

Moment of Silence

1. Welcome to Plenary!
 - a. [How to use a microphone]
 - b. [Introduction of the Students Council and Honor Council student leaders]
 - c. [Reminders] Please try and keep noise to a minimum so that we can finish plenary tonight. Plenary has given out packets for a week so if no one stands up to talk then we will move on.
2. Rules of Order and Agenda
 - a. Took time to look over the rules of order and agenda
3. Questions concerning agenda or Rules of Order.
4. Call for amendments to change Agenda or Rules of Order.
 - a. Brian Guggenheimer '16: Changes to time limits
 - i. Amendment addressing the fact that with 9 resolutions, plenary would take more than the constitutional time limit
 - ii. I propose that we slightly shorten each of the resolutions time periods by about $\frac{2}{3}$
 1. Presentations time 5 minutes ->3 minutes
 2. Question and Answer time: 10 minutes -> 6 minutes
 3. Pro & Con time: 15 minutes ->10 minutes
 4. Combine friendly and unfriendly amendments into one 7 minute time period
 - iii. Changes to Rules of order
 1. Time limit for one person speaking 2 minutes ->1 minute
 2. Plenary should take 4 hours, with option to extend by 45 minutes up to 2 times (currently the procedures allow one extension of 30 minutes)
5. A vote to accept any amendments to the agenda must have 2/3 majority vote.
 - a. Amendment PASSES
6. Presidential Announcements
 - a. Last semester's resolutions have been fully implemented
 - b. Donuts with Dan, etc
7. Resolution #1 Honor Council Facilitated Confrontation
 - a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Michelle Parris '16, Chris Hadad '17, Erin Lipman '17, Kyle Albagli '16, Irene Evans '16.
 - ii. This change is not an amendment to the wording of the constitution
 - iii. People feel that they only contact the Honor Council with trials. Honor Council wants to reach out to people as a facilitator, a support person for both parties. This person can help people with processes and abstract will be printed for facilitated confrontations with consent of the parties.
 - b. Question and Answer session
 - i. Pro-Con debates:
 1. PRO: Melissa Lee-Litowitz '15: I support this resolution and think it is an important next step for the Haverford community especially with confrontations in which a power dynamic is involved. The facilitator would just add to the things that Honor Council can do to the support the student community.

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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- ii. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters
 - 1. Chris: Thank you Melissa.
 - c. Call for Friendly and Unfriendly Amendments: (NONE)
 - i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - ii. Question and Answer
 - iii. Pro-Con debate
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - d. Moment of Silence
 - e. Vote on Final Resolution
 - i. Resolution PASSES.
- 8. Resolution #2 Honor Council Transparency and Interpretation
 - a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Michelle Parris '16, Chris Hadad '17, Erin Lipman '17, Kyle Albagli '16, Irene Evans '16: This resolution has two parts. First part is Honor Council transparency. This would require that council send minutes of meetings to community. Post cases of the past three years on the website without revealing what is confidential. Make the Honor Council website up to date, user friendly, and have information important to the community. Send out semester emails to the community about what is going on in Honor Council.
 - ii. Second part of this amendment is interpretation. Articles 6 and 7 (types of trial and universal types of procedures) also have ambiguity. Council should be able to interpret things that need flexibility.
 - b. Question and Answer session (NONE)
 - c. Pro-Con presentations (NONE)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters (NONE)
 - e. Call for Friendly and Unfriendly Amendments: (NONE)
 - i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - ii. Question and Answer
 - iii. Pro-Con debate
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - f. Moment of Silence
 - g. Vote on Final Resolution
 - i. Resolutions PASSES.
- 9. Resolution #3 Honor Council Procedural Modifications
 - a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Michelle Parris '16, Chris Hadad '17, Erin Lipman '17, Kyle Albagli '16, Irene Evans '16: Three minor constitutional changes.
 - 1. Procedures for what happens when a Haverford student has a trial at Bryn Mawr. Mirrors what is in the Bryn Mawr constitution..
 - 2. Changes the date of the librarian's appointments time to fall semester.
 - 3. Pre-trial procedure. ask for statements, review, send to trial or drop case. Abstracts may be published for dropped cases.
 - b. Question and Answer session (NONE)
 - c. Pro-Con presentations (NONE)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters (NONE)
 - e. Call for Friendly and Unfriendly Amendments: (NONE)

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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - ii. Question and Answer
 - iii. Pro-Con debate
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - f. Moment of Silence
 - g. Vote on Final Resolution
 - i. The resolution PASSES
- 10. Resolution #4 30-Day Reimbursement Deadline
 - a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Jason Hirsch '16 and Misael Cespedes '16: Resolution introduces 30 day deadline for club reimbursements. We have flood of people trying to get reimbursements at the end of the semester, which is impractical for treasurers.
 - ii. Students must come after 30 days for reimbursement or ask for extension. This would increase efficiency and help future treasurers. Bryn Mawr does this currently and has only had to grant one extension this year.
 - b. Question and Answer session
 - i. Q: Ali Lamacki '16: does this apply for cumulative costs, such as JSAAPP.
 - ii. Ans: no; try to come in once a month; some people come in December needing money from September.
 - iii. Q: James Faville '17: Would it be less confusing if people had a month instead of thirty days?
 - iv. Ans: Sure, all of this will be at treasurer's discretion
 - v. Q: Would wages, specifically BLAST wages be included in this policy?
 - vi. Ans: Yes; this is part of what resolution is addressing (BLAST guilty of coming in at last minute).
 - c. Pro-Con presentations
 - i. PRO: Damon Motz-Storey '16: good resolution; I'm one of those BLAST people who waits since i know i won't get in trouble; I am reason for resolution
 - ii. CON: Lee Anderson '15: Haverford is a stressful place; people get behind on things; if you spend money for a club, there is no reason you should not get repaid; part of treasurer job
 - iii. PRO: Ryan Gilliom '15: I think this is just to get the general trend of checks to be more evenly distributed throughout the semester. I don't see a problem with this
 - iv. PRO: Laura Eckstein '16: Could not agree with Ryan more; 30 days is ample time to seek reimbursement from treasurers.
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters
 - i. Thanks for the thoughts, we appreciate some of the support we had
 - e. Call for Friendly Amendments (NONE)
 - i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - ii. Question and Answer
 - iii. Pro-Con debate
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - f. Call for Unfriendly 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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- i. Presentations of recognized Unfriendly Amendments
 - 1. ATTEMPTED AMENDMENT: Joshua Hilscher. '18: amend resolution timeline to 50 days from 30 days (retracted due to lack of signatures)
 - ii. Question and Answer
 - iii. Pro-Con debate
 - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment
 - g. Moment of Silence
 - h. Vote on Final Resolution
 - i. PASSES
11. Resolution #5 Amendment to the Social Honor Code
- a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Adela Scharff '16, Brittany Steele '17, Angelique Spencer '17, Jenny Ahn '17, Sherilyn Galvez '16, Dawit Habtemariam '15:
 - ii. this resolution will have a friendly amendment that changes new sentence slightly to include transphobia and discrimination based national origin or English capability, and to make minor modifications to wording
 - iii. Last year TIDE spoke to a lot of students of color and a lot of students expressed wanting to see racism prohibited in the Honor Code
 - iv. This will also make prospective students feel more welcome if they feel like Honor Council is a resource for them.
 - v. Doesn't change spirit of social code, lists examples of how aspects of identity might relate to the social code. This could also help a jury to be clear in trial situation
 - b. Question and Answer session (None)
 - c. Pro-Con presentations
 - i. CON: .MaryKate Cavanaugh '18: I feel that there are too many different opinions on what racism or discrimination are on this campus. I think this may lead to a lot of censorship, this adds a lot of bars to an already high bar and will lead to a lot of pressure on the social Honor Code
 - ii. PRO: Chris Pence '18: I'd like to think we can incorporate this into our current discussion; hope that more confrontations can occur
 - iii. CON: Mac Perkins-High '17: I think the social code is a document that governs how we relate to each other, not a place for political statement. Also implies that everything not prohibited is okay. Where does that leave room for other things that aren't okay?
 - iv. PRO: Sara Malia Daguio '18: This does not limit scope of Social Code; just gives specific examples of violations of Code; these are examples of things which show disrespect to Haverford students.
 - v. PRO: Tamar Hoffman '15: I don't think this will inhibit our conversations, I think it will just make people feel more welcome here
 - vi. PRO: Katie Frank '17: I agree with Tamar; unique and powerful way of making explicit values which are already supposed to be in Code
 - vii. PRO: James Truitt '17: I don't see this leading to censorship. I think its about us determining what is acceptable.
 - viii. CON: John-Francis Villines. '18: It's hard to disagree with any sentiments expressed. I was reading an article recently where it quoted

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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

“crazy” as “an ableist slur”; do not like implication of restriction of speech to that degree and I haven’t seen ableism play out; rest of resolution makes sense.

- ix. PRO: Kenzie Thorp ‘16: Crazy is an ableist slur. People who don’t think these issues are a problem are not the ones who have to deal with microaggressions; this resolution puts these directly in Code.
 - x. CON: Kaziah White ‘16: While I think these things are very important, I think they are already part of the code. These problems come from problems in how it plays out. I think we should be having discussion of how to make them happen within the current wording of the code
 - xi. PRO: Andrew ‘16: The resolution acts as an educational tool to an extent; freshmen reading the code during Customs may learn about issues they have never heard of before; value of resolution is that it encourages discussion of these issues.
 - xii. PRO: Robin Banerji ‘15: What Kaziah said is correct, this should be coming out of discussion of student body, which happened last semester. Everybody here was invited by emails and facebook. This is a direct product of that. I think that since we have discussed, we should move forward
- d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters
- i. Angelique Spencer ‘17: Both sides have brought up valid points. This makes the Honor Code more political, but the Honor Code itself is a political statement. This is from many students who have complained about these issues and not knowing if they could go to Council since they didn’t know how they would address it
 - ii. Jenny Ahn ‘17: We should respect and value each other; easy to say when coming from a background where it is easy to trust others; many students come from a different background where it is more difficult
- e. Call for Friendly Amendments:
- i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - 1. Kevin Liao ‘18, Adela Scharff ‘16: Adding discrimination based on transphobia, national origin, and English capability:
 - ii. Question and Answer:
 - 1. Q: Joshua Hilscher ‘18: What signifies an insult to a political identity
 - 2. Ans: To clarify, its not saying that you’re not allowed to insult people, but rather discriminate or harass. It would be, say, harassing somebody because they’re conservative
 - iii. Pro-Con debate:
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment:
 - 1. 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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- i. PASSES
- 12. Resolution #6 Alcohol Policy Changes
 - a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Ali Lamacki '16 and Candace Todd '16, Ivan Sanchez '15, Patrick Quinn '17, Frannie Gascoigne '17:
 - ii. This resolution came from recognizing that the language of the policy has not been amended for years; changing intro and goals to be more in line with Code (“trust, concern, respect”); changing number of HoCo and StuCo reps from 2 to 1, and adding rep from women’s center
 - b. Question and Answer session
 - i. Chris Pence '18: Wondering about change to representative from Women’s center.
 - ii. Ali Lamacki '16: I have always had 1 rep from Honor Council and Student Council and 1 women’s center rep; did not realize this was not in policy; women’s center rep is present in recognition that many issues the women’s center addresses are alcohol related; other reps are to maintain communication with student government
 - c. Pro-Con presentations
 - i. PRO: Michael Furey '17: I firmly support the changes since it provides language of integrity which is essential part of our Honor Code. These are also important part of the way alcohol is dealt with. I would like out of this a higher level of conversation between those who drink and those who don’t, since that is very fundamental.
 - ii. CON: Jeremy Steinberg '16: I want to draw attention to change to rule 3 (addition of phrase “for those who choose to drink”) I agree with this in principle. I feel like in practice this is adding further protections to a group that is already privileged, I feel like we should be adding further protections for those who do not drink.
 - iii. PRO: Damon Motz-Storey '16: Brief response to Jeremy; I agree that the policy benefits those who choose to drink; but I read this line as about not coercing students to drink more than they are comfortable with.
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters
 - i. We appreciate the comments. The alcohol policy is not designed to privilege a certain group, even if that doesn't happen in practice all the time. We did add that clause in rule 3 to protect everyone equally from being coerced into drinking too much
 - e. Call for Friendly Amendments (none)
 - i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - ii. Question and Answer
 - iii. Pro-Con debate
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - 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

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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- h. Vote on Final Resolution
 - i. PASSES
- 13. Resolution #7 Gender-Neutral Language in the Students' Constitution
 - a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Claire Dinh '16, Damon Motz-Storey '16: This amendment amends student constitution to remove he/she or his/her. When reading the student constitution, we realized that the language is not consistent throughout. There is "he/she" and sometimes "they" when singular pronoun is needed. We also want to make the language of the constitution gender neutral to make it more inclusive.
 - ii. Damon Motz-Storey '16: Claire asked if anyone would like to join her and help her propose the resolution last semester, [and I was interested]. There are, have been, and will be students at Haverford who do not identify themselves as "he" or "she".
 - iii. During customs week, we all talk about respecting everyone, and about the gender pronouns everyone wants to use.
 - iv. Knowledge about what a college do for LGBT group can really be great for prospective students.
 - b. Question and Answer session (none)
 - c. Pro-Con presentations
 - i. CON: James Truitt '17: I like this idea a lot; about making people more comfortable. But I am uncomfortable changing the pronouns of the constitutions in this way since there have been a lot of re-wordings. I do not feel comfortable with it because there are many places where things have been left out.
 - ii. PRO: Laurie Merrell '16: Response to previous claim; I feel that Damon and Claire have done a conscientious job changing the wording, and that they are striving for a more inclusive document.
 - iii. PRO: Daniel Washburn '17: Of all the modifications to the Honor Code, both this year and last year, this is perhaps the least significant changes that we have. [I'm not concerned about the wording changes].
 - iv. PRO: Student '16: I do not identify within the gender binary. I feel that I contribute a lot to the community, and I want to be part of it. I think this change is really important.
 - v. CON: Irene Evans '16: [Issue in change of wording] The first section retains the responsibility to clarify with professors, but losses the part about students being obligated to be aware of their work habits.
 - vi. PRO: Alex Johnson '15: I have had several LGBT friends telling me in various terms that within our generation, our conceptions of gender and sex (man, woman, he, she, etc.) will explode. The very simple labels we use; he, she, gay, lesbians, bi, are going to be completely worthless, so it is about time for Honor Code to update to predict the explosion of the gender and sex. We should be ahead of our time by voting for this resolution.
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters
 - i. Thank you so much for your comments.
 - ii. A friendly amendment to change the second section to re-introduce the phrasing about student awareness of work habits.

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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- e. Call for Friendly and Unfriendly Amendments:
 - i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - 1. Melissa Lee-Litowitz '15, Damon Motz-Storey '16, and Claire Dinh '16: propose some minor language clarifications "Students have the responsibility of being conscious of their own work habits..."
 - 2. [Melissa retracts part of amendment due to added grammatical issues, amendment adding "work habits" back to section about students' responsibilities remains amendment]
 - ii. Question and Answer:
 - iii. Pro-Con debate:
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment:
 - 1. Amendment PASSES
 - f. Moment of Silence
 - g. Vote on Final Resolution
 - i. Resolution PASSES
14. Resolution #8 Eliminating gender categorization in Freshman housing
- a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Sophia Abraham-Raveson '18, Matija Lagator '17:
 - ii. This resolution will give Freshmen the option to live with a suitemate or roommate of different gender if they feel more comfortable, doesn't force anyone. This also makes non-binary students more comfortable. Trans' inclusivity committee is also working on this by trying to make a gender neutral housing option for freshmen
 - b. Question and Answer session
 - i. Q: Ian Cumberpatch '18: On the survey, is this required to be filled out?
 - ii. Ans: Yes
 - iii. Q: Ian: If you don't fit into gender binary but your roommate does, what would opposite gender entail?.
 - iv. Ans: Currently survey asks if you identify as male, female, or other. If other and comfortable with a different gender, could be matched with male, female, or other
 - v. Q: Geoffrey Martin-Noble '16: Does survey define suitemate; I did not know what that meant before I came
 - vi. Ans: Like Gummere, etc. Nothing to do with the resolution, but it is important to clarify.
 - vii. Q: Brian Guggenheimer '16: To what extent have you talked to res life or dean's office?
 - viii. Ans: We have met with Residential Life, Dean Martinez and trans-inclusivity committee; they are in favor of this
 - ix. Q: Abby '16: In terms of apartments, suitemate basically means sharing bathroom which freshmen might not know. Would this be defined?
 - x. Ans: Yes that would be clarified on the survey.
 - xi. Q: Chris Pence '18: If you say gender other, and want someone with same gender, does this mean you can only be placed with "other", could one specify they would be comfortable with male or female?
 - xii. Ans: Maybe the way we phrase it is difficult to comprehend but there is a box to clarify or specify preferences.

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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- xiii. Q: Student'18: What about people who are questioning their gender?
 - xiv. Ans: It is up to them, they can specify if they want.
 - xv. Q: May Plumb '16: What if someone is concerned about rooming with someone of opposite biological sex. If this is solely based on gender, how could this be addressed?
 - xvi. Ans: Housing will only ask for gender not sex.
 - xvii. Q: May: Have you considered offering explanation of sex vs. gender?
 - xviii. Ans: If this was to be implemented, then there will be an explanation of what sex and gender are in the survey.
- c. Pro-Con presentations
- i. CON: Ryan Gilliom '16: In support of idea, but concerned with implementation method; I think this needs more work and could be done through administration and trans-inclusivity committee rather than through approving specific language at plenary
 - ii. CON: Zak Oglesby '17: I'm not so much concerned with spirit but logistics. With suitemate being included, this might be another factor complicating the making of Freshman halls.
 - iii. CON: Ian Cumberpatch '18: The resolution needs more refinement. What is written in the resolution, and the questions in the housing survey perpetuate gender binary. For those who feel like that they are not included in gender binary, it would be really confusing for those who do not understand what these terms mean.
 - iv. CON: Ivan Sanchez '15: Against insofar as when I was a freshman I had no clue what gender was, I would have been very much confused, this requires a level of well-versedness for Freshman that not everyone has
 - v. CON: James Faville '17: I think that this resolution is neglecting that sex and gender are different- I would want to propose to add two more questions saying I would feel comfortable having a roommate of the same or different sex
 - vi. PRO: Daniel Washburn '17: Don't see point in belaboring these points more. We should move on to amendment process and belabor them there
- d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters
- i. In response to comment on reinforcing gender binary, this is why we said "a different gender..." not "the different gender..."
 - ii. Point of this resolution was not to impose these direct words on the housing survey; idea was to show student support for general idea
- e. Call for Friendly and Unfriendly Amendments:
- i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - 1. Sam Hersh '15, Kristen Tatum '16, Anna Malawista'15
 - a. It was mentioned that Trans' inclusivity committee is working on implementing gender neutral housing. This housing would be based in Tritton and singles. Comfort with and need for this would be rated on scale on survey. Customs team and freshmen would be comfortable with situation, with preference to students who need this type

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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

of housing. We were working on this before this resolution.

- b. Amendment: Replacing resolution with resolution asking for student support on what Trans' inclusivity committee is doing [Dela gives wording]
- c. This will be going through senior staff to be implemented next year

ii. Question and Answer:

- 1. Q: Chris Pence '18: Does not address needs/wants of people concerning opposite gender roommates/suitemates
- 2. Ans: We discussed that in our committee, about how that would be set up in the apartments. There has not been a student asking for both gender neutral housing and a roommate, so we are assuming that there are students who need gender neutral housing. In a long term, we would love to address that issue, but it would be next year or later. we would love to go through with this amendment right now for the next new freshmen coming in.
- 3. Q: Sarah Eppler-Epstein '15: There is specific plan you mentioned; are you asking the student body to support specific plan, or to support general sentiment of original resolution
- 4. Ans: Its literally just showing student support for our efforts. In this case, it is specific proposal to have option to have gender neutral housing for freshmen. Not necessarily specifics of original resolution.
- 5. Q: Tamar Hoffman '16: I was wondering how you think that this will affect experience of diversity on campus since freshmen housing focuses on being exposed to different things
- 6. Ans: This issue is something res life has been working on for a while; goal is to deal with needs of trans' students; going to talk with Customs teams about this issue so that conversations continue

iii. Pro-Con debate:

- 1. CON: Brian Guggenheimer '16: I don't want to say I totally disagree with what you are trying to do, but this is concerning to me since we came with one resolution and are doing something totally different. If we come back next plenary with something more specific then that is more actionable.
- 2. CON: Niki von Krusenstiern '15: Amendment and original resolution are totally different; option for co-ed cisgendered roommates very different than offering a gender neutral hall
- 3. PRO: David Cookmeyer '16: True; this completely changes resolution. Really tangible for students to know what is going to happen.
- 4. PRO: Student '18: I want to observe that this amendment will show support without limiting exact form, we will leave details to people whose job is to set up housing
- 5. CON: Student: Wondering if we can add sentence to amendment adding original resolution ideas

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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- iv. Response to Pro-Con debate by amendment presenters
 - 1. Resolution wording: "This resolution expresses support for the Trans' inclusivity committee to increase housing options for first years"
 - 2. I feel that we aren't leaving behind previous resolution completely since it works towards same goals. When we talked to res life, we acknowledged that same students would tend to show support for each. Going forward to senior staff either way
- v. Moment of Silence
- vi. Vote on Friendly Amendment:
 - 1. Amendment DOES NOT PASS
- 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 DOES NOT PASS.
- 15. Resolution #9 Amendments to Students' Council's responsibilities
 - a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Maria Bojorquez-Gomez '16, Claire Dinh '16: There are five parts to our resolution, all making internal changes to Students' Council.
 - ii. International students are also represented in Students' Council.
 - iii. Chair of Facilities Fund responsibility transferred from Student Council Presidents to Officer of Arts
 - iv. Replace Co-Secretaries' semesterly report with monthly digest to keep aware what everyone in Student Council is doing.
 - v. Each officer will have to report on their activities rather than Co-Secs.
 - vi. Reps are supposed to show up at every meeting and show updates of their works; they could be asked to step down by the Presidents if they miss more than 2 meetings
 - vii. Extend term lengths of class reps from semester to year
 - viii. If Junior reps go abroad, they may step down.
 - b. Question and Answer session
 - i. Q: Brittany Steele '17: I was wondering why would international students be represented by the officer of multiculturalism, why not inventing an officer for international students? International students have different experiences than American students of color.
 - ii. Ans: Great idea, but at the moment we have officer of multiculturalism that does encompass a variety of experiences, this is the best option for now
 - iii. Q: Daniel Washburn '17 Two things that I am concerned about: Vote of previous amendment was not nearly clear enough to be called and the moments of silence should be observed in silence.
 - c. Pro-Con presentations (NONE)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters (NONE)
 - e. Call for Friendly and Unfriendly 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 and hcsecretaries@gmail.com!

- i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - 1. Jack Rasiel '17: Amendment to part 2 section f; Chair of Facilities Fund should be both officers of arts and campus life; not just arts; not that officer of the arts would be biased, but having it shared by two people ensures better representation of student body.
 - ii. Question and Answer (NONE)
 - iii. Vote on Friendly Amendment:
 - 1. Amendment PASSES
 - f. Moment of Silence
 - g. Vote on Final Resolution
 - i. Resolution PASSES
- 16. Addressing concern on previous resolution (8)
 - a. Claire Dinh '16: Would have needed simple majority. In the eyes of us up here, we did not achieve this. Many people abstained.
- 17. Opening ratification of the Honor Code: voting to open ratification process which will take place online
 - a. Presenters introduce resolution.
 - i. Chris Hadad '17, Michelle Parris '16:
 - ii. Saved best for last: the Code
 - iii. Two years ago, ratification failed, which led to 90% of students coming to special plenary.
 - iv. Great thing about code is that it can be amended every plenary, as it was tonight
 - v. We hope at this point you are satisfied with the code as written, we recognize that implementation of code in daily life is important and hope we can strive to resolving these issues
 - vi. Encourage all to share thoughts and concerns about ratifying the Code
 - vii. Thanks to everyone. Ratification should be online this week
 - viii. We look forward to reading your comments on Honor Code
 - b. Question and Answer session (NONE)
 - c. Pro-Con presentations (NONE)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters (NONE)
 - e. Moment of Silence
 - f. Vote on Final Resolution
 - i. PASSES: ratification process will open up this week.

Moment of Silence