

Meeting Notes of the General Assembly
Wednesday, 30 March 2016

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Minutes

IV. Public Comment Time

Joe:

- Reads email BSG sent to student body about not continuing with the impeachment process
- Wrote this speech expecting the people who usually come to this meeting with a back and forth to respond
- Michelle I respect you. You and other members of BSG were targeted by barstool and other media outlets, which is not okay. The Bangor Daily News wrote an article where you stated that students of color are receiving violent backlash. As a VP of BSG, there is a theme of hypocrisy.
- I wrote an article about the division of campus.
- Would like to call out Kiki, one of the students who attend the last couple BSG meeting. She wrote a blog where she introduces herself as a member of intergroup dialogue and related Clare to a “piece of shit”, and that at the end of one of the BSG meetings “every nerve in her body wanted to slap” Clare. How is that not power? What does Kiki know about Claire and her friends? How is Clare not marginalized? Isn’t democracy supposed to be an accurate representation of all. The battle [for democracy] is lost.

Caleb:

- The definition that Kiki gave about Racism is not accurate. Racism isn’t necessarily prejudice plus power.
- As a liberal Hispanic, it is not clear to me that the tequila party was ethnic stereotyping.
- The BSG should revise their definition of cultural appropriation.
- We need to consider the Tequila Party in the grounds of indignation and defense and cultural appropriation and misappropriation.
- For indignation & defense – if something upsets you it does not make it wrong. Indignation is not sufficient to comply offense.
- For cultural appropriation and Misappropriation- Cultural appropriation is when one group adapts one aspect of another’s culture. *Cultural misappropriation* is cultural appropriation gone wrong. Is not clear it is a case of *cultural misappropriation*. The fate of the tequila party goes down towards the two parameters of indignation and misappropriation.

V. Introduction of Guests

- Dean Scanlon
- We are going forward with a process of accreditation
- Through the public sphere, going through the process we get a stamp of approval from the organization saying that yes, Bowdoin College is a place of integrity.
- Internally, it is a process where the school can learn and make improvements. (At the end they give a report)
- We are starting now and thinking of the 9 standards of accreditation
- We will be studying the 9 standards throughout the fall and writing a 100-page report in the fall of 2017.
- We would like two Bowdoin students to be part of the accreditation process. The person will need to be here for the next two years.
- Would not like to rule out someone studying abroad in spring. Most of the writing will be done in the fall of 2016.
- There will be a meeting May 16, and we would like to have the two students identifies by then.
- What is the commitment like?
- There will be meetings in the fall semester. Student life is significant component. The two students can hold a couple office hours and students can come and give feedback. They would be active participants in providing questions

- The ideal person looks like: someone who is interested on how the institution works and what is the bigger picture, someone comfortable speaking in meetings with administrators, someone who wouldn't mind organizing meetings and giving feedback. They will be working with members of faculty and senior administration.

VI. Old business

VII. Reports of Committees

- Student Affairs- Luke Von Maur '16
- Student Organizations Oversight Committee - Emily Server '16
- Academic Affairs - Andrew Millar '16
- Facilities and Sustainability – Kevin Hernandez '18
- Student Activities Funding Committee- David Levine '16
- Executive Committee- Daniel Mejia-Cruz'16/ Michelle Kruk '16

Proposal to vote: Amendment to the bylaws

- Andrew: We may be moving quickly with the amendment to the bylaws, in light of everything that has been happening on campus
- Benjamin: worried moving too fast, we need to think this through
- Carlie: How will this weigh in in our current situation [of the impeachment]? It was vague and left a grey area. There is nothing unfair about this.
- Articles of impeachment have been rescinded. What if someone were to reintroduce articles of impeachment?
- Emily: At a certain point, how many times can you try to impeach someone. Isn't that kind of a form of harassment?
- We can put language in there, "you can't impeach someone more than once".
- We should put language that we can't try someone for repeated offense. It is important to have this in our bylaws because there has been a lot of tension on campus with this.
- There's an election coming up, and would like to have this in the bylaws before next BSG meeting.
- The impeachment amendments should go into effect now. I don't foresee anything happening that would require us to need it.
- Andrew- A part we are not thinking about enough is the clause with "not being in good standing". Should someone who is on academic probation have to discuss why they aren't in good academic standing with the BSG?
- David: In regards to the good standing clause, we want to respond to college processes. The more investigating, the more were open to liability.
- A lot of the reasons that you might not be in good standing does not affect how you perform your role in the BSG. However, you can have a conversation about how that happened. You can quietly resign, there doesn't need to be a public discussion on why it happened.
- Clare: It isn't our job to punish someone who isn't in good standing. That is not our goal. This makes the BSG much larger than it was intended to be
- Danny: We don't want to diminish the standing that the BSG has, and want to be a body that takes themselves seriously. Res-life, sports teams and other groups on campus face sanctions. People should face sanctions if they are academically unsuccessful. If you are struggling academically it in your best interest to take time off.
- Danny Miro: the goal is to stablish a social standing. If someone in the j-board committed offence they face repercussions.
- Jack: In the j-board if you plagiarize that affects how you do your job. There are some probations that could affect how you participate on the BSG. We need to be more careful of what we define.
- Michelle- next year's BSG can continue working on this
- Emily- the BSG is not a punitive body we aren't the J-board. These procedures are protective of us becoming a punitive body because you are automatically removed. You falling out of good standing with the college, doesn't mean you are punished you are just on probation. It would preventative of being a punitive body.

- Danny: For example: What happened with tequila party, if you would of fell out of good standing, we wouldn't even have to have an impeachment. We wouldn't have impeachments left and right for petty things. It would be automatic removal, and protects the BSG.
- Andrew: Should the person [not in good standing] get in front of BSG body to explain situation?
- David: Do you have another idea or alternative. Not sure how much more it exposes us to legal action. Can't think of anything better than this framework.
- Anna: The reason that you fall out of good standing can be something that you might not want to share with the BSG. You would be disclosing something that you normally would share to another student.
- David: is impeachment the best way to go?
- Lucia: It would be hard to talk about personal things, but what if something happens that does affect your abilities to be a good role model.
- Do we feel comfortable with just the impeachment procedure as a means of removal?
- Danny: I don't foresee an executive committee asking for all details as to why someone fell out of academic standing. If concerned with privacy, in *article 4ai*, if the matter is very private, communicate with dean to explain the situation.
- Arindum: Can we vote on the inclusion of the good standing. We can vote on whether or not we want to include good standing.
- We should clarify that from this point forward this procedure will be used for any event that comes forward.
- Lucia: In this situation, we are not going to re-introduce these articles.
- Emily: we can't do it case by case.
- David: we can because there is a difference in this case. We need to include language of 'no double jeopardy'. However, in this case we introduced articles, were worried about legal action and could not continue.
- Emily: It is not unusual for people to rescind articles of impeachment.
- David: This case is exceptional because there is not a situation where we can't continue an impeachment process because no article was in place.
- Danny: the idea of double jeopardy should be clarified. (makes change to page 11)
- We never went through a process; we have one now.
- Brian: we were writing a new procedure and then using it. That was the problem.
- David: motion to include double jeopardy language.
- Clare-: if articles of impeachment were allowed after this. It is going to be the exact same process. The idea is that it would be that after the procedure was in place, now we can go forward with the impeachment. The procedure catered to this situation.
- This process was not created with Claire and Duncan in mind
- Clare- The design was created because of the situation
- David: we don't expect people to file an article of impeachment, they were never voted on. We weren't able to continue.
- Reed: My understanding is that the articles were dropped because you can't impeach when we don't have clear rules. The idea that they can be impeached because now there are rules is kinda problematic.
- Arindum: I don't know where I stand on this spectrum, but Clare and Duncan were not tried. It seems unfair for the conversation to be shut down. I am Personally not for the impeachment. But it is harmful for the community that it never happened.
- David: If anyone has another point, you should file a motion that can't be used on events in the past
- Sarah: in it being shut down. Students voices were not heard. We need to consider that
- Emily: not every impeachment is going to have a trial. If you file impeachment and rescind them, and submit them again isn't that double jeopardy?
- David- up until we have a vote it is just pieces of paper. It only counts as double jeopardy on voter's day.

- Motion to vote: Do we want these amendments to apply now and moving forward or can they be retroactive. (Yes= they can be retroactive, No= they can't be retroactive)
- Duncan- Before anyone decides to put article of impeachment, there needs to be a discussion maybe just with executive committee, where the person who is being accused can share their side.

VIII. Reports of Members

a. Class Councils

· 2019-

· 2018-

· 2017-

· 2016-

b. Inter- House council

c. Entertainment Board

d. Athletic Council

e. McKeen Center:

f. At- Large Representatives:

IX. Report of the President- Daniel Mejia- Cruz '16

X. Announcements

XI. Adjournment