

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Minutes from Plenary, September 25, 2011

1. Quorum at 6:59 p.m.-Floencia Foxley '13-Welcome to Fall Plenary 2011
2. Moment of Silence
3. Introductions of front table Plenary People
4. 3 minutes to look over rules of order and agenda
5. 5 minutes to make for suggested amendments to change Agenda or Rules of Order-no suggestions at end of 5 minutes
6. Last call for changes to agenda or rules of order
7. Announcements
 - a. Resolution just passed at BMC about Bi-Co Liaisons
 - b. Quorum-if you need to use the restroom, go out left door, other door counts for quorum
 - c. Something about poetry?
8. Resolution #1- Establishing and Defining the Role of the Honor Council Bi-Co Liaison
 - a. Producers introduce
 - i. Emily Dix '12-resolution about creating a bi-co liaison. When an HC student violates the honor code at BMC, BMC handles it, and vice versa. Right now it is problematic for several reasons-school doesn't have record of violations so if there are future violations the home institution doesn't know it; also problematic for community standards
 - ii. Jacob Axelrod '14-a lot of work with Haverford Honor Council and BMC Honor Board. Exact same thing added to both constitutions.
 - iii. Emma Richards '12-any case where a Haverford student goes to Honor Board or vice versa, a rep. from the home school attends that meeting, including circumstantial portion. He can then bring back to the home school what happened.
 - iv. Anna Brockway '12- Important for keeping track of how many cases, person in the room from Home Institution can provide necessary perspective about why violation might have occurred
 - b. 10 minutes for question and answer
 - i. Allison Serpico '12-what do you mean by non-consenting participant?
 1. Emily Dix '12-Consenting on whether violation occurred and on resolutions; no one added who will be consenting. The

These minutes reflect the opinions of Aubree Penney and Gabi Winick, the Honor Council Co-Secretaries (apenney@hc or gwinick@hc) and Allie Kandel and Hannah Zieve, the Students Council Co-Secretaries (akandel@hc or hzieve@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of either Council. Questions/comments? Email code@hc or hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

person will be present at the trial. They can give some insight, but are not making the decision.

- ii. Elinor Hickey'12-Who would be the Bi-Co liaison?
 - 1. JA-The Bi-Co Liaison is a member of HC Honor Council or BMC Honor Board-whatever best works with schedules, it will be a member of the school's respective Honor Board
- iii. Lucian Grand '12-What is the information that will be transmitted regarding the trial?
 - 1. AB'12-relevant information, chair's report or abstract, it's on discretion of the board
- iv. Brian Brown'14-What exactly are these procedures and do they expect us to know them before they're actually up and out?
 - 1. JA-guidelines on Honor Council website and have been sent last semester, were also emailed out by Emily and Anna last semester
 - 2. AB-guidelines based on best practices, getting across the idea that this exists
 - 3. (Gabi got Aubree some potato chips during this time)
- v. Final call for questions
- c. Pro-Con Debate
 - i. Con: Ian Gavigan '14-Really appreciates the 2 big points that this resolution is trying to address, namely communication between the 2 schools, but he has a problem with the way it may have an issue with confidentiality, adding an extra person in the room. This could be addressed using better direct communication. It could be emailed directly so a record can be kept. Or the other group could give a presentation to the other Board at the end of the semester, and then produce a document relating to that. He supports underlying concerns, but he has an issue with the confidentiality of the involved party.
 - ii. Con: Besan Radwan '14-inaudible....through deans rather than
 - iii. Pro: Aubree Penney '13: The Bi-Co liaison will make dealing with these issues much cleaner and streamlined. That this keeps it within council.
 - iv. Con: Michael Rushmore '14: It was very busy last semester...and confidentiality...[inaudible].
 - v. Pro: Jon Sweitzer-Lamme '14: I think that this is more than what a librarian [inaudible].
 - vi. Pro: Jen Reeve '14: We all came here for the honor code and I think that we all believe in the honor council and what honor council can do and should trust them on this decision.
 - vii. Pro: Emily Brown '13: [inaudible]...I think this is a good resolution.

These minutes reflect the opinions of Aubree Penney and Gabi Winick, the Honor Council Co-Secretaries (apenney@hc or gwinick@hc) and Allie Kandel and Hannah Zieve, the Students Council Co-Secretaries (akandel@hc or hzieve@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of either Council. Questions/comments? Email code@hc or hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- d. Florencia Foxley '13: 2 more minutes if anyone wants to come and speak for or against this resolution.
- e. Response to Pro-Con:
 - i. Anna Brockway '12: The resolution does not explain certain things because it's in the constitution and it explicitly says that it will be a member of Honor Council as the liaison and to change that would require a plenary to change the constitution.
 - ii. Jacob Axelrod '14: Confidentiality can be ensured by having an Honor Council rep as the liaison. It's the best means of communication in line with the values of student government.
- f. Florencia Foxley '13: Time for friendly amendments.
 - i. No one comes up.
- g. Florencia Foxley '13: Time for unfriendly amendments:
 - i. Ian Gavigan '14: I'm working on an amendment for this resolution, but in order to do this. I need to motion to extend this time. Amend that the communication would involve email between the dean and the parties involved. There would be an end of semester presentation between the home institutions to explain the differences, and there would be a document compiled at the end that would explain the differences. This document would be added to the trial packet to be kept on file.
 - 1. Florencia Foxley '13: Extended this resolution needs to go to paper ballot because could not tell whether it passed by visual ballot.
 - 2. Paper Ballot: Resulted in not having extended time.
- h. Moment of Silence
- i. Visual Vote to ratify original resolution
 - i. Resolution passes
- 9. Alcohol Policy Ratification
 - a. JSAAPP Co-Chairs Present Alcohol Policy
 - i. Liz Crooks '12 and Gebhard Kenny '14 – believes policy works, wants to remind everyone that it works because we take responsibility for our actions
 - b. Q&A
 - i. Andrew Thompson '12 – has it changed since last year?
 - 1. Liz answers no, it hasn't
 - ii. Andy Jenness '12 – how did Haverford operate prior to JSAAPP's establishment
 - 1. Liz answers that JSAAPP has been around for longer than she's been here and doesn't know
 - iii. Andrew Adirim-Lanza '15 – what would happen if we didn't pass the alcohol policy?

These minutes reflect the opinions of Aubree Penney and Gabi Winick, the Honor Council Co-Secretaries (apenney@hc or gwinick@hc) and Allie Kandel and Hannah Zieve, the Students Council Co-Secretaries (akandel@hc or hzieve@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of either Council. Questions/comments? Email code@hc or hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

1. Gebby answers that we wouldn't have a policy beyond the laws of Pennsylvania and places like Lunt would not be open
 - c. Pro-Con Presentations
 - i. Andrew Thompson '12 – con – quoting Will Harrison, “I have concerns about ratifying a policy that most of us break regularly.”
 - d. Response to pro-con debate by JSAAPP co-chairs
 - i. Gebby states that in an ideal world everyone would follow the law, but this isn't an ideal world and the alcohol policy recognizes that and wants to promote a safe environment
 - e. Visual Vote on ratification of Alcohol Policy
 - i. Passes
10. Resolution #2: Additional Jury Guidelines – 2/3 Majority vote
- a. Presenters have five minutes to introduce resolution
 - i. Anna Brockway '12 – additional jury guidelines to be invoked when there are discrepancies between when the juries and person on trial say; Suggestions for what the juries could do; gives options to jurors; not mandatory
 - ii. Emma Richards '12 – in the case that additional parties should be involved as jury
 - iii. Emily Dix '12 – allow jury to consult someone with expertise in a certain area to better serve as jury
 - iv. Jacob Axelrod '14 – have the jury to take some time (up to 24 hours) when having a difficult time coming to a decision
 - b. Question and Answer session: ten minutes to be extended no more than once by ½ vote
 - i. Philip Drexler '14 – how will this affect the already difficult scheduling process?
 1. Anna Brockway '12 – just a suggestion, if they need more time, they can take more time; left up to the consent of a particular jury
 - ii. Matt Mazewski '13 – inspired by specific incidents that happened during the course of an honor trial; example of a decision made too hastily? Is there ever a stipulation that a decision made in a specific time that would need this extra time
 1. Suggestions did come out of the Planet's abstract; the idea of this is that juries know that they have this option
 - iii. Andrew Thompson '12 – in the 2nd paragraph, how long should the reflection time be
 1. Emily Dix '12 – depends on the jury and what they feel that they need; standard would be 24 hours, just as between tentative and final res.

These minutes reflect the opinions of Aubree Penney and Gabi Winick, the Honor Council Co-Secretaries (apenney@hc or gwinick@hc) and Allie Kandel and Hannah Zieve, the Students Council Co-Secretaries (akandel@hc or hzieve@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of either Council. Questions/comments? Email code@hc or hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

2. Follow up question– does HC jurors have a guideline as to how long a trial should be
 - a. Anna Brockway '12 - Try to get a trial done as fast as possible but there are always scheduling constraints
 - iv. Fiona Lin '14 – clarification on how the jury members will present their questions to the uninvolved party? Compromise confidentiality? Looking specifically at the 3rd paragraph. Leaves more room for error
 1. Emma Richards '12– use a professor from the tri-co, i.e Swarthmore who does not know the student personally; use people who were already involved, confidentiality is not an issue then
 - c. Pro-con presentations
 - i. No Pros or Cons were presented
 - d. Response to pro-con debate
 - i. No Pros or Cons were presented
 - e. Call for friendly amendments
 - i. No Friendly Amendments were brought
 - f. Call for unfriendly amendments
 - g. Moment of Silence
 - h. Visual vote to pass the amendment
 - i. Passes with a visual vote
11. Closing remarks
 - a. Only one hour and twenty-six minutes total of Plenary!