Spring 2014 PLENARY AGENDA

I. Moment of Silence
   A.
   B. Everyone is silent.
II. Welcome to Plenary!
   A. Jacob: Start with introductions. People introduce themselves.
III. Rules of Order and Agenda
   A. Three minutes to look over Rules of Order and examine Agenda.
   B. Five minutes for questions concerning agenda or Rules of Order.
      1. No questions
   C. Call for amendments to change Agenda or Rules of Order.
      1. Jon Laks '14: Section 5
      2. Visual ballots vs. paper ballots
      3. Have opportunity to talk with other people. That's the purpose of speaking during plenary. It's important for someone to have the right to having people close eyes during vote. Amendment is to have people close their eyes.
   D. A vote to accept any amendments to the agenda must have 2/3 majority vote.
      1. Jacob: Paper ballot
      2. Fails
   E. Michael Rushmore '13: Add 9th component to rules of order. Ask that faculty and administrators not be present. This is a safe space for students, and we need a time out from admin for a couple of hours.
      1. Con: Kathryn '14: Are there any staff members who aren't students here? (raise hands). Okay great just wondering
      2. Con: Ali Lamacki '16: Part of HC/community is open dialogue for students and teachers, teachers not part of voting, it's cool that deans and presidents are here
      3. Con: Ben Wohl '14: Disagree, agree with Ali, works with Res Life, helps deans do their jobs better, increase effectiveness of student governance, important they stay here, especially coming here on a Sunday night
      4. Con: Jon Sweitzer-Lamme 14-: Part of what Haverford amazing is trust and dialogue, esp b/w student body and faculty, need for respite is false
      5. Pro: Jon Laks '14: I'm still a little confused, I get uncomfortable when certain members are assigned that they can watch without participant, they are just looking at us doing are thing, that would be my concern. Did I interpret everything correctly?
      6. Moment of silence, then vote: Amendment fails
IV. Presidential Announcements
   A. Clearness Committee
      1. Phil: Vice Presidents appointing next Sunday, applications due on Friday
      2. The committee meets once every 4 years for a full year to evaluate the

Honor Code and the quality of student life at Haverford. Email coming shortly.

   3. Will be surveying students for questions that they want answered by the committee

   B. Last Semester's Resolutions
       1. Jacob: into effect if we ratify code this semester

V. Resolution #1 (Resolution to Decrease Financial Barriers to Student Government Participation) - Majority vote

   A. Presenters have five minutes to introduce resolution.
       1. Alison Marqusee '16: Resolution is to allow certain student government leadership positions to count for Work-Study. HC and SC co-chairs are big time commitments--difficult for people who work part-time to fill these roles, meaning that people on work-study are less likely to participate in student government as leaders. They don't have as much input into administrative decisions. Not everyone must be represented at all times but everyone must have access. The Deans' Office has agreed to fund four positions for 10 hours per week for Work-Study for students whose financial aid packages include Work Study. Students not on Work-Study would not be paid. It is not to make these positions paid but to allow more students to participate. To sum up, if you want all students to be equally represented then there should be no structural barriers to their participation. This is not a total solution but is a step in the right direction.

   B. Question and Answer session: ten minutes to be extended no more than once by 1/2.
       1. Question (Geoffrey Martin-Noble '16): Students pay tuition prior to completing the job and are guaranteed a job--how would it work if they get paid after paying tuition?
           a) Answer: That's the same for all Work-Study jobs--students pay tuition and then are paid through Work-Study afterward.
       2. Question: Gillian '16: Suppose we have one person on financial aid and one who isn't, how would this change the dynamic of the situation?
           a) Answer: Not sure, the idea is not to make this a paid job, but to make sure that everyone has access. This would solve more problems than it would produce.
       3. Question: Harris Rothman '14: Who is responsible for paying for these new positions?
           a) Answer: This resolution is just intended to make the door open, a suggestion to make these jobs available for work-study.
       4. Question: James '17: Can you explain your characterization of Haverford as __--?
           a) Answer: Haverford has been on a general increase of diversity.
           b) Haverford's diversity has been getting more diverse each year
           c) Do you think it's pertinent to the resolution?

        d) Yes.
5. Question: Ian Oxenham '15 Has the administration agreed to cover the cost
      a) Answer: They are on board
6. Question: Miriam Pallant '14: Wondering if this info will be public to people beyond the school?
      a) Answer: No, not unless someone chose to disclose that info
7. Question: Kathryn Dorn '14: Don't want to ask this question, but is there any way to elect more than four people who would be eligible for this?
      a) Answer: This only applies to positions of SC co-chairs and HoCo presidents
8. Question: Lee Rosenthal '15: What were criteria for which positions can be used for work study?
      a) Answer: These are positions that make hierarchical decisions with the administration, so I figured that if any positions were eligible for this, these would be the ones?
9. Question: William Leeser '15: Do students get a monthly check?
      a) It'd be like any other work-study job, so you would bring timesheets to the Deans' Office with how many hours you had worked in a particular month.

C. Pro-Con presentations: fifteen minutes with motion to extend by fifteen minutes no more than twice by 1/2.
1. Pro: Jeremy Steinberg '16: As someone who served as HC co-sec last year I was privy to what was going on with the co-chairs and how much work they had to do. I considered running for co-chair but couldn't because I wouldn't have time to do that and work, so I think this resolution should pass.
2. Pro: Kenzie Thorpe '15: As someone on work study and who loves being part of student government, it's important that this resolution pass. It will enable people to serve on positions and to do a better job because they're not stretching themselves so thin. You sacrifice a lot to do these positions, this will allow people to do a better job at one thing.
3. Pro: Ryan Baxter-King '16: I was HC co-chair last semester - I'm lucky that I'm not on work study and I don't know what I would've done if I had a job at the same time. This would encourage people to run for co-chair who couldn't do it otherwise, but not for the money. It wouldn't bother me if my partner was on work-study and
4. Con: Brian Guggenheimer '16: Not exactly sure where I stand on this issue, but I have some concerns. HoCo Co-chair position was really crazy and I resigned because it was so difficult. I had two jobs at the time and was over-committed. The co-chair before me was also working work study. I think it is important for everyone to have ability to access these positions, but I'm not sure whether this will achieve that, or if the job itself

is too big. There are equity issues about whether or not someone would be getting paid to do the same work as someone else. There are other positions integral to the Haverford community that won't be included in work study. I don't know if this is the way to fix that problem .

5. Pro: Jenna Brower '15: I was SC co-sec last year and I think this is a great resolution because it doesn't provide all of the funding we need to make these positions equitable, I would have applied for other positions if I knew my finances would be taken care of. To reply to Brian, this resolution opens up possibilities. We should start putting this in motion rather than putting it down because one person would get aid and one didn't.

6. Con: Karina Weiner '15: Speaking in I statements - I am fully for sentiment of resolution and that people on work study get opportunity to be on student government, however, just because someone is not on work study doesn't mean they don't need to have a job and make money. Not sure about logistics of resolution.

7. Pro: Jon Laks '14: I just want to make a few things explicit. One has to do with Leeser's question. The college is becoming more diverse in in terms of racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity. If you look aat SC co-presidents they have not been representative of this diversity. SC and HC are very different from other types of positions, in that they are replacing work that would be paid at other institutions which would be done by administrators. They add value to the College.

8. Pro: Michael Rushmore '14: It would be great if everyone got paid, but right now, there have been a lot of resignations in SC and HoCo

9. Pro: Thy Vo '14: Only so many hours during the day, and SC and HoCo people are working during those hours. unfair to expect student leaders to do that while you're doing work. Students should be being paid for this labor. People who are sacrificing time and energy to try and help their community should be paid.

10. Pro: Jon Sweitzer-Lamme' 14: I watched three generations of HC co-chairs go through the process of trying to make it work and say close friends get physically and emotionally exhausted. It causes actual damage to people.

11. Pro: Matt Da Silva '14: For those who have doubts about this resolution because it doesn't go far enough or the logistics or tricky - This is a start, not set in stone. Let's push this forward and see how it goes, and then we can change it as needed in the future. This isn't the last Plenary, let's take this step, and then take it from there.

D. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes.

1. Alison Marqusee '16: Thanks for your input on both sides. Everyone has a lot of valid points, and I'm especially aware of the idea that people who might not be on work-study still have financial obligations. People affected by this can make changes to it in a year if it doesn't work. I'm proposing

this with the knowledge that we can take a step forward and see if it works.

E. Call for Friendly Amendments: support of all presenters and approval of chairs needed – five minutes allowed to turn in

F. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
   1. Alison Marqusee '16: Specifying 10 hrs/**week**

G. Moment of Silence

H. Vote on Friendly Amendment – majority vote
   1. Amendment passes

I. Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed – seven minutes allowed to turn in Unfriendly Amendments with a motion to extend by seven minutes no more than once.

J. Moment of Silence

K. Vote on Final Resolution
   1. Passes

VI. Resolution #2 (Revision of Honor Council Procedures) – 2/3 majority vote

A. Presenters have five minutes to introduce resolution.
   1. Introduction of Presenters Ryan Baxter-King, Erin Berlew, Zack Rosenthal, Michael Furey, Brian Guggenheimer, Michaela Novakovic, Karina Weiner
   2. Karina Wiener '15: So we are presenting 4 resolutions in one. All of them as a whole will make council more efficient so that we can focus on what is happening right now.
   3. Zachary Rosenthal: Not get back-log for the previous semester
   4. Brian Guggenheimer '16: Alleviate time commitment, second piece allows concil leadership to delegate responsibilities to other members, formally establishes staff-person/assistant, outside Honor council for (printing, shredding), secretarial responsibilities
   5. Michael Furey '17: To address problems of last semester to have a formal proceeding to ask reps to formally announce resignations.
   6. Ryan Baxter-King '16: reduce backlog of abstracts so that it doesn't happen again, establishes a formal Honor Council committee for abstracts

B. Question and Answer session: ten minutes to be extended no more than once by 1/2.
   1. Question: Micah Walter '14: Second part of resolution, why wouldn't this staff person be on Honor Council and how does confidentiality works?
      a) Answer: There are a number of options. We are testing this with Janela Harris. We are envisioning this as someone who already abides by confidentiality, or with a graduate assistant who is not a part of the community, thus not a concern.
   2. Question: Maddy Durante '16: Wondering about second part, mentioning noncritical responsibilities, inform the committee what the person is really

taking on?

    a) Answer: Brian: Non critical responsibilities could be anything deemed such a thing that is not needed to be done by chairs and secs. We had conversations with administration, and this was a suggested option. Let me read off some that we thought of, though not exhaustive. Keep track of old resolutions. Follow up with previous chairs to get old chair reports. Print abstracts. Shredding after meetings. Put together docs for trials. To assemble jurors. Email abstracts. There may be others

3. Question: Maddy: Let people know what they're doing, who they are?

    a) Answer: Other people can correct me, but I would imagine that the community should know who the staff person. The librarian's role is published, a similar approach could be utilized.

    b) Zach: Right now this staff person is doing little things, such as answering emails

4. Question: Angie '15: Replacing chair's report, something special about co-chairs writing abstract?

    a) Answer: Zach: Leaving that option open. We are revising the trial procedure, we will need someone to keep track of what goes on in trial, but it need not be so long winded as a chair report.

5. Question: Kathryn Dorn '14: Does or does not include graduating seniors? someone who's going to study abroad?

    a) Answer: Karina: We have thought about people being abroad or who have graduated.

6. Question: Zach '17: One point will remove requirement for chair's report?

    a) Answer: Brian: Kinda. The chairs report is in a different section of the constitution. The chairs' report is in under judicial powers. Need to be sub, can strat from notes, write abstracts based off of that, even though submitted at some point, doesn't specify what chairs report is, make process start soon

7. Karina: What that means is that we are getting rid of the formal requirement. The chairs can write a report, but we are changing the definition, making it a short summary.

8. Phil: Motion to extend Q&A to 10 more minutes?

    a) Motion fails

C. Pro-Con presentations: fifteen minutes with motion to extend by fifteen minutes no more than twice by 1/2.

1. Con: Kathryn Dorn '14: about publication part. Not exactly convinced that following up with resolutions, secretarial less of an elected person sort of task, some kind of more specific statement about the person being not a member, not elections, another elected person whose job upholds confidentiality, is important enough to be able to be elected

2. Pro: Jeremy Steinberg '16: Respond to Kathryn's concerns. Honor council

is time consuming, but I made it through. It would be a lot easier if I were able to delegate things like scheduling. Printing was a huge time commitment that I didn't need. Honor Council is useful, so it will make things faster so the school can know what's going on

3. Angie '14: One issue is the availability of knowledge, confidentiality. Hope that resolution keeps in mind, not for graduate assistant, should not push off commitment to someone not on Council
4. Con: Maddy Durante '16: I believe that Honor Council has a lot of work and that we should take steps to alleviate that. But I am very uncomfortable with this. We need to know who is working on these trials. We have student government, and we should be a part of that. The appointment of someone without election makes me feel uncomfortable.
5. Pro: Aaron Madow '14: Know that there have been lots of resignations, think about how people presenting resolution are from HC, concern that the person not elected, but more important is crisis, people involved are trying to make it doable
6. Pro: Michael Furey: [difficult to hear through speaker] One quick thing to remember is that it involves

D. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes.
1. Karina: Some things to address: There were concerns about the role of the staff person, we feel we have the perfect person to do this, because Janela has served as co-sec and confidentiality. If it is not feasible for a student to do this in the future, we will change this. Term length allows for someone to do this at all times.

E. Call for Friendly Amendments: support of all presenters and approval of chairs needed – five minutes allowed to turn in
1. Zack: We would like to add to line 27 about position being published on honor council website.

F. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
1. None

G. Question and Answer: five minutes
1. Question: Ian Gavigan '14: Possible to add any person's name to be published on the website?
   a) Answer: Yes! Thats the proposal! :) "Name and duties…"

H. Pro-Con debate: ten minutes
1. Ryan: announcement- pg 6 4th paragraph, HC has right to appoint member, new bolded language not changing anything other than formatting
2. No pro/cons

I. Vote on Friendly Amendment – majority vote
1. Passes

J. Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed – seven minutes allowed to turn in Unfriendly Amendments with a motion to extend by seven minutes no

more than once.

K. Presentations of recognized Unfriendly Amendments
1. Micah Walter '13: Some members have expressed the wording of 2g. About delegating responsibilities to a staff member, I ask that this part of the amendment be removed and voted on separately.
2. Kathryn '14: Instead of striking entirely, remove words on top of pg 6 "graduate assistant…" substituting for "student member" so anyone could be a part of it
3. Zack: Staff person is not making any decision. No say in matters.
4. Karina: elected vs. staff person. One is job, other is representative.
5. Motion to have 7 more minutes passes
6. Two Unfriendly Amendments: neither received enough signatures
L. Moment of Silence
M. Vote on Final Resolution
1. Resolution passed! :)

VII. Honor Code Ratification
A. Honor Council Co-Chairs Present Honor Code
1. Karina: Last Spring, at plenary, failed. Seemingly unfortunate event served as catalyst for making Honor Code more powerful
2. Ratified for second plenary
3. Resolutions to affect procedures, but Honor Code itself doesn't not need to change, still uphold same values
4. Reaffirm the values of our community, reaffirm our commitment to it
5. Michaela: Community forums to keep people informed. We will have clearness committee to evaluate efficiency as a whole
B. Question and Answer session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice.
1. Question: Michael Furey '17 - is this to ratify the Honor Code or open up elections?
   a) Answer: We are voting on opening up ratification of the Honor Code elections
C. Pro-Con debate: 15 minutes with motion to extend by 10 minutes no more than 3 times.
1. Con: Ethan Adelman-sid '16: Something is fundamentally wrong with this school, and the Honor Code is breaking. We need a frantic and honest discussion about the state of the Code and the school. I see things going on campus that make me not want to ratify the Honor Code. Please come up and let's have a discussion about this. We understand the academic honor code, but don't pay attention to the social honor code. We are supposed to share our opinion with each other even when it will make someone uncomfortable. People aren't sharing what they believe, but what they think they're supposed to believe. This goes against the Code. The administration doesn't respect the Code. The plenary minutes and resolutions go on the website, only one of them has been approved by the

administration. We are not implementing the code, the administration is not implementing the code. We need a debate before we can open ratification.

2. Pro: Jon Sweitzer Lamme '14: I would ask the previous speaker if this is not the frank and honest debate that he asked for.

3. Pro: Andrew Szczurek '16: As much as I don't know about administrative complaints, but we should all being honest is important. Covering opinions behind veil of trying to fit in what is politically correct, a lot of bull-shit, anyone who disagrees with this point is an idiot.

4. Pro: Fiona Lin '14: With all do respect to everyone who has spoken before me, I have to agree with Ethan. I don't believe that this is the way to go about it. I think we have produced a lot of valuable dialogue since Special Plenary, I'm wondering how repeating this experience is the way to go, or if we should ask people to change their own opinion. Rather than trying to change a document. I would love it if everyone on this campus would think about what the Code means. That's what this process is about, not voting, but remember the values we believe in.

5. Pro: Jon Sweitzer Lamme '14: Follow up on glib remarks - perhaps the best way to deal with the real issues that Ethan brought up is to work with the Code in our daily lives. The code is functional, but we may no tbe working with it the way we need to. Personal question we all need to think about. That is the way to fix a lot of problems

6. Con: Michael Rushmore '14: To respond to Jon- if the issue is that the administration is not dealing with the code, implementing and ratifying it in our lives is not going to solve that. That has nothing to do with how the administration deals with it.

7. Con: Jonathan Laks '14 - I understand from back when I was a prospective student that the Honor Code becomes a very big part of life here, but everyone has a varied experience with how much they pay attention to it. There are people on both ends of the spectrum.

8. Time is called. - Two minutes.

9. Jon: To conclude, we were brought here by the Honor Code and there's a lot of talk about personal relationships to the Code, but people are trying to co-opt us to support the school.

10. Pro: Kathryn Dorn '14: Speaking seriously, I'm not sure anyone would enjoy going through what we went through last year, neither us or the administration. Let's just ratify the code.

11. Con: Brittany Steele '17: I'd like to address what was said first about the social Honor Code. I have heard several people think that the social code shouldn't exist, and that's a problem that should be addressed.

12. Pro: Daniel '16: As the first blind student here at Haverford, I chose this school because of the code. Being a sophomore, all of my exams are take home, regardless of whether the rest of the class's exams are take-home

because I cannot take them with the rest of the class. It shows that we are living through this document, especially the academic Code. I would not feel satisfied if we were to get rid of it altogether; it should be kept and cherished as it continues to revolve. If it were to fall, I would reconsider my place at this institution.

13. Pro: Jason Faville '17: This is a place for great reason. We aren't going to solve anything by blaming the administration. It would be great to have a forum in which we can talk about the Code as a student body.

14. Pro: Naomi Goodman '14: I question whether the issues we've brought up are issues with the Code itself, or people not being perfect. These are real issues with the social honor code, but that's what confrontation is for. If someone is being too PC, that's why you need to confront them for it.

15. Motion to extend Pro-Con debate by 10 minutes - fails.

D. Response from the Co-Chairs (3 minutes)

1. Karina - Thank you for voicing your concerns. The Code failed last year and sparked a lot of discussion but the discussion shouldn't stop there. Last semester we started having Community Forums and we're continuing them this week.

2. Michaela - A few people raised concerns about the role of the administration in all of this. The Code is student-facilitated so we can continue to talk about this.

3. Karina: Thank you for contributing tonight. We hope that you evaluate it.

E. Vote on opening ratification of Honor Code – 2/3 majority vote

F. Moment of Silence

1. Resolution passes. Ratification will open on Thursday - check your emails.

VIII.   Final Moment of Silence