01. Weekly Meeting
   a. Committee Updates
      i. Faculty Outreach: Did not meet due to snow day
      ii. Social Issues and Awareness (SIA): Met on Friday to plan out community
discussions and collaborate with Special Plenary Committee
      iii. Abstract Editing: Met on Saturday to review abstracts to bring to Council
      iv. JSAAPP: Met on Monday to discuss party host training
      v. Marketing: Did not meet, will publicize events for Council and Special Plenary as
they come up
   b. Special Plenary Guidelines
      i. Council needs to decide if Special Plenary can address anything besides
Honor Code
      ii. Anything to cause Code to not ratify in first place? Absolute overhaul?
Since things are going on, special plenary should address these things
      iii. I feel like as far as my understanding and understanding how splen
committee discusses this there may be some beneficial changes to the
constitution and this is a good chance to make those changes, im willing
to consider it
      iv. I think that I would be much more comfortable if changes we’re
consenting to are in relation to the Honor Code somehow, even though
resolutions outside of Honor Code are important, I don’t think it should be
given equal light in this case, I think it’s impossible for us to focus on so
many things at once
      v. I think one of the difficulties is the distinction between code and how it’s
applied, I think a lot of people have trouble with how the code is applied
      vi. Question: do you think it’s appropriate to discuss what came up in splen
meeting?
      vii. Special Plenary meeting met monday, I heard Kim Benston made a
request to committee
      viii. (redacted)
      ix. Renewed CDE for article 6 idea
      x. For special plenary only code changes, could put CDE in honor code
      xi. I think our decision should mostly be around what we think these
constitutional passages are saying and try to put aside personal
investment in wanting to change things, more on what do we think
constitution is saying
xii. This might be dumb, but if we decide people can only amend the honor
code but it’s part of the constitution so couldn’t they put amendments that
aren’t super relevant to the code in the code
xiii. I think already happened with some resolutions like the other one that
wasn’t passed
xiv. At regular plenary, anything can be changed or make value statements,
question here is special plenary specific to code?
xv. Is time a factor? If we say that if we finish the honor code stuff before a
certain time then do we allot other stuff?
xvi. I think that’s rules of orders run by co-presidents, 4 hours plus 2 30 min
additions
xvii. What kind of resolutions outside? Composition of honor council,
multicultural liaisons
xviii. I don’t think that stuff that’s outside the honor code should be considered
since we didn’t ask if that’s what was ratified
xix. Based on riley, constitution very related to how code conducted on
campus, I think a lot of people have said code is fine no problems really
but misconducted
xx. I have a huge problem with that, if you believe the constitution doesn’t
work then fine, but we did not ratify the honor code so there must be
something that we can change such that we can ratify an honor code, in
future plenaries we can bring more resolutions, I don’t think we should
focus on other issues directly
xxi. I don’t think there’s a very clear distinction, in the way that it’s
experienced, on a theoretical level I agree, but at a practical level I don’t
think there’s a lot of trust in the Honor Code so I think it should be open to
constitutional changes
xxii. Im worried that a large portion of people who voted against ratification,
even though i agree with what you’re saying about how it’s playing out, if
people don’t see the changes they thought they might want it to fail
xxiii. I agree I think I’ve learned more about distinction between code and
constitution, I don’t think I understood the difference before, I think it’s
really hard to tell
xxiv. It’s on us a bit to not have people understand the difference between the
code and constitution, this is just me ranting but a lot of the stuff that is
going to be proposed is stuff that is already there - holding the honor code
hostage
xxv. I think that if people had opportunity to vote on constitution it would have
been similar, I think the code and constitution are linked in how people
think
xxvi. What would happen if we told people the difference between the code and the constitution? Would difference clarifying either pass the honor code or not bother following?

xxvii. I think it’s a bad look, i’m worried about the optics of us being like ‘you can’t change honor council’ since we’re, you know, honor council

xxviii. I agree, I think what should have happened we should have explained the difference between the code and constitution, since that didn’t happen I theoretically agree with above it shouldn’t be beyond code but I don’t think that’s practical, I think we should do things the right way next time but for this time we should allow it 

xxix. In the future, it would be beneficial to attach PDFs of the code and the constitution 

xxx. Is there a way that we could allow it but have this message go out to the student body for the sake of transparency and acknowledging this miscommunication

xxxi. I think we’ll send an email about whatever we consent to, can include summary of discussion, clarify differences between 2, feel that due to our understanding

xxxii. This portion of our meeting is not confidential so it will go on public minutes

xxxiii. I don’t know if this is helpful or right, but I think it’s important that in the constitution there’s 2 ways for special plenary, the one where we reach quorum voting but not for ratification seems to exactly say for code, but the other way (the way that happened) it doesn’t have the language about for the code, feels like a different special plenary than one that is just to modify code

xxxiv. I feel really strongly that we should allow the constitution to be modified. I’ve considered the role of judicial interpretation and theory. If it’s our goal to ensure that the students are comfortable and want to vest power into this document, then they should be able to modify the document to reach that point

xxxv. Sounds like most people in favor of including constitution

xxxvi. Wording for statement?

xxxvii. One idea, do we want to say we encourage it to be more about code but allow other things?

xxxviii. I don’t agree with that statement

xxxix. I also think that if someone drafted one about the constitution it won’t change things, the people who are gonna do it already know they’re gonna do it

xl. In terms of exact wording, I want to see somethings earlier said brought up but also include want students to be able to address concerns that caused them to not ratify the code

xli. We should make it clear that the central thing we care about is the honor code but the changes we make to constitution and code all surround code
xlii. The Constitution reads “a Special Plenary will be….”. Given the interconnected nature of the Honor Code and its applications as outlined in the Students’ Constitution, the student body will have the option to make amendments to any portion of the Students’ Constitution, not only the Honor Code, at a Special Plenary, the idea being that students deserve any and all option to modify the code in order to feel confident investing power in it.

xliii. To play devil’s advocate, are we just manipulating this to get $\frac{2}{3}$ majority?

xliv. Instead of addressing problems with the honor code, students will propose resolutions about other stuff and the code will get ratified without changing.

xlv. I would personally feel more comfortable without the word comfortable.

xlvi. I like this statement but I recognize it’s a little extreme, the people who the contract binds give it power.

xlvii. Question: it’s important to do that, but also important that within guidelines we respect some of the protocol putting forth so that it can be used to the best good in the future, does anyone see any contradiction in that? In another circumstance, could this be interpreted to the detriment of the community?

xlviii. I don’t see any major detrimental factors, we have to follow some guidelines about Plenary, this just gives this special plenary special guidelines.

xlix. Since such high quorum then it can’t be hijacked.

l. Consensus: 15 members present 14 consent, 1 stands outside.