Members Present: Alex, Danny, Carley, Hannah A, Ethan, Oliver, Saumya, Anna, Leah, Lynnie, Chris, Arthur, Frannie
Public Portion Guests:

A. [Rose/Bud/Thorn]
B. [Committee Updates]

1. Faculty & Bryn Mawr Outreach
   i. Leah: Is pizza, prof and code happening?
   ii. Frannie: Haven’t gotten any interest from faculty.
   iii. Chris: Sent out survey to all the faculty.
   iv. Saumya: Haven’t heard from honor board. Sent two emails.
   v. Leah: We have a resolution that recommends we co-host.
   vi. Lynnie: You could mark it as urgent or put it in all caps. You can also email a board member directly.
   vii. Saumya: I’ve been emailing he head.
   viii. Lynnie: Yeah our bi-co liaison has been pretty responsive.
   ix. Leah: **Tries to figure out structure of Honor Board**

2. Abstract Editing
   i. Anna: Abstract discussion on Wednesday, Transformers, Monty Python and Moonrise Kingdom. Just me and Cesar.
   ii. Leah: Do you know how to get cookies?
   iii. Anna: I can call insomnia cookies etc.
   iv. Leah: Yeah, but reimbursement process
   v. **Discussion of logistics, possible variety of food, etc.**

3. Social Issues and Community Outreach
   i. Carley: We were going to hold an event about confrontation on Tuesday but since it’s election day, will push it back. Emailed last week other affinity groups. Haven’t gotten back to us. Talking to them in person, have meetings on Sundays and Mondays. Sent on Monday night, so might be responded to this week, so definitely have something next week.

4. Social Code, Confrontation, and Mediation:
   i. Ethan: We did an event. We had a couple people showed up. Small group. Talk about how to talk and disagree in politics. Great conversation and went immediately in a different direction than I had planned for. People still brought up points I wanted brought up. That general conversation later in the semester might be interesting.
   ii. Leah: Two article on the clerk that made me think of that event.
   iii. Anna: It’s hard to get people to come from, if we could put stuff in the DC that are conversation starters.
   iv. Ethan: Clarification of the purpose of this is how to talk, not talk about it.
   v. Saumya: Time consuming task force will be once a week. Prefer someone from Hoco that’s not me.
   vi. Leah: Anyone else interested in JSAAPP task force? Okay, we can think about it.
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C. Guidelines:

1. Leah: These are guidelines to the multicultural liaison [community outreach multicultural liaison plenary resolution]. Approved by student body at plenary, have to wait for denial/approval from president before we can enact. President Benston contacted me and Maurice two weeks ago and he had some problems with the resolutions, some suggestions, or stuff he wanted changed. He emailed us an edited document with strikethroughs, etc. I talked with Chris about this, our interpretation is that it is not president’s place to make edits. Has to approve or not approve, and student council’s presidents have to organize community discussion and special plenary. Our goal is to have it approved. We proposed a compromise could be guidelines. Chris do you want to explain what guidelines are?

2. Chris: Guidelines are chamber rules, for example how an appeal works. They are stuff council do not have to follow, but we should follow and are expected to generally follow.

3. Leah: These are what I drafted with Maurice. Kim Benston got back to us with concerns about these. Do people think it would be helpful to go through his original concerns?

4. Frannie: I’d like to hear your concerns.

5. Alex: that feels counterproductive, only productive to talk about remaining.

6. Frannie: does the new email address original?

7. Anna: Why are we looking at these?

8. Leah: We have to consent to them.

9. Lynnie: We have to consent to all of our chamber rules, etc.

10. Anna: My understanding is that the multicultural liaison is part of honor council?

11. Leah: they are specifically related to confrontation and social code, meet with exec board, etc. They are a liaison to honor council is where liaison text came from.

12. Anna: Wanted to know what our vantage point with this was.

13. Leah: One of his main concerns which we tried to mitigate in resolution 1, in allowing liaison to both mediate and confront, takes away neutrality of mediation. Kim’s Benston’s concern was that someone could mediate and then confront. His preference is for them to not be able to confront, our take was it would have to be two different liaisons. Do we want to talk about this step by step?

14. Arthur: Could we go through all of them?

15. Leah: then he was concerned about liaisons telling exec board confidential information about cases. We have a line in resolution, liaisons will share confidential. Took away from mediation position. Mediations supposed to be confidential. Had a comment about guideline 2, wanted stronger version. His third concern was that training should occur before they accept cases, resolution 4. Applies to any council representative serving liaison function. Wanted to change, in resolution about OMA, to OMA, staff, or representative deemed by dean of students. Comfortable change because it’s an administrative concern because he know what might happen to OMA. Under authority of president, unlike other suggestions. If people are uncomfortable to changing that in the resolution. Guideline 2 came up in our meeting that part of his concern of serving as a confronting party, was the jury might not hear from the student. Wanted stronger versions of guidelines 2 and 3. Guideline 6 because he was still concerned about confronting, etc. Wanted us to reconsider it in the future. And guideline 5 is in response to something that was brought up to us at plenary that thought this could be expanded to queer or trans students.

16. Lynnie: Does anyone have any questions?

17. Saumya: If he still has more concerns, are you going to change it?

18. Leah: I just listed his concerns.

19. Alex: The easiest one is number 4, applies to any member of honor council.

20. Riley: You think it should be added or cut out?
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21. **Added, makes Kim more comfortable**
22. Riley: I really hope Kim Benston learns a lesson which is pay attention to resolution before they get passed. Will he agree to these guideline?
23. Leah: Kim Benston thinks it should be stronger, reads out statement from Kim Benston.
24. Riley: He understands he can’t change resolutions?
25. Leah: Don’t know if he knows that, he understands why Maurice and I won’t want him.
26. **Discussion about use of word “guidelines” and other similar semantic issues**
27. Leah: what about just here are some guidelines to the community multicultural liaison to Honor Council. He wants to make it stronger, clarify what number 2. If someone asks liaison for help to confront, honor council must hear from student.
28. Anna: As it stands in resolution, does exec board and does jury know who the original student that requested confrontation know.
29. Leah: What happened in Planes?
30. Arthur + Chris: they knew the names.
31. Ethan: Was resolution intending for jury and exec board to know name(s) of who is being confronted for, or remain anonymous?
32. Leah: My thought behind allowing liaison to confront is safety. It would be a last resort. If a student felt they could not confront due to safety. We have text in constitution about having an honor council member confront on someone’s behalf. Mixed feelings about being allowed to remain anonymous. Assumed they would not be anonymous.
33. Anna: I feel like if they’re not anonymous it lessens the protection, if it is a worry of danger. I don’t think, I don’t know all circumstances, they wouldn’t be concerned about being attacked within trial, but outside of trial. If their name is present within trial, going to be a concern anyone.
34. Chris: In past, someone brought a case, asked someone on council to confront, and they remained anonymous.
35. Ethan: Are they anonymous to the jury specifically? To the confronted party?
36. Chris: The case I was talking about never went to trial.
37. Anna: What I’m trying to get to is what I would like to see is a clarification, I think a statement from confronting party is necessary. To clarify why they needed to go to a liaison. Specifying that it could or should, completely anonymous. How that is sort of okay within the process.
38. Leah: How do people feel about making it slightly stronger? A jury or council should consider it.
39. Oliver: Why does it have to be anonymous to the jury? Could be anonymous to confronted party but also confronting.
40. Anna: How does it change to know a name? I hear what you’re saying, but if there’s some extreme issue, keeping fewer people in knowledge of who actual confronting party is makes it safe. Shouldn’t change interpretation of statement.
41. Ethan: My initial response to that is a name is a person, it very much is the case that a name is a person, a human being who has been put in this circumstance. It’s important we recognize that and I think that putting that forward to the jury I feel like having a jury having a conversation about anonymous confronting someone or other is different from someone being there. Even if they don’t see that person there. To the extent possible would like having person requesting a liaison to have a say in the process. Don’t see how you get full restoration without that. You don’t need to have confronted party.
42. Riley: Two interesting issue. Is it possible to reach restoration when the party can’t know who the other is. Secondly, if we decide it’s okay for there to not be that meeting is the jury knowing the name of the original party relevant? I think that it’s not relevant. Trying to use ambiguous might be bad, but pseudonymize it is better.
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Worth it to protect individual’s safety.

43. Ethan: Clarification on both of those points. Difference between saying Ethan Adelman-Sil, in reference to what I’m saying versus a pseudonym says this. The point on second one was not so much restoration with confronted party not knowing, it’s can we reach full consensus with confronting having more involvement with the trial process.

44. Leah: A few thoughts I had is that I really do think liaison as confronting party is a last resort. If we want to specifically say that we could. I think having a last resort. I think all degree to which original confronting interacting less is a last resort. Had case last spring where jury met with original confronting party, but never in the same room. Anonymous absolute last resort. In terms of restoration, if liaison confronting on behalf of a person, also on behalf of the community. Restoration with the community can be reached. What do people think about allowing anonymous?

45. Lynnie: Other opinions?

46. Frannie: Could you say in response to extreme circumstances?

47. Leah: Could I read out resolution as I have it right now? **Reads out**

48. Arthur: Feel like should be stronger language, also anonymous.

49. Leah: Already met with Kim Benston. There’s a chance the dean of the college suspends student, and restoration is still wanted, could still go to trial.

50. Anna: In response to that, either a fear of physical danger, could be a verbal assault/abuse issue.

51. Alex: To want to remain anonymous doesn’t have to be imminent threat of danger.

52. Lynnie: I was going to use language of undue emotional anguish.

53. Leah: Do people want to change should to will? Arthur would it make you more comfortable if we changed it from should to will?

54. Arthur nods

55. Anna: Most of these statements are should, will stand out if it’s will.

56. Riley: Wise strategic move to move towards statements that seem binding, but we know in our hearts they aren’t binding.

57. Leah: What about telling confidential details to exec board if a case comes to trial.

58. Lynnie: Mediations are supposed to be confidential, strongly agree with Kim Benston’s concern. If a mediation failed, being brought to honor council, sharing confidential information should only be shared only if relevant. One of, at least outside Haverford community, big thing is confidentiality.

59. Anna: This is liaisons, not mediating liaisons, which is two different. What about confronting? Are they required to forward all information from confronting party to exec board?

60. Leah: What do people think about this?

61. Alex: I don’t see if there aren’t details that are unproductive or necessary why it matters.

62. Leah: If I’m correct, I think what Kim Benston and Lynnie are concerned about is that it’s not strong enough. One anecdote is a case last spring, had two different mediators.. Two mediations, one done by one co-chair, then the other co-chair. Second one went well because first co-chair shared information about what happened. Could require consent from confronting party. Also, if a case needs to be handled extra delicately, would be helpful to know. For example, in knights council sent out requests for statements on saturday night leading to physical altercation, might have been better if there was a mediation beforehand and exec board known about it could have meeting. Also see Lynnie’s concerns, must have explicit consent.

63. Alex: In the mediation could have things about what happened that isn’t so important to keep confidential, in fact necessary.

64. Lynnie: I think productive and necessary assuages my concerns.
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65. Leah: Do people want should or will? Do you think so that it’s not just one thing that’s will?
66. Anna: Should have all of them being consistent.
67. Leah: Do people think they should all be will?
68. Arthur: Should all be will for same reasons stated above.
69. Leah: Do people think six should be a will?
70. Ethan: No. It’s kind of hard to demand reflection.
71. Leah: slight hesitation with making 1 into will. I don’t feel strongly about separation there. Not helpful.
72. Lynnie: I think it should be will.
73. Leah: Cool. Can we talk a little about five? I think one of our concerns is that we don’t want to be trivializing people’s experiences, but we did want to address the concerns that it’s just not people of color that are underrepresented at Haverford.
    Do people have thoughts on this?
74. Arthur: Don’t know if other people are reading this the same way, but the use of “future” makes it seem like it doesn’t work for the current Haverford community.
75. Leah: What about the entire Haverford community?
76. Hannah A: Could you elaborate?
77. **Arthur elaborates**
78. Frannie: What about “current and future”?
79. Hannah A: I think issue was what it would be like in future, but that’s a good compromise.
80. Riley: I think question to underlying question, I think this position as it will be created probably won’t be perfect, but best way is to try it. If there are problems, then make changes. If it becomes clear for one of multicultural liaisons to be queer, changes can be made. No law and no sort of new change to a community is ever perfect at its inception. Not perfect but should give it a try.
81. Leah: Any other guidelines we should consider? Doing it as council, not as president. Do people feel good about these guidelines? Why don’t we take dishes to dishroom, and then come back.
82. *Council takes quick break*
83. Leah: Are there any other concerns that people want to voice?
84. Leah: Does anyone want me to read the guidelines outloud?
86. Leah: *reads current guidelines outloud*
87. Leah: Any concerns, questions, suggestions?
88. Arthur: I think I still have a few concerns. In general, upon thinking more, I would not feel comfortable consenting to this today if only because we don’t have the original resolution in front of us. Yes, we have these guidelines in response to certain concerns by the President, but I don’t think we can fairly evaluate what other concerns haven’t been addressed by these guidelines, because I haven’t looked at the original wording in the resolution itself. I’m also still concerned about the anonymous part, when you have a liaison confronting on behalf of someone, I feel very strongly restoration would be very hard - if not impossible - to achieve if they [the original confronting and confronted parties] don’t ever meet. You can only paraphrase someone’s situation to some level of accuracy, and I think that very much could influence the outcome of that proceeding, so I think it makes sense that the jury meets the original confronting party. And I guess if we really are concerned about confidentiality stuff, then I think that we should say that the liaisons only share details about mediations if parties consent about them sharing it with the Exec Board. I guess that’s more of a consistency thing.
89. Leah: If the desire to reflect on them over the next week is non-negotiation, then I think we should stop speaking about them now unless anyone has other thoughts to add.
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90. Lynnie: Do people have other responses to Arthur’s concerns?
91. Anna: Yes, but if we’re not going to make a decision tonight…
92. Lynnie: We can still have productive conversation.
93. Ethan: What is the opportunity cost of us having productive conversation now? Is there something else we can get done tonight that will be beneficial?
94. Leah: We have other abstracts, one of which we can discuss tonight.
95. Lynnie: Do other people agree with Arthur about wanting more time to reflect on these guidelines? Would having the original resolution be helpful? I see Arthur’s point that over the course of a week we may think of additional ideas.
96. Leah: I think the only thing I would bring up is that I don’t know if Kim Benston will feel comfortable approving the resolution before we consent to these guidelines, so we could consent to them, and if people were comfortable, we could revisit them in a few weeks in the way that we talked about the role of the Librarian.
97. Arthur: I wouldn’t block, I would stand outside, but with the numbers we can’t have anyone standing outside.
98. Leah: If you don’t think there is anything that a conversation in the next 20 minutes can do to mitigate your concerns, then I think we should move on.
99. Lynnie: If you think you need another, week, take that week.