

# 8:30 PM – 10:00 PM, Sadove Conference Room Minutes

Rafael Osella

# 1. Call to Order

#### **Present:**

		Rafael Osella
Isa Cardoso	Alex Kropaneva	Allison Sheehan
Nickie Conlogue	Marvin Lopez	Matthew Sinning
Cicille Dan-Morton	Joe Maalouf	Felix Tager
Max Ganem	Dewayne Martin	
Jackson Harris	Ryley McGovern	Excused:
Josue Herrera Rivera	Evelyn Molina	Abigail Hagan
Emily Jiang	Adina Mujica	Nevaeh Gutierrez
Tommy Keith	Subin Myong	Michelle Estrella
Lena Klink	Raymond Ni	

• We are working with the Oneida Nation to create a new land acknowledgment as well as actionable plans to honor our commitment to developing a relationship with the Oneida Nation.

# 2. General Public Comment Period (TIME: 00:40)

#### Sofia Weinstein'24 (she/they) commented:

"I am writing to ask for a widened selection at Bundy Cafe, specifically for lunch and dinner. This will greatly improve the quality of life down the hill, and is largely a matter of accessibility on campus."

**Joe Maalouf** agreed with the public comment. He mentioned that there was a lack of diverse selections within the Bundy Cafe and it is frustrating for the students living in Bundy. Going to Bundy Cafe and it having food is a miracle; having lunch or preferably dinner so that students can eat down the hill and don't have to go back up. He further stated that tour guides are required to say that Bundy Cafe is a full dining hall which is inaccurate.

**Felix Tager** mentioned that they have not been able to open the kitchen for dinner in Bundy. However, it is posted that Bundy is open while it actually is not. Therefore, students are going to Bundy only to not be able to eat and having to go back up the hill. He reminded the Assembly that there are seven dorms in the area with students that rely on the dining hall which often has nothing that is feasible for a lot of people. Furthermore, students with dietary restrictions are often unable to eat any of the food served by Bundy Dining Hall.



**Joe Maalouf** stated that he was able to get approval to get the Bundy Cafe hours extended to what they should be. The matter of food being there is different. He mentioned that there are currently cookies and bagels, but that selection is minimal and doesn't sufficiently satisfy the need for real food down the hill. He noted that fixing the problem is halfway there and hopefully there will be more initiative to do more.

**Jackson Harris** mentioned that Reuben Haag, who runs Bon Appetit, has been very open to working with SA on improving things in the past. If the collective body thinks Bundy Cafe should be a priority for the allocation of resources, then the Health Committee can reach out to Bon Appetit regarding this issue.

#### 3. New Business

• Approval of Minutes from 3/28 (TIME: 06:00)

The motion to approve the 3/28 minutes passes unanimously.

• Guest Speakers: Dayna Campbell and Alexis Takashima, Hamilton College Judicial Board (TIME 06:20)

**Dayna Campbell** thanked the assembly for allowing them to come present and ask for SA's collaboration to include a J-Board member from the Class of 2023. She mentioned that she has seen campus shift these last few years and that within this time period, there has been a lot of misinformation about what the J-Board does, what the community standards office is, and what the process is for them. She reminded everyone to nominate their peers who are trained and who want to review potential violations of the college policy and adjudicate. She emphasized that everyone can apply if they have less than six points. It is up to students to self-nominate their peers.

Alexis Takashima mentioned that to be chair of the J-Board, students need to serve at least two complete terms as voting board members. The entire board is made up of three students from the sophomore, junior, and senior classes each, three faculty members, and one staff member. Usually, three students, one faculty, and one staff member are selected during board hearings. For any given hearing, there is an option if there is a conflict of interests between the accused student and the board for a little bit of leeway with who will do the hearing. The Board typically deals with violations of the code of conduct and college policy. She mentioned that Administrative hearings are confused with J-Board hearings. Administrative hearings cannot be appealed and are conducted by only one faculty member and one student. It is not a board overseeing the case and is a more intimate conversation between situations that are a lot more black and white; you either missed your test or not. The only grey areas were when people were not aware of status changes or the



# Hamilton College Student Assembly General Meeting of the Central Council - April 4th, 2022

timing of test openings. These situations are more dedicated to the administrative hearings which she states that she can sit as the chair and as a voting member. A faculty member and she can sit on one administrative hearing and make a decision together. In a Judicial Board hearing, she is there to mediate the conversation between the students on the board and the staff. and not a voting member. When she is on the J-Board, she is not allowed to express her opinions to the voting members. She is there to deliver the sanction afterward to the accused student. She makes the point that the J-Board since COVID has been lumped with the COVID protocol enforcement team. She mentioned that she applied in her sophomore year before COVID happened. Her experience with the J-Board now is very different from what it was during her first two semesters as a member. Because the past few years have been overflowing with COVID cases, it was very difficult to explain what the J-Board does. Now, as they are moving away from the COVID policy enforcement realm, there are less frequent board cases. Most of the Class of 2023's interactions have been administrative hearings through COVID.

**Dayna Campell** mentioned that there have been more J-Board members than ever before. There were things that people did in the past that broke college policies such as bringing people from outside of campus. In the past, there was a warning process proceeded by a process to determine a student's eligibility to stay on campus. She noted that there is no more virtual learning. COVID policy is a published college policy. When there are posted rules and policies that are violated and students violate them, it is a violation of college policy and the code of conduct. It was an intentional decision to move to continue COVID testing. The COVID policies stressed a lot of people out but policies were created to keep people safe. Now, the board has moved onto a more normal time with a non-separate process. She wants people to know that if students are not elected to the J-Board, then students will not get their say. She noted that the J-Board members work tirelessly to look at evidence along with other work that they do. She emphasizes that while there is a lot of work involved within the process, they are also open to answering any questions and giving clarification on running and getting involved within the J-Board. She emphasized the need to continue the relationship with students so they can understand the processes involved and get involved within the board. Annually, a list of anonymized cases and their outcomes is publicized.

Alexis Takashima added that she has never seen an outcome where anyone on the body is outraged or the accused student felt like they did not get a fair process in her time on the J-Board. In an effort to get this call to recruit J-Board members, for the Class of 2023 and for the future, she emphasized the importance of recognizing the fact that the school is really lucky that students and faculty members are open to hearing each side of the case. There has never been a situation where the board would just hear all the information and then cast a unanimous vote. She expressed her belief that there is a lot of thought put into how the student themselves would be impacted by the



vote. Recently, the J-Board spent three hours in a meeting on one case where the student was close to 10 points because everyone was sympathetic and wanted more information on the case to give a sanction that kept the school safe, kept the student responsible while being sympathetic to what the student was going through. She believes this is a big testament to what the board is about especially because one may never know how someone will react to different controversial policies. She noted that the people who are critical of the COVID rules and can give feedback on them are the type of people that they want on the J-Board. She emphasized that this position is not just for people who think that all the rules are perfect and should be upheld every day.

**Dayna Campbell** emphasized that if people had points, they can still be on the J-Board because they want different experiences represented. Violations of the policy will not be a personal judgment inflicted on the students. She emphasized that people agree to comply with the rules when they come here so they should know what is written. She reiterated that if someone does not know a policy, they can ask. She noted that the J-Board members are students too so students should ask when they do not know something. There is a lot of humanness within the process and she wants other people to be involved in it.

#### Questions/ Comments: (TIME 21:36)

**Joe Maalouf** mentioned that some students do not join because they think that the J-Board is corrupt. He asked what would give students the opinion that the board is corrupt because students do not join for that reason.

**Dayna Campbell** replied that she does not know because she is not a decision-maker and has transitioned out of sitting in on J-Board due to taking on additional responsibilities. She noted that she has found that there is a lack of information. The question to consider is whether the information is accessible and clear online which is something that she takes very seriously. She mentions that sometimes students can be misinformed in the deliberation process whether it is by being misinformed by a friend or hearing something untrue, etc. In the end, the process is the process.

**Jackson Harris** mentioned that one thing talked about was wanting a diversity of students on the J-Board which includes people with different opinions on policies. He asked how much input and authority over policy J-Board members had over the policies or whether they were just executors of the policies.



# Hamilton College Student Assembly General Meeting of the Central Council - April 4th, 2022

Alexis Takashima replied that when she says policies, she means situations such as a student giving an explanation for why they missed a test or an explanation for why they were in someone else's dorm at the time. She expressed the need to have members of the board that will tell the student that their actions were wrong for certain reasons or acceptable under the circumstances for certain reasons. This gives the board the ability to then talk amongst themselves and see the human side of the charge. The members themselves of the board do not have any authority over what the policy is. J-Board members are not allowed to give exceptions to college policies. The point is to look at what the student is charged with and come to a conclusion on whether the charge given fits the action. More importantly, if the student is being charged with reckless intentional conduct, the board's job is to decide if the student's action falls under a charge or if it was an accident. She noted that it is a difficult line to walk because the J-Board does not have all the information that they want all the time. The authority of the members comes in the belief that the J-Board members will understand the criteria for each charge. She mentioned that even if students were charged for one thing that can potentially also be a charge for another thing, the board's job is to decide whether they are responsible.

Jackson Harris asked whether the members on the J-Board had any role in the charging process.

**Dayna Campbell** replied that in terms of having authority over the policies, any student can go to her, Catherine Berryman, Dean Martinez, or Dean Landry, and bring suggestions and questions to the code of conduct as most of the categories have been there for a very long time. She noted that updating the policies is rare but it has been done before as they did last semester with the college's marijuana policy to reflect the policy on alcohol. She mentioned that this was done by collaborating with SA and looking at current laws. While a student cannot just decide at the moment what should or should not be included in the college policy, there are steps to get to the outcome of policy change. She reiterated that if anyone has questions or concerns in any particular area to express them to ensure a fair policy. In terms of the charging process, the information comes from different areas such as Residential Life, campus safety, staff members, etc. Every report does not turn into an actual case. All of the evidence is looked at during a hearing and a student is presumed not responsible unless the information is reviewed by the decision-maker.

**Rafael Osella** asked if asking for a representative in the Class of 2023 was on top of the approval process. (yes)



Joe Maalouf mentioned that some people do not have faith in the J-Board as he has heard from people he knew as well as his own personal experiences dealing with the board with COVID violations. He noted that it seemed like the J-Board used leading questions which makes students question their faith in the Judicial Board. He expressed his belief that with the type of questions asked, it sometimes seems like the accused will need legal counsel within their hearings. He asked how the Judicial Board can revamp itself to regain the trust from the students in the Judicial Board.

Alexis Takashima mentioned that his COVID hearing was an administrative hearing and not a J-Board hearing. She reiterated that it is the job of the board to decide if the action falls within a specific category or charge. Typically, there are specific criteria that the board uses to illustrate each charge. Under the charge of reckless or intentional conduct, there are around five things that they are looking for. What the board wants the accused student to do is agree or disagree that their given charge happened. She emphasized that there were a lot of steps that people had to go through to ensure each person is given a fair sanction. Open-ended and accusatory questions are often the easiest way for a student to reveal whether they did or did not commit something that they were charged with.

**Joe Maalouf** mentioned that the open-ended and accusatory questions are also the easiest way for a nervous student to deny their allegations rather than admitting what happened. He noted that reaccessing the types of questions asked can be a good step.

**Dayna Campbell** replied that she will take that feedback and mentioned that the questions asked are in the manual but they are not prescribed questions. In terms of the manner of the questions, she noted that it would all come down to training which the campus investigator does. Accused students are allowed to bring in an advisor and other pieces of evidence. She noted that it is a situation that is not great due to the ambitious nature of many of the students here. On the one hand, the hearing should not be one to attack someone as the purpose should be to allow peers and people in the community to talk about your behavior. However, the behavior must be talked about. She wants people to prepare for situations that they may not expect. If there are specific things about a situation, they want to hear. She noted that if anyone has questions, they can email the community standards email (comstand@hamilton.edu) or her personally (dncampbe@hamilton.edu).

- Committee Updates:
  - Cicille Dan-Morton '24, Chair Academic Affairs, Enrollment, and Development (AED) (<u>TIME: 37:02</u>)



**Cicille Dan-Morton** mentioned that this semester AED is working on improving financial literacy on campus, financial aid, and university budgeting. A software they have is iGrad which helps students budget and save and teaches financial literacy. A guest for one of the meetings will talk about how to use it. Students can also use the app beyond their time at Hamilton.

# Felix Tager '23, Chair - Student Activities Funding Committee (SAFC) (<u>TIME: 38:10</u>)

Felix Tager mentioned that over the last seven months, the SAFC community has been working on a proposal that will outline a new funding and treasurer system which will hopefully go into effect next year. The changes in the treasurer system will replace the cluster treasurers with a sole treasurer. This introduces new funding codes that allow clubs to have merch and loss restrictions. It also includes a new transparency clause that requires Media Board and CAB to release their funding request and publish their budgets. It also introduces rollovers which means that budgets will rollover. This has been a huge effort that has taken a very long time, so he wanted to thank everyone who has been on SAFC for the past few months and before. He also thanked Kaity Stewart who has been working on this tirelessly. He noted that this has been a tough challenge as this has been something that has been worked on a lot and failed. He is grateful for the committee which helped make a policy document that actually makes sense. He also mentioned that the trustees have welcomed the proposal. He mentioned that this is tangible proof that constitutional problems can be fixed with effort and time. There is a document for everyone to read and a SparkNotes version that has been sent out in an email to the whole school. SA will vote on this next Monday and if it passes there will be a full school vote, as this is a constitutional amendment. If the whole school vote passes, the new budget system will go into effect when clubs apply for the next year's budget. Class treasurers will be departing from SA immediately after the full school vote if it passes. SAF will go into effect immediately after to start the rollover process.

**Emily Jiang** emphasized the need to read the document and receive input from peers. They asked for everyone to read the document- even just reading the email would be appreciated.

**Felix Tager** mentioned that the public comment for people to send in feedback will still be available but will be closed on Friday because the committee needs time to edit the document based on the feedback received. He shouted out Joe Maalouf, Kaity Stewart, Emily Jiang, Marvin Lopez, and Allison Sheehan for writing a good portion of the documents. They will be available to answer questions on the sections they wrote. He also stated that he will also be available to answer questions because he has been involved in the process.



Emily Jiang shouted out Felix Tager for chairing the committee.

**Noelle Juliano** thanked everyone who worked on this proposal and mentioned that this is a good thing for SA. She mentioned that before they move on, she wants them to outline the main changes if this proposal is approved.

**Felix Tager** mentioned that there are two major documents. The rollover proposal and the establishment of the SAF committee is the first document while the funding codes are the second document which also includes the new funding system.

**Emily Jiang** mentioned that any rollovers from the previous budget will roll over and stay within the parent budget like SA and CAB. It means that most of the student activities fee will stay within the groups that originally received it. So, if a club saves a lot of money, it will stay within the parents budget and not go back into general funding. Excess funding will be managed by the new SAF committee, which will reallocate excess funding. The new SAF committee will be comprised of the SA treasurer and president, voting members representatives from CAB, Media Board, and DMC. This proposal will also create a traditions fund that will support class traditions, which are outlined further in the actual document.

**Marvin Lopez** mentioned that with the new funding codes, organizations will receive funding at the beginning of the semester. If they have an excess, it will be taken into consideration when determining how much they will get the following semester.

Allison Sheehan mentioned that new expenditures have been added which can be applied under this new SA funding with the big one being apparel. She noted that there is a new transparency section that makes the request and spendings of CAB and the Media Board public. Furthermore, the funding code language has been clarified.

**Marvin Lopez** mentioned that there have been increases in limits on the budget for food and other things, which have been adjusted to account for inflation. He emphasized the need to look at the document and suggest comments.

# Nickie Conlogue '25, Class President - Underclassman Formal (<u>TIME</u> <u>48:59</u>)



**Nickie Conlogue** expressed her excitement about the collaboration between the delegations of the Class of 2025 and 2024 for the underclassman formal. The formal is open for freshmen and sophomores and will take place this Saturday, April 9th, from 8pm to 12am. There will be performances, catering from from Cremeria, cupcakes, a chocolate fountain. She restated that both delegations are very excited about the formal.

# • SA Tables Schedule - Week of April 4th, 2022 (TIME 50:08)

**Marvin Lopez** mentioned that there will be tables on Tuesday and Friday to talk about elections and get opinions on the funding codes. He asked for members to join.

Club Name	<b>Requested Budget</b>	<b>Recommended Budget</b>
Society of Physics Students	\$1,764.30	\$1,764.30
La Vanguardia	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
Mock Trial	\$705.00	\$705.00

# • Funding Requests: (TIME 51:25)

**Marvin Lopez** mentioned that if all the funding requests are approved, the remaining budget is \$13,961.15 which clubs can use further. SA funds are not coming out of this budget.

#### The motion to approve the budget requests as recommended passes unanimously.

#### 4. Announcements

- The SAFC documents will be sent out for review today. Please give them a look and send in feedback to the form provided in the email.
- Student Assembly assists the Class and Charter Award selection committee in seeking nominations for student leaders and an outstanding professor every spring. An email with survey links will be going out asking you to make nominations so we can continue this great tradition of recognizing students and professors for great work. Please fill this out as soon as you can! Nominations will close on 4/19!

Alex Kropaneva reiterated some announcements for Org Leaders. She noted there are deadlines for club events, contracts, and travel bookings. Friday, April 8th is the deadline to notify Student activities about contracts or if your organization is traveling off-campus and needs to reserve a



hotel or Airbnb. Contracts and traveling requests should be made at least 10 days prior to the event. The last day to host an event or program is Friday, May 6th as no events or programs are permitted during Reading Days or Finals Week except for approved study breaks.

# 5. Motion for Closed Session

• Update and Discussion about Wellness Package Items

#### 6. Adjournment

If you would like to be put on the agenda for a public comment, email <u>sa@hamilton.edu</u> by 8:00 PM on Sunday. Otherwise, submit them <u>here</u> using your Hamilton email account.