



GUSA

14th GUSA Senate

Eighth Meeting of the Summer Session

Sunday, June 29th, 2020

[Zoom](#), 9 PM EST

Meeting Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. [Attendance](#)
- III. [Pending Legislation](#)
 - A. [AN URGENT RESOLUTION to CONDEMN the Appointment of an Accused Sexual Harasser as a Class of 2020 Alumni Ambassador and Georgetown's Culture of Neglecting Survivors](#)
- IV. [Public Comment](#)
- V. Good of the Order
- VI. Adjournment

Next Meeting: MONDAY, July 6th, 2020

[Zoom](#), 5 PM EST

[Absence Form](#)

Access & Wellness Chair: Olivia Kleier, oak12, (415) 336-4788

Executive Summary

- I. Legislation Considered
 - A.
- II. Other Business Considered
 - A.
- III. Current Projects
 - A.

Interested in one of these projects? Connect with a senator [HERE](#). All ideas and support are welcome!

Questions, comments and concerns may be logged on our [14th Senate Feedback Form](#).

Meeting Notes

- I. Call to Order
 - A. Time: 9:00pm EST
- II. [Attendance](#)
- III. Confirmation of agenda
 - A. Sanchez: Why we're here - GUSA usually doesn't call people out by name, we usually condemn actions not the people. The university's legal counsel has advised against specifically using the name because the student could sue against GUSA. I don't want to put anyone at risk of being involved in a lawsuit. As long as we change the name to the identifier of the position it will be fine. Also, no one can know if this person was reprimanded because their record isn't available to anyone except for them and the university. We have not been specifically told this but it has been cautioned that we should.
- IV. [Pending Legislation](#)
 - A. 2020-06-29-01: [AN URGENT RESOLUTION to CONDEMN the Appointment of an Accused Sexual Harasser as a Class of 2020 Alumni Ambassador and Georgetown's Culture of Neglecting Survivors](#)
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Questioning
 - 3. Debate
 - a) Sanchez: I motion to reconsider AN URGENT RESOLUTION to CONDEMN the Appointment of an.... by opening up debate for the amendments 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11 , 12, and 13
 - (1) Seconded
 - (2) passed
 - b) Sanchez: I would look highly upon a motion to make amendment 4
 - (1) Removes the clause about disciplinary action
 - (2) debate
 - (a) Volpe: I think it's important for us to be factually accurate about what we know. The microfinance initiative and GUASFCU were supposed to release more information but they didn't.

- (b) Galvan: I'm so frustrated that the university was so quick to talk to us about this situation but in other circumstances they haven't acted quickly at all. It's ironic how fast they acted here but when students come forward about how they've been uncomfortable they haven't done anything.
- (c) Wakilzada: if we don't have information about what has happened in terms of discipline, it shows that the university isn't really for survivors.
- (d) Sonsalla: instead of this amendment, it would be better to make the other amendment if ruled dilliutory.
 - (i) Sanchez: i think it would be better to amendment it afterwards
- (e) Ziac: motion to vote
- (3) Vote
 - (a) Motion passes
- c) Sanchez: motion to make amendment #6
 - (1) Motion to pass assuming unanimous consent
 - (a) Passes
- d) Sanchez: motion to introduce amendment #3
 - (1) McGrail: I know we have to amend this because we can be sued. But I want to emphasize how important it is for survivors to be able to name their survivors in public. This really silences survivors. I don't like having to take his name out, I don't want to hinder the amendments being passed but I don't feel right voting for it.
- (2) Vote
 - (a) Passed
- e) Sonsalla: motion to make amendment 15
 - (1) Question
 - (a) Bazail: would it be allowable to amend the amendment
 - (i) During debate

(2) Debate

(a) Bazail: motion to amend amendment 15 to include GUSA called for transparency, not the Hoya.

(b) Sanchez: without objection move to a vote

(3) Vote

(a) Passed

f) Ziac: motion to make amendment 7 to explain why we're calling them an accused sexual harasser

(1) Questioning

(a) Rassieur: correct me if I'm wrong, but it's almost implying that he's been vindicated but people just decided not to investigate so I feel kind of uncomfortable.

(i) Sanchez: since we don't know what's happened or what has been investigated, we can't say that he was convicted

(b) Chaudhry: because we don't know anything, can we even say he wasn't convicted?

(i) Sanchez: We can amend it to say that we don't know if he was formally convicted to make sure we don't misrepresent.

(c) Tang: was this part of Aysha's recommendations?

(i) Sanchez: she said that since we're saying accused, we need to say why we're labeling it as such.

(2) Debate

(a) Sanchez: I think it's a good idea to not vote this in to make sure we don't have to deal with repercussions

(b) Tang: Same thing as Sanchez, I think having it on the second line really lessens the impact.

(c) Sanchez: without objection move to vote

(3) Vote

(a) Fails

g) McGrail: motion to make amendment 8, I think it's important to show why we're having a waterdowned version and should be transparent that the university was the one who told us to not include his name. We wouldn't change anything but it's the university that's telling us we couldn't do that.

(1) Questioning

(a) Chaudhry: it says a bill but is it a bill or resolution?

(i) Sanchez: everything we put out is a bill

(2) Debate

(a) Sonsalla: i motion to amend so that it says the university legal council strongly recommended

(i) Sanchez: without objection, vote to confirm

(a) Motion passes

(b) Sanchez: without objection move to vote

(3) Vote

(a) Passes

h) Rassieur: motion to approve 14 and 16 unanimously

(1) Bazail: motion to vote

(2) Vote

(a) Motion passes not unanimously

i) Bazail: I have been silent about this so far but really that's because I've just been fuming all day since the minute I got a text from the Speaker regarding this. I've been thinking a lot today about that quote from Barry Goldwater, "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice, moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue." And honestly, I just have to say Georgetown should be ashamed of itself today for not growing a spine. So many top-level administrative officials have been on

this bill today, from VP Kilkenny, to Samantha Berner, to Associate VP Erika Cohen-Derr. And I know that Todd Olsen had a meeting with the individual's family to do damage control. The university should be ashamed of itself for not protecting survivors and you know, I never truly realized how much Georgetown truly doesn't care until right now; I didn't realize when BSC put up those signs saying "Georgetown Doesn't Care" on John Carroll how much of a freaking indictment it is on the conduct of our university. And that indictment only keeps growing. Let's be real, there is no justice here, there is no virtue here, there is only moderation here and cowardice. I'm tired of carefully-worded statements, I'm tired of writing resolutions that are just being tossed in the trash. They're failing our Jesuit values, the community, and everything they stand for. We are in a fight for the soul of our university and we must recognize that this fight is so much bigger than us right now and that we have to keep on. We need to do what we must to survive this fight, but we have to keep on fighting and ensure we as an organization keep this fight going.

- j) Rassieur: I feel so defeated and that at every single step, the university tries to limit us the entire time. During the divestment resolution, the university was already patting itself on its back on the day of the referendum after years of ignoring GUSA and protests. They deliberately make it clear that they aren't listening to students voices and weren't taking direct action because of the referendum. It's depressing that they only pay attention to us and activists in order to oppose us. I also feel like this has been what's happening with the reopening plans. They put so much attention on what we do to show that they won't listen to what we say. We shouldn't have to be limiting what we say
- k) McGrail: one of the reasons I got involved was to make sure survivors are heard and be able to help them.

When the administration was upset with this, I felt personally slapped in the face. I was wondering if they read the minutes and knew a survivor was leading the charge for this bill and just didn't care. Did the administration meet with survivors? Did they ask how their experience has been on campus after that behavior? Are they giving more attention to those accused rather than the victims? The university is a coward. It seems like he has no standing to sue our organizations. I'd be sued and I'm not afraid of him doing so. The fact that the university is afraid of a lawsuit shows pettiness on his part and it sickens me that we have to take his name off the bill.

- l) Volpe: Georgetown doesn't care and I want us all to repeat that as much as we can. Personally, I was ready to fight this and if I didn't have to worry about others, I would've taken this to a lawsuit. These issues are so pertinent and important and there needs to be action. I was prepared to face a lawsuit and take this higher.
- m) Sanchez: as the speaker, I've been put into a really difficult position today because it's my responsibility to protect everyone. I personally have very different opinions, so I had to put my opinions to the side in order to protect this group. Don't feel defeated, feel motivated to take action, knowing that they're watching what we're doing and saying. This is just one of the many ways that Georgetown has failed us, and while they continue to fail us, we'll continue to be on their ass. Use this to fuel your anger and what you do in the future.
- n) Ziac: motion to vote

4. Vote

- a) Motion passes by voice vote

5. Certification

- a) We hereby certify that the foregoing legislation was duly considered by the Senate at a meeting at which a quorum was present and that the same was approved by a voice vote, this 29th day of June, 2020.

- b) Speaker Sanchez and Vice Speaker Lipke have not signed the legislation.
- c) President Ferretti has not signed the legislation.

V. Public Comment

- A. Akanksha Sinha (as4474): I wanted to say thank you to everyone's solidarity. I know this sucked but I'm very appreciative of everyone here.
- B. Stephanie Glascock (sag292): The fact that I knew about this guy at the very beginning of my experience on campus shows how much the university does not care. The university could be protecting others who aren't as publicly known and we need to continue fighting to protect survivors.

VI. Good of the Order

- A. Wakilzada: laughing during this discussion shows how we're failing the students. For us to sit here and laugh about this issue is really disgusting.
- B. Sonsalla: I really echoed McGrail's sentiments that it's important to name them but as a disclaimer everyone's statements yesterday were about the accused.
- C. Negrete-Retamales: I wasn't here originally but I joined at the very last minute due to the importance so I abstained because I wasn't here for the entire meeting. I also want to echo Steph and Senator Wakilzada that someone was laughing, as a survivor I'm glad I couldn't see that because it would've made me uncomfortable. I also abstained because as a survivor, I didn't feel comfortable voting for this.

VII. Adjournment

- A. Time: 10 PM EST