

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

1. Call to Order (TIME: 00:00)

○ **Present:**

- Tommy Keith
- Bryce Febres
- Nicole Ramirez
- Séamus Wiseman
- Maya Mathews
- Ashley Garcia
- Julian Perricone
- Penelope Hoopes
- Connie Lorente
- Caroline Paulson
- Shavell Jones
- Stephanie Wu
- Amanda Kim
- Tatum Barclay
- Lóri Fejes
- Jackson Harris
- Jeffrey Bush
- Dylan Morse
- Juliet Davidson
- Emily Fienco
- Nyaari Kothiya
- Frank Meng
- Mariam Saied
- Nadav Konforty
- Geoffrey Ravenhall Meinke
- Amari Leigh
- Omar Lopez

○ **Excused:**

- Matt Knowlton
- Jenny Tran
- Orlando Paz
- Luis Morales

Voted to approve the minutes from the April 6th meeting (TIME: 3:06).

2. Old Business

○ **Elections Update (TIME: 4:00)**

■ **Presented by: Bryce Febres**

The election rules meeting happened yesterday (4/19/2020) and today (4/20/2020) at 6:30pm EST open to all candidates who are running for Student Assembly positions. Important dates for all the people running were announced, and starting today, everyone got their election signatures

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

sheets needed for running. Febres reminded the Assembly that because electronic consent plays a role in candidates receiving their signature that there is a strong reliance on honor code for this process. He also reminded that the Student Assembly passed an electronic vote to lower the amount of signatures needed to run for election given the circumstances that press this semester. Other additions to this year's election include Student Assembly using its platforms on social media and its Email Listserv access to announce candidacies; these announcements will include both candidate's platform and a photo of them in order to help with recognition given the lack of oncampus exposure these campaigns are undergoing. This was a combined effort on both the part of Febres and Publicity. Important dates for the election: at 12:00 am on April 28th, voting to all students will open and close on at 11:59 pm on April 29. Votes will be counted and totalled for public release on April 30th.

3. New Business

- Student Resources for Basic Necessities **(TIME: 6:50)**

- **Presented by: Dean Maria Genoa-Homs**

There was a resource bank created by the Hamilton College's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion team and the Days-Massolo Center Acknowledging that if COVID-19 is impacting you and your families. This list covers a lot of resources supporting different things such as wellness, emergency aid, mental health, etc. It can be found on the [DMC website](#), the [Hamilton College virtually everything webpage](#), or in an email sent to all students a few days ago.

- **Comments /Discussion:**

- **Bryce Febres:** I have received a lot of messages concerning the CARES act. And people were asking how that works and get distributed, etc.
- Dean Genoa-Homs: Information regarding the CARES Act will come out this week. As its written in legislation is there to support students, you can submit a request for funding. If you have a direct need for it, feel free to reach out now to the SEAS committe(seas@hamilton.edu) or to Dean Genoa-Homs herself(mgenao@hamilton.edu).

- Honor Court Constitution Changes **(TIME: 16:20)**

- **Presented by: Dean Tara McKee**

The honor court is approaching the student Assembly to vote on changes the court has proposed to the honor courts constitution. $\frac{3}{4}$ th approval of the Student Assembly is needed to implement the following recommended changes. There are many changes already being done in practice by the Honor Court, but they are not described accurately in the constitution. So aside from linguistically small changes proposed, most of the changes essentially reflect how the court currently operates. They also wanted to distinguish the language of the rights of those who are elected at the beginning of the semester versus dealing with someone who is filling a vacancy. Conflict of Interest can be taken with the dean of students rather than the Chair of the honor court. Any ad hoc group should require a quorum which is at least five students and one faculty member. Under procedures of the honor court, if a case is dismissed, a witness or a respondent could appeal this decision, but respondents, never have a scenario where that happens. A bigger

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

change being proposed is removing the option for an administrative hearing if a second violation is discussed, rather it must be taken up with the honor court. Another change is that the chair no longer has to recognize members to speak in the honor court, as in practice it's a little more informal than this. If someone is lying, then it would be a conduct hearing; this wasn't specified that it would be a conduct hearing. Another change in terms of procedure, when the advisor to the respondent speaks, the individuals have had a chance to have their closing statements. Another bigger change deals with common practice that during deliberations that the chair of the honor court or the dean of students do not partake, rather they only provide information that explains precedent and to report any other disciplinary actions; rather the chair is only there to move the proceeding along. The biggest changes the Honor court is proposing have to do with the honor court's sanctions. Information regarding first time offenses has been reorganized and included in one section as to scattered around the entire section. A proposed first time offense is one step up from having the offender watch a tutorial is a withdrawal from the class with no effect on the GPA. There have been situations where a loss of credit with no effect on GPA has been received as better than taking the tutorial and remaining in a class where the professor would give them whatever grade they choose. But the court wants to be clear that "X/F" before the Withdrawal on the transcript. To make clear that this sanction is for greater penalties violating the code. Dean McKee mentioned that the X is typically removable after two years or on the upon graduation. The next big change has to do with the sanction regarding a second violation; meaning in the constitution it says this will result in an immediate expulsion. However, in practice, a second violation has not been sanctioned with expulsion given mitigating circumstances around the case concerning both the first and second violation. Typically in these cases 1-3 semester suspensions have been applied, but is not limited to this on a second violation. They also sought the approval of the faculty on this decision. Finally a third violation had to be accounted for since that is now possible; and this would result in expulsion. These are things that were in place but not reflected in the constitution. Finally the Dean added that all honor court results are kept privately in the Dean of Student office, and for first and second violations that do not result in suspension or expulsion those files are trashed a year after the student graduates. However if a student's record has a suspension or expulsion sanction, those records are kept permanently. This is a practice the honor court has kept, and they would now like to make written in the constitution.

- Comments/Discussion (**TIME: 30:55**)
 - **Jeffrey Bush** asked would an XW be used for a second violation? Would it be permanently recorded like XF?
 - **Dean McKee** responds saying a person could have a XW Permanent on their transcript. So let's say a person has a first violation, thus a W. So the court could go back and change the W to an XW. And yes a person could do both a suspension and expulsion for XW. Ideally though there is flexibility to give to honor courts options for punishment.
 - **Lóri Fejes** said in the report that is sent out every semester regarding the outcomes of the Honor court, he remembered seeing that there was a case

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

where as a sanction, the college withheld the degree of the student for a year. While you may not be able to discuss the specificity of the case, he was wondering if in the document, there are any words that would give creative freedom to the honor court and where do you draw the line?

- **Dean McKee** responded saying under section 4, the different sanctions are listed in the document. We didn't want the court to make up its own sanctions, so we changed a section allowing the court to modify or assign other sanction that it deemed appropriate. In that particular case, the court felt that the sanction they came up with was comparable for that specific case and felt that the other sanctions would be a greater punishment.
- **Lóri Fejes** said it's his understanding that if a student goes through a case and is found not guilty of violating the honor code, but the professor can still fail them on the assignment. Is this a fair thing to do?
 - Dean McKee responds by saying grading is the faculty prerogative. Faculty has the last word when it comes to grading. A faculty member could have a grade penalty even for an individual who went through the process and was found not guilty. If a student felt like that was biased or was unfair, they can go through the grade appeal process, which is monitored by the Dean of Students office.
- **Juliet Davidson** asked why if a case is dismissed that the professor has the right to penalize a student even if they were found guilty? For being wrongly accused?
 - **Dean McKee** responded saying that a faculty mentor can provide any grade outside the honor code process. Often, professors choose to handle things without the honor court themselves. Because it's designed to protect both faculty and students. But there is enough subjective right in the control of grades... So the honor court has the grade appeal process is different and allows students to appeal a grade if they feel like they are being taken advantage of
- **Lóri Fejes** provided an example saying imagine a student takes performance enhanced drugs, with that be taken through the honor court?
 - **Dean McKee** responded saying there are no changes in what can be taken as an offense to the honor court. Rather this would consult a conduct court proceeding.

A motion to approve the honor court's changes brought to the Assembly pass. **(TIME: 43:40)**

The next step per Article XI section 2 of the Student Assembly Constitution seeks a vote from the student body approving these changes. The results of the vote requires a majority vote in order for it to also be approved by the faculty. This change will be added to the Student Assembly's election ballot as a formal "ballot question" going out on April 28th.

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

- SA Virtual Fundraiser Ideas (**TIME: 14:00**)

- **Presented by: Penelope Hoopes**

Phi Beta Chi began a fundraiser for the National Bail Fund Network that provides money to over 60 different bail funds in the United States. She is asking if the Student Assembly would consider using its platform to help uplift this fundraising effort by using Student Assembly's email platform. She also wants to open the conversations about other causes the Student Assembly might consider supporting. Tommy said well have discussions about getting this out by Evote to move forward with this. Keith added to please reach out to Penelope [@phoop@hamilton.edu](mailto:phoop@hamilton.edu) on ways we can use the Student Assembly platform to support other Covid-19 relief efforts.

4. Public Comment Period (TIME: 45:30)

- **Presented by: Eric Stenzel'23**

Stenzel'23 would like to give a public comment but first wanted to hear from Séamus Wiseman, the chair of the Constitution Committee about the Constitutional interpretation decision that was brought forth by Stenzel and Bryce Febres earlier this afternoon regarding the constitutionality of Student Organizations endorsing platforms and candidates up for Student Assembly elections.

- **Séamus Wiseman** began his statement saying that it was decided by a 3:2 vote after a two and half hour long discussion that Student Organization endorsements (be it any organization on campus even those that do not receive funding from the Student Assembly) were deemed unconstitutional by the interpretation of the Constitution Committee. Wiseman added that a broader argument discussing the opinion and dissenting opinion of the committee will be published along with this week's minutes. He mentioned that a number of factors were considered. The committee believed that if any organizations were to get involved with the Student Assembly elections, it would endanger the voting rights of students so far as it would take away from the democratic processes the elections' requires. Organizations would have a bigger voice than students because they would be capable of coercing members to vote in a particular way. The primary means of coercion being the way that they allocate funding to the benefits of their members. Wiseman clarified that this interpretation decisions isn't meant to limit Organizations or their member's voice; organizations are still allowed to speak in anyway that they like; however it was decided that if an organization speaks their opinions (whether it be on social media, through their listserv prilages, or in an organization meeting) and if there is an reason to believe that a candidate solicited that student organizations political opinion, it will result in the candidate's removal from the election. This decision will require the reliance on the student body to report any instances they see violating these election policies.

Eric Stenzel'23 began his public comment first on the point of coercion; he was confused by how an organization issuing a statement in support of a single/ collection of candidates by a democratically sound process, should be what they choose to do, can be deemed coercive. He brought up the predicament of funding as the primary means of coercion refuting it saying the implication therefore being that an organization's backlash to a student not voting in favor of

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

their decision would be self-sabotage as the organization would stop spending money. He then began to say that he thinks if a student decides to run for an Student Assembly position, then they should simply recuse themselves from all the organizations affairs regarding funding to avoid a conflict of interest. He also added that the Student Assembly constitution covers funding codes which allow more than quorum representatives to recuse themselves and still pass funding budgets. He also added that by assuming organizations are coercive means that have a mandate or an ability to force students to vote for a particular candidate, which they do not give that ballots for Student Assembly elections are secret. He added that if this decision by the committee stands it assumes that student organizations can not influence federal elections with endorsements and so forth. He also added that by this decision the Student Assembly looks at federal and United States government elections are inherently antidemocratic. So to look at real real examples, this is not an interpretation that the federal elections committee would agree with, nor would student organizations agree with. Finally he mentions that this decision directly violates the college policy on freedom and speech and freedom of expression. He points to the college's policy on freedom of inquiry and expression reading, "Students and student organizations are free to examine and discuss all questions of interest to them and to express opinions publicly and privately. They should always be free to support causes by orderly means which do not disrupt Hamilton College's or the community's regular and essential operation. At the same time, it should be made clear to the academic and larger community that students or student organizations speak only for themselves in their public expressions or demonstrations." This means there is a precedent already set saying that Hamilton college allows its students to have political opinions, referring that an endorsement is a direct expression of political opinion. Therefore he argues that putting in place a consequence for an organization's sharing of opinion would be a direct violation of this code, alluding that this is a form of censorship. So he finds it incredibly problematic that the Student Assembly would look to marginalize how students express their opinions. In conclusion, Stenzel believe that the voting rights of students is not actually violated (opposed to the interpretation made by the Constitution Committee), no student will not be able to cast a ballot by way of an organization posting an political opinion, and this constitution committee interpretation goes against the college's policy on freedom of inquiry and expression, and it also sets a precedent that Student organizations can have their freedom of speech limited by the Student Assembly especially regarding Student Assembly elections.

○ Questions/Comments:

- **Séamus Wiseman** first clarifies some terminology responding saying that all of the points he addressed were brought up during the constitutional committee meeting. He added the term "coercion" is used here because it refers to both external and internal matters regarding a person even if information is kept private. The second, the committee discussed the real world analogues of democratic forums such as the United States government. In the end it was decided that the Hamilton Student body does not function and can not be compared to other governance to decide interpretations of the Student Assembly's constitution.

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

- **Eric Stenzel'23** responded this is a statement. Saying that by not considering the Assembly to reflect the governance of the United States, then how is the Student Assembly a representative body that reflects the students of Hamilton College? The students of Hamilton College either have the Student Assembly as a tool to advocate for them or it doesn't. He asserts that the Student Assembly cannot claim it is a body politic if it does not allow endorsements of the nature being discussed.
- **Julian Perricone** asked Stenzel a series of questions. Perricone verified that Stenzel is running to be the Class of 2023 President in the Student Assembly for the 2020-2021 academic year. Perricone then verified that Stenzel is planning to receive endorsements for his candidacy, and that these endorsements may involve a collection of candidates running for Student Assembly representative positions. Perricone then agreed with a lot of what the Constitution Committee has said and also what Stenzel has said. But Perricone stresses the distinctions between the student body and the United States people as there are many ways in which they function very differently. He also asked Stenzel to clarify the endorsement conflict of interest argument he made earlier.
 - **Eric Stenzel'23** responded saying the Student assembly constitution states that if you have a conflict of interest with an organization it is expected that the Assembly representative will recuse themselves from a funding code decision regarding said organization. To imply this to his argument, Stenzel'23 agrees to recuse himself from funding decisions regarding all organizations that endorsed him as a candidate.
- **Julian Perricone** continued with that information saying that a voice still speaks much louder than a vote in the Assembly, and so he would hope that Stenzel, if endorsed by an organization, would not speak during its funding decisions. He also verified that there were a total of twelve candidates (including Stenzel'23) that would have to abstain from votes if they were endorsed by the number of organizations that he plans to be endorsed by. Given how many people who would have to abstain from those votes, Perricone does not feel like this is how the Assembly should function, on a basis where half of the Assembly has to abstain from votes that pertain to a large number of organizations.
- **Lóri Fejes** said there could be a situation where more than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Assembly are endorsed by a certain organization and therefore would not be able to vote on that organization's funding requests which would essentially just make the Student Assembly self-destructive. He also doesn't understand how the current parameters for elections are so bad that endorsements are the only solution. An endorsement will become a contest for badges. Furthermore it will deter students from reaching out to

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

other students who are not involved in organizations therefore Student Assembly representatives will not be representing their class, rather the organizations. He added small organizations pull great weight and voice on campus, and that distribution of student voice to organization voice is problematic.

- **Eric Stenzel '23** addressed the quorum point by referring to Article 10 section 8 subpoint c sub subpoint one it says, “Students and student organizations are free to examine and discuss all questions of interest to them and to express opinions publicly and privately. They should always be free to support causes by orderly means which do not disrupt Hamilton College’s or the community's regular and essential operation. At the same time, it should be made clear to the academic and larger community that students or student organizations speak only for themselves in their public expressions or demonstrations.” Regardless of how many people recuse themselves, the remaining have to vote. Stenzel also further says the reason for the endorsements are to address this issue that the Student Assembly has not been a body that properly advocates on behalf of students. So this measure would help get people in office that would do those things. This should help reinvigorate the Assembly to fulfill its role and change it to better support the students it serves. He called attention to the Student Assembly’s decision on the grading policy it released did not properly reflect the student body. There are high stake advocacy things that are not being taken seriously.
- **Lóri Fejes** had a question wondering if students are endorsed by the same organizations if that implies they are on a ticket together. Given that there has been a rule against this in the past, Fejes is curious if it still applies.
 - **Séamus Wiseman** said that wasn’t considered during the Constitution committee meeting this afternoon. The Constitution committee was only concerned with the bylaws, not the rules of the election. Because those rules are at the discretion of the vice president. Wiseman added that the Constitution Committee was concerned with looking at the constitutionality issues about these quasi political parties which was brought forth today during the Constitution meeting by both **Bryce Febres and Eric Stenzel’23**.
- **Nadav Konforty** wanted to say this whole proposal feels very “shady;” and that it sounds like people are creating political parties for their own personal gain. And they won’t represent the student population, rather they will only represent the groups that endorse them in this quid pro quo exchange for a vote for representation. He thinks that if someone wants to run for Class President is that your loyalties are to your class not organizations. Because we don’t have seats for certain factors of campus,

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

and although Konforty understands the appeal of receiving an endorsement, it doesn't work in the spirit of representing students. He adds that this is a Student Assembly, not an organization's Assembly.

- **Tommy Keith** says that he agrees with Konforty and adds that if organizations have a problem with the way they are being represented, they should be taking it up with their representatives; so that they can then be addressed by the Assembly. Any student should be able to do that.
- **Nadav Konforty** continued that a lot of the people apart of this party have good intentions, and he agrees with a lot of their proposals. However this way of going about it shows a lack of understanding about how the Student Assembly functions and what its purposes are.
- **Malik Irish'22** was at the meeting in support of Stenzel'23 on this topic. The organizations that are endorsing Stenzel'23 do not feel like they are properly supported, so the whole idea that Student Assembly represents everybody is not a working practice. He also wants to mention there would be no reason for an organization to use money to endorse a candidate. There's not an attempt to run a political campaign, running ads, etc. Funding has no relations to groups. He also disagrees with the quorum point about abstentions impeding the validity of a vote even given that it is addressed in the Student Assembly Constitution. Irish'22 also added that if measures are being taken to limit endorsements from student organizations, then the same conversation should be had regarding endorsements on social media by individual students, because they have very similar effects.
- **Bryce Febres** asked for clarification on whether Irish's organization has already decided to endorse Stenzel'23's ticket.
 - **Malik Irish '22** says yes.
 - **Eric Stenzel '23** clarifies that he was unaware of this and communicated that they will not accept endorsements until campaigning has begun.
- **Séamus Wiseman** responded to Irish'22's comment on personal endorsements via social media explaining that discussions were had regarding this topic and it was decided that endorsements of that kind do not have the same level of coercion so candidates will not be disqualified for endorsements of that kind.
 - **Saphire Ruiz'22** clarified that in the organization that Irish'22 referred to, they decided internally to endorse Stenzel'23 if it was allowed, but did not make a public endorsement and did not consult Eric on this decision.
- **Lóri Fejes** proposed extending the meeting to 10:15pm because many people have been waiting to discuss this issue for over an hour.

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

This motion passes to extend the meeting fifteen minutes.

- **Amanda Kim** asked Irish'22 for clarification about his view that endorsements are not about advertisement. She adds that she thinks Konforty made many good points. She thinks it's problematic for a candidate to represent select groups on campus rather than their entire class. She also questions if recusing oneself from funding completely eliminates the conflict of interest. She provides the example of legislation being discussed regarding a specific group that has endorsed a candidate, explaining that that candidate would have to recuse themselves from discussion and voting.
- **Julian Perricone** wanted to address a couple of Irish'22's comments. First he explains that he views friends groups and clubs as similar in function, but different structurally because clubs bear the college name, have all campus email handles, and receive funding from SA. He also questions why endorsements and advertisements from clubs are necessary, presuming that Stenzel'23 has already gathered the support of club members and has a good sense of the community's needs.
 - **Eric Stenzel'23** answered that they have spoken to organizations to understand what issues are important to them and will support them regardless of their decisions to endorse. He explains that the role of endorsement is to give organizations the ability to publicize the issues they find important and emphasize the importance of having them addressed on campus.
 - **Julian Perricone** responded saying that he believes that can be done privately by organization members without an official endorsement. He doesn't see the necessity of endorsements to win an election.
 - **Eric Stenzel'23** clarified that he didn't say they were necessary to win, but he believes their function is to elevate a certain message across campus in a way that individual students are unable to. He adds that if elevating a specific candidate helps further their organization's mission then it is within their rights under the US constitution and Hamilton College policy.
- **Lóri Fejes** felt sad about what Malik said, because he knew that Malik Irish'22 was in the Student Assembly in the past. He wishes Malik Irish '22 would make his grief about the Assembly and its fall through on representation and advocacy responsibilities known to Student Assembly members. He also adds that if endorsements were to be considered possible what implications that would have on how the Assembly could structure internal organizations affairs would be something to consider on behalf of **Noelle Niznik or Orlando Paz**.

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

- **Saphire Ruiz'22** represents an organization potentially looking to endorse Stenzel'23, she is not running for a position and was present at the meeting to talk with the Student Assembly about the issues being presented in general. First Ruiz'22 mentions a concern about calling endorsements for Eric Stenzel'23 a political party; she was under the impression that is not what Stenzel was attempting to do. Ruiz'22 thinks that a lot of different political party inferes that this work is attempting to take over the Student Assembly which she says it is not. Ruiz'22 also adding that representatives being more dedicated to their class year over their class, the people they are to represent would not be the case. She adds that organizations represent large portions of the college and have a better understanding of what all other class year's needs and wants are when compared to Student Assembly. Ruiz'22 adds that this would just be another way for students to assert their opinions into Student Assembly affairs; Ruiz'22 revisits the example Malik Irish'22 gave about marginalized populations not having a voice on Student Assembly pointing to the disconnect between the grading policy Student Assembly supported versus the one Black Latinx Student Union supported. Ruiz'22 thinks these disconnects could be mitigated if there was more representation from these organizations making Student Assembly members are more in touch with the people who are represented through these organizations. It would also be a way for organizations to tell their members that there are Student Assembly members that we know are supporting your interests. She also revisits with concern that these endorsements can be considered coercion, mentioning that organizations make decisions all the time that do not reflect the entirety of the organization, but never is there pressure to vote on act a certain way because of an organization's decision. Ruiz'22 reiterated that ballots are secret, so coercion is not something that should be a concern.
 - **Séamus Wiseman** addressed two things. The first being that students running for office will still be allowed to support the relationship organization's ideals. And the second element as far as being called a political party he apologizes, but this was terminology used by Eric Stenzel'23 at an earlier meeting.
- **Jeffrey Bush** mostly agreed with everything that has been said by Julian Perricone, Nadav Konforty, Lóri Fejes and wanted to respond directly to Ruiz'22, thanking Ruiz'22 for coming. He believes that Student Assembly absolutely needs to address these concerns as Student Assembly has not done a great job representing student organizations' interest, but Bush doesn't think this is the way for people to represent. Bush gives an example claiming that he is running for re-election and is the president of spanish club, but would never ask Spanish club to formally endorse him because he admits that Spanish club is not representative of the entire

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

student body. However for someone seeing that Spanish Club endorsed me doesn't know our membership size, and it might have a far greater pull. Thus it's an organization's interest that has greater influence than a student's interest. Bush adds he wants to work with organizations that do not feel represented, and something should be worked through with Student Organizations relations. Bush also has technical questions asking Séamus what is the goal of having a discussion here? Can the Student Assembly veto a decision made by the constitution committee.

- **Séamus Wiseman** said no; the decision made by the Constitution Committee is final.
- **Tommy Kieth** wanted to discuss the new grading policy that has been brought up a few times. He added that there was an overwhelming majority of members of the Assembly that voted in favor of that decision, so he added that if a student has a problem with the way people voted they one should vote for candidates that espouse those policies. In other words a candidate does not need to be a student that represents you and your organization's interest.

A motion passes extending the meeting an additional ten minutes.

- **Geoffrey Ravenhall Meinke** thanked the people present for coming to the assembly tonight, adding that the Student Assembly likes when that happens. He adds that he personally can not understand the struggles the underrepresented people are going through. But he directs the rest of his message to the Assembly saying the Assembly talks about how the Student Assembly does nothing, but no Student Assembly members have written proposals and brought them to the Assembly. He sits on the community affairs committee, and they have done many tabling events waiting for people to come speak to Student Assembly members and no one has come. In fact people actually actively avoid those situations. He perhaps adds that maybe those aren't the ways that people want to contribute. But he speaks back to the audience saying tell us what you want. He says to the people who sit on the Student Assembly next year, put forth legislation that makes the changes you want to see. And if you want to see changes made, talk to your Student Assembly representatives. He says that Student Assembly members have nothing else to do aside from sit through Monday meetings and go through the agenda points unless students give them something to do. Geoffrey seconds Tommy Keith's point that Student Assembly members can support values that organizations hold. He says that this conversation is about soliciting endorsements from certain groups and the effect that has on people's participation in Student Assembly as representatives.

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

- **Amanda Kim** thanked everyone for sitting through this long meeting. To respond to Sapphire directly first, she asked what soliciting endorsements means for independent candidate access. Kim agrees that having candidates come speak with organizations sharing their views and so forth is a really great idea, but it seems like the platform is ready to go. Internally, it seems like organizations have already made decisions to endorse these eleven people. Which, to her, seems like a political party; whether they call it a ticket or a party is a semantics issue. It is functioning as a party. She worries about what this means for candidates who weren't invited to join the party who are running and planning their advertisements accordingly; she is concerned with the fairness regarding that, especially since the election rules meetings were just finished today. There are a lot of things behind this proposal that are anti-competitive. Secondly, Kim echoes Geoffrey's points about student outreach attempts. She has sat on the cultural affairs committee herself and they have attempted to email student organizations asking for input and have waded no responses; she pointed at an attempt to put together an intercultural council, but the initiative failed because there were no responses from organizations. So she agrees there are a lot of points that Student Assembly needs to step up on, but she disagrees with the argument that Student Assembly has not made an effort to have these conversations. Finally she added that organizations are made up of people from multiple class years and so she worries that there will be cross influence in what are supposed to be class elections.
- **Nadav Konforty** thanked Irish'22 and Ruiz'22 for speaking tonight because it brought forth a lot of good points. Konforty is always sad when there are students who don't feel supported by the Assembly. He adds that in the end, everyone present at this meeting cares about the student's well being. Konforty's personal perspective that elections should be solely based by class year over everything would be inhibited by this proposal. Konforty believes the issue goes beyond Kim's point about semantics, that to call it that would be a cop out, and says the philosophy department would agree with him. A rose by any other name still seems sweet; Konforty uses this analogy and Merriam-Webster's definition of a political party to claim that this proposal is one. Konforty also said that there are members of this current Assembly who are supporting this party, and he finds it interesting that a lot of their work and criticisms mentioned by the party have never come up in Student Assembly correspondence. So it's hard to hear that the members of the Student Assembly are criticizing the Assembly even though it is work they themselves have not done. Konforty ends with there is a lot of work to be done on everyone's part, but those supporting this party should make strides in this direction.

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

APRIL 20TH, 2020

5. Announcements ([TIME: 1:52:16](#))

- Check out the [Virtually Everything Website](#) for updates on all things related to Student Life.
- The Days Massolo Center put together a [COVID 19 Student Resources page](#)
- **Bryce Febres** added that there are issues with some candidates and adding the election rules, and this will be handled outside of Student Assembly meetings. Febres reminds candidates to abide by the rules, as a violation will result in total ineligibility.
- **Geoffrey Ravenhall Meinke** wanted to announce that 4 years ago today that Noelle Niznik officially became the official Director of Student Activities at Hamilton, and Ravenhall Meinke wanted to acknowledge this as Niznik has been amazing, and her dedication not only to Student Assembly, but also to the college has been more than fabulous. (He mentioned how she was on this Zoom call at 10:20pm, that the Assembly and the college owes a lot to her!)
 - **Noelle Niznik** responds saying thank you for the announcement, adding it is these Zoom calls and working with students that has kept her going throughout this pandemic. She adds that it's been a great four years in the Director role and can't wait for the next four.