Meeting Minutes from November 22, 2015

Members Present: Sophie McGlynn ’18 (co-chair), Adela Scharff ’16 (co-chair), Kyle Albagli ’16 (co-secretary), Erin Lipman ’17 (co-secretary), Brian Guggenheimer ’16 (librarian), Jeffrey Duncan ’16, Matthew Novak ’16, Audra Devoto ’17, Levi Bowers ’17, Carolyn Woodruff ’17, Madison Arnold-Scerbo ’18, Santiago Laverde ’18, Arlene Casey ’19, Arthur Chang ’19

Moment of silence

A. Reflections on Knights Abstract Discussions
   1. Levi: Suggestion of having a “conflict resolution committee” like Bryn Mawr does for social cases
      i. Maddie: Might give impression that Council is not good at handling social issues (though unsure about this)
      ii. Levi: If it is in Constitution, people would just expect this
   2. Sophie: Idea of having a process for social cases where particular things (such as separation) are off the table
      i. Arthur: Disagree; this would make juries less flexible
      ii. Dela: Idea was concerning social cases in general
      iii. Levi: Would not be in community’s best interest if we took separation away from all cases
      iv. Maddie: Maybe we could stipulate this for other proceedings, but if it ended up in a trial it would be back on the table
   3. Arthur: Many people in the discussions were siding with the confronted party
      i. Other members have heard a mix of views
      ii. Brian: People seem less willing to say they are on the confronted party’s side, but from having conversations with many people it seems pretty evenly split
   4. Matthew: One person thought that Honor Council writing a letter meant they (Council) did something wrong
   5. Sophie: Many people had questions about abstract; we may not have realized how confusing abstract is
   6. Matthew: One person brought up the fact that there were many legal issues
      i. Brian: There were many threats of legal action, but deans shielded us from most of it; we were carefully trying to follow procedures
   7. Brian: Would be really nice if we keep talking about how to fix academic and social trials - either adding procedures, or adding
potential for more flexibility

B. Mental Health and Honor Code Forum
   1. Maddie: A lot became talking about mental health resources and problems with resources - not that many suggestions for changes
   2. Sophie: In circumstantial, people have to choose between sharing mental health circumstances that caused violation or being seen as not being open - process doesn’t work well for people uncomfortable talking about their mental health, people feel pressure to share
   3. Brian: Long term solution is destroying stigma surrounding mental health in community
   4. Dela: What about situations where party is not aware of how to describe mental health circumstance
   5. Lynnie: Question of when there should be an expert witness involved in cases of mental health
   6. Dela: Cases where student says something about mental health and doesn’t know what to make of it so asks expert witness, idea that jury should trust parties’ interpretation of their own mental health

C. Discussion of possible expedited academic trial process
   1. Brian: Bryn Mawr’s conflict resolution committee has a form for collecting statements; maybe we can do something similar
   2. Audra: Constitution currently says that cases should be sent to trial unless trial goals have already been met; I would be uncomfortable radically changing procedures unless we changed this
   3. Sophie: For now, we can start requesting statements in a more standardized way and see how it works

Moment of Silence