

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

1. Call to Order

Present:

Gabriel Bit-Babik
Isa Cardoso
Nickie Conlogue
Cicille Dan-Morton
Ashley Garcia
Nevaeh Gutierrez
Michelle Estrella
Abigail Hagan
Emily Jiang
Lena Klink
Cole Kuczek

Marvin Lopez
Ryley McGovern
Raymond Ni
Dewayne Martin
Subin Myong
Eric Santomauro-
Stenzel
Felix Tager

Excused:

Emily Boviero
Jackson Harris
Christian Hernandez
Natalia Reboredo

2. Land Acknowledgement

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

3. General Public Comment Period

Patrick Clearly (he/him) '24 wrote:

“Are there any plans currently to talk to Res Life about seeking amends for those students forced into forced doubles? I believe in this institution and hope it can carry out its mission swiftly”

4. New Business

- **Approval of Minutes 10/25**

The motion to approve the 10/25 minutes passes unanimously.

- **Funding**

Club Name	Requested Budget	Recommended Budget	Approved Budget
-----------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

Poetry Slam Club	\$30	\$30	\$30
Student Dance Alliance	\$1080	Resubmit as advanced funding	Resubmit as advanced funding
Classics Club	\$449.65	\$449.65	\$449.65

Felix Tager mentioned that he is finding solutions for organizations that do not have their funding approved in time. In terms of Student Dance Alliance, he mentioned wanting them to resubmit as they failed to include travel expenses to gain an understanding of their entire budget. The funding for Classics Club is an amendment to their past strategic funding.

The motion to fund Poetry Slam Club and Classics Club as recommended passes unanimously via voice vote.

The motion to have Student Dance Alliance resubmit their budget passes unanimously via voice vote.

○ **VP Replacement Election Update - Elections Chair Rep. Isa Cardoso '25**

Isa Cardoso mentioned that nobody decided to run, neither through filling out the interest form nor contacting her directly. However, the Constitution mandates an election despite the lack of candidates. The Constitution encourages write-in candidates, so if only one person has their name put onto the write-in ballot, with one vote, they could be the vice president of the Assembly, which she mentioned is not ideal considering the Assembly wants to be representative to the entire student body. She stated that if someone reached out to her, with 40 signatures and an election platform, agreeing to run, she would be willing to go over election rules and put this candidate on the ballot. The platform has to be sent out twice before Monday (election day). Only then their name can be put on the ballot. If nobody gets any votes, then the Assembly has to elect a vice president pro tempore to serve until the end of the semester.

Gabriel Bit-Babik added that the pro tempore can be elected within the central council for the duration until the election happens. If there is an election and nobody is elected, the vice president pro tempore is unsure whether they remain, which isn't an issue because currently the Assembly does not have a Vice President. However, the Assembly is required by the constitution



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

to have an election within the next week. If nobody is on the ballot, the Assembly will be forced to have a write-in election, where the result may not be representative of the student body.

Isa Cardoso stated that somebody running would be the easiest solution to this issue. She added that due to it being the middle of the semester, she understands that there is a lack of interest. She encouraged anyone willing to please run.

Gabriel Bit-Babik emphasized that without someone running, there will be a ballot with only a write-in section. He explained that if someone were to write in someone's name, that person would constitutionally win the election no matter the vote percentage. However, this person is not required to accept the position. He further mentioned that should one person run and receive one vote, as long as that the most votes received, this person has the ability to take the position of Vice President of the Assembly. He mentioned that is not how he believes the democratic process should operate and stressed that the Assembly needs to avoid this at any reasonable cost.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel added that in order for someone to win they would have to express interest in running to the election's chair prior to the election.

Abigail Hagan wondered if it was possible to lower the requirements as she views 40 signatures to be a too high requirement.

Neveah Guiterrez commented that considering the entire student body, 40 signatures is not a lot.

Isa Cardoso mentioned that 40 signatures is the minimum number of signatures even in extenuating circumstances in terms of precedent. Eric Santomauro-Stenzel and Sapphire Ruiz were able to get significantly more than 40 signatures when they ran. She mentioned that a minimum of 40 signatures is already a pushed down minimum for these times.

Dewayne Martin added that he got more than 40 votes when he ran for president last year.

Gabriel Bit-Babik clarified that the 40 signatures is an Article 5 bylaw and cannot be changed without a campus-wide vote. Therefore, the 40-signature requirement cannot be removed without a campus-wide vote which brings the assembly back to its starting point in this matter. He reiterated that it should not be too difficult to obtain 40 signatures.

Questions/Comments:



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

Cole Kuczek asked what would happen if no one runs for a write-in campaign.

Isa Cardoso responded that if nobody wins, the Assembly will have to fill the spot with someone on the Assembly.

Gabriel Bit-Babik clarified that if there is a vacancy, an election must be held within 3 weeks of the vacancy. Should nobody run, that process is ambiguous in the constitution. The Assembly currently has the option to elect a pro tempore Vice President that can be elected from within the central council. If nobody runs or becomes pro tempore, there will not be a Vice President for this semester.

Isa Cardoso asked if the constitution would allow a vacant Vice President positing.

Gabriel Bit-Babik answered that the constitution is not written with the idea of a permanent vacancy in mind.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel asked what would happen if someone from the central council ran for the pro tempore and whether they would get their spot as Representative or Class President back at the end of their term as pro-tempore.

Gabriel Bit-Babik responded that it is correct, but the pro tempore would retain their position until the election is held. However, none of this is mentioned explicitly in the constitution and this is his interpretation of what is written.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel asked what would happen if an elected representative would continue to be a representative after the determination of their term as pro-tempore.

Gabriel Bit-Babik responded that for the duration of this person being pro tempore Vice President, this person would no longer hold their seat as Representative or Class President as no one can have more than one position on the Assembly. However, at the end of their term of pro tempore Vice President, they can return to their former position.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel asked if the vacant position in the class delegation can be filled.

Gabriel Bit-Babik answered that if the person does not resign from their position, then no.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

Isa Cardoso stated that there is only a few weeks left in the semester and thus in the term of a new Vice President.

Abigail Hagan volunteered to run for Vice President.

Isa Cardoso stated that while someone can run an unofficial campaign as a write-in candidate, they cannot retain their spot as a Representative or Class President.

Gabriel Bit-Babik restated that no one on the central council can have more than one position at a time. While anyone from the central council can serve, they would need to resign from their current position.

Dewayne Martin asked to stop the conversation here since the same points are being reiterated. Running as a write-in requires relinquishing the existing Student Assembly position, and if nothing happens then a pro-tempore Vice President will have to be elected.

- **Proposals for Structural Changes to SA**

- Rep. Abigail Hagan '25 & Deputy Secretary Lena Klink '25

Abigail Hagan described the points of the proposal. She mentioned that faculty members should be part of the assembly because many of them share similar interests to the students. The faculty can talk to the admin when the council cannot seem to get through. Additionally, the assembly should talk to Noelle more to create events for the constituents so they are well liked.

The one-aim approach states that the assembly should not juggle topics every meeting; instead of being stuck on one discussion, SA should focus 1-2 proposals out every month; the set quota would help motivation.

There should also be somewhat of a time limit for each member to speak for increased efficiency. Sometimes people speak so long that people put down their hands, and that shouldn't happen. Abby also proposed meetings begin earlier, perhaps at 7:00. A member or the president would also motion to vote earlier, when the discussion begins to become 'fruitless'.

Abby proposed establishing accountability for class delegations, by establishing a time or responsibility for class reps to reach out to their constituents for their opinions. It wouldn't be a survey of public opinion, but rather class reps actively reaching out and asking. There should also be a requirement for a certain number of class events to engage the student body socially.

Abby also suggested establishing order by addressing members by name and position, which would slow down the conversation and also make it easier for the secretaries. She further suggested a Student Assembly retreat, like a low-cost trip of some sort, in order to get to know



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

each other and create bonds to look forward to in the Assembly, and connect the different class years.

In terms of the secretary department, Abby suggested writing an easily digestible summary of each agenda item discussion so people would be more interested in reading them.

Felix Tager wanted to recognize that closer ties between faculty and assembly might result in holding the administration less accountable.

Abigail Hagan clarified that faculty is not the same as the administration.

Felix Tager mentioned that faculty are involved in the administration because they are a part of committees and as such are influenced by administration. He mentioned that sometimes meetings have to go late, and asked what Abby saw happening in regards to the time limit.

Abigail Hagan responded that a time limit is not a literal time limit. It rather is a regulation if a member is talking excessively to ensure that everyone who wants can be part of the discussion. This regulation would be up to the President or Vice President's discretion.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel clarified that currently, he has been very lax with calling on people because when he does, he gets approached and asked why he is cutting people off. At the same time, he is also approached and asked why he is not stopping the discussion. He mentioned that thus far, he has encouraged people to motion to return to the previous question which brings the Assembly automatically into voting. This has only failed once this semester. He mentioned that he also has discretion to cut off discussion, but often chooses to not do so. As stands, the chair does have the discretion to end discussion and move on.

Raymond Ni mentioned that the secretary department implements a talk tracker to ensure that people who do not talk as much talk more, and people who talk too much make space. It is not to penalize people for not talking or for talking, but rather to ensure that people who talk less get priority in getting called on.

Gabriel Bit-Babik asked if the document could be shared.

Raymond Ni replied that he would share it.

Isa Cardoso shared her concerns about the time limit as some people may know more than others and thus would have more grounds to speak; a time limit might limit the effectiveness of



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

their commentary. She also expressed her appreciation for the secretary department's talk tracker. She asked for clarification on the one-aim approach: If only one topic is focused on, the Student Assembly might receive complaints for not focusing enough on the diverse issues on campus.

Abigail Hagan responded that smaller issues should be brought up in committees as opposed to general meetings. Committees have a significant amount of power in talking to the administration and the school. Things that involve the entire central council's opinion would be more in the one-aim approach.

Cicille Dan-Morton mentioned that names could escalate situations as calling people out by name personalizes the conversation.

Abigail Hagan clarified that her intention was to help the secretary department, but agreed that this is a good point to bring up.

Gabriel Bit-Babik asked the difference between the one-aim approach and what the Assembly is currently doing.

Abigail Hagan replied that her proposal was drafted before the October break, when the agendas were overfilled and the Assembly had to run until 10:30pm as too many topics were on the agenda. She mentioned that some of these issues could have been brought onto committees individually.

Noelle Juliano wanted to thank Abby and Lena for compiling and presenting about restructuring, and mentioned that they had a lot of good ideas.

Abigail Hagan mentioned she'd love more ideas about class-oriented events and communicating with constituents.

Emily Jiang mentioned that they liked the idea of digestibility of the summaries because many people see the minutes as a gossip document to see what individual people say as opposed to seeing it as an avenue for learning about what SA is doing, since the minutes are so focused on individual statements. Summaries would make the SA less like a foreign body that participates in drama and more like a group that's actually doing things, is responsive and connected to the student body.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

Raymond Ni brought up that adding more secretaries might create a “too many chefs in the kitchen” scenario which makes it difficult for the secretaries, and makes it difficult for Raymond to manage more people.

Abigail Hagan thanked the secretaries for their contributions, and added that she is unsure where to go from here with the proposal.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel responded that restructuring proposals can move on to a motion if it’s something less permanent, or a bylaw or constitutional amendment, which he’s happy to sit down and talk about. Drafts should be submitted to Eric, Gabriel, and Raymond. Bylaw requires a simple majority of voting members, while constitutional amendment requires approval by $\frac{3}{4}$ of the Assembly and election approval by the student body. Those votes would probably be part of the Assembly election in December.

Gabriel Bit-Babik added that the votes have to be recommended by the parliamentarian, meaning they have to be reviewed by him beforehand.

Cicille Dan-Morton asked if they would talk about the proposal in their next structuring meeting, and asked about the timeframe.

Eric Santomauro-Stenzel gave an overview of the next few weeks - SA has four more meetings after this before the December elections, and any amendments would need to be approved during those meetings. The formal draft should be ready prior to the meeting where it will be introduced. There will be another whiteboard session where the ideas can be discussed, but ultimately what SA needs is an amendment to have on the floor that has been shared out in a meeting announcement email, to be discussed within an open session meeting and voted on. The timeline depends on when that’s ready.

5. Announcements

- *From Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion Maria Genao-Homs: Save the Date! On November 8, 2021 we will join colleges and universities across the country in the National First-Generation College Celebration. Join us from 11:00 am - 1:00pm in the Barn for kickoff festivities that aim to celebrate the success of our First-Gen students; swing by for snacks, music, a selfie in our interactive photo booth, learn all about the first-gen identity and drop a ticket for exciting raffle prizes. The week will be filled with many more events sponsored by*



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

11/1/21

campus partners. Please be on the look out for more marketing materials to come. From one First Gen'er to another First Gen'er...I am glad you are here and look forward to seeing you there!

- '23 Pres. Cole Kuczek (he/him) has resigned effective Monday, November 1.
- Please submit class banner submissions to '25 Pres. Nickie Conlogue (nconlogu@hamilton.edu) for the Class of 2025 and to '24 Pres. Christian Hernandez Barragan (cjhernan@hamilton.edu) for the Class of 2024!
- The SAFC (Student Activities Fund Committee) currently has two vacant positions open to all Hamilton students. If interested, please contact Central Council Treasurer Felix Tager (ftager@hamilton.edu) or satreas@hamilton.edu.

Ashley Garcia mentioned that her committee is working on making infographics detailing what work the committees have been doing. She wants the committees to be prepared to tell her what they have accomplished or are working on as a committee.

