



1801 Panorama Drive, CC-4 – Bakersfield, CA 93305 – Phone: (661) 395-4355 – Fax: (661) 395-4722
www.bakersfieldcollegesga.weebly.com

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION
Special Executive & Senate Board Meeting Minutes
Bakersfield College

Wednesday, March 5th, 2014 3:00p.m. – 5:00p.m. Location: Executive Board Room

I. Call To Order

Meeting was called to order at 3:00p.m., by Acting President Shelby Sward.

II. Flag Salute

III. Roll Call

Present: Shelby Sward, Erin Robinson, Nathan Mayer, Daniela Miramontes, Trina Goree, Shelby Fallas, Victoria Kovacevich, Aeri Kim, and Advisor Elizabeth Peisner

Late: Daniela Garcia

Absent: Edwin Borbon, Eric Beadle, and Jose Perez

IV. Adoption of the Agenda

Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to adopt the agenda.

Motion passed by general consent, 7-0-0.

Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to suspend the orders of the day and move into Recognition of Guest.

Motion passed by general consent, 7-0-0.

V. Approval of the Minutes

-None

VI. Recognition of Guests

Reggie: Asked Trina Goree could the GSA club borrow her canopy April 22, 2014 for the Garden Fest event?

Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to suspend the orders of the day and move into New Business, 2. Special Orders, item a.

Motion passed by general consent, 7-0-0.

VII. Additions to the Agenda

-None

VIII. Reports

-None

IX. Unfinished Business

-None

X. New Business

1. Expenditures

-None

2. Special Orders

- a. **Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to review and discuss the proposed constitutional amendments and revisions.**

Discussion:

Nathan Mayer: Article X: Ratification section implies that the document is an amendment of the existing Constitution whereas it is an entirely new Constitution with a new structure, so we should either remove that article all together or reword it.

Elizabeth Peisner: May we modify the date so that the date the new Constitution will take effect will be simultaneous when the incoming members take office.

Outcome: The changes will be implemented before the second review of the constitution in our next Senate meeting.

Erin Robinson: I also have issue with the Parliamentarian and the Secretary only being elected members. (Article III: Branches of the Student Government Association, Section 1, Pages 3 & 4 and Article VIII: Elections and Appointments, Sections 1 & 2, Page 10)

Daniela Miramotnes: *Read the Article III: Branches of the Student Government Association, Section 1, items C and H, pages 3 & 4*

Shelby Sward: *Opened discussion on the Secretary and Parliamentarian positions not being voting members.*

Nathan Mayer: The major points, in my opinion, are that the two positions require a greater degree of objectivity than other positions. The Secretary is responsible for recording the minutes and if that person were to have a biased position it can be reflected in the minutes. The Parliamentarian is responsible to maintain parliamentary procedure

and enforcing the constitution which also require objectivity in that if I favor one side that person can possibly sway the interpretation of the constitution during debate.

Erin Robinson: I disagree; I think that purpose of approving minutes in a meeting is a form of checks and balances. If the Secretary were to record the minutes in a way that didn't reflect what actually happened during Senate meetings that person wouldn't be doing their job, and other avenues should be taken to deal with that issue. Everyone has a bias in any position. If the Parliamentarian were to use their knowledge of the constitution and or Roberts Rule to control the debate then he or she isn't performing their job accurately and it is the responsibility of the other SGA members to hold each other accountable and call that person out on what they are or aren't doing. Just because a person may or may not abuse their power shouldn't be the determining factor if they should have those powers. It is prejudging those incoming individuals that they want to do their job ethically.

Shelby Sward: My opinion is that the Secretary should be a voting member's whereas the Parliamentarian shouldn't. I don't think that we should be textbook; I use the SSCCC as my model. The SSCCC have a non-student as the Parliamentarian and the Secretary as a student that is a voting member. My thoughts behind that are, the Secretary sends the minutes out to everyone before the actual meetings to be read and reviewed so that if there are any issues we can address them before approving the minutes, as a form of checks and balances, and I don't think that is something that has been abused. As far as the Parliamentarian that is different, during the meetings there isn't any motion or action that can be taken if the Parliamentarian was to be abusing their power. The saying goes why fix something that isn't broken.

Trina Goree: The reasoning to take away the voting rights of the Secretary and the Parliamentarian is speculation at this point. There is nothing, to my knowledge, that has been done to remove the voting rights from either position. But I feel that we are leaders and not followers and any changes should be ours (the SGAs) decision, but as far as everything else it is all speculation.

Nathan Mayer: There is also practical argument for changing the Secretary to a non-voting member because in meetings I feel that it is difficult for a Secretary to be a fully focused voting member and Secretary at the same time. You are inherently going to be sacrificing either of the two.

Shelby Sward: I agree with Nathan, but being the President you face the same dilemma of having to multitask. And no one is going to be perfect.

Shelby Fallas: By taking the voting powers are the positions going to paid positions?

Elizabeth Peisner: Yes

Nathan Mayer: What is the status in the E-Board positions being paid?

Elizabeth Peisner: The paid portion will remain as the same. There will be just changes within the titles of the E-Board and there will be an added position.

Erin Robinson: To address Nathan last comment, it can happen that the Secretary can sacrifice their minutes regardless because without voting rights the Secretary can still be

distracted by being engaged in dialogue during debate, or is the Secretary not allowed as well.

Elizabeth Peisner: Without the voting rights the Parliamentarian and the Secretary will not be given discussion rights as well.

Erin Robinson: See I feel that is a problem because no SGA member should be silences at the table during meetings. Especially as an Executive Board member that is representing the study body just like another member. Every SGA member should have a voice at the table.

Daniela Miramontes: I generally like the idea that both positions be elected. As far as either having voting powers that can be left up to interpretation.

Trina Goree: I know that we are changing the Bylaws, but what's the problem with why the positions are being changed?

Shelby Sward: Opened discussion in regards to Secretary and Parliamentarian being elected positions:

Nathan Mayer: I don't think that we can discuss that before we settle the matter with the positions being voting members. So I think that we should continue discussing that issue and vote on it before moving on.

Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to decide if the Parliamentarian position should have voting rights in the Senate meetings.

Discussion:

Nathan Mayer: The referee shouldn't play the game.

Trina Goree: I feel that it should stay the same the way it always been.

Motion failed by general consent, 2-6-0.

Outcome: The Parliamentarian will not be a voting member in the Senate meetings.

Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to decide if the Secretary-Historian position should have voting rights in the Senate meetings.

Discussion:

Nathan Mayer: I feel that the score keeper shouldn't play the game.

Motion passed by general consent, 5-4-0 (The Acting President, Shelby Sward voted to break the tie)

Outcome: The Secretary-Historian will be a voting member in the Senate meetings.

Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to decide if the Parliamentarian should be an elected position.

Discussion:

Nathan Mayer: I think that the position doesn't require people skills, so any student can win the students vote/positions, but not have the skills that are required of the positions, and with that I don't think that the Parliamentarian should be an elected position.

Trina Goree: Based on that argument it could apply to all positions and shouldn't be the deciding factor. If that is the case than all SGA positions should be appointed rather than elected.

Erin Robinson: I agree with Trina, SGA are advocates for the student body and the students should have a say in who they want to represent them. In case of a vacancy then appointment is fine, but to pick and choose is a disservice.

Daniela Miramontes: I agree that the election process is a population contest, but the Parliamentarian doesn't have to be a people person, but I think that it is time that we take action in what we have learned because we have had people in office that weren't skilled in people skills.

Shelby Fallas: In the UC and CSU system the two positions are appointed, correct?

Elizabeth Peisner: Yes

Shelby Fallas: Being that it is done everywhere else, we should get students used to that process in the UC and CSU system.

Erin Robinson: So if the two positions are appointed who is going to appoint to do the appointing, the outgoing or the incoming President? (Addressing Shelby Sward) I don't know what it is to be the President, but looking on the outside in, it doesn't seem that you have the time to host a series of interviews, that time should be used for something the Association can benefit from and in all honesty is a waste of time.

Nathan Mayer: All you made valid points and I suggest that the appointment be done by the current term, and the Senate interviews all potential candidates.

Shelby Fallas: The issue of the interview process being a time constriction, because there would only be a few candidates that would be interviewed for the position.

Trina Goree: I just want everyone to keep in mind that we are going from appointing Senators to them being elected, and E-Board members from being elected to being appointed.

Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to call the question.

Motion passed by general consent, 8-0-0.

Main Motion: Motion to decide if the Parliamentarian should be an elected position.

Motion failed by general consent, 4-3-0.

Outcome: The Parliamentarian will be an appointed position.

Moved by Nathan Mayer and seconded by Daniela Miramontes to decide if the Secretary-Historian should be an elected position.

Discussion:

Nathan Mayer: Since we made the position a voting member than we should vote to have that position an elected position.

Motion passed by general consent, 8-0-0.

Outcome: The Secretary-Historian will be an elected position.

Discussion:

Erin Robinson: I have an issue with members of the Judicial Review Board; I feel that it should consist of the members that are listed, but not the SGA Advisor. Just like in the Student Conduct Meetings/Hearings the SGA Advisor that also doubles as the Director of Student Life facilitates those meetings and doesn't have a say in the matter.

Outcome: The Constitution will read that the Judicial Review Board can't meet unless the Advisor is in attendance.

Aeri Kim: It states that the President is to appoint members to the committee, so are we going to keep that the same or not, since there were an issue with appointing the Parliamentarian and Secretary positions.

Shelby Sward: I don't think that would be an issue because the members will have already been elected/appointed and sworn into office.

Nathan Mayer: I have an issue with the balance of power within the three powers of branches (The Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Branches, starting at Article III, Section I Executive Branch). The Senate is described as being vested with Executive, Legislative, and Judicial authority, on page 7, Article V. It implies that giving explicit authority to the E-Board is dangerous because it undermines the authority of the Senate. Ideally I wouldn't want an Executive Board acting independently from the Senate because the Senate should give authority to act to the Executive Board (Article III). I think that it would be best to strike out the first sentence.

Erin Robinson: I have another issue on page 8, number 7 (*read section*)

Nathan Mayer: I also have that same issue, because it needs to be reworded to be made simpler. But I think it should stay because it gives the students the right to remove someone from their job if they aren't doing their job, along with having a member removed internally.

Erin Robinson: I don't think that it should be only for the President and Vice President; it should be for all elected positions.

Nathan Mayer: The students can recall any elected member. It also reads that we can remove a Senator with a 2/3 votes.

XI. Other Reports

1. Renegade Pantry

- No report
- 2. Safe Space
 - No report
- 3. Student Senate for California Community Colleges
 - No report

XII. Announcements/Discussion

-None

XIII. Adjournment

Moved by Trina Goree and seconded by Shelby Fallas to adjourn at 4:51p.m.

Motion passed by general consent, 8-0-0.



Erin Robison
SGA Secretary 2013-2014