

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

1. Call to Order

Present:

Emily Boviero
Isa Cardoso
Nickie Conlogue
Eric Cortes-Kopp
Cicille Dan-Morton
Ashley Garcia
Melanie Geller
Nevaeh Gutierrez
Michelle Estrella
Joseph Han
Jackson Harris
Abigail Hagan
Christian Hernandez
Emily Jiang

Jungwon Kim
Lena Klink
Cole Kuczek
Dewayne Martin
Ryley McGovern
Maya Mathews
Wriley Nelson
Raymond Ni
Subin Myong
Fatima Oliva
Natalia Reboredo
Eric Santomauro-
Stenzel
Felix Tager

Excused:

Ele Sorensen
Saphire Ruiz

2. Land Acknowledgement

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel read a [land acknowledgement](#) created by the Shenandoah-Kirkland Initiative (SKI).

3. Statement on Cuba

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel read the following statement:

“We unequivocally stand against political repression, police violence, and all forms of state oppression against movements for freedom and democracy, in Cuba and everywhere. The Cuban state's actions to deprive its people of due process, free speech, and democratic accountability are abhorrent and stand against the values of the Hamilton community. We encourage all members of our community to speak up against this state violence and donate to humanitarian causes. As we approach these conversations, we must recognize that we are here in the United States, and ask ourselves what we can do to stand in solidarity with the Cubans in Cuba. I invite members of the Hamilton community with proposals beyond private donations to reach out with how we can further aid efforts for freedom and global solidarity.”



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

4. General Public Comment Period

Gabriel Bit-Babik '25 (he/him) expressed his appreciation for the passage of resolution 21-3. He is waiting and hoping to see what SA will do to help that effort. More broadly, he has questions about the dining situation on campus, and wonders if there are any updates for the rest of the student body. Finally, one comment to campus - he encourages other students to come to public comment and participate in SA.

Sam Born '23 wrote the following statement:

“My name is Sam Born '23 and I am a junior in Bundy West. I understand that the student assembly has had ongoing conversations about the parking situation for students on this campus. I recently received a ticket for parking in the bundy loop for no more than 30 minutes in order to change and use the restroom before I went to the fitness center. I feel that it would be important for the assembly to implore the administration to not only tone it back on parking tickets for students but also find a way for kids to find parking more easily on Hamilton's campus. I think this is a major issue for many students at Hamilton and I would love for some change to be made at some point. Whether this means new parking lots or new designations for students to park, I think this is an issue that angers many students here. Thank you for your help and I hope we can continue to raise this problem in your future meetings.”

5. New Business

- **Approval of Minutes 9/13**

The motion to approve the 9/13 minutes passes with unanimous consent.

The motion to approve the 9/06 minutes passes with unanimous consent.

- **Confirmation of Interim Class Treasurer**
 - Class of 2024: Kathy Guerra Vazquez (she/her/hers)

Christian Hernandez Barragan mentioned that he has appointed Kathy for Interim Class Treasurer of '24, who has sent a blurb to be read on her behalf due to her inability to attend the meeting:

“Hello! My name is Kathy Guerra Vazquez, I am in the class of 2024 and I use she/her/hers pronouns. I was born and raised in Mexico, but I immigrated to Houston, Texas eight years ago. My intended majors are Neuroscience and Hispanic Studies and I am involved in La Vanguardia, ROOTS, BLSU, Tropical Sol and I am a part of the Opportunity Program at Hamilton College. If given the opportunity, I will ensure that as an interim class treasurer, I will be able to help clubs



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

and organizations continue with the previous funding model. Additionally, I will work in any way that I can to prepare these organizations for the cluster model that will be implemented in the future. It is significant to also ensure that clubs and organizations allow inclusivity in the college and are satisfied with the fundings provided by Student Assembly.”

The confirmation vote for Kathy Guerra Vazquez for Interim Class Treasurer passes unanimously.

6. Funding

Amount Remaining: **\$ 75,711.50 for Fall semester**

Total General Fund: **\$ 151,423**

Amount Remaining Non-Strategic: **\$ 15,142.30**

Amount Remaining Discretionary (with Rollbacks): **\$ 3,785.58**

Starting Strategic Budget: **\$ 60,569.20**

Strategic Budget (including advanced funding): **\$ ----**

Organization	Items/Services Requested	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Result
Discretionary ; submitted by President and VP	SA logo buttons (50x)	\$27.30	\$27.30	N
SAAC	Pizza (Essential Food Purchase)	\$100	\$100	N
Slow Food	Food from Grocery Store (Pasta or Rice),	\$50	\$50	N



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

	Produce from Common Thread farm to cook lunch			
Juggling Club	Juggling Balls, Juggling Clubs, Shipping	\$647	\$647	N

Amount Requested: **\$ 1006.30**

Amount Recommended (Non-Strategic): **\$150 (\$647 is strategic)**

Amount Recommended (Discretionary): **\$27.30**

Amount Remaining if Funding passes (Non-Strategic): **\$14,992.30**

Amount Remaining Strategic if Funding passes: **\$59,922.20**

Felix Tager mentioned that next week the assembly will be approving 150 budget proposals. He mentioned that they do not have a full treasury for votes. He expressed the need for organization funding training to be completed by Tuesday at midnight; organizations that fail to do so will not be eligible for funding this semester. He mentioned that if strategic budgets are late, they cannot be accepted. Additionally, organizations will not receive funding if Title IX is not completed. The Treasury will be taking a firm stance against sexual assault on campus, beginning with Title IX training.

Abigail Hagan asked how organizations can find the forms for funding.

Felix Tager answered that the forms can be found on the website and everyone has access to them.

Felix Tager mentioned further that funds will not be provided for unnecessary food. The reasoning for this is that the Treasury believes that all events should be funded in an equal manner as opposed to some events with food and some events without. They believe funding should be done for organizations and events that require food to function or if food moves the event forward; food will then be recommended by the Treasury for approval. All but one item for which funding needs to be approved during this meeting is coming out of non-strategic funding.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel expressed his and Sapphire's plan of buying 50 2.25inch Student Assembly logo buttons that will be distributed to all members of the assembly. They will act as a sign to students that the wearer is a member of the assembly and someone they can talk to. It can act as an on-duty type of thing; if the button is worn, the wearer is available for students to talk about assembly matters. The price (27 USD) is low compared to previous assembly merch purchases and will come out of the discretionary budget.

Felix Tager stated that Treasury approved the funds but mentioned that the buttons may not be efficient, and recognized that other items could be pursued for merch.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel added that this is what also would be used to fund class events or other independent expenditures of the assembly.

Maya Mathews asked if the purchase of buttons will prevent the purchase of other merchandise.

Felix Tager replied that the purchase of buttons does not necessarily prevent the purchase of other merchandise. If there is a focus on getting funding and merch later towards the end of the semester, there will be limited backlash.

Eric Cortes-Kopp mentioned that the sweaters were hundreds of dollars when the Student Assembly budget was cut that year which caused outrage.

Felix Tager added that the external merch dealer recommended may be cheaper, but the 1500 USD estimate for sweatshirts will be quite high nonetheless. In comparison, 27 USD for buttons will not be a problem.

Joseph Han mentioned that he wanted to go against the buttons because many student organizations have not received funding. He also mentioned that he was unsure when he would wear a button.

Abigail Hagan concurred and emphasized that she would not know when she would ever use a button, though she appreciates advertising the availability of SA. She suggests funding clubs first, then investing in something that's more effective.

Felix Tager clarified that the buttons would be coming out of a separate fund from the club funding thus not impacting club funding.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Subin Myong agreed with Abigail Hagan and Joseph Han, stating that even if assembly members wear the button, many students will not notice as many students wear a substantial amount of pins making the Student Assembly pin not easily recognizable.

Jackson Harris explained that although 27 dollars is not much, it does not look for Student Assembly to be making purchases before approving club funding.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel mentioned that if budget was an issue, he would buy the buttons himself.

Eric Cortes-Kopp mentioned that if the buttons were a little bigger it would be more justifiable, since he likes the idea.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel expressed that he could change the size of the buttons.

The motion to approve the SA buttons is postponed by two weeks.

Felix Tager mentioned that organisations are asked to submit strategic funds for the entire academic year, and the Deputy Treasurers are working on clarifying those budgets. He mentioned that food is sometimes considered an essential item in the budget, due to them being essential to the operation of the club. SAAC has put in a \$100 request for pizza, and the Treasury committee voted in favor of the request.

Eric Cortes-Kopp asked why the funds cannot just go to athletics.

Felix Tager added that democratization will rethink the way funds are distributed. Club sports are not under athletics but are under Student Activities and not funded by the Student Assembly. SAAC is a Student Assembly club and not a club sport therefore technically not athletics.

Eric Cortes-Kopp expressed that club sports and Athletics should fund sports instead of Student Assembly; SAAC should not be under Student Assembly funding.

Jackson Harris stated that while making sense, until SAAC is moved out of Student Assembly funding and to Athletics, it is nonsensical to deny SAAC funding.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Cole Kuczek asked if Student Assembly approval of SAAC's request would lead other clubs to request funding for food purchases. They mentioned that the Student Assembly may want to avoid this increase in food requests.

Felix Tager mentioned that it would not come out of the strategic budget, but out of non-strategic budget, thus not impacting the general plans for the year.

Cole Kuczek asked whether this would set up a precedent for nonstrategic funds.

Felix Tager replied that it was a mixed bag. SAAC requires the funds in this case to function and is more a question over who should be funding the pizza. Until they can figure that out, it is the assembly's job to fund SAAC. Additionally, he mentioned that if the assembly wanted to make this a long term rule, they would need to pass bylaws surrounding these restrictions.

Abigail Hagan mentioned that the way to combat this situation is to put on a cap for food requests allowing clubs to know the maximum amount of food requests they can put in. She suggested a cap of two food requests per year so that organizations have the ability to request food and do not feel like they are being oppressed by the Treasury Department.

The motion to approve the SAAC funding passes.

Felix Tager said that Slow Food is a food-essential based organization and follows the same policy. Their costs are fairly low and the organization has done a good job of budgeting; this is something that Student Assembly should encourage other organizations to do as well.

The motion to approve the Slow Foods funding passes.

Felix Tager described that this funding will be from the strategic budget even though traditionally it would be nonstrategic. As there currently is a budget delay, they need to be funding meetings and requested a high price, as well as the smaller nonstrategic pool. He wants to recognize that this will be taken into account for their strategic cap, and that the Treasury will be more critical of their further requests.

Abigail Hagan asked if Student Assembly ever asks for receipts or an itemized list.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Felix Tager responded that they require the quantity and price of the item as well as shipping, which is sent to SA and (name) when they send the invoice. Felix mentioned he could send the funding form out.

Eric Cortes-Kopp mentioned that in the past there has been controversy over who owned those receipt materials, and some orgs wanted everyone to have access to those materials. He asks if this is the same case, or if it will be used exclusively for Juggling Club.

Felix Tager replied that the decision is made by the College and not by the students.

Maya Mathews agreed that anything that is bought by the college should belong to the college.

Isa Cardoso asked a clarifying question about the strategic/nonstrategic funds - she wondered if they can request all of this money and then more later on.

Felix Tager said that the strategic budget is planned; however, the nonstrategic budget is not planned. Some clubs will not be operational before the strategic budget is due, but they can still apply for the nonstrategic budget. The downside is that much funding is given during strategic funding; Treasury is much more critical about nonstrategic funding. A lot of strategic funding will be optimized to make sure it fits under that cap.

Jackson Harris asked if the Assembly bought the juggling balls, if the college would own them even though they come out of the Student Assembly's budget.

Felix Tager replied that they would belong to the Student Activities Department.

Joseph Han commentend on microphone etiquette. He would appreciate it if individuals would wait two seconds after the green light flashes before speaking in order to prevent a sudden increase in voice volume.

The motion to approve the Juggling Club funding passes.

6. Old Business

- **Judicial Board Confirmations**



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel mentioned that the assembly overruled the 24 hour notice requirement for guest speakers so that Catherine Berryman could come and speak about the judicial board nomination process.

- Guests: Catherine Berryman and Dayna Campbell, Director and Assistant Director of Community Standards
 - Remarks

Catherine Berryman noted that she is the director of community standards in which she is the Title IX coordinator and came to speak to the assembly regarding the judicial board process. She explained that the board would get a report of potentially prohibited conduct which usually comes from Campus Safety, Residential Life, or community members. She stated that the board reviews the reports and determines whether there needs to be further investigation. If a case is further investigated, then a case is created and the student is charged with potential prohibited conduct with a charge letter. All the information gathered is sent to the student. If the matter is a matter that will not result in expulsion or suspension, then the student is offered an administrative hearing. She mentioned that a judicial hearing is a hearing in front of 5 members of the judicial board which includes 3 student members and 2 faculty staff members. However, many students opt to take an administrative hearing which is less formal with all the rights of a judicial board hearing. The rights include the right to not have to testify, the right to be assumed not responsible until proven otherwise, and the right to bring witnesses, advisors, etc. Most cases go to an administrative hearing that takes place in front of an administrative hearing officer, board members (Travis and Ashley), as well as other members that are trained, and a Student judicial board member. The student Judicial Board member will ask the student questions and make a determination if the policy has been violated, and what the sanction should be. The other route is a Judicial Board hearing which is a performal hearing that is overseen by an elected Judicial Board chair, who is a nonvoting member that guides the process. The Judicial Board has these hearings about potential prohibited conduct which is evaluated by looking at evidence presented on behalf of the charges. In a hearing, students can present their own information - they are presumed not responsible, don't have to speak if they do not want to, and can bring an advisor and any witnesses. The process takes place in front of 3 student Judicial Board members, 2 faculty/staff who are selected out of 9 students and 6 faculty staff representatives. Judicial Board members serve an important role on campus and she takes it seriously that students are involved in the process. The number of cases depends on the number of reports - she mentioned that there were many cases last year, but she is hopeful there will be less this year. Faculty/staff are selected through faculty/staff processes - students are selected after Catherine puts out a call for applications for about a week, in which they submit their interest and a platform, which goes



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

to current Judicial Board members to review and then vote. She emphasized that she and Dayna Campbell Berryman have no voting role in the vote of the Judicial Board members and noted that it is entirely in the hands of students.

- Questions

Jackson Harris asked if the process explained in Catherine Berryman's speech is the whole process. He asked further if the Student Assembly has to confirm anything after the existing Judicial Board selects their replacements.

Catherine Berryman answered that there is a list sent to the Student Assembly for public comments and confirmation after the Judicial Board members have been selected.

Jackson Harris asked if this process took place last year.

Catherine Berryman replied that this process did not happen last year.

Jackson Harris followed up asking why this process did not take place last year.

Catherine Berryman reiterated that last year was a hectic year with an entire rechange in the Title IX rules and a whole separate COVID-19 process. She emphasized that the process to involve Student Assembly into the confirmation process was not done with malevolent intent as she would not care to intentionally hide who was on the Judicial Board.

Subin Myong mentioned that when SA was told that they were allowed to interview the people they were supposed to confirm for Judicial board, they were told that it had to be delegated to a committee in which not all the voting members of SA could be in. As a result, she asked whether that was a decision from the administration.

Catherine Berryman replied that it was not a decision from administration. She mentioned historically, there has not been questioning Judicial Board members in the past who are sent for confirmation. This was a new process so she cannot speak to it.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel mentioned that the assembly originally proposed live in-person hearings for every submitted nominee but was told by a senior member of the college administration that they had no authority to do this and was opposed deeply to



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

any hearing process. He mentioned that the process that he came up with was the greatest extent of compromise with the administration to involve students in the Judicial Board confirmation process. He explained that the current process was the last option the assembly had.

Catherine Berryman clarified that the Student Assembly and others said they wanted to ask questions to the Judicial Board members. She mentioned that it wasn't necessarily a compromise and that she is willing to discuss what an actual process looks like.

Eric Cortes-Kopp expressed that while he understood why the hearing process was not wanted by the administration, it is stated clearly in the constitution that the Student Assembly confirms Judicial Board students. They asked why the administration is so opposed when it is inferred that the assembly can take extra steps to alleviate the work. He asked if this meant that students should not go through hearings if they are making decisions about other students.

Catherine Berryman replied that a hearing process wasn't part of the judicial board appointment process historically and the nominees ran on the premise that they would not have a hearing. She mentioned that if this process were to be changed, it was a different kind of discussion and didn't think there was a point in reiterating it as she came to explain the judicial process.

Maya Mathews asked if the manner in which the assembly members voted would affect the Judicial Board members served.

Catherine Berryman responded that this would be a conversation that would later regarding it.

Wiley Nelson states that Article 2 of the SA constitutions reads that once members are chosen, the student assembly shall allow the student body their input regarding the appointments before confirming the appointment. He explained that this statement contained two enumerated responsibilities: soliciting input from the students and voting on the nominees. His official opinion is that SA has the procedural authority to delegate the responsibility internally as it sees fit. The official vote from the assembly would have to be binding as delegated in the constitution.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel clarified by asking if a collective "no" vote against a nominee would indicate that the student would not serve on the Judicial Board.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Wriley Nelson replied that that is correct.

Jackson Harris asked if Catherine Berryman agreed with the language within the constitution that Student Assemble could approve nominees. He asked whether she agreed with it and further asked what the language regarding confirmation meant to her.

Catherine Berryman replied that she agreed with the language that is within the procedures. She mentioned that the important part is that it's a publication of the student Judicial Board members in which the student body can make comments regarding it. She noted that the group is focusing too much on what SA says instead of it's role as a publication to the student body.

Jackson Harris asked what the alternative would be if the assembly was focusing too much on what SA said.

Catherine Berryman clarified that she meant that the important part of SA's role regarding Judicial Board nominees was the publication to the student body.

Jackson Harris asked what it meant if hypothetically the assembly voted not to confirm a Judicial Board nominee.

Catherine Berryman replied that there is no precedent for that.

Jackson Harris reasked what it would mean to her if the assembly voted no to a nominee.

Catherine Berryman reiterated that there was no procedure in the language for what would happen if the Student Assembly voted no to a nominee.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel asked if the Student Assembly had no binding authority regarding the Judicial Board process.

Catherine Berryman replied that the language was what it was.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel asked whether she could define the word "confirmation" to the assembly. He then asked what would happen if less than a majority of the assembly voted to confirm a Judicial Board nominee.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Catherine Berryman replied that there's no precedent for what would happen.

Jackson Harris asked what the solution would be if there is no precedent or followup language in the constitution for what would happen if the Judicial Board nominee is not confirmed. He wanted clarification on whether the Assembly would have to draft an amendment to create that language.

Catherine Berryman replied that this issue would be a longer and trickier conversation. She explained that the Student Assembly had some say in the process but the way that the delegation happened was separate from the Student Assembly. She expressed her belief that this was a conversation that needed to be held in a more strategic and thoughtful manner than what was possible during the current meeting.

Eric Cortes-Kopp looked up the word “confirm” and stated that the word meant “to give approval to.” He stated his belief that if SA voted no, not listening to them would go against student, faculty, and college governance along with the college's official policy. If SA would vote no, not following their vote would be a breach of not only students and their constitution but the faculty who are clear on the guidelines.

Catherin Berryman replied that there is no precedent and because of that, there will be constitutional challenges.

Joseph Han asked if there is a precedent for not publishing Judicial Board names like last semester.

Catherine Berryman replied that this has not happened in her tenure. She emphasized that not publishing the Judicial Board names was not intentional. They had the Judicial Board and secondary students for just covid violations, and they had a lot of cases.

Joseph Han mentioned his approval for the Judicial Board being a student process but expressed being horrified by the lack of oversight in the process considering it is completely internal. He asked if SA will be included in the process if they vote no in this confirmation process.

Catherine Berryman responded that she hears what SA is saying, and that SA is here for the confirmation vote.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Subin Myong brought up the point that SA was supposed to be representatives of the Student Body. She then asked why she and the assembly wasn't allowed to receive the responses that the other committees got regarding the nominees.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel mentioned that he strongly believed hearings should have been public, in person, and attendable by any students with every comment allowed to be spoken but was told that the assembly did not have the authority to do that. He mentioned that he was told that SA will be put at legal risk from the students the public comments were about if SA were to publish them.

Subin Myong mentioned that public comments were disclosed confidentially among the committees. She asked why he was allowed to take in the information and access that but other assembly members were not allowed to.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel replied that the information would have only been distributed only to committees as to avoid public discussion regarding the Judicial Board nominees. He believed that this was done to ensure that the process is as private as possible

Maya Mathews mentioned that another element guiding the reason for holding private committee confirmations was because of worry around committing slander in discussing individuals' fitness for the position. She then motioned to end the discussion regarding the process of confirmation so that time could be given to discussing the actual nomination to be voted on.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel mentioned that a certain motion would move them out of questioning and the assembly would be voting blanketly on the yes nominations at once. The motion in question is to divide one of the nominees and vote on them separately. He asked if there were any further questions for Catherine, and seeing none, moved on to the next agenda item.

- “Yes” Recommendations from Committees
 - Fan (Fiona) Xiang '22 - recommended by Student Health Committee
 - Jeffrey Bush '22 - recommended by Sustainability & Facilities Committee
 - Laura Hester '23 - recommended by Sustainability & Facilities Committee



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

- Luna Zou '24 - recommended by Residential Life & Safety Committee
- Zavier Alvarez '24 - recommended by Justice & Equity Committee
- Ben Ziegler '24 - recommended by Academics, Enrollment, and Development Committee
- Katie Shaw '23 - recommended by Academics, Enrollment, and Development Committee

Emily Boviero mentioned that the AED committee talked about it and asked why Eric Cortes-Kopp wanted to divide the question on Katie Shaw's nomination.

Eric Cortes-Kopp replied that he is concerned about the Philosophy Club controversy and says that there are no associations to other candidates, so they think that SA should split it just in case.

The motion to divide the vote on Katie Shaw's nomination passes.

■ Debate and Voting

Eric Cortes-Kopp mentioned that the association with the Philosophy Club warranted the "No" vote as another candidate who had a "No" recommendation is also part of the Philosophy Club.

Melanie Geller mentioned that there were no public comments regarding Katie Shaw but there was no reason to be suspicious as there were 60 people in the philosophy club - if they were all nominated, would one assume they were all involved in misconduct and deny them all?

Emily Boviero reiterated what Mel said and emphasized that there were no complaints regarding Katie Shaw.

The motion to approve Fan Xiang, Jeffrey Bush, Laura Hester, Luna Zou, Zavier Alvarez, and Ben Ziegler as Judicial Board members passes.

YES votes: 22

NO votes: 0

Abstentions: 0

The motion to approve Katie Shaw as a Judicial Board member passes.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

YES votes: 20

NO votes: 1

Abstentions: 1

- “No” Recommendations from Committees
 - Casimir Zablotzki ‘22 - recommended by Justice & Equity Committee

The discussion began with a brief overview of ground rules to protect the identities and reputations of all students involved, at the request of some members. Members were instructed to avoid using individual students’ names, referencing identifying incidents, and to speak using terms like “allegation” rather than speaking as a matter of fact.

Next, members heard details regarding the Justice & Equity Committee’s reasons for recommending a “no” vote on this nominee. The Committee had multiple reasons for their decision. The Committee felt that the nominee failed to explain why he wanted to serve on the Judicial Board and why he believed he was qualified for the position. Moreover, the Committee felt that the nominee’s responses to all questions were insufficient and dismissive of student concerns regarding fitness for office and allegations of COVID-19 misconduct.

Other members of the Assembly raised concerns regarding student public comment about allegations of COVID-19 misconduct, to which a representative of the Committee responded that it was the nominee’s answers to the question, rather than the allegations themselves, that made them decide the way they did.

Other members raised concerns about the nominee’s close relationship to the publication *Enquiry* as its Editor-in-Chief, and the paper’s off-campus sponsor, the Alexander Hamilton Institute for the Study of Western Civilization. Some students raised specific concerns about an article authored by the nominee entitled “The Internet and Cultural Rot.” Some members expressed concern regarding the nominee’s ability to effectively and objectively serve on the Judicial Board due to his publication’s association with the Alexander Hamilton Institute, which these members stated has a documented and ongoing history with alt-right causes. They specifically emphasized their personal opinions on concerns related to gender and race.

Some other members expressed a desire for more information on the nominee before voting, including being able to see the nominee’s responses to committee questions in the future. One member suggested that the Assembly should presume innocence of the nominee until determined



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

guilty with regard to the allegations that the nominee violated COVID-19 guidelines. One member expressed a desire for the Justice & Equity Committee to ask more questions and to postpone the vote because to them it seemed the Committee was not pushed in either direction based on the nominee's replies.

It was clarified that the Justice & Equity Committee felt confident in their recommendation to vote "NO" on the nominee, and that a follow-up would be unlikely to adjust the recommendation.

Some members expressed a desire to move into voting procedure, and their requests were honored.

On the nomination of Casimir Zablotzki '22, the Central Council of the Student Assembly voted via roll call vote *not* to confirm him. In line with the Constitution of the Student Assembly, Judicial Board, and Hamilton College Policy, this student may not oversee any judicial or administrative hearings and will not be a member of the Judicial Board, as ruled by the Parliamentarian.

YES votes: 0

NO votes: 20

Abstentions: 2

- **Student Organization Audit Updates - Director of Organization Relations Natalia (Nat) Reboredo '24, Treasurer Felix Tager '23**

Natalia Reboredo mentioned that the organization audits have been going well, though she has been getting concerns from clubs regarding funding and their relationship with SA. There has also been general confusion about the funding process. She mentioned that training for organization leaders is out and is due Monday of next week. Funding is due tomorrow.

Felix Tager mentioned that there are a lot of issues with trust with the assembly-something that has been recognized over the years. Many organizations feel like they have not been involved with the funding process. There have been a lot of concerns regarding the Student Assembly's priorities regarding funding, and that various organizations have not felt included. He mentioned that general concerns will be submitted to the general assembly in the future.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/20/21

Joseph Han asked the possibility of moving back to the Sadove Conference room for general meetings. He noted that it is harder to hear in the Events Barn. He would like to motion to move the meetings back to the Sadove Conference Room.

The motion to postpone the motion to move meetings back to the Sadove Conference Room fails.

The motion to move this motion to e-vote passes.

Jackson Harris mentioned that he will have a meeting with Frank Coots. Next week, he will talk further about the parking situation and that he is cognizant about the students and campus community's continuing concerns about parking.

Maya Mathews asked whether Frank Coots gave off any initial impressions.

Jackson Harris mentioned that he was not fond of putting student parking in the elephant graveyard.

Emily Boviero made an announcement that for academic and enrollment, there is not a chair, but she noted this is conversation for another time

Felix Tager said he would like one student from each club on the funding committee to broaden diversity of thought. He would like for '25s delegates to go through a twenty minute training.

7. Announcements

- Sophia Katz '25 and Faith Hollyer '25 have been nominated for confirmation by the Assembly to the Honor Court. Students may submit comments on these nominees to sa@hamilton.edu. Comments will *only* be distributed to members of the Assembly.
- The COVID-19 Task Force has two vacant spots for appointments from the SA President (Saphire Ruiz '22). Interested? Email sa@hamilton.edu expressing your interest and why you're a good fit! *President Ruiz is specifically looking for students with interest or background in mental health, Greek Life, athletics, and/or DMC organizations (and beyond!).*
- Students who have received a parking ticket on campus should appeal them using the instructions on the back of the ticket. [Link here](#). Appeals are determined by a board including students. While an appeal is not guaranteed, it often does work. The Residential Life & Safety Committee of Student Assembly is working with Campus Safety to identify and implement stronger solutions.

