Assembly
I. Call to Order & Roll Call
   a. C. Huang called the meeting to order at 4:48pm (EST).
   b. Roll Call
      ii. **Members Absent:** All members present.

II. Land Acknowledgement of the Gayogó:ni: Gúnaꞌóni: (Cayuga Nation)
   a. Cornell University is located on the traditional homelands of the Gayogó:ni: Gúnaꞌóni: (the Cayuga Nation). The Gayogó:ni: Gúnaꞌóni: are members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, an alliance of six sovereign Nations with a historic and contemporary presence on this land. The Confederacy precedes the establishment of Cornell University, New York State, and the United States of America. We acknowledge the painful history of Gayogó:ni: Gúnaꞌóni: dispossession, and honor the ongoing connection of the Gayogó:ni: Gúnaꞌóni: people, past and present, to these lands and waters.

III. Announcements and Presentations
   a. C. Huang shared updates on initiatives from the past semester. Several SA members have been working on mental health and tele-health care for international students. Currently, New York state licensing restricts any mental health or tele health care to be provided to students outside the U.S. The SA has been working with the Office of Student Government Relations, which includes SA member L. Smith, to see what can be done on the state level to advocate for increased access. In the interim, SA members V. Xu and Y. Yuan have been working with international student organizations to see what is needed right now.
   b. M. Adeghe clarified the removal of the Vice President of Research and Accountability that occur the previous Tuesday. M. Adeghe motioned to remove the Vice President of Research and Accountability for two main reasons. One being the physical and emotional violence M. Adeghe received from them at a hockey game, which prevents them from being an unbiased and impartial chair of a committee that is focused on research and accountability. Furthermore, the nature of the position is that all members of the SA should feel comfortable going to this person with any type of internal conflict. M. Adeghe stated that even though this event took place
before the start of the SA term, past actions are not exempt from accountability. This rhetoric is used to silence victims.

c. U. Chukwukere provided clarification for the removal of D. Anadkat from the SA. On Wednesday, December 9, the Executive Committee voted to remove D. Anadkat for dereliction of duty to the Cornell community and high crimes against the SA. D. Anadkat failed to maintain active membership in at least one SA committee. There was consultation with the Vice President of External Affairs M. Baker who informed the Executive Committee that the former representative failed to accept the invitation to join the communications committee and never attended a single meeting. The Vice President of Internal Affairs substantiated these claims and further informed the Committee that D. Anadkat was never an active member. The Executive Committee found the former representative to be in violation of their senior roles.

d. Calling for the Disarmament of the Cornell University Police Department: Updates and Changes Presentation led by U. Chukwukere, M. Adeghe, K. Restrepo, and S. Woldai

i. U. Chukwukere stated that many co-sponsors of Resolution 11 received intense harassment for the direct result of speaking out and advocating for themselves in their communities. Malicious emails were sent to the New York Times, President Pollack, Vice President Lombardi, scholarship providers, professors, employers, and other parties relevant to co-sponsors. Personally, U. Chukwukere received blatantly racist and homophobic posts on platforms such as Reddit and GreekRank. Other organizers received hateful private messages during SA meetings as they tried to speak on Resolution 11.

ii. M. Adeghe stated that in the face of all of, many members of the SA remained quiet as they witnessed their black peers by harassed and ridiculed. It is especially concerning, as there was unanimous support for the Black Lives Matter resolution last week. At the virtual town hall, many members of the community shared traumatic experiences with the police. Several members of the SA did not attend this town hall. Furthermore, members against Resolution 11 took the time to write an op ed condemning the SA and their actions, while still remaining quiet as they witnessed their black peers be harassed and ridiculed. Over 200 students come to the town hall and there were 51 unique speakers, where only 7 speakers spoke against Resolution 11.

iii. K. Restrepo shared several testimonies from members of the community. These testimonials show there was an overwhelming response for the disarmament resolution that’s been trying to get passed for over a month now.

iv. S. Woldai explained that opponents of Resolution 11 on the SA created their own watered-down version of Resolution 11 calling for reform, rather than disarmament. This resolution is piggybacking off the hours and extensive work by organizers. Further, instead of trying to get the resolution through the appropriate committee, they attempted to pass their resolution through the communication committee. As Vice President of the Diversity Inclusion
Committee, S. Woldai stated no member reached out to them to discuss this resolution and was extremely disappointed about that.

v. K. Restrepo reaffirmed that C. Huang is allowed to chair the discussion on Resolution, as C. Huang has no financial stake in the resolution, and therefore it is not a conflict of interest. Additionally, the removal of both A. Gleberman and D. Anadkat were done completely legitimately and would have occurred regardless of how they voted on the resolution.

c. C. Huang wished every who celebrates a Happy Hanukkah and apologized for not adjusting the time of the meeting.

f. C. Huang shared the spring semester SA calendar and asked for those with questions to please reach out.
   i. One committee member asked in spring finals were taken into consideration.
      1. C. Huang answered that spring finals were taken into consideration.

g. C. Huang shared a statement on Recognizing and Condemning Racist Attacks Against Assemblyman Chukwukere.

IV. Open Microphone
   a. S. Kelly asked why it is SA members responsibility to be addressing and calling out anonymous statements on GreekRank. SA members are trying to defend themselves against backdoor moves trying to remove them.
      i. U. Chukwukere expressed his disappointment in this question. U. Chukwukere shared this harassment they experienced to highlight the cost of being black at Cornell.

   b. A. Hu shared the work of HEAL, an organization at Cornell that provides mental health chatting support in Mandarin Chinese. A. Hu stated they believe that a lot of unique mental health issues of international students are often overlooked by universities. Not only does New York state have restrictions, but it is also hard for international students to express intimate issues in a foreign language and there are huge cultural stigmas with professional mental health. Due to the pandemic, many students have not been able to go home for over a year and do not have that family support. HEAL is a service in Mandarin that is informally structure as peer chats which students can book a time to chat. A. Hu asked for people to spread the word about this initiative and more awareness around international student mental health in general.

c. G. Altaras expressed his disgust with the harassment that members have experienced on both sides, but also stated that members should be cognizant of quickly jumping into bad faith assumptions.

d. C. Duncan expressed concern with the recall petitions that seemed to have been launched by other members of the SA. It should be the constituents of those members as opposed to other members doing it in secret.

e. D. Anadkat explained that they ran for SA in March and applied for the Communications Committee, since then a lot has happened, and it has been an extremely busy semester. About a month ago, D. Anadkat received an email asking if this still wanted to be on the committee and D. Anadkat admitted to missing that email. D. Anadkat stated they were not notified of any meetings and was not informed they were breaking any rules. The only crime they committed was missing an email.

f. J. Reed refuted the idea that people in mental health crisis will comply because of a baton at their face or a gun at the hip of the person next to them. From personal
experience, J. Reed shared that being threatened or having violence against you will not help in a mental health crisis. The idea that a gun needs to be there is false and increases the probability of violence.

g. N. Noctyma asked why one person exemplifying the issues of homophobia and racism at Cornell not enough for members to stand against it. N. Noctyma expressed concern when people asked questions to someone who specifically said they are not taking questions and comments on their own trauma. It is extremely disrespectful.

h. A. Loretemola asked what the situation is with free printing.

i. M. Adeghe answered that students get $15 worth of free printing each semester, which is about 250 pages.

i. W. Brody stated that members who were removed from the SA because of violating bylaws were only removed after their votes against the resolution and the petitions failed to recall them.

j. S. Chessler stated that Cornell Dining is changing their meal plan policies for the spring semester, where students will not be able to alter it. S. Chessler asked if the SA could exert some pressure on Cornell Dining to prevent that from happening.

i. A. Miramontes asked for S. Chessler to email them for more information.

V. Business of the Day

a. E. Moy motioned to amend the Standing Rules of SA per Section 1 Rule 2, specifically E. Moy moved to amend Section 6 Rule 9 to read “Any voting SA member may attempt to overrule a decision by the Executive Committee by submitting their challenge in the format of a resolution or in the form of a motion at the next regularly scheduled meeting. A simple majority of the voting membership must be reached to overrule the Executive Committee at any time”.

i. C. Huang asked the parliamentarian if you can motion to amend the Standing Rules on the floor or if it has to be in the form of a resolution.

ii. E. Moy stated that Section 1 Rule 2 of the Standing Rules states that the Standing Rules may be edited at any time by a majority vote by membership of the SA, so it does not appear to require a resolution.

iii. E. Moy made a motion to amend.

1. L. Abd Elmagid dissented and that stated that it should require two thirds of the SA to overrule in order to represent a majority of the SA.

2. E. Moy stated that the Executive Committee is made up of only 7 members and a majority vote would be more representative than just those 7 members.

3. M. Adeghe stated that it is more powerful to have a two-third majority than a simple majority and the Executive Committee members were voted on and approved by the whole SA.

4. U. Chukwukere stated there is absolutely no reason to change the Standing Rules.

5. M. Baker stated that if the Standing Rules are not amended, this is inconsistent with previous actions. Only four members of the Executive Committee voted to remove D. Anadkat and five members voted to remove Representative A. Gleiberman. M. Baker
stated they believed there should be a unified response to these situations.

6. L. Abd Elmagid stated that the Executive Committee has been following all rules and has been completely consistent with their actions. The whole SA voted to approve the Standing Rules at the beginning of the semester.

7. Vote to vote – failed 15-12-2

8. M. Baker stated that the importance of following rules has recently come up and that during the removal of Vice President of Research and Accountability, M. Baker was not allowed to vote. By definition of the Vice President of External Affairs, M. Baker would need to be removed from the vote by two thirds majority vote of the whole voting body of the SA and that did not occur. M. Baker stated that the rules were not followed then. M. Baker reaffirmed that this motion should be passed because it is not right for four or five people on the Executive Committee to be not following the bylaws and be making decisions unilaterally.

9. S. Woldai stated that M. Baker was not allowed to vote because of a conflict of interest, as M. Baker had served on the Research and Accountability Committee for the entire semester.

10. U. Chukwukere supported S. Woldai’s statement and agreed that M. Baker had a conflict of interest.

11. M. Baker explained that nowhere in Robert’s Rules does it say that conflict of interest constitutes committee membership. There is no precedent that M. Baker's committee membership constitutes a conflict of interest.

12. E. Moy agreed with M. Baker’s statement and stated that they will be passing a resolution in the future to change the Charter and other aspects of the executive decisions.

13. S. Kapoor stated she believed that a conflict of interest is only when someone has a financial stake in the decision.

14. M. Adeghe stated that it is financial state and a personal relationship with the question on the table.

15. Z. Sherin stated that when they mentioned that C. Huang chairing during a discussion of a resolution, they co-sponsored was a conflict of interest, Z. Sherin was called sexist. Z. Sherin asked for an apology from those that stated that M. Baker had a conflict of interest.

16. L. Davis-Frost stated that this debate is making a mockery of shared governance, there is not a single other assembly that spends 30 to 45
minutes going through bureaucratic stalling when there is 290 people attending this meeting.

17. C. Huang stated that this debate is disrespectful to community members who have attended this meeting for specific resolutions.

   iv. Motion to table – **tabled 14-12-3**

b. C. Huang asked for SA members to amend the agenda to begin discussion on Resolution #23, as it is time sensitive.

   i. Motion to amend – **amended**

VI. New Business

a. SA R23: Demanding Cornell Allows Anabel’s Grocery to Reopen for the Spring 2021 Semester

   i. Abstract: Due to the coronavirus pandemic, Cornell prohibited Anabel’s Grocery, a student-run and non-profit grocery store on campus, from operating in its facilities in Anabel Taylor Hall this fall. A wide spectrum of students experience food insecurity on Cornell’s campus; however, first generation, low-income, and BIPOC students are affected at a higher rate. Rates of food insecurity have worsened in the face of the pandemic. The University cited the existence of the Cornell Food Pantry as the reason Anabel’s Grocery is a non-essential activity during the pandemic, but the two entities serve different purposes. While the Food Pantry serves an immediate need for students in crisis on campus, Anabel's Grocery sells fresh, affordable food at subsidized prices to Cornell undergraduate and Graduate students that wish to shop in our store, with no qualifications needed.

   Anabel’s closure has limited students’ options for accessing affordable groceries without along, often risky, commute to area grocery stores.

   Anabel's Grocery is prepared to operate safely in the Spring semester, resuming what has actually become an essential service to the Cornell community, particularly students with limited food budgets and modes of transportation who seek fresh, affordable food.

   ii. D. Gonzales explained that they are proposing to have Anabel’s groceries to be redeemed for the Spring 2021 semester. Cornell has deemed it has not essential, as the Food Pantry would serve to replace Anabel’s Grocery. However, Anabel’s Grocery is essential.

   iii. M. Feely stated that Anabel’s Grocery’s mission is to provide fresh, healthy, and affordable food to all students on campus and receives many of its supplies from local farms and producers. Anabel's Grocery is able to provide affordable food through its subsidy fund, which is actually generously given by the Student Assembly Students Helping Students Endowment fund.

   Anabel Grocery’s shoppers save 30% compared to Wegmans. Due to the being closed this semester, 76% of Anabel Grocery’s shoppers are now going to Wegmans instead. It was found that approximately 30% of Cornell’s
undergraduate students do not eat as often as they think they should and they numbers are higher for communities of color.

iv. C. Lee shared that students indicated increased Covid-related stress on being worried they would contract Covid-19 off campus. There are also several issues with transportation.

v. Motion to vote on Resolution #23 – passed 26-0-3

b. E. Moy motioned to untable the discussion on amending Section 6 Rule 9 of the Standing Rules.

i. L. Abd Elmagid dissented, stating that as this is the last meeting of the semester and there are 257 participants for the items on the agenda.

ii. M. Stefanko explained it would be highly irregular to bring this debate back in a session that it was tabled in.

iii. Motion to untable – failed 12-14-3

c. C. Castillo motioned to amend the agenda to add Resolution #30 to the beginning of New Business.

i. Z. Sherin stated that resolutions with co-sponsors that are Jewish should be prioritized.

ii. N. Watson stated that they are Jewish and are supportive of moving this resolution forward.

iii. C. Huang explained that change in time to any regularly scheduled meeting must be requested two weeks in advance of the regularly scheduled meeting.

iv. N. Watson stated they did not appreciate having to expose one’s identity so that resolutions are prioritized.

v. Motion to amend the agenda – amended 18-0-2

d. SA R30: Calling For the Disarmament of the Cornell University Police Department

i. Abstract: This resolution is calling for the disarmament of the Cornell University Police Department.

ii. Motion to vote on Resolution #30 – passed 15-1-1

1. L. Abd Elmagid – yes.
5. U. Chukwukere – yes.
7. A. Lampert – yes.
8. S. Lim – yes.
12. L. Smith – no.
13. V. Valencia -yes.
15. S. Woldai – yes.

e. There was a motion to amend the agenda to begin discussion on Resolution #29.

i. Motion to amend the agenda – amended

f. SA R29: Extension to Good Samaritan Laws

i. Abstract: This motion seeks that Cornell extends Good Samaritan Laws.
ii. Z. Sherin explained that in New York State that are Good Samaritan laws that allow individuals to seek help for other individuals without fear that they themselves will face legal consequences. At Cornell, Good Samaritan Laws are narrow, whereas if 3 individuals were underage drinking and one individual had a medical emergency, only the individual that called authorities would be protected from legal consequences. Z. Sherin stated that they hope the SA would urge Cornell to extend their Good Samaritan Laws to highlight they prioritize student safety above everything else.

iii. T. Reuning asked for clarification for how Cornell would extend their Good Samaritan Laws.
1. Z. Sherin answered that this resolution is to highlight student support for extending Good Samaritan Laws.

iv. S. Woldai agreed with the sentiments of the resolution but expressed concern that it would protect fraternities from facing repercussions for their misconduct.
1. Z. Sherin stated this resolution’s purpose to help all students, regardless of their stance on Greek Life.

v. K. Cardona asked for clarification if this resolution protects fraternities.
1. Z. Sherin explained that in some senses it does protect fraternities, as if a person is overdrinking at a fraternity and needs support from authorities, the fraternity will be protected. However, right now, individuals will drink too much and they’ll need support, but would be unable to do so. Getting support shouldn’t be something that one has to decide between protecting their friends from getting some sort of reprimand and student safety.

vi. R. Horrigan expressed concern that Greek Life will be protected for doing something wrong in terms of hazing. From R. Horrigan’s understanding, no one will get in trouble for partaking in drinking or drugs are the student receives medical attention. If a student then files a hazing report, would the fraternity or sorority still be liable.
1. Z. Sherin stated that, if hazing is concerned, they wouldn’t necessarily get in trouble with the direct use of alcohol, but Cornell has a fairly strict policy on hazing that would not be affected by extending Good Samaritan Laws.

vii. W. Henderson asked why fraternities shouldn’t be reprimanded for causing students to drink excessively.
1. Z. Sherin stated that students should not have to think twice about having to get medical assistance for their peers.

viii. M. Adeghe expressed her distaste with the Greek Life system but reminded members that people in Greek Life are human beings and they are fellow
students. Regardless of the fact that they are in a frat, students should not mean that they let their friend die because they are too scared to call for hell.

ix. Motion to vote on Resolution #29 – passed 16-0-3

g. There was a motion to table Resolution #28 until the first meeting of next semester, as many of the co-sponsors of this resolution are no longer present at this meeting.
   i. U. Chukwukere dissented.
   ii. Vote to vote – failed 8-9-1
   iii. The motion to table Resolution #28 was withdrawn.

h. U. Chukwukere motioned to remove Resolution #28 from the agenda.
   i. A. Miramontes Serrano dissented, stating that co-sponsors of the resolution are not present.
   ii. M. Adeghe stated that this resolution should be discussed at the beginning of next semester but explained that the co-sponsors of this resolution are not in attendance by their own volition.
   iii. T. Reuning echoed M. Adeghe’s sentiment, but stated that this resolution should be tabled indefinitely, not removed.
   iv. L. Smith looked favorably on tabling the resolution indefinitely.
   v. U. Chukwukere withdrew their motion.

i. SA R21: Requiring a Community Chair the Research and Accountability Committee to Increase Constituent Accountability
   i. Abstract: This resolution seeks to provide more opportunities for the community to hold the Student Assembly accountable by changing the Committee of Research & Accountability to be chaired by a non-Student Assembly member of the Cornell undergraduate community.
   ii. M. Adeghe explained that the Cornell community has recently been dissatisfied with the SA. The main purpose of the Committee of Research & Accountability is to remain unbiased and a neutral arm of the SA that would keep SA members accountable. This resolution is calling for the Chair of the Research and Accountability Committee to be a regular community member and not a SA member.
   iii. L. Abd Elmagid stated that this resolution seeks to increase community input and it makes more sense to have an outsider person holding SA members accountable.
   iv. Motion to vote on Resolution #21 – passed 13-0-2

j. The attendance of SA members dipped below quorum and the meeting ended at 7:32pm (EST).

Respectfully Submitted,

Ciara Shanahan
Clerk of the Student Assembly
S.A. Resolution #17
Reduction of Convocation Committee’s Student Activity Fee Allocation

ABSTRACT: This resolution is putting in place a temporary reduction of Convocation Committee’s SAF allocation due to their violation of Appendix B of the Student Assembly Charter.

Sponsored by: Uche Chukwukere ‘21

Whereas, The Student Assembly, through the delegated authority of the President and the Board of Trustees, is charged with the allocation of the Student Activity Fee (SAF)

Whereas, The Student Assembly Charter, Appendix B Section 2E States:

If the SA determines that an organization has committed a violation, the SA may impose a fine, reduction or revocation of the organization’s by-line funding allocation. In order for a fine, reduction, or revocation of funding to occur, a two-thirds majority of the SA must concur. Reasons for a fine, reduction, or revocation of funding include, but are not limited to, violation of these rules, violation of campus policies, or violation of contract. Any money garnered from a fine on an organization shall be placed in the Special Projects Fund of the Student Assembly. If a reduction or revocation of funding affecting the remainder of the funding cycle occurs, the University shall attempt to reduce the SAF to reflect the lower amount. Excepting that, the money shall revert to the Special Projects Fund;

Whereas, Convocation Committee is in current violation of Appendix B, Section 4, part F, i which states, “At the time of the selection of Convocation Committee membership, the Convocation Committee Chair shall invite all voting members of the SA, directly-elected undergraduate members of the UA, and student-elected trustee(s) that belong to that class year to participate as full voting members of the Convocation Committee. The SA Vice President for Finance shall serve as an ex-officio member of the Committee.”

Whereas, At the time that the Convocation Committee membership selection was under way, no voting members of the Cornell Student Assembly that belonged to the class of 2021 were extended invitations and still have not been extended invitations to join the Convocation Committee

Whereas, The SA Vice President for Finance should be able to serve as an ex-officio member of the committee and should have the opportunity to be involved in all committee meetings in any fashion regarding Convocation Committee.

Whereas, the Convocation Committee has had multiple opportunities to specifically work with members of the Appropriations Committee and the Student Assembly to resolve these violations since the Spring 2020 academic semester.

Whereas, Convocation Committee has blatantly disregarded and refused to comply with Appendix B, Section 4, part F, i, and has claimed that they have provided compromises and “flexibility” in order to comply where they have offered none.

Whereas, the Convocation Committee and the work that they do is important to the Cornell community and they must have accurate and fair representation on the committee.

Originaly Presented on: 11/19/2020
Type of Action: Legislation
Status/Result: New Business
Be it therefore resolved, Convocation Committee’s Student Activity Fee allocation be reduced and access to remaining funds suspended until full compliance with Appendix B of the Student Assembly charter is met.

Be it finally resolved, Convocation Committee’s current SAF allocation at $18.00 per student per year be reduced to $0.50 per student per year and the funds generated from the reduction be placed in the Special Projects fund until full compliance with Appendix B of the Student Assembly Charter is met.

Respectfully submitted,

Uche Chukwukere ‘21
Vice President for Finance

(Reviewed by: Executive Committee, 5-0-2, 11/18/2020)
S.A. Resolution #22
Creating an ad-hoc Taskforce on Harassment, Bias, and Discrimination

ABSTRACT: This resolution creates an ad-hoc Taskforce that will be an extension of the Student Assembly but housed within the Office of the Student Advocate. The charge of this taskforce is twofold: 1. To support students and provide resources for students experiencing harassment, bias, and discrimination and 2. To gather feedback and concerns from the Student Assembly and the student body on how current policies for reporting harassment and bias can be improved and propose those recommendations to the Student Assembly and Cornell administration.

Sponsored by: Cat Huang ’21, Anuli Ononye ’22, Noah Watson ’23

Whereas, Cornell currently provides options for reporting bias, discrimination and harassment through the Bias Reporting website under Cornell’s department for Diversity and Inclusion;

Whereas, the current existing administrative reporting structure on reporting bias, discrimination, and harassment does not fully address the needs of students nor ensure that perpetrators of bias, discrimination, and harassment are held accountable;

Whereas, the current administrative reporting structure fails to address online harassment on non-Cornell affiliated or controlled platforms, as well as anonymous online harassment;

Whereas, online harassment and targeted attacks on multiple platforms are not new, but have been exacerbated by the move to fully virtual instruction due to the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas, students have expressed a need for support in navigating their options for reporting bias, discrimination and harassment, and assistance in documentation of these issues;

Whereas, to ensure neutrality and impartiality in the discovery process of the taskforce, the taskforce will largely be led and supported by staff from the Office of the Student Advocate as many members within the Student Assembly have reported that they have experienced harassment and the taskforce wishes to avoid any conflict of interests in leadership when conducting its review process;

Be it therefore resolved, the Student Assembly will create an ad-hoc taskforce that is housed within and led by staff from the Student Assembly and the Office of the Student Advocate. This taskforce will be comprised of two co-chairs and six members. The two co-chairs will be the President of the Student Assembly and the Director of the Office of the Student Advocate. Two of the members will be members from the general student community, two members will be Student Assembly members, and two members will be staff members/caseworkers from the Office of the Student Advocate;

Be it further resolved, this ad-hoc taskforce will be known as the Taskforce on Bias, Harassment, and Discrimination.
45  **Be it further resolved**, the charge of this ad-hoc committee will be to support students
46  experiencing bias, harassment, and discrimination as well as collect and solicit feedback on
47  how current policy addressing bias, harassment, and discrimination can be improved;
48
49  **Be it further resolved**, this ad-hoc committee will function for the remainder of this academic year,
50  developing policy proposals and recommendations that consults all stakeholders: students,
51  faculty, and the administration, including but not limited to the Bias and Response Team
52  (BART) and the Office of the Judicial Administrator (OJA);
53
54  **Be it finally resolved**, the proposals and recommendations will be presented to the Student
55  Assembly throughout the semester in the form of verbal or written reports, and the final
56  recommendations will be presented to the Student Assembly in the form of a resolution by
57  the end of the academic year.
58
59  Respectfully Submitted,
60
61  Cat Huang ‘21
62  President, Student Assembly
63
64  Anuli Ononye ‘22
65  Director, Office of the Student Advocate
66
67  Noah Watson ‘23
68  Executive Vice President, Student Assembly
69
70  (Reviewed by: Executive Committee, 6-0-1, 12/06/2020)
S.A. Resolution #24
Creating a Diversity and Inclusion Scholarship

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this resolution is to allow for the Diversity and Inclusion Committee to distribute their funds amongst minority organizations in the form of a scholarship.


Whereas, minority organizations that aim to uplift marginalized voices and promote diversity on campus have historically been underfunded;

Whereas, it is the Diversity and Inclusion committee’s utmost duty to “brainstorm, formulate, and lead implementable policies in the field of diversity and inclusion;”

Whereas, the Diversity and Inclusion committee was granted $2,000 for the 2020-2021 school year under the Appropriations committee;

Whereas, due to COVID-19 restrictions on in-person events, these are excess funds.

Be it therefore resolved, the Student Assembly should allow these funds to be distributed to minority organizations on campus in the form of four $500 scholarships;

Be it further resolved, the Diversity & Inclusion committee will create and review applications in order to deem which organization is best fit to receive the funds;

Respectfully Submitted,

Selam Woldai ‘23
Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Student Assembly

Tomás Reuning ‘21
LGBTQ+ Liaison At-Large, Student Assembly

Angely Morel Espinal ‘24
Member of Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Student Assembly

Maia Lee ‘24
Member of Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Student Assembly

Harry Ducrepin ‘24
Member of Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Student Assembly

Youssef Aziz ‘22
Member of Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Student Assembly

Original Presented on: 12/10/2020
Type of Action: Legislation
Status/Result: New Business
Richmond Addae ‘23
Member of Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Student Assembly

(Reviewed by: Diversity and Inclusion Committee, 8-0-1, 12/07/2020)
S.A. Resolution #25
Including Pronouns and Phonetic Name Pronunciations in Class Rosters

ABSTRACT: This resolution is calling for the incorporation of students’ phonetic name pronunciations and pronouns in all professors’ class rosters.

Sponsored by: Tomás Reuning ‘21, Bo Miebach ‘21, Selam Woldai ‘23

Whereas, names and pronouns are central to students’ sense of self;

Whereas, students with less common, polysyllabic, and/or non-English names often feel pressured to shorten or “anglicize” their names or have noticed being called-on less than their peers with more common and/or monosyllabic names;

Whereas, a national campaign by the National Association of Bilingual Education has found that, especially for international students and immigrants, incorrect pronunciation of names can hinder academic progress and can impact a students’ sense of belonging;¹

Whereas, the correct pronunciation of students’ names is essential to creating an inclusive learning environment for the diversity of names and cultures represented in the Cornell’s student body;

Whereas, increasing the normalization of stating pronouns creates a more inclusive environment for transgender and nonbinary people;

Whereas, studies demonstrate that misgendering transgender and non-binary youth has detrimental effects on their mental health;²

Be it therefore resolved, the University should include students’ name pronunciations and pronouns on all class rosters;

Be it further resolved, this should be optional for all students out of consideration for transgender or non-binary people who may not yet be “out;”

Be it finally resolved, the University should implement this change prior to the start of the Spring 2021 semester, in the interest of creating a more inclusive learning environment as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted,
Tomás Daniel Chávez Reuning ‘21
LGBTQIA+ Liaison At-Large, Student Assembly

1 https://www.pbs.org/newshour/education/a-teacher-mispronouncing-a-students-name-can-have-a-lasting-impact
2 https://www.childtrends.org/research-shows-the-risk-of-misgendering-transgender-youth
S.A. Resolution #26
Encouraging Diversity in Professional Organizations

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this resolution is to get the Student Assembly and the University to encourage professional organizations to admit more diverse applicants in future application cycles.

Sponsored by: Harry Ducrepin ‘24, Maia Lee ‘24, Selam Woldai ‘23

Whereas, Cornell prides itself on its “any person, any study” mantra, emphasizing the space of inclusivity.

Whereas, the demographics of Cornell do not represent the demographics of this country, and the demographics of professional organizations on campus do not either.

Whereas, systemic barriers limit access to opportunities, such as admission into professional organizations and key prerequisites for these organizations.

Whereas, modern discrimination in organizations is often covert and more present during recruitment processes.

Whereas, it is important for people of color to see themselves represented in all spaces on campus to prevent feelings of imposter syndrome.

Whereas, in a 2016 study, it was found that 21% of African-American people and 16% of Hispanic people felt they had been treated unfairly in hiring processes as opposed to only 4% of White people.

Whereas, organizations stand to benefit from increased diversity in the long run as organizations would otherwise overlook and miss out on talented recruits because of discriminatory policies.

Whereas, some ways in which organizations can reduce bias and discrimination in recruitment processes include hiding demographic characteristics, establishing transparency and being cognizant of first impressions.

Whereas, professional organizations can self-regulate how inclusive they are via a Diversity Chair on their executive boards.

Be it therefore resolved, that the Student Assembly and the University urge professional organizations to strive for greater diversity in their recruitment cycles.

Be it therefore resolved, that the Student Assembly require all professional organizations to create a Diversity Chair on their Executive Boards.
Be it further resolved, this resolution is sent to all presidents of the pre professional organizations on campus and the executive board of the Professional Fraternity Council.

Respectfully Submitted,

Harry Ducrepin ’24  
*Diversity and Inclusion Committee Member, Student Assembly*

Maia Lee ’24  
*Diversity and Inclusion Committee Member, Student Assembly*

Selam Woldai ’23  
*Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Student Assembly*

(Reviewed by: Executive Committee, 6-0-1, 12/08/2020)
S.A. Resolution #27
Final Exam Policy Extension to Thirty Hours

ABSTRACT: The Student Assembly recommends that the Faculty Senate consider changing the final exam policy from 24 hours to 30 hours and propose that the Senate begin simulation testing of this policy.

Sponsored by: Youhan Yuan ’21, Alexa Slyman ’22

Whereas, in Cornell University faculty handbook Chapter 5 page 97, “It is university policy to discourage more than two examinations for a student in one twenty-four hour time period. Members of the faculty are urged to grant student requests for a make-up examination;”

Whereas, on Cornell University Registrar Website, “More than two exams in twenty-four hours is defined as one of the following:

- More than two exams in one day (9:00 AM, 2:00 PM, and 7:00 PM)
- An evening exam followed by morning and afternoon exams (7:00 PM, 9:00 AM, and 2:00 PM)
- Afternoon and evening exams followed by a morning exam (2:00 PM, 7:00 PM, and 9:00 AM);”

Whereas, in Cornell University Registrar Website, during final exam week, there are three exam periods each day: 9:00 AM, 2:00 PM, and 7:00 PM;

Whereas, final exam week is one of the most academically strenuous times of the semester;

Whereas, on Cornell Health’s website, the Mental Health Initiative includes “to foster a healthy educational environment;”

Whereas, current exam policies allow students to take three exams in a 30 hour period;

Be it therefore resolved, that the Student Assembly recommends that the Faculty Senate and University Registrar perform simulations using previous enrollment data to evaluate whether the change of policy would bring benefits to the student body.

Be it resolved, that the Student Assembly recommends that the Faculty Senate change the current final exam policy into “it is university policy to discourage more than two examinations for a student in one thirty hour time period, or four consecutive examination periods;”

Be it resolved, that the thirty-hour period will be defined as four consecutive examination periods.

Respectfully Submitted,
Alexa Slyman ’22
Chairperson, Health & Wellness Subcommittee of the Student Health Advisory Committee

Cornell University Student Assembly © www.CornellSA.org
(Reviewed by: Health & Wellness Committee, 14-0-0, 12/08/2020)
S.A. Resolution #28
Campus Policing Reform

ABSTRACT: The Student Assembly calls for Cornell University to adopt the following changes to university’s policing system.


Whereas, the student body has expressed concerns regarding our campus police system, and the effects police presence has on students, specifically students of color, in realms of mental health, ability to focus on academics, and overall safety.

Whereas, in recent months police brutality towards minorities and people of color has once again invoked national attention following repeated incidents of fatal police encounters.

Whereas, the history of prisons and police have disproportionately affected members of the African American community, in addition to mental and psychological trauma resulting from constant news and media coverage.

Whereas, for the reasons stated and unstated above, certain students feel less than safe around police officers, a sentiment which is often extended to campus police.

Whereas, Cornell prides itself in being a campus for “any person and any study” and must make sure that goes to ensure any student feels safe on campus.

Whereas, Cornell has already recognized the need to update its police system's policies and procedures and looks to establish a new system to respond to students' calls.

Whereas, the Cornell Student Assembly recognizes the work of the CUPD and their efforts pertaining to diversity and de-escalation training.

Whereas, there are shortfalls in the communication between CUPD and the student body in regards to department policy, training program, and internal complaints about police officers.
Be it therefore resolved, that the Student Assembly calls for the CUPD to annually publish information on the CUPD website regarding relevant procedures and policies: namely, diversity and de-escalation training, the use of force policy, and complaints by members of the Cornell community.

Be it further resolved, that Cornell establish an unarmed support unit including social workers, mental health professionals, and others deemed fit, with the set purpose of helping students in non-violent situations such as mental health issues and drug or alcohol use.

Be it further resolved, that Cornell administration prioritizes pre-emptive funding and support for CAPS and other university mental health and social services.

Be it finally resolved, that the Cornell administration re-evaluate when it is deemed necessary for campus police to carry firearms and create a system to limit the number of police or frequency the police carry them when on duty.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kayla Butler ‘24
Freshman Representative, Student Assembly

Zion Sherin ‘22
Community Member

Morgan Baker ‘23
Vice President of External Affairs, Student Assembly

Claire Tempelman ‘24
Freshman Representative, Student Assembly

Evan Moy ‘21
College of Arts & Sciences Representative, Student Assembly

Lucas Smith ‘22
Undesignated At-Large Representative, Student Assembly

Andrea Miramontes Serrano ‘24
Freshman Representative, Student Assembly

Raquel Zohar ‘23
Students With Disabilities Representative At-Large, Student Assembly
Kate Santacruz ’22
Transfer Representative, Student Assembly
Annette Gleiberman ’22
Vice President of Research & Accountability, Student Assembly
Dillon Anadkat ’21
Undesignated At-Large Representative, Student Assembly
Youhan Yuan ’21
International Students Liaison At-Large, Student Assembly
Lucas Zumpano ’22
School of Industrial & Labor Relations Representative, Student Assembly
Valentina Xu ’22
Undesignated At-Large Representative, Student Assembly

(Reviewed by: COMMUNICATIONS, 6-0-0, 12/06/2020)