Members Present: Leah Budson '19, Chris Hadad '17, Dylan Gearinger '19, Arthur Chang '19, Oliver Child-Lanning '18, Anna Saum '18, Carlotta Pazzi '20, Daniel Mayo '19, Hannah Melville '20, Saumya Varma '20, Frannie Gasciogne '17, Riley Wheaton '20, Hannah Abrahms '17, Lynnie Woodruff '17

Public Portion Guests:

A. [Introductions]
B. [Committees]
   1. [Reads out committee lists]
   2. Leah/Lynnie: Come up with what you want to do/mission statement for this semester, decide weekly meeting time, talk about first thing you want to do
   3. Logistics about scheduling committee events.
   4. Break-out:
      i. Social Code, Confrontation and Mediation (Riley only one there for this)
      ii. Faculty and BMC outreach (Frannie, Saumya, Chris)
         1. Frannie: Talked about issues that faculty had about trials and the code (36 responses). Only some were oriented to code and council. Some need more orientation, how to do that. Talk about creating a task force of faculty members to figure out how to make the relationship between code, council, and faculty better.
         2. Saumya: Want to get more people to respond (another survey).
         3. Chris: Talked about one of the main issues, a quarter of professors said they wouldn’t be involved in another honor council proceeding. Some of the reasons were the length of the trial time, giving up autonomy, worrying about resolutions. One potential plenary resolution about more minor violations. Talked about BMC, meet with Honor board, differences in the honor codes, etc.
      iii. SICO (Social Issues and Community Outreach) (Oliver, Carly, Hannah & Danny)
         1. First meeting next Monday, day after plenary. Have post-plenary discussion. At 7 pm in stokes 102. Wrote down some ideas from SIA last year and community education and outreach from last year. Thinking about collaboration and the honor code, gearing it towards first years, social media & honor code or social media and confrontation. Mental health and honor code, working with Haverminds and race and honor code, went well last year. Jury composition and honor council composition and the gender binary. Substances and the honor code. Carly will look at honor council website to see how to make it more accessible. Incentivizing first year halls to come. Like pizza party for whoever comes out the most.
         2. Chris: Will be sending out email about getting bios of all of you.
   iv. Abstracts
      1. Dylan: One of the main issues was talking about getting more people to show up. Already scheduled abstract discussion for next Friday, 7 pm. @ MCC. Talking about five different abstracts at the
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moment. Each of us will take one and be ready to talk about/questions.

2. Leah: Make sure to chat Cesar.

3. Anna: Also have food incentives/other stuff

4. *Discussion about food options*

v. (Alex enters)

5. [Role of the Librarian]

i. Librarian is a position on honor council that is appointed by students’ council. A role that he has to have is pointing out constitutional issues. Any resolutions or anything decided upon must be checked by him for constitutionality. He is a non-consenting member. Spectrum ranges from heavy involvement to not sharing unless there is a constitutional issue. Can also share opinions that he feels are not being considered. Can also bring precedent and knowledge of previous cases into play.

ii. Hannah: We could also ask him what his opinion was, didn’t have to be related to the constitution.

iii. Lynnie: Chris has been on council, he’s been co-chair, so he has institutional memory and his own opinions.

iv. Leah: What do people think would be a helpful attribute of a librarian?

v. Frannie: I like being able to ask him a question; I think he has a lot to offer.

vi. Riley (in response to Frannie): Should he only offer when he is asked for his opinion?

vii. Frannie: it would be good to be able to ask him for his opinion.

viii. Ethan: I like when he can share historical points that could guide us. Being able to freely input on personal opinion/decision would be really good.

ix. Leah: I know Frannie mentioned that he’s not a consenting member, would not make as much sense to have him participating in open discussion.

x. Anna: He has more experience than anyone in this room. Has hypothetically experience of years to guide us. It does becomes problematic because could tip the scales, affects consensus in an unusual way. Can’t consent or not consent, but change how people are viewing things based on opinion and not fact. Agree with Oliver and Frannie that he should be able to share historical things.

xi. Hannah: From what I can tell he knows a lot, but could also become twelve angry men scenario if he just starts arguing with, if we all, he doesn’t have a vote anyway but we could get bogged down with one view. Even with precedent, it should be something we ask because precedent could create bias as well.

xii. Riley: Danger of him speaking him as much as us is it endangers the objectivity of his position. He’s supposed to be a procedural check on us. If he’s personally engaged with the process he would have a little bit less authority to critique the involvement of others who are in disagreement with others. The difficulty is keeping us in check if he’s trying to talk with us.

xiii. Anna: To add to that, if there were a contentious discussion, could strain his position if he were a minority voice.

xiv. Alex: I think objectivity is important, don’t think he shouldn’t be inherently part of the process. But I think it’s valuable, but one he doesn’t talk that much anyway, two, he knows his place and when it’s appropriate, we’ve had problems in the past where librarians try to dominate and he knows not to do that. He should have a free reign to say what he wants, even if it’s not a constitutional fact. I trust him to only speak when it’s
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relevant/unique perspective.

xv. Leah: Read out what Ethan said: “useful to have another voice/opinion, but shouldn’t be a voting member if he doesn’t want to be, trusts the room, consent to whatever is said.”

xvi. Hannah: I really like his role last year, whatever we decided, it was perfect. He spoke when we were missing something, like “it’s this way in the constitution”

xvii. Lynnie: Anyone who hasn’t spoken yet want to say anything?

xviii. Saumya: I agree with Anna, don’t want him to get too wrapped up. He has previous experience, don’t want to be like we have to wait for you.

xix. Anna: I agree with Alex to some extent. I respect what Hannah Abrahms said but I wasn’t here last semester, and I’m sure he did a good job, but he should be able to share his experiences, but shouldn’t be a constant.

xx. Carley: Should be able to use his experience and combine with our thoughts to make the best outcome.

xxi. Leah: How do people who say he shouldn’t say his opinions feel about these guidelines?

xxii. Riley: I have faith that he’ll safeguard his own role, say generally what we want you to do but trust you to do what’s right.

xxiii. Frannie: Totally down with that, trust Chris.

xxiv. Lynnie: General trust in Chris to share what he needs, to interject constitutional and historical points as appropriate. Anything want to add/comment.

xxv. Alex: Found him to be a useful role.

xxvi. Leah: More comfortable with the guideline, always bring up constitutional point, precedent and things we haven’t considered, soft guideline on not sharing any of his own opinion. Sharing an opinion about something we’ve already discussed, don’t see how that’s productive. Personally don’t see value in him bringing up an opinion we’ve already discussed. How do people feel?

xxvii. (lots of yes’s): Lynnie: Can we go revise this role. (yes) Just so that it’s not in stone.

xxviii. Alex: Usually a few weeks in check-in and see how he’s doing.

xxix. Leah: What I have written down, and let me know if it reflects:

1. Always share constitutional points
2. Historical precedents and relevant and productive points we haven’t considered
3. Personal opinion should not be given unless asked for or if it is completely necessary.

xxx. Lynnie: Is there language anyone disagrees with?

xxxi. Alex: Can you read it one more time?

xxii. Leah: [re-reads]

xxiii. Anna: the third line doesn’t reflect what people said, sounds more like share your opinion if necessary, whereas what’s being said is please don’t unless you feel strongly.

xxxiv. Statement: Chris will always share constitutional points. He will also always bring up historical precedents when relevant and productive. Personal opinion should not be given unless asked for or if he deems it completely necessary (14 members consent)