I. Call to Order
   a. President V. Valencia called the meeting to order at 4:54pm

II. Roll Call

III. Land Acknowledgment of the Gayogohonq (Cayuga Nation)
   a. President V. Valencia stated the land acknowledgment

IV. Late Additions to the Agenda
   a. A. Lampert motions to add Resolution 13 under New Business, passed by unanimous consent
   b. S. Bhardwaj motions to add Resolution 12 under New Business, passed by unanimous consent

V. Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of the November 3, 2022 meeting minutes
      i. S. Bhardwaj motions to change “Amisha Chowdhury to Chowdhury,” passed by unanimous consent
      ii. B. Mehretu motions to approve the meeting minutes, passed by unanimous consent

VI. Open Microphone
   a. None

VII. Announcements and Reports
   a. V. Valencia announces a written statement on the recent events involving Greek life
   b. R. De Lorenzo announces the approval of $321 to the Disability Awareness Union at Cornell to host an event to discuss mental health and disability justice
The event will consist of welcomes, intros, Disability Awareness Union presentations, Cornell EARs presentation, student testimonials with a Q&A, and a reception.

$180 will go towards two hours of sign language interpreters for the event and the rest will go towards refreshments and advertisements.

C. Taylor expands that getting referred to disability specialists is extremely difficult at Cornell, so the goal is to increase awareness of resources that are available and provide a step-by-step guide to navigating referrals that’ll be on video and recorded with a transcript and sign language interpretation on their website. It’ll be available to all students for at least the next year and a half.

V. Valencia clarifies that since it’s less than $400 there’s no vote, just an announcement.

J. Kalinski asks how much is left in the special projects fund.

R. De Lorenzo responds it’s around $15,000 - $321.

S. Bhardwaj asks when the event is.

C. Taylor responds it’s on Tuesday the $15^{th}$ at 4:30pm in Ives 112.

c. S. Bhardwaj announces an in-person meeting for the Student Health Advisory Committee this weekend to discuss the recent events in Greek Life and how we can support students and survivors.

d. D. Cady announces that President Pollack will be visiting the University Assembly on the $15^{th}$ as well.

VIII. Initiatives

a. None

IX. Presentation and Forums

a. None

X. Business of the Day

a. None

XI. New Business

a. Resolution 12 is presented by S. Bhardwaj, R. De Lorenzo, and S. Williams.

i. S. Bhardwaj states this resolution condemns the recent events and urges the implantation of harm reduction strategies in Greek life.

ii. S. Bhardwaj reads their resolution.
iii. It details the crime alerts relating to roofying and sexual assault that went out over the weekend
iv. On November 6th, all IFC social events were suspended by the IFC
v. On November 7th, President Pollack and Vice President Lombardi released a joint statement condemning these events and reminding the community that this behavior must be eradicated
vi. Cornell is committed to facilitating a culture of safety, consent, and inclusivity and all students must feel safe and supported in Greek Life and other social spaces
vii. In order for Cornell University to remain true to its motto of “any person, any study,” Cornell must reaffirm its dedication to the safety of students of all genders, sexual orientations, races and other backgrounds
viii. The Cornell SA unequivocally condemns sexual assault and the drugging of our peers in the strongest possible terms
ix. The SA urges administration to implement actionable steps to reduce harm inflicted on our community, including strengthening mandatory, semesterly trainings on consent culture where a majority of fraternity members from each chapter are present, exploring further a relationship with the Tompkins County Advocacy Center and Greek Life organizations to promote healthy relationships and improve the safety of social settings, and bolstering supports for survivors of sexual assault, including restructuring the Title IX office to reduce wait times with support staff, decrease case resolution times, and provide support if survivors pursue legal action
x. S. Williams continues that they meet with IFC and PHC and have been in contact with members of MGFC
xi. R. De Lorenzo states he’s very happy with this resolution and members of IFC, PHC, and MGFC are here as well
xii. M. Baker asks about the decision in line 42 to make it a majority and not more
xiii. R. De Lorenzo responds that Greek organizations have many members, some sorority orgs have 100+. Having the majority of those people there is very strong for the community, but it could definitely be more
xiv. V. Valencia emphasizes that the SA, IFC, and PHC really care about working together to ensure that these events don’t happen again
xv. D. Cady encourages everyone to look at how they can help with this resolution. Exploring ways we can further develop the relationship with Tompkins County Advocacy Center sounds incredible. Maybe have them present here and talk about ways we could support them. Also talking about
ways we could further support the title ix office, ways we could examine some issues around case wait time and staff shortages. We have a lot of money and resources and are well-connected to work on this.

xvi. S. Bhardwaj states they’ll be talking about title ix on Saturday at the Student Health Advisory committee meeting, so that’s the first step and they’ll keep everyone in the loop

xvii. D. Cady motions to end debate, passed in a vote of 19-0-1

xviii. In a vote of 18-0-2, Resolution 12 passes

b. Resolution 13 is presented by the Office of Ethics
   i. V. Valencia clarifies that since it is a bylaw amendment it will be voted on next week
   ii. Office of Ethics explains that this is a re-introduction of the Office of Ethics bylaws amendments. Most of the changes were friendly amendments and some bring back old functions that the original bylaws already have.
   iii. Line 88 adds a clarification about the ex-officio position that the chairperson of the Office of Ethics has
   iv. Line 102 brings back the original term limits for members of the Office of Ethics keeping it at a term of one academic year unless their term is renewed and clarifies the process for removing fellow members of the Office of Ethics
   v. Line 126 clarifies that any vacancy in the Office of Ethics is able to be filled by any member of the SA if confirmed by 2/3 vote and reviewed by Office of Ethics
   vi. Line 139 adds a new process that requires the chairperson of the Office of Ethics to be confirmed by a 2/3 vote of the SA
   vii. Line 142 added that the chairperson of the Office of Ethics will decide upon the retention of the voting membership of the incoming office
   viii. J. Kalinski thanks them for their work on this and their patience in this process
   ix. B. Mehretu asks about line 41 and how that process would work
   x. Office of Ethics responds that the chair is elected by the Office of Ethics and confirmed by the SA and then after that the chair decides if the members who are staying on are indeed staying on and then the SA can fill the vacancies in the beginning of the next academic year
   xi. D. Cady asks about line 160-165 and the intention behind having a full Cornell University student body vote
xii. Office of Ethics responds that the rational of having it go to community vote is because the vote of no confidence removes all members of the Office of Ethics, so they opened it up to a vote of 15% of the student body, so that previous decisions of assemblies can’t be wiped away by one assembly.

xiii. C. Taylor states that 15% of the student body would be a higher turnout then we usually receive in the SA Spring elections and would make it almost impossible. Is that the level they wanted to assign?

xiv. Office of Ethics responds that the 15% number was put in their suggested changes document, but could make it something more in line with how voting turnout has been in previous semesters. They don’t want to make it impossible at all.

xv. B. Luckow states an appropriate change would be a minimum of the last election cycle turnout or no threshold at all.

xvi. Office of Ethics asked if the that would be allowed.

xvii. C. Taylor states the wording for that would be “at least the percentage of the undergraduate population that voted in the previous terms student assembly presidential election would be required in order to remove a member of the Office of Ethics from their position” and it can be done.

xviii. M. Baker states it should say “it’s sufficient to”.

xix. C. Taylor motions to amend the line to say “a percentage of the undergraduate population which voted in the previous terms student assembly presidential election in the will be sufficient to remove a member of the Office of Ethics from their position”.

xx. D. Cady dissents. Asks why it can’t be a simple majority.

xxi. B. Luckow states we’re making the assumption that more people would care about this than the presidential election and if we can not meet that threshold then we’d be stuck in a cycle of no confidence, so doesn’t think there should be a threshold.

xxii. Office of Ethics responds they had a community vote of a majority before and have more confidence in that.

xxiii. R. De Lorenzo motions to amend like 162-164 to say “5% of the undergraduate population must vote in favor of the Office of Ethics Student Assembly membership for the vote to be sustained” by unanimous consent.

xxiv. S. Bhardwaj dissents. Office of Ethics recommends the simple majority.

xxv. B. Mehretu motions to amend line 162-164 to say “by simple majority,” passed in a vote of 15-1-3.

xxvi. M. Baker asks if it was 50% of people who turnout.
xxvii. Office of Ethics says yes
xxviii. D. Cady states in line 171-172 there shouldn’t be a three-meeting limit because he doesn’t see a purpose for it
xxix. Office of Ethics states the reason behind that is if it’s during anytime then they could potentially get the bylaws changed and passed at any time to prevent someone from getting a violation and that could affect the outcome of any violation
xxx. V. Valencia states they could change it to “while an investigation is occurring”
xxxi. D. Nachman asks for clarification on why they did this
xxxii. Office of Ethics responds that it’s a check on them, so that they don’t change the bylaws
xxxiii. A. Lampert motions to amend line 171-172 to say “not while an investigation is ongoing,” fails in a vote of 3-12-7
xxxiv. R. De Lorenzo motions to strike lines 171-172 by unanimous consent
xxxv. S. Bhardwaj dissents. The Office of Ethics brought up valid reasons for having this check
xxxvi. C. Taylor states they could make it “the bylaws as they stand at the beginning of an investigation will hold through the investigation”
xxxvii. Office of Ethics states that they like that a lot, but didn’t know if they could do that
xxxviii. B. Luckow suggests that all changes in the first three meetings could be immediate and the rest could take place later, but likes C. Taylor’s suggestion more
xxxix. D. Cady motions to strike lines 171-172 with the understanding that if an investigation were to come up that requires changing the bylaws a debate could occur, passes in a vote of 14-3-4
xl. B. Mehretu motions to postpone to next week, passes in a vote of 17-0-2

XII. Adjournment
   a. R. De Lorenzo motions to adjourn, passed by unanimous consent

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Megan Birmingham
Clerk of the Assembly