

SPRING PLENARY 2004

We reached quorum of 454 at 7:36.

Plenary began at 7:42.

I) Moment of Silence (called by Jon Debrich)

II) Welcome to Plenary

Jon welcomed everyone.

III) Rules of Order and Agenda

a) Three minutes to look over Rules of Order and Agenda

b) Five minutes for questions concerning Rules of Order and Agenda

There were no questions.

c) 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 Scott Simpson 04 introduced an unfriendly amendment to strike item IV from the agenda.

d) Presentation of recognized Unfriendly Amendments: five minutes

Scott: I think we should get rid of Resolution #1 because it upsets the system of checks and balances. We should have the option to change the agenda during plenary so that insignificant resolutions won't waste time. We should also be able to prevent a few people from creating a lot of resolutions.

i. Question and Answer: five minutes

Zach Withers 06: Why strike this from the agenda instead of arguing against it in the pro-con debate?

Scott: Dangerous resolutions shouldn't make it to the agenda.

Zach: So should we name this the Scott-Simpson-knows-what-you-want-to-vote-for-resolution?

Josh Mertz 06: Why didn't you bring this up in previous SC meetings?

Scott: It was brought up, and why does this matter? Zach wouldn't withdraw the resolution.

ii. Pro-Con debate: ten minutes

pro: Cole Sorrelgreen 04: Don't discuss this resolution; we have too many already.

con: Zach Withers 06: Time spent arguing is time lost for debating the resolution; we're wasting time by trying to strike this.

pro: Chris Migliaccio 05: We'll lose quorum if this takes too long. This resolution doesn't affect plenary.

con: Chris Bates-Withers 05: What will we accomplish by striking it that we can't accomplish by voting against it? We should put ideas out to student body.

pro: Scott Simpson 04: pro

con: Ben Wolff 04: An unfriendly amendment says that we can't be trusted to debate things and we just want to vote them down. It's more democratic to argue about them.

pro: Brian Richichi 06: This is a useful tool, and we should trust each other to use it responsibly.

con: Greg Reed 06: con

pro: Scott Simpson 04: It's an undemocratic resolution.

con: Emi Bryant 06: How is this undemocratic? It's more democratic to discuss it.

pro: Charles Vos 04 and Nora Wasserman 04: The Lunt resolution was stricken and didn't die; plenary isn't always best place for compromise.

con: Zach Withers 06: Everything should be heard and discussed.

pro: Charles Vos 04: If we can use it responsibly, strike it.

con: Chris Ody 04: con

pro: Cole Sorrelgreen 04: Let's vote and get on with plenary.

con: Ben Wolff 04: We could still vote it down after we discuss it.

pro: Scott Simpson 04: Vote for the unfriendly amendment so we can hear the important stuff.

Moment of silence

iii. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment, majority rules

The unfriendly amendment passed, and resolution 1 will be stricken from the agenda.

e) Review the new rules of order and agenda

IV) Resolution #1—Ensuring That All Resolutions Are Heard—Zach Withers

~~a) Presenters introduce resolution: five minutes~~

~~b) Question and Answer Session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice~~

~~c) Pro-Con presentations: twelve minutes to be extended by ten minutes no more than 3x~~

~~d) Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes~~

~~e) Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed—seven minutes to gather~~

~~f) Presentation of recognized Unfriendly Amendments: five minutes~~

~~i. Question and Answer: five minutes~~

~~ii. Pro-Con debate: eight minutes~~

~~iii. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment, 2/3 vote needed to pass~~

~~g) Moment of Silence~~

~~h) Vote on Final Resolution, majority rules~~

V) Resolution #2—Budgeting Guidelines—Greg Reed and Dave Poolman

a) Presenters introduce resolution: five minutes

Greg: We're dealing with problems in the Constitution regarding the office of treasurer and the budgeting process. Dave: There's nothing in the Constitution about budgeting guidelines. We want something to give treasurers in the future so they have guidelines so everything will be more fair.

b) Question and Answer Session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice

Oleg Nudelman 05: The guidelines say that budgeting should depend on the popularity of clubs. How do you plan to measure the students' interest in any particular club?

Greg: We measure clubs' popularity by participation.

Reid Sherman 04: How do you determine when food is essential to events?

Dave: Food is essential when a lot of people show up drunk, which is why SC events always have food.

Carolyn Hotchkiss 06: Why are food and drinks singled out?

Greg: A lot of organizations budget for it for their meetings, and with so many more clubs, SC has less money, and food and drinks at meetings aren't always essential to the

organizations.

Erica Phillips 04: Will you explain part VA1?

Greg: We've had problems with Bryn Mawr because they don't budget at the same time as we do. We'd like to leave 2 weeks at the end of each semester so students can determine what they'll need for the next semester

Erica: When does Bryn Mawr budget?

Greg: Their policy is similar to what we're proposing now; they budget at the end of the semester.

Kristen Cox 04: It's useful to have food for cultural clubs—is it prohibited to use SC funds for food?

Dave: You can use SC funds for food, just not alcohol.

Ariel Emmett 04: Would you budget during finals?

Greg: Nothing is set in stone yet. These are just general guidelines that will allow prepared clubs to submit budgets in May?

Ariel: So would budgeting be during finals?

Greg: No.

Isaac Schamberg 07: People this year shouldn't be held accountable for last year's spending.

Greg: Treasurers will take this into consideration.

Chris Migliaccio 05: Would you do 3 budgetings then?

Greg: No, next year's treasurers will budget this spring for next fall.

c) Pro-Con presentations: twelve minutes to be extended by ten minutes no more than 3x
con: Matt Kearney 05: You could argue that no activities benefit all students.

pro: Nate Favini 05: pro

con: Thatcher Mines 04: Food is good. Won't this be difficult to organize at the end of the semester? It's better to leave budgeting to beginning of semester.

pro: Rich Carthas 05: Don't get hung up on not being able to have food.

con: Scott Sheppard 06: It's too subjective.

pro: Charles Vos 04: You could bring an amendment to the amendment if you have problem with it. Don't vote against this just cause of the food issue; bring a resolution.

con: Diane Fruchtman 04: It's harder to budget at the end of the semester when you don't know who next semester's members will be. Frosh should have say in what the club budgets for.

pro: Chris Migliaccio 05: It's good to make things less subjective, and frosh don't make decisions about what a club's money gets spent on.

con: Carolyn Hotchkiss 06: I'm going to present an unfriendly amendment to remove section d on food.

pro: Chris Bates-Withers 05: It's good to give people guidelines.

con: Spencer Walters 05: I'm going to present an unfriendly amendment to get rid of section 5 part a. Some frosh may have good ideas and want to start clubs, and they should be able to do that.

pro: Scott Simpson 04: Two years ago the treasurers misplaced a lot of money. We should have guidelines so we don't have any more disasters. As of now, treasurers can do whatever they want, and we should have some set of guidelines.

d) Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes

Greg: Section 5 clause a will relieve strain on treasurers to budget everything at the beginning of the semester. Budgeting at the end of the previous semester will not be set in stone; final budgeting will be done in the fall. Frosh won't be excluded; these are just preliminary guidelines. Budgeting for non-essential food takes money away from other organizations, and it's important to strengthen entire community.

e) Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed—seven minutes to gather

Spencer Walters 05 introduced an unfriendly amendment to get rid of section 5 part a.

Carolyn Hotchkiss 06 introduced an unfriendly amendment to remove section d on food.

f) Presentation of recognized Unfriendly Amendments: five minutes

Spencer: I want to strike part V a. The treasurers could still do this if they wanted since there aren't budgetary guidelines; they can budget whenever they want.

i. Question and Answer: five minutes

There were no questions.

ii. Pro-Con debate: eight minutes

pro: Greg Reed 06: I'm not opposed to Spencer's amendment.

con: Chris Kingsley 05: Budgeting ahead of time is a good idea; we're trying to give treasurers more guidelines.

pro: Oleg Nudelman 05: It's good for frosh to be able to start clubs.

con: Nathan Vogel 06: As long as end of semester budgeting is preliminary, then it's fine.

pro: Diane Fruchtman 04: It's not just frosh who would be restricted; it would also apply to people abroad, tri-co, etc. A club shouldn't have to be pre-existing to get money.

con: Jen Carman 06: It's preliminary, not final. And some clubs need money right away; this should be really helpful to the clubs who need money right away.

pro: Diane Fruchtman 04: People get reimbursed if they spend money before budgeting.

con: David 04: Organizations need a better chance to get off the ground.

pro: Spencer Walters 05: This leaves things open to treasurers; they can do a preliminary budget if they want.

Lauren Hradecky announced that there is a typo in the agenda: we actually need 2/3 vote for final resolutions to pass and a majority vote for unfriendly amendments; come speak to her if you have problem with switching back to the way it should be.

iii. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment, ~~2/3~~ majority vote needed to pass

Moment of Silence

The unfriendly amendment passed.

Presentation of recognized Unfriendly Amendments: five minutes

Carolyn Hotchkiss 06: I'd like to remove section V d. Restricting food and drink is bad; all organizations can use food, and it's important for clubs to have food. If we don't have enough money, we should save it in other ways.

i. Question and Answer: five minutes

Chris Migliaccio 05: Have you ever run a club that paid for food?

Carolyn: No.

Chris: How much money do you think clubs spend on food?

Carolyn: I don't know.

Chris: What kind of food is needed to lure people to clubs?

Carolyn: It's up to the club.

Greg Reed 06: Don't you think budgeting for food puts a burden on the budgeters and other people?

Carolyn: We can budget for food in better ways.

Greg: Do you think that spending thousands of dollars for snack food is appropriate when we could use this money to bring in speakers, activities, etc?

Carolyn: The precise amount of money is not an important part of this discussion.

ii. Pro-Con debate: eight minutes

pro: Diane Fruchtmann 04: If you don't want people using money for food, don't give it to them.

con: Greg Reed 06: In the past, clubs have already budgeted for thousands of dollars for snack food. This punishes and restricts all organizations; how can we argue for snack food over events?

pro: Oleg Nudelman 05: It's good to set a precedent. We should stop clubs from budgeting for stupid stuff.

con: Erica Phillips 04 read the amendment with emphasis on "essential." The amendment is adequately vague to allow the treasurers to use their discretion.

pro: Brooks Ambrose 06: Please give us more money for clubs, President Tritton. Food is only way to get people to join clubs.

con: Ankur Patel 07: SC doesn't over-budget, and clubs can find other means of financial support

pro: Andrew Yeats 07: Food is legitimate; don't put this in the Constitution.

con: Lauren Adriaansen 07: We could raise funds in other ways to have food at events.

pro: Chris Bates-Withers 05: This doesn't say that SC has to honor every request for funding for food; let the treasurers do their job.

con: Amy Havassy 07: As part of the budgeting committee...clubs ask for twice as much money as we have, and food should be the first thing to go. Eat your own food. Food shouldn't be the incentive to join clubs.

pro: Matt Kearney 05: Look at the word "essential": treasurers are handicapping themselves because food is never essential.

iii. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment, 2/3 majority vote needed to pass

Moment of Silence

The unfriendly amendment fails to pass.

g) Moment of Silence

h) Vote on Final Resolution, ~~majority rules~~ need 2/3 vote

Vote on resolution as presented minus section V clause a; moment of silence. The resolution passed.

VI) Resolution #3—SC Surplus Fund Creation—Spencer Walters

a) Presenters introduce resolution: five minutes

Spencer: I'd like to make a friendly amendment to move my resolution into Greg and Dave's resolution (part 2). We don't have a lot of money, and right now if SC has extra money, SC gets to decide what to do with it. The only way to have a really great speaker or event is to save extra money at the end of the year and put it into an account. I don't want to hear complaints from upperclassmen who won't see the results of this.

b) Question and Answer Session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice

Oleg Nudelman 05: Why not give extra money to Haverfest?

Spencer: Maybe we could create a committee to oversee the account, but the only way to make people know about this is to have the resolution like this so we know when money will become available.

Emily Pellman 06: If this doesn't pass, where will the money go?

Spencer: SC exec. board will decide what to do with it.

Robin Dean 04: Where did you get the number \$2000?

Spencer: It seemed like a reasonable amount, and I talked to the treasurers this year. We can't take money without repayment unless it's every 4 years. Last year we had \$8000 left.

Robin: What kind of account would this money go into?

Spencer: Just a regular account that would allow savings to add up. \$2000 that doesn't get put in account will be used.

Andrew Peterson 04: How do we know what people will want to do with the account?

Spencer: SC will still keep track of all finances and see what people want.

Trace Frazier 04: What about juniors who are abroad?

Spencer: I don't have a plan to deal with that.

Jason Rusman 07: Would money ever go to a specific club or organization that really needs it?

Spencer: We'll make up for deficits if we have to, but the account is really for surplus money.

Jason: So there won't be any leeway for 3 years?

Spencer: Since we can't tell exactly how much money we'll have, I think it'll be better to wait 4 years.

Jason: Is the debt stuff written into the resolution?

Spencer: Yeah, it's written that debt will be subtracted out.

c) Pro-Con presentations: twelve minutes to be extended by ten minutes no more than 3x
pro: Cole Sorrelgreen 04: The Roots came when I was a freshman. Pass this resolution so we can afford more stuff.

con: Andrew Peterson 04: Will this actually ensure that people keep track of funds?

d) Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes

Spencer: The guidelines aren't completely specific, but the spirit is there. Treasurers will be reasonable in interpreting this.

e) Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed—seven minutes to gather

There were no unfriendly amendments.

~~f) Presentation of recognized Unfriendly Amendments: five minutes~~

~~i. Question and Answer: five minutes~~

~~ii. Pro-Con debate: eight minutes~~

~~iii. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment, majority vote needed to pass~~

g) Moment of Silence

h) Vote on Final Resolution, need 2/3 vote

The resolution passed.

VII) Resolution #4—Concerning Sexual Harassment—Elizabeth Bonapfel and Brooks Ambrose

a) Presenters introduce resolution: five minutes

The presenters asked for moment of silence. Brooks: This is the beginning of a process to solve the problem of sexual harassment. This resolution is also meant to start debate to see if the campus should solve the problem. This resolution is a statement of intent; it doesn't actually do anything yet. Hopefully we will create a new policy at fall plenary. Elizabeth: This is not the final policy. Right now Deans' Panels and President's Panels are the only ways of dealing with sexual harassment. This doesn't deal with minor instances of sexual harassment. We need to start now to get this into Constitution. We'll present our policy at fall plenary, and next spring we'll amend what we're currently adding to Constitution. Brooks: We'll likely have public forums. Elizabeth: Public forums will give us community feedback.

b) Question and Answer Session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice

Robin Dean 04: How do you define sexual harassment? Are you defining it more in a social setting?

Brooks: What we're doing is starting a dialogue. Plenary is not an easy fix. Calling somebody a dirty name, etc. needs to be dealt with by a student mediated panel.

Elizabeth: There's no procedure for this. We need a non-intimidating student mediation panel and a definition of what is less severe sexual harassment.

Jen Carman 06: You mentioned the idea that Council is insufficient... why is Honor Council not sufficient? Why not put this in the social honor code?

Elizabeth: We're hoping that this will serve as a facilitation panel. It goes hand-in-hand with the social Honor Code.

Brooks: We want a body that can recommend things to HC. Council is very busy, and maybe this can take some things off their plate.

Elizabeth: Hopefully people can be trained.

Zach Withers 06: It sounds like everything gets shoved into faculty panels.

Elizabeth: Honor council can kick cases to a President's Panel or a Deans' Panel. Sexual assault and rape cases go to Deans' Panels. Most cases that go to Deans' panel are student-faculty cases, not student-student cases.

Zach: What is the point of having HC if everything gets sent to faculty?

Brooks: I dunno... ask somebody who knows.

Karl Blumenthal 06: If this doesn't pass, will you still hold forums?

Elizabeth: We'll probably still hold community forums. But since plenary is such good forum...

John Katsos 07: How would this relate to how HC deals with mediation now?

Brooks: Council's training is tailored to their needs; we need a different type of mediation and hope to get a student mediated panel.

John: Council is trained to conduct mediation panels...what else do you want?

c) Pro-Con presentations: twelve minutes to be extended by ten minutes no more than 3x

con: Cole Sorrelgreen 04: It's an inherently bad idea to put something in the Constitution that we may not do.

pro: Elizabeth: It's a three-part process. We want to change the Constitution and current sexual harassment policy, and we're hoping to get the ball rolling now.

con: Robin Dean 04: The term "sexual harassment" is very vague and can be defined legally and otherwise. People are scared already; don't intimidate them more with ambiguity. Having a panel is a really good idea. Maybe there could be relationship counseling, too. Things that aren't sexual harassment shouldn't be called that. HC can't handle law.

pro: Lauren Adriaansen 07: The separate concern of law is specified. The three-part process would begin dialogue. This is the sort of thing that should be addressed with dialogue.

con: John Katsos 07: Debate needs to be continued throughout the semester, but it is redundant to add in another mediation panel. HC is trained to deal with this. They do a Student Facilitation Panel. It's redundant to ask for another mediation panel.

pro: Brooks: A Deans' Panel is intimidating because it's only if it's serious, but if it's not serious, where does it go? This is a complicated problem that cannot be decided here. Go to the forums.

con: Zach Withers 06: Why are we trying to solve this at plenary? Panels are a great idea, but why are we trying to amend the Constitution before we even know what we're doing? I agree that it's weird if students have to go to a Deans' Panel or a President's Panel.

pro: Nora Spriggs 06: Any means by which we can talk more about this is crucial to our community.

con: Laura Scorr 06: Clarifying honor council procedure...we currently have SFPs; we've all been trained in basic mediation. A serious case would go to a Deans' panel, but the less serious cases would go to an SFP. How would this make things different?

pro: Elizabeth: We want something that is separate from but affiliated with Honor Council. There is intimidation involved with taking things to Honor Council, and we want a non-intimidating environment. We want more specific training catered to issues of harassment.

con: Robin Dean 04: This uses the same term for definition of harassment as United States law, but it can be interpreted in many ways. We should think about finding another term to clearly define sexual harassment.

pro: Elizabeth Sullivan 05: We need to talk about this. This is the first step in the process. We're not making substantial changes; we're making sure something gets done by the deadline.

Time for the pro-con debate expired. A vote to extend pro-con debate by 10 minutes failed, and the pro-con debate was not extended.

d) Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes

Brooks: People say that it's not appropriate, but it will at least start forums. Elizabeth: I

beg you not to silence this issue. Sexual harassment has been a problem here since the college went co-ed. We need continued dialogue. Don't silence this any more than it has already been silenced.

e) Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed—seven minutes to gather
There were no unfriendly amendments.

~~f) Presentation of recognized Unfriendly Amendments: five minutes~~

~~————— i. Question and Answer: five minutes~~

~~————— ii. Pro-Con debate: eight minutes~~

~~————— iii. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment, majority vote needed to pass~~

g) Moment of Silence

h) Vote on Final Resolution, 2/3 vote needed

The resolution passed.

VIII) Resolution #5—Limiting Trials for Social Code Issues—Dave Langlieb & Mark Robinson

a) Presenters introduce resolution: five minutes

Dave: I'm here for two reasons. 1. Haverford College is too politically correct. 2. I'm sick and tired of being held to a notion of community standards that I know I don't understand. The other day, someone told me a Jewish joke. I laughed, and then I said I was going to take him to Honor Council. Then I realized that I could. This could be breaking the notion of abstract community standards. I have been threatened three times with trials. This is wrong. Therefore, I'm proposing reasonable and understandable guidelines. This resolution doesn't prevent you from confronting. This resolution is the best possible way to resolve these conflicts. If something doesn't fall under state/local law, you shouldn't be held accountable.

b) Question and Answer Session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice

Cole Sorrelgreen 04: How many semesters have you served on Honor Council?

David: None.

Scott Simpson 04: I'm having trouble finding the resolution in the packet.

David: It's the fifth resolution.

John Katsos 07: If right now everything is ambiguous, do you have to make a rule for everything?

David: No, just for breaking school policy or the law. The only things that can't go are things related to free speech.

Josh McHugh 06: Where does your resolution stand on offensive actions as opposed to offensive statements?

David: Any action that is not specifically prohibited by state, federal, or local law or Haverford policy could not be taken to trial.

Lauren Adriaansen 07: Can you explain the no obligatory resolution part?

David: HC can't hold you accountable.

Andrew Peterson: What is the social aspect? What about community standards?

David: Community standards are garbage. Everyone has different ideas of community standards, and those ideas are all different from Rob Schiff's idea of community

standards “cause he’s fucking insane.”

Lauren Hradecky 05: So do you expect us to memorize every law?

David: Yes.

John Katsos 07: So are trust, concern and respect out the window?

David: In respect to HC, yes. Not with social concerns.

John: And if we try to come to resolution but it doesn’t work and we stay pissed?

David: Then we shouldn’t talk. We’re dealing with an HC issue—holding people accountable. John, as a Republican this resolution is written for you.

John: What about trust, concern, and respect?

David: They can be practiced on individuals.

Kevin Monahan 05: Can you give a reason for this?

David: The fact that the Charlie case was even brought to Council is absurd.

Jon announced that the time for the Q & A period was up. There was a vote on whether or not to extend the Q & A period by ten minutes, and it was decided to extend the Q & A period.

Dave Snyder 04: The way that you represented HC was inaccurate. You can’t threaten to take people to Honor Council. If you confront somebody and can’t work things out, then you email code@haverford.edu. Discussion with deans and exec. council then helps decide whether to bring it to council. Then HC decides whether or not to bring it to trial. What is the purpose of what you’re doing?

David: This is a legitimate concern, a political concern.

Robin Dean 04: What relationship do you think this has to Jeremy and Cole’s new Honor Code?

Cole: We’d like to separate ourselves as much as possible from this resolution.

Spencer Walters 05 read the first sentence of the Honor Code then asked: why not revise this in a positive sense by saying that personal expression is encouraged?

David: It’s ambiguous, and it’s just too messy.

Andrew Yeats 07: You made the assertion that the only cases that apply are freedom of speech cases...so why would you phrase it the way it’s phrased? What else are you thinking of?

David: Nothing else. This is saying what can go to trial.

Andrew: Do you see HC as punitive?

David: No, but people are forced to do things, and we should go by restorative justice.

Joshua McHugh 06: If this was passed, how would you expect the Rhoads incident to be handled?

David: By confrontation, and then I would try to get HC to mediate, but if both parties weren’t amenable to a trial, then there would be no trial.

c) Pro-Con presentations: twelve minutes to be extended by ten minutes no more than 3x

con: Cole Sorrelgreen 04: There are situations that are not explicitly addressed in state law or college policy, such as sexual harassment. Why not just say freedom of speech? HC gets to make decisions regarding what is or is not appropriate to go to trial.

pro: David: Cole can't think of one example. Sexual harassment is under law.

con: Jeremy Pober 04: This is not a resolution about freedom of speech. This is a don't-be-a-dipshit clause in the Honor Code. People are going to take offense to things, and if people don't have the good sense to draw the line, then they should be confronted and forced into dialogue.

pro: Chris Migliaccio 05: We shouldn't even open ourselves up to the possibility of people being separated.

con: Joshua McHugh 06: I refuse to go to school in an environment where I can't confront people and bring them to Council. There are some things you just don't do, especially in an academic environment.

pro: Scott Simpson 04: This doesn't mean that you can't confront people. It just means that you can't threaten somebody with a trial.

con: Nathaniel Grabman 07: What about the KKK? What if I dress up like a KKK member and parade around? It's just wrong.

pro: Chris Migliaccio 05: "Just wrong" is retarded...

con: John Katsos 07: These types of things would never go to trial. If dialogue is needed, then it will go to and SFP for mediation. If local, state, and federal law dictate everything, then why do we have an Honor Code?

pro: Scott Simpson 04: If we could eliminate threats, that would be great.

con: Sam Clearman 07: This is the whole point of the Honor Code.

pro: Cole Sorrelgreen 04: Is anyone undecided? It seems like people are clear and we can move on.

con: Laura Perlberger 06: Most of us chose Haverford because of the community standards. This resolution will make Haverford not Haverford.

pro: Chris Kingsley 05: Which Haverford are we talking about? To actually take somebody to trial for stuff like that is ridiculous.

con: Elizabeth Sullivan 05: People seem to think that HC is a policing body. The primary step is confrontation. HC isn't meant to punish. It's ridiculous to undermine the whole idea of confrontation. The Code says that it isn't acceptable to threaten people with a trial.

Jon announced that the time for the pro-con debate had run out, and after voting on whether or not to extend the pro-con debate, it was decided not to extend the debate.

d) Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes

David: I understand if you feel that the community standards a vital part of what makes Haverford Haverford. I am asking that it not define HC trials. All my resolution does is ask that you have a basic idea of what you're talking about when you take somebody to trial.

e) Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed—seven minutes to gather
There were no unfriendly amendments.

f) ~~Presentation of recognized Unfriendly Amendments: five minutes~~

————— i. ~~Question and Answer: five minutes~~

————— ii. ~~Pro-Con debate: eight minutes~~

————— iii. ~~Vote on Unfriendly Amendment, majority vote needed to pass~~

- g) Moment of Silence
- h) Vote on Final Resolution, 2/3 vote needed
The resolution failed to pass.

IX) Resolution #6—New Honor Code—Cole Sorrelgreen and Jeremy Pober

- a) Presenters introduce resolution: five minutes

Cole: We took the old code and made a few changes. We made two major changes. First of all, the Code used to be prescription of how we're supposed to act. We want it to be a reflection of how we actually do act. Currently, any violation of the social Code should be confronted, but it's not; this cheapens the Code. With our resolution, you're not breaking the Code every time you fail to confront someone. This makes true violations more meaningful. Jeremy: There are also complaints that no one does anything about not living up to the Code. Cole: We need to define what is a violation of the Code. Right now, not confronting someone for playing music too loud is violation of code. With our resolution this would no longer be a violation. This leaves the Code more open to interpretation.

- b) Question and Answer Session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice
Spencer Walters 05: Does the Code have to stand by itself? Is moving ratification to the Constitution ok?

Cole: No, the Code is just part of the Constitution. Moving things between the two documents doesn't change their importance. Jeremy: Shortening the Code will make more people read it.

Carolyn Hotchkiss 06: You said you wanted nothing to do with Dave Langlieb's proposal, but there's still ambiguity in your resolution with "should" instead of "ought."

Jeremy: Now it's up to you to decide if you confront someone.

Carolyn: I don't think that's in your wording.

Cole: We want to leave the Code more open to interpretation. Council can interpret it that way if they want.

Brooks Ambrose 06: The intent of the confrontation clause is to have people do things they're not necessarily comfortable with. Clarify what you said—should you not have to confront someone if someone is sexually harassed?

Cole: You should confront if you think there has been a violation of the Code.

Ryan Sajac 06: Where did you put some of the things that used to be in the Code?

Jeremy: We moved it to the Constitution; the procedural stuff is no longer in the Code.

Kristen Cox 04: What about having a forum instead of redoing the whole code?

Cole: We're not actually changing it that much.

Zach Withers 06: The Code says to confront people who do things you think are wrong. This rewrite says you don't care if there are right or wrong things.

Jeremy: We're leaving confrontation more open.

Andrew Peterson 04: So what are you changing?

Cole: We took out the original community standards section because it's in the preamble.

We also added a sentence to the preamble. Maybe we changed confidentiality. We might be taking things out, but we didn't change the spirit. We took stuff out after social concerns because they needed to be in the Constitution.

Keith Weissglass 05: You just said you took out the community standards sections, and the part about trust, concern, and respect isn't anywhere else.

Cole: We're trying to make the Code a more spirit-driven document.

Jon announced that we had reached the 3-hour time limit. Plenary can be extended 3 times, one hour each time. Moment of silence. There was a vote to extend plenary for one more hour. A motion to extend the question and answer period failed.

c) Pro-Con presentations: twelve minutes to be extended by ten minutes no more than 3x

Jon announced that we were close to quorum and asked people to please stay.

con: Dave Snyder 04: You took out the part that defines community. You took out trust, concern, and respect, and those are the most important parts. I'm also concerned that they didn't say that they took this out.

pro: Jeremy: Trust, concern, and respect are still in our Code.

con: Kristen Cox 04: It's good to bring this to plenary, but you need to make explicit the changes that will be made.

pro: Cole: Don't call us dishonest and say we're doing things half-heartedly. I care about the Code. Our presentation was a conscious choice. The Code is the same. The major change is making the Code more open to interpretation.

con: Chris Ody 04: We're confusing 2 things: are we still required to confront? Is it about how we choose to value sexual assault, etc.?

pro: Brooks Ambrose 06: No one knows what they change cause no one knows what the Code was originally. Let's have forums.

con: Charles Collett 07: This would make it impossible for Council to bring people to trial for an infraction of the Code.

pro: Cole: How?

con: John Katsos 07: Why should I vote for a code that will promote discussion when I've just spent three hours discussion a code we already have?

pro: Jeremy: Because plenary is a bad forum for discussion. No one wants to be here anymore, and nothing substantive can be said. Maybe you wouldn't have to be here for 3 hours in the future.

con: John Katsos 07: There's no reason to put in place another code. If you want to promote discussion, start up forums.

pro: Josh Mertz 06: pro

con: Brian Richichi 06: Your resolution is really unclear. "This is intellectual masturbation, and it's wasting our time."

pro: Josh Mertz 06: pro

con: Carolyn Hotchkiss 06: People don't understand the social Code already; making it vaguer won't help.

pro: Brooks Ambrose 06: Making it shorter helps frosh and everyone else.

con: Christine Lamanna 04: I don't live up to the confrontation standard, but there should be a document to give standards.

d) Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes

Cole: Lots of people didn't like our presentation...sorry, don't let that affect your voting.

This resolution is just trying to make things more open to interpretation. The social code is not more vague. Shortening things is good. Jeremy: Most people haven't even read the 4 page version. Don't not vote for us cause our presentation was half-assed. We're against giving specific situations in writing. It should be up to the student body to reconsider things. Plenary is not the best forum to do that. Cole: We did this because we want a new code, not to create forums. Let's create a shorter, clearer code.

e) Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed—seven minutes to gather
There were no unfriendly amendments.

~~f) Presentation of recognized Unfriendly Amendments: five minutes~~

~~i. Question and Answer: five minutes~~

~~ii. Pro-Con debate: eight minutes~~

~~iii. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment, majority vote needed to pass~~

g) Moment of Silence

h) Vote on Final Resolution, 2/3 vote needed

The resolution failed to pass.

X) Honor Code Ratification

a) Honor Council Chairs present Honor Code

Miriam Achtenberg: Your presence here testifies to the strength of code. We won't tell you to vote for or against it. Miriam read the preamble. Liz Bacon: The Code is just an ideal that we strive for. As seniors, we should be disillusioned, but we're not. The vaguest ideals in the preamble are the richest part of code and the part that has been around the longest. Consider it as an ideal, flawed as it may be.

b) Question and Answer session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice
Jon announced that we were still close to quorum.

There were no questions.

c) Pro-Con presentations: twelve minutes to be extended by ten minutes no more than 3x
con: Cole Sorrelgreen 04: I just spent a lot of time talking about what I think is wrong with the Code. I don't think the Code should be an ideal that we can't live up to. Someone deal with this and fix it.

pro: Julien Colven 05: I work at a restaurant and hate how people treat each other. People don't deal with their problems. The ideal of confrontation is something we should strive for. My little brother just got in trouble for stealing; they didn't talk about how it affected the community. We need to keep this Code in place.

con: Emily Pellman 06: con

pro: Smiddie 04: I came here because of the Code. I just wanted to say thanks to the community for making the Code work for me.

con: Spencer Walters 05: I love Smiddie.

pro: Emily Pellman 06: I also came here for the Code and like being in the Haverford community because of the Code.

con: Arie Beitman 04: This is my first time speaking at plenary.

pro: Vann Joines 06: I love the Honor Code, and I love you people. Wooooo!

con: Nate 07: The Honor Code is not an ideal; it is the ultimate manifestation of the hypocrisy of the student body. We don't deserve it until we can embody what it says. We don't deserve a code that teaches respect when we don't have any for each other.

pro: Terry Cathopoulis 04: I've never spoken at plenary either. I've been robbed here a lot, but I would never say that we don't deserve an ideal like this. You shouldn't

jeopardize what you believe in. “I just think he spoke crap.”

d) Response to Pro-Con debate by Honor Council chairs: three minutes

Miriam: It’s when people aren’t here that they value the Code so much. It’s why so many of us came here. Liz, reading something an alum wrote: People don’t believe the Code until they see it for themselves, until they see the everyday evidence of the Code. There’s a challenge to not make this just an ideal; we do this by ratifying the Code. Miriam: Voting for it now doesn’t mean we have a code—we still have to ratify it, and Council will be tabling.

Jon: Please stay...we can’t lose quorum during the vote.

e) Moment of Silence

Announcements:

Free coffee and tea at Lunt tonight.

Next week we start planning staff appreciation day.

Sex and the City is showing in Sharpless.

f) Vote on ratification of Honor Code, 2/3 vote needed to pass

Lauren announced that 450 of 456 people (98.6%) voted to ratify the Code.

Miriam asked that everyone turn in the ratification cards.

XI) Final Moment of Silence