

Meeting Notes of the General Assembly  
Wednesday, 09 March 2016

**I. Call to Order**

**II. Roll Call**

- Absent: Michelle J, Jenna, Christen

**III. Approval of Minutes**

- By instead of “my” on page two.

**IV. Public Comment Time**

- Cannot do the impeachment because of legal procedures. The by-laws were vague, and would make everyone liable to legal action, therefore the proposal is being rescinded.
- Kevin: does not agree that the procedure should be rescinded but it was something that was advised by members of administration.
- Jacob: Worried that the way the constitution was written made members vulnerable to legal action. The members that proposed the impeachment do not have the money or willing to pursue it without a statement from Bowdoin College saying they will support us, in the case of a lawsuit.
- Kiki: Many students don't want to learn. They are not sorry. If you (Clare & Duncan) were really sorry or willing to learn, you would have resigned from your position. If (Clare & Duncan) were sorry they would not have to hold a defense against the defenseless.
- Student: Sorry that the school has silenced you. And sorry that BSG members that proposed the impeachment had to do something that did not come from their heart, something that they did not believe in. (Rescinding the impeachment process). Who is here to defend us?
- Student: I am a Mexican student that was affected by this and no one has had the decency to (my face) that they are sorry. I have not received an apology. I will be expecting an apology.
- Student: Is there another way to go about this because it is problematic that certain choices can't be made because of fear of lawsuits. It is interesting how BSG is trying to exercise participating in government in a college setting, and seeing the way that money comes into play. If the apology were sincere, your actions after the incident would have been different (Clare and Duncan). We see the way that money is running BSG and school. I didn't believe it until now, and it is a total violation of democracy. “Freedom of speech”, but there is no freedom.
- Bill: How can you continue being in the position with the damage that you cost. You voted for a statement of solidarity. This is black and white and what you did was wrong. This (not being able to continue with impeachment proceeding) is a problem. There needs to be a process for holding each other accountable. This is unacceptable.
- Student: If you are sorry, resign. You have hurt people. Just step down.
- Student: Apologizing and then threatening with a lawsuit is stupid. You used your power. This is a power dynamic, and you have just expressed “I have power, and I will hold it over you”

- Student: If there is not a complete precedent, no one should be impeached. However, you do represent the campus now. You represent people who have been hurt, legal defense looks like a rejection of the thing you are being accused of. Talk to the peers you represent. We need to know that you have learned from this. You need to show people/ let them know that you have grown from this process.
- Student: Thanks to those who had the courage to bring the petition forward. Some people who are here in this room are the once who have shown up in the past two weeks to express their frustration. They don't want to have the conversations. The conversation is now over. This is another affirmation that you can continue what you are doing with no repercussions. We don't matter and our voices aren't important at all.
- Danny- This is very difficult for student body. The bylaws in the constitution were vague. Therefore, procedures for impeachment need to be in place. We were going to carry out the procedure, while trying to figure out the process itself and it is difficult to come to terms with. We need to put it in bylaws and legitimize it before we impeach someone. Question of legal suit will always be around, directed at BSG at its people. People lose. That is why it is important to follow the process to a T. This is all very tricky, which made the assembly vulnerable for a legal suit. This is a manifestation of privilege.
- Jacob-Want to correct an in fallacy. Any info that we received (in regards to not continuing the impeachment process) was from administration. They said that we are liable for lawsuit, the constituents did not say they were going to file a lawsuit. We did not want to take the risk, and we sorry if we demonstrated coward-ness. At no point did no one say we will sue you.

## V. Introduction of Guests

### VI. Old business (In executive session, not sure if this was off the record)

- We might face personal lawsuits
- There were legal issues that might open up after the impeachment
- Our vote is our word, and it means something if we don't hold ourselves accountable for that
- Clare: Are we bound to a contract when voting for a proposal like using green cups (to encourage eco-friendliness), and then not using them?
- It is different voting on a statement than a proposal: If proposal helps the campus move someone forward, it is different than proposals that are monetary
- We have a tendency to vote unanimously on everything. We don't all agree on stuff unanimously
- If anyone has a different opinion, maybe you're given the opportunity to speak. Stay true on voting for what you believe in.
- It sucks that there are voices and opinions on the assembly that are damped.
- Be conscious of accountability. How do we want to view action ethnic stereotyping? We turn on the TV and there are people that are getting killed by police, but the police are not held accountable for their brutality. There is no accountability.
- Some are trying to present what they are thinking but can't because of fear.
- Clearly we have more work to do.

- I was elected my opinions to represent the student body. There is a striking balance between individual voice and representation (of others).
- There's a lot ambiguity. Some viewed statement of solidarity as standing behind students who felt hurt. I don't think it was entirely clear. It isn't a clear contract that warrants impeachment.
- I thought you could impeach anyone for anything.
- People have felt vulnerable, and there is misrepresentation from both sides of the spectrum. When we are all voting, we need to be careful about voting for what we believe in.
- If we pass articles about impeachment, will there still be a fear about being sued?
- There's frustration with a legal suit being brought up. The question of law suit will always be there.
- Say what you mean and mean what you say. Difference in opinion makes the BSG stronger.
- We are student leaders, we are adults. We need to take the agency in our decisions.

## **VII. Reports of Committees**

- a. Student Affairs- Luke Von Maur '16
- b. Student Organizations Oversight Committee - Emily Server '16
- c. Academic Affairs - Andrew Millar '16
- d. Facilities and Sustainability – Kevin Hernandez '18
- e. Student Activities Funding Committee- David Levine '16
- f. Executive Committee- Daniel Mejia-Cruz'16/ Michelle Kruk '16
  - Proposal to Vote: Proposal 141534.
  - Proposal to Vote: Amendment to the Bylaws.
  - Timing caps. People should have as much time as they want to say what they want when they speak.
  - When voting on a proposal, the first three voting yes or no can push the rest to vote yes or no.
  - Once you are kicked out (through impeachment) you can re-apply
  - Why isn't there anything that protects the student being impeached? (Like not releasing the students name)
  - BSG cannot preclude The Orient from releasing the name. It cannot be hidden from the student body.
  - David make a slight change to the Bylaws.
  - Emily S: In regards to the "visibility of name", when people run to be part of assembly you have to take credit for what you do on campus. It is the result of a more solidified procedure. If you violate any of these things, your name will be out there.
  - Lucia: During public comment time, we should allow time for the petitioners and responders to make their case. So people can understand why it is happening.
  - Lucia proposes change to impeachment procedure.
  - Chase S: In case that there are multiple people that have the same charge against them, in the impeachment would they still be able to vote? – There is a conflict of interest.
  - There's a clear bias. We are a student government, it works differently.

- Quincy: If there are more petitioners, then defendant, if you allow both parties to vote, you skew balance
- Responders and petitioners, should both be able to vote
- Proposal to vote: The responder or petitioner should not be allowed to vote. A “yes” vote means that yes the petitioner and responder get the vote. A “No” vote, neither get to vote
- Michelle yes, Luke- abstains, Andrew yes, Emily yes, Brian yes, Harriet yes, Clare yes, Khelsea yes, Duncan yes, Lucia yes, Riley yes, Jacob yes, Arindum no, Chase no, Quincy no
- Do we think this is a just process? - Yes
- Khealsea – proposes change
- Someone please define “reasonable amount of time”
- We could we say “about 24 hours”
- There is an issue with timing – we should give people a fair notice as what is happening
- 24 hours is a good amount of time for a notice
- To serve you need to sign a document saying that you are in good standing in the college. But my majority vote you will be reinstated. If something goes wrong, check with exec committees if it will interfere with duties as a member of the student gov.
- David reads Article IV in Amendment to the Bylaws
- Only president is informed if you fall out of good standing.
- If assembly member is not in good standing, they can’t represent student body
- Motion to suspend rules of vote. (One final vote should be held today.)
- Result of vote: 12 said yes, 2 abstained, 9 said no. The motion is defeated.
- Motion to have first vote for bylaws today and suspend two-week rule. (And have the second vote after spring break)
- Result of vote: Assembly unanimously votes yes
- The first vote is passed, the second will be held after Spring break.

### **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 (meeting was extended until 10:30pm)**

- David- Proposal to vote: There shouldn’t be a time cap for this meeting

- Jack, Claire, Duncan – voted against.