

1. Moment of Silence
2. Welcome to Plenary!
  - a. Introduction
3. Rules of Order and Agenda
4. Questions concerning Agenda or Rules of Order
  - a. Michelle '16: What percentage is needed to pass the resolution?
    - i. Claire '16: For Rules of Order: 50%; for resolutions involving changes to the Constitution or alcohol policy:  $\frac{2}{3}$ ; for all other resolutions: 50%
  - b. Brian '16: Rules of order part of agenda, which says  $\frac{2}{3}$ .
    - i. Claire '16: Yes, needs  $\frac{2}{3}$ .
5. Call for amendments to change Agenda or Rules of Order
  - a. Daniel '17, Geoffrey '16, Claire '16: Propose that part of resolution 1 relating to rules of order be applied to this plenary, except for one typo in Rules of Order #10.
    - i. The resolution also clarifies what quorum means
    - ii. Came out of last plenary because of confusion over votes
      1. Part 1: Allows people to challenge ambiguous votes.
      2. Put in the constitutions what the Rules of Order are.
6. A vote to accept any amendments to the agenda must have 2/3 majority vote
  - a. Amendment PASSES.
7. Presidential Announcements
  - a. Fully implemented last year's resolutions. SC is meeting about renovation of the space outside the DC.
8. Resolution #1 Revisions to Plenary Voting Procedures and Rules of Order
  - a. Presenters introduce resolution
    - i. Daniel '17, Geoffrey '16, Claire '16:
    - ii. On page 8, we have the three parts of voting process. There is nothing about what requires for passing resolutions. What percentage is needed to pass a resolution or pass an election. When it is required to be  $\frac{2}{3}$  or 50%.
    - iii. The only new thing is adding the option for people to challenge the decision of the presidents. If 8 people come forward after the presidents announce the vote, then a formal vote must be conducted.
    - iv. No procedure from last year discussed about this issue.
  - b. Question and Answer session
    - i. Michelle '16: Plenary can be extended only one time but in your resolution it can be extended two times. Why this change?
      1. Daniel '17: We took the rules of order as they were before, and added the part for the resolution. We do not know how they came up with it.
    - ii. Geoffrey '16: In the last spring plenary, amendment to Rules of Order to only allow one extension. We were working on those. Would accept friendly amendment.

These minutes reflect the interpretations of Erin Lipman and Kyle Albagli, Honor Council Co-Secretaries, and Ann-Victoria Isaac and Natalie Yao, Students Council Co-Secretaries.

They are neither reviewed nor approved by the rest of Honor Council or Students Council  
 Questions/comments? Email [hccosecs@hc](mailto:hccosecs@hc) and [hcsecretaries@gmail.com](mailto:hcsecretaries@gmail.com)!

- iii. Michelle '16: In the resolution, No. 3 of Rules of Order says  $\frac{2}{3}$  needed, but you said  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Reason for this?
  - 1. Claire '16: What is in packet is what we are going off of and asking people to vote on.
  - 2. Geoffrey '16: Conversated and decided that current rules of order are same as they are in agenda
- iv. Vaughn '18: Why is the number of students needed to challenge a vote set at 8?
  - 1. Claire '16: 8 is the number of the plenary people: 2 Co-Chairs, 2 Co-Vice Chairs 4 Co-Secretaries. We are assuming that plenary people are in agreement with the presidents about the vote, so 8 makes it even.
- v. Vaughn '18: Why are they from the "Student Association"?
  - 1. Claire '16: The student association means the student body in the Constitution.
- vi. Brian '16: Time period for dissenting? Is there time for people to talk to each other or do the presidents make these decisions during plenary?
  - 1. Geoffrey '16: Student Council can figure out specifics, Co-Chairs call for dissent and leave a reasonable period of time for people to come forward
- c. Pro-Con debates
  - i. None
- d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters
  - i. None
- e. Call for Friendly Amendments
  - i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
    - 1. Presenters: Part 3 under voting procedures - changes the section "majority rules voting" to reflect what is stated in current Rules of Order (some procedures require  $\frac{2}{3}$ , some  $\frac{1}{2}$ ); will specifically add agenda to things that require  $\frac{2}{3}$ .
  - ii. Question and Answer
    - 1. None
  - iii. Pro-Con debate
    - 1. None
  - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
    - 1. Amendment PASSES.
- f. Call for Unfriendly Amendments (NONE)
  - i. Presentations of recognized Unfriendly Amendments
  - ii. Question and Answer
  - iii. Pro-Con debate
  - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment
- g. Moment of Silence
- h. Vote on Final Resolution

These minutes reflect the interpretations of Erin Lipman and Kyle Albagli, Honor Council Co-Secretaries, and Ann-Victoria Isaac and Natalie Yao, Students Council Co-Secretaries.

They are neither reviewed nor approved by the rest of Honor Council or Students Council  
 Questions/comments? Email [hccosecs@hc](mailto:hccosecs@hc) and [hcsecretaries@gmail.com](mailto:hcsecretaries@gmail.com)!

- i. Resolution PASSES.
9. Resolution #2 Revisions to Responsibilities of Students' Council Members
- a. Presenters introduce resolution
    - i. Claire '16, Jason '16, Ian '17, Tristan '18:
    - ii. Since last year Students' Council is trying to balance the tasks within SC.
    - iii. Ian and Tristan: noticed this year that the budgeting process was pretty time-consuming so we want to have class representatives serve on Budgeting Committee
    - iv. We want to have the Co-Secretaries co-chair the Facilities Fund Allocation Committee, instead of the Officer of the Arts and the Officer of Campus Life.
    - v. Appointing a whole new position called an Election Coordinator rather than having the Co-Secretaries do the elections. We really need someone to focus solely on this matter.
  - b. Question and Answer session
    - i. Jay '18: Curious why the chairing of Facilities Fund Allocation Committee is moved to the Co-Secretaries since it is not similar to their other roles
      - 1. Claire '16: Co-secretaries will be freed up by not having them run elections; also, Officer of Campus Life and Officer of the Arts already serve on Appointments Committee and Budgeting Committee; Co-Secretaries are the only pair in Students Council that do not chair a committee.
    - ii. Jay '18: Asking why it makes sense for Co-Secretaries to chair this specific committee
      - 1. Claire '16: Essentially trying to allocate responsibilities more evenly to distribute time and stress each position takes
    - iii. Arthur '19: Asking why you decided to have Election Coordinator only paid if no one applies in the first round. Wouldn't that encourage people not to apply at first?
      - 1. Jason '16: If no one runs, SC will pay Election Coordinator; this is kind of a game theory thing; hopefully people do not try to cheat system.
    - iv. Student '18: Why isn't the position just always paid?
      - 1. Jason '16: Co-Presidents are paid (only if they are on financial aid; as per resolution last year); running elections is a tough job and we want to encourage people to do it if no one steps forward initially.
    - v. Damon '16: To whose discretion is it whether student council does offer financial compensation and how much?
      - 1. Jason '16: Would be by consensus of SC; amount to be paid would also be decided by SC; money would come from SC budget
    - vi. Arthur '19: Who appoints Elections Coordinator?
      - 1. Jason '16: It would be Appointments Committee.

These minutes reflect the interpretations of Erin Lipman and Kyle Albagli, Honor Council Co-Secretaries, and Ann-Victoria Isaac and Natalie Yao, Students Council Co-Secretaries.

They are neither reviewed nor approved by the rest of Honor Council or Students Council  
 Questions/comments? Email [hccosecs@hc](mailto:hccosecs@hc) and [hcsecretaries@gmail.com](mailto:hcsecretaries@gmail.com)!

- c. Pro-Con debates
  - i. Student '19 CON - Worried that offering financial compensation would deter people from applying in first round.
  - ii. Brian '16 CON: Issue with first part; understand that we should distribute work of Students' Council amongst all members, but it makes more sense to let Students' Council distribute responsibilities depending on amount of work they have at the time, rather than putting more requirements into the Constitution.
  - iii. Michelle '16 CON - Running elections seems like a really central aspect to what being SC Co-Secretaries are. Don't think any software is so complicated that Secretaries serving an entire year can't take the time to figure it out.
  - iv. Schaf '17 PRO - Just because software is easy to learn; we often have to run elections several times; it is good that we are assigning elections to a separate position; have a super sparkly day!
  - v. Marykate '18 CON - Monetary compensation only second time is like bribery. Won't get someone as motivated.
  - vi. Jay '18: PRO - Running and managing elections is perhaps more tedious than other roles and less exciting and glamorous. Offering to pay someone makes sense, don't need someone to invest a lot of emotional energy, just logistical task.
  - vii. Justin '18 CON - Worth pointing out that having a first round of appointments that would not be paid would be giving advantage to those not on financial aid.
  - viii. Student '19 CON: Sometimes in running election, someone needs to make decisions that are ambiguous. Would Elections Coordinator make these decisions, or would SC decide? How much is being asked of this position?
  - ix. Vote to extend Pro-Con debate by 7 mins: DOES NOT PASS
- d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters
  - i. Ian '17: In response to Brian's question about why SC clearly defines responsibilities, it makes it easier to offer job descriptions for those running for SC and to know what is expected of them.
  - ii. Tristan '18: Increasing number of people on Budgeting Committee to make process more efficient.
  - iii. Claire '16: In response to Elections Coordinator being necessary - I've been Secretary and elections are a lot to juggle. Having someone else do it will free Secretaries to contribute in other ways.
  - iv. Jason '16: We had concerns that people would step up to run elections; we are about to propose a friendly amendment surrounding issue of paying Election Coordinator
- e. Call for Friendly Amendments
  - i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments

These minutes reflect the interpretations of Erin Lipman and Kyle Albagli, Honor Council Co-Secretaries, and Ann-Victoria Isaac and Natalie Yao, Students Council Co-Secretaries.

They are neither reviewed nor approved by the rest of Honor Council or Students Council  
 Questions/comments? Email [hccosecs@hc](mailto:hccosecs@hc) and [hcsecretaries@gmail.com](mailto:hcsecretaries@gmail.com)!

1. Damon '16, Kyle '16, Arthur '19: Amendment to change resolution so that position of Elections Coordinator will be paid regardless of whether or not they are appointed in the first round. Elections coordinator will also run Honor Council election (not just Students Council)
    - a. Specifically: Cross out the part "SC may offer financial compensation to the Elections Coordinator if no one applies in the first round of appointments for the position"
  - ii. Question and Answer
    1. Schaf '17: Since the Election Coordinator is paid, is the position still considered part of the SC, since the SC are unpaid?
      - a. Jason '16: The Co-Presidents of SC are also paid.
      - b. Claire '16: This position would not be part of SC. Appointed by appointments committee.
  - iii. Pro-Con debate
    1. None
  - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
    1. Amendment PASSES
  - f. Call for Unfriendly Amendments (NONE)
    - i. Presentations of recognized Unfriendly Amendments
    - ii. Question and Answer
    - iii. Pro-Con debate
    - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment
  - g. Moment of Silence
  - h. Vote on Final Resolution
    - i. Resolution PASSES
10. Alcohol Policy Ratification
- a. JSAAPP Co-Heads Present Alcohol Policy
    - i. Meg '17, Lauren '18: Alcohol policy says that students are responsible for their own well being and that of others.
    - ii. We recognize that it is not perfect, we think it fits with the Social Honor Code and encourages students to protect one another.
  - b. Question and Answer session
    - i. Michelle '16: the policy states that that students engaging in actions inconsistent with the Alcohol Policy should be removed by the host. Also states in policy that students are responsible for being conscious of Pennsylvania law. Does this mean that host of party should remove people who are drinking under age?
      1. Lauren '18: Under the policy no; under the law yes; if an underage guest is drinking, they should know they should not be doing so; if they do not, someone else present should confront them

These minutes reflect the interpretations of Erin Lipman and Kyle Albagli, Honor Council Co-Secretaries, and Ann-Victoria Isaac and Natalie Yao, Students Council Co-Secretaries.

They are neither reviewed nor approved by the rest of Honor Council or Students Council  
 Questions/comments? Email [hccosecs@hc](mailto:hccosecs@hc) and [hcsecretaries@gmail.com](mailto:hcsecretaries@gmail.com)!

- ii. Michelle '16: Just asking whether the fact that they are drinking at all underage against the policy since it asks students to be conscious of laws.
  - 1. Meg '17: Policy says "reminds students of law" doesn't explicitly forbid underage drinking.
- iii. Michelle '16: Last year, resolution changed policy to say that one member of SC and one member of Honor Council should serve on JSAAPP instead of 2; policy does not reflect this.
  - 1. Lauren '18: Older version of alcohol policy in packet.
- iv. Brittany '17: Says that disregard for policy will be brought to JSAAPP. What constitutes a procedural violation?
  - 1. Lauren '18: ex) not having alcohol in closed containers.
  - 2. Meg '17: ex) also for example using spaces such as Lunt for events that are not the type that should be held there.
- v. Brittany '17: What is a JSAAPP inquiry?
  - 1. Lauren '18: JSAAPP inquiry is sort of an Honor Council trial-ish type thing.
- vi. Jay '18: How often do JSAAPP inquired occur?
  - 1. Meg '17: Our understanding is that they don't happen often, but always available if needed.
- vii. Jonathan '17: What are the party guidelines?
  - 1. Meg '17: Available on JSAAPP website. eg) parties in Lunt or James house should relate to the arts, etc.
- c. Pro-Con debate
  - i. Ali '16 PRO - Was JSAAPP co-head for previous three semesters; wanted to express strong support for alcohol policy; has created a culture where Haverford students take care of each other. Haven't had a student admitted to hospital for alcohol poisoning in recent history. This is good in comparison to similar schools. But also students need to participate in policy more.
  - ii. Sarah '17 CON - Agree with a lot of the policy, but disagree with some specific parts. Policy talks about providing education. Website links for education are insufficient and lead to pages that are difficult to access.
  - iii. Josh '16 PRO - In favor of policy; just wants to make sure people read it before voting on it; there are certain parts of policy that we as students do not follow as well as we should (eg - not drinking in academic buildings)
- d. Response to Pro-Con debate by JSAAPP Co-Heads
  - i. Meg '17: In terms of education on website, we are reworking website to make it more accessible. We are also working with Women's Center, SAO, etc. on other education and discussion initiatives such as workshop on being active bystander.
  - ii. Lauren '18: Really going to work on educational aspect of policy this year
- e. Vote on ratification of Alcohol Policy

These minutes reflect the interpretations of Erin Lipman and Kyle Albagli, Honor Council Co-Secretaries, and Ann-Victoria Isaac and Natalie Yao, Students Council Co-Secretaries.

They are neither reviewed nor approved by the rest of Honor Council or Students Council  
 Questions/comments? Email [hccosecs@hc](mailto:hccosecs@hc) and [hcsecretaries@gmail.com](mailto:hcsecretaries@gmail.com)!

i. Policy RATIFIED

11. Moment of Silence