General Assembly Meeting Agenda
February 4th, 2020 - 7:00pm
Commonwealth B — Squires Student Center
Roll Call Question: If you were a fictional character, what TV show or movie would you be in?

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
   a. Quorum met
   c. Absent: Scott Braatz, Saachi Khurana, Jacob Labinger, Christopher Reutt, Ester Rivera, Ashley Shebat, Melanie Sherrill, Robbert Siemens, Blake Smith, Lucas Tuosto, Peter Woods
3. Adoption of Agenda
   a. Motion to adopt
   b. Motion passes
   c. point of order: were the new members called for attendance?
      i. No, they weren’t, Victoria is sick, and that was an oversight
      ii. All confirmed new members are here
   d. no discussion
   e. motion passes
4. Reading of Minutes
   a. motion to amend the minutes
      i. remove section 9 subsection c point 10 subsection c and d (under the motion to vote)
      ii. Where Scott made a speech in opposition, and as advisor Scott should remain an advisor
      iii. Scott should remain impartial but he said it so it should be in there
      iv. The advisor should be impartial, and it also interrupts a motion which is a point of order which should have been called in and of itself
      v. Scott: role is to be impartial but not silent, role is the organization and the students, if something is hurting the students and SGA then he can speak on
it. Happy to discuss with students and students can speak to Gina if they feel Scott is not doing a good job.

vi. Several people have been annoyed about the speak up and some members of the body felt it was inappropriate, the advisor has the ability and role to advise to people when they’re writing legislation, and just because people disagree with the advisor doesn’t mean they should change their opinion, it is the students responsibility to hold these discussions.

vii. Did you say that you felt that Scott was personally attacking you? There were no points raised in the meeting that Scott was attacking somebody, it was a valid point, and it is the advisor’s job.

viii. Scott: Point of Order- we can continue to discuss this but there is currently a motion on the table to remove this, so regardless of this, we need to discuss if it needs to be redacted and if you want to continue the discussion about my role that’s separate.

ix. Conrad: we’re just talking about if the comment was biased or not.

x. Motion to Vote
   1. Seconded
      a. Vote to remove section of minutes
      b. Aye- 8
      c. Nay- 17
      d. Abstain-7
   2. Motion fails

xi. Motion to fix under motion to vote under section c, the yays and nays are switched the motion did fail
   1. motion passes

xii. Motion passes to approve minutes

5. Special Orders
   a. Public Forum
      i. Jackson: Not here as chief justice, here as a student
         1. Wants to combat two things
         2. Wants to close the gap on food insecurity
         3. Asks you to begin impeachment proceedings against the president
         4. VP and I have many fundamental disagreements, but I know that is because he is a man of conviction and this president is a man of convenience
         5. The President has to act as a liaison and spokesperson, has failed to meet members of administration. consistently missed his meetings
with the president of the university… there were times when our body and our organization were left without representation

6. Sources of people who have seen missed meetings include members of the executive branch, GSA members, president Sands

7. This hurts our organization and the student body…

8. The president willfully neglected duties, we face serious challenges in this school, and we must have a serious leader

9. For those of you who are worried about what this will bring to the organization, I think it will bring nothing but good, I remind you that impeachment need not be hasty nor without evidence

10. During announcements, there would be a motion to form an impeachment inquiry committee

11. For all of you that seek the truth you should support the creation of a joint inquiry committee

ii. Questions:

1. It’s not only the president’s job to be a liaison between our organization and other orgs but also between undergrads and administration and other power, and to represent undergrads, how do you think this has affected undergrads?
   a. Jackson: imagine a room where undergrads aren’t represented… imagine the problems undergrads face. This is the equivalent of your lawyer not showing up to your court date

2. There are other routes of sanctions, would you mind telling us about them?
   a. I guess a claim could be filed, a number of us have spoken to the president and the president was very dismissive, if we wish to repair our name in the university, impeachment is a necessity. The bylaws say willful neglect is grounds of impeachment
   b. The wording is shall be grounds of impeachment
   c. The accuser shall make the allegations

3. Clarify the main charge about the actions that caused him to meet these constitutional pieces, was that he was missing meetings with President Sands?
   a. Not only President Sands, but I am saying by missing these meetings he failed to be a liaison for undergraduate students
b. Do you know how many meetings or which?
c. He hasn’t attended a single university commission meeting all year, CSA, there’s an informal meeting with President Sands and I would say he’s missed almost all of those. I think if you reach out to different members of these councils, they will affirm he was not in attendance. He missed Core 5, CSA, and University Council

4. If the president is impeached does the vice president become President?
   a. Yes, VP would become president. at this point we’re so close to the election that VP would not be filled and there may not be a special election

5. The job of the SGA president is an external role, if they’re not at these meetings, then what are they doing? that is their job

6. How is the inquiry committee created and who is on it?
   a. it’s in the bylaws

Confirmation of Judicial Officers
   iii. Allie Schrant (Chief Justice)
       1. Freshman, majors in political science with a concentration in legal studies, was HAJ until Jackson resigned and will now take over his role

b. Confirmation of Legislative Members
   i. Lauren Hoyns (CLHS)
       1. not here

c. Civil Discourse
   i. Did not know this would be so needed today, try to refrain from gossip when you don’t go to the person it can make the problem seem bigger than it is; use mindfulness in terms of how we’re treating each other; respect each other; we’re here to represent the student body, you need to separate somebody’s argument from them; go talk to Sanskriti if you have conflicts; reflect on forgiveness; listen to others respectfully; never listen only to rebut; try to remember a criticism isn’t as personal as you think it is; communicate directly and with vulnerability
   ii. It matters how you bring it to the table, not only what you bring; your fellow representatives aren’t your adversaries; we have some very important decisions ahead of us; we need to remember why we’re here and try to stand up to the values our students expect from us
6. Officer Reports
   a. President– Adil Sageer
      i. Come to my office hours to talk about university governance
      ii. Will have new members next week
      iii. Finalized the candidates for VP of Student Affairs
      iv. Apply to be BOV rep,
      v. Will address this stuff in announcements later, but the claims aren’t true
   b. Vice President– Blake Barnhill
      i. Victoria is sick, she’ll present the budget next week. Let her know if you
         know any office supplies that can be ordered or if you want to use the
         clicker,
      ii. Sign up for office hours
      iii. Let Chapman know of event ideas
      iv. Let Joe know if you have social media ideas
   c. Chair– Sadie Faith Andersen
      i. Talk to Sanskriti if you have not signed up for office hours
      ii. Committee meetings are starting this week
      iii. Check slack and emails
      iv. Think about what you want to work on;
      v. Let Sadie know if you need or want to change committees
   d. Secretary– Victoria Dashevsky
      i. is sick
   e. Advisors– Scott Nachlis, Gabby Singh
      i. Scott: Sounds like there may be concerns about what I said last week, I’m
         here to support all of you, and make sure you’re all learning, I would never
         intentionally hurt any of you, there are checks and balances in that, if you
         have concerns about the way I am doing it, I would encourage you to chat
         with me; I think there’s a lot of potential and for all of you to do that much
         more; there are some big decisions happening over the week
      ii. Gabby: While Scott and I as advisors meet with students, that does also
          extend to these meeting and it is appropriate for us to speak on a topic

7. University Governance Commission/Committee Reports
   a. CSA met-orientation meeting
   b. University Council-
      i. BOV interviews
      ii. assessing current government structure
      iii. will be hearing from different groups
iv. Moving degree requirements to the day you enter college
v. religious absence accommodations bill passed
vi. new school of communication and design
vii. resolution to create AP senate for ap faculty
  1. what’s AP faculty?
     a. Administrative and professional faculty, people like Scott
viii. When should we expect to hear back about university governance?
  1. that’s an Adil decision
     2. Adil: finalized list tomorrow, Victoria thought she could do a better job and I could finalize it

8. SGA Committee Reports
   a. Academic Affairs
      i. Will talk to faculty senate meeting about our SPOT survey legislation
      ii. Campus grade legislation was just sent to Mike earlier this week
   b. Campus Development
      i. Had the first meeting, talking about the structure for this semester, and updating the AdHOC
   c. Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility
      i. First meeting tomorrow
   d. Student Health and Wellness
      i. Will send representatives to the mental health committee, Jack’s been attending the mental health coalition

9. Unfinished Business
   a. none

10. New Business
    a. Bill to Increase and Redefine Allotted Absences for General Assembly Representatives
       i. Point of Clarification: Conrad and Jack rescinded their bill, so this is a completely new bill that doesn’t have anything to do with Conrad’s Bill
       ii. It has quotations from the Judicial interpretation and our responses to it
       iii. Questions
           1. When it says in section 5 shall be grounds for impeachment only, does that mean you’re removing the appeals process?
              a. yeah, it’s going back to constitutional precedence
           2. Did you speak with judicial when you wrote this bill?
              a. Did not, I wrote is based on the constitution, bylaws
           3. Did you speak to anyone outside of leg?
              a. Spoke to Sadie
b. Sadie: it was sent to advisors

4. When did this not become a thing?
   a. The precedent is in the constitution and bylaws
   b. Impeachment and the process of appealing existed at the same time?
      i. no, no, impeachment would be the only thing
   c. bylaws said impeachment or removal, judicial has been interpreting that as removal
      i. Allie: we’ve been using the appeal process when someone gets to three absences, we meet and discuss to see if the appeal should be granted

5. What is some?
   a. the number of people on the bill and the amount of time we’ve spent discussing this should quantify some

6. For when it says when a representative misses an entire meeting, how would this affect quorum? say the votes are different for a bill that was passed?
   a. the reason we added it was leniency with time, currently the judicial interpretation is missing any single vote, I don’t want you to be scared to go to the bathroom

7. What happened with the poll?
   a. Conrad can speak to that, I didn’t add it to the bill because I felt it was an internal issue

8. Sara: would you consider putting a cap, like 10-15 minutes coming in within a meeting?
   a. We can definitely discuss that

9. Point of order, can the gallery speak during meetings?
   a. Gallery: why not write legislation that addresses time limits, to what Sara was saying, to what addresses the issue?

10. I think this legislation does address the issue, I think there are multiple issues to the attendance policy, the bill is still open to amendments, the impeachment clause is important to the bylaws based on the precedent

11. Let’s say I miss four meetings, why would you go through an entire impeachment process saying I missed four meetings when there’s data saying I missed four meetings and judicial can use that?
a. Impeachment lets both sides have discussion
12. Natalie: are you aware of what majority requirement for impeachment?
   a. Yes, ⅔
e. Am I wrong when I say ¾
c. Oh, maybe ¾
13. Seems this was done to check and balance by a different branch, instead of a popularity type of thing
14. We as SGA representatives hold ourselves to a high standard
15. Do you think it’s better for the body to do that than having an impartial third party do it?
   a. I think it makes sense for the body to do it, I think the judicial branch has other powers as outlined in the bylaws and constitution
16. Point of order: I thought representative impeachment was sent the judicial branch?
   a. Judicial investigates
17. I think it would be more beneficial to have it okay to miss a certain amount of time, but also to have judicial procedures in there as well
18. Thank you for bringing up the bylaws and everything, the judicial process is about checks and balances, right?
   a. yeah I think so if the case is about impartiality
19. You can also file a claim
   a. I don’t think I understand your question
20. If someone breaks the bylaws or constitution we can file a case with the judiciary, and say this person missed three, and both would make their case to the judiciary, in a sense do you think that would be pretty much the same thing as an appeal process?
   a. similar, but in impeachment, they have a voice and know what they’re on trial for
21. I would be able to miss 27% of meetings without repercussions, how would that be okay?
   a. I think setting up a limit for time would be a good idea, please add it. I think flinging around the number 27% isn’t what this bill is intended for, I think the bill allows us to be faithful representatives and represent our constituents, I think harsher deadlines makes it harder
22. How would this affect meeting times if we have to impeach our fellow representatives
   a. I don’t think it would be super long

23. Would we have to create an inquiry committee?
   a. Representatives, have a different process, the impeachment is much more in the hands of the GA for reps and in the hands of the judicial panel for President and VP

24. How would we know when we would be impeaching people?

iv. Discussion

1. Conrad wrote a speech, the argument that a bylaw change should only take change next semester is unconstitutional, only constitutional changes happen next semester. Thinks the current policy is a little too strict, any interpretation having to wait is wrong, we should not hesitate to change an unfair rule, removal of an elected official is no small matter; edits become effective upon a ⅔ vote, the moment we pass the vote it becomes effective

2. If you miss roll call, you miss the entirety of the meeting, so how does this bill solve anything?
   a. Blake: that’s for the current process

3. How can you logically say missing roll call is missing an entire meeting? People, then come late and then their vote still counts. how does that make sense?

4. The current system is that the proposed change is that you show up after roll call they will go back and mark you here

5. Eliminating this line about judicial power, removes all judicial power, so if you file a claim there’s nothing the judicial branch can do if you showed up five minutes before the meeting ended you could be counted as here, it’s not feasible to have an impeachment for everyone; not going to a meeting with your dean as a college rep can be grounds for impeachment; I don’t think any of you should be impeached for that but you can be; this is a blatant abuse of power by the legislative branch to take power away from the judicial

6. Someone who’s listed as a sponsor resigned minutes ago

7. Move to amend line 4, change to if a representative misses more than ¼ of a meeting
   a. Seconded
   b. Discussion:
i. Sara: we can’t quantify that ¼ of a meeting is, we don’t have time bounds in a meeting, i think we should say its the first ten minutes of a meeting
   1. Wouldn’t it be easier to just say 30 minutes?
   2. Amend the amendment to say ….
   3. Motion rescinded

   c. Motion to extend the discussion by 15 minutes
      i. yay: 20, no: 9; abstain: 2
      ii. passes

8. Move to amend section 4 and say an absence is defined as missing the first 10 minutes of a meeting

9. Point of information: it has to be changed in the bylaws too right?
   a. Yes

10. I don’t think it’s appropriate to allow people to come late whenever

11. I see the point, but I think it’s too strict and unfair to count someone who was here and participated and voted as absent; I recommend saying when a representative shows up or arrives later than the first ten minutes of the meeting

12. Can we say misses more than the first 10 minutes

13. There is the proxy system and if something really major comes up you have a proxy, and the appeals process

14. I would suggest amending it to be in terms of votes

15. Point of information. could you tell the person taking attendance why you’re late

16. currently, you can appeal it to judicial but it’s a box thing not in person

17. General assembly needs to be here for public forum, and that’s the first couple minutes of a meeting

18. Point of information: is voting for agenda considered a vote?
   a. Yes

19. If we don’t meet quorum, we can’t have a meeting

20. Motion to end the discussion and move to a vote
   a. seconded
   b. yay: 33
   c. no: 0
   d. abstain: 0
   e. Motion passes
21. voting on motion of amendment on section 4
   a. yay: 22
   b. no: 10
   c. abstain: 1
   d. Motion passes

v. Discussion on bill
   1. People haven’t touched on second and third clauses, the difference between retention and absences, the argument is if people have a less strict policy then they will stay in the body more, you have no data showing people resigned because of the attendance policy; this is going to allow them to show late and then miss an additional meeting; our basic job is to come to these meetings and vote;
   2. If we did impeachment only we would need to have 5 different processes for the 5 people who got 3 absences tonight, imagine adding that to a meeting it’s 9:12 right now. Move to amend line 5 to two absences per semester and shall be grounds for judicial review.
      a. That’s asking to strike that
      b. Second to the motion to strike
   3. Can you bring up the data from the poll I sent Sadie? sent out a poll to the updated roster; out of 33 respondents, there were 10 that said no its not too strict and 23 said yes
   4. Sara: what is the definition of strict?
      a. I can look at a dictionary
   5. I feel like we should keep the impeachment part, I think you’re overestimating the amount of time it takes to impeach, it’s just like two votes during announcements
   6. Motion to vote, to end discussion
      a. seconded
      b. yay: 34
      c. Nay: 0
      d. Abstain: 0
      e. Motion fails
   7. Voting to strike line 5
   8. yay: 21
   9. nay: 13
   10. abstain: 0
      a. Motion passes
11. Announcements
   
   a. Adil: I’m very disappointed right now, the claim is 100% false. The claim is that I missed these meetings regularly. University Council:
      i. This is not appropriate right now
      ii. This is not the point to have the adjudication about what’s being discussed, there’s a process
   
   b. He can defend himself at the proper time when proceedings begin if we decide to vote for them
      i. Can’t you override any other points?
   
   c. I’m going to ask you sit down and let the GA speak first.
   
   d. I think it’s unconstitutional. After an accusation, there’s a formation of an inquiry committee and he can state his case then, I don’t think there’s anything allowing this.
   
   e. Articles 7 of impeachment to formally make impeachment uses article 4 of constitution, and reading the president’s outlined duties, section c of article 4, section d subsection 2, subsection 12,
      i. introduce a motion in bylaws of impeachment and inquiry committee
      ii. Seconded

   1. Have to create inquiry committee before voting
      a. Jonathan chooses: Jonathan, Conrad, Brogan, Sara, Miles, Jack
      b. Adil chooses Drew, Reena

   iii. Discussion on inquiry committee
      1. Wants to point out the seriousness of these charges, the point of the committee is to find out if those accusations are true; if he was not, if the president was not at those meetings that is utterly disrespectful, we need to take those accusations extremely seriously
      2. Can you list the names on the committee again?
      3. We also need to talk to the other people who were cited as evidence
      4. The full investigation happens a little later
         a. The bylaws say the committee should investigate and come back to the meeting next week with findings
      5. There is an investigation, it is specifically talking about if those charges are valid not if those charges were true, they are not having the full determination, they’re not determining if the person will be impeached
6. Just like Sam was able to speak last year, I am going to speak
7. Chief Justice should step out of the room
8. I think it’s unfair to not let him, especially compared to last year
9. To clarify, feels the president was asked questions not that he spoke answers to
10. So, can we ask adil questions right now?
11. What was alleged wasn’t attendance last year
12. When can he defend himself?
13. We’re discussing the motion that was made
14. Adil were you absent for the meetings? if so why?
   a. you can’t ask that
15. This is a grey area, we should vote, and have this committee, I think we’re just lengthening the meeting
16. Even the thought of any of those things being true should be of concern, if the president is as innocent as he said, there should be nothing wrong with having an inquiry, the most appropriate response is to create this committee
17. I want you guys to consider that last year the president was allowed to talk about things, this year I can’t say anything. I ask you vote no and allow me to talk.
18. That’s what the committee is for, is to investigate the claim, also can we see the claim?
19. Motion to vote
   a. seconded
   b. yay (26) nay (3) abstain (1)
   c. ⅔ majority needs to be made to vote-⅔ met
20. Vote on if the committee should be made
   a. yay (12) nay (15) abstain (5)
   b. fails
   c. move to reconsider
   d. This is all about seeing if this is an impeachable offense
      i. can’t reconsider
      ii. Vote again
         1. voting on if you want to reconsider
            a. yay (12) nay (19) abstain (1)
            b. motion fails
      iv. Can this be made again?
         1. Will have to let you know after discussing with Judicial branch
v. motion to adjourn
   1. seconded
   2. We had hands up
   3. I don’t think it’s polite to motion to adjourn when people have hands up
   4. yay (25) nay (7) abstain (1)
   5. Motion passes

12. Adjournment
   a. Meeting adjourned at 9:54 pm