Members Present: Chris Hadad ’17 (co-chair), Michelle Parris ’16 (co-chair), Kyle Albagli ’16 (co-secretary), Erin Lipman ’17 (co-secretary), Brian Guggenheimer ’16 (librarian), Melissa Lee-Litowitz ’15, Sarah Brody ’15, Brianna Lowey ’15, Olivia Raus ’15, Irene Evans ’16, Adela Scharff ’16, Monica Zorrilla ’17, Madison Arnold-Scherbo ’18, Santiago Laverde ’18, Alex Bitterman ’18, Sophie McGlynn ’18

Public Portion Guests: Sherilyn Galvez ’16

Moment of Silence

1. TIDE
   a. Education and Outreach Committee wanted to reopen this collaboration; Sherilyn is here as a guest from TIDE; goal is to discuss what form another joint community forum might take
   b. Melissa summarizes “Race and the Social Code from last semester
      i. Small groups split and discussed topics such as multicultural juror requirement, microaggressions, customs, etc
   c. Brian suggests having one topic of next community forum be resolution 5 from plenary (changes to Social Code)
      i. This was discussed at post-plenary discussion, but no one from TIDE was present
   d. Suggestion that multicultural juror requirement also be discussed
      i. Sherilyn suggests that someone serving as a “multicultural juror” might feel a disproportionate amount of responsibility is bringing up certain different perspectives; thinks that someone’s background can play a huge role in understanding a violation; all jurors should be conscious of those things; having an international student on the jury would also help with this issue
      ii. Council member suggests that nobody is really satisfied with multicultural juror requirement; could definitely use discussion to try to improve
   e. Discussion of the benefits and drawbacks of discussing MJR and resolution #5 at the same or separate forums
   f. Questions about what has come out of past discussions about the MJR
      i. Brian says that two suggestions he has heard often of how to change it are (1) adding different diversity requirements, which leads to having more requirements than jurors and (2) eliminate requirement and let randomness account for diversity; Brian sees these discussions as stalled because neither of these extremes are feasible
      ii. Melissa points out that if the requirement were eliminated,
differences in who volunteers to serve on a trial would become more pronounced

iii. Idea of an international juror requirement brought up with last semester, but many potential issues identified with that idea as well

iv. Only way we will come up with a solution is by talking about it; new voices could help

g. Irene suggests leaving the discussion open so as to not shut out people who have other main concerns besides the MJR

i. Melissa adds that making it specifically about the MJR might make the discussion more open and productive

ii. Might be beneficial to talk to people at community forum about some of the past discussions that have occurred concerning the MJR

iii. We could see what comes out of forum, and design future workshop based off that

2. Committee Updates

a. Multiculturalism Committee

i. Made survey for ISO and affinity group heads; got 33 replies; got interesting feedback that can be used to design a future survey to send out to a wider population

ii. Considering sending survey to HC-All students, but this may be more difficult to focus survey on race

iii. Going to write up summary of results from first survey

iv. Also talked about making a presentation at ISO possibly concerning confrontation and perhaps plagiarism

1. With plagiarism, perhaps would have a worksheet of examples and ask students to say whether or not they would consider it plagiarism

2. Also looking at making guide for Bryn Mawr ISO

3. Council member points out that Haverford international students are not overrepresented; also take academic integrity tutorial (which includes examples of plagiarism)

4. Member suggests that time could be better used for abstract discussion; would introduce idea of abstract discussions

5. Members do think it could be interesting to discuss “what would be considered plagiarism in your high school?”

b. Community Education and Outreach Committee

i. Had two abstract discussions last week

ii. Members suggest that we should go back to having at least two discussions for each abstract - feel that many abstracts do not receive enough time for discussion; discussion of how to make sure that abstracts can have more space for discussion while still releasing abstracts to clear up the
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backlog and having community forums

iii. Original idea behind replacing public portion with community forums was to tie community forum topic to a point of interest in the abstract released that week

iv. Planning a MJR forum for this week; also working on a sexual misconduct forum in collaboration with the women’s center, a discussion concerning the Bryn Mawr Honor Code in collaboration with Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board, and a forum in collaboration with SAGA

v. Working in videos

c. Faculty Outreach Committee

i. Faculty survey sent to provost and will be released soon

ii. Have begun planning pizza, professors, and the code (April 23)!

d. Student Life Committee

i. Putting together thoughts about what to present to coaches

ii. Drafted questions aimed at athletes to get their feedback about the Social Code, which we can add to our own ideas about the presentation

e. Freshmen and Applicant Outreach Committee

i. Talked with Customs co-heads about encouraging more interaction with Bryn Mawr customs cousins during Customs Week, particularly concerning Honor Code education

ii. Have emailed admissions about meeting based on results of survey

Moment of Silence