General Assembly Meeting: September 30, 2012

Agenda:
Opening of the Meeting: Meeting called to order at 7:00pm

1. Fight song and role call
2. Open Forum
   a. Ben D’s video recording
      i. Mansoor: It was a public meeting, so it should be open to the public in video form
      ii. Andrew Trexler: Agrees with the fact that since it was a public forum, it should be open to the public in video form
      iii. Jason Shatz: It should be up to the discretion of Wesleying and not the WSA.
   b. Chloe: Please try your best to come to the meetings
   c. Martin: Rotating blog - FiFaC will be blogging this week
   d. SJB New Procedures
      i. The point system
         1. A way of calibrating and sanctioning
         2. New model
         3. Numerical scale
         4. Not going to change the way that the SJB sanctions, but will put the sanctions into numerical form
         5. Understand their standing with the university
         6. There is a range for all sanctions: not any more rigid than it was before
         7. Not an expectation of what will happen because the SJB can still decide what they want to do.
         8. Visit the The Dean of Students Office website for general information on the points system
         9. Talk to your Dean for your own personal points
3. Board of Trustees Meeting Resolution
   a. Sponsor: Nicole Updegrove
      i. Video on Wesleying of the students who went to the Board of Trustees meeting
      ii. Some stayed outside the meeting, but other entered and were called to the SJB
1. They are in danger of losing jobs and receiving SJB sanctions
   iii. If the administration goes forward with these charges, the administration-student relationship with only get worse
   iv. The administration should try and see the students side and open up a forum
   v. No one should lose their jobs for this

b. Chloe Murtagh: Since this was recently proposed, the bylaws would have to be suspended in order to vote on this tonight

c. Jason Shatz: Approval of the clause that reads that the WSA is aware that many students do not understand the executive session. The executive session is always justified. Many students misinterpreted this as a scheming session. The Board of Trustees has not engaged in a wrongdoing and were not trying to scheme. Acknowledges Zach Malter’s efforts.

d. Christian Hosam: What was the specific charge?
   i. Nicole Updegrove: Failure to comply and Clause #15
   ii. Christain Hosam: Friendly amendment to include any interested trustees even if they are not local

e. Nikki: The meeting was disrupted, then both sides were taking video and Public Safety passed on the video to the SJB. What happens next?

f. SJB Member: The SJB does not bring charges, they work with students who have had charges brought against them. They decide whether there needs to be a hearing, whether or not there were violations, etc. Hopefully, they will be meeting tonight. The reports were brought to the SJB with the charges already decided. The SJB will meet and discuss this incident. The students who walked into the room after warned by P-Safe receives summons because they were asked by a university official and they disregard it and enter the room anyway. No hearings have been scheduled. Students get notified of charges before the hearing and then the SJB deliberates. Anything that is brought before the SJB are alleged violations. They are just what the patrolling bodies of Wesleyan think are violations.

g. Nikki: What is the likely range for the students who got written up?

h. SJB Member: It depends on the history of each individual student. For example, someone with 6 Failure to Comply sanctions will be facing harsher sanctions than someone who doesn’t have any.

i. Jacob Blumenthal: When do we vote to suspend the bylaws?

j. Andrew Trexler: Whenever someone moves to do so

k. Nicole Updegrove: It is extremely important to vote tonight because it will go down as something that the WSA really cares about and will send a stronger message than just a straw poll. If SJB hearings get scheduled for this week, this resolution won’t hold as much sway. When it comes to reslife, they are notified
every time a student is notified. There is a big difference between getting wasted with your hallmates and something entirely separate from that.

l. Trexler: I would like it if someone would explain why we have institutionalized a week between a resolution being introduced and voting on it.

m. Christian Hosam: We like to give members a week to think about the resolution, familiarize themselves, etc. before they vote. However, this resolution shouldn’t need a week because these are extenuating circumstances and what needs to happen is quite clear.

n. **Straw Poll in favor of passing this resolution: 31 Y, 2 N, 0 A**

o. Sam Ebb: The other reason we give people a week is so that we can go talk to other students since we are representing the general public.

p. Evan: There is a reason we have rules, but sometimes the rules do not apply.

q. Jason Shatz: Voted not to suspend the bylaws because we need to deliberate a little bit more, hear others opinions. The conversation should not and ought not to be ended prematurely.

r. Jesse RS: Friendly Amendment - Make the reason why we thought judicial action is not appropriate was because the students did not see a reason to comply. Right now it says talk about activism, but this is obscuring it.

i. Benny Docter: This is an important addition to this document. We need to talk about the way that the administration proceeds with discussions that are really important. We need to clarify that this is about the level of inclusion across the entire process. There are representative, but we are representing a large group of people who feel under-represented.

ii. Jason Shatz: What constitutes “peaceful demonstration?” Some believe that barging into the room constitutes the Trustees right to privacy. Agrees with Benny Docter, and believes that we have to discuss this with clear language.

s. Jacob Blumenthal: Thinks that ResLife should not fire people, but thinks that the SJB charges should go through. The video shows P-Safe officers warning students. This is a clear cut case. The students broke the rules. We should focus on the job standings.

t. Chase Knowles: Agrees with J. Blumenthal. They should receive SJB sanctions, but they should not be losing their jobs. They understood the fact that they were going to get punished. They should not be punished that harshly.

u. Andrew Trexler: This case is not really about the case. There are many people that feel that this demonstration was one of the most respectful and productive acts of activism that this campus has seen in recent memory. The student-administration will be damaged if students are harshly punished. The failure to comply rule should not really apply.
v. Lily Herman: They should go to the SJB, but we are not yet condemning their protest. We are saying that since they broke the rules, they should receive hearings.
w. Nicole Updegrove: [In response to J. Blumenthal] It’s been clear that we can’t tell the administration to listen to the students about need blind, but we can tell them that they can’t condemn the students who are trying to have their voices heard.
x. Sam Usdan: If we do alleviate the charges, it comes across as condoning this behavior.
y. Christian Hosam: The signal that is sent by this resolution is very important. Every time administration takes away a little bit more of the students voice, it becomes much harder for future students to do the same thing. It is important to look at the context and articulate the fact that if they do go to the SJB, it sends a signal that dissent is dying.
z. Jacob Blumenthal: The SJB is for deciding what to do on a case by case basis. This is not draconian. It is the most democratic thing, because we set forward the guidelines for the SJB.

aa. Jesse RS: Technically violating policy is not the same thing to facing sanctions. We need to recognize that there are institutional safeguards for those who violate policy. Those who were brought before the SJB are for going through the SJB process and accept the charges.

bb. Andrew Trexler: Hopes to urge the administration to follow reasons and judgement over technicality. Even though students have technically violated the rules, the context changed the nature of the circumstances. Students do not know what an executive session are or why they have to be closed. These charges change the relationships across campus in negative ways. This was a peaceful and respectful way of protesting.

c. Syed Ali: It’s strange to ask the administration to be flexible with their rules if we bare not flexible with our own. A lot of students are in favor of urgent action. Not confident that we are going to do anything in the next week, but we are going to actively engage the students.

d. Sam Ebb: We can vote on the resolution by parts (Straw Poll - Clause 2)

i. **Straw Poll on Clause 2: 14 Y, 12 N, 4 A**

4. Academic Advising Resolution
   a. Mansoor Alam: Friendly amendment - the word punishment being changed to another word (retracted)
   b. Christian Hosam: Friendly amendment - Clause about adequate information. Replace harmful information to inadequate information (retracted)
   c. Martin Malabanan: Why do the fora have to capped at three?
      i. Sam Ebb: More than three would be overkill and stretching the department and professors thin.
d. **Voting: 31 Y, 0 N, 0 A: Passed**

5. Academic Calendar Discussion
   a. Marri Jarris: Reading period length on the 5 year calendar. People wanted longer reading period. However, when it was revealed that lengthening reading period would cost $25 per students did not agree. Now, they are discussing shortening the reading period, but students feel strongly that the reading period should remain at 4 days.
   b. Chase Knowles: What is reading period?
      i. Mari Jarris: It’s when you study without classes. There are no assignments, 24 quiet-time, etc.
   c. Lydia Rex: Why are they thinking about making shorter
      i. Sam Ebb: Saturday finals
      ii. Zach Malter: Longer would be a cost to the university
   d. Christian Hosam: Is there talk of extending reading period, but taking time of fall/winter break
      i. Sam Ebb: 25$/day for housing. Given the cost proposition, it was overwhelmingly decided that it would be kept at 4 days
   e. Jason Shatz: There are some professors that believe that the whole semester should be a “reading period.” However, I think that four days is completely insufficient. The reading period should be extended, but without the “no assignments” rule.
   f. Zach Malter: This is going to be decided on Tuesday, so it is imperative to suspend the bylaws
   g. **By-laws unanimously suspended**
   h. **Voting: 29 Y, 0 N, 0 A Passed**

6. Committee Reports
   a. AAC
   b. COCo
   c. FiFAC
   d. OEAC
   e. ITC
   f. SAC
   g. SBC

7. Minutes Approval - Approved Unanimously

8. New Business and Announcements
   a. Mari Jarris: Meet and greet between WSA Office Staff and members
      i. Thursday Oct 18th 5:30-7:30 pm
      ii. Oct 25th 5:30 - 7:30pm

Meeting Adjourned: 8:26pm
Respectfully Submitted,
Bruno Machiavelo ‘16