

Plenary

Quorum to be reached : 466 : Time Reached 7:21

- I. Moment of Silence (7:26) - Jon
- II. Welcome to Plenary - Jon welcomes the student body. Respect all opinions - plenary is on a time system. Please State name and class. watch for the chords on the pro side.
- III. Rules of Order and Agenda- Jon announces
 - a. 3 to 5 minutes to look over rules of order and agenda
 - b. Call for unfriendly amendments: 75 signatures needed seven minutes allowed to gather signatures and hand in the amendment to be extended by seven minutes once.
 - i. Nora Wasserman, Charlie Vos, and Katie Schogol- Unfriendly amendment against the agenda to strike item IV from the agenda.(ending at 7:39)
 - c. Presentation of recognized Unfriendly amendments: five minutes
 - i. Katie Schogol, Nora Wasserman, Charlie Vos, Tatiana Marshall (seniors) - Smoke free Lunt. Necessary but not a correct forum for the discussion. - See Unfriendly Amendment - This is a Lunt community decision - talked to Joe Tolliver. Forum for intimate discussion.
 - ii. Question and Answer: five minutes
 - Laura Kasakoff '06 - if you invite Haverford community what's the difference if we discuss this now?
 - Answer - some have no interest in going to Lunt. And people in intimate discussion should make the decision.
 - Chloe Caraballo '06 - approximately between frequenters how many do you think visit Lunt basement and cafe?
 - Answer - estimate - prepay 50 people on prepay -- about an audience of 200 regulars, 100 more for events and concerts. Often open to the entire community.
 - Jason Coleman 04 - When you have your meeting how will you come to your decision about smoking / non smoking at lunt
 - Answer - impartial moderator to moderate the discussion and come to consensus or compromise. Will honor what this group decides. Plenary resolution will be set in stone otherwise we can change whenever we want.
 - iii. Pro-con debate: ten minutes
 - Con - Cole 05 -- This resolution has a place at this plenary. It is there to discuss non-constitutional and non-honor code thing.
 - Pro - Jeremy Pober 04 - this is a clause for the housing code -- have they talked to the housing committee? no one has had a chance to think and discuss it

- Con - Julien Colvin 05 - Not an honor code issue. This does affect this community.
 - Pro – Greg Greenberg 05 -- This is a yes or no forum. Whereas a small discussion would give people options.
 - Con - Chloe '06 -- plenary is about compromise. not just a yes or no issue. We can propose another unfriendly amendment. How do you strike out without a discussion? Plenary is the only forum for a community decision.
 - Pro – Nora Wasserman '04 -- not the entire community, these 400 might overlap, but by no means an exact overlap. Would like to discuss with people very passionate about it. this is not the forum. Compromise isn't ideal at plenary -- other forum will be more ideal than at plenary.
 - Con - Emily Pellman 06 - This is the forum to discuss this issue. Lots of people will find excuses not to go to the discussion. We have quorum now.
 - Pro – Tatiana Marshall 04 - Haverford has a history where special forums are attended. Plenary is not the only place where this has to happen
 - Con - Laura Kasakoff 06 – This is a perfect place to discuss this -- Lunt is funded by SC - money goes into this so that everyone should decide from this forum.
 - Pro - Chris Haagen 07 - Wants to do things that would shorten plenary. Would be better with a smaller group anyway.
- iv. Vote on unfriendly amendments, majority rules
- Visual Vote - majority rules -- the amendment passes in the eyes of the chair.
- d. Review of new rules of order and agenda

IV. Resolution # 2 Alcohol policy clean-up

- a. Presenters introduce: 5 minutes - Julien Colvin 05
 - i. See attached resolution. These are clarifying changes that would help the understanding the alcohol policy.
- b. ?'s and answers
 - i. No questions
- c. Pro-con presentations
 - i. No pro-con comments
- d. Call for unfriendly amendments
 - i. no unfriendly amendments
- e. Moment of silence
- f. Vote on final resolution, majority rules
 - i. Resolution passes in the eyes of the chair

V. Resolution #3 - Keeping Clean

- a. Presenters introduce: 5 minutes Nora Spriggs 06, Karl Blumenthal 06

- i. See attached resolution. We want to keep the buildings and grounds clean. Especially after Haverfest. Broken glass is an issue - people keep getting cut. (Comfort and Lloyd).
- b. ?'s and answers
- i. Jennifer Carmen 06 - students should take responsibility - those who drink or those who throw the party?
 - ii. Answer - anyone who drinks but especially those who throw the party. No way to police this. This should be an individual thing -- not people who throw the parties
 - iii. Jim Dupont - class of 07 -- does this address students from other colleges and communities?
 - iv. Answer - We don't have any power to warrant over other students.
 - v. Chris Kozy 06 - Should this be for the social honor code or for the alcohol policy?
 - vi. Answer - This should be honor council not JASAPP. They do fall under the jurisdiction of the honor council as well.
 - vii. Jim Dupont 07 - isn't it evident in the social honor code?
 - viii. Answer - yes, but it still happens and it should be addressed in the alcohol policy. We feel that the alcohol policy should remind the students of this necessity.
- c. Pro-con presentations
- i. Con - Kyle Smiddie 04 - should not be set in stone we need to follow this (already in the Social honor code).
 - ii. Pro - Nathaniel Grabman - You guys should pick up your crap.
 - iii. Con - Zach Withers 06 - we have an honor code where we should respect each other. This is common sense -- we don't need to tell people this again. Not necessary to spell everything else.
 - iv. Pro - Brooks Ambrose 06 - Obvious that JSAAPP is redundant with the honor code. Arguing against this because it is redundant is not a good argument.
 - v. Con - Jeff Barten 04 "con"
 - vi. Pro- David Hilden 07 - The more stated the easier our ideals
 - vii. Con - Jim Dupont - redundant to place this in after we have cleaned it up. Must respect each other is common sense.
 - viii. Pro - Chris Haagen 07 -- people still do this
 - ix. Con - Jeremy Pober -04 it's because people are drunk. They don't care about it. You must confront people about this. But modifying this will not stop anything.
 - x. Pro- Matt Lowe 06 -- people are worried about the negative affect. When people are going to be reading the social honor code -- it's a redundancy that won't cause any problems and might help. No problem with it.
 - xi. Con -Ryan Sajac 06 - "Con"
 - xii. Pro - Ryan Seajack 06- you are drunk that night and party. At 2 in the afternoon at founders there was still a mess. You should go back and clean up everything. Disrespectful otherwise.

- d. Response to pro con debate
 - i. No response
 - e. Call for unfriendly amendments
 - i. Nora Spriggs, and Karl Blumenthal - Adds the phrase all violations will fall under the jurisdiction of the honor code. 76 signatures.
 - f. Presentation of recognized Unfriendly amendments: five minutes
 - i. Adds jurisdiction of infraction to the Honor Council and not JSAAPP.
 - ii. Question and Answer: five minutes
 - Carolyn Hotchkiss 06 - If this falls under the honor council - is this not for the spring?
 - Answer - No not a change in the honor code.
 - Jennifer Whitlock 04 - I don't understand how you punish someone for littering
 - Answer - not up to us how and when. That's an honor council / deans panel. Same way they have handled it before.
 - Jennifer Whitlock 04 - can you clarify the difference between JSAAPP?
 - JSAAPP does not handle violations.
 - iii. Pro-con debate: ten minutes
 - Con - Cole Sorrelgreen 04 - Honor code states that we must follow all policies. Why does this matter?
 - iv. Moment of Silence
 - v. Vote on unfriendly amendments, majority rules, visual
 - Amendment passes by majority
 - g. Presenters read new amendment before the vote.
 - h. Moment of silence
 - i. Vote on final resolution, 2/3 visual votes.
 - i. Resolution is passed
 - j. Request for paper ballot -- For keeping clean.
 - i. Resolution Passes with 73 % of the votes.
- VI. Resolution # 3 - Julien Colvin '05 Clarifying Public/Private Question
- a. Presenters introduce: 5 minutes
 - i. See Attached Resolution - Defines a private space as a student residence or a yard porch or stoop adjacent to the residence. Can only serve the alcohol indoors. Cannot drink in stairwells or halls - which are public spaces. Will lessen the amount of Alcohol policy violations.
 - b. ?'s and answers
 - i. Hans Herzl-Betz 07 - clarify advertised to bi-co and tri-co communities.
 - ii. Answer -flyers are open parties. if you are invited by invitation the alcohol is allowed. not through flyers
 - iii. Christopher Bates 05 - should we consider the wording from party guests to event guests.

- iv. Answer - It might be changed - friendly amendment
 - v. Hans Herzl-Betz 05 - why can't we serve outside?
 - vi. Answer - State Law. [
 - vii. Brooks Ambrose 06 is posting on GO considered a flyer?
 - viii. Answer - yes.
 - ix. Erica Phillips 04 - Is a bathroom a public space?
 - x. Answer - in a dormitory yes that is a private space I believe. I don't think this wording would prohibit that.
 - xi. Theresa Heller 04 - Is Leeds green my yard?
 - xii. Answer - it is adjacent to hall also -- I left it open for JSAAPP to define. There is a point where it extends to a private space.
 - xiii. Caleb Jacquith 05 - Clarify drinking outside
 - xiv. Answer - serving is illegal in public space.
 - xv. Caleb Jacquith 05 - isn't drinking also outside allowed
 - xvi. Answer yes. You can't consume or serve alcohol outside in PA.
- c. Motion to extend Q and A - failed
 - d. Pro-Con presentations
 - i. Con -Elizabeth Bonapfel 04. Concerned by getting rid of Public space section will create another ambiguity. will present unfriendly amendment.
 - ii. no pro.
 - e. Response to pro con debate
 - i. Wouldn't be opposed to re-adding the sections. The current policy doesn't define the public spaces. Not opposed to the idea, but it needs to be clear.
 - f. Call for unfriendly amendments (7 minutes to collect signatures)
 - g. Presentation of recognized Unfriendly amendments: five minutes
 - Elizabeth Bonapfel - 04. 75 signatures obtained.
 - i. Calls for a MOS. There was confusion a couple of years ago that we thought we clarified. Julien is clarifying the private spaces. Policy defines the private spaces. Would like to make all changes into an A clause. Clause B will define public spaces in the alcohol policy. See attached unfriendly amendment. Added HCA trail, laboratory buildings, and any space not defined by private space. Redundant but important but clarifying.
 - ii. Question and Answer: five minutes
 - Question by Charlie Vos and Kyle Smiddie - to exclusive - what if we build a building that's not academic. We are making a friendly amendment - changing "defined as" to "such as".
 - Will Carroll 05 - Art 2, Sec C. Does this supercede the administrations recommendation?
 - Answer - yes it makes it explicit, but it does not supercede the college's recommendations.
 - iii. Pro-con debate: ten minutes

- Pro - Julien Colvin 05. Likes the amendment change.
- iv. Moment of Silence
- v. Vote on unfriendly amendments, majority rules
 - Visual vote - in the eyes of the chair the amendment has passed.
- vi. A friendly amendment has occurred. Julien rereads the clause changes. Clause 5 reads - as noted in the changed amendment.
- h. Moment of silence
- i. Vote on final resolution, majority rules. - visual vote since there were no cons in the pro-con debate.
 - i. In the eyes of the chair the resolution passes w/ 2/3 of a vote.

VII. Alcohol Policy

- a. JSAAPP chair presents alcohol policy - Chris Migliacio 05 JSAAPP Chair
- b. Q and A
 - i. Hans Herzl-Betz 07 - What justification is there in the rule that you can't serve alcohol outside?
 - ii. Answer - much more coercive and its illegal in PA. It's a respect for others. This is the policy as it stands right now.
- c. Pro Con
 - i. Pro - Julien Colvin 05. -- now is the time to speak if you have a problem with the AP. We are responsible adults. I am against the behavior that people exhibit when they are drunk. - Everyone needs to make sure that they are responsible. Don't do stupid things. This community will be a lot better place. - vandalism
 - ii. Con Christina Moran 04 - I see seniors say think twice before you ratify this policy. If the community doesn't follow this policy then maybe we don't deserve this.
 - iii. Pro - Jeff Barton 04 "pro"
 - iv. Con - Elizabeth Smith 04 - it is illegal to drink if you are under 21. We didn't talk about this.
 - v. Pro - Jeremy Pober 04 - This is a policy that we must take this into your own hands. The idea that we don't follow the policy comes up every year. 18 year olds should be allowed to drink and do keg stands.
 - vi. Con -Laura Kasakoff -- I will not follow the alcohol policy. I am against it for that reason.
 - vii. Pro - Elizabeth Bonapfel 04 - It's an amazing applicable document b/c it incorporates the AP with the Honor code. The college with its Quaker roots doesn't want to encroach upon the rights of us as students to make our own decisions. It recognizes that we are capable of drinking. We must work together as a community for this to work. Realism is important.
 - viii. Con - Keith Weissglass 05 - 2 problems w/ AP. people don't follow it. It's also restricted by people other than us. Thus it is a hollow policy. Maybe it's just for show. I don't know. I

don't drink and it feels weird to say it. It doesn't bother me (haverfest) but the vandalism does affect me.

- ix. Pro - Brooks Ambrose 06 -- The AP is our attempt to keep stupid things from happening. This is a good way for that.
 - x. Con - Cole Sorrelgreen 04 - Don't agree with the "Ideal" comment. do you want to hold up to that ideal. Do you agree with the ideal to hold yourself to? Do I like this as what I say is mine? Ask yourself that question before we vote.
 - xi. Pro - Elizabeth Bonapfel 04 - my final plea to people to be kind to what we have and to appreciate it. Many places don't have this.
- d. Response by JSAAPP chair
- i. There are limitations by the administration - we don't want to be sued. The administration has been tolerant. Those who suggest to get rid of alcohol don't realize it will not produce a better community. We have a healthy community with the policy here. Don't be an idiot follow the policy and vote for it.
- e. 687 people right here. Thanks for maintaining Quorum!!!!
- f. MOS
- g. Vote on Ratification , majority rules (50%+1) - by ballot # 2
- i. The AP passes with 526 votes yes, 20 nos, 14 abstentions.
- VIII. Final Moment of Silence

These minutes reflect the views of SC Co-Secretaries Joshua Mertz and Spencer Walters. Any questions email exec@haverford.edu. Thanks.