## 1. Call to Order

**Present:**

| | | **Excused:** |
|---|---|---|
| Tatum Barclay | Cole Kuczek | Jiin Jeong |
| Johanna Bowen | Emma Liles | |
| Emily Boviero | Dewayne Martin | **Unexcused:** |
| Jeffrey Bush | Alex Medina | Juliet Davidson |
| Luke Carstens | Dylan Morse | |
| Olivia Chandler | Adina Mujica | |
| Michelle Estrella | Wriley Nelson | |
| Emily Fienco | Raymond Ni | |
| Ashley Garcia | Jess Parsons | |
| Lucy Hamann | Dorothy Poucher | |
| Jackson Harris | Pablo Reina-Gonzalez | |
| Christian Hernandez | Saphire Ruiz | |
| Gianni Hill | Mariam Saied | |
| Savannah Kelly | Salwa Sidahmed | |
| Stephen Kelly | Caroline Ullem | |

## 2. Land Acknowledgement

**Saphire Ruiz** read a land acknowledgement created by the Shenandoah-Kirkland Initiative (SKI).

## 3. General Public Comment Period

**Melanie Geller '22** wrote:

"Hi, this may be outside the jurisdiction of SA, but there are rumors circulating that the owners of Opus are retiring, and in the event that they cannot find replacements to take it over, Bon Appetit would run Opus. As someone who loves Opus and uses it for a source of continuous joy, I was wondering if students could share their opposition to Bon Appetite taking over. Obviously these are unconfirmed rumors, but if SA has power in impacting this, I hope you can bring it up to the administration that students would love for Opus to remain separate from Bon Appetit."

**Comments/Questions:**

**Johanna Bowen** mentioned that many of the things that have been said about Opus are simply just rumors and stated that anyone who has questions regarding Opus should reach out to her at jgbowen@hamilton.edu.

**Jenn Fleming '22** wrote:

"Hi, I was just wondering what the timeline is for the return of the club audits. I know it was originally mentioned that they would be returned between two to three weeks after March 30 but it has been over a month. Thanks so much! P.S. I am also concerned about Opus!"

**Questions/ Comments:**

**Savannah Kelly** responded by saying that the process of returning the club audits has been slow but that they are close to being done. Emails should be expected within the next few days.

4. **LITS Policy Q&A with Joe Shelley, Vice President for Library and Information Technology**

**Saphire Ruiz** mentioned that due to concerns about the LITS policy sent out in a recent email, Joe Shelley has been asked to come answer questions and to address any concerns.

**Joe Shelley** thanked the assembly for inviting him and for all of the work they have done. He understands that there have been concerns about the policy and that he is happy to address them. He explained that there are two areas of the policy that LITS has: the Listserve policy and the appropriate use of technology policy. He explained how these two policies are different from one another but that they reference each other. He went on to state that from his understanding the area of concern is on the appropriate use of technology policy. He explained how from his knowledge no extreme groups have been sanctioned as a result of the policy and that the policy is simply sent out periodically to ensure that it is abided. He also understands the concerns for students that have only seen this policy for the first time. After these concerns were brought up, they realized how they want to revise the policy and take feedback from students, faculty, and staff. He asked for feedback, questions, or suggestions on how the policy can be improved.

**Questions/ Comments:**

**Pablo Reina-Gonzalez** thanked Joe for coming and expressed that his main concern with the policy is that it is very vague. To the students, the policy can be interpreted as selective enforcement as it can target student organizations that the administration might disapprove of. He then explained that last summer, many organizations and David Wippman have been political in their support of BLM. He then asked why the policy hasn't been enforced since Joe started working at Hamilton and why it is only being enforced now with the Student Assembly's email on Governor Cuomo.

**Joe Shelley** appreciated the suggestion. He then went on to state that LITS did not do any kind of enforcement in the past or even now, instead they just sent out a campus reminder. He explained how campus reminders are never meant to target or blame anyone but instead that they are meant to remind students to keep the discourse appropriate. In addition, he agreed that the policy is vague and that it should be revised because statements like BLM should not be taken as political or something that students should worry about when putting in an email. He agreed that the policy can be selectively applied to groups depending on the administration or the person that is enforcing it, therefore, this is something that needs to be addressed. He agreed that the language for the policy needs to be reviewed and revised.

**Saphire Ruiz** reiterated that the concerns over the policy were brought up because Wippman and Noelle had given the assembly word about sanctioning them due to their statement on the Derek Chauvin trial.

**Joe Shelley** expressed how he was not aware about this issue and has no information about it but it thankful Saphire brought it up.

**Jeffrey Bush** thanked Joe for coming to talk with the Student Assembly since the policy has been an issue that has come up. He asked if Joe could state the difference between the appropriate use of technology policy and the Listserve policy. He also stated how Joe mentioned a couple of times that there was an appropriate discourse about the technology and asked him if he could state what he thinks undertakes an inappropriate/appropriate discourse of technology.

**Joe Shelley** stated that he will first address Jeffrey's question on the inappropriate use of technology policy. An example of inappropriate use of technology is that an employee of the college is not allowed to use college resources to sell things out of their office. He then mentioned that discourse must be participated in voluntarily not because they were made to. He emphasized that the policy should not be used to censor information instead it is about making sure the resources are used for the right purposes by students, staff, and faculty. He also emphasized his belief that a narrower language can be beneficial because the broad language the policy has now can be misused. He then went on to the second topic brought up by Jeffrey. He expressed his belief that the Listserve policy should also be revised as he has heard feedback from students and faculty that the amount of emails have been overwhelming and people have been having issues seeing the important emails. He went on to say that they want to look at the technology being used for Listserve to see how they can improve everyone's experience. He also brought up that he has been able to make one revision to the Listserve policy regarding sanctions given to organizations that sent too many emails via Listserve. His revision now allows student organizations to receive a warning before they are sanctioned. In addition, the warnings reset every year.

**Emily Boviero** thanked Joe for coming in to discuss the issue. She mentioned how even though the email was only sent out as a reminder it seemed very convenient for it to be sent out after Saphire, Chirstian, and Eric's statement about supporting the survivors and speaking up against Andrew Cuomo's sexual allegations. She emphasized that the description of the policy needs to be more specific because showing support for sexual assault is never political.

**Salwa Sidahmed** asked if Zoom applied to the fair use of technology policy and whether participating in political discussions in class are included in the policy.

> **Joe Shelley** explained that any college technology (zoom, computer, emails, etc.) apply to the policy but he emphasized how they would never want to restrict these conversations during class or meetings which is a good reason to review the policy.

**Jackson Harris** asked that if the policy is not being used to restrict these conversations then why does the policy exist. He also stated that if the policy is being used in a discretionary way then it is giving the authority to someone to determine when the policy should be implemented.

> **Joe Shelley** mentioned that this was again a good reason to review the policy and emphasized that the way he has seen the policy been used is not to be selectively enforced instead to council, remind and to keep discourse on track.

**Jackson Harris** stated that Joe brought up BLM and how it is not a political statement. He agreed with Joe's point of view but he also understood that to many it can still be seen as a political statement. For this reason, he asked Joe who the authority the students should turn to should be on what is or is not a political cause/statement.

> **Joe Shelley** mentioned that this is another reason to review the policy. He explained that he wanted to listen to suggestions before he made any changes to the policy and emphasized that the policy should be clear enough so that issues like these should not have to come up.

**Wriley Nelson** thanked Joe for coming to the meeting. He asked how the policy relates not to the Student Assembly but to the rest of the organizations more specifically political organizations. He stated that one of the great things about Hamilton is that the students recognize that almost everything in life has a political hense to it. He also mentioned his concern that any sort of restriction on this kind of political discourse when the institution has a lot of political organizations only seems to benefit the status quo.

> **Joe Shelley** mentioned that his comment was another reason to review the policy. He stated that the policy has not been interpreted or applied in this way but he can see how the policy can be read in that way. He mentioned that his belief is that the policy's purpose is only to make sure that resources are being used appropriately. He emphasized the need to relook at the way the policy is worded.

**Christian Hernandez** thanked Joe for coming to the meeting. He stated how Joe has mentioned reviewing the policy and about speaking with faculty and students when doing so. He asked how Joe sees this collaboration happening specifically with students.

> **Joe Shelley** responded that he would want to collaborate to come up with different processes they could use to gather feedback broadly. He would want to make sure that he is hearing input from students, political organizations or anyone that may be affected by the policy. He went on to mention that surveys could be used to gather feedback, a staff assembly could be organized so they could directly talk to the staff about the issues that come up, and making sure everything is run through a legal council is important. He understands that everyone is really busy so he has reached out to the people that work with him to see how they can revise the policy but would love to hear feedback from the assembly.

**Christian Hernandez** agreed with Joe but he emphasized that there is a difference between sending a survey and actually having student representatives answer questions and be there since the beginning of the review process. He stated that Joe should keep this in mind when reviewing the policy.

> **Joe Shelley** mentioned that the LITS committee is having a meeting and that they would be more than happy to talk to more students to receive feedback on the policy. He also mentioned that there are currently two student representatives on the committee.

**Jackson Harris** mentioned that he met with Joe during the summer and is thankful that he came to talk with the assembly. He emphasized that many of Joe's answers have been really repetitive by saying that the issues brought up only highlight the need to review the policy. He mentioned that the language for the policy needs to be specific enough so it could work but also not too specific or vague that it would target organizations and students whose very existence is political. He reiterated that in many situations, such as the BLM movement, there are people that are going to claim that making these statements are exclusionary or derisive. He mentioned that he is not sure if this is a policy where the language could solve the problem. He emphasized the importance of determining who is in charge of deciding what is political or not as there are many students and organizations that could be affected by this. He also mentioned that he does not see a reason for a policy restricting political speech to exist and that instead there should be a policy that excludes hate speech.

> **Joe Shelley** mentioned that he understands that a policy that allows speech except for in very narrow conditions is needed. He reiterated that he is writing down the students suggestions to see what they need to change to improve the policy.

**Saphire Ruiz** reiterated Christian's point about having student involvement and Jackson's concerns about who is making these policies. They mentioned the need to have several SA

committees involved in the review process.They also mentioned that many student committees would overlap well with the goals of the LITS organization. They emphasized the importance of having student elected representatives as they represent a part of the student body. They then reiterated that their concerns came up when there were conversations about sanctionioning the assembly because their emails have been said to be a violation of the policy. They then asked who is being targeted for enforcement and reiterated their concern about the timing as before the board sent out the email, they checked the Listserve rules to ensure that the email was not breaking any rules and found no violation. They then mentioned that the policy was updated right after to reflect the current policy. They emphasized that a large part of their concern with the policy is that it can be applied to other student organizations.

**Joe Shelley** replied saying that the appropriate use of technology policy was last revised in February of 2017 and has not been touched but that they were updating the Listserve policy with warnings. He mentioned that this could be the reason why Saphire saw the update which is an unfortunate conscience. He apologized for the confusion on the website.

**Saphire Ruiz** reiterated that when they looked at the Listserve policy there was no link but when they went back to look after the email had been sent the Listserv policy had been updated.

**Joe Shelley** thanked Saphire for their comment and mentioned that they will be careful and make sure that these misunderstandings don't happen in the future.

**Luke Carstens** mentioned that the version of events that they were given was that the people responsible for sending out these emails had checked and found that there was a policy about pertaining political messages but not pertaining that you could be sanctioned for sending out these emails. Further checking he saw that the policy was linked to sending out messages and being sanctioned for sending them. To him, that sounded like a change because of how it is applied.

**Joe Shelley** stated that it could be confusing if the policy appears differently on the website. He then provided a link to the policy but emphasized that it hasn't been changed or reviewed yet.

**Emily Boviero** had a question regarding the creation of the policy since it was created in 2016. She wanted to know if Joe had any context about the policy.

**Joe Shelley** replied saying that he did not know the context about the policy but his theory was that it was created to make sure that the resources were used appropriately. He emphasized that it has never been meant to stop student activities.

**Sapphire Ruiz** thanked Joe for coming and is happy that revisions will be made on the policy. They are looking forward to working on the revisions because this is something that impacts the entire student body. They are also happy that the policy has not been enforced on student organizations.

**Joe Shelley** mentioned that he took notes that many of the assembly's committees might have feedback on the policy. He wants to make sure he does not limit the opportunity to submit feedback and that he is being inclusive. He thanked the assembly for having him in the meeting.

5.  **New Business**
    ○  **Approval of Minutes**

*The motion to approve the 4/26 minutes passes.*

        ○  **Constitution and Bylaw Amendments**
           ■  **Cluster Funding**

**Wriley Nelson** explained that the first amendment that the assembly is going to look at is an amendment to the funding model, also known as the cluster model, that was passed during the end of last semester. He explained that the amendment has already been voted on but needed to be implemented as the assembly voted to postpone the implementation by a semester. The other amendment is an amendment to the bylaws and funding codes that puts into writing that all student assembly funds will roll over from one semester to the next if they are not all spent. Furthermore, the central council's discretionary fund will be fully funded so the assembly can put on all campus style funding. He mentioned that it was fairly easy to roll funds back from the discretionary funds to the general strategic/ non-strategic funds.

           ■  **Cluster Representatives**
           ■  **Roll-Over Student Assembly Funding**

**Alex Medina** mentioned how the funding committee had a meeting to talk about the transition into the cluster model in the coming fall. He reiterated that the assembly has voted to postpone the implementation of the amendment in the beginning of the semester to review and get feedback about a few of the proposals. He stated that the cluster format will have ten general clusters: each cluster with organizations with similar missions and values.The amount of funding each cluster will get will be based upon generally what those groups have been requesting over the past few years with some discretion. He mentioned that student activities are working on finalizing the clusters but this should be done by the end of the semester and ready for the next semester. $123,000 was the amount given for student activities during this academic year and it was split in half between the fall and spring semester. He mentioned that the money left over from the first half of the semester ($46,000) did not rollover to this current semester as the assembly started out with about $54,000. The money was reallocated to other funding sources

without notice which is why they are looking to introduce this new bylaw to prevent things like this from happening again and also to follow precedent to how things have been done in the past.

**Saphire Ruiz** mentioned that the student assembly budget has already been decreasing over the past couple years so it is very important for them to keep every cent given. In future years, if the money is not rolled over and allocated somewhere else, it significantly impedes the ability to fund events and programs in terms of what the assembly can decide to do. They mentioned that Dorothy Poucher and student health's movie night the next day cost almost all of SA's discretionary budget. It wouldn't have been such a big part of the discretionary budget if the budget was larger. They mentioned that in January, the assembly was told that they had over $100,000 but they went into the semester to see most of it allocated to other funds without their notice. They emphasized that this amendment is to ensure that in the future, SA gets all the money allocated to them without disappearance as it is part of the student activity fee. They reiterated the need to have full access to their funds to prevent situations where they are not rolled over during one academic year.

**Questions/ Comments:**

**Gianni Hill** asked how the student assembly determines the percentages to where the rollover funding goes in regards to discretionary or general funds.

> **Wriley Nelson** replied saying that this was in a preliminary state of development and wanted to open it up for feedback. Currently, the percentages are calculated by taking the existing set up during the beginning of the year which is 75% strategic funding, 5% discretionary funding, and 20% non-strategic funding. They would skew the percentages to favor the discretionary fund. He emphasized that the listed funds rolling over are for normal, non-COVID circumstances. He mentioned that by a 2/3rds vote, the assembly could roll the money from the discretionary fund into the other funds as necessary. This amendment is an attempt to preserve flexibility

**Gianni Hill** mentioned that during his tenure, the assembly created a bylaw that stated that every semester, they changed the discretionary funds to a percentage of the total operating budget as a whole instead of $5,000 as a whole due to increases in the student activity fee. He also mentioned that with the discretion of the president and the vice president, the assembly could request up to 10% of the total operating budget for the semester. He expressed his worry that these numbers would conflict with the 10% cap for the discretionary funds.

> **Wriley Nelson** mentioned that there were a number of solutions to his concern. He explained that the central council can override the 10% ceiling by a 2/3rds vote. In case of special circumstances, the assembly could throw in an extra clause about money rolling over.

**Adina Mujica** expressed her belief that she did not think it was appropriate or feasible to expect the assembly to go into debate over documents that were sent only two hours prior to the meeting.

> **Saphire Ruiz** responded saying that the 20 page bylaw is not going to be voted on as the procedure was already done last semester. They clarified that the assembly was already in the mindset of planning around these amendments as they were going to be voted on next week.

**Gianni Hill** reiterated Adina's point about needing time to look over the bylaw. He also mentioned his concern regarding the constitutional amendment which makes it so cluster delegates are being voted on by the E-board members of those specific clusters. He mentioned the lack of accountability that can result from semester to semester if that were to happen because there is no guarantee that the E-board members are going to be consistent as there is no vetted process. He expressed his concern about adding more voting members as the assembly was already decently sized and already has very low turnout rates from semester to semester in which positions are hard to fill.

> **Wriley Nelson** mentioned that as a result of that concern, the assembly was hoping to push the amendment forward to next semester due to the fact that the assembly is currently far below the threshold for filling the offices it has available. He mentioned that the amendment was most likely going to be withdrawn and explained that he is currently working on the funding rollover to edit it.

**Travis Hill** thanked everyone for allowing him to join tonight. He wanted to check in because he was surprised that funds were not rolled over from fall to spring semester as that was not Noelle's impression. He acknowledged that the feedback he received from Noelle was that it was common practice to roll funds over from the fall to the spring which is why it is important to make sure that everyone is on the same page.

> **Saphire Ruiz** responded that the money was rolled back and the assembly started out without funds from the fall semester which was reallocated to non-student assembly areas.

> **Alex Medina** mentioned that the funds have in the past been reallocated to different activities even though they had been told that all of their funds would be rolled over. Their concern is that this has always been the case which is why they want to implement this new bylaw as there is nothing in the constitution that prevents the rolling over of funds from one semester to the next.

**Gianni Hill** mentioned that every year prior, the fall semester funding always rolls to the spring semester and the reason he liked this amendment is because it allows the carrying of funds from year to year. He emphasized that funds that are not used at the end of an academic year are

usually reallocated to the Hamilton general funding. This causes student assembly as a whole to lose those funds. He reiterated his belief that funds that are not used should be rolled over year to year because what students pay for student activities should stay in student activities. He mentioned that the only reason this has been a major topic discussion this year is because of the large amount of unused funds in this year as most years use up the student assembly funds.

**Saphire Ruiz** clarified that this policy does consider carrying the SA funds from one year to the next. They mentioned that the bylaw arised from a shared understanding that the student activities fee should remain the student activities fee that goes to students as it is what students pay for. They wanted to ensure that passing the funds would not be an issue in the future in case the assembly does have a lot of funding left over that can be rolled over.

**Jackson Harris** expressed his support for the bylaw. He mentioned that whether the funding goes to the endowment or general funds, the location does not make a difference because this money is supplied by the students so that is where the money should remain. Giving money to the Hamilton fund should be optional but the student activities fee is different because it is required from students to supply the students.

**Gianni Hill** hopes that in the end, they should aim to keep the student activities fees in student activities even if it is not used for Student Assembly. He also wants to push for the funds to be carried from year to year.

**Gianni Hill** mentioned that there should be a system on a Google Doc with a suggestion mode as it would be easier for members to add in amendments that they have instead of proposing them during the meeting.

***The motion to extend the meeting until 10:15 passes.***

6. **Old Business**
   ○ **Election Updates**

**Adina Mujica** thanked everyone who submitted their campaign information and mentioned that there will be a lot of write-in campaigns this year because they were not able to fill many of the classes. She emphasized that elections are from May 8th to 9th and stated that if anyone had any write-ins to email her at amujica@hamilton.edu.

7. **Committee Reports**

8. **Announcements**
   ○ **Vaccinations**
      ■ Reminder to fill out your vaccination records if you're fully vaccinated
      ■ Student Health Portal