

Bowdoin Student Government

BOWDOIN COLLEGE

Meeting of the **Bowdoin Student Government**

17 Oct. 2007

- I. **Call to Order** at 8:45 p.m.
Dustin apologizes for being late. Several members were at the “Is Bowdoin queer friendly?” forum. This explains their tardiness.
- II. **Roll Call:** Kristen is absent
- III. **Stephen Hall, Director of Off-Campus Study:** Dustin says that most of the time tonight will be devoted to off-campus study. We’ll get as far as we can before the automatic adjournment at 10 pm. Wishful thinking.

Stephen Hall thanks the group for the invitation to the meeting. He recognizes surprisingly few students here. Maybe many here are unfamiliar to him because they are busy with student government and decided not to study abroad. He points out the sheet that addresses some of the issues regarding off-campus study. He finds the most convenient way to compare how Bowdoin’s situation works against other institutions is in the first paragraph. Some are very much like Bowdoin, some less so. Those schools together compare notes quite a bit. He says that they are proud of Bowdoin’s high participation rates (54%) in study abroad. The graph shows where Bowdoin stands in comparison with the other schools. There are several that are higher (Colby and Bates included), but we compare very nicely. Amherst and Williams are a little lower in the percentages going abroad. The next table shows a comparison to the whole group and where Bowdoin stands in terms of where people go. The Middle East number is low, but at that point one or two students make a big difference. He thinks we are a little low in Africa and Asia, not so much in comparison to the whole, but some schools are more represented in the developing world. With our Asian Studies and Environmental Studies departments as strong as they are, we can and should send more students to these areas.

Someone asked about the Approved Lists. We call it the Options List because “approved” gives the wrong impression that we are endorsing these programs in a stronger way than we are really able to. There are about 110 programs on the list: a lot of schools have something similar, but there are a few that don’t (Middlebury, Amherst). There are numbers that show the length of approved lists at other schools. It’s fairly easy to go off the list and petition...33 students did this year. This is a little more liberal than other schools (some don’t allow students to go off the list at all). Another question addressed requirements for study abroad. One area where we are on the liberal end of the scale is that there is no GPA requirement. Most schools require something like a 2.7. His sense is that qualification for study abroad is not directly connected with GPA. Many programs have a GPA requirement of their own. If we had this

requirement, we would wear ourselves out looking at requests...it would possibly do harm in excluding people.

The hot topic, of course, is the language requirement. Bowdoin is looking at whether we would want to ask students to have two semesters in the language of the country that they are going. The idea is to prepare them for a better understanding of the culture, the country, and, obviously, the language. Some schools are strict in this, and some have a requirement for language as well. That's something that the committee has discussed at meetings. They discussed it in faculty meetings this summer as well. They are sending the proposal to CEP with a breakdown of the various opinions. He doesn't think that anything will happen fast, but the CEP will receive it and get to it some time this year.

Another thing that compare differently at Bowdoin is that in studying abroad, you pay the program and nothing to Bowdoin. Most programs are less costly than Bowdoin. Another pattern that some colleges follow is charging the whole tuition and reimbursing the program the lower amount of money for participation. Bowdoin has no interest in this, and colleges have found that it doesn't work as much in their favor.

Another thing that has come up is that, when studying abroad from Bowdoin, you earn 4 credits per semester spent away. That is all that appears on the transcript. Many schools are beginning to put the grades and the course titles on the transcripts. Bowdoin is not considering this, but it should be kept in the backs of our minds. There was also a question about the fair. It is very crowded. This year there were 43 participants, which is about as many tables as can fit in the room. Everyone on the list and a few other programs that might interest students are invited. Not everyone can come, but 43 did, which is decent representation. That's pretty much everything Stephen has to say.

- Sam asks if in schools that put the grades on, if it counts in the GPA. Stephen says that this is rare...there are 3 stages of liberality: putting the titles on, putting the grades on, and including it in the GPA. Bryce doesn't see a problem with including titles, but it would be different in having it affect the GPA. Sam wouldn't be opposed to including the grades. Stephen has heard of students doing well in study abroad and wanting this to be recognized. Everyone from advisors to future employers could see this all in one form. Some people say that they are taking risks and aren't sure how they will do, so some are worried about having an apparently poor record.
- John is curious for other systems that have different grading systems. Do they convert this? Stephen says that it is often converted to our system. There is sometimes a suggested translation scheme. There is something like this on the Bowdoin transcript, actually. This is the area of expertise for the registrar.
- Rutledge says that there were talks of setting a grade, and if you reached that it would show up and if it didn't it wouldn't be recorded. That could be an idea to implement in study abroad grading options. Stephen isn't familiar with this idea but indicates that it is a possibility to consider.
- Jess wonders if it could be an option for students to choose how much information about the program and the study away to include. Stephen has thought about this himself. There are no plans to change the system now. He

suspects that they would make any changes that would be consistent for all students.

- Tony asks if they considered making the language requirement while the student is studying away. Stephen says that that would be implicit in the proposal. Most programs require the language while you are there anyway, making it a mute point. Some schools require continuing with the language when students return. That would be hard to police and is not part of the current proposal.
- James asks what criteria they look at in approving programs. Stephen says that they are looking for a good academic fit. Some are heavy on marketing and business...things we can't give credit for. It helps if the sponsoring organization is a university or college that we know has a high reputation. Sometime this can't be evaluated without a visit, and staff visits are an important part of the decision. We are looking for geographical breadth. Even if we don't have many students going to a certain place, it is important to keep that option there so students know that there are many options. We are also looking at programs that manage the logistical side of things well. An example is good, safe housing, an intercultural experience rather than an island of Americans, programs that aren't too expensive. We are also looking not to duplicate too much within the list. We would rather develop experience and expertise with a few programs.
- Kata asks how financial aid transfers. Stephen says that Bowdoin aid, federal aid, and state aid all transfer up to the cost of Bowdoin. The package goes down with less expensive programs.
- Ben F asks about students who want programs in certain areas but don't want to be with Bowdoin students (for example, there is only one program that goes to Denmark). Stephen says that Denmark is special because there is little out there and the DI's program is so well regarded. Most programs make an effort to get students out there. We are looking for that in programs...an attempt to break up groups. There are various techniques to do this. He does hear that students want to do different things to get away from Bowdoin students. There are American students all over the world, and it is hard to get away from this. It is hard to get the experience of being the only American there. The Colby student and Amherst students are also a heck of a lot like Bowdoin students.
- Dan says that the perception he has is that people are unclear about how to navigate at this stage: what they should be doing. He's curious as to how people go about the counseling element here and helping people choose a program that they want. Stephen doesn't think that we need to spend time on advocacy at Bowdoin, because people realize that it is a possibility. We introduced the fair a couple years ago. We widely advertise with the introductory meeting. We know that it's hard for messages to get through in the amount of email that we get. We do have more staff and more advising hours, and are thus focusing more on appointments. Someone should make an appointment or come in during walk-in-hours in the afternoons. We have 18 office hrs per week. People ask why we aren't open the whole time, and the answer is that things happen. We get questions from programs all the time, forms to sign, files to check. He hopes that they are accessible. Dan's concern is that the resources are there, but that students at this time don't know how to access those resources. He doesn't think that students are using the website. Students seem to know that things are going

on, but they don't know how to navigate the system or what steps to take. Stephen says to spread the word that people can just email the office. The students he sees now are planning ahead and get nervous about it, but the ones he worries about are those who don't.

- Tony asks what the pros and cons were regarding the language requirement. Is the goal to make the students fluent? In that case, why take the language while there? It seems to be discouraging to students more than anything else. That and it forces students to make choices far in advance. Stephen recognizes that it is a tricky question. A year of a language won't provide fluency. People who are experts in teaching language and culture feel that two semesters of a language is bare minimum to allow someone to come to grips with what's surrounding you. It would be harder once arriving to find your way around. Many schools are looking for two years. We are not saying that you can't study abroad without language, we are just saying it about certain countries: we can prepare you if you are going to these countries. Bowdoin off-campus studies program will be stronger if they are studying what they have already studied here. Tony suggests an alternative choice for students who couldn't fit language into their schedule (he gives the example of a pre-med student who wants to study in Barcelona). Stephen says that the proposal anticipates that there will be petitions from students to get exceptions to the rules. They are also looking at programs that would deserve an exception anyway because they may not be tied to the local culture anyway. That pre-med student might have to ask himself if studying in Barcelona would be good preparation (although it is fun).
- Rutledge says that at a college like Bowdoin, people have had extensive and intense training in high school. He personally took 7 years of Spanish. In his experience, he is able to pick the language back up, and he feels there are students in the same situation. This could be a hindrance to students who have had dreams to study away. This is just another obstacle. Stephen responds that there is the possibility of previous language experience built into the proposal. The CEP will consider this. Say this wasn't built in...their reasons would probably be because they are still looking for a connection. We are talking about the Bowdoin education, not dreams of studying away.
- Dustin raises a vote to extend the meeting to account for more questions. Vote passes.
- Clark says that he wants to lay a few comments out there. He finds fault with the argument that it isn't in the best interests of someone who is pre-med to study in Barcelona. The idea of a liberal arts education is to expand the horizons of the students, not just prepare for the job. He also thinks that people who are taking rigorous courses and don't have time for language might most need a different cultural experience. This could be problematic in the requirement. He also wants to hear about people who are interested in the EU but don't speak French or in Art and don't speak Italian. Stephen says that you would be hampered without a European language in either of those areas of study. This isn't meant to sound callous, but we'd be doing you a favor to have you study a language. He hears what Clark is saying about the liberal arts education. We are looking for study abroad to connect with something. He doesn't think that a couple of semesters of language are impossible to achieve. If you really are in love with the

idea of going to Barcelona, it seems like learning the language is a respectable goal.

- Amir brings up the issue of students who may not know if they want to go abroad. It would already be too late by the beginning of the sophomore year if they hadn't thought about it before. Stephen says that it is very specific. We wouldn't say that you couldn't go, but that for certain countries they would recommend the language. We calculated that 25 students would've been affected by this rule. That's a small proportion of those who go abroad. With advance warning of this rule, it would be possible for them to plan ahead. This isn't a done deal and it's not going to be implemented in the near future. There's always room for exceptions, but it's hard to anticipate.
- Ben L feels like the language requirement is essential because the level of expectation for linguistics in America is embarrassing. When people can't even order food, it's hard to adapt and be a part of the culture. It's essential to breaking out and a critical element of being part of the culture.
- Dustin is wondering if this could be put in context. We are moving toward a more strict distribution program, and was there discussion about how that fit into the current system. Have they considering the complications that could arise with all these requirements to fit into the first two years? Stephen doesn't understand the existing requirements and how that will pan out. The committee learned slowly that the requirements don't *need* to be met in the first two years, but that it is recommended. It is a worthwhile concern. Dustin thanks him for coming and bringing so much information.

Ben F requests for those with laptops to shut them. They're everywhere. Dooley orders me to shut my laptop. Looking back on the meeting, I wish I had.

- IV. **Approval of the Minutes:** Bryce says that his class officer team *did* meet, they just didn't have anything to report. Ben F moves to approve the minutes. Approval passes unanimously.
- V. **Public Comment Time:** No one wishes to comment.
- VI. **Committee Reports:** Dustin says that we will push through committee reports. Cross of AB in New Business.
- a. **Student Activities Funding Committee**
 - i. **New Rule Proposal:** Will says that the rule proposal stems out of issues with a clubs that are trying to get chartered: Robocup and the Swahili club. Simply, they can't fund language lesson clubs. They wanted to pay for the instructor to come here. There are culture clubs, but SAFC hasn't ever paid for teachers. With Roboclub, they are not as open a club as others. They are more of a research-grant organization. They go through extensive training and require expensive equipment. We want a line to clarify that SAFC doesn't fund academic pursuits like these that should fall under the jurisdiction of the college itself.

- Ben F understands where they are coming from. In terms of the language clubs, he opposes this. It's a club nonetheless, even if it's about instruction. If it isn't offered here, people form the club. He thinks that it is entirely too limiting as written. Will says that they could charter the Swahili club, but it opens it up to having to fund other similar clubs. Will says that the issue is that it's not sustainable. He has to consider if in the long-term, the SAFC can sustain and fund the group. We go as far as culture, but we have to draw the line at academic instruction. They did offer to pay for cultural events.
- James asks if this is on a continued/sustained basis. Would a one-day workshop fall under this? Nicole says that they were thinking about weekly instruction, or even biweekly. Anything continued under the same person...that becomes an academic discipline. She doesn't know how a one-day workshop would go. It sounds negotiable, but if it's strictly about language, it seems academic.
- Amir agrees with this proposal. The purpose of the bill is to say that we won't support clubs based solely on instruction. Workshops seem different, but the word "teach" leans toward academia. It's just not sustainable...they can't charter some and not others.
- Ben F says that they are telling the student body that they have to do languages that the school provides. Rugby is continuous and daily. Why is that different...a rugby coach vs. a Swahili teacher.
- Sam K says that saying this implies that student activities are non-academic.
- Dan moves to amend the bill to remove "or language". That way it leaves it to the SOOC to determine whether or not a group will exhaust the funds. Sam D. would not favor changing the language. We need to make a stand for or against this instruction. Rutledge was considering a clause like "in extremely rare cases..." Dan thinks that most of us here aren't experts on how the SAFC works, and we put a lot of trust in giving them discretion. He thinks we should trust them in being reasonable. John thinks that we should amend this because it is redundant to say "language instruction". It would also allow leniency.
- Jess doesn't know how much work it would be, but what about creating another group that is related to instruction? Nicole says that they are reconsidering groups that use instruction. It is getting a little out of control. Those things aren't academic, though. They are looking at this issue now.
- Ben L suggests incorporating "consistent" into the wording. Perhaps an African culture club could do a workshop or something so that these things could be incorporated into a group that is more sustainable in other formats.
- Ben F doesn't support this at all in terms of the language. Why would they even keep in "academic"? They are still funding consistent coaching, why would they remove just "language"? Will says that the idea behind this is that it is a first step. The SAFC budget is being eaten away. The Dance dept is asking why SAFC is paying for instructors. This isn't to prevent people from getting money. The point is that the college has to pick up the tab at some point. The activities funding is for things that the college can't provide. Academic things should not be included in this. He agrees that there are club sports that are sucking away huge parts of the funding. This is just a step.

- Those in favor of the amendment to remove “language“: Dan, Amir; opposed, everyone else except Jess (who abstained because she’s confused), Nicole, and Will (because they are presenting the bill); ***Motion Fails***
- Sam D is not proposing a motion, but he throws out that it might be best to table this and have SAFC and SOOC go over this again.
- Sam K says that we have very different issues going on...the money issue and the mission issue. How do we reconcile the two? How is their role any different than to provide what the college can’t?
- Liza says that an SOOC requirement for a club is that it is sustainable. She would argue that a language or academic club is not sustainable. It would be hard to have different levels of class going, which would happen after a year. People devoted to pursuing something that Bowdoin doesn’t offer make that sacrifice.
- Will says that the reason for not tabling this is that they are currently working with these groups. They are working in the idea that the policy will be there. The policies will help the groups get the funding they need outside of the SAFC. The ball will start rolling for them to get help from other areas of the college. It should move to the academic realm. He needs support to get this through. It will be an immediate effect for the student body and for student life.
- Ben F says that this *is* student life. This is a serious debate. He came to Bowdoin never thinking he wanted to go to Israel or study the issues of the area. Just because he didn’t have that idea before he came into Bowdoin...It should be part of the liberal arts education. This is a serious change that we should all understand.
- Rutledge thinks that making this change will make the administration understand that there are areas that students are interested in that the college isn’t offering or supporting. Right now we are considering the “no learning at recess policy“. Bowdoin has money, and they need to step up and support.
- James says that we are looking for a short-term fix here, and the ramifications of this bill are far-reaching. Bowdoin as an institution should be looking to as many resources as possible to support the academic life of students. There are things that lie outside the realm of the liberal arts education that aren’t considered academic.
- Jess is less confused. She likes the bill and thinks that the departments will take more responsibilities if we make moves like this. People can talk to deans and other areas. Spending money on a few clubs limits accessibilities to other clubs.
- Sign up for light bulb distribution on the handout that is coming around
- Amir says that not supporting this bill...He’s a math major and there are math classes that he can’t take here. Where does it stop? It doesn’t. There are many interests that are driven academically, and it is the responsibility of the departments to address them. This budget is for non-academic purposes.
- Jacq clarifies that the mission of the college is that students have some agency in guiding their own education. We can’t have tutors every week, but having some lessons once in a while would be a good rule.
- Darren says that he agrees that this is a band-aid bill and that a different solution should be found. There is a strong enough argument against RoboCup anyway.

- Ben F says that by passing this bill, we would be saying what clubs are acceptable. That's a bias. We are also kicking out clubs that would get funding. He doesn't see where the overlap is between Swahili and the Romance Language dept. If we kick them out the door and there isn't someone to pick up the tab...He would rather vote and say no, then vote once we know what happens to these organizations. We should know that they will get money and where it will come from.
- Will explains the background now. Robocup needs sustainable funds that we can't provide. It works out to 8% of our budget every year. Half of the budget is already pre-allocated. They have a set amount to use throughout the year. The amount of money that the SAFC works with is incomparable against the resources of the college itself. This isn't just a student decision. We are working with Allan and the leaders of Robocup. We are giving them the money they have gotten before. They are requesting things in their budget that wouldn't even be covered in the blue book. It's simply not a sustainable pursuit for us.
- Ben F says that they can just deny it then. Will says that it's a much larger issue. They are always the first place that administration sends students. Deans should be at the front end helping students find money. These Robocup kids are learning something completely new. It is part of their academic experience. Ben brings up the rugby team. Will says that they have funded things in the past that they are hurting from, and this is part of the movement to change that.
- 10 o'clock: Vote to stay: 15 in favor. After many recounts the number reaches 17
- Nicole says that she understands how important this is. It's insanely important to her and to Will. Their goal is not to screw over students or to not give students money. This bill is to get money out to students. That is always what they are thinking about. They think about what a club means and if it is sustainable. They do a lot of thinking to understand how clubs work. They are trying to play catch-up now. There are some things that need to be out of the scope of certain entities. She appreciates the discussion, but everyone needs to understand that their intention is not to screw people.
- Dan wants to get the facts straight. What are the steps after this? Will says that he won't name out clubs. To sponsor a club they need to make sure that it is open to the campus. They are thinking about the return to students. Who else can take these things on? They need to look at athletics and what things are possible from that angle. Dan asks why this is a necessary step. Will says that these issues have come up and that makes it necessary now. It will help these clubs. If the person chartering the Swahili club goes to Barry with 50 people, it will be effective and they can indicate that it is an academic matter. These other things that we fund are general, not things that would fit in the academic realm. Saying that it's not our responsibility helps when dealing with academic affairs and bringing this issue up.
- Ben L moves to end the discussion. He thinks that "consistent" should be added in. He moves to vote and end discussion. Ben F thinks that it is the most irresponsible thing we could be doing. This has significant ramifications. Why don't we table this until we know where the money is coming from? This debate shouldn't be coming from us. This is a timing issue. Don't vote for Ben LeHay's motion. Gasps and raised eyebrows.

- Sam D understands Will's frustration. He doesn't know where he stands and agrees that it would be irresponsible to vote. A band-aid solution could be to not fund this, another could be to do the opposite and fund it.
- Rutledge hears Ben F's concerns about the money not being there, but he thinks that if we pass this, the decision will be in the hands of the college. They will have to step up and decide to do something. He's tired of half-way jobs because of poor funding. We have so much damn money.
- Jess thinks we should vote on this because the effect will be immediate and it concerns something going on now.
- Sam K says that this is an immediate cut from clubs that are functioning now. This is an inaccurate assessment, and Will tells him so. We are making a decision based on the fact that we have other work to do.
- Dooley thinks that we should remember that this is how you get change. We need to make decisions that will force someone else to take action in a good way.
- Tony says that this is a sensitive subject matter. He doesn't see this being addressed immediately if we do refer it to Sam's committee. When would it get addressed if we did table it? Sam D says that academic affairs won't act on this if that is the intent. Academic Affairs moved slowly. If the argument is that it will force them to act quickly, it's flawed.
- Sam S says that we are going to need to table this, because we didn't even talk about it as a whole when not everyone is done thinking about whether we want language or academic. What action do we want it to take for people?
- Rutledge says that the Robocup team is world champion. Will they really turn their backs on a world-champion team? There is an uproar and Rutledge wonders if he should pull the fire alarm.
- Will says that the agreement is that if they take this step, things will start coming through for Robocup. They need to buy their humanoid robots to start programming. The issue is already solved. This is part of the symbolic action. This way, the administration can't bounce it back to us.
- Alison says that it is more than just these two things. Keep in mind that this is more applicable to a lot of clubs.
- No one has a scintillating comment about voting tonight. Those in favor: 16, which is two thirds. ***Motion passes: We are voting tonight.***
- Jeremy from Robocup hasn't discussed this with all the members, but he has heard that the general sentiment is that the SAFC shouldn't be responsible for funding this. There is a lot of money involved, and the money they need shouldn't prevent them from being able to fund other events and groups. They have had many meetings, and a lot of people high in the Bowdoin administration have directly interacted in the process. They will get the money from other sources.
- Ben F says that it is not about that one club. He thinks that they are rushing through this. We should come back with a comprehensive idea after having more conversations. Maybe SAFC just needs a bigger budget. (A pleasantly reductive view of the situation)

- Dustin says to keep in mind that this is from student activities. It is a separate pot. He is not going to call on you because your hand is up. Sign up for light bulbs.
- John says that there seems to be some disagreement between long-term effects and what we need to do now. We can just say that the SAFC will not fund Robocup, and put that in the books.
- Dan says vote no tonight, let the SAFC come up with a more comprehensive proposal.
- Kata asks what kind of comprehensive proposal they are talking about. It won't change anything. It's not a band-aid, it's the opposite. Continuing to fund these things is the band-aid. The only way to get money from elsewhere is by cutting off these funds.
- Justin says that we all agree that we pay enough tuition for our academic interests to be covered. Will isn't saying that we shouldn't fund the students, but that the obligation lies in the departments.
- Sam D says that this issue is one of instruction more broadly. That's an issue that SAFC needs to deal with. They are rushing through it.
- Amir motions a 5 minute recess. Those in favor: Amir. Motion fails.
- Nicole says that this is moving in a positive direction. They don't want to make this more bureaucratic than it needs to be. Right now, we are talking about academic instruction; we will deal with the others later.
- Bryce says that his problem is that it is too restrictive. There could be situations where it would be too limiting. The discretion should be given to the SAFC. They put their decisions on paper, Robocup takes it to the administration, and there will be action.
- Rutledge says that no one believed that the money would come from somewhere. Overwhelmingly we understand that the school will take Robocup funding. Their answers show fatigue in the process (violent objection from the opposite side of the table). If Robocup is the example, the school will understand that they need more outlets.
- Ben L says that this is his favorite BSG meeting in the post-Leinhart époque. We should place more trust in our chairs. We should move into voting. He objects because this is filibustering.
- Clark says that we should bring it back to what the bill says. He doesn't think that the chairs will interpret it this way, but the word "consistent" is missing. He thinks that this could be used in the future to limit one-time funding.
- Sam D says that we don't need to be talking about this in terms of Robocup. This is a big, overriding issue. The SAFC rules do not function like a bill of rights.
- Jess asks if they don't need to have this to say no to the Robocup. Nicole says that Robocup already has their funding.
- Dennis says that we should support Nicole. If we don't, then these groups won't get the money at all. It will stop at the SAFC. There is more possibility that it will work if we add this.

- James says that Robocup has their money, and this bill would take it away from them? No. This is about long-term changes about how SAFC functions and what their responsibilities are.
- Rutledge doesn't think that we are getting anywhere. He urges people to vote on the grounds that Will and Nicole know where they are coming from and where they are going. That's realer than robots.
- Sam D says that while he has faith in these two, this is a large-scale issue. His views have flipped 180 degrees in the last day. This idea hasn't been given the attention it deserves.
- Ben L says that nothing profound has being said. Let's vote. With 2/3 vote, we can vote to vote right now. Sam thinks that it is a terrible practice to make a rule for a discussion that is going on currently.
- Will says that it is a good time to regroup about what the activities fee is. It has always been intended as an activities fee, even if this has been misused in the past.
- Vote on the proposal. Those in favor: Nicole, Kata, Dooley, Liza, Justin, Will, Amir, Hannah, Ben L, Jess, Rutledge, Dennis, Tony, Christian; Opposed: Sam K, Sam D, Ben F, Dan Bryce, Clark, Sam S, Alison, Darren, James; ***Proposal Passes***

What really matters at this point? Let's consider movie tickets and ignore the rest of the agenda (I feel like this could be done most weeks).

b. Facilities Committee

- i. **Movie Rickets Funding Proposal:** Dooley says that we offer movie tickets for \$5. You can go the day the movie opens. We are running out after two weeks. We need to restock. Dustin says that this is something that we get back. The extra money traditionally comes from the money we make from the shuttle service. Motion to vote this week. Seeing 2/3. Those in favor of the proposal: unanimous. ***Proposal Passes.***

There is a motion to adjourn. Sam D says that while there are several people who strongly disagree with the end we came to tonight, we shouldn't portray the actions that we took tonight as irresponsible on the behalf of the BSG. Be careful in talking about this. Those in favor of adjourning...

Dustin needs to do his report. Committees are getting intense. Dinner at 5:30 tomorrow. Sam is right. You can state the point against the proposal, but it was a vote within the group. People have said inappropriate things in the past, so watch this. Get the light bulb sheet to Dooley. Let people know if you are having time-commitment-issues.

VII. Adjournment at 10:47 pm