Start of Meeting: 24 total
Total Present:
Individuals Absent: Graeme Brown, Holly Lallis, Taylor Haberstock, Diego Hernandez, Maddie
Taylor, Molly Manuel, Hannah Johnson, Merrill Read

Parliamentarian Open Remarks
Zack: Waiting for free speech task force
No deans here.
Any opening comments people would like to address. Any announcements?
EBoard report now.

EBoard Report
Tyra: going into winter break, making Jan Plan arrangements for funding requests. I’ll be in
India, will be filtering funding requests remotely. I know a lot of you will be doing class events
and will have individual reimbursement requests, so please use Campus Life credit cards. In
extreme cases, trying to convince Nathan that he can sign off of it. Don’t want big balances on
your personal cards. Working with CEC and Lexie in the Pugh Center and plan on how to
support them for MLK activities & programming. Reaching midpoint of the year, exciting, I can
look forward for rest of year. Strict guideline for beginning of the year; cut down on frivolous,
unneeded spending. That has worked well as well as influx of funding requests from Pugh
Center. Continue fully funding Pugh clubs, they have had particularly good events. Will send out
update to Finance Committee.

Sam: (will add later)

Zack: I will not be here for Jan Plan. OCOC will not be approving new clubs. All those activities
will resume and be revised for the second semester.

Laura: We will be holding motion-writing sessions. As mandatory as you can make them for
individuals who haven’t written them. We’ll be sending out meetings. We’ll try to make them
fun; have snacks and stuffs. Throw out ideas. Host them once a week in the SGA Office. Start
planning action for the spring semester.

Community Forum

Class Reports
Class of 2022
Avery: Class dinner was super successful, Foss was packed within the first 7-8 mins. Full, people
couldn’t sit down. A few problems with it. Another one in Jan Plan, so looking forward to
ironing those details out.
Dave: Mental Health Narrative event, which will be in February.

Class of 2021
Ashlee: Proud of everything we’ve accomplished this semester. Supporting students; study abroad process. Doing another class dinner, fun programming over Jan Plan.
Tyra: Remote programming from DC.

Class of 2019
Matt M.: Class dinner was also last week. Olive did a good job planning it. Wine & cheese night, all of cheese and wine were consumed. Working with Nathan on progress towards nailing details for Senior Week. Over break, ask people what they want to see for senior week this year. Maximize budget on programs the people want. Also start the process for planning junior-senior soiree in the spring.

Class of 2020
Sam: Not much to report.
Ben: Smooth sailing.

Zack: Thank you guys for improvising and going with the agenda schedule change.

Free Speech Task Force
Ashlee: A lot of concerns about documents right now. Well-rounded group of students = SGA with diverse opinions. Changes have been made. Read over document again. Questions or concerns. Things of that nature.
Prof. Reisert: The overall structure is pretty similar. Begin laying out what the college’s central task is. Educational and scholarly mission. Some degree of freedom of speech is required for the college. The mission stuff is paragraphs 1-3, 4-6 aspirational community values. We say how we hope people will engage with each other with mutual respect, apologize for hurting other people’s feelings. Paragraph 7, lots of change. 8 is new(ish), here, we’re trying to protect both faculty and students, non-faculty and staff, area we’re still thinking hard about. People speak for themselves and in general what you say on social media is generally not going to be the college’s business. 11-15 really get explicitly into the limit of things. 11 celebrates the importance of protests; college affirms protest is an important form of speech and expression; we being to come up against the limit; your right to express yourself and my right to express myself is not a right to silence anybody else. 12-13 talk about some things that are sanctionable; in other words, someone can get punished for defamation for making a threat of violence, someone doxing you; publishing your transcript against your will/without your consent. Harrassment is against college policy and against the law; wording on that. 14 is entirely new since the last version we saw. We are trying to think about a sliding scale of community reactions to what people say. There’s a set of things that people say and someone should pull them aside to say you shouldn’t have said that/you hurt my feelings. We have been talking about a severe set of things where sanctions are appropriate. Intermediate set of consequences. If you’ve publicly acted as an ass and not a mule, consequences that float from that float from being an ass and not a mule. 15 underscores the mission of the document.
Sam: 14 who would decide if you’re acting as an ass and not a mule, who would draw that line. Consequences of losing leadership positions would lie in hands determining the punishment or in hands of administration.
Joe: Those are all excellent questions and answers that we do not have.
Richard: Let me give you a sense of that. Fully student run w/ a faculty advisor. Solely an advisor that don’t get involved with governance. It might be that group of students who decide. Other situations like employment that is done through the college. There might be something the administration might do against the staff member. Doesn’t rise to the level that the staff member loses his/her job. Student group steps in because it’s one of their own, Dean of Students Office because it’s a CA/ARD, it might be a coach stepping in in an Athletic situation. Can come from different directions. Deliberately vague because of that. Is that helpful?
Sam Kane: How would you ensure certain groups wouldn’t push the envelope in terms of what’s considered “the line”? That people are abusing the power and the offense.
Richard; We’ve been batting that one around. In a perfect world, students would have a set of values students would live by. COOT leader there is a set of expectations you’re supposed to liveup to. And hopefully the leaders live by and follow these. There’s something special about being a COOT leader, in a perfect world all of those rules would be written down and enforced. Then people would know. Student organizations begin to work on what values they want to live by.
Zack: Nathan & Campus Life want to establish a constitution for each club on campus. May be a requirement in the upcoming semester. Implemented in the fall. Clubs can fall back on that. Does anybody have any comments/concerns about this document? This is a time for us to express our opinions right now as a result of the controversy that has occurred on this campus.
Richard: Making sure that the institution has a responsibility for some of this as well. Too much responsibility lies on marginalized students to recognize and bring attention to injustices committed on this campus. Administration needs to have increased responsibility around this. Paragraphs 5-6, especially 6, we tried to build in the thought that each of us sitting here have a responsibility, but also the institution has a responsibility as well. Cannot rely on the same group of students time and time again. We want to let you know that we’ve heard you and we added that into the paragraph.
Russ: Page 1 across to page 2.
Tanner: This document is I understand it, is a statement of values rather than a binding document. Is that correct?
Joe: Sort of, yes. Our understanding is that we’d be asking the faculty and this body to approve these values. Our report will include some policy recommendation that will correspond to some of these values. Policy consequence in some places is fairly clear and others will require rule-making and more explanation. The spirit of the values are pretty classically liberal. And I think that the action paragraphs where it’s stating these sorts of things may be sanctioned. It’s our expectation that (they’re all sanctionable now). Detailed things like chalking and postering, you know, precisely how events get run. Those are things we’ll make recommendations on in hopes they’ll be consistent with the spirit of this document.
Russ; Severity of penalty for different circumstances details will be in different document.
Richard: No set of principles when a crisis arises; no core values; it becomes more difficult. This is an attempt to say where the values of the college lie. They lie in the principle of freedom of expression. The challenge of community building; broad free expression is difficult form tiem to time.
Ashlee: I think that something we’re trying to encapsulate in this document is that we’re trying to build this community. We’re at a state of not being unified; this is a real concern for others. In this document, attempting to build a community; that’s a process in which institutionally Colby has a part in and that we as community members have a part in.

Laura Polley: You mentioned that you’re still talking over paragraph 8. What were some arguments against it?

Joe: Does not mention non-faculty/staff. Essentially to the extent that the spirit of the task force, extend protection being able to speak out as boraldy as we can. How fully we can incorporate the staff. For example, VP Uchida, his job in a very important way is to sepak for the college. If I’m an individual faculty member, people understand that faculty are cats that wander about how they will. If I say something terrible about DGreene. If VP were to publicly speak out against DGreene, he’d stop being the VP very soon. As we work out this language, acknowledge the reality, especially leadership staff, have the responsibility to advance the mission. Have to be careful with what we promise.

Richard: Rest of paragraph recognizes rightfully so, in many/most instances when folks speak out, it’s personal and not speaking for the college; root of paragraph to begin with.

Russ: Important for faculty members to clarify that they have a right to speak out as individual citizens on any possibly controversial political issue.

Joe: Tyson, Temple University speaker, said some things about Palestinians that his employers took Umbridge out. Employers at CNN decided they didn’t want him anymore. The university is looking for discipline against him. Under our policy that wouldn’t be allowed. Under our piece he would be able to say what he wanted. DGreene would say, well you know faculty, it’s up to them if they want to speak their mind. As much as possible that’s the direction we want to proceed in.

Sam: Is the December deadline still a thing?

Joe: We have missed the deadline. We have taken an incomplete for the semester. We’ll have a final report to present at February faculty meeting. Our hope is that people at this stage that people will respond to edited draft. Hope that people say “we can live with this”. If we hear fundamental objections, then we will go back to the drawing board to reconsider the foundation.

Richard: If we’re running off the rails, we would love if you could tell us now.

Sam: Why does it skip from 8 to 11?

Joe: Reisert can’t count. This has happened multiple meetings. Often my syllabi have numbering problems. Anyway at one point Paragraph 8 was two paragraphs (there was an 8 and a 9). I don’t know.

Russ: Lots of combining and breaking up of paragraphs.

Reisert: I take full responsibility for not knowing how to count.

Ashlee: Document does place a lot of emphasis on freedom of expression. Do you feel that this document properly/doesn’t/values it too much? Is the wording okay? Do you agree with the wording, do you not agree? Do we dedicate more writing to clarify specific epithets?

Sam Lee:

Joe: There’s a threshold question in Paragraph 11. Do we think that the expression associated with the party, which I’ve only heard about third hand. Whether that expression constituted harassment and if it rose to that level; that would be sanctionable. If it did not rise to that level,
but it was may be conduct that various observers judged to be incompatible with the values of organizations, then loss of privileges would be appropriate, I guess not directly for the conduct, but if you’re a leader representing the group and the group does not want the individual to represent that group anymore, then that student no longer is a part of the group. We don’t have those details to say.

Avery: Clarifying question calling back to what was said earlier. It would have been up to respective groups to which the students were a part of to determine if their leadership positions would be taken away. Is that what this document is going after. E.g. being a COOT leader, up to COOT committee to decide if they can have that position or not.

Joe: That would depend on how Dean of College Office determine discipline. Threshold issue is in the hands of the administration. Right now, Richard’s answer to Sam’s question about how 14 would work, sort of different relevant groups would have their own mechanisms. Dean of College: can determine if student is permanently barred from leadership position for rest of time at Colby.

Russ: Those kinds of groups it’s beyond the group itself because it’s connected in a structural way to the college (COOT). If it’s the Colby Mountaineering Club, that is an independent student group that operates like other student clubs.

Richard: It would be first swiped by administration to see if any administration policies were violated. Is it harassment/defamation/invasion of privacy? Go to individual groups (whether they’re student run, administration/student run, whatever case it may be). One of the questions refers to language; if their actions were antithetical to the Colby Affirmation. There would need to be a determination made in CAC area as to way thought the violation had been hit. How good of a job they educate the community on what these values are. Perhaps in orientation and during the first-year, we haven’t done as good of a job/maybe we have asserting this values. In the future, Deans look at how have we pushed hard to ensure that we have espoused our values. Doesn’t mean suspension/expulsion/probation but it might mean you cannot be a CA anymore, off-campus housing privileges taken away and make you move back on campus. It’s soft.

Shivani: Thank you for taking us through the process of how the Akon Day party would have been handled. When does this document come in place when there is a group that has been targeted in a specific way; drawing the line until knowing what has happened. How does the document play into the process. Okay, looking at Colby’s values, the affirmation, what has been violated?

Richard: 12 and 13 are really sort of the line in the sand for really bad things that express things from a legality point of view. The broadest interpretation of the first amendment, these are no-nos. The Dean of the College/Students would look at this and any other policies in place first to see if insituational/legal violations had occurred under current #12&13, maybe answer is no and now you’re in 14. Did that help?

Shivani: Yes.

Ashlee: What we’re trying to encapsulate is that things exist on a scale. Some things reach a level and some things don’t. All the levels are encompassed in 12-14.

Sam Kane: Say someone was involved with an incident of bias that falls under 14, but afterwards applied for a position of leadership on campus, how do you recommend people hiring for those positions interpret the events of bias.
Joe: Periodically you’ll see on the front page of the Morning Sentinel, students who have been summoned for underage drinking. Groups for who students volunteer no longer want them. Don’t want students who break the law to be a part of their group. Being summoned for underage drinking in the great scheme of things is a minor offense. Reputation of being an ass depends on how large of an ass one was. I think it’s going to be fact-sensitive. When you’re selecting people for positions of leadership, there are always multiple candidates. And part of the story too is the redemption narrative. I did a stupid thing as a freshmen, sophomore and junior years I’ve redeemed myself. Senior year, they prove they get another shot. Very context-sensitive. College is a period of learning. One of the ways we learn is by making mistakes and doing things that are bad/stupid/wrong. I don’t think college should be set up so that one bad mistake as a freshmen shouldn’t tar you forever.

Ben: At a meeting a few weeks ago, a freshman brought up: how do we define groups/individuals. If I wore a shirt to this meeting and said that “anti-DG” I would be punished for that. DG says you wouldn’t be sanctioned for that. If a student wears a shirt “F*** Asian-Americans” that is sanctionable because they are a federally protected group. Instances of slander vs. instances of purposeful harassment.

Joe: A lot of detailed questions will have to be handled at the level of senior admin. I can say a little about how I think these values play out. First of all, groups protected by federal/state law (numerated set of groups), race, gender, etc. If someone wears a t-shirt (one person), maybe that’s harassment. Maybe that’s just you being obnoxious. There’s a fact determination that has to be made. I think it becomes threatening if there’s a big group of people that wear a shirt that says “screw this group”. You can definitely fear “eff the president” or “eff Prof. Reisert” around campus. You’d be free to do that. Harassment vs. defamation. Statements that are false/damaging. If the administration/disciplining process found out that you’re spreading damaging lies about people, you’re taking away someone’s reputation unjustly. That’s appropriately subject to sanctioning.

Laura Polley: Once it goes into the group process, how will groups get that information. Will it be freely given or will groups have to enquire and seek it out themselves?

Joe: I’m not sure we know. In Richard’s answer, one possibility of this playing out, we haven’t worked this out. Can imagine a world in which there’s kind of official statement from the college where this incident wasn’t consistent with our values. Leave groups to decide for themselves. The damage to the community in doing things that are insensitive and obnoxious in part comes them from being public. There’s an argument that incidents that have become notorious/triggered attention, then perhaps not so. Very preliminary and we’re open to advice about this.

Laura Polley: I think the values are pretty well-written out. If it’s just a student organization judging, some of the details can’t be given to students. Another caveat. If trying to figure out leadership roles, want to make sure specific details are shared but also protecting the privacy of the student.

Richard: Rush to judgment; not knowing the full story. I would hope that every organization would take it upon themselves to take time. Notice an opportunity for student to be heard before a decision/judgment is made. If student values leadership position in mountaineering club, give them a chance to say something before you make a decision. Maybe make judgement afterwards.
Zack: Any last comments/questions/concerns?
Richard: I hope that you let Ashlee know or let the three of us know. We would rather know sooner than later. Go back to the drawing board or does this suck? Do we have to go back to the drawing board. Lesson from tonight: even professors need extensions!

Old Business
Zack: I ask that all of you bear with me and the rest of us up here and get through these motions very quickly.

**Motion 1**—redesign ColbyCards
Ellie: Student health working group has been focusing on the past few weeks. Working to redesign the ColbyCards (photos for reference in the motion, examples of other institutions with more resources), make health resources on/off-campus more accessible. Carry phone numbers with us all of the time. We would hope to get this going so that next year, first-year class ID cards will have these resources. New cards phased in.
Zack: Look at photos in motion.
Ellie: Promoting for people to call for help when they need it. Right now the only number on our ID is the emergency number for security. The resources are on other institutions’ cards and these resources already exist.
Ashlee: Where will old information go?
Sam Lee: (answers)
Avery: Would everyone on campus get a new ID card?
Ellie: No, it would phase in over the next several years. First-years get new card. Lose card, get the new card.
Tanner: You can also replace your card for free regardless.
Zack: Do you want to elaborate on that?
Tanner: If the scanner thing doesn’t work on back of card, say your ColbyCard is broken. So get it replaced for free.
Zack: Any other comments/concerns.

Vote: All present are in favor!

Zack: This means SGA endorses this motion

**Motion 2**
Tanner: Motion to take a group photo.
Zack: May have to be tabled.
Sarah Bibeau: Class of 2020 has perfect attendance tonight!
Zack: People are not too up in arms tonight. Let’s take a photo tonight and then footnote it to another photo for those who are absent. Alright, thank you, Tanner. This is outside of parliamentary procedure. No need to vote on it.

**Motion 3**
Julia: In the event that a co-president steps down/is booted, bring up a senator to replace co-president and then hold election for senator.
Zack: So a quick clarifying question, so SGA would vote.
Sarah Bibeau: Vote of confidence of 50%.
Gen: Would all senators be up for selection? Or would one person be chosen?
Sarah Bibeau: If co-president has someone in mind from the senator of group they can choose that person.
Zack: Vote of confidence for person to take co-president position. Newly opened senator position would be open for election.
Ashlee: If president were to bring someone up, would remaining co-president have to argue reason why they want the specific senator.
Sarah Bibeau: Explain why that senator would be good for the position. Can make a case for that senator. Didn’t put in motion, but could be a good idea.
Zack: Does that satisfy the point?
Ashlee: Yes.
Nena: Why a pre-existing senator? Why not the actual co-president spot up for election.
Julia: Don’t want current co-president to lose position. Easy transition for someone with SGA experience to become co-president. Senator election is the simplest election to hold.
Sam:
Tyra: In the future, to have defense for candidate you’re choosing. Don’t want co-president to pick closest friend. Wouldn’t be the wisest option.
Avery: Make a suggestion/ask you guys what you thought about this. Keep it within SGA, senator is moved up, and then class council member is moved up.
Matt Mitchell: If a class-president stepped down, would senator be required to bring up a senator?
Sarah Bibeau: Constitution emphasizes that there be two class presidents per class.
Laura Polley: What if they don’t see any of their senators fit? Go to class council to do that?
Sarah Bibeau: Motion doesn’t specify.
Tyra: Class council members are chosen by presidents and not elected into SGA. Not be selected in the same way. In that situation get a completely new senator.
Sarah Bibeau: Have already someone elected to SGA was our main motivation.
Ben: I agree with Tyra. Having SGA vote on the class senator being pulled up makes sense since the senator has already been elected and the class voted him/her/them in. No brainer: a scenario where class-president steps down in middle of semester. Would senator serve as co-president for rest of year or just for rest of semester?
Sarah Bibeau: I would say they stay.
Ashlee: There’s not anything in the motion how quickly this has to be done?
Sarah Bibeau: It says it has to be done before the beginning of the next semester.
Julia: Can do it right away, can wait.
Sam Kane: In the case co-president/senator is removed, elections are at discretion of EBoard. Elections must be held within 3 weeks. The language of Constitution now stands that a separate election occurs. So have to amend that part of Constitution.
Zack: Does the passage you just read, is it addressed in this motion?
Sarah & Julia: No.
Ashlee: In the language of the motion, this would be an amendment. So it needs to be unanimously voted upon.
Sam Kane: *reads from Constitution*
Tanner: Difference between by-law and Constitution?
Sam Lee:
Matt Mitchell: Molly went abroad, Merrill and I had to run again. Molly decided to go abroad in the Fall of last year, so Merrill had to run with me again. Would Merrill have to pull up a senator?
Julia & Sarah: Yes
Justin Zhang: Can we go over again, what a vote of confidence means?
Sarah Bibeau: >50%
Justin: What happens if vote of confidence is not met?
Sarah: Would have to choose another candidate.
Justin: Why not run a completely new election? Why not have SGA vote?
Sarah Bibeau: It wouldn’t be effective. Can talk to your senators and gauge who wants to do it, who would be best.
Ashlee: President can definitely see how much a senator is dedicated to SGA. Certain qualities; flexibility to choose. There’s value in that in what remaining co-president has to say.
Tanner: What happens if none of senators want to be co-president?
Sam Lee:
Zack: It was decided that Ashlee would serve out the rest of her term alone and then would pull up a senator next semester.
Sam Kane: Move to table.
Tanner: Second.

Vote: All in favor of tabling.

Zack: We’ll address it at a future meeting.

Motion 4
Shivani: Hannah came up with it and asked me to read it. Same kind of process where you have course evaluations for lab assistants. Process would go through Provost McFadden. It would be another box on your course evaluation. This is primarily for STEM.
Zack: Laboratory assistant. What is it? I do not take science courses. Laboratory assistant is a student that sits in on the lab. Do they have outside of lab hours?
Shivani: No.
Zack: Interesting. Does anybody have questions about this motion?
Ben: Who does this apply to?
Shivani: Any major in which lab assistant gets paid.
Zack: Cool. Any questions/comments?
Justin Zhang: Why did you not extend this to TAs as well?
Gen: Specifically TAs don’t have an active role in lab/classroom. They’re tutors. Hannah’s point with this, lab assistants have a higher positions than tutors.
Laura Powell: Is the position held for one semester?
Shivani: It’s at the discretion of lab teacher.
Laura Powell: What if there is no need to do an evaluation if the student is only doing it one semester.
Zack: Any other comments?
Tanner: Move to question.
Sam Leppo: Second.

Vote: All in favor!

Sam: Send committee reports to Maddie.

Laura: It’s late.
Tyra: I pulled a full-on all-nighter.
Ashlee: Are we going to take a picture?
Laura Polley: Yes.
Zack: Jesus.

The gavel was passed.