I. Call to Order
   a. E. Winarto called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm.

II. Approval of the Minutes
   a. A motion was made to approve the minutes from the February 26th meeting, there was no dissent.

III. Presentations
   a. Dean Van Loan and A. Waymack then made their presentation.
      i. There is now a draft policy proposal from the Consensual Relationship Policy Committee.
      ii. People can post comments on the current rough draft (6 pages).
      iii. There is also a one page synopsis for the very busy colleague.
      iv. The committee has met frequently since November, and received dozens of insights from colleagues. They have reviewed policies at 50+ peer institutions, and have or will visit all the assemblies. They have met with 7+ college HR directors, 20+ graduate field assistants, and various student groups.
      v. We are entering a 3-week comment period on this language. Then the assemblies will all vote on their versions of this, and President Pollack will review them and combine them.
      vi. If there are specific groups you think the committee should meet with please email C. Van Loan or A. Waymack.
      vii. The policy deals with relationships between possible authority figures and possible subordinates.
      viii. Instances where there will be no relationships allowed:
1. Between undergraduates and faculty.
2. When one party has academic authority over the other.

ix. There are disclosure and recusal mechanisms in this draft. The policy also creates the “6.x office” which will reach out to the subordinate when a relationship is reported.

x. M. Battaglia asked how broad is the term “administrator” in the policy and how they plan to account for nuance there.

xi. C. Van Loan: we need to specify what “administrator” in a department is. It gets to the question of direct control, and if the administrator runs some far off branch of something we can see the nuance. We should clarify more what is acceptable and what is not.

xii. M. Battaglia brought up how students seeking multiple professional degrees have access to hundreds or thousands of classes, and how that could spiral into a blanket ban on some relationships for these students.

xiii. A. Waymack: we can take many classes, but some of them don’t apply to our fields of study. We’ll have to revisit multiple professional degree programs.

xiv. C. Van Loan: this bans undergraduate relationships with faculty because undergraduates have less life experience than graduate students and undergraduates fund Cornell’s lawyers with tuition. To solve problems that arise from relationships with undergraduates is much harder.

xv. D. Brown commended them for the work they have done and asked if the subordinate has any burden to disclose the relationship.

xvi. A. Waymack: the burden will be on the authority figure to recuse or disclose.

xvii. J. Goldberg asked would a bunch of individual comments be better or a resolution from the GPSA.

xviii. A. Waymack: we want both. They want feedback from the GPSA especially when its about graduate/professional students.

xix. E. Law asked for clarification on what they mean by professional advancement authority.

xx. C. Van Loan said it really comes down to does the authority figure have the power to affect the subordinate’s academic or professional future.
xxi. C. Cannarozzo: did you say that veterinary residents are considered to be faculty?
xxii. A. Waymack responded that they are counting them and post-docs as students.
xxiii. C. Cannarozzo asked are they discriminating between veterinary interns/residents, because they are very different.
xxiv. A. Waymack asked C. Cannarozzo for help in explaining this later.
xxv. E. Cecchetti: what is the enforcement mechanism at the lower level of disclosure? How public is it expected to be?
xxvi. This policy is going to be in peoples faces. It’s not to embarass people, it’s to encourage ethical behavior. How public the disclosure is depends on the situation.
xxvii. A question from the audience asked what happens to preexisting relationships?
xxviii. C. Van Loan: this is such a small probability that they are not nervous about this.

IV. Division Breakouts
V. Committee Updates
   a. Executive: E. Winarto sent out an email about an ongoing voter registration drive. If anyone is interested in that please let the Executive Committee know. They’ve been discussing Notice and Respond training with administration.
   b. Operations and Staffing: the next meeting is the 23rd and they will continue the restructuring conversation.
   c. Communications: nothing to report.
   d. Appropriations: nothing to report.
   e. Finance: nothing to report.
   f. Student Advocacy: they are trying to follow up on things that were brought up at the town-hall: bus passes for student employees, handicap parking being clear of snow, and accommodations in the law school. They are creating a slack channel for SAC updates.
   g. Diversity and International Students: DISC and SAC co-hosted a town-hall and an information session for law school accommodations. They’ve been discussing
English proficiency for International Students and they are working with the Graduate School on this. There will be a meeting with a lot of administrators on March 28th. This month’s lunch dialogue is March 20th, 11:30-1, room TBD, and they will be discussing mental health.

h. Programming Board: co-sponsorship funds are gone. Agava will be catering for Grad Ball.
   i. Faculty Awards: nothing to report.
   j. General Committee: nothing to report.
   k. Consensual Relationship Policy Committee: see presentation above.
   l. Graduate School: nothing to report.

VI. New Business
   a. Introduction of Resolution 12
      i. The purpose of this resolution is to request the creation of a graduate and professional student version of the notice and respond F2F program. The estimated cost is $50-80 thousand. This resolution is a call to the administration and the alumni affairs office to find the funds.
      ii. A motion was made to table the resolution until the next meeting, there was no dissent.

VII. Old Business
   a. Discussion of Resolution 9
      i. M. Munasinghe: the sponsors were supposed to meet with VP Lombardi and Dean Pendakur to talk about these proposed changes, but it had to be rescheduled because of the snow day, so she suggested we table the resolution until the next meeting.
      ii. A motion was made to table this resolution until the next meeting, there was no dissent.
   b. Discussion of Resolution 11
      i. M. Battaglia: commended R. Harrison for the resolution and recommended committing it to the Operations and Staffing Committee.
      ii. N. Rogers: we don’t have anyone to interpret what appears in our governing documents. We need to think about who interprets our documents. He hopes Operations and Staffing will have this conversation.
iii. A motion was made to call the question on the resolution, however there was dissent, and the motion was withdrawn.

iv. A motion was made to commit this resolution to the Operations and Staffing Committee expecting an update in two meetings (if they don’t have something in two meetings the GPSA will reconsider this Resolution).
   1. E. Law: is there any intention to send this to the President?
   2. R. Harrison: if we can accomplish something out of Operations and Staffing, then no.
   3. E. Law suggested instead of framing this as a resolution we could make this a motion.
   4. N. Rogers: if we do it this way and Operations and Staffing doesn’t do something we can reconsider the Resolution.
   5. M. Munasinghe: Operations and Staffing can change literally everything in this resolution. If they can’t reach a consensus, then the full assembly will deal with it.
   6. The motion to commit the resolution passed 10-0-6.

VIII. Open Forum
   a. T. McCann stated that it would be useful if there was a document or guide about how the GPSA runs for field representatives. If anyone is interested in working on that with T. McCann reach out to him.
   b. N. Rogers wanted to remind everyone that the GPCI is still a thing. It needs to be a collaborative effort if it’s going to succeed, email ngr27 with questions.
   c. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting, there was no dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:48pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Matthew Ferraro
Clerk of the Assembly