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Charlie Bruce ‘16: Sorry that was so loud, I’m just very excited. Please take your plenary packet out- I’m going to be reading everything from it.

AGENDA

1. Overview of Plenary (Welcome)

2. Approval of the Rules of Order and Agenda

3. Resolution 1: Reaffirmation of the SGA Constitution

4. Resolution 2: Waiving the Requirement of Minutes in Honor Board Hearings

5. Resolution 3: Recommitment to the Values of the Honor Code

6. Resolution 4: Honor Board Reports to Other Institutions

7. Resolution 5: Institutional Memory of the Self-Government Association

8. Resolution 6: Measure to modernize and rename the Alcohol Concerns Review Board in the spirit of self governance and continuing education

9. Resolution 7: Recommendation for the Reinstatement of the Campus Shuttle

HISTORY OF PLENARY

In 1892, Bryn Mawr College became the first institution in the U.S. to give students the responsibility to decide on how they should govern themselves. While it was considered a radical experiment, it has become one of the most valued aspects of the Bryn Mawr education. The tradition of student autonomy and responsibility has created a unique campus where students participate in discussion and resolution of the most important issues facing the College.

Twice a year, students get the opportunity to present resolutions to the entire student body. The Spirit of Self Governance is a beautiful thing and should make all Mawrters proud.

ROBERT’S RULES OF ORDER

Plenary uses a form of communication based on Robert’s Rules of Order. This ensures that the will of the majority is done while protecting the voice of the minority. The rules of order may seem awkward and sometimes constraining, but they will limit chaos and personal attack. Please give your attention to the guidelines and follow them. In the long run, they will make Plenary run smoother and faster.

Quorum is essential and required. This means that everyone must enter and exit from the side door of Goodhart. Votes are only valid if there is quorum.

Order of Business:

Each resolution will be presented as follows:

· Reading of the resolution by the presenter(s)

· Explanation of the resolution by the presenter(s) – 3 minutes · Floor open to questions and Pro/Con statements – 12 minutes

(questions are given priority during this time)

(If amendment is presented, it is given an additional 8 minutes)

· Floor open to Pro/Con statements only - 7 minutes

· Rebuttal period for presenter(s) of the resolution - 3 minutes · Voting on the resolution

If there is discussion occurring at the microphones, then discussion will occur for at least 12 minutes as outlined above, before the question may be called. This is to ensure that a minimum discussion is given to all resolutions, as the community has already warranted these resolutions worthy of discussion.

If there is no discussion at the microphone, the SGA Executive Board will give a 30 second time limit for those who wish to speak to identify themselves by either approaching the microphone or alerting their section counter. If after the 30 seconds no one has announced that they wish to speak, the amendment or resolution will be voted upon.

There will be a member of the SGA Executive Board moderating as well as another member keeping time for each resolution. One minute and 30 second warnings will be given for each timed period.

SPEAKING

\*\*If you wish to ask a question, please line up at the middle yellow QUESTION microphone. \*\*If you wish to make a statement in favor of a proposal, please use the green PRO microphone.

\*\*If you wish to make a statement in opposition to a proposal, please use the red CON microphone.

There will be a moderator at each microphone who will limit the number of people standing in line. Please keep your statements to one minute, so that everyone may have time to speak. Please listen carefully to the speakers to avoid asking the same question or making the same basic point. If you have already spoken on an issue, you will not be allowed to speak again until everyone else who desires to speak has done so. If you must talk while in your seat, please be considerate of those around you who may be trying to listen to the discussion. Most importantly, please be patient and respectful of all other members. Even though you might not agree with an idea, everyone has the right to speak and be heard.

The President will call on microphones alternating Pro/Con. Only the people at microphones who are recognized by the President will be permitted to speak, and again, no person at the microphone will be allotted more than one minute to comment on the resolution.

VOTING

Voting is a right and privilege extended to all members of the Association. The options for exercising this right are pro, con, and abstain (no opinion, or you feel like you don’t have enough information to provide an informed vote). For a motion to pass a majority of members present must vote pro.

Please raise hands high, and know who your counter is for your section. The President will ask that everyone return to their proper seat during a vote, so as to make sure everyone is counted accurately.

All votes will be done visually unless there the majority of the vote is unclear. If you believe you are not being counted, please see a counter or come to the front of the stage.

DEFINITIONS

AMENDMENT: An addition or change that is proposed to a resolution which is on the table for

discussion. Please try to use language such as “strike,” “add,” and “replace with.” If the amendment strays too much from the original intent of the proposal, the President may declare the amendment to be out of SCOPE, or outside of the resolution’s jurisdiction or purpose. All amendments must be written down in advance of approaching the microphone and presented to the microphone moderator. All amendments must be presented and discussed as written.

After an amendment is presented, it must be seconded at a microphone by another member of the Association, and is then open for debate. At this time, all discussion regarding the original resolution ceases to allow adequate attention to be given to the amendment. If you are speaking to the main resolution during this time, the President may request you to come back to the microphone when debate on the main resolution resumes.

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME: This needs a simple majority for approval. When making the

motion, please specify a length at which time shall be extended (4 more speakers/5 minutes, etc.). It must be made before time has expired, seconded, and then passed by a simple majority.

MOTION TO COMMIT/REFER: If you feel like more research needs to be done in order to support the motion you may move to refer to a committee (I move to refer\_\_\_\_\_ to a committee/task force). Upon doing so please specify the size, responsibilities and composition of the committee.

POSTPONE INDEFINITELY: This may be done if you feel like there is inadequate information and you feel like the motion does not warrant discussion. The effect would be to postpone debate entirely and move on to the next order of business. If desired, it could then be brought up at Plenary the following year.

CALLING THE QUESTION: A request to stop all discussion IMMEDIATELY and put the resolution to a vote. This MUST be voted upon, and requires 2/3 support. It is basically a vote to vote. The first vote will be to close discussion and move to the final vote. If this fails discussion continues; if this passes then the presenter moves to the rebuttal period and then we vote on whatever debate is currently occurring—i.e. an amendment or the original resolution. If you CALL ALL PREVIOUS QUESTIONS, this would include the same premise as calling the question, only we would proceed to vote systematically on any amendment on the table and the original resolution. This motion may only be made after the original 10 minutes of discussion have elapsed, and must be recognized by the President.

POINT OF ORDER: A motion made after an infraction of Robert’s Rules of Order. May be made from any place in the room. The Parliamentarian will confer with the President regarding the error and then will present a method of recovery to regain order.

\*\*\*IMPORTANT\*\*\*

These motions as well as the amendment process are serious procedures; which can, if abused, hinder the process or render it unfair. Please use them with discretion and allow the existing process to work as efficiently as possible. All motions must be presented at the microphone.

FOOD

All food must be consumed in the atrium and the lobby. In the case that food is consumed in the Auditorium, SGA will not be allowed to use Goodhart in the future. Please abide by and uphold the Social Honor Code by respecting this rule.

PLEASE CLEAN UP AFTER YOURSELF AND RECYCLE PLENARY PACKETS/BOOKLETS!

Also I made a huge goof, so these are all printed one sided, so please recycle them. The 2016-2017 EBoard will present the first resolution.

Rachel Bruce ‘18: Hi, I’m Rachel Bruce ‘18, and I will be SGA Secretary.

Rhea Manglani ‘17: I’m Rhea Manglani ‘17, and I will be SGA President.

Shaina Robinson ’17: I’m Shaina Robinson ’17, and I will be SGA Vice-President.

Swati Shastry ’18: Hi! I’m Swati Shastry ’18, and I will be Head of the Honor Board.

Jocelyne Oliveros ’18: Hi! I’m Jocelyne Oliveros ’18, and I will be SGA Treasurer.

Charlie Bruce ‘16: Resolution 1, Reaffirmation of the SGA Constitution, presented by the SGA 2016-2017 EBoard.

Rachel Bruce ’18: Whereas, the Self-Government Association of the Undergraduate School of Bryn Mawr College is the first and oldest system of self-governance in the United States,

Jocelyne Oliveros ’18: Whereas, the spirit of self-governance permeates almost every aspect of the Undergraduate Bryn Mawr College experience,

Shaina Robinson ’17: Whereas, the students of Bryn Mawr College have pledged to work together for the welfare, benefit, and preservation of the community as a whole,

Swati Shastry ’18: Whereas, we recognize that to reach full potential of our community, we require a commitment on the part of each and every individual,

Rhea Manglani ‘17: It is hereby resolved that we, the members of the Self-Government Association of the Undergraduate School of Bryn Mawr College present today, the 21st of February, 2016, on behalf of the entire Self Government Association, reaffirm our commitment to self- governance, the SGA Constitution, and the Honor Code .The Bryn Mawr College Self-Governance Association -- the first collegiate student government in American history -- was established in 1892 as a way for the students to govern themselves. SGA is having the voice and the power to create positive change in our community through confrontation, discussion, and action. SGA also empowers us to create a community of mutual respect for all Mawrters. This resolution is to reaffirm our commitment to the spirit of self-governance, the Honor Code, and the SGA Constitution.

Charlie Bruce ‘16: We will now open the floor for 12 minutes of questions. If you have any questions, please line up. Since 30 seconds have passed, we will move this to a vote. The options are Yes, No, Abstain. This resolution passes. The next resolution will be Waiving the Requirement of Minutes in Honor Board Hearings, presented by Molly Mac Dougall ’16 and Celeste Gambino ’16.

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: Whereas it is in the spirit of restorative justice for proceedings to be kept comfortable and confidential, Whereas the Honor Code states that minutes will be taken during hearings (Article II, Section A, Subsection 2, Subsection e; Article II Subsection B, Subsection 2, Subsection d), Whereas information that comes up in hearings is often sensitive, Whereas it would be inappropriate to have permanent records of certain information discussed in hearings,

Celeste Gambino ’16: Be it resolved that, the requirement of minutes taken during hearings be stricken from the Honor Code to protect the safety of hearings and the confidential information discussed during them, Be it resolved that, Article II, Section A, Subsection 2, Subsection e be changed to read, “...Each record includes all written statements and the Honor Board’s final decision in the case.” Be it resolved that, Article II Subsection B, Subsection 2, Subsection d be changed to read, “Social hearings are confidential. Each record includes all written statements and the Honor Board’s final decision in the case.”

Molly Mac Dougall ’16:The Honor Code prescribes that we take minutes during hearings, but we feel that having a member of the Honor Board focusing on taking minutes has significant potential to disrupt the conversational nature of a hearing and make the environment uncomfortable. Sometimes, things come up in a hearing that are irrelevant to the Honor Board’s understanding of a case, and it seems inappropriate to have personal information like this on a student’s permanent record if it does not pertain to the Honor Board’s resolutions. Statements produced by the confronting and confronted parties are kept in the Honor Board’s records, as are final decisions and notes from the Honor Board about things brought up in the hearing that were not in the minutes. Abstracts of relevant information are also created, kept on record, and later released to the community. We want to remove the language in the Honor Code that calls for minutes to also be kept in these files, as they are unnecessary to understanding the case and could harm the restorative process of a hearing.

Charlie Bruce ‘16: We will now open the floor for 12 minutes of questions. Priority is given to question microphone.

Brenna Levitin ’16: What happens to minutes now?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: It’s in the dean’s office, no one can look at them, but they are there.

Hannah Zamore ‘19: It may be more effective to have the minutes. How can get them to use in the future?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: We don’t use them. It’s disruptive to have them taken. It’s inappropriate and ineffective.

Celeste Gambino ’16: We also have the abstract. So, the minutes are more sensitive details that we don’t think should be written down.

Chris Lichtenstein ’16: I feel like this is too broad. It would work better to still take minutes but to perhaps do them from a recording, or perhaps to allow the honor board to black out more sensitive things. I think this is too drastic a step, if this is also too broad for an amendment, we should table this, and rework it for next semester.

Charlie Bruce ’16: Are you making a motion to table it?

Chris Lichtenstein ’16: Where is it?

Charlie Bruce ’16: Page four. It would be postponed indefinitely, are you making a motion to postpone it?

Chris Lichtenstein ’16: Yes.

Charlie Bruce ’16: We need a second.

Shreepriya Poudel’16: I second.

Charlie Bruce ’16: So if you are currently standing please take a seat. Section counters get ready. So the vote is yes I propose to postpone, no I do not, and abstain. Section counters you will need to count for this. The amendment will not be postponed.

Isabel Gellert ’19: How can you determine if the summaries are unbiased if minutes aren’t verbatim?

Celeste Gambino ’16: Specific opinions are not included, but you can read our summaries online. It doesn’t have the same detail as minutes, but they are very helpful. They are based on events, not opinions.

Farah AlYaqout ’16: I’m pro this resolution because note taking can be very distracting during a hearing. The abstract remains, and the people who are apart of the honor board feel that this is an important change that needs to be made.

Shreepriya Poudel’16: Why did we start this system in the first place?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: We’re not actually sure why the minute requirements began. However, the last several honor board heads haven’t been doing it this way, because the minutes take away from the quality of the hearing.

Maya Berrol-Young ’17: I’m concerned about the details. Verbatim accounts can be used for evidence of misconduct, so how can you see those things if you don’t have a record?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: The deans and the president of the college review any procedural issues, and we take that very, very seriously. Procedural issues are addressed regardless of minutes being taken.

Maya Berrol-Young ’17: Can I respond to that? I’m concerned that because you’re going on no written records on either side, it doesn’t serve anyone because you have no written proof.

Rachel Massey ’18: Hi, I’m Rachel Massey, and I’m an Honor Board Rep. I’m asking this for your sake, not so much for my own. If you haven’t been through a hearing- how does it feel to have very intimate life stories and details being written down and listened to?

Celeste Gambino ’16: As someone who has been through that, it’s very uncomfortable. It’s like you’re taking down a life story that you wouldn’t want to happen to anyone, or that you wouldn’t want anyone to know. Again, it’s secure in the dean’s office, but it’s hard to know that- that this written record is written down somewhere, and that makes people uncomfortable.

Anushka Robinson ‘19: These minutes are sealed in the dean’s office. Can they be unsealed?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: I’ve never seen that happen.

Celeste Gambino ’16: We certainly do not have access.

Haley Varnum ’19: If you’re concerned about it, you can Google “Bryn Mawr Honor Board,” and they are really through.

Emily Siegel ’16: If the problem is that typing is distracting, why no sound recording?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: We don’t want any computers; we think that it makes the hearings feel more impersonal. I would be uncomfortable talking about details about my personal life that goes into the college records. We want people to feel comfortable. We don’t want a recording device to get in the way with that.

Celeste Gambino ’16: Agreed. We want people to feel comfortable.

Calla Carter ’18: The past few directors of the honor board haven’t been taking minutes. Why?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: I don’t know really, but just some cases didn’t have minutes taken.

Calla Carter ’18: So is this resolution just a formality?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: We’re doing it because this is a more effective way for the honor board to function and run.

Charlie Bruce ’16: The time for discussion has ended. We are going to go to a vote, the options are yes, no, and abstain. Raise your hands if yes, raise your hands if no, raise if you abstain. This resolution passes. The honor board is also presenting resolution number three.

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: Whereas, the life of the Honor Code relies on community investment and engagement, Whereas, all members of the undergraduate community have a responsibility to abide by the Honor Code, Whereas, confrontation is the necessary first step toward bringing an infraction to the attention of the Honor Board, and is a responsibility listed in the Code (Article II, Section A), Whereas, our bi-co partner, Haverford, lists a similar responsibility for individuals to the community in its Honor Code (Article 2, Section 3.06),

Swati Shastry ’18: Be it resolved that, we, the undergraduate students of Bryn Mawr College, reaffirm our commitment to positive confrontation. Confrontation is necessary for the Honor Code to work. The Honor Code calls for students to confront infractions of the Honor Code face to face and in a constructive manner. We acknowledge that active practice of confrontation is necessary to maintain the Honor Code as a contract between students, and a defining factor of the relationship between students and faculty, and reaffirm our commitment to practicing such confrontation.

Charlie Bruce ‘16: We will now open the floor for 12 minutes of questions. Priority is given to question microphone.

Kieres Regensburg ’16: If this is already in the honor code, what is being changed or what is this purpose?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: Nothing, we are just reaffirming the commitment, just like the honor code reaffirmation.

Maddie Hanson-Colvin ’16: This, I have some questions, about confrontation being the only way, so I haven’t read the honor code, but- if confrontation has been tried, what would be the next step?

Swati Shastry ’18: Could you reiterate that, please?

Maddie Hanson-Colvin ’16: Confrontation has been tried, and it doesn’t work, what’s another method that is deemed more appropriate- how does the honor code account for that?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: You have many ways that you can deal with a problem. Confrontation is the first step to brining a problem to the honor board. You can check the honor board blog for other ways.

Maddie Hanson-Colvin ’16: Thank you.

Charlie Bruce ’16: If you wish to make a statement, please line up, if not, we will call this to a vote. Ok, so the options are vote yes, no, and I abstain. Raise your hands if yes, raise if no, and abstain. Thank you, this resolution passes. Number four, honor boards reports to other institutions presented by Rachel Massey and Molly Mac Dougall.

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: Whereas, at the moment, all hearings concerning violations of the Honor Code are reported to institutions of higher education, Whereas, certain violations of the Honor Code are understood in hearings to be mistakes in good faith, Whereas, not all students were afforded the same education on issues like plagiarism and use of resources in high school, Whereas, the intent of the Honor Code is to bring about restoration after an infraction, Whereas, it counters the values of restorative justice to penalize such a lack of education with such an impactful measure as reporting to other institutions of higher education, Whereas, Haverford, our closest peer institution with a student-run Honor Board, has the discretion to recommend that infractions not be reported,

Rachel Massey ’18: Be it resolved that, the Honor Board be given the discretion to recommend on a case by case basis that the Dean’s Office not report violations to other institutions of higher education. Currently all infractions are reported to other institutions of higher education as having had “disciplinary hearing.” Hearings for some infractions, like a student in ESEM not properly using in-text citations, do not seem to warrant such a label, since we approach them as educational opportunities. We want to be able to make a recommendation in resolutions from a hearing that the Deans Office not report that hearing, based both on the severity of the infraction and the surrounding circumstances.

Charlie Bruce ’16: We will open the floor. Please line up at the microphone. Questions begin.

Elizabeth Tramontana ’18: By institutions of higher education, what do you mean?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: Grad schools, med schools, so on, even if you transfer.

Brenna Levitin ’16: So, if like we have to give overviews for sexual assaults on campus, would things of that nature be reported?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: What you’re talking about is a different kind of process, and is reported by law to the federal government. That would be title IX. When we do social or academic hearings we have to report them to higher institutions right now. What we’re trying to do is get the discretion to choose to report our honor board hearings. If an institution asks for disciplinary hearings, we tell them about social or academic hearings, but by our school’s ethos our hearings are not disciplinary.

Briana Grenert ’18: Are the deans required to tell right now?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: The deans asked us to do this basically. At this point in time, the honor board does not have the discretion to not say anything.

Miranda Smith ’16: Who’s decision would that be?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: Everyone on the hearing.

Miranda Smith ’16: Would it be case by case?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: Consensus of all the members of an honor board

Anushka Robinson ’19: What about the threshold for a reoccurrence?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: Reoccurring infractions would be reported. But, default reporting, but case-by-case basis.

Elizabeth Tramontana ’18: I’m against this because the evidence provided to us is not good reasons. Although we all have different values of levels of education from high school, we all go through an extensive understanding of plagiarism and we all begin here at the same level. We should have a level of infraction to be important, and they may have messed up a citation, but cheating on an essay is a big deal. Students that are applying to schools- they don’t get any repercussions. Med schools are really competitive programs, and that’s not fair to not report infractions.

Rachel Massey ’18: That was a lot, so I’m going to divide that into pieces. Not all professors treat plagiarism the same way. Even different high schools treat plagiarism a different way. People have different resources, and we don’t want to label something as disciplinary because someone just doesn’t know something. We don’t want to have this idea that the honor board is the police. We are here to look out and protect the community, and we are not here to ostracize people who have committed accidental infractions. Further, we have situations where students have received retributions that are not just us reporting to higher institutions. Professors can drop grades, so higher institutions have that to reflect on.

Katherine Larson ’19: This is only a recommendation to the dean’s office…?

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: So theoretically, all resolutions are recommendations because we are a group of students, but if this were approved, the deans would do this.

Sanya Aurora ’17: I think this is a pretty great idea. I had a pretty good training in India, but my other school didn’t have anything, so these standards aren’t accessible. I don’t want to be disciplined for something I didn’t understand.

Alison Robins ’17: I am for this. As a peer mentor, we don’t teach about plagiarism, and we don’t teach about it during customs week. The nuances of plagiarism are so intricate, it’s impossible to know everything. This is the way of the institution helping you, rather than dooming you. This is really important, please pass it.

Meera Jayaraman ’17: I am also a member of the honor board. Our cultural backgrounds and our class backgrounds are important to take into account. We operate in the grey area, so we can’t just place standards on to people; we want to see the compounds of this. We need to take into account cultural backgrounds, and the way I see it is the administration is trying to help us.

Maya Berrol-Young ’17: I propose an amendment? “Honor Board Hearings resulting in ESEM courses will not be reported to grad schools.”

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: We don’t want to automatically not report that, because we could have cases where plagiarism is very apparent and meaningful.

Charlie Bruce ’16: A vote- yes, no, abstain. This amendment does not pass. We will have one more minute for discussion.

Celeste Gambino ’16: So kind of to reiterate, it’s a little bit of confusion. ESEM is really not perfect, however, a lot of times professors don’t go over plagiarism. They will hand out a book, and it’s up to the students to educate themselves. It’s a lot of pressure. Also ESEM is only an example, ESEM is not a solid part of the resolution, but rather an example we choose to use.

Isabel Gellert ’19: I’d like to propose an amendment to the resolution that reads, “All infractions reported will be differentiated between disciplinary and not disciplinary.”

Molly Mac Dougall ’16: They can’t do that.

Isabel Gellert ’19: I drop the amendment.

Leah Baker ’19: I motion to extend time by five minutes.

Maya Berrol-Young ’17: I second.

Charlie Bruce ’16: We will need to take a vote. The options are yes, no, and abstain. This motion does not pass. We will need to take this resolution to a vote. The options are yes, no, and I abstain. This resolution passes. Resolution 5: Institutional Memory of the Self-Government Association, presented by Nora Dell ’19.

Nora Dell ’19: Whereas the knowledge present in SGA records dating back to 1892 could be valuable in solving present day problems. Whereas without institutional support or permanence, a project will face challenges in recovering and organizing those records. Whereas the following Subsection D in Article IV, Section IX reading, “The Traditions Committee may appoint a Bryn Mawr College historian”, has not been utilized in recent years. Whereas the work of a committee would make those records useable in a shorter period of time. Whereas Black at Bryn Mawr and similar student initiatives have done wonderful work preserving critical moments in our history. Whereas institutional memory, or the collection of learned experiences by a group of people collaborating in an institutional framework, is important for the transmission of learning from generation to generation, and injects accountability and transparency into the system of self- governance. Whereas this constitutional amendment seeks to make the preservation and presentation of institutional memory, in the spirit of those student projects, a permanent, intergenerational feature of the Self-Government Association. Whereas the lack of institutional memory among members of the SGA Representative Council and Executive Board pertaining to the history of their positions affects their ability to execute their responsibilities. Whereas the annual turnover of position holders and their constituents results in the forgetting of solutions to recurring problems. Whereas “improv[ing] the Self-Government Association’s ability to effectively and efficiently achieve objectives and confront issues through a commitment to the preservation and utilization of institutional memory” is a long term goal of the Representative Council.

Whereas the efficient and effective resolution of issues confronting the student body is a long term goal of the Self-Government Association. Be it resolved, that the following Subsection be removed from Article IV, Section IX: “Subsection D: The Traditions Committee may appoint a Bryn Mawr College historian.” Be it resolved, that “The Committee on Institutional Memory” be formed, hereby referred to as “committee” to collect, research, and publish materials pertaining to the short and long term history of SGA in the area of elected and appointed officials. This committee shall be comprised of up to six appointed positions, and chaired by a “SGA Archivist” who would be elected to serve on the representative council. Be it resolved, the constitution be amended as indicated in Appendix A and Appendix B.Be it resolved, that the “SGA Archivist” be elected through a Special Election to be held at the earliest opportunity following the passage of this resolution, in accordance with Article 9 VIII, Section IV, Subsection E of the SGA Constitution, and in the future through a normal elections round in the spring semester. Summary of Resolution: Objectively, this resolution increases the efficiency and effectiveness of the representative council, as well as our process of Self-Governance. However, it also seeks to build respect and community; institutional memory weaves a common narrative between us, fostering mutual understanding. It is that moral impetus that pushes this resolution forward, that pushes this committee forward. It is about bringing us together as we discover our shared history, as we discover our shared future. Appendix A: The SGA Archivist Add to Article II, Section I, Subsection C, a position of “SGA Archivist.” Add to Article IV, Section I, a Subsection S: SGA Archivist, reading: 1. The position of SGA Archivist shall be an elected position, held by only one person. 2. The SGA Archivist shall have one vote on the Representative Council. 3. The SGA Archivist shall attend meetings of the Representative Council and will advise on issues relating to SGA. 4. The SGA Archivist shall call and preside over meetings of the Committee on Institutional Memory. 5. The SGA Archivist shall present quarterly reports at Representative Council meetings on their findings that are relevant to current issues and discussions of the Representative Council and greater campus community. 6. The SGA Archivist shall, to the best of their ability, assist in carrying out the SGA’s long and short term goals. 7. The SGA Archivist shall collaborate with the SGA Executive Board and Representative Council to grow institutional memory continuously, from year to year. Appendix B: The Committee on Institutional Memory

Add to Article VI, a Section XIII: Committee on Institutional Memory (hereafter referred to as “The Committee”), reading: Subsection A: The Committee shall be headed by the SGA Archivist, and comprised of up to six additional members of the SGA. Members of The Committee shall be appointed by the Appointments Committee in the spring semester. Subsection B: The Committee will assist the SGA Archivist in carrying out the SGA’s long and short term goals. Subsection C: The Committee shall be responsible for the preservation and utilization of institutional memory in the Representative Council and the SGA. At least one member of the committee shall be responsible for collaborating with affinity organizations. Furthermore, the Committee will maintain a public SGA Archive. Appendix C: The Practical Role of the SGA Archivist

Following their election, and before the committee is appointed, the SGA Archivist will draft committee by-laws, in consultation with the necessary authorities. Furthermore, the Archivist will continue to build a relationship with special collections, working to establish a timeline for the creation of the ‘public archive’. The Archivist will also begin compiling material to present to the representative council on a quarterly basis.

10 Following the appointment of the “Committee on Institutional Memory”, the Archivist will work with the committee to refine and pass previously drafted by-laws. They will assign more specific responsibilities to certain members, among them being the constitutional responsibility to collaborate with AMO [Alliance of Multicultural Organizations] groups. The SGA Archivist will act as a resource to other representative council positions by allowing them to easily access historical documents and information relevant to their position. Moreover, the Archivist, possessing comprehensive knowledge of SGA history, will be able to bring up that history during meetings, enabling informed debate. Effectively, the Archivist “represents” past iterations of the SGA.

The SGA Archivist will also reach out to new members of the representative council to facilitate the transfer of knowledge and institutional memory from one class year to the next. This will allow representatives to actively participate in their responsibilities from day one. In sum, it is through the aforementioned that the SGA Archivist injects accountability into our system of self-governance.

Appendix D: The Practical Role of the Committee on Institutional Memory

The primary focus of the committee is the preservation of institutional memory. It will accomplish this in the following ways:

1. Putting archived materials into a useful format.
2. Reclaiming knowledge and expertise through oral histories.
3. Processing ‘exit surveys’ taken from members of the representative council.

The committee will preserve this information in a public, easily accessible archive. Creating this archive and processing the vast amount of historical information in special collections is the first undertaking of the committee.

In the future, the committee will actively build the public archive in collaboration with the representative council and members of the Self-Government Association. The archive itself will contain primary and secondary sources, as well as summaries of events and positions. The goal is for a reader to be able to view everything from the most basic of summaries, to the most detailed meeting minutes. Information will be available on a wide variety of topics, including special committees, special events, and the SGA budget. In 1892, the founders of our SGA said “it is by all coming together in one common aim that the true college spirit is aroused. This was done this year by meetings of our Self-Government Association. In spite of the mistakes we have all of us, from the youngest freshman to the most mature graduate of some larger university, come together for one purpose and one end - that end being all possible good that it is in our power to give Bryn Mawr.” Institutional memory, as you just heard, is the collection of learned experiences by a group of people collaborating in an institutional framework. So what this resolution is trying to do - it to bring the order of institutional memory to our self-government association. I want you to think about this in two ways. Objectively, this resolution creates a committee and a new position on the representative council to run that committee. And this committee will maintain a public archive - so if you want to know about the budgetary history of a club, you can know it. If you want to know about the history of a position or committee, you can know it. If you want to know about fasting in protest of the Vietnam War, or read the meeting minutes from 1992, or even 1892, you can do all of those things. But one of the most important things this committee will do is to continue to build institutional memory from year to year, so that we never again have to spend, what will be months, sorting through old, disorganized, partially incomplete records. It is my vision that even the class of 2052 will be able to go back and read about what we have said today, what we will say tomorrow, and the next - so on and so forth. But I want to think a little more subjectively. We are an institution. And I think what drives institutions forward is a strong moral grounding. This resolution represents fundamental institutional change. That is the kind of change that preservers long after all of us have left. Institutional memory weaves this common narrative between us - it fosters mutual understanding, trust, and respect. At the end of the day, it is that moral impetus that pushes this resolution forward. Institutional memory assists in building our community through efficiency and transparency, and through love and respect. It is about bringing us together as we discover our shared history - as we discover our shared future.

Charlie Bruce ‘16: We will now open the floor for 12 minutes of questions. Priority is given to question microphone.

Brenna Levitin ’16: I have a bunch of questions. First of all, have you discussed any of this with special collections? If so, what is their involvement? And I’m curious how you plan to create an archive?

Nora Dell ’19: I think it’s in one of the appendices? To access historical documents. Appendix C, first paragraph. So, a lot of records in special collections, so it would be to digitize them.

Anushka Robinson ’19: This is a good idea, but I have a couple of questions. Will this position only be with SGA? What about other areas of Bryn Mawr?

Nora Dell ’19: It is exactly as what is written. I wanted to create something with purpose. What the archivist will do is what will happen in SGA, and problems we confront, the nature of SGA is to come together and talk about issues on campus. What is in the archives is applicable to us, and we have special events, and under those special events would fall things like protesting. In the committee, we would make sure we are always collaborating with the community, and we can find evidence of it on the archive.

Delaney Williams ’17: Just a detail- spring semester has two election rounds, so like April and February. For which election would this be?

Nora Dell ’19: I left it vague so I could determine that.

Briana Grenert ’18: It seems to me that this is a really good idea. I think institutional memory is important.

Alexis Wiltshire ’17: How is this different from SGA secretary?

Nora Dell ’19: They would do work with archives, and would digitize that.

Elizabeth Vandenberg ’16: On page 10, in appendix c, you say, that they’ll develop committee bylaws- who are ‘they’ the constitution deals with, like the RepCo for most bylaws, and would yours be different?

Nora Dell ’19: I put that in there because I would run for this position and I don’t have a draft.

Elizabeth Vandenberg ’16: Do we ask students or special collections?

Nora Dell ’19: The EBoard and RepCo.

Brenna Levitin ’16: So you mentioned a public archive? Like Internet, are you talking about that? – It’s very vague. So much of this material is public already in special collections, so are you trying to make this material accessible? But it’s already accessible? I think this is very vague.

Nora Dell ’19: Digital Archive.

Brenna Levitin ’16: So I work for special collections, and you’re talking about an enormous amount of storage space for a digital collection. How will you fund that?

Nora Dell ’19: We discussed hard drives, but also the Wordpress.

Nolan Julien ’18: I believe that this would be beneficial as we have multiple events already that I feel deserve a separate catalogue. Being on the EBoard of NAACP and Sisterhood, you would have our support.

Hannah Chinn ’19: Follow up

Miranda Smith ’16: I motion we extend time 10 minutes.

Brenna Levitin ’16: Second.

Charlie Bruce ’16: The vote is yes, no, abstain. Motion does not pass. But remember you can still talk to Nora after this! We will take this resolution to a vote. The vote is yes, no, abstain. Yes- this resolution passes. Resolution six, Measure to modernize and rename the Alcohol Concerns Review Board in the spirit of self governance and continuing education, presented by Sam Heyrich ’17 and Bridget Murray ’17.

Bridget Murray ’17: Whereas The Alcohol Concerns Review Board (here in after referred to as “ACRB”) has recently become re-instated, after years of inactivity, in which time students affiliated with the board have graduated, and records relating to it have been lost. Whereas the role of the ACRB has changed since the time it was defunct, the culture of Bryn Mawr College continues to evolve and it proves imperative to update the board to reflect the needs of the community. Whereas it is in the spirit of self-governance, keeping our community safe and continuing and promoting education, the ACRB shall increase efforts of peer-education in regards to alcohol, drugs and parties in addition to holding those who violate the party policy accountable. Whereas there should be a student lead initiative dedicate to peer-education focused on drug and alcohol education, which shall promote the health and safety of all Bryn Mawr College Undergraduate students

Sam Heyrich ’17: The purpose of this resolution is to update the structure, function and goals of the recently re-instated Alcohol Concerns Review Board (ACRB) as the culture and needs of the Bryn Mawr College Community continue to evolve and it proves imperative to adapt the purpose and goals of the Board to more accurately reflect the needs of the College community. It is in the spirit of self-governance to keep our College community safe and to promote continuing education. The ACRB shall increase efforts of peer-education in regards to alcohol, drugs and parties in addition to holding those who violate the party policy accountable.

Melanie Bahti ’16: We have had this resolution read at SGA, and it looks like it has changed quite a bit since then. I’m curious as to what we are resolving?

Sam Heyrich ’17: A lot of it is in appendix B. I didn’t want to read it or it would confuse people, but I will read it now. Be it resolved that the name of the ACRB be changed to “Board of Social Life Orientation and Wellness (BSLOW)” as mentioned in every instance in appendix A. Strike Article VI, Section I, Subsection B, Sub-subsection 8. Be it resolved that Article VI Section XI Subsection B be changed to read “the members of the board shall be The Head of Social Committee, The Head of Campus Safety Committee, one member of the Honor Board and one Dorm President to be voted upon by the residence council. The head shall be a member of the board. The head of the board will be determined by the consensus of the board.”

Strike Article VI Section XI Subsection C. Be it resolved that Article VI Section XI Subsection B be changed to read “Quorum for a review session or hearing of the Board shall be 3 people.” Be it resolved that that there be a Section XI Subsection H that reads “the board shall be responsible for hosting continuing education efforts including but not limited to 2 events in the fall semester including one aimed at continuing education for all returning Bryn Mawr College undergraduate students and at least one additional educational event, and at least one in the spring semester.”

Miranda Smith ’16: You said that you didn’t want to read it or it would confuse people. What is being replaced then?

Sam Heyrich ’17: The names, it would strike the current number for quorum.

Miranda Smith ’16: Can you elaborate on that?

Sam Heyrich ’17: Yeah! So it, quorum, would be three people, so the people on the board would also be drastically reduced.

Elizabeth Vandenberg ’16: I was just wondering how the Dorm President process and honor board rep would be chosen?

Sam Heyrich ’17: We left this vague to establish the process in the future. We wrote it so it would be more modern, and so students in the future wouldn’t have to go through this process again.

Charlie Bruce ’16: Any more questions? To a vote! Yes, no, abstain? This motion passes. The next, and final, resolution is number seven- Recommendation for the Reinstatement of the Campus Shuttle presented by Niki Barker ‘16 and Rachel Bruce ’18.

Niki Barker ’16: Whereas many students, especially those with physical disabilities and health concerns, often find it difficult or are unable to access Brecon Hall, the Pensby Center, Cambrian Row, Batten House, and the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research (GSSWSR). Whereas many students taking classes at the University of Pennsylvania find it difficult or time-consuming to reach the R-100 (Norristown High Speed Line) due to the 1.5 mile distance, and the College only provides financial help for students using this form of transit.1 Whereas students may find it difficult to access Bryn Mawr Hospital and other medical offices and must often use a car service or Campus Safety to attend appointments, which presents a significant financial burden on students and a time/personnel burden on Campus Safety. Whereas the Lantern Van runs from 7:00 PM to 1:00 AM during weekdays and from 4:00 PM to 1:00 AM on the weekends, providing an invaluable service to community members with nighttime on-campus transportation needs. Whereas Lantern Van student-employees often find it difficult to find substitute drivers during nighttime hours when they may need to complete educational obligations.

Whereas the Lantern Van requires at least four employees to run a successful shift but does not currently have enough to consistently do so.

Whereas according to the Winter 2015-16 Student Accessibility Survey, 98% of students surveyed are in favor of one or both of two easier methods of accessing the Pensby Center/ Cambrian Row/Brecon Hall area of campus.2 Whereas the College ran a prior Campus Shuttle until 2009 (proposed by a Plenary Resolution in 1998-99) that made stops at the following locations: Glenmede Manor (no longer owned by the College), Pembroke Arch, the Bryn Mawr R-100 station, the Bryn Mawr and Rosemont R-5 stations, the Campus Center, Public Safety, GSSWSR, and Brecon Hall/Cambrian Row.

Whereas the reinstatement of the Campus Shuttle would open the campus for all community members regardless of physical status, impairment, or disability, and would greatly ease the social and time demands put upon residents of Brecon or Batten, visitors to Cambrian Row/ Pensby, or students who attend the Graduate School.

Rachel Bruce ’18: Whereas the reinstatement of the Campus Shuttle would increase the turnout for cultural and community events at the Pensby Center and Cambrian Row, as well as social events at Brecon Hall and Batten House. Whereas the reinstatement of the Campus Shuttle would allow students taking Penn classes to be able to more easily access the R-100 stop, as well as allow students to return to Bryn Mawr’s campus in a timely manner. Whereas the reinstatement of the Campus Shuttle would allow the undergraduate student population to more easily access graduate school-level courses and resources and allow the graduate students to better access main campus resources. Be it Recommended that the College reinstate the Campus Shuttle to run during class hours (approximately 7 AM to 7 PM) and during the day on weekends (approximately 10 AM to 4 PM), circulate at least once per hour, and that the College hire a professional driver(s) to staff the Shuttle during the daytime hours. Be it Recommended that the Campus Shuttle make the following stops: Brecon Hall/Cambrian Row, Pembroke Arch, Bryn Mawr R-5 Regional Rail Train Station, Bryn Mawr R-100 Norristown High Speed Train Station, Rosemont R-5 Regional Rail Train Station, and the GSSWSR. Be it Recommended that the College hire more students (a recommended total of 20 employees overall) to work for the Lantern Van so that the service can have multiple vans running nightly (including an accessible van available upon request), students are able to find substitutes when necessary, and increase work-study/job opportunities for students. We propose to reinstate the Campus Shuttle to make the Bryn Mawr campus more accessible for all community members. BMC had a Campus Shuttle which was stopped in 2009 due to budget cuts. We recommend to have the reinstated shuttle make stops at Brecon Hall/Cambrian Row, Pem Arch, the Bryn Mawr and Rosemont Regional Rail stations (R-5), the Bryn Mawr Norristown High Speed Line station (R-100), and the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research (GSSWSR). We also propose to expand staffing for the Lantern Van so that the service can run more efficiently at night when the shuttle would not be in service.

Charlie Bruce ‘16: We will now open the floor for 12 minutes of questions. If you have any questions, please line up.

Shiwei Zhu ’19: What route would this take?

Niki Barker ’16: We are proposing a circular route, but we don’t know for sure exactly yet. We created a map in appendix A, but transportation would have to figure that out.

Precious Robinson ‘19: I think this is a fantastic idea for accessibility and financial accessibility. The R-100 is significantly cheaper than the Bryn Mawr Station. I’ve already had to take out loans, I don’t wanna have to take out loans for SEPTA. Students shouldn’t have to sacrifice their experience here, this is fantastic.

Abby Ackerman ’17: This was cut before due to budgets? How do you envision this, then?

Niki Barker ’16: The funds would be determined by the appropriate authorizes. I think the controller’s office. Appendix B shows who specifically we have talked to.

Elizabeth Vandenberg ’16: What follow up budget cycle would this go though, would you be submitting this budget?

Rachel Bruce ’18: The proper authorizes - ideally we would have this go into affect as soon as possible, but specific logistics would be determined by the proper authorities.

Elizabeth Vandenberg ’16: Who are they?

Rachel Bruce ’18: Transportation and the President.

Miranda Smith ’16: I understand that the budget is important, but if any space on this campus is not accessible to a student, we are not doing our jobs. It is vital to have our campus be a safe and inclusive space.

Steffany Chou ’18: When would this be implemented?

Niki Barker ’16: Ideally as soon as possible, we are fairly late in the budget cycle, possibly next year.

Devin Arey ’16: I really like this. I was wondering about the lantern van, though?

Rachel Bruce ’18: We had considered that, but the lantern van is a student run service, and they are students first. We also looked at a second blue bus stop, but that schedule is set according to classes, and it’s already tight.

Niki Barker ’16: Also, it’s a big liability if students were running this.

Alison Robins ’17: I support this, but I have a question. I was wondering why the Rosemont rail?

Rachel Bruce ’18: That was suggested by Mike Ramsey, it’s more accessible for people.

Revital Laurence ’19: In terms of financial burden, do we have to buy new busses?

Niki Barker ’16: We already have vans for this.

Lauren Dana ’16: This would be a very useful resource to have for hospital trips.

Nolan Julien ’18: I am currently taking a class and I need to use the R-5. A day pass is 12$ a day, which is a lot of money a week. I want to be able to buy stuff, so if Bryn Mawr is willing to something that can help make things cheaper for us, I’m for it. I think we should pass this.

Kit Webber ’18: Have you taken any steps on the environmental protection?

Rachel Bruce ’18: We have thought about it. Transportation will work those things out. We think, however, that the student body has a large desire and need for these buses.

Kit Webber ’18: Just because people want something doesn’t mean it’s good for the environment.

Joie Waxler ’16: So, I’m for this, I think it’s really great for accessibility. What about the vehicles- are they wheelchair accessible?

Niki Barker ’16: We already have a wheelchair accessible van that we would use.

Revital Laurence ’19: I motion to extended time by five minutes.

Brenna Levitin ’16: I second.

Charlie Bruce ’16: Vote to extend time, yes, no, abstain. This motion does not pass. We will now go to a vote. The options are yes, no, abstain. This motion passes. Anassa kata, kalo kale, Ia ia ia Nike, Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr! Thank you all for a successful plenary!

*February 21st, 2016 /// 4:00pm Plenary Ends*