I. Call to order at 8:30 pm
II. Roll Call: Dani and Brian are absent due to an Econ exam; Ricardo, Michael, Sam Vitello, and Chris Lord are also absent.
III. President’s Welcome: Derek welcomes the assembly to their first meeting of the semester [it’s about time...!]! He also wants to extend a special welcome to the “newbies” [does this classify has hazing?]. He starts with an introduction as to what the BSG’s role is on Bowdoin’s campus. He says that we are here to represent the students’ interests and present them to the administration. He says that it’s also the BSG’s job to communicate administrative practices to the students. Finally, he reminds everyone that where ever they are, they should be listening for student suggestions and bringing them up at meetings in order to help find a person to get these new initiatives done.

Tonight, we are going to start off with the guests from the Judicial Board (J-Board) and the Sexual Assault and Misconduct Board (SAMB). They recently put a report out, and Dean Laura Lee, Dean Meadow Davis, and head of the J-Board RJ Shea are available for questioning. Derek emphasizes that this is the BSG’s time to get to know about the J-Board’s process.

IV. Public Comment Time
V. Guests
a. Dean Lee and RJ Shea ’12 from the Judicial Board
   • RJ kicks things off by stating that students who appear before the board are those who have been accused of alleged violations of the social and academic honor codes. The reason for the publishing of these reports is to inform the student body of the type of cases that make it before the J-Board in order to demonstrate Bowdoin’s community standards. All-in-all last year, the J-Board heard fifteen cases. Of those fifteen, seven were due to violations of the social code, and there was one case heard by the SAMB. Of the eight academic violations, only one was found not-responsible. In the remainder for the remaining seven cases, the J-Board followed the precedent for plagiarism – that is an F in the course and a one-semester suspension. RJ cautions that not all cases are the same, and that punishments range from a judicial reprimand to a two year suspension. Of the seven social code cases, two were found not responsible. The disciplinary actions given to the remaining five included social probation, counseling, written apologies, and suspension, all of which were in line with previous precedent. RJ finishes up his summary, stating that any questions about the process of the J-Board can be directed to either him or Dean Lee, but any questions about SAMB should be directed to Meadow.
   • Derek opens the floor to questions concerning the J-Board.
   • Dean Lee throws out a disclaimer, saying that they cannot answer questions on specific cases (due to confidentiality), but can answer any questions on process and cases in general.
Derek begins with a question on trends of cases coming to the J-Board. He asks if there is any major shift in trends of type of cases coming before the J-Board, as in is there an indicator of “where Bowdoin is headed?”

Dean Lee says she doesn’t think so. She says that the ratio of social-to-academic cases flip-flops from year to year and doesn’t see to follow any discernible trend. She does note that, over time, there has been an increased use of internet-involved academic cases, but that’s to be expected with the advent and prevalence of computer-based technology.

RJ throws in his two-cents saying that there has been no real trend since he’s been on J-Board. He also notes how cases vary. For example, some academic cases are black-and-white (either by the accused’s confession or by obvious facts), and there are some similar cases that fall into a grey area of students maintaining innocence and the J-Board must determine the correct sanction. He adds that, in terms of social cases, every case is unique in its own sense.

Jordan wonders if there are times of the year where students are more prone to commit acts that are against the academic and social honor codes – i.e. during midterms and finals or in the beginning of the year.

Dean Lee confirms that there is a tendency for one or two academic cases to be brought up during the finals period. As for the rest of the year, academic assignments tend to be more spread out, and thus there doesn’t seem to be a clustering effect.

Jordan asks a follow-up question: he wonders whether the J-Board has ever had two cases at once, or what is the general level of proximity of cases.

Dean Lee admits that a couple of cases have been very close, with one case following right on the heels of another. Last year, she said, there was not a single case until December (evidence of a “dry spell” or long lull). It really depends.

Chase inquires as to the fact finding process. He asks if there is a witness for and against students brought before the J-Board and what the judging process is.

RJ says that in social cases, randy Nichols does investigating on behalf of the complainant and also sits in on the complainant’s behalf. In academic cases, the professor accusing the student presents the evidence, usually shown to Dean Lee before the case. In either case, the student is “read their rights” (so to speak). Overall, the board does no fact-finding in and of itself.

Dean Lee adds that when a student is assaulted, it is not the student him/herself who brings the case, though he/she is involved as a witness. The J-Board itself “investigates” by questioning during the hearing.

Anirudh hears that every year, someone who has gone through the J-Board process tends to want to give a forum on his/her experiences with the J-Board and give a talk on “don’t make the same mistakes I’ve made” type of deal. He wonders if anything like that is currently in the works.

Dean Lee says that’s been a suggestion in the past, and that it’d be something very interesting and instructive. She says that there was a student who had expressed interest in doing something like that, but it was difficult to find a venue (i.e. the how and when) to hold such a discussion. In the end, the
student ended up changing his/her mind due to a lack of comfort with the situation, and thus far there have been no other offers.

- Allen wonders how our number of J-Board cases compares with the numbers of cases at our peer institutions.
- Dean Lee responds that not only does she have no idea, but that the data can be misleading due to the judicial set-up of each institution. For example, in Hamilton’s process, they have a new point system whereby a student could not go through the judicial process if he/she takes responsibility for his/her actions and accepts the sanction. Thus, this would not appear in the “number of J-Board cases” at Hamilton whereas it would if the case had been conducted at Bowdoin. She does say that the Dean there mentioned that there are maybe one or two board hearings per year, but they are also suspending six or seven students per year. Dean Lee concludes that judging based on the number of board hearings can thereby lead to inaccurate assumptions, since students can bypass the judicial system at some institutions.
- Tessa wonders if all cases are based off of solely precedent. She asks if the J-Board finds itself reverting to older cases often or if they are usually presented with cases that are unique and requires a new precedent to be set.
- RJ states that they always try to rely on precedent for consistency purposes. There are some cases, though, that precedent needs to be set, and in which case the J-Board determines the “correct” course of action through discussions and deliberations. He does say, however, if the presented case does fit into a “cookie-cutter mold,” that the J-Board sticks with what was previously done.
- Jack knows he’s about to touch on an “iffy” subject area, but he references the bias incidents last semester. He asks if the J-Board/Deans’ office is doing anything to attempt to rectify that and if they anticipate any changes in trends for the increased reporting of these incidents.
- Dean Lee says that, unfortunately, the J-Board cannot hear anonymous reporting of bias incidents — i.e. the J-Board cannot hear a case where no one has been accused of being guilty of committing the act. Many of the bias incident cases have, thus far, been “untraceable.” She does say, however, that when/if the party responsible is known, the case will indeed come before the J-Board.
- Seeing no more questions, Derek thanks the J-Board and moves onto the SAMB. He gives Dean Meadow Davis the floor.
- Meadow reports that in 2006, Bowdoin redid its sexual assault and misconduct policy pretty entirely (she adds the disclaimer that ‘06 was the first year she was here and she therefore was not involved in the rewriting process). During the rewrite, Bowdoin “officially” redefined the definitions of assault and misconduct, which stood with the College for the next five years. Since then, a number of cases have come through, and in fact, the number of cases has increased from prior to 2006. This spring, she says that the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education has issued a “Dear Polly” letter, basically telling every college what they were obliged to do with information surrounding sexual assaults. It stated that every institution has to have a
policy with clear guidelines, that was easy for people to find, and that had reasonable deadlines. It also stipulated that ResLifers, Security, and any other “resource” organization on campus had to engage in training surrounding sexual assault and misconduct awareness and prevention. In accordance with these guidelines, Bowdoin’s policy is in pretty good shape (having been based off of UVA’s policy), but some slight changes have been made. For example, Bowdoin has shifted its definitions ever so slightly. The sexual assault and misconduct policy is now considered to be the “sexual misconduct policy.” This reflects a change in process from the SAMB (now the SMB) once looking at assault and THEN misconduct to looking at misconduct, under which is a subsection definition of assault. For example, the SMB now will be looking for nonconsensual contact and then looking for nonconsensual intercourse instead of the other way around. The policy will also now cover sexual exploitation due to nationwide trends of an increase in transmission of sexual photos and videos via texting and internet publication. Additionally, Bowdoin’s old policy meant that there had to be an act of sexual misconduct, whereas now anything of a sexual nature is heard by the board. This also lead to a change in jurisdiction – formerly, the J-Board heard cases of harassment, but those cases will now be heard by the SMB. Some other changes that have been made were interim measures that can be instituted – like setting up class- and housing-accommodations in accordance with no-contact orders.

Meadow then explains who makes up the SMB. She says that they pull members from the J-Board who then receive additional training specifically for the SMB. When the cases are brought forward, one student from the J-Board, one faculty member from the J-Board, one Dean, and the head of the J-Board (RJ in this case) hear the case. There was already a case that was almost heard this year; however, the person accused accepted responsibility and so did not have to appear before the SMB.

- Derek opens the floor to questions.
- Anirudh asks Meadow to comment on the Speak About It program that is relatively new (it has been going on for about two or three years now). He knows that the program itself has helped ResLifers shape conversations on their First-Year floors, but he wonders if she could comment on how the show has been received campus wide or how it has affected other programs.
- Meadow agrees with Anirudh that Speak About It has shifted conversations on campus, and notes that more people now (as opposed to three years ago) have a better handle on the concept of consent. She notes how the number of cases before the SAMB/SMB hasn’t changed drastically since the show began, but she holds firm that Speak About It has done awesome things for campus. Meadow also notes that, with the new “user-friendly” policy, more cases might be making it before the SMB as compared to the former, harder process. She also informs the BSG that Bowdoin’s Speak About It is now going national – it is currently at seven other colleges including Utica, Williams, Colby, Bates, and USM [super awesome].
- Seeing no more questions, Derek thanks Dean Lee, Dean Davis, and RJ for coming to speak to the BSG. *Megan starts the clapping before a round of applause ensues* Derek announces that we will be moving into the proposal section of the agenda now. He notes that, in the BSG constitution (which
everyone has in their supplied binders [thanks for actually giving me one this year, Anirudh]), there is a two week rule in place. This means that any proposal proposed must be presented one week and voted on at the next meeting. He explains that the reasoning for this is to get BSG members to go back to their respective constituents and get their opinions on the matter. Additionally, the two week rule allows for BSG members to look at the same proposal with a fresh set of eyes. Derek does inform everyone that the two-week rule can be suspended, and such a suspension is usually reserved for non-controversial, “housekeeping” business.

- Before turning it over the VP of Facilities to present Facilities’ proposals, Anirudh also provides a briefing on the voting procedure. He says that in order for voting to occur, a quorum (18 people) must be present. In presenting proposals, there will be five minutes of discussion about each proposal after the presenter proposes the proposed proposal which can be extended if need be [but preferably not...]. When the time comes to vote, there needs to be a motion to vote and then a second to motion. In voting for a proposal, a majority of people must vote “yea” in order for a proposal to pass. In order to surpass the two-week rule, a first vote must be taken to suspend the two week rule, and then a second vote must be conducted on the passage of the proposal.

- Derek adds that this year will be slightly different presentation-wise. In order to reduce redundancy, proposed proposals will be presented during committee reports and not under “new business” as they were last year.

VI. Old Business

VII. Committee Reports

a. Facilities Committee

i. Proposal: Shuttle Service

- Chase introduces himself and gets into the first of three proposals. Many people have already taken advantage of the shuttle service with Brunswick Taxi over fall break. Each year, Bowdoin negotiates a contract with Brunswick Taxi (he refers everyone to the back of their packet for this week’s meeting). On the weekend, the shuttle service offers three-dollar shuttle rides to Cook’s Corner, Freeport, and Old Port and daily gives free rides anywhere within a mile of campus (though students are encouraged to tip). As for vacation travel, Brunswick Taxi organizes it so that, for no more than twenty dollars, students can get from campus to Portland to catch a bus or plane. Last year, the contract was signed for $9,500. This year, Bowdoin would be paying them $9,700 for their outstanding service in the past.

- As the floor is opened for discussion, Allen asks why exactly we are raising the payment this year – gas prices? – awesome service?

- Chase responds that every year the company asks Bowdoin for a considerable larger sum then we end up paying them. This year, they didn’t ask for any more money, and in order to show our appreciation of their service and show that we realize the strain rising gas prices might be having on their service, the increase in price just strengthens the relationship we have with them.
• Jordan brings up the good point that the new people should be given a context – i.e. talk about the budget.
• Anirudh agrees that this is a good idea and informs everyone that he will be giving us a budget update later in the semester. He says that there are specific line items that are “standard” at this point – and this is one of those standard purchases that the BSG has built into their budget. Anirudh says that if they are debating something that will come from programming, he will inform the BSG members.
• Seeing no more discussion, Jordan motions to vote tonight and Tessa seconds. There is a vote – unanimous approval of suspending the two-week rule.
• Chase motions to vote on the proposal, and Allen seconds. Proposal is unanimously approved! [Congratulations to everyone for sticking to the 5-minute rule. Let’s keep it that way, k? k]

ii. Proposal: Movie Tickets
• Chase brings up his second proposal of the night, which is the purchase of movie tickets from Regal Cinema. It is a popular service we provide, where BSG buys 200 movie tickets for $7.50 a ticket and then sells them back again to the student body for a discounted price.
• Anirudh says that this is an example of money that is not line-budgeted [but he is wrong, as shall be revealed...]
• Allen wonders if there is an easier way to go about this. He remembers last year that Isa came with this proposal every few weeks. He suggests that maybe this proposal can be on a “purchase schedule” instead to be assured that there will always be tickets behind the Info Desk and the supply doesn’t run out before BSG purchases more.
• Before Chase has a chance to answer, Anirudh corrects his previous mistake. He amends his statement – these are in fact line-budgeted – the BSG has allotted $7,000 to pay for them.
• In response to Allen’s question, Chase says that Isa is a great guy (his predecessor), but he’ll be in more contact with Carla at the Info Desk than Isa previously was. In other words, Chase has got it covered and we won’t ever be too low on tickets. And while a schedule would make things a lot easier, it really cannot be predicted, since the demand for tickets fluctuates with which movies are out.
• Seeing no more discussion, the two-week rule falls into place and this will be brought up again next week for voting.

iii. Proposal: Newspapers
• Chase’s last topic is the newspaper contract. For the past few years, the BSG has been providing the papers available in Thorne, Moulton, and Smith. Traditionally, BSG pays the USA Today Readership Program (USATRP) $8,300 and then gets back the excess money that USATRP doesn’t use in providing Bowdoin with papers. For example, last year they spent $7,500 and BSG got the remainder of the money back. Chase also states that this is part of our “line-item” budget.
• Amy asks if Chase can elaborate on the USATRP.
• Chase explains that the USATRP provides Bowdoin with all the papers on the newsstand, including the local Brunswick paper, the *New York Times*, *USA Today*, and others he can’t remember. They used to supply the *Boston Globe*, but no one read it, so USATRP cut that and put in more *Times* papers. If newspapers go unread, USATRP automatically drops the number supplied for the unread and adds more to a frequently read paper. In this way, they have a clear idea of what Bowdoin students read and what we need more of, and they can tailor our subscription to those needs.

• Seeing no more questions, the two-week rule falls into place and this proposal will be submitted for voting next week.

b. BSG Affairs Committee:

• Anirudh introduces himself and admits that he’s memorized everyone’s faces [not that he’s a creeper or anything…]. He fills the BSG in on what the BSGAC has been doing. Mostly, they’ve been working on constitutional things; all of the proposals also go through him, so he can construct the meeting agenda – so on Friday everyone will receive a reminder email for proposal collections. Anirudh also invites everyone and anyone to contact him with any proposal ideas, no matter how crazy it might be. BSGAC has also been conducting elections for the first-years and for the seniors – he congratulates the newly-elected reps that are here this meeting.

• Bernie, the programming chair, also introduces himself. Most people on BSG already know him, since he’s been sending out emails for the retreat on Saturday. For that retreat, 28 people have confirmed their presence but they only have 27 seats in the cars – so he asks others to please help in moving people there.

c. SAFC

• Brian Kim, the Chair of the SAFC, is currently taking an Econ exam and couldn’t be here. No one from BSG sits on SAFC, but they are technically under the jurisdiction of the BSG.

• Megan also sits on the SAFC as an At-Large Representative, so she will explain what SAFC entails. Basically, the SAFC is composed of the class treasurers of each class, two At-Large Representatives, the Chair of the SAFC, someone from the Student Activities office, and the SOOC chair. They preside over the activities budget and allocate money towards events happening around on campus and for particular clubs. They make sure that the events are well-planned before doling out money and make sure that the money is being used appropriately. So far, the money is looking good.

d. Student Affairs Committee

• Allen explains that the SAC deals with anything that has an aspect in student life, basically – ranging from athletics to ResLife to multiculturalism to career planning et al. For the past few weeks, he’s gone around to almost all of the first-year bricks with career planning to introduce them to the center. Last Friday, the SAC hosted its first interclass council meeting, where 15 of the 20 members showed up (which is a really awesome turn-out). Last Friday, he attended a meeting on student affairs with the trustees, where he met with Becky Rholigan, the VP for Institutional Planning and Assessment, who compiles stats on the Bowdoin
student body. She reports that the admissions rates are looking good and that the success of Bowdoin students after graduation is, for the most part, awesome.

e. Student Organizations Committee
   - Dani is also taking a test currently, so Jack will fill in.
   - Jack is a senior who has been on the SOOC for three years now. This year is the first year that they met and chartered organizations before they set the committee – so it has just been Dani, himself, and Michael Yang doing all that work. So far, they have chartered the Bowdoin Globalist, Spirituality Club, and there is one more pending club that he cannot remember. Dani has also been doing a lot of stuff on her own, like reorganizing the way we manage clubs – but that’s something he cannot speak to.

f. Academic Affairs Committee
   - Jordan says that his committee mostly works with the Dean of Academic Affairs and with professors. In addition, Jordan sits on the Banner Advisory Committee (which is switching Bowdoin over from Bearings to a new system called Banner). He reports that Banner should be in place by 2013. Additionally, Jordan sits on the Correction and Educational Policies Committee, the Trustees Committee, and on some committee involved with the Library that I can’t type quick enough to get the name of. Some things the AAC did last year was put in the works an extension to Thanksgiving break. In the spring last year, they began the syllabi project, where they uploaded the syllabi to many classes so students could look at those before they enrolled. This year, the AAC got up a lot of the first-year seminars for the first-years. Jordan confirms that the AAC will continue to be working with that. A future project for the AAC will be major flow-charts. He explains that some departments have papers with flow diagrams of how to approach that major. Jordan hopes to help all departments make a visual aide like that and maybe even make one for minors as well. This, of course, won’t be needed once Banner is in place, but in the meanwhile...

VIII. Member Reports

a. Class Representatives
   - 2015 – Hannah reports that the first-years are still enthusiastic and loving life. The class officers are going to be meeting for the first time this Friday (and they are super excited to have set a meeting date). Daniel also introduces himself, confirming that Hanna has summed everything up nicely.
   - 2014 – Sam introduces himself and his lovely assistant Abbie *laughter at Sam’s use of “assistant”* [Vanna White wasn’t available, so he settled for Abbie...]. So far, Sam reports that the sophomores have had a few meetings and have been organizing some events here and there, including the first-year fondue to get them excited for their own BSG elections. They are also in the works of throwing the Mr. Polar Bear Pageant and coordinating a community outreach for their class, which will be a volunteer activity at a local senior home.
   - 2013 – Amy introduces herself and her co-rep Ricardo. The juniors met about a month ago and have been ironing out the details of a pie tasting event in Dagget Lounge. They are also working on a class-sponsored karaoke night in the pub.
   - 2012 – Grace and Tommy report that they just had a meeting yesterday and haven’t really begun to talk about anything except for senior sweatshirts.
b. IHC Representatives – Max says that so far, the houses have had a pretty good year – they had a fun battle for the first campus-wide. Thus far, the Inter-House Olympics have gone well, and the IHC has even revamped the house-cup point system (their web-scoring system is almost done). As for long term goals, Max says that the IHC is trying to figure out how to get certain weekends when houses aren’t in the spotlight.

c. E-Board Representative – Chris isn’t here, but Derek commends the E-Board on a good Racer-X concert.

d. Athletics Representative – Kaitlin introduces herself and says that she represents the athletic council, which has a representative from all varsity sports teams. She reports that they are expanding Polar Bear Nation at the request of Jeff Ward and encourages all BSG members to like the Facebook page *laughter*. Additionally, NCAA Division III sports now have a partnership with the Special Olympics. Therefore, the athletic council and varsity sports teams will be starting to work with an independent association in Maine. In other news, for Yellow Shirt Day, athletics funded to pay for all the T-shirts for sports teams.

IX. President’s Report – Derek wants to thank everyone for a great first meeting – we’ve survived! As for guests, Derek realizes a lot of people haven’t gotten their “gears going,” but he wants to make sure that everyone reads the documents he sends out so everyone can be well prepared to ask questions. He gives examples of things that have come up with J-Board in the past: the way the J-Board is selected, the quality of the reports (due to the omission of much information due to confidentiality), etc. He says that usually, the week before, the BSG will brainstorm together, but unfortunately that couldn’t happen this time. As for the BSG in general, Derek leaves everyone with a final thought. He says that the major work of the BSG doesn’t happen in this room – it happens when we are out and around on campus and working in our subcommittees. He says that it is in small groups where the deep discussions happen (especially since BSG meetings have to end at 10:00pm according to the constitution). Derek then wraps up by reminding everyone that there’ll be a retreat to the Costal Studies Center on Saturday, where we’ll be fed doughnuts and coffee and decide what subcommittees we may want to be a part of. He asks that the SOOC Judiciary Committee should stay after to meet with him.

X. Adjournment at 9:22 pm