

STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

1. Call to Order

Muhammad Ahmad Rao
Christopher Akuleme
Bethany Fell
Max Ganem
Ailis Hayden
Emily Jiang
Lena Klink
Marvin Lopez
Ryley McGovern
Ting Mei
Quentin Messer
Evelyn Molina

Kiara Nelson
Raymond Ni
Jacob Piazza
Mason Schroeder
Allison Sheehan
Nicole Soret
Felix Tager
Katrinah Tejada
Prim Udomphan
Joshua Zeledon

Excused:

Emily Jiang
Alexandra Kropaneva

Unexcused:

Adan Corea

2. General Public Comment Period ([TIME: 00:01:15](#))

Kateryna Tsaryova '23 (they/them) commented:

“Good evening! I do not know if this is the most appropriate space to bring up this question, but I wanted to ask if there is a possibility that a bench (or several benches) could be installed by the Sadove jitney stop.

At the top of the hour, there are frequently students sitting on the road, on the curb, or on the sidewalk waiting for the jitney, which is not a physically-accessible seating position for everyone, and more uncomfortable to do in colder weather. I believe students frequently do this (or simply stand outside, which is likewise not accessible for everyone) because sitting indoors in Sadove tends to remove students from their place in the queue for the jitney.

I know the counterpoint can be made that sitting in Sadove is acceptable if students communicate their place in the queue to each other, but I would like to mention the bench by CENTRO's UTC-30 bus stop at the KJ circle. Having a bench at a bus stop is not a New York State requirement, and sitting in KJ could equally suffice, yet there is still a bench by that bus stop. A bench by the Sadove jitney stop would be really nice.

Thank you for your time.”

Marvin Lopez noted that he and Emily have biweekly meetings with President Wippman in which they could bring this up. They are talking about the Jitney already and can also bring this up.

Jack Jee '24 (he/him) wrote:

“Bring back the late night jitney... from don's rok to campus on the weekend”



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

Dylan Fargis '24 (he/him) commented:

“Please bring back the Jitney from town on the weekends”

Deanna Durben '25 (she/her) wrote:

“Please bring back diner sushi, it’s been missed by everyone as a healthy and delicious option. Thank you.”

Corey Bravo Sloan '25 (he/him) commented:

“There is a huge problem with a lack of student parking on campus. I am currently living in Saunders, and there is no consistent student parking nearby. The closest student parking is *one row* of the KTSA lots, which is always full. Last semester, there was expanded student parking in that lot (and others, I’m pretty sure) due to demand, and I’m not sure why it was removed. I have an off-campus internship (that I got through Hamilton!) and medical needs that require me to have easy access to my car on the regular; on-campus parking being a 7-15 minute walk away from my dorm is not reasonable, especially considering that many, if not most other dorms have parking nearby.

I understand that more parking lots cannot be feasibly added to campus. Would it be possible, then, to expand some faculty/staff parking to be inclusive of students, especially students in dorms like Saunders and (for non-first-years in) Dunham who are pretty far from all other lots? I feel as though it’s a reasonable request to have regularly accessible parking near my dorm, so I don’t have to constantly worry about being late to work or doctor’s appointments. Further, Saunders residents, despite being on Griffin Road, are not technically allowed to park in Griffin Road parking, because a special permit is needed to park there. My question is, then, where are we supposed to park? The lots on the opposite sides of campus? North Lot? Outside of medical and work reasons, having minimal student parking discourages people from bringing cars to campus, which (though otherwise seeming like a good thing) furthers the divide between Hamilton and its neighboring towns/cities — and this does a disservice both to Hamilton and these communities. With more student parking, students would be able to visit Clinton, New Hartford, Utica, etc. without (at least in my experience) having to worry about where they park when they return to campus. Would it be possible for Saunders and Dunham residents to have permits much like Griffin Road residents that allow us to park in the lots actually near our dorms? Or would it be possible to expand the KTSA lots to be more inclusive of student parking? I feel like this is a very easy fix.

On another note (but still about parking), I truly don’t understand why parking tickets are \$50. As a first semester sophomore, I have been learning the rules about parking on campus over the last few weeks (as the website is actually quite unclear, especially with the KTSA lots!), and I find it abhorrent that tickets are \$50 for rules that are so unclear that everyone I have sent them to understands them in a different way. Could the rules be made clearer, specifically the KTSA lot rules? It saying "last lot near pavilion/row closest to KTSA" can be interpreted in many different ways — primarily, it reads as "the lot closest to Bab Pav AND the row closest to KTSA," *not* what it actually is (in the lot closest to Bab Pav, ONLY the row closest to KTSA).

Further, why are there no warnings before tickets? Why are they so expensive? With such a lack of student parking on campus, it seems unreasonable to also be charging students so much



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

money every time they have to resort to parking in a non-student lot/row. Further, where does the money from the tickets go to? I don't understand why Campus Safety charges such a high price (for context, parking tickets in NYC are \$65. These tickets are almost as expensive as an NYC parking ticket. Yeesh.) for students parking in faculty/staff lots — *especially* considering the fact that there is a huge lack of student parking on campus! I feel like there is a better solution for students parking in faculty/staff lots other than a \$50 ticket (with 0 transparency as to where the ticketed money actually goes) every time they are caught. Maybe add more student parking? Or have 3 warnings before a ticket, to encourage people to find other parking BEFORE they're charged \$50, not after? I'm not 100% sure, but the current system feels too harsh, especially considering the lack of parking on campus and the lack of nearby parking for certain dorms.”

Ryley McGovern asked if anyone wanted to respond and mentioned that Jackson Harris ‘22 started to work on this issue last year.

Felix Tager added that it can be added to the agenda for the ResLife and Student Safety Committee.

Nicole Soret ‘25 (she/her) wrote:

“Can we please do something about the flies in fojo, commons, and diner!!! It’s really uncomfortable to have flies in ur food as ur eating.”

Ryley McGovern noted that the flies have gotten a lot worse in comparison to last year. Last year flies were not a huge problem in FoJo. He mentioned being confident that the Assembly can figure something out.

Ashby Howard ‘25 commented:

“Please bring back the Friday and Saturday late night jitney. I have witnessed too many drunk drivers these past weekends and think it would be smart to have the Late Night Jitney back”

Seth Tobin ‘25 wrote:

“Bring back late night jitney from Rok”

Henry Storch ‘25 (he/him) commented:

“bring back late night jitney from rok”

Lucas O'Dowd ‘25 (he/him) wrote:

“Bring back the late night jitney from the Rok.”

Autumn Halfpenny ‘25 (she/her) commented:

“Please bring back zipcars. It’s hard for students who do not live close enough to have a car on campus and for students who cannot afford to have a car on campus to get around to places not on the jitney schedule without them.”



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

Francis Kinlin '25 (he/him) commented:

“Bring back the late night Jitney from Don’s Rok.”

Nicolas Gritz '25 (he/him) wrote:

“Bring back late night jitney from rok”

Spencer Goldberg '25 (he/him) wrote:

“Bring back late night jitney from rok”

Edward Gamble '25 (he/him) commented:

“please bring back the Weekend Night jitney back from downtown clinton to campus. i don’t want to have to rely on drunk drivers or ubers”

Marvin Lopez mentioned that he and Emily are in discussions concerning the Jitney and will bring it up again.

Connor Griff '26 (he/him) commented:

“Bring back late night jitney from rok”

Ely Silverman '26 (he/him) wrote:

“Please put a water fountain in wertimer. We are struggling enough with the hill, please give us a water fill station!”

Lydia Bullock '26 (she/her) commented:

“We would like a water fountain in Wertimer.”

Ryley McGovern read aloud an anonymous comment from the Class of 2025 which asked about the absence of fans and some sort of ventilation in the dining halls. The commenter further noted that they have seen sweat dropping from Diner staff’s foreheads into their food on multiple occasions and raises the issue of poor treatment of staff. The commenter asked why working conditions are not improving if tuition has increased.

Marvin Lopez shared that traditionally the Student Health Committee has taken on requests such as fans and water fountains, so this may be better addressed in a committee space rather than broader Student Assembly meetings. He also said that students should keep sending in comments as it is very helpful to get greater numbers that can be shared with administration even if these comments are not read aloud individually but are rather grouped together.

3. Old Business (TIME: 00:13:34)

- **Minutes from 9/12**

The minutes from 9/12 pass as written by unanimous consent.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

4. New Business (TIME: 00:14:05)

- **Annual and Contingency Budget requests: Treasurer Prim Udomphan ‘26**

Club (Annual Budget)	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended
Super Smash Bros. Club	\$600	\$600
ICA - International Cultural Association	\$5,500	\$5,500
Geological Society	\$2,000	\$2,000
Women in STEM	\$1,050	\$1,050
Bike Co-Op	\$950	\$950
Student Athlete Advisory Committee	\$2,100	\$2,100
Women in Finance Club	\$2,000	\$2,000
Disabled Students' Network (DSN)	\$100	\$100
Bowling Club	\$9,854.08	\$9,854.08
Classics Club	\$150	\$150
Badminton Club	\$3,000	\$2,200
Feminists of Color Collective	\$3,450	\$3,450
Urbanism and Design	\$500	\$500

Prim Udomphan noted that 13 clubs requested an annual budget and read out the club’s requested budget and recommended budgets. Most clubs got recommended in full, except Badminton Club, who was given 800 USD less than requested, due to them planning on using it for sweatshirts.

Jacob Piazza asked why the Bowling Club needed 10, 000 USD.

Prim Udomphan replied that the club will host an event eight times a year, which will consist of 40 students and will be hosted off campus.

Jacob Piazza asked if there is a way to check how much they requested last semester, as he felt that they had two trips, but requested the same amount. He questioned if there is an accountability system in place if they do not do what they say they will do with the money.

Marvin Lopez replied that they have records for what they have spent in the past, and pointed out that Felix is a good person to ask. He stated that when they rewrote the funding



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

codes, in the instance that you do not do what you said, Student Assembly can give out less money to said club, but that it is the first time that the new system is being tried.

Felix Tager mentioned that Bowling Club was a new club last year, and were only active in the second semester. The amount requested is for the 8 trips, compared to only the four that they did last semester.

Bethany Fell asked to break down the logistics of Bowling Club, and how much the trip costs per person. She mentioned that in her mind, bowling costs around 10 USD, and the board club was shunned when they made the same request, being told it was absurd. They felt that a skateboard has a more long term value rather than throwing a ball for 40 people.

Prim Udomphan answered that it costs 475 USD for a round trip on the bus, as well as around 755 USD for shoe rentals. In total it costs 1,231.76 USD each time to bowl, including total cost of bowling, rented shoes, and transportation, for each individual trip.

Bethany Fell asked if the club buys new shoes every time they go bowling.

Prim Udomphan answered that the club rents the shoes, hence the repeated cost.

Marvin Lopez proposes to vote all in one motion, unless someone would rather vote on them individually.

Felix Tager noted that if someone is a member of a club, they must abstain from voting for budget requests for their own club.

The motion to fund all clubs except Bowling Club and Badminton Club in full as recommended passes unanimously via voice vote.

Motion to fund Bowling Club as recommended passes via voice vote.

Motion to fund Badminton Club as recommended passes unanimously via voice vote.

Club (Contingency Budget)	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended
Slow Food	\$70	\$0

Prim Udomphan mentioned that Slow Food requested 70 USD for fuel to transport students and parents to go to the Farmer's market this weekend. Prim mentioned she recommended zero USD as the club has not used up all their annual budget.

Ryley McGovern asked how much money the club had left.

Prim Udomphan answered that they have around nearly \$2000 left.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

Ailis Hayden asked if the club specified why they needed more money.

Prim Udomphan replied that the club only asked for pots, pans, and food in their original request for an annual budget. They did not request money for gas in order to transport people. Additionally, according to the new funding codes, they are allowed to utilize their money more flexibly, therefore they can use it for anything they want that does not go against the funding codes. They are not required to spend money specifically on what they originally asked for.

The motion to fund Slow Food as recommended passes unanimously via voice vote.

- **Initiative Proposal: President Emily Jiang '25 (TIME: 00:24:30)**
 - First-year Clinton Tours

Felix Tager noted that he is speaking on behalf of Emily Jiang today who cannot be here. He reiterated that this is Emily's idea but also noted that he is a big fan of it. This idea is for First-Year Clinton Jitney tours which will help students new to Hamilton get acquainted and welcomed to the community, especially to the town of Clinton. He noted that he is a big fan of the proposal specifically because this will also help educate students on small businesses in the area especially because it is important to support and work with small businesses. The idea is to get four to five freshmen to get onto the Jitney with one or two upperclassmen who are familiar with the area and shops and who can act as a tour guide. The 'tours' will stop at places like Rainbow Cupboard, the Cremeria, and Utica Coffee. There would also be free tokens for The Cremeria for whoever signs up. There is an opportunity for upperclassmen who don't know the area well to sign up as well. An email would go out every Sunday for the following week, to gauge interest and figure out transportation logistics so that the tours do not grab the entire Jitney. Another option would be for Student Transportation to help. Further, SA could communicate with store owners to maybe get discounts or coupons for the students on the tours so they can stop and check out shops, as well as maybe having goodie bags at each stop, sponsored by SA, so students can get something at different locations. Felix and Emily are interested in working with sophomore and freshman student representatives on their ideas for this proposal. Emily requested that there be a raised hand poll to gauge interest, and then a second raised hand poll to see if anyone would be interested in being a guide. Emily also noted that they would be interested in serving as a guide.

Felix Tager added as a note that it would probably be best for the tours to not use the Jitney in order to not crowd it for students who need to go to places. He instead proposed to use the SA discretionary budget to rent transportation to both support student workers.

The majority of Assembly members showed interest in the proposal demonstrated by a show of hands.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

- **P/VP Election Date Vote: Vice President Marvin Lopez '23, President Emily Jiang '25 (TIME: 00:28:08)**
 - Wednesday 11/16 (before break) or Friday 12/2 (after break) instead of the usual during Finals week

Marvin Lopez mentioned that he and Emily are proposing two dates, Wednesday 11/16 (before break) or Friday 12/2 (after break), but that it does not have to be either of those two dates. The reasoning for this proposal for a change in dates has to do with not having enough people voting at the end of last semester. At the last meeting, no decision on a date was made.

Felix Tager stated that he would prefer the earlier date.

Marvin Lopez asked if anyone prefers the later date and noted that he feels like this should be voted on now.

Raymond Ni noted that he would prefer the later date and that the best way to get an opinion on this is to vote.

- Vote for a date change

The motion to change the voting date for SA President and Vice President to Wednesday 11/16 passes via placard vote.

- **Bylaws Addition Proposal & Vote: Ethics of Assembly Membership, by Class President Felix Tager '23 (TIME: 00:33:05)**
 - Presentation, discussion, and voting

Saphire Ruiz '22 (they/them) submitted the following comment:

“Dear Student Assembly and the rest of the Hamilton community,

I, Saphire Ruiz '22, former SA President, am writing today with regards to the amendment on the floor concerning holding office on the Assembly simultaneously with being an editor on a student publication or being on the E-Board for CAB or Media Board. I wholeheartedly support this amendment and encourage all of you to pass it.

SA cannot represent and advocate for the student body to the best of its ability if there are members on the body whose loyalties, concerns, and responsibilities are split between SA and Media Board or SA and CAB. For example, when the Student Activities Fee Committee was creating recent changes in the funding codes and regulations, there were many concerns around the splitting of the Fee between SA, CAB, and Media Board. With students holding positions across multiple bodies, the question of how to fairly allocate those funds becomes much more complicated. How can someone who is both on SA and CAB adhere to both of their



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

commitments and responsibilities if the bodies are competing for funding? That student will *have* to choose one to support more than the other. I already saw that in my own time on the Assembly, when a member who was also Editor-in-Chief of *Spec* voted against the Assembly buying pins for members (~\$30) but defended *Spec* buying Clinton mugs for staff members (the smallest Clinton mug is \$30, meaning we can bet to buy mugs for *Spec* staff costs a lot more than \$30).

There's also a larger concern about the ability to complete work. During my presidency, many members of the Assembly held E-Board positions in organizations. What we found, unfortunately, is that those who held more positions outside of SA were less able to fulfill all of their duties and responsibilities of the Assembly. This caused many conflicts and meant that projects had to be dropped altogether or significantly reduced, making it harder for the Assembly to actually govern. Although this is more of an issue for Class Presidents and members of the Cabinet, CAB and Media Board are the two largest bodies on campus other than the Assembly. The kinds of responsibilities that leaders in those bodies experience are often far greater than other organizations or clubs. It's unreasonable to expect someone to completely fulfill their responsibilities while being on both SA and CAB/Media Board. As such, SA members should have to concede their E-Board positions on CAB/Media Board once they become an Assembly member.

For the sake of time, I will end with my specific concerns about SA members holding editor positions on student publications. Although some may not see it as such, the Assembly ultimately is a political body charged with the responsibility of representing and advocating for the student body. As such, it *must* be a body separate from student media. Separation of media and government is a core tenant of any democratic system, and for too long the political implications and consequences of the mixing of SA and the Media Board/student publications have been ignored.

What happens when a member of the Assembly, who is also an editor of a student publication, gives confidential Assembly information to said publication, in hopes of doing something such as swaying student opinion on a policy or amendment? Or worse yet, misconstrues Assembly information to a publication? The Student Activities Fee Committee, for example, was a very successful endeavor that has the potential to radically (and positively) change the way student orgs are funded. What if a member of Media Board, who was also an Assembly member and against changing the structure, had used their position in both bodies to release inaccurate information about the Committee's goals, in hopes of making it more difficult to change the structure for the better? These are the kinds of risks we take when there is no separation between SA and Media Board/student publications.

In January 2021, when myself, Kavya Crasta '21 (Spring VP), and Eric Santomauro-Stenzel '24 (Fall VP) had been given access to the SA email after winning our election, we discovered an email that left us deeply bothered. The email, which is attached, seems to have been accidentally sent from the SA account by former SA President Amanda Kim '21, on November 18th, 2019. It



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

was sent to President Wippman and Mike Debraggio (Director of Community Relations), with Claire Goldstein '22 CC'd. At the time this email was sent, Kim and Goldstein were both editors for *The Spectator*, although we never learned their exact titles. An excerpt from the email reads:

I've just heard back from our Opinion section editors about their content for this week. They are no longer running pieces on Because Hamilton or financial aid. They now have two pieces lined up: one on Marie Yovanovitch and another on how the internet meme 'OK

Boomer' is ageist... Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you again for taking the time to meet this morning.

When we first discovered this email, Kavya, Eric, and I had no idea what to do with it, primarily because Kim at the time was still on the Assembly, and a prominent and respected member at that. Kim and us also had conflicting ideologies and policy concerns, and we knew that our bringing this up would be seen as an attack on Kim rather than concern over the implications of the email.

For the following year, we would still have no idea what to do with the email, even after Kim graduated, primarily because we wanted as much information about the contexts surrounding the email as we could before making it public knowledge. Upon learning that this amendment would be discussed tonight, I felt very strongly that the email had to be made public.

Although we're still unsure of the exact context of the email, one thing is certain: while president of the student body, Amanda Kim had a meeting with President Wippman and Mr. Debraggio about upcoming pieces for *The Spectator*; a meeting where two opinion pieces about the College were discussed and subsequently cut (and seemingly never published at a later date) and replaced with two pieces irrelevant to the College.

The Spectator, as many of you most likely know, has [standing weekly meetings with President Wippman](#), and has had such for the last few years. Until I came into office in 2021, *The Spectator* met more often with President Wippman than the President and Vice President of SA. It's written directly in the [Media Board Constitution](#) that the Editor-in-Chief of *Spec* meets weekly with the "President of the College and the Director of Communications and Development.. in order to stay on top of campus events."

What *exactly* is discussed in these meetings? Why are there no public notes or records of what happens in them? Why are there barely any comments, interviews, etcetera from President Wippman about on-campus issues in *Spec* news pieces, despite the publication having constant access to him?

Why was the president of the student body able to regularly influence pieces published in the only "official" student publication on campus, and seemingly with guidance or encouragement from the President of the College?



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

We would be outraged upon learning that President Biden regularly has control over what *New York Times* or a similar publication releases, so why are we okay with something similar happening here?

This was not my first and only time where I found myself deeply concerned with the relationship between members of the Assembly and the College and *The Spectator* and the College. For most of my time on campus, *The Spectator* and the Assembly have behaved as mouthpieces for the College.

Just this past year, I personally experienced having a piece I planned to publish in *Spectator*, one that would be critical of both the College and *Spec*, [get shut down for “libel.”](#) When the student admissions union was being voted on and the topic was significant on campus, *Spec* shut down any Letters to the Editor about the union, even after a damning comment by Monica Inzer had been made in a previous *Spec* piece that left many outraged and upset. In recent semesters they’ve published multiple “news” pieces that were uncritically supportive of the College, [even encouraging people to donate to Because Hamilton](#). I’ve heard from multiple former staff members on *Spec* their own stories about pieces being cut, delayed, or significantly changed whenever they were critical of the College. When we came into office, we heard from many members of the Assembly, including former Presidents and Vice Presidents, that the College didn’t respect the Assembly and that the body was often made to complete “little projects” the Dean of Students would request of the Assembly.

Separately, the control and influence the College has over student publications like *The Spectator* and over the Assembly is damning. Together, they converge into a nightmare, where students, especially those who are most marginalized, are silenced and powerless. Together, we get situations like Amanda Kim having influence over both student government and student media, and using that influence to favor the College above all else, at the expense of students.

The Constitution must reflect this unfortunate history and present at Hamilton, and the Assembly has a responsibility to put an end to this.”



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022



Student Assembly <sa@hamilton.edu>

Spectator Opinion Pieces 11/21

1 message

Student Assembly <sa@hamilton.edu>

Mon, Nov 18, 2019 at 7:07 PM

To: David Wippman <dwippman@hamilton.edu>, "Michael (Mike) Debraggio" <mdebragg@hamilton.edu>

Cc: Claire Goldstein <cgoldste@hamilton.edu>

Dear President Wippman and Mr. Debraggio,

I hope you're having a nice evening! I've just heard back from our Opinion section editors about their content for this week. They are no longer running pieces on Because Hamilton or financial aid. They now have two pieces lined up: one on Marie Yovanovitch and another on how the internet meme "OK Boomer" is ageist. The editors are considering writing another piece if they end up needing more content, but they haven't determined what they'd write about yet.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you again for taking the time to meet this morning. I hope you both have a wonderful rest of your week and a great Thanksgiving break!

Best,
Amanda Kim

Marvin Lopez mentioned that this was technically a public comment but was moved to be read out before the presentation of the bylaw proposal as it was relevant to it. He asked if someone had anything to add.

Jacob Piazza asked if he could critique the comment, or just comment on it.

Marvin Lopez answered that he can critique it.

Jacob Piazza noted that he is not a fan of what he has seen from the bylaw proposal. He thought that Sapphire's comment was a very long piece. He agreed that Media Board and CAB E-Board members should not be serving on SA, especially not as Assembly President or Vice President. He added that the situation regarding *The Spectator* Sapphire addressed in their comment is horrific and that he does not want *The Spectator* to be solely a mouthpiece of the College. However, he noted that this has nothing to do with SA and that it was coincidental that Amanda Kim was part of SA. However, he added that the SA President should not hold editor positions and suggested that the bylaws could say something of that nature rather than prohibit anyone on the Assembly from working for a news publication.

Jacob Piazza further mentioned that there have been all these grand comments about democracy. He noted that in the years he has been at Hamilton, SA has never been a democratic body. There were 20 to 30 people voting and he got appointed by Raymond, so he was not voted for at all. Furthermore, there is a high rate of turnover on the Assembly. Therefore, SA is not a very democratic body. In the end, there are a lot of 'what ifs' in the sense of 'what if somebody does something', but if that happens SA should punish that individual. He also added that this is not



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

only about *The Spectator* but that this would also affect other publications — *The Bull*, *The Monitor*, *The Duel Observer* — that are not necessarily pro-Hamilton. They are rather very critical of the College and more democratically functioning bodies than *The Spectator*. He ended by calling into question the complete relevancy of the public comment to the bylaw amendment.

Katrinah Tejada noted that she was concerned about *The Spectator* meeting more often with President Wippman and the Dean of Student Relations than the SA President and Vice President. She mentioned understanding that the Editors have to keep up with student news and events but she questioned why they are not meeting with President Wippman to discuss the issues that continue to happen and that they are continuing to get called out for. She further noted questions why the meetings between *The Spectator* and President Wippman are private and added that she did not know that *The Spectator* met with President Wippman before reading Sapphire's comment. She mentioned that she had to submit something to *The Spectator* and had to fight with them to get it published. They had comments about what parts of the article they would like to change and made her feel like they did not want her piece to be published. She noted that this might not have been *The Spectator*'s intention and that her piece was a little off. However, she also mentioned that every other paper she had contacted to get her piece published allowed her to do so without any issues.

Raymond Ni stated that as a member of *The Spectator* he understands that there are issues with the publication. However, the main issue he finds with Sapphire's comment is that not all campus publications are news. Furthermore, he points out that the person who wrote the public comment, former SA President Sapphire Ruiz '22 and their Vice President, Eric Santomauro-Stenzel, both worked for *The Monitor* in leadership positions.

Correction: Sapphire Ruiz, though writing for The Monitor, never held an E-Board or editor position in The Monitor. They did not write for The Monitor while in office as President. Eric Santomauro-Stenzel was a Managing Editor before his term as Vice President, but not as Vice President. He did not hold an E-Board or editor position for The Monitor again until Spring 2022, after his term in office. He did not write for The Monitor while in office as Vice President. These facts have been confirmed by Madison Lazenby, Editor-in-Chief of The Monitor.

Excerpt from a note by Raymond Ni submitted to the SA Slack after the meeting concerning the misinformation:

“Hey all, I wanted to address a comment I made in the SA meeting where I spoke about the writer and their VP being on The Monitor staff while being in office. I realized that what I said came off as a jab and I received information that my statement was actually incorrect. The admin at that time was not part of it nor editors. I wanted to apologize for misleading the assembly.”



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

Felix Tager noted that the document has been updated since last night when it was sent out but added that he has notified everyone of the changes. The document was updated as it contained unclear wording which has now been clarified. He further added that the wording reads “on campus” and “reports on Hamilton College” as often students work for an off-campus publication called the Enquiry and he wanted to make sure that this is also included in the proposal.

Felix Tager read out his proposal for an amendment to the Central Council By-Laws which addresses the ethics of membership. He noted that this is the first of a few bylaw amendments he will be introducing this year to create a code of ethics and code of conduct for members of the Assembly.

Jacob Piazza noted that he had a few questions as he finds the wording to be confusing. The main confusion he has with the language is what positions will count towards this. He knows that some people are staff writers and senior staff writers while others are editors.

Felix Tager noted that he believes that an editorial writer is a staff writer based on what he gathered from his conversations with people in Student Activities. An individual who is a staff writer is considered to be in an editorial position, which is why he included that. However, a staff photographer is not considered to be in an editorial position. As such, an individual on the Assembly could still work as an assistant. He added that Hamilton is a small school which is why he only included news publications in his proposal and not all publications, so SA members can still work for publications, like the *Duel Observer* or *Suture*, as they are not technically news publications. He noted that he consulted with his friends who are sitting on Harvard’s student government and Yale’s student council respectively who mentioned to him that their student government central council members are barred from being a club leader because it is a conflict of interest when voting on budgets. Because Hamilton is a small school, SA does not have such rules which is also why he tried to be as lenient as possible while setting some standard for being an SA member and in editorial positions.

Jacob Piazza asked which publications would be affected.

Felix Tager replied that this depends on what the publication is defined as. Any club that is deemed as a news publication in their club statement that a club publishes to the Org Relations department and is available on Presence would be affected.

Raymond Ni felt like he should be the person who should say something about this because he is both Junior Class President but also Social Media Editor/Manager for *The Spectator*. He mentioned that he feels like he is fighting for his position on this Assembly, as if this passes, he, alongside a few people on the E-Board, would have to resign which is something he does not like. The reason he does not like this is because it implies a sense of retroactivity. He mentioned that he campaigned and got all his signatures to run for Class President. However, if this amendment to the bylaws were to pass, he would have to resign from this position which he does



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

not want to do. He further stated that there are positions on the E-Board filled with people who would have to be replaced should this amendment pass, calling out specifically the secretary which is usually the hardest position to find a replacement for. He reiterated that he does not like the retroactive enforcement and added that this could be a conversation next year so that the bylaw change would not affect any people currently on the Assembly.

Felix Tager responded that Raymond has no obligation to stay on *The Spectator* and can choose to stay on the Assembly. He added that E-Board members are in closed meetings and have information that others do not. This makes them unfairly biased and also gives them the ability to report on things that others do not have. As such, they should be held to the same standard.

Quentin Messer asked why CAB and Media Board are included.

Felix Tager replied that they are included to prevent conflicts of interest. One of the responsibilities of SA is to appoint the budget of the Student Activities Fee. If an individual is both on Media Board and the President of Student Assembly, or the SA treasurer and on CAB's E-Board, this individual would be giving a vote to Media Board and CAB respectively during the deliberations of how the Student Activities Fee is divided and what the budget of Media Board and CAB should be. As such, the inclusion of CAB and Media Board is to prevent the vote from being biased.

Jacob Piazza noted that this campus is small. Since the campus is so small, individuals have much greater insight on what is going on on it. There are also not that many students that want to do these activities because of course loads. He also agreed with Raymond on valuing a *Spectator* position over a Student Assembly position and suspected that most people would do the same. Most people are here for their career and an editor position at *The Spectator* or *The Monitor* is more important for someone's resume than a position on the Assembly unless they are the Assembly President or Vice President or someone who is making a lot of change which is hard to foresee. He mentioned that he thinks that people would choose *The Spectator* or *The Monitor* over an Assembly position. Additionally, given how small the student population is, this hurts individual students. This school does not have 10,000 people, so each student matters and this change to the bylaws would prevent them from reaching their aspirations. He felt like SA could watch what Assembly members are doing. For example, if someone would publish an article in *The Spectator* that contained privileged information, someone will notice and the issue can be fixed. He then added that there also has been an issue in the past with having enough members on SA and he does not want that problem to occur again.

Muhammad Ahmad Rao mentioned to ensure that there is no conflict of interest, SA could bar members from voting on issues that would present a conflict of interest to them. As such, members could stay on the Assembly and on the E-Board of news publications. He then asked if SA can currently bar members from voting if the issue voted on presents a conflict of interest for them.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

Allison Sheehan replied that such an amendment could be written. She further added that votes concerning *The Spectator* do not occur very often.

Marvin Lopez reiterated that this would need to be introduced as a separate amendment which would take a long time. He stated that historically members have just abstained from votes that presented a conflict of interests. However, for the proposal to pass, $\frac{3}{4}$ of SA members would need to vote yes on it.

Allison Sheehan added that at this point a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority would be 13 yes votes.

Marvin Lopez noted that people could abstain, but if there are less than 13 yes votes, the proposal would not pass.

Felix Tager stated that the goal of his proposal is not concerned with voting on issues that present a conflict of interest but that E-Board members of news publications are in this space entirely. It is a conflict of interest to have them reporting on something that they are in the room for.

Ailis Hayden stated that it would be good to have it not be retroactive, so that Raymond would not have to choose between his SA and *Spectator* position. Raymond did not come into this term knowing his *Spectator* position would become an issue.

Marvin Lopez mentioned that SA could amend this on the spot or could table it or and come back to it once it has been revised. He is not sure how the amendment could include something that would allow current SA members to be exempt from this rule, through adding another clause, but noted that it is difficult.

Quentin Messer asked how many people on the Assembly would be affected by this at the moment.

Marvin Lopez replied that if this passes, the two people on SA would either have to let their editorial position on a news publication or SA go.

Tessa Chefalo asked for clarification on who is actually affected by this, because according to the Media Board Constitution, only four of thirteen publications on campus that specify “news” in their description, and *The Spectator* and *The Monitor* are not among those four. Those four are *The Continental*, *Culture*, *The Topical*, and *Signature Style*. She further noted that the bottom part of the bylaw amendment mentions anyone in an E-Board position on the Media Board, which counts every editor of a publication, because the media board is made up of one Chair, one member at large, and every editor.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

Felix Tager replied that the reason for that specification is that, in the Media Board, there are both members at large and people that join on without being a part of the publication. He wanted to prevent anyone who is a voting member on the Media Board from being on the SA Central Council. His definition of “news” is based on the publication’s Presence file, for which *The Spectator* is stated as news, and he is going off of that.

Tessa Chefalo offered that she was asking this as a point of clarification, because when this amendment is enforced, if it is passed as is, this confusion around definitions could come into question.

Marvin Lopez noted that the idea of clearly defining “news” for this amendment is an important point, and that SA needs to think about how they enforce what counts as news. He mentioned that SA has options: they can vote to pass the amendment, or table it, and send it back for review.

Jacob Piazza added that, at this moment, without a clear definition of “news” in this amendment, it could be abused or misconstrued. If someone is on *Signature Style* and SA, and someone, based on the Media Board’s Constitutional definition of “news,” wants to decide that *Signature Style* is news and that that person is breaking this amendment, someone could write a piece in *The Monitor* saying that the person shouldn’t be on SA. Even if the person is not forced to leave SA, there would need to be clarification — like the conversation happening now — and it is not worth the confusion.

Marvin Lopez asked if Jacob would like to take any specific action.

Jacob Piazza requested to have the amendment tabled, to send it back for edits.

Marvin Lopez responded that they could table it, but that it would have to be a motion.

Jacob Piazza said that he would not be taking a specific action at this time.

Mason Schroeder noted that one thing he wanted to make sure that SA doesn’t reach over is the fact that you can still submit articles to publications, you just are not able to have editorial power or control what articles are put out. If you want to write about something, you’re still able to submit an article to a publication, you just can’t have the last say as to if articles get put out or not. That is the main conflict of interest that this amendment is trying to prevent. For example, Raymond, if he wants to stay on SA, could still write for *The Spectator*, he just would not have final say over the articles published, or the social media involved with the articles. He wanted to note that distinction.

Raymond Ni noted that he wants to focus on what is present. He clarified that he does not edit the *Spectator*, and does not get control over what news gets published. Further, he is not in the private meetings with President Wippman. Rather, his role is to create infographics for people to



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

have easier access to the news. He feels that it's insensitive to tell him to quit *The Spectator*, because he has meaningful connections with people on both SA and *The Spectator*.

Correction: The Social Media Coordinator's role (according to an editor of The Spectator and upon further clarification from Raymond Ni) includes deciding what parts of Spec articles make it onto social media. This includes editing a "blurb" of an article to include in social media graphics and captions but not edits of articles for the website or print version of The Spectator.

Quentin Messer noted that in the future, it is important to make sure there are enough people for SA to run properly. He asked if there is a way to think about if there *is* a problem down the road with populating SA, if there is a way to recognize that this amendment may be the reason why, and then reverse it.

Felix Tager noted that any bylaw can be repealed.

Jacob Piazza said that earlier in the meeting, he thought that Felix shared that a staff writer position counts as an editor position, which he does not think is true, as staff writers do not have control over anything other than what they are writing — which contradicts what Mason said. He thinks that the amendment needs clearer definitions, because though the people who wrote the amendment know what they're trying to say and prevent, those intentions are not necessarily the same way it'll be used/interpreted by others.

Marvin Lopez asked if Jacob would like to motion to table the bylaw amendment for today.

Ryley McGovern asked, if the amendment is tabled today, when SA would talk about it again.

Marvin Lopez answered that the amendment can be brought back to the Assembly at any time through a motion — it could go back for edits and be brought back next week, the week after that; it could never come back, but it would be tabled in good faith of bringing it back at some point.

Ryley McGovern clarified that it is just a matter of motioning to bring it back.

Allison Sheehan noted that it is up to Felix if he wants to make edits, and the amendment can be put back on the agenda if it comes back to the Assembly.

Marvin Lopez added that it is up to Felix if he or anyone else wants to motion to bring it back after this meeting.

The motion to table the Obligation of Membership amendment presented by Felix Tager '23 passes via voice vote.



STUDENT ASSEMBLY MEETING

9/19/2022

Felix Tager noted that he will clarify the language and then send the amendment back.

5. Announcements ([TIME: 01:12:52](#))

- The Be the Match Marrow Donor Registry will be taking place this Wednesday from 11-2 in the Barn. If you are between the ages of 18 and 44, come get registered as a bone marrow donor; It's easy, it's free, and it takes just a few minutes! More information is in your emails.
- Committee times have been decided and meeting times will be published in an email.

Closed Session for Short SA Central Council Information Session

The motion to enter into a closed session passes via voice vote.

6. Adjournment

