



Cornell University Student Assembly

Student Assembly Trustee Report, 2010-2011

Submitted by Vincent Andrews, Student Assembly President

Introduction

The 2010-2011 Student Assembly has attempted to expand its role on campus beyond Resolution writing. The following 2010-2011 Student Assembly Trustee Report will include a description of the Assembly's guiding philosophy for the year and will present the Resolutions and reports which we have passed through the Assembly within the context of those initiatives. Though this report demonstrates all the actions the SA has reviewed and voted on as a body, the report does not do justice in presenting all the work Assembly Representatives have accomplished. Due to the nature of this document, the many initiatives which individual SA members have addressed are unable to be presented here. However, it is unequivocally the motivation of each individual Representative, regardless of whether they presented their actions in Resolution form or not, which has allowed this Assembly as a whole to be successful. Therefore, the initiatives presented here are simply the most visible actions the Assembly has undertaken.

Guiding Philosophy

The Student Assembly's broad goal this year has been engagement. Whether it be engagement of external bodies, such as other Universities or Assembly's or whether it be internal engagement, such increasing the utility of SA committees and independent student organizations, the Assembly has looked to broaden its relevance on-campus by interacting with more organizations. The Executive Board of the SA has espoused this philosophy of engagement by coining the term "SA as a Hub" and administrators have termed the 2010-2011 Student Assembly as "one of the most prolific SA's in recent memory".

Initiatives

Student Mental Health

One of the Student Assembly's major initiatives this semester has been to address the issue of student mental health on campus. The Assembly has addressed the issue of mental health from a programming perspective, with the organization of the Cornell Caring Community Celebration on November 11th, and addressed it through Resolution 21, 22 and 40.

Cornell Caring Community Celebration (CCCC)

The Student Assembly organized the Cornell Caring Community Celebration (CCCC) as a follow-up to the Spring 2010 Lift Your Spirits event. On November 11th, the Student Assembly held Cornell's first Caring Community Celebration in an effort to unite the student body season, and foster mental health awareness in an upbeat environment. CCCC aims to promote mental health awareness and student unity on campus each semester through a positive and preemptive approach. Multiple student organizations participated and helped to organize the informative, yet entertainment-filled, evening.

The Daily Sun featured the celebration, which 400 students attended, on the front page of its publication on November 12th, and commended the SA for spearheading the mental health initiative with the Caring Community Celebration and Minority Representative Roneal Desai's Resolution 40. The assembly on whole will continue to prioritize campus unity and student wellbeing, including student mental health in the coming semester, and will be organizing a CCCC event this Spring.

Special thanks go to the organizations who participated; EARS, Minds Matter, CUEMS, Class Councils, Cornell Dining, the Panhellenic Council, the Interfraternity Council, Habitat for Humanity, Sexual Health Awareness Group (SHAG), Consent Ed, Cornell Asian Pacific Islander Student Union (CAPSU), African Latino Asian Native American Students Programming Board (ALANA), Black Students United (BSU), and Asian and Asian American Forum (AAAF) for participating in the celebration. Also, a very special thanks to CU Jazz, The Hangovers Acapella, Last Call Acapella, and WVBR for performing at the event, as well as Dean of Students Kent Hubbell for speaking at the event.

Resolution 21 - Establishment of the Cornell Caring Community Committee (CCCC)

Charged the SA to bring together all undergraduates in order to promote health, friendliness and community networks on Campus by establishing a Cornell Caring Community Committee which will put on a "Caring Event" each semester.

The primary charge of the Student Assembly Cornell Caring Community Committee (CCCC) will be to connect students with fellow classmates, neighbors and friends. The Committee will enhance student's experiences on campus outside of the classroom. The Committee will create a strong network to combine all student organizations devoted to mental health and care on campus. Through the creation of this committee and by connecting with the Student Assembly, a dialogue between students, various organizations, administrators and the rest of the Cornell community will commence and encourage all to understand the importance of living outside of the stresses of academia.

Furthermore, the continual event (once a semester) held by the committee will allow students to look forward to and depend on an organization put on by students and for students that centers on the livelihood of every undergraduate at Cornell.

Resolution 22 - Creation of Student Assembly Ad-hoc Committee for Advisory System Review

Created an ad-hoc committee to review and investigate concerns with the current faculty-advising system for each college. The ad-hoc committee and the whole S.A. will solicit feedback from the student body regarding their advisory system experiences in the form of a Speak Up event and or poll. The S.A. believes that student input is invaluable in the review of the systems.

As a result of this resolution, SA President met with Vice Provost Laura Brown to discuss the University's report on advising. Addressing this issue is an ongoing initiative.

Resolution 40 – Recommendations to Faculty Regarding Mental Health and Well-Being of Students

In an effort to engage the other Constituent Assemblies, resolution 40 requested the Faculty Senate and the faculty in general to adopt a number of actions, enumerated below, in an effort to reduce student stress. The proposed actions are currently in front of the Faculty Senate, Educational Policy Committee (EPC) and will hopefully be presented in some form in front of the entire Faculty Senate this Spring semester.

Proposed actions:

The Student Assembly respectfully proposes the faculty adopt the following actions to create a healthier, more supportive environment for students:

- Faculty within colleges and departments are encouraged to coordinate prelim, paper, and project due dates to avoid conflicts and allow students adequate time to prepare for each
- Establish a precedent of having make-up examinations be at least a week away from the original test date (either before or after)
- Provide in their syllabus a universal statement vowing to consider the student experience and stating their commitment towards the accommodation of students in regards to classroom affairs
- Additionally provide in this statement a formalized mechanism to request a change in a prelim date, a change in due date for a paper or other turned in assignment, and/or a makeup examination
- Faculty be encouraged to provide the specifics of the above mechanism(s) in their syllabus and discuss such measures briefly during the first day of class;

The Student Assembly respectfully proposes the faculty provide a clarification as to the instances when accommodation is objectively necessary, and in making their decision as to what situations to include they should keep in mind those instances including, but not limited to:

- Situations where students have an unusually high amount of work/exams/assignments due in multiple classes in a short period of time
- Situations when students are having personal issues outside of the classroom

- Situations where students will be absent from campus or extremely occupied with extracurricular activities such as sports, conferences, tournaments, or other events that enhance their university experience in a productive way;

The Student Assembly makes their recommendation on behalf of students to faculty as to when they believe accommodations should be made, and that these specifics are:

- Situations where students have three or more items worth more than 20% of their final grade in any number of classes in a 96 hour span,
- Faculty will honor requests made 2 or more weeks in advance of the prelim/assignment date;

Finance Review

The Student Assembly is charged with allocating the Student Activity Fee (SAF) to byline funded organization (currently 29 groups) and with managing the Student Assembly Finance Commission (SAFC), which allocates a portion of the SAF to over 300 Independent Student Organization. In an effort to continue our philosophy of engagement, the Assembly has already met with every byline funded organization this year and has partnered with the SAFC to improve its funding allocation process.

Student Assembly Finance Commission (SAFC) allocation process review

A large initiative undertaken by the Student Assembly has been to review and propose changes to the manner in which the Student Assembly Finance Commission allocates money to the 400 Independent Student organizations who apply for funds every semester. The allocation of student funds can be considered to be one of the Assembly's most important roles on campus.

Resolution 7 – Examining the SAFC Funding Process for Independent Student Organizations

In an effort to improve on one of the most important functions of the SA, Resolution 7 established an ad-hoc committee to examine and review the current Student Assembly Finance Commission (SAFC) funding process for Independent Student Organizations.

The ad-hoc committee was charged to consult with existing Independent Student Organizations in its review of the SAFC funding process.

The ad-hoc committee then presented its recommendations on how the SAFC funding process can be improved at the second-to-last SA meeting of the Fall 2010 academic semester.

The report and proposed changes which resulted from this ad-hoc committee is presented as Appendix A.

Organization Review Initiative

The Student Assembly Organizational Review Committee (SAORC) established its process for engaging and reviewing the over 800 student organizations at Cornell and also reviewed its first 58 groups. The SAORC was established as a committee of the SA last year because Cornell has so many student organizations and thus it is often hard for some groups to find the resources they need on

campus. With the creation of the SAORC, the SA helps like-minded groups to become aware of each other's existence and through the Student Activities Office it encourages student organizations to closely collaborate.

This is *immensely* important to the student population as a whole because when more groups work to co-host and co-run events, the end result is of much higher quality and will appeal to a larger number of people. In addition, as the SAORC makes sure that the only groups that exist serve a legitimate purpose to our community, i.e. not shadow organizations for a larger central one, it helps to remove redundancies. This is extremely important because it means that funding sources like the SAFC can be better distributed, allowing club memberships to grow. The SAORC is thus striving to make the student organization system better for those that it affects...the students.

The Committee presented a progress report which was presented on the February 10th SA meeting and can be viewed on the Assembly's website.

Byline Funded Organizational Review Process

The SA Created a New Non-Byline Funding Year Review Process. In order to improve communication with by-line funded groups between funding cycles and continue the theme of SA engagement, the Appropriations Committee asked each organization to prepare a financial & operational report denoting their past performance and future plans. Each organization presented their report to the Committee over the semester and the groups were able to understand some of the concerns that may come from the SA in the future. In addition, Assembly members were able to understand some of the groups' issues so that they could be more informed for the Fall 2011 byline process.

The Committee produced a report after meeting with each group to guide the groups' SAF requests in the future. Specifically, we worked with the Cornell Cinema to ensure that the next by-line funding process would be smoother than previously. Both of our organizations worked together to listen to each other's concerns and make changes that would mitigate any potential issues in the future.

Reports from all the meetings can be obtained upon request.

SAFC Appeals

With 18 appeals from the SAFC in Fall 2010, the SA did a terrific job of ensuring that all issues were handled appropriately and without major controversy. Appeals were handled fairly, equitably, and maturely and student organizations were kept adequately informed throughout the process. Only one appeal was brought to the full SA which is a vast improvement in relation to past semesters. All other appeals were determined in the SA Appropriations Committee.

The Fall SAFC appeal process was concluded with Resolution #20, 23, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

University Recognition Policy Response

Upon first hearing about the changes to the University Recognition Policy, the SA was troubled by the administration's lack of consultation with student governance and relevant stakeholders. For example, as per the mandate issued by the Board of Trustees and the President of the University,

the Student Assembly has legislative oversight over the Office of the Dean of Students, which houses the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs (Article 1.1 of the SA Charter). Therefore, the Executive Board of the SA felt that the fact the Student Assembly was not consulted or even notified about the changes negatively reflected upon the process in which the proposed changes came about.

Apart from the Student Assembly's legislative responsibilities, the SA is also the main funding body for the majority of student organizations on campus, including those providing non-alcoholic and alternate social programming for students. The lack of communication with the SA suggested the Assembly members that the administration may not have recognized the broader issues and implications of the proposed plan.

In an effort to address the changes to the Recognition Policy, the SA offered a multi-faceted perspective on the issue by incorporating the opinions of students not represented by the Greek governing bodies and how these changes may come to affect the broader student experience.

The Student Assembly hoped to assist with the review of the University Recognition Policy and its implementation in order to ascertain how the initiative will affect all students. As part of its review, the Student Assembly requested information from the University through Resolutions 8, 9, 10 and 11. The Student Assembly has the authority to request information per its charter:

Article 1.1 Legislative Authority Over Policies

The Student Assembly (herein after referred to as the SA) will have legislative authority over the policies of the Department of Campus Life and the Office of the Dean of Students, and have the authority to review the budgets and actions of said departments.

Bylaw 1.1.a Pursuant to the authority of Article 1, Section 1, the SA shall by majority vote have the authority to require at any time information directly from a department or a specific individual within that department concerning the budget, policies, or actions of said department. The request for this information shall be made at a SA meeting.

Bylaw 1.1.b Should a request [for information, as described in 1.1.a above] be refused, the SA by simple majority vote may request the information be given to the Vice President for Student and Academic Services who shall forward it to the SA. The Vice President for Student and Academic Services shall act unless otherwise directed by the President, pursuant to Article 1, Section 5.

Resolution 8 - Gannett Health Services and Alcohol Related Incidents on Cornell's Campus

Requested any information from Gannett Health Services regarding alcohol consumption on campus in an attempt to determine consumption trends.

Resolution 9 - Judicial Administrators Office and Alcohol Related Incidents on Cornell's Campus

The Student Assembly requested statistics detailing the number of students who have had one alcohol related incident, the number of students who have had two alcohol related incidents, the number notifications sent to parents of students who have had two alcohol infractions, the number of students with three alcohol related incidents and the number of students who have been placed on academic probation and/or suspension due to three or more alcohol related incidents. In

addition, the Assembly requested that the information detailing these incidents are broken down by the academic semester and living location (dormitories, Greek housing, or off-campus) of the students.

Resolution 10 - Cornell University Police and Alcohol Related Incidents on Cornell's Campus

Requested any information from CU Police regarding alcohol consumption on campus in an attempt to determine consumption trends.

Resolution 11 - City of Ithaca Police and Alcohol Related Incidents on Cornell's Campus

The Student Assembly requested any information from the Ithaca Police Department regarding alcohol consumption in Collegetown and around Cornell's campus.

Resolution 13 - Residential Programs and Alcohol Related Incidents on Cornell's Campus

Requested any information from Residential Programs regarding alcohol consumption on campus in an attempt to determine consumption trends.

Conclusion

The Student Assembly received reports from Gannett, the Judicial Administrators Office, te Dean of Students Office as well as the Residential programs regarding alcohol consumption on campus. Though much data was presented, the SA could not reach conclusive results regarding how the changes to the University Recognition Policy would affect consumption of alcohol on campus.

Late Night Programming

Due in-part to the changes of the University Recognition policy, the Student Assembly identified that there existed a lack of University sponsored late-night programming on campus. The SA passed Resolution 18 in response.

Resolution 18 - Late Night Programming

Established an ad-hoc committee to coordinate the creation of a document which details how to create successful late night programming on campus. The committee was charged to outline what University resources (independent of SA allocated resources) are needed to provide successful late night programming on campus.

The committee's resulting document was submitted to the SA for review and was forwarded to the Vice President for Student and Academic Services, the Dean of Students and the President of the University on January 7th.

The committee report has been included in this report as Appendix B.

The Student Assembly has continued working towards establishing a late-night programming venue this semester.

General Engagement

Beyond engaging organizations through specific agenda initiatives, the SA has also engaged organizations in a variety other forms.

Ivy China

In 2010, the Ivy Council continued its partnership with the ACSF, with a second Ivy-China Summit and Ivy-China U.S. in 2010-2011. Cornell University sent SA President Vincent Andrews as its 2010 delegate.

Initiated by students at Cornell University in 2008, the Ivy Council established a partnership with the All-China Students' Federation (ACSF) in order to strengthen the relationship between American and Chinese student leaders.

To launch the exchange, an Ivy League delegation of student body presidents and Ivy Council leaders visited Beijing, Wuhan, and Shanghai during the summer of 2008 which former SA President Ryan Lavin attended.

The Ivy Council holds three objectives in its involvement with China: (1) To establish a platform of discussion and exchange between student leaders at Ivy League schools and their Chinese counterparts. (2) Provide a glimpse of society, politics, business, culture, and university life in one country to student in the other. (3) Introduce students on both sides of the exchange to new and differing perspectives.

Communication Improvements

The SA has been working very hard to improve communication with all students. Resolution 4, Resolution 6 and Resolution 53 begin to demonstrate our work on this effort.

Resolution 4 – Establishing 'Speak Up' Events Hosted by the Student Assembly

In the Assembly's attempt to increase its outreach and engagement, this resolution amended the Assembly Charter to require the SA to hold at least one "Speak Up" event per semester. The Assembly used the Cornell Caring Community Celebration as its Fall Semester "Speak Up" event and is currently planning a cook-out on the Arts Quad as its Spring Semester "Speak Up" event.

Resolution 6 – Responsibilities of the Vice President of Public Relations

The Resolution attempted to grant the Student Assembly the ability to send email notifications and updates to the entire student body through a list which the Office of Assemblies currently maintains. After consultation with the University Vice President for Communications the Assembly was not granted access to the system. The Assembly has continued to pursue a means to communicate with all students but also re-focused its effort into creating a brand-new website through Resolution 53.

Resolution 53 - Communications Budget Change

The passage of this resolution represents the Assembly's commitment to create a new, interactive website. The resolution allocated \$1000 to the Communications Committee budget from the surplus in the Student Assembly administrative budget for the payment of web design services (\$650) and additional promotion activities (\$350). The money will be used to create a completely new Cornell SA blog and will enable the SA to better interact with students as well as provide different outlets and forums for students to discuss, collaborate and network among themselves.

The URL for the SA's new website is cornellsa.org

Public Service Committee

The SA Public Service Committee is the first outreach committee of its kind and represents the epitome of SA engagement. The SA partnered with over 80 public service organizations on campus to write and distribute a 15 page guidebook detailing all the public service organizations on campus. The creation of this pamphlet makes Cornell SA one of the first undergraduate student governments around the country to do this kind of work and to try and inspire students to get involved in the community.

A copy of the pamphlet can be obtained upon request.

Environmental Initiatives

The SA Environmental Committee has successfully partnered with multiple sustainability organizations on campus which resulted in an active environmental agenda on the Assembly. Though many of the initiatives were not passed by the full Assembly, the Committee has continued to use the SA as a tool to reduce the University's carbon footprint.

Resolution 35 - Taking Back the Tap

The Assembly requested that Cornell Dining slowly phase out the sale of bottled water on campus and encouraged students to purchase fewer plastic bottles. The Resolution was submitted to the President and, though he did not agree to stop the sale of bottled water on campus, he agreed to look into ways in which the administration could distribute water in a more environmentally friendly manner on campus.

Resolution 50 - Proper Waste Management by SAF Funded Organization

In the Assembly's continued effort to reduce the University's carbon footprint, the Assembly passed this resolution urging Student Assembly funded groups to reduce their paper plate, cup and general paper usage and increase their recycling. It also recommended the University change its University Use Policy (UUP) form to automatically require the inclusion of recycling dispensers during events.

Internal Changes

Through amendments to the SA Charter, the Assembly was able to improve its internal functions to increase engagement on campus.

Resolution 44 - Adding 4 At-Large Seats to the SA

As a result of the many issues the Student Assembly has had to address this semester and the many issues it was not able to address, with the President's approval, the SA has increased the number of voting Representatives from 23 to 27 members. Three seats are to be designated as "undesigned at-large" and one seat is to be reserved to an additional Freshman Representative.

Resolution 5 – Committee Review of Resolutions

To increase the engagement of the Assembly's Committees, this resolution requires all resolutions to be "reviewed" by an SA Committee before it can be brought to the Assembly floor. This is an important step to increase engagement because there are many non-SA Representatives on SA Committees who are able to effectively contribute to the Resolution making process.

Resolution 27 - Creation of the Greek-LGBTQ Relations Ad-Hoc Committee

Through the creation of an LGBTQ Relations Ad-Hoc Committee between the Student Assembly and the Greek system, the SA LGBTQ Representative and interested community members are able to address the many points of concern which exist in the Greek Community regarding LGBTQ issues. This is an ongoing initiative on the Assembly and represents the SA's engagement of the Greek governing bodies.

Resolution 43 - Requiring SA Review of Housing Information

The Student Assembly Charter grants the SA "authority" over the division of Campus Life. Therefore, in the Assembly's effort to improve the effectiveness of housing communication between the Administration and students, the University Housing department has agreed to discuss outgoing communication with the SA Residential Life Committee before it is sent. This resolution will both increase the engagement of the SA with the University Administration and will improve the Administration's communication with students.

Resolution 26 - Clarification of Designated At-Large Seats

To ensure the SA continues to address and engage Minority Student, International Student and LGBTQ Student Issues, the Assembly permanently designated "at-large" seats to address those issues. President Skorton accepted the Charter change.

Resolution 34 - Charter Revisions II

After a 2 year effort to write a clearer and more readable charter, the Assembly successfully passed and President Skorton accepted a new format for the SA charter.

Resolution 51 - Addressing Women's Issues Through Internal Changes to the Student Assembly

In an attempt to increase the participation of woman on the Student Assembly and to ensure that the Assembly continues to address the many issues affecting woman on campus, the Assembly passed this Resolution specifying that one of the newly created at-large seats be designated as the Woman's issues seat. Do to the recent nature of this resolution, the Assembly is still waiting for Presidential approval.

Other Student Assembly Actions

The Assembly has also passed many other Resolutions which cannot be sorted into broad agenda initiatives.

Resolution 1 – Approval of the SA 2010-2011 Standing Rules

As occurs at the start of every academic year, the SA reviewed its internal functioning, made a few minor adjustments, and passed a new set of internal policies.

Resolution 2 – Conflict Free Resolution

Worried by the use of "conflict minerals" in electronic devices, the Assembly passed a resolution requesting the administration cease purchasing electronics from companies who use conflict minerals in their products.

Resolution 3 – Change in Transportation Notification

Due to Ithaca weather, students frequently use public transportation to get around campus. However, also due to Ithaca weather, public transportation routes and service are often affected. The University and Tompkins County does a poor job of notifying students about route or service changes. Therefore, the SA passed Resolution 3 requesting the administration to use the “Special Conditions” listserv to communicate route and service changes to students. The Assembly is still waiting President Skorton’s response.

Resolution 12 – Request for an Annual Report on Executive Compensation

As a result of budget cuts and potential tuition increases, the SA passed Resolution 12 recommending the Administration to release the compensation figures of all Administrators listed in the Cornell Annual and Financial Report and requests the disclosure of the philosophy and rationalization behind executive compensation policies in clear and plain English. President Skorton accepted the resolution in part and rejected the resolution in part.

President Skorton agreed to disclose “the manner in which compensation is set and the process that is used, the compensation philosophy that drives decisions regarding executive compensation, and the cost of executive compensation as compared to the budget of the university”. President Skorton declined to provide the exact compensation figures of University administrators.

The Resolution, President Skorton’s response and the University’s report regarding compensation philosophy can be found on the Assembly’s website.

Resolution 15 - Possession of Pepper Spray on Campus

In response to recent forcible touching incidents on campus, the SA passed Resolution 15 requesting that the University allow students to carry pepper spray on campus. Citing to safety concerns President Skorton rejected the resolution.

Resolution 16 - Creation of Student Assembly Judicial Board Ad-hoc Committee

The SA passed Resolution 16 to create an ad-hoc committee which would write a report detailing how the Assembly could create a judicial body to potentially establish a more just and fair process for reviewing certain Student Assembly policies by ensuring greater independence in the review process, thereby reducing the potential for conflicts of interest. This process is ongoing.

Resolution 19 - A Response to Recent Instances of Anti-LGBTQ Bullying

As a result of anti-LGBTQ bullying incidents around the United States, the Assembly passed Resolution 19 stating that the Student Assembly strongly condemns bullying of any individual or group for any reason, and specifically on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. The Resolution also urged the President of Cornell University to publicly affirm Cornell’s commitment to combating bullying and promoting an open and caring community at Cornell.

President Skorton affirmed his commitment in his written response to the resolution.

Resolution 25 - Mandating Soap in Dorm Bathrooms

This resolution requested that soap dispensers be placed in every University dorm and that housing officials regularly check that the dispensers are full. President Skorton responded that due to budget and staff constraints, University Housing is unable to accommodate the request.

Resolution 38 - Approving Non-Discrimination Clauses, Part I

Following up on a resolution passed by the 2009-2010 Assembly, the current Assembly approved the addition of non-discrimination clauses in all byline-funded student organizations. The non-discrimination clauses were largely a result of the debate surrounding the 2009-2010 Assembly Resolution #44.

Resolution 39 - Call For All Students to Boycott CollegeACB.com and Similar Gossip Websites

The Student Assembly called upon all students to boycott CollegeACB.com and any similar site that induces students to engage in defamatory gossip, and to refrain from accessing and posting on these websites in order to live up to our values as citizens of the Cornell community in this “Sense of Body” resolution.

Resolution 41 - Approval of the Spring 2010 Election Rules

After a very lengthy and thorough process, the Assembly decided to maintain the direct election of the President and Executive Vice President without the use of slates or tickets. The resolution also removed restrictions on electronic communications and changed the number of signatures certain candidates need to acquire to run in the elections.

Resolution 42 - Creation of a New Service Learning Cooperative

In response to a request by members of a Housing Cooperative, the Assembly passed this resolution and its accompanying report urging the administration to review the process and potential for bringing a new Housing Cooperative to campus. This process is still ongoing.

Resolution 46 - Student Bill of Rights Ad-Hoc Committee

The Assembly created an ad-hoc committee to explore and potentially write a “Student Bill of Rights”. This process is ongoing.

Resolution 47 - A Response to Recent Instances of Violence Against Women

This Sense of Body Resolution states that the Student Assembly strongly condemns violence of any sort, targeted at any individual or group for any reason, and specifically violence against women and sexual assault. The Resolution also urged the administration of Cornell University to look at implementing innovative means of preventing sexual assaults on campus and greatly improve the enforcement mechanisms charged with handling such issues, including the Office of the Judicial Administrator and the University Hearing Board.

Resolution 48 - SAFC Guideline Changes

As occurs every semester, the Assembly reviewed and approved changes requested by the SAFC Commissioners to the SAFC Funding Guidelines.

Resolution 49 - SAFC New Commissioners

As occurs every semester, the Assembly reviewed and approved the appointment of new SAFC Commissioners.

Appendix A-

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee Examining the Student Assembly Finance Commission Funding Process for Independent Student Organizations

I Executive Summary

The Committee was charged to identify ways in which the allocation process of the Student Assembly Finance Commission (the Commission) could be restructured to ease organizations' access to funds. The Committee identified several aspects of the allocation process that affect the organizations' experience and evaluated several alternative practices for each aspect, considering impacts on several key factors.

The Committee recommends the following permanent changes:

1. *Year long budget period.* Unspent funds allocated in the fall semester should no longer revert at the end of the semester; rather, the funds will continue to be available to the organization in the spring. Allocations will be capped on a per-year rather than per semester basis. An organization that receives adequate funds for the full year in the fall semester thusly would not have to apply again in the spring for additional funds. Organizations that receive allocations in the fall semester would also have the opportunity to apply for additional funds in the spring, if needed.
2. *Opportunity in the spring to apply for a budget for the next year.* Organizations could request a budget for the following academic year during the spring semester of the current academic year. This would allow such a group to secure funding for events that occur early in the fall semester.
3. *Unlimited "Special Project Requests".* Organizations could request an unlimited number of special projects. Special Project Requests would be exclusively limited to situations where organizations have new or changed circumstances (e.g. qualifying for a tournament or cancellation of a speaker).
4. *Reduced supporting documentation requirements submitted online.* Organizations would only be required to submit proof of contact for speakers and proof of room reservation for local events. Such documentation would have to be scanned/pdf'd and attached to the online application.
5. *Brief activity report required to be submitted online after each funded activity is completed.* Organizations should submit brief reports regarding local events, travel events, and publications supported by the Commission through an online form. A report would collect information about the nature of the activity, number of participants, and other metrics relevant to the Commission or the Assembly.

The Committee further recommends the following changes be implemented on an experimental basis to evaluate their suitability for permanent implementation:

1. *Changes to nature and timing of the allocation hearings.* Organizations will receive preliminary releases of their allocations prior to the opportunity for hearing and may bring additional information, including supporting documents, to the hearing if they request a hearing. This change

will reduce the number of hearings that need to occur and make those hearings that do occur a more effective opportunity for organizations to obtain an adequate allocation without need to appeal to the Assembly.

2. *Second opportunity for initial budget application mid-semester.* Organizations which have not already applied for an initial budget may submit such requests at a new opportunity in the middle of the semester.

These changes would be implemented through amendment of the Commission's Funding Guidelines and would be put into effect for the 2011-2012 academic year.

II Background

The mission of the Student Assembly Finance Commission (the Commission) is stated in its charter as follows:

The Student Assembly Finance Commission is a committee established by the Student Assembly (SA) to:

- promote the participation of Cornell undergraduates in decision making within the University,
- insure student control of the undergraduate activities funding,
- interpret and implement the funding criteria approved by the SA,
- allocate student activity funds,
- interpret policy, and
- assist the SA with related functions concerning student organization funding.

The Ad Hoc Committee Examining the Student Assembly Finance Commission Funding Process for Independent Student Organizations (the Committee) was established by Student Assembly Resolution 7, which charged the Committee to “present a recommendation on how the SAFC funding process can be improved by [Thursday, November 18]”. The principle goal articulated for the Committee was to determine “the process to access Fee money be made easier”.

To that end, the Committee has prepared this report, identifying issues and alternative courses of action related to each. For each alternative considered, the commission considers impact on several relevant factors to inform its decision about which to pursue.

The Committee intends that this report and its recommendations be circulated amongst the student body for comment and further refined before the courses of action recommended are finalized.

III Stakeholders

The Committee identified the following stakeholders, who should be consulted before any final policy proposal is advanced:

1. officers and advisors of registered student organizations eligible for commission funding,
2. members of the commission,
3. staff of the office,
4. staff of the SAO, and
5. Dean of Students office.

IV Relevant Factors

For each alternative solution considered to the following interests are weighed:

1. impact on ease of attainment and utilization of commission funds for organizations,
2. ability to assure responsible and effective use of funds,
3. ability of office to support and impact on office resources,
4. ability of commission to support and impact on commission resources, and
5. conditions and restrictions imposed by institutional policies, legal requirements, and best practices.

V Key Recommendations

The Committee recommends the following course of action:

1. a year long budget period,
2. three opportunities to request initial budget, including one before start of budget period,
3. one unqualified opportunity (“second chance”) to adjust a budget each semester after the initial allocation,
4. unlimited qualified opportunities (“Special Project Requests”),
5. fewer prospective (“look forward”) requirements submitted online only,
6. brief retrospective (“look forward”) reporting requirements for activities,
7. hearings held after preliminary allocation release and with ability to submit new documentation.

VI Definitions

Activity: A local event, travel event or publication within the meaning of the commission's funding guidelines.

Allocation: An act by the commission of appropriating funds to a budget for an organization. Each allocation consists of a budget and a rationale explaining the basis for that budget in the commission's funding guidelines.

Budget: An appropriation of funds to an organization consisting of amounts approved for each expense category provided by the commission a budget period in which expenses are allowed.

Budget adjustment: Modification of an existing budget by the commission, including adding funds, reducing funds, or redistributing funds among expense categories within the budget.

Budget period: The period of time in which funds allocated to a budget may be spent. Funds remaining unspent at the end of this period revert to the commission and cease to be property of the organization.

Commission: The Student Assembly Finance Commission

Expense category: A classification of allocated funds associated with particular conditions in the commission funding guidelines

Independent organization: A student organization that registers with the SAO in an “independent” status. Such organizations are considered independent of the university and subject to different privileges and restrictions compared with university organizations.

Office: The Office of the Assemblies.

Purchase order: A contract in which one organization prospectively agrees to pay a vendor for certain services.

University organization: A student organization that registers with the SAO in a “university” status. Such organizations are considered part of the university and have an advisor who assumes responsibility for their operations as part of his or her employment in the university.

UUP: Use of university property policy, which requires that on campus events with certain attributes must be approved by several university departments. Organizers of events meeting such criteria must seek approval through an online form managed by the SAO.

Year: Unless otherwise stated, a “year” in this document is one academic year running from the first day of classes in the fall semester until the last day of classes in the spring semester.

VII Issues and Alternatives

1 Duration and number of budget periods per academic year

The question in this section is what should be the lifetime of allocations once they are made.

1.A One budget period per semester (current practice)

Allocations revert at the end of each semester, so the lifetime is from allocation until the end of the semester.

Other alternatives are assessed compared with this baseline.

1.B One budget period per year (recommended)

Allocations revert at the end of the academic year. Unspent allocations from the fall semester, would thus remain available to an organization to spend in the spring semester.

1. A single budget period would decrease the workload and responsibilities of most organizations by requiring only one application to secure funds per year. It would, however, require greater preparation on the part of organizations as they would have to have a complete budget plan for a full academic year rather than a semester. Whether on the balance this would ease the burden on groups depends upon the level of detail and supporting documentation required and the opportunity for later adjustment of budgets.

2. No significant impact.

3. Would significantly reduce workload of office by eliminating roughly halving the number requests processed.

4. Would significantly reduce workload of commission by eliminating roughly halving the number requests processed.

5. Would bring organization practices more into conformity with university practice of annual budgeting.

2 Number and timing of opportunities to request an initial budget

The question in this section is how many opportunities should be provided to organizations to request an initial allocation.

2.A One opportunity per semester (current practice)

Organizations receive one opportunity per semester to request an initial budget. Other alternatives are assessed compared with this baseline.

2.B Two opportunities, one before the budget period starts and one starting after

In addition to applying after a budget period has started, organizations could apply prior to the start of each budget period.

1. This approach would enable organizations to secure funding for events that occur early in fall semester, which is not possible under Alternative A.

2. No significant impact.

3. Spreading a fixed number of requests across multiple deadlines would spread out the associated work for the office, reducing acute workload but not overall workload.

4. Spreading a fixed number of requests across multiple deadlines would spread out the associated work for the commission, reducing acute workload but not overall workload.

5. Would serve institutional interest in supporting student programming throughout the academic year, including at the start.

2.C Three opportunities, including one before the budget period starts (recommended)

In addition to applying after a budget period has started, organizations could apply prior to the start of each budget period. An additional opportunity would be provided in the middle of each semester for organizations that have not applied for an initial budget in either of the previous opportunities.

1. This approach would enable organizations to secure funding for events that occur early in fall semester, which is not possible under Alternative A. It would provide greater flexibility in timing of submission compared with Alternative B.

2. No significant impact.

3. Spreading a fixed number of requests across multiple deadlines would spread out the associated work for the office, reducing acute workload but not overall workload. Relatively greater number of deadlines could generate some more administrative burden compared with Alternative B.

4. Spreading a fixed number of requests across multiple deadlines would spread out the associated work for the commission, reducing acute workload but not overall workload. Relatively greater number of deadlines could increase administrative burden compared with Alternative B.

5. Would serve institutional interest in supporting student programming throughout the academic year, including at the start.

3 Number of unqualified opportunities (“second chances”) to adjust an existing budget

The question addressed in this section is whether to offer a second chance to organizations to adjust their allocation if the first proves to be inadequate. Such opportunities differ from “Special Project Requests” and other qualified opportunities in that they do not impose requirements any different from the initial allocation process.

3.A None (current practice)

The commission provides for adjustment of budgets through Special Project Requests only under limited criteria. No unqualified “second chance” exists for organizations that miss the first opportunity or receive an inadequate allocation because of lack of details. This is the baseline for comparison with other alternatives.

3.B One per semester (recommended)

Regardless of the length of the budget periods, organizations would have one unqualified opportunity to adjust budgets each semester.

1. Offering a true second chance to organizations would provide substantial flexibility that acknowledges organizations may be unable to plan expenses that occur later in sufficient detail for requests at or before the start of the semester.
2. No significant impact.
3. Would increase workload of office depending on extent of utilization by organizations.
4. Would increase workload of commission depending on extent of utilization by organizations.
5. No significant impact.

4 Number of qualified opportunities (“Special Project Requests”) to adjust an existing budget

Special Project Requests are currently allowed when an organization has new circumstances or new local or travel events it did not anticipate in its original budget. All alternatives below assume that regardless of procedures for the regular budget, special project requests will be limited to local and travel events, allowed only in the event of new circumstances, and require an organization to have a specific event in mind.

4.A One per semester (current practice)

Organizations may request one special project per semester. This is the baseline against which alternatives are assessed.

4.B Unlimited number (recommended)

Organizations may submit as many special project requests as needed over the course of the budget period.

1. Would provide additional opportunities for organizations to receive funding any time circumstances change.
2. No significant impact.
3. Office would have some additional burden to the extent more special project requests are submitted. This could be offset by having sufficient flexibility in the regular budget process that organizations seldom feel the need to submit a special project request.
4. Commission would have some additional burden to the extent more special project requests are submitted. This could be offset by having sufficient flexibility in the regular budget process that organizations seldom feel the need to submit a special project request.
5. No significant impact.

5 Prospective (look forward) documentation requirements

The question in this section is what documentation requirements should be required before the commission allocates funds for organizations. This is distinct from questions of what

documentation are required to authorize payment, which arise mostly from university audit policies, and questions of what documentation should be required after events, which are of a different nature and addressed in a different section.

5.A Extensive prospective requirements, no retrospective requirements current practice)

Some of the current documents required to be submitted with a request for funding include: proof of travel event, proof of venue reservation for local event, proof of contact for speaker or performer, travel mileage, and price quotes for any durable good or contracted service. Significant specific detail is required in application, including number of copies where copying or printing is desired, nights of lodging, mileage, etc. for each activity supported. This is the baseline against which other alternatives are evaluated.

5.B No prospective requirements

Organizations would not be required to submit any prospective supporting documentation. Instead allocations would be based in part on prior-year budgets, prior-year spending, and certain details provided by the organization only to the extent that the new request differs from what was received in the previous year.

1. This alternative would eliminate the chief obstacle to allocating budgets. It would substantially reduce work required to prepare requests and the likelihood of those requests being funded. Many of the required details are difficult to obtain far in advance of activities, hindering many organizations from requesting funds for events on a longer timeframe than a few weeks in some cases and a semester in most cases.

2. Prospective documentation requirements are intended to assure funding has been granted for expenses that are likely to actually occur. In reality, roughly 25% of allocated funds are never spent even with the rigorous documentation requirements currently in place, casting doubt on the effectiveness of such requirements. Furthermore, regardless of documentation submitted at allocation time, effectively all of the same documentation is required again when the organization seeks reimbursement or payment of actual expenses. The requirements also have worked against accountability goals because commissioners, in the torrent of allocating activity, sometimes approve allocations that should be rejected at expense time. This sets up a conflict between the organization and the office at payment time because the office is sometimes compelled to approve an expense it would have rejected solely because the expenses was mistakenly approved at allocation time. On the balance, therefore, elimination of such requirements would have little impact on overall accountability and could even improve accountability overall.

3. This alternative would relieve the office both of the work associated with processing and filing such information and of the liability for loss of documents.

4. By extricating the commission from applying detailed formulas at the allocation stage, the workload could be significantly reduced. This would allow the commission to focus on more substantive criteria.

5. No significant impact.

5.C Fewer prospective requirements submitted online only (recommended)

Proof of activity (i.e. proof of speaker contact, venue reservation, proof of travel event, and/or sample copy of publication) would be required, but other documentation such as price and service quotes could generally be omitted. Such requirements would be scanned and submitted as an electronic attachment to the online budget request.

1. Online submission of documentation would save organizations a trip to the office and assure that documentation is not lost or misplaced in handling. Fewer requirements could simplify process for organizations. At the same time, requiring activity specifics will continue to prevent many organizations from submitting complete requests on an annual timeline or even a semester timeline.

2. No significant impact.

3. Electronic submission would reduce office work associated with receiving and sorting submitted documents.

4. Fewer requirements would reduce commission work associated with review of remaining required documents.

5. No significant impact.

6 Retrospective (look back) documentation requirements

The question in this section is what documentation the Commission should require organizations to submit after each supported activity. This is distinct from any requirements for authorization of payment, which are based primarily on university audit rules and outside the scope of this report.

6.A No retrospective requirements (current practice)

The commission does not consider past performance of an organization in determining what funds it is eligible for. This is the baseline against which alternatives would be measured.

6.B Retrospective reporting on activities through online form (recommended)

Organizations must submit a brief report on each activity for which commission funds were used, identifying objective details such as: number of participants, number of undergraduate participants, location, description of event, purpose of event, whether UUP was required and, if required, filed. While such details would be self-reported, the SAFC might implement an audit policy where commissioners would randomly select some activities for scrutiny and might ask organizations to document certain details (for example a guest book or trip roster for verifying number of undergraduate participants). Requirements would be directly related to commission allocation criteria and reporting needs.

1. This would be a new obligation for organizations, but a more practical one than current prospective requirements. If combined with elimination or significant reduction of prospective requirements, it would represent a significantly reduced obligation for the organizations.
2. Retrospective documentation requirements, by contrast, pertain to events that already happened for which accurate details are possible to obtain. Furthermore, the organization can submit them over time and without having to assemble all the information in the same period it is struggling to assemble its funding application. Such documents provide more accurate and helpful information for assuring responsible use than do prospective documents.
3. With a relatively simple online reporting form, the additional responsibility for the office would be minimal.
4. With a relatively simple online reporting form, collection of information would impose very little work on the commission per se. However, verification of self-reported details through audits would be a substantial commitment. Combined with elimination or substantial reduction of prospective reporting requirements, this could consume roughly the same amount of commissioner time but spread it over a longer interval that allows more schedule flexibility to commissioners.
5. University practices increasingly emphasize metrics. Being able to quantify the commission's impact on actual activities would benefit overall understanding of its impact on student life.

7 Timing and procedures of hearings

This section addresses questions about when hearings should occur and how they should be structured procedurally. This question only addresses those hearings conducted by the Commission as part of the allocation process. The procedures of the Assembly related to the appeal process are outside the scope of this report.

7.A Before allocation is issued, no new information admitted (current practice)

Any organization requesting \$500 or more may have a hearing. Such hearings are held before any decision is rendered and do not permit the organization to submit any new information. This is the baseline against which other alternatives are evaluated.

7.B Hearing is held after preliminary allocation and rationale are released, new information allowed (recommended)

Initial release of allocations would be preliminary. Organizations would have an opportunity to request a hearing after allocations are released to permit them to request adjustment by challenging the rationale for the preliminary allocation and/or presenting additional information.

1. Changing hearings to occur after a preliminary decision is rendered offers two benefits to organizations: they need not request a hearing if they are satisfied by the preliminary decision, and they have a specific rationale and decision to confront during the hearing if they choose to have one. The absence of this information in the current timing of hearings greatly limits their substantive benefits. Allowing presentation of additional information at a hearing offers an opportunity for

expeditious resolution of documentation or detail issues that would otherwise require the organization to pursue less suitable and more cumbersome routes to funding (appeals, special projects, or seeking alternative funding sources).

2. No significant impact.

3. Fewer hearings would mean less work for the office.

4. Fewer hearings would mean less work for the commission. Allowing submission of supporting documents would enable expeditious resolution of situations that might otherwise resolve through cumbersome appeals or additional funding requests.

5. Allowing a hearing after preliminary decision provides a fairer process where an organization can respond to a specific rationale.



Late Night Programming Ad Hoc Committee Report

*Vincent Andrews, Student Assembly President
Finance*

Adam Nicoletti, Student Assembly VP

*Natalie Raps, Student Assembly VP Public Relations
President-Elect*

Dan Freshman, Interfraternity Council

Cameron Breen, Cornell University Program Board Chair

Asa Craig, Student Trustee

Annabel Fowler, 2012 Class Councils President

Mike Katz, 2011 Class Councils President

*Kyle Scott, Committee on Campus Life Chair
Programming Director*

Lauren Ritter, Student Union Board

*Dan Cahalane, Cornell Concert Commission Finance Director
Board Chair*

Katie Mehary, Cornell University Program

Executive Summary

The committee cites the lack of an appropriate venue that allows student-led late night programming as one of the largest impediments to on-campus programming. The committee recommends that appropriate steps be taken to create a venue with consistent hours of operation, especially during late night hours, and offers an assortment of food and drinks.

Historically, there has been a prominent location for students of all classes to gather socially on campus. The committee would like to encourage an atmosphere of on-campus late night programming. We believe a well-operated venue would be highly profitable and popular with students.

This venue can be created through the partnership of a byline-funded organization and Cornell Dining that would build upon a pre-existing relationship. An existing student-run byline-funded organization should be responsible for determining and coordinating the programming as well as governing its use. Dining would ensure the space was properly run and financially self-sufficient with a contractual agreement to allow student to program events in the space.

Finally, it is a firm belief within the committee that, to ensure the consistent interaction of upperclassmen and underclassmen, alcoholic beverages should be served at this venue. This would attract older students who would otherwise have little incentive to travel back to campus and would create a fun, safe environment for students of all different classes to meet.

Overall, this venue would serve to strengthen the ties between Cornell students, offer a safe, controlled late night environment, and encourage programmatic collaboration between student leaders.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
I. Venue – Structure & Location.....	4
II. Attraction.....	5
III. Programming.....	7
IV. Stakeholder Responsibilities.....	9
V. Conclusion.....	10
Appendix A – Potential Venue Locations.....	11

Introduction

The Student Assembly Late Night Programming Ad Hoc Committee was established through Resolution 18 to report how Cornell University can create “late night programming” which appeals to all students. Due to recent campus discussions centered on the Greek System at Cornell, it has become apparent to student leaders that more “non-exclusive” late night programming should occur at Cornell.

During the first meeting of the committee, student organization leaders cited the lack of an appropriate and available venue on campus to organize programming was the single largest impediment to programming. Many felt that existing venues on campus were either not available at late night hours or were not attractive to the average undergraduate student who might prefer a more party-like atmosphere.

To accomplish this task, the Committee divided itself into three subcommittees: venue, programming, and attraction. The venue subcommittee was charged to investigate needs for a potential location. The Attraction subcommittee attempted to determine how to attract students from all parts of campus and the Programming subcommittee looked at what type of programming could occur at such a venue. This document is written in accordance with the structure of the Committee.

I. Venue – Structure & Location

The success of any late night programming venture on Cornell's campus revolves around the dedication of a space for programming to occur. The dedication of such a space could occur through the partnership of a byline-funded student organization with Cornell Dining. Cornell Dining locations are financially self-sufficient entities that are already considered social venues by students. Allowing a byline-funded organization to program in the space would enhance both the financial viability of the dining location through increased student attendance (and in turn greater food revenue) through the creation of popular programming that could be paid for with SAF money.

Non-Location Specific Location Criteria

Whatever space is allocated for late night programming use, the committee determined that it must contain the following amenities, must have certain space and layout criteria and must be open for the specified hours.

Permanent Structures

- Serving Station for food and drink concessions
- Raised Stage
- Sound System
 - With a sound board for multiple uses, such as Karaoke
- Projector for media, broadcasts, presentations, etc.
- Televisions to show sporting events

Space Layout

- Easily accessible from ground levels
- Convenient bathrooms
- Capacity of at least 150 people

Hours

- Consistently open 7 days per week
- Consistently open during late night hours
 - Sunday through Wednesday from 4pm-11pm
 - Thursday through Saturday from 4pm-3am.
- Consistent space for people to eat and drink around tables, thus evening events/programming shouldn't completely take over the space
- The venue should stay open late to conform with the social hours of students
 - One comparable campus structure is Bear Necessities. There exists no comparable campus late night eatery for students living outside North Campus that satisfies needs of West Campus and Collegetown.

II. Attraction

Whatever late night programming space is chosen, the venue must remain an attractive and accessible locale for all Cornell students. The venue must offer prospects that are universally appealing to the greater Cornell community, and it must offer adjoining prospects that remain separately appealing to the different demographics and constituents of the student body as well. These constituencies include, but are not limited to:

- Freshman, sophomore, junior and senior undergraduate classes
- Greek system
- Multicultural community
- Transfer student community
- Student-athlete community
- Campus clubs and registered student organizations

If these groups sustain a vested interest in the venue, we are confident that the venue will offer a robust variety of programming and student representation. Only with these qualities do we truly believe this venue can remain a sustainable concept and a permanent fixture at Cornell. We believe that the existence of an accessible campus venue would eliminate many of the logistical obstacles these groups encounter to hold late night programming. As a result, we cite several programming events held by various student constituencies as proof of the need for a campus venue.

Events by Greek and Independent Organizations

Greeks and Independent Organizations would be able to benefit directly from a campus pub. Many of the events they throw have to be outsourced to locations off-campus.

- Keep venue very cheap (or free) to rent out to campus organizations or societies that may be used for philanthropy or other fundraising events
 - Provides venue for Class Council, greek organizations, or any other organization on campus that want to hold bar events
- Live bands
 - Comparable campus structure: Thumpty Music. The Theta Delta Chi fraternity often holds dry concert events at their fraternity house on University Avenue, with proceeds often going towards charity. Other fraternities and organizations who rent fraternity houses have expressed interest in holding similar events, but few have access to an affordable venue space that is large enough to hold such an event.
- Greek social events
 - Comparable campus structure: sorority “crush” parties. Every semester, each Panhellenic sorority usually hosts a large social event at a third-party venue. Several hundred invitations are usually sent to Cornell students. All invited students are permitted to enter, but only 21-year-olds are served at cash bars.
- Can be used by any of the University or Independent Registered Student Organization (of which they are over 800) as a space that may be used for recruitment and social events

- Can be used for class events such as Zink’s nights, prelim pick-me-ups, receptions and events that students from all classes can participate in
- Can be used for Fraternity and Sorority recruitment events in the Fall Semester
- The venue can be a sufficient locale for system-wide Greek events that embody values-based recruitment. Potential programming events would include the Fall Recruitment Weekend and Greek Week.
- Can be used for MGLC intake interest events in the Fall and Spring Semesters, eliminating the liability and logistics associated with MGLC organizations renting out fraternity residences for philanthropic and social events.
 - Surfacing events are often significant and meaningful moments for each MGLC chapter’s latest line class. Having these events in a public setting has often posed a challenge to MGLC chapters. A neutral hosting venue would eliminate many of these challenges.

Food & Alcohol

- Drink and food prices should remain relatively low in order to compete with Collegetown prices.
- Non-alcoholic purchases should be BRB-accessible.
- The venue should operate as an over/under establishment (18 to enter, 21 to drink) to appeal to upperclassmen that would otherwise socialize in a Collegetown bar. This will ensure that the venue appeals to all age groups on campus.
 - One comparable campus structure is Junior/Senior Class Bar Nights. These events are well-attended by upperclassmen students, primarily because they allow 18 to 21-year-old students to socialize at a neutral venue. Currently, no on-campus or off-campus venue allows students to consistently socialize in such a fashion at a neutral location during the evening.

Safety & Security

- The venue should provide easier, safer access to the campus social scene without having to travel to Collegetown.
- This venue should only be open to students with or students accompanied by a student with a valid Cornell ID during late night hours.

Implementing these recommendations will ensure a feeling of non-exclusivity and provide a consistent social experience. Such a venue also satisfies the universal and consistent need for a late night venue on any given night for all students and it can also appeal to specific groups on campus if necessary, Greek organizations are highlighted below.

III. Programming

Based on the wide variety of interests among members of the Cornell community, we believe that with an array of programs, the venue will be an appealing place to go for underclassmen as well as upperclassmen.

For programming to be successful the campus venue should be open 7 nights a week with specific programming occurring on Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays. On these nights, the programming would be organized by a student organization. On Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday nights, the venue can be used as a late night dining hall and pub. Additionally, it would be a place that campus groups and Greek houses can reserve for charity events, programs with guest speakers, and social events.

In order for this venture to succeed, it is important that it attract a large number of Cornell students. As the focus of this initiative is to provide a safe and fun environment for a large cross-section of Cornell students to hang out at on the weekends, we propose the following programming ideas for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights:

Thursday Night – *A laid-back and relaxing type of programming for students including:*

- Jazz and acoustic music performances
- Trivia nights
- Open mic night
- Stand-up comedy

Friday Night – *We intend to have an atmosphere similar to that of a typical college social event with music and specific areas designated for dancing. Suggested programming would include:*

- Karaoke
- DJ mixing and live music

Saturday Night – *The bars in Collegetown do not have drink specials on the weekends. To attract upperclassmen on Saturday night:*

- Drink specials for those over 21
- DJ mixing and live music for students over 21 and under 21 to enjoy

Larger Events

Each month there should also be at least one night dedicated to a large-scale event that would be funded with money co-sponsored by larger budget organizations. Byline-funded organizations like Cornell Concert Commission and Cornell University Program Board would have the financial means to contribute to larger-scale programs. To ensure co-sponsorships occur the SA could amend the Appendix B SAF Funding Guidelines. These events could include:

- Small band performances
- Comedians
- Slam poetry nights
- Casino nights

Initial Opening

In order to advertise the campus pub and get students excited about it, we propose having a opening celebration on the first weekend when the venue initially opens. Coupled with drink specials for those of age, we propose three multiple nights of heavy programming, perhaps including a comedian and band, to be funded through co-sponsorships with byline-funded organizations and the SA.

IV. Stakeholder Responsibilities

The recommendations above can be achieved through the partnership of Cornell Dining with a byline-funded organization. Cornell Dining would manage the space on a financial and staffing standpoint while a student run, byline-funded organization would manage the programming of the space.

Cornell Dining Responsibilities

- Operate all institutional contracts and requirements of physical space
- Production and sale of food and drinks
- Manage staffing necessary for
 - Food production and sale
 - Janitorial needs
- Generally runs all aspects associated with a dining space

Byline-funded Organization Responsibilities

- Manages programming which occurs at space
 - Use SAF allocation used to pay to bring artists/acts/activities
 - Manages organizations who may wish to rent out the space and has to authority to weigh which types of events help accomplishes the space's mission.

The goal of this partnership is to create a financially sustainable venue for Cornell Dining which satisfies the late night programming needs of students. The programming, paid for through an SAF allocation, will attract students who in-turn purchase food and drinks, which in turn cover all cost (and perhaps produce a profit) for Cornell Dining.

V. Conclusion

As a result of its discussions, the committee cites the lack of an appropriate venue for late night programming as one of the most important issues to address. The committee recommends that appropriate steps be taken to set up a space on campus that will be attractive to a broad range of students for a diverse array of programming. Such a venue would need to have consistent hours of operation, especially during late night hours, and offer an assortment of food and drinks. This proposal would also allow students to socialize in a safe environment and keep them on campus.

It is a firm belief within the committee that for the consistent mixing of upperclassmen and underclassmen, alcoholic beverages should be served at this venue to attract those older students that would otherwise have little incentive to travel back to campus. Furthermore, we feel that a fun, safe environment for students of all different classes to meet each other would be a positive force at Cornell.

Most importantly, the space should be dedicated to programming organized by student groups and these organizations should be able to rent the venue for specified amounts of time. An existing student-run byline-funded organization should be responsible for determining and coordinating the programming as well as governing its use.

Finally, this venue could be created through the partnership of a byline-funded organization and Cornell Dining that would continue to foster an important partnership. The committee believes that for such a space to be successful there needs to be shared responsibility between Dining and student leaders for its upkeep and operation. Dining would ensure the space was properly run and financially self-sufficient with a contractual agreement allowing student groups to run events in the space.

Overall, this venue would serve to strengthen the ties between Cornell students, offer a safe, controlled late night environment, and encourage programmatic collaboration between student leaders.

Appendix A – Potential Venue Locations

Ceramics Studio, Willard Straight Hall	
Pros	Cons
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the Student Union, Ceramics Studio <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Non-academic building <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Noise and student traffic will not effect any other organizations b. Late night programming experience helps to fulfill the mission of the building c. Has an established student programming board in SUB (Student Union Board) 2. Ceramics Studio a very large space, with multiple levels <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If converted, could have a large outdoor terrace b. Room for a dining establishment as well as a dance space 3. Separate entrance, so that Willard Straight Hall could close and the venue could remain open. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enormous capital investment needed to renovate the ceramics studio into a usable space. 2. Even if the capital could be found, it would take a long time before the space could become usable. 3. May face pressure from students who currently use the ceramics studio 4. Cornell Dining already operates 3 eateries in Willard Straight Hall (Okenshields, Ivy Room, Cascadeli)

One World Café, Annabel Taylor Hall	
Pros	Cons
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stage and lighting already present 2. Dining options already exist 3. non-academic building 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not a very large space 2. Surrounding offices may be disturbed by increased student traffic 3. Location restrictions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No close ground floor entrance, hard to get to b. No patio options c. Building designated for religious purposes

Hughes Dining, Law School	
Pros	Cons

<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Full kitchen present for Dining's use2. Large space with room for stage and sound system, as well as dance and table space3. Potential for lots of outdoor seating4. Lots of windows open to beautiful gorge-side atmosphere5. Proximity to Collegetown makes it a viable option for lazy upperclassmen6. Satisfies the late night-dining need for students in C-town, and students walking back from campus late at night	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Located in a graduate, academic building and noise may disturb building occupants
--	--