

Representative Council Plenary

Transcript Spring 2026

This RepCo Plenary transcript was created by Evan Pineo '28, Maya Tan '27, Zara Kepler '28, and Yeseo Lim '28 to the best of their abilities. Quotes may not be accurate or verbatim. Any edits made after the transcript was sent out are marked enclosed with [brackets]. Moments where strikes occurred are noted with **XXX**.

RepCo Plenary officially began and met quorum at 7:13pm.

Esénia Bañuelos '26: Welcome to RepCo plenary. Tonight is not about voting on resolutions whether you like them or don't like them. I'm Esénia. I'm the outgoing SGA president and I'm here with the amazing two incoming presidents over here we have Autumn Kelly and Angi Lee. Please give them a round of applause.

Applause

Esénia Bañuelos '26: Tonight we have 11 resolutions to get through, as you have noticed we are in Dalton 300. Why we have the lights off, is if you turn the lights on right now you basically can't see the screen. If you have your phone with you, I'm gonna show your QR code, so that we can turn the lights back on. It starts to get a little...It's kinda hurting my eyes. You guys can scan this code and it should take you to the doc immediately. So make sure you have it so we can turn on the lights and we don't have eye strain especially with these colors that are really bright. Let me know if ... you want me to keep this up in front of you? Scan it because we're probably gonna turn the lights on in a few minutes. Make sure also to download it, because as you can imagine a lot of people on the same doc can make the doc pretty glitchy. I'm going to go over here to turn on the lights. You guys tell me what you prefer in terms of lighting. If you guys prefer the dark, tell me. Yay or nay.

Yay

Don't go any brighter? That's awesome. Thank you guys. Alrighty. As you might have seen on our Instagram posts and materials on your table, there's a lot of important resolutions reaffirming our SGA resolution and honor code. A lot of these resolutions are going to be quite lengthy; we aren't going to read every single word. A lot of these are routine or changes we do every single year. Please, please, please, read it. It's like terms and conditions, you're just hitting

yes or no or abstain. We're gonna read the whereas and be it resolved of every single long resolution. A lot of these resolutions are incredibly important. These resolutions go from affirming student media from going to the practices the college employs in private investigations to looking at the deans panel process, etc. A lot of you guys may not have been here for yesterday's big cheese forum. On the tables too you'll find a different QR code that says the history of big cheese. I think it's very important that everyone has a version of the document with them. It basically goes over a narrative history of Big Cheese, and as you guys might have seen on our presentation over here, it actually shows how big cheese originated from a controversial moment, because big cheese . It started as a response from then president Jane McAuliffe trying to implement a campus in Abu Dhabi every single semester every year. Since then it's been another scandal, another controversy, something else that's really big and serious. Then again, big and serious tend to define big cheese and things many of us know that. Whether you have been here all four years or this was your first year. So everybody have the packet? Does everybody have the voting form open in a different tab on their google chrome? That is also on the tables so make sure you scan that, especially if you came in late. It says open. Do not hit yes no or abstain. If it's not loading, tell me personally. It's a link to the slides and not the questions? Is anyone else having that problem? Awesome. What I'm going to do is, can everybody go to mentimeter.com, um and then what I'm going to do is, hold on I'm going to have everyone just like kahoot enter a code and then you can just log in to the mentimeter. It will say enter code to join a live Menti. The code is, yes ... thank you Angie ... **XXX** The code is, starting again, **XXX**.
Angi. Angi.

Isabelle '26: And wait, Esénia, are we doing the thing where we limit how long we can talk about each resolution? 10 minutes?

Esénia ‘26: Yes. Only 15 minutes. Every single one. The 15 minutes starts after we read the resolution. If... We wait 20 seconds, usually at RepCo plenary, for someone to raise their hand and provide a comment or suggestions if 20 seconds have passed, we start the timer.

Blanca ‘26: The Mentimeter still shows the slides for me

Esénia ‘26: The slides? Oh, then just don't vote.

Blanca: No, like, not any questions. Like, just the slides.

Esénia ‘26: Ugh.

Isabelle ‘26: Wait, refresh your page because other people's is fine. **XXX**

Esénia ‘26: Okay guys, do not hit yes. Can someone refresh right now?

Yeseo Lim ‘28: It works.

Esénia ‘26: It works? It works. Do not hit yes no or abstain. I'm gonna leave it open like this on my phone. Can people see options now?

Audience says yes.

Esénia ‘26: Don't hit yes no abstain. Without further ado we have everything that we need, our voting, we have our packets, let's get started. The first resolution that we are going to present is ... we have the document open really quickly ... This is definitely the resolution. RepCo plenary ,here we go. Alright, so Isabelle, come up. Resolution #1.

Isabelle ‘26: oh that's me

Isabelle ‘26: *Presents Resolution #1.*

Resolution #1: Reaffirmation and Recommitment to the Values of the Honor Code

Presented by: Co-Heads of the Honor Board Isabelle Stid ‘26 and Julia Kotes ‘27

Summary: This Resolution serves to reaffirm our commitment as the Self-Government Association to the values of the Bryn Mawr College Honor Code. Positive confrontation is necessary for the Honor Code to work. The Honor Code calls upon students to positively confront infractions of the Honor Code face-to-face and in a constructive manner. We acknowledge that the active practice of positive confrontation is necessary to maintain the Honor Code as a contract between students and a defining factor of the relationship between students and faculty. We reaffirm our commitment to practicing such confrontation and to upholding the Honor Code's values of honesty, integrity, respect, and restorative practices.

Whereas, the Honor Code is the foundation of the Bryn Mawr College community,

Whereas, the Honor Code offers Bryn Mawr students unique academic and social privileges, including, but not limited to, take-home tests and quizzes, self-scheduled exams, and self-government,

Whereas, the Honor Code centers truth-seeking and restorative practices by creating space for conversations among community members to occur after a breach of trust or violation of the Honor Code,

Whereas, the continued life and health of the Honor Code relies on community investment and engagement, particularly through being willing to engage in positive confrontations after a breach of trust or violation of the Honor Code,

Whereas, all members of the undergraduate community have a responsibility to abide by and uphold the Honor Code,

Whereas, positive 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),

Be it resolved that, we, the undergraduate students of Bryn Mawr College, reaffirm our commitment to the Honor Code.

Esénia '26: Perfect!

Isabelle '26: Any questions? If there's no questions, I'm going to give a spiel. No questions. Well I will say, this is very important at this point in time, because we also really think about in what ways can we, and I'll share the spiel also at plenary, but in what ways do we expect the privileges of having the Honor Code without doing the responsibilities of what that asks of us and I think that's a big thing and we should all think about that, especially as it seems more and more we fall back from the responsibilities that we owe to one another, but still expect these privileges, which will not work for long.

Esénia '26: Thank you Isabelle. Alright, we are going to start with voting. Please open your mentimeter right now and vote yes, no, or abstain. Okay, hold on, wait. One second. It should say Honor Code at the end. We're gonna change it to Honor Code. Mentally change it. I'll mentally change it after we hit quorum. We need three more. 36.

Isabelle '26: Come on, people. Who's not voting? You can click no, like, I don't GAF but just vote.

Esénia '26: We're still at 36. Something is...

Natalie '26: Mine says view only, like it won't let me vote.

Isabelle '26: View only? What were you gonna vote?

Natalie '26: Yes.

Audience laughs.

Isabelle: Alright, we're at 37.

Esénia '26: We're at 37! Still two more, we're still not at quorum. We need to pause. Is there anybody else that is struggling to open Mentimeter right now? If not, we probably need to ask the people... we need one more.

Isabelle '26: Who was taking that long to vote? Get it together.

Autumn '27: We need one more.

Esénia '26: We're at 38, wait actually, did we make it? Oh, we're at 39. passes. Awesome. Let's go. We have voted to affirm the honor code. Right, so the next one is...

Evan '28: Wait, can you read the results?

Esénia '26: Oh yes, 39 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, passes. Alrighty, so as you guys may have heard, I'm going to give a very brief summary of the big cheese email and what's going on over here, a little bit of what we talked about yesterday, the importance of the resolution, and also the fact we have this resolution that is something built on what we decided and what we talked about last night. It's very... I don't want to say unfinished, but it deserves a lot of you guys' attention and we really want your feedback as much as you can give it and really I think talk a bit about Big Cheese. I think a little bit about big cheese, for one it's an event that's existed since 2008 hosted, and in general it been hosted in the same exact way, questions are asked, in the constitution under the responsibility of the SGA President, Big Cheese exists for particularly as a panel of administrators or other people in power as the guests of big cheese, but we don't have anything about the structure that's codified. There's nothing that's protecting the ability to ask questions, there's nothing about structure, that's remained very salient over the past couple years, there's really nothing about the goal or mission of big cheese, especially after what I heard

yesterday, what are our values... the ability and right for students to ask questions, in particular, how do we just in general, move not just as one body of students within but like between ourselves but also how do we interact with faculty, senior staff, administration, and all these other entities. As an SGA we, in particular, have just as much opportunity to have a voice to ask questions etc. The point of this resolution is to give structure to what we know as Big Cheese. Now, many of you might be freshman and only know big cheese from what you experienced in the semester before. I highly encourage you to look again on your tables and really make sure you read a bit about Big Cheese. Maybe even see the text from the slides, some of them are a lot of quotes. In general, I think it is really important that we discuss what is the structure of Big Cheese is and what is the change we need, what some arguments we can make, based on the language and the questions on the constitution are. Angie and Autumn, can you read the Big Cheese resolution?

Angi and Autumn: *Reads resolution #2.*

Resolution #2: Codifying the structure and mission of Big Cheese and student/senior staff communication

Introduced by SGA '25-'26 President Esénia Bañuelos '26 and '26-'27 Presidents Angi Lee '27 and Autumn Kelley '27

Summary:

The SGA Executive Board has held Big Cheese every semester since 2008, an event expressly dedicated to “creating more transparency for students” through questions asked to senior staff and prominent faculty and staff of Bryn Mawr (SGA Constitution, pg. 5). Despite this salient

feature of the event, the structure of Big Cheese is not protected under the SGA Constitution, and the available information does not reflect the importance or organizational expectations of Big Cheese.

This event has been defined by the ability for students to ask guests questions. Spring 2026 Big Cheese was canceled due to the invited guests' declination to participate in an event where questions are asked. This resolution codifies the structure of Big Cheese to ensure that the event may only be hosted by the Executive Board within these historical parameters. On Tuesday, March 17th, 2026, the Executive Board held an open forum to gauge student interest in redesigning Big Cheese, and students generally elected to retain the structure, though to add an introduction at the beginning that explained the history of the event briefly.

Whereas, there is no language in the Constitution explicitly detailing the structure and procedures concerning Big Cheese,

Whereas, the Constitution does not state that questions about campus concerns must be asked during Big Cheese, despite evidence of a question and answer portion in every Big Cheese since 2008,

Be it resolved, this new addendum to the Self-Governance Association Constitution would provide specific language detailing guidelines for the purpose of Big Cheese and how it should be conducted,

Be it resolved, the new Self Governance Association Constitution will codify that the President of the College, the Dean of the Undergraduate College, along with members of administration, must attend Big Cheese,

Be it resolved, it will be made mandatory that all future Big Cheese Forums must be transcribed, archived, and accessible to the Bryn Mawr campus community and the public,

Be it resolved, Big Cheese will be a productive space for students to address their issues with the College.

Esénia '26: So, in general, if you want to look at the language, we talk a little bit about what is exactly is being changed. Some of the things people wanted were people suggesting additions or specific language that would protect Big Cheese as it exists. I'm going to go over here. One thing that we talked about is we need to make sure Big Cheese happens because what is the ultimate goal? Well, Big Cheese needs to return, right? But it's not just about Big Cheese returning because, again, the reason we cancelled Big Cheese is that we wanted the opportunity to see if we can ask questions. At the moment, the only structure, the only opportunity to host Big Cheese, was going to be a closed discussion. There was not going to be any opportunity to ask a single question of the guests who were originally going to sit on the panel, and that also

included me and also the Honor Board heads. We were originally going to sit on that panel, and it was just gonna be a discussion about how campus safety is holding responsibility. Which is true, but in general, I think this level of change that was, I want to say, not necessarily asked of us to make. I think, really importantly, we just need to make sure what it is that we want, particularly, about the structure to remain salient, so we added SGA will host with senior staff, several opportunities throughout the year, not just Big Cheese for students to be able to come together and ask questions, also engage in dialogue with senior staff. Particularly, this discussion, as it regards to Big Cheese, has historically always included serious campus and relevant off campus concerns relevantly as we gauged from Fall 2025 Big Cheese this can be about **XXX**, this can be about surveillance on campus, this can be about...in general really any aspect of these topics should not necessarily be avoided by Big Cheese or any of the organizers of Big Cheese, by any SGA that is coming after us or in particular any future collaborators or guests of Big Cheese. Another thing that people wanted is a revisiting, a very brief revisiting, just like how we do at plenary, of the history of Big Cheese and how it started. I think really naming that history is really important because something I found out is that I didn't really know too much about Big Cheese before I became SGA president and really did not, you know people when people would tell me you know Big Cheese really just became contentious, or Big Cheese became this really controversial event, I just took it and I didn't question question it, right? I imagined it just was a natural evolution of cancellations and differences between administration and students, but as we have discovered as it's available in that document and in the slides, it's really important, like it's always considered controversial or even mildly contentious events on campus. We really wanted to make sure we made a history, that was a suggestion from one of the attendees last night. Big Cheese will remain a protected event under the SGA president, something that is also very

important is that we are also adding to article 5, which is the assembly under the SGA constitution. And here, we specifically name out the Big Cheese procedures, which is the exact structure. “The Big Cheese forum is an event for students to ask questions about campus and relevant off campus concerns to a panel of administrators at Bryn Mawr College to create more transparency for students.” This is actually, this language already existed to describe Big Cheese. It was already for the purpose of transparency on campus, we added the rest. “In accordance with the history of the event, it is expected that the President of the College, Dean of the Undergraduate College, and Provost attend each Big Cheese and invitations are inherently sent to them as early as possible.” This is naming in particular the fact that even though the president and the dean of undergraduate college and faculties, residential life, are people we kinda expect every single semester is not really anything, there’s no invitations to make sure this happens. This is actually a very specific, since one of our questions was is there any roles that need to be at Big Cheese for it to be productive every single semester and students particularly named these roles. The Dean of the Undergraduate College, The President, and the Provost. The SGA President solicits topics and relevant material in the months leading to Big Cheese, which is what I did at the beginning of the semester and also in fall 25 and spring 2025. Communication about pre-selected topics will be released to guests as soon as possible. That is not new information, all questions, all topics that are presubmitted are released to Big Cheese guests within two weeks of the event. That is really important to name outright. The next thing is each Big Cheese must begin with a brief history, well yes, with a spontaneous open forum is what actually follows. We have the history, we have the presubmitted questions part, and then we have the Q&A. If you guys remember Fall 25 Big Cheese, about 30 minutes of that was the q&a. I think it’s really up to each individual SGA whether they do a limit in terms of like whether students fill out or if they

want to sign up for topics like plenary, we think it's really up to any SGA how many questions each student can ask. Like, last semester we limited students at two questions. All of these things are really up to each individual SGA and their needs as they see it. Regardless, what needs to be salient and protected is the fact that we have a Q&A following or at least as part of the SGA event. Yes, go ahead.

Rai '27: I just have like one concern.

Evan '28: Can you say your name and class year?

Rai '27: Um, I'm Rai... Uh... Class of 2027? Uh, and, sorry about the confusion.

Anyway. At the top of the resolution, where it says the new self-governance association will codify the president of the college and the dean of the undergraduate college, along with those ... must attend big cheese. I worry because I was aware that in the past a Big Cheese event, like the president of the college had decided not to make it and we still had Big Cheese and it's still important for those who did appear and have that opportunity. I feel like there could be like a reword ...

Esēnia '26: Okay!

Rai '27: ... of the situation just like in case especially because of the "must attend" piece of it. I feel like, it's just this, like, so it doesn't seem like, we're putting like, um uh just to be more amicable in that sense even though we want them to attend and we wanna make it mandatory we dont want it to come off as, um, I don't know. I just feel like the language could be kinda...

Esēnia '26: Do you want to propose an amendment following ... ?

Mistica Mendoza '27: ...

Evan '28: Can you say your name and class year?

Mística Mendoza '27: Oh, sorry. Mística Mendoza Perez '27. Like, I guess... I would like to add onto that thought would be getting another notification from the President, like two weeks ahead of Big Cheese, and give a reason why she or they will not be attending so at least students are aware the president won't be there, but at least we have other people in the staff.

Esénia '26: Perfect. So, like, for example, let's say it's not that they must attend, um, but if they aren't going to attend, they have to explain or at least give notice that they won't be there. So, I'm going to finish reading this first, but then I'm going to go to Rai and do two more amendments. Are you proposing an amendment, by the way?

Mística '27: I guess so?

Rai '27: Can we do a joint amendment if possible?

Esénia '26: Yes. Alright, so, okay. And then, um, following this. I mean, the only relevant info is that under the Secretary of the SGA Big Cheese events will always be transcribed, which is another big thing that was really important to bring your institutional memory to these events. Not only that but other public facing events that involve collaborators, that involve students, staff, that involve faculty. All of these events need to be transcribed, this specifically emerged because actually there was a stretch of about 7 or 8 years where no Big Cheese's weren't transcribed because they posted the agenda on the Bryn Mawr SGA website. All of that stuff is lost. We don't want that to happen again. So, we also have that. Is there anything else? I think it's pretty much it in terms of responsibilities in terms of Big Cheese. I'm going to start with the two amendments. Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Isabelle.

Isabelle '26: I just had a question, I'm keeping time. My question was, so, with this certain parties thinking Big Cheese is polarizing and not really wanting to participate anymore, is the, like, plan of this to kind of make this resolution knowing that it likely will not change other

parties' non-participation? Almost as like a gotcha, like, we made this rule, you weren't attending! I guess I'm just interested in, like, how we think this will materially change the fact that parties aren't participating because they think it's polarizing.

Esénia '26: Right. Right. Good point, I mean really here's nothing we can functionally do to force anyone to come to Big Cheese. I think you can't really force in the room anybody to do anything. ... I think really importantly what this kinda shows is every single event in the SGA is otherwise preserved by procedure pretty much to the T in the constitution. Big Cheese has not had that kind of or enjoyed that kind of privilege, even though we followed a salient structure all these times is fine. I think really one of the things I'm trying to accomplish with this is Big Cheese was almost completely changed. We went from 2 questions per each student to zero questions to be answered by any student. That is a massive change. That is a massive chop, concerning chop, and also I mean talking about Big Cheeses or events by SGA that aren't necessarily co-constructed with students or particularly decisions that can necessarily be informed by the entire student body. I think really I think this entire resolution puts forward a decision by the student body to decide that, okay, this event, which has been hosted every single year for the past 18 years, has a structure. If they decide not to attend, even then, I mean again, even then, there is still going to be this at least preservation of the event. Couldn't another event happen? Maybe it's not Big Cheese, but maybe another SGA comes up with an event that's inviting senior staff to come together that doesn't follow the rigid structure of Big Cheese. I think that's totally fine, but in terms of preserving this piece of Bryn Mawr history? I think it's really important that we cement it. That we keep it. If there's anything else in the future proposed together to the student body...

Isabelle '26: No, that makes a lot of sense and that's very helpful for my thinking. I just didn't want it to be a gotcha thing. ...

Esénia '26: Oh yes. Again, we really wanna make sure that Big Cheese itself is preserved, but also, I mean students we spoke to really said they wanted this particular event and the structure to come back and I think if this is what students want, then if we pass this resolution depending on those numbers, that will really show, I think, to the rest of the entire populations on campus what that would look like. So, we're going to start with amendments. Any more questions I can answer really quickly? I mean, ask your questions actually. Let's start with amendments. I think what we are going to do ... how do you guys want to combine both of these amendments and both of these goals. Think of a salient way to combine them. This exact language is what would be voted on by students.

Isabelle '26: Wouldn't an example be, sorry not to jump in here, but Provost, Dean of the College, President, ought to attend Big Cheese, and if are unable to, must publicly say why two weeks before the event?

Mystica '27: Um, yep.

Isabelle '26: Must publicly give notice and reason?

Rai: I think even, like, instead of "ought to," we could say "is encouraged" or "is expected to"?

Audience talks.

Isabelle '26: Sorry.

Mistica: I think the ought to is good enough because, regardless, if they say yes or no ... and give me a reason I don't feel well yes ... we don't have to like guess ... but it would be ought to.

Blanca '26: My name is Blanca. Class of 26. I think “expected to”, like you said over here, is also a really great phrase because I think it underscores the relationship students have with members of senior staff that we know, they have something to say, and answers to our questions and we know that they know that we have questions, so I think it really highlights the fact that we’re in community and we need something from them, whereas “ought to” is impersonal so I think it should be “expected to.”

Esénia '26: Is there anybody else who has any feelings on any way of ought to or expected to? Rai and Mistica?

Mistica '27: I prefer “expected to.”

Esénia '26: Right. Awesome.

Maia '26: Yeah, so, going back to what Isabelle said about giving public notice, do you feel like or think giving public notice is necessary or would it be like notify SGA e-board in a timely manner? I feel like ... I have ... Like, more like... I just don’t know. I feel like I have like or like, or what does the public notice look like?

Isabelle '26: I think that was what someone else originally brought up, right? Or, I don’t know. I’ll say I’m sure the public notice would be “Oh, we don’t want to because it’s like such a polarizing event, whatever whatever” but I think that in and of itself has value, but also I thought someone else over there said or “if they can’t go say why.”

Esénia '26: Yes, they said that.

Isabelle '26: So yeah, I was just thinking language.

Maia '26: I’m just thinking is that going to take the form of an email to the whole school or can it be like an email to SGA E-board?

Caroline '28: Like including in the transcript?

Evan '28: Name?

Caroline '28: Caroline '28.

Evan '28: Yeah, yeah.

Caroline '28: Like email SGA privately and their notice of lack of attendance is included in the transcript?

Esénia '26: We could, we could include it in the transcript, but I think what's happening here is so students know before Big Cheese, just so they're aware of it. We could definitely include it in the transcript after "just so you know, President was absent here."

Isabelle: I don't think Cadge needs to send a whole email, like "I'm not coming", but I'm thinking Cadge should email us, or not Cadge, or senior staff. You know what I'm trying to say. They will notify the SGA E-Board who can then choose to share that out.

Esénia '26: Alright, so, Rai... I'm going to start writing it because it's easier to see when voting. I just want to have a specific sentence that we can all vote on. We're all voting on this one amendment. So, the President of the College, the Dean of the Undergraduate College, and provost are expected to attend Big Cheese. If they are not able to attend, they are... they must notify SGA within... what is a good window? Do you guys want a window? Two weeks?

Audience agrees with two weeks.

Mistica and Rai: Two weeks.

Esénia '26: This is going to take a second for me to type, just to make sure the language is clear. Yes. Every person says their name. Except, I think... Yes, every person says their name.

???'26: ... Class of 26. My concern with the two week notice is the off chance that an actual situation does arise. That's a really like, I doubt if they're cancelling ...

Isabelle: I think if a situation did arise, they would just not come, and we'd be like oh sorry, my dog just died. Oh my God. You're all good.

??? '26: Can we add something?

Isabelle: Considering we aren't physically forcing, I don't think it's worth it to add, like unless there's numbers ... something.

Caroline: Is it more to address people choosing not to attend?

??? '26: I didn't want it to sound like hold accountable and they were still expected to come or something.

Esénia '26: We're just going to rock with the assumption that if you're not coming...?? Then like, let's say, probably not going to come... At least we have like this expectation and specific guest list, for example, some people might just wanna hear from student engagement ... okay so ... The President, Dean of Ungraduate, and Office of the Provost are expected to attend big cheese. If not they must notify the SGA Executive Board within two weeks. Okay it doesn't let me because of the title limit assume that when it says that it says within two weeks. This is the entire amendment. Is this okay, Mistica and Rai?

Mistica: Yep.

Rai: I don't know if you're writing it so you can see it on the screen or if you're just saying it out loud.

Esénia '26: I'm writing it so that when you guys will be able to see it but when it says "w", imagine it says within two weeks. And you guys should open Mentimeter and see the amendment now. Yes, no, abstain to pass this amendment. Here we go. 30. We're missing 9. 8. 7. 6. 6 more votes needed. 2 more votes needed. 1 more vote needed. Okay, so this passes. 34 yes ... is there any other amendments or things you would like to change?

Caroline '28: Yes, um, Caroline '28. Kind of unrelated and I'm just kind of floating this, but like, can we add an amendment that people can ask for clarification when someone asks ...

Isabelle: I think that's just like assumed.

Caroline: But having that without it being one of their two questions, like being able to say can you expand on this?

Esénia '26: I can say. We don't have limited questions, that's just like, independent decision up to the SGA each year.

Caroline: Can we say that would be restrictive on their follow-up question if there ... People being able to ask that without it being a follow up...

Isabelle: When we had a limit, the follow up counted.

Caroline: You would have to ask, can you clarify on that, like that kind of sucks that's me basing that on ...

Esénia '26: I'm going to say, it would be up to the board ... like decisions about plenary about that but does anyone in RepCo feel really strongly that a follow-up question should be protected by the constitution? Alright. Any other amendments or changes that you would like to recommend to the Big Cheese resolution. Any clarifying questions we can ask? This is the last chance to make any changes. Okay period.

Isabelle: There's like 10 seconds for questions left.

Esénia: Oh. Okay, period. I'm going to exit really quickly and we're going to start with the vote. We passed that amendment and now we're passing the resolution of the amendment, not the resolution ...

Maia: Say again?

Esénia '26: If I put this vote up here that says codify Big Cheese with the amendment.

Maia: With the amendment.

Esénia: So, with the amendment, again a reminder the amendment was “The President, Dean of Ungraduate, and Office of the Provost are expected to attend big cheese. If not they must notify the SGA Executive Board within two weeks.” We’re going to vote on the actual resolution itself with the amendments. Yes, no, or abstain. We need 39 votes. 15. 19. 22. 6. Okay. Ring our votes please. Two votes. Any issues.

???: Can I get a yes vote?

Esénia: 38 one more. Anyone else having internet issues? Yes. Perfect. 39 this passes, it’s going to plenary. We move on to resolution #3. Alrighty so, passing ahead to adding a portrait of Enid Cook to the Great Hall, written by Alexie Coleman and presented by Angi Lee ‘27 and Adara Alexander.

Angi Lee ‘27 and Adara Alexander ‘27: Reads Resolution #3

Resolution #3: Adding a Portrait of Enid Cook ‘31 in the Great Hall

Written by: Alexie Coleman ‘27

Edited by: Angi Lee’27

Summary: Enid Cook was the first Black woman to graduate from Bryn Mawr College in 1931, earning her degree in Chemistry and Biology. Despite this, she faced many hurdles, including not being able to live on campus. The College has a history of excluding Black students from admission, and, once they were admitted, they were not allowed to live on campus. It was not

until 1948 that the first Black student, Gloria Millicent White, was able to reside on campus.¹ In 1970, Black students showed up to protest a list of demands urging the college to house them in a Black Cultural Center. The Perry House was established, but with it came the struggle that Black students have always endured on campus. Perry House was far from the main campus and became uninhabitable and went offline in 2012, making Black and Latinx students concerned about their future in a living space.² It was not until 2015 that a Black cultural center for Black and Latinx students was built and named after Enid Cook.³

Fast forward to 2023, not too long ago, M. Carey Thomas' name was removed from the Old Library, where the Great Hall stands,⁴ after a long history of racism and anti-semitism tied to the building.⁵ This was executed through the hard work of BIPOC students during the BMC Strike in 2020, which the College continues to dismiss.⁶ The Arch Project, unveiled in April 2025, brought new ideas for creative historical art meant to commemorate Black staff who worked to build Bryn Mawr at the height of exclusion.⁷ A Portrait of Enid Cook in the Great Hall, formerly named after Thomas, would create a new legacy at Bryn Mawr, continuing to honor Black students, staff, and faculty at Bryn Mawr who were excluded from residing on the main campus. The Great Hall is a space where many cultural celebrations take place, and it should be a place where Black history is honored. Today, the College asserts itself by committing to its mission statement on racial justice, equity, and inclusion.⁸ However, there is no visual sign of Enid Cook and her legacy here at Bryn Mawr outside of the Black and Latinx cultural center (The Enid Cook Center '31) behind New Dorm. Furthermore, it was not until the Fall 2025 Plenary that the Black at Bryn Mawr tour was recognized in the Black Studies Plenary

Resolution as a tour that should be mandatory for incoming students, staff, and faculty.⁹ The College is still committed to its mission statement, and by denouncing the history of the College that was perpetuated by hate and discrimination—this resolution is meant to recognize Enid Cook '31 and other Black students who were not able to live on campus, and ensure that their efforts are also celebrated outside the Black and Latinx cultural center.

Whereas, the College must be held accountable to uphold its commitment to racial justice and equity.

Whereas, many students, faculty, and staff do not learn about the history of Enid Cook' 31 unless they take a Black at Bryn Mawr Tour.

Whereas, learning and knowing the faces behind Black History on campus is important in denouncing the racist history of the College.

Be it resolved, the portrait will honor black students, faculty, and staff who were not allowed to stay on main campus.

Be it resolved, the portrait will be visible and big enough to see.

Be it resolved, the College will coordinate the process of the portrait with the Intercultural Dean of Engagement, the Impact Center, and the AMOs: Sisterhood*, Mujeres*, BACaSO, and Zami+.

Be it resolved, that if Special Collections does not have an archival portrait, then a new portrait shall be done by a local Philadelphia artist and funded by the President's Office.

Esénia: Alrighty, any questions for our resolution writers?

Rai '27: I had a question about where you wanted the portrait to be in Great Hall because I worry that like there might be disagreements as to like where it may be placed and discourse. It may be placed in a corner. I wouldn't want it to be, I'd rather it be one of the first painting you see having that as a note to, just as you said about the size, it should be visible. It should be one of the first things students should see when they enter.

Angi: Yeah, go ahead.

Blanca '26: Blanca '26. Okay, I agree but most of the portraits in the Great Hall are to the side because the first thing you see when you enter the Great Hall are the windows... um kind of all the portraits are to the side either next to athena or kind of to the left when you enter so I think that like making an amendment to ensure that this portrait would be like front and center could be a good idea, but it would probably go with the rest of the portraits which is where I think it should go to should seeing as Enid Cook is part of Bryn Mawr College's history, just like all the other portraits, not necessarily special or unique to Bryn Mawr College's history. I understand it though.

Angi: Thank you so much for your comment Blanca, and back to you Rai?

???: Like Blanca said, alternatively if it were to be more front and center, my idea would be to the left or right of Old Library because it's right there front and center. We're not allowed

to put it outside or inside where it explains the plaque. But, my first thought is definitely in the Great Hall with the rest of the portraits.

Esénia: Any other questions? Rai, did you have any clarifying questions after that?

Rai: No, no, no, no. I forgot what Great Hall looks like

Audience laughs.

Esénia: You're so good. Alright, without further ado we're going to start with the voting process. Alrighty, one sec as I get this up. Alrighty, um, please open your voting your mentimeter and vote yes, no, or abstain to adding a portrait of Enid Cook to the Great Hall. 8 more votes, that was really fast. Thank you guys. 4 more votes. Sorry, 5 more votes. Anyone struggling with the WiFi? Verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain. One more vote.

Paulina '28: She will be proxying for me.

Esénia: Passes 39 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Thank you, Angi, Adara, and Autumn. Alright, moving forward to another incredible resolution by Adara Alexander, SJE Head, resolution #3, mural in the tunnels.

Adara '27: *Reads resolution #4*

Resolution #4: Mural In the Tunnels

Presented by: Adara Alexander

Summary: Underneath Bryn Mawr's campus lies a network of tunnels that Black Bryn Mawr employees were historically forced to use, as they were required to work out of sight of the rest of the campus. These tunnels today have been largely cut off from student access, but still can be accessed under Old Library, where the location has been repeatedly defaced by graffiti. This resolution aims to create a mural in the tunnels in order to accurately show what the tunnels were, reclaim the space, and prevent further acts of vandalism.

Whereas, the tunnels are under Carpenter and Old Library,

Whereas, there is currently no official statement about what the tunnels are inside the tunnels besides a 4x4 piece of paper located at the far end of the tunnels,

Whereas, despite word of mouth, not everyone is aware of the history of the tunnels, to the extent that the location has been used as a location for graffiti, specifically, the signing of people's names,

Be it resolved, by Bryn Mawr hiring Black artists and Students to create a Mural spanning the tunnels to both properly commemorate the space, and stop the anti-black practice of graffiti in the tunnels

Adara: So, um, yeah, that's pretty self explanatory, but I do want to add that through the funding for this would come from either the President's Office or Impact Center and we would work with the Black at Bryn Mawr Tour. Shout out Jasmine! And, yeah, we would students would have a voice in selecting the artist. We would curate a bunch of Philly local artists and we would make sure that they were all paid, same with students as well and we would try to get a grant. If anyone has any questions?

Isabella: Should we just add that as an amendment?

Adara: Oh, yes.

Isabelle: I propose an amendment.

Esénia: Adara, I'm going to ask you to repeat that one more time so I can keep the language, and I will say, it's a little bit cut off, but ... Maia is it okay that I abbreviate the amendment for the document? A lot of it cannot fit on the document.

Maia: Adara, can you repeat the amendment?

Adara: Of course. So, um, words. Um, funding for the mural would come from either the President's Office or the Impact Center and students would be compensated from the President's Office or Impact Center and would have a voice in selecting the artist via a list of curated artists from a list of curated local Black artist.

Esénia: Alright... local Black artist... gets paid... Alright.

Adara: Would it be useful to have an amendment that states which students or should I like specify like AMOs more specifically?

Esénia: That really is up to you.

Adara: Okay. I think it's fine.

Esénia: Alright, so, we're going to move forward and vote on this as a resolution. As a reminder, I'm going to open it up now. It says President's Office or Impact Center funding, students would be compensated by the grant from the President's Office or Impact Center and a list of curated local Philly artists. Vote right now. We need 39 votes. That was really fast. 16 votes. We need 10 more votes. 2 more votes. Alrighty. 1 more vote please. Oh, yes?

???: I was basically gonna say what Isabelle said, and I don't know if it just wasn't included in the Mentimeter, but would it be productive to also include that you would be working with Black at Bryn Mawr Tour or is that something you would more want to talk to them afterwards instead of officially saying it in the resolution?

Adara: Sure?

Jasmine: Do it!

Esénia: So, we're gonna do a sections amendment in that case. To say what we have so far, 40 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no. President's Office Impact Center funding, collabing students would be compensated by the grant, local Philly artists curated by a list, then we have the second amendment that says, that this is... remind again the language for Black at Bryn Mawr? Or can you remind me of the idea you had?

???: Umm I just mentioned, like, "this will be undertaken in collaboration or coordination with coordinators at Black at Bryn Mawr."

Esénia: Okay. This project will be undertaken in collaboration with the coordinators of the Black at Bryn Mawr Tour. So, this is amendment number 2 “The mural project will be undertaken in collaboration with the coordinators of the Black at Bryn Mawr Tour.” We need one more second. Alright, vote now. 39 yes. 39 votes yes, 0 abstain. As we are voting right now. Jasmine, go ahead.

Jasmine: Can I add something? I don’t know if I’m allowed.

Esénia: People are still voting right now, but depending on what you say we can add another amendment.

Jasmine: Just that like there’s... we now have Black at Bryn Mawr signs around the tunnels, there are like our own poster boards now. I don't know if you wanna include that instead of like an official thing.

Esénia: Poster boards in what sense? In terms of like... just to add it as a part of the mural project?

Jasmine: No, like they're there, they just got added Hell Week. I don’t know if you wanna add that. Just in case they’re like “Oh but there are already things there”, like they might push back against you like why do you need something else if there are already signs. Because these are new signs that weren’t there before.

Esénia: Let’s see, so for example, like if senior staff were to say we already have the poster board, why do we need more?

Jasmine: Yes, exactly. Maybe like, I don’t know how this works not gonna like, but just something acknowledging that there is something there, but also that recognizing that something more has to be done.

Adara: So, maybe like, i.e. there are Black at Bryn Mawr signs already has signs, this should also be an addition just to acknowledge.

Esénia: I'll say we have still not passed this current amendment. The new amendment that Jasmine is proposing, we're going to do a new amendment, but the current amendment, is the mural project will be undertaken in collaboration with Black at Bryn Mawr. We need 9 more people. 29 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain. 8 more people. 8 people that need to give verbal yes no or abstain. We still need 8 more. Yes. Verbal, what's your vote? 32 yes. 6. We need 5 more.

Adara: Anyone having internet issues?

Isabelle: Guys, c'mon, vote. Who hasn't voted? C'mon. Who hasn't? Look around.

Esénia: We still need 5 more. Who cannot log in right now? Verbal yes, no, or abstain. I know 5 people didn't walk out of this room, so why are taking...

???: It originally was on the other question, so people might have voted, like the vote on the Honor Board, so people thought they voted, but then the question was done.

Isabelle: Should we just do a close your eyes quick vote?

Esénia: Everybody close your eyes. Let's do it. Alright, raise your hand if yes. Some people are also holding multiple fingers, make sure you have that as two people.

Isabelle: Yep, we're good. Passes.

Esénia: Perfect, yes, passes. Thank you so much, that was more than 39.

Isabelle: 39.

Suli '26: I'm sorry, I'm Suli class of 26. There are a couple typos in it, can we get those fixed before it goes to the whole school? Like, Carpenter is misspelled. Those are just things that I... small details.

Adara: I already sent out the revised document.

Suli: Awesome. Thank you.

Esénia: We're going to do this third amendment really quickly which is just to acknowledge the existing contributions from Black at Bryn Mawr in the tunnels. Acknowledgment resolution... Do you just wanna acknowledge it in the resolution or in the actual project itself too?

Adara: Um... in...

Esénia: Because we're saying weacknowledge but in what way are we acknowledge? Like is it just the language of the resolution or is it like...

Adara: The language of the resolution. Like, as a major, like there is...

Esénia: Ah, okay, perfect, okay. Just a reminder of what we're doing. We're taking whereas there is currently no whereas statement, but instead whereas there is already an existing contribution from Black at Bryn Mawr.

Evan '28: That doesn't make any sense.

Esénia: Alright. So. Now, we're voting on this third amendment. Acknowledge the resolution. Whereas there is currently an existing contribution from Black at Bryn Mawr. 30 more votes. 23. 21. 17. 15. 12. 9. 6. 5. Anybody verbal yes?

??: Yes

Esénia: Thank you so much. 38. One more. Huh? There's a yes here. We already counted it okay, perfect. One more. Yes, no, abstain.

Isabelle: So help me God y'all, we're gonna have to do another quorum check if we don't get this.

Esénia: Perfect. It passes. Yes. 38 yes, verbal yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Um, any more amendments to this resolution before we pass the resolution with these three amendments?

Perfect. Now we are going to attempt to pass this resolution to plenary. Open your mentimeter. Alrighty, so. We are passing, or we are attempting to pass this resolution with three amendments to add a mural to the tunnels. We need 16. Verbal yes verbal no. 11. 8. 9. 3 more. 2. Verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain. 11. 8. 9. 3 more. 2. Verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain. It passed. 39. It passes to plenary. Thank you so much, Adara. Resolution #4, updating SFC By-Laws and new budgeting rules.

Jet: I'm Jet.

Zoe: I'm Zoe.

Jet Taylor and Zoe Beer: *Reads Resolution #5.*

Resolution #5: Updating SFC By-Laws and New Budgeting Rules

Presented by: Zoe Beer '26, Co-Treasurer of the SGA and Jet Taylor '27, Co-Treasurer of the SGA

Summary: The SFC Bylaws have not been updated to reflect SGA Treasurer practices and changes that have been passed down throughout the years. Reflecting on the “budgetary crisis” from Fall 2025, the current SGA Co-Treasurers have deemed it necessary to update the Student Finance Committee Bylaws with clearer guidelines and set forth new rules to stabilize SGA funds in case of another downturn. The goal of this resolution is to secure Bryn Mawr student clubs and committees for the future and equip future Co-Treasurers with clearer, more progressive guidelines. The SGA Co-Treasurers, Zoe Beer and Jet Taylor, have updated the SFC Bylaws to reflect accuracy and practice.

Whereas, the SFC Bylaws are outdated and its language has not been officially updated since Spring 2024.

Whereas, the SFC Bylaws are not up to date with SFC and SGA Treasurer practices,

Whereas, in Part II, Section 15 (b), the language used is “If clubs fail to spend 75% or more of allocated money, they face a penalty of 25% of their entire budget.”

Whereas, in Part II, Section 15 (c), the language used is “If clubs overspend their budget, it will come out of next semester’s budget.”

Whereas, there is no established Safety Fund that ensures the SGA Budget runs on a continuous surplus and has a constant source to pull from in case of emergency.

Be it resolved, SGA Treasurers have rewritten the Bylaws to reflect utmost accuracy.

Be it resolved, the SGA Treasurers have rewritten the Bylaws to reflect current practices and proceedings with the Office of Residential Life and Student Engagement.

Be it resolved, future SGA Treasurer(s) can refer to this updated bylaws document document for SFC and club proceedings.

Be it resolved, Part II, Section 15 will contain rules on overspending allocated SGA club budgets rather than detailing consequences for underspending.

Be it resolved, Part II, Section 15 (b) will reflect a new rule for overspending funds such that SGA Treasurers will stop reimbursing club purchases once that club's total budget has been spent.

Be it resolved, in Part II, Section 15 (c) establishes that overspending will be allowed at the SGA Treasurer(s)' discretion should extenuating circumstances arise on a case-by-case basis for individual clubs.

Be it resolved, Part VIII has been updated to establish a Safety Fund in the SGA budget and reflects the need for a long-term mindset. Part VIII outlines the rules of maintaining the Safety Fund for future SGA Treasurer(s) who will hold authority over the account. By establishing a safety cushion in times of emergency, future SGA Treasurer(s) can be better prepared for a budgetary crisis.

Be it resolved, every semester, the SGA Treasurer(s) will maintain a Safety Fund in the total budget. This fund must always hold at least 10% of the overall SGA budget available for that semester and must be used only in case of emergency. If some of the safety fund is used, the Treasurer(s)'s first priority will be replenishing it to the 10% mark.

Zoe: If you're curious, there's an updated link to our by-laws that have all the details.

Esénia: Thank you so much, Jet and Zoe. Do we have any questions for our treasurers?

Katerina '28: Hi, I'm Katerina '28. I was wondering about the be it resolved, it was like, before that, it was saying that overspending funds that SGA will stop reimbursing club

purchases. Is that kind of like, if an emergency does happen, like the last be it resolved, could people get reimbursed in case of like emergency overspending?

Zoe: Yeah, thanks for the clarification. That's what that means. It means that if you are having some certain extenuating circumstances, whatever that may be in your communication with us, we'll work with you on that.

Katerina '28: Okay, great.

Esénia: Any more questions for our lovely treasurers? Go ahead.

?? '27: I'm ???, class of 27. I'm curious if you guys have a definition for what constitutes an emergency ... ?

Zoe: We don't have defined emergency, but I think for future treasurers and also the student body if you guys deem a budgetary crisis. At the moment, we don't have a clear definition.

Esénia: Anything else for our treasurers?

Natalie '26: In the be it resolved, it will contain rules for over spending rather than detailed consequences for underspending, does that mean that there is not that it's being shifted that there isn't consequences for underspending or will it just be new?

Zoe: That's correct. The whole underspending got a little tricky and it's just too much to account for every time, so the mindset has shifted.

Natalie '26: I'm Natalie, class of 26.

Esénia: Alright. Anything else? Anything before we start with Autumn with voting?
Alright, Autumn. Alrighty.

Autumn: Alright, it's live now.

Esénia: The faster you vote, the faster we get to our resolution. You aren't voting on if you like it, we're voting on whether we should send it to plenary. So, this should not be too much of a complicated decision. Yes, no, abstain.

Autumn: 5 more people. Yes, no, abstain, no internet not working.

Esénia: Passes 39 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Thank you, Autumn. Alright, so, moving on to resolution #5: affirmation of support for student media. We have our presenters in this room, yes. Feel free to just ...

Nomah Elliot '27: So, we wrote this mostly in response, um I'm Nomah, and I wrote this along with Hannah Epstein. She was the main writer. Give her the credit. Rana Rastergaria, and Isabelle Protopapas. Isabelle and I are the current EICs for the Bi-Co News. Hannah and Rana are the outgoing senior ones and we wrote this mostly in response to um the administration response to our article that we put out last semester on private investigations, as well as the events, the emails Wendy sent out to campus, things said at Big Cheese. A lot of the text of this is based on the official guidelines from the Student Press Law Center, but, yeah. So the whereas is ... *reads resolution #5*

Resolution #6: Affirmation of Support for Student Media

Written by Hannah Epstein '26, Rana Rastegari '26, Nomah Elliot '27, and Isabelle Protopapas '28

Summary: Across the country, the student press has faced unprecedented pressure from both federal and administrative forces. In April of 2025, nonprofits working to protect student media issued a warning on the impediment of outside influence on student newspapers, the first of its kind. Signed by six organizations, including the Student Press Law Center and the Associated Collegiate Press, the document outlined how federal organizations, under the jurisdiction of President Donald Trump's administration, have put student journalists in a uniquely difficult position. College campuses across the nation have faced substantial and unprecedented pressure from the White House amidst a looming possibility of federal funds being pulled and the rising risk of ICE presence on campuses. Coverage—especially on administrators' response to these pressures—is needed more than ever before. But such coverage now comes with novel risks.

Last semester, our reporting on the hiring of private investigators at Bryn Mawr College led to a pushback from the administration that we have seldom experienced in our more than century-long history. To put it bluntly: President Wendy Cadge repeatedly attempted to discredit our work and tarnish the reputation of our student journalists. She has subsequently failed to either apologize or address her behavior, even after acknowledging the legitimacy of our reporting.

Universities and colleges are at a pivotal point in their histories. Administrators, many facing extreme pressure from federal authorities, are taking extraordinary actions to limit the freedom and autonomy of student journalists. At the University of Alabama, two student magazines—one dedicated to uplifting Black voices, the other centered on women—were suspended by the university's administration, who cited Trump's anti-DEI legislation as their motivation behind the decision. At Indiana University, the student newspaper's faculty advisor was fired after refusing to censor the paper at the administration's request. The examples go on.

The purpose of this resolution is to showcase student support for the free press before we take this policy to Bryn Mawr's Board of Trustees. If adopted by them, the policy outlined would give us the ability to continue our work, offering crucial information to the Bi-College student body uninhibited by the influence of administrators and without fear of reprisal from their offices.

Whereas, student media is facing an unprecedented risk of censorship across the nation;

Whereas, Bryn Mawr College does not currently have a policy outlining its commitment or protections to student journalists;

Be it resolved, Bryn Mawr College shall adopt the following policy on free expression and the protection of student media.

Be it resolved, Bryn Mawr college shall publish the following policy on their website, and circulate it to all faculty, staff, and students.

POLICY ON FREE EXPRESSION AND THE PROTECTION OF STUDENT MEDIA

Based on the official guidelines by the Student Press Law Center.

Bryn Mawr College recognizes the value of a free student press as a necessary forum for uninhibited discussion about The College. It is therefore the policy of Bryn Mawr College's Board of Trustees that all student-edited campus media are designated public forums for student expression and thought.

It is the policy of the Bryn Mawr College's Board of Trustees that students shall have the right to determine the content of student media. The following guidelines relate both to establishing grounds for actions subsequent to publication, as well as a commitment to the protections of student journalists on campus.

Preamble: Any disciplinary action must be conducted in a system that provides adequate due process. The burden rests with the college administration to demonstrate the necessity of its disciplinary action.

This policy does not authorize or protect school-sponsored media that:

- *Is libelous or slanderous;*
- *Constitutes an unwarranted invasion of privacy;*
- *Is obscene;*
- *Violates federal or state law; or*
- *So incites students to create a clear and present danger of the commission of an unlawful act or the violation of a lawful school policy.*

It is the responsibility of student journalists, not Bryn Mawr College, to ensure the following:

- *That all media produced is held to the highest standards of journalistic integrity;*
- *That all quotations which are published are reasonably verified/fact-checked;*
- *That news is presented in an objective manner; and*
- *That all student media offers reasonable room for comment when giving a platform to accusations against a person or institution.*

Bryn Mawr College publicly adopts the following protections for a free, independent, and uninhibited student media presence on campus:

I. Bryn Mawr College shall not...

- A. Ban student expression solely because it is controversial, or gives platform to "fringe" or minority opinions, or is distasteful, unpopular or unpleasant;
- B. Prohibit student journalists from publishing/partaking in criticism of the policies, practices or performance of faculty, college administration officials, the college itself or of any public officials;
- C. Impede Student Governance Association funds to official student media because of disagreement over editorial policy;

- D. Ban the publication or distribution of material written by non-students;
- E. Engage in any activity or cause which attempts to control, diminish, manipulate or otherwise censor student media;
- F. Engage in any activity or cause which dismisses, punishes, or retaliates against student media staff due to disagreement over editorial content, and where such action is motivated by otherwise lawful content or newsgathering activities;
- G. Engage in any activity which attempts to publicly discredit, defame, or malign student media and student journalists, where such action is motivated by otherwise lawful content or newsgathering activities.

II. Adviser job security

- A. The student media adviser is not a censor. No person who advises student media will be fired, transferred or removed from their position by reason of their refusal to exercise editorial control over student media or to otherwise suppress the protected free expression of student journalists.

III. Prior review/restraint

- A. No student media, whether official or non-college-sponsored, will be subjected to mandatory review by college administrators, faculty or employees prior to publication or withheld from distribution by any representative of the College.

IV. Liability for student media

- A. As recognized by several courts, the college assumes no liability for the content of any student media over which it exercises no editorial control. The college urges all student journalists to recognize that with editorial control comes responsibility and potential liability for all content and newsgathering decisions.

Upon passing of this resolution, these statements shall be published in full on Bryn Mawr College's website, circulated to faculty, students, and staff, and become official college policy.

Nomah: Any questions?

Isabelle: I guess, my question would be like, just from a trying to think of how to ask this. From a strategic standpoint, if you're asking for a new policy to be ... I guess this is more of a comment than a question and it's a little controversial. If you're asking for senior staff to adopt a policy, like I'll just say to me it seems silly in that same ask to be like "boo you senior staff". I

would just keep the boo you senior staff private. I think it would make it more likely to be an adopted policy, but that's just my two cents.

Nomah: Yeah.

Esénia: What would be... if you're suggesting an amendment...

Isabelle: No, I'm not suggesting an amendment. I'm making a generally...

Nomah: Was there like a specific line?

Isabelle: ... statement just in the background, of like, if you scroll up Esénia? I mean, like, y'all do what y'all want. I don't know. I think it would make it much more like.

Esénia: Do you mean like in the summary?

Isabelle: No, I mean, I think to put it bluntly, "Wendy repeatedly attempted to discredit our work and tarnish the reputation of our student journalists" I think Wendy's not gonna be super likely to adopt the statement after reading that.

Audience laughs.

Isabelle: But, I mean, that's just my two cents.

Nomah: Um...

Evan: I mean that's what she did...

Nomah: I think that's a really good point.

Isabelle: You catch more flies with honey.

Nomah: Can I introduce an amendment then?

Esénia: You can.

Nomah: Um, yeah. Can we just? I think it is hard. I think we can...

Isabelle: But if that's what the people who wrote it think is best. I was just saying to myself that it would seem...

Nomah: I think that we can redact everything past in that paragraph “to put it bluntly”.

Isabelle: I’ll say I’m not suggesting that as an amendment, but you are. I just think it’s just bad to write that because I just think that’s not a good way to get what you want.

Esénia: So for example everything that in this paragraph, to put it bluntly, remove these sentences? We’re introducing an amendment to remove “to put it bluntly, President Cadge repeatedly attempted to discredit our work and tarnish the reputation of our student journalists. She has consistently failed to either apologize or address her behavior even after acknowledging the legitimacy of our reporting. You need to put redact. Alright, we are currently writing this. Yes. Alrighty, so, we’re going to start. We’re going to... This is an amendment to remove the sentence that starts with “to put it bluntly” ...

Isabelle: I’m not suggesting this, but...

Esénia: Anybody who wants to give verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain. 31.

Evan: 31? Vote!

Esénia: I meant 31 people have voted! Not that we needed 31 votes. We’re not flopping!

Evan: Oh, I was like damn guys.

Esénia: Let’s just say I have sauce. 34 yes. Verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain.

Blanca: Whenever I’m voting, it says I have to push. I have hit yes, no, abstain, but I keep trying to vote and it says I’ve already responded to the question.

Isabelle: Just vote twice.

Esénia: I’m gonna assume that’s a yes, so 39 yes. Sorry, not 39 yes. 35 yes, 0 no, 3 abstain. This amendment passes. Any other suggested amendments or questions for our resolution writer? Okay, we’re gonna move on to vote to pass this resolution with the amendment. Alright, setting it up so it says with amendments. Alrighty. Check on your

mentimeter. We're voting right now to pass the resolution with the amendment to plenary.

Thirty... Three more. Yes, no, abstain. Verbal responses.

Autumn: 3 more, 2 more, 1 more.

Esénia: One more. Yes. verbal yes, no, or abstain. 37 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Thank you so much, Nomah. Perfect, passes. Alright, moving forward we have now... resolution #6 out of 11. Please make sure you're actually reading these resolutions as soon as you get the chance, especially before plenary, just so people actually know what they're voting yes, no, or abstain on. Next up is, there is a resolution from Co-Heads of the Honor Board, Isabelle and Julia, presented by Isabelle, updates to reflect best honor practices. Isabelle also...

Isabelle: Bootlicker City let's get in here. So, what are we doing? Sorry. Our changes. We are making some changes. We are doing this in two different ways. There are 4 major changes, I'm going to quickly walk you through them, then I'll do the whereas. The first one is to clarify what the role of the Dean Designee is. Right now, we don't say you have to be a certain staff level position. They could be like pull a total banana wanna move. Back in the day when we had Mia Harevy, they could say Mia Harvey is the head of the Honor Board. That was something they could do. We're now saying it needs to be at a certain institutional level so that person in that position has freedom to make choices that go against what other administrators want so that they have the institutional where withall to not be worried about job security if they make a choice that the higher ups disagree with and also so that they have the experience to handle really difficult situations, so we are saying this person has to be a director, assistant director, associate director, dean, assistant dean, or associate dean. That's kind of the pay level of a college, like our college, that makes sense for this type of position, um, in my opinion, Julia's opinion, Dean Rocco's opinion, and general vibes wise. That's the first one. It's also to clarify that who appeals

would go to. Right now, it says that appeals would go to the President. This just does not make sense in the 21st century, when the role of the President of a College is not running the day to day institution but is in long term fundraising and strategic visioning, y'know? Like Wendy should not be the person who decides if you get a zero on your math test. That doesn't make sense. Wendy's not qualified to make that decision. She has a PhD in religion. That's not who you want being in charge. I'm a religion major. I can say that.

Audience laughs

That's not who you want saying you get a zero on your math test. You want someone who has like... **XXX** That's who you want appeals to go to. Dean Tomiko, her background is like student services, life, whatever. If that ... it would go to the provost. Again, just makes sense, clarifying. Next one is if a social honor board hearing is called, we would have three student reps from the academic board serve along with the heads of the honor board. This is just clarifying a previous change where we clarified that social honor board panel would be drawn from the academic honor board. This makes it much easier to have social honor board hearings because in the past it was randomly selected students, so I would be like you're having a social honor board. I would be like you, you, you. Come to this hearing. Decide on the students fate. Please be confidential. That's not a great system. So now we changed it, so we're drawing upon students who are already trained and we already trust with a certain level of confidentiality. Now, we're clarifying that it's three students. What other changes did I make? Yep, that was it. Clarifying dean designee and appeals process. Yep. alright. So, any questions now or later?

Esénia: questions now

Isabelle: Questions, feelings, thoughts, reactions. No? Wow...guys I want a controversial one. *Reads resolution #7 whereas*

Resolution #7: Updates to Honor Code to Reflect Best Modern Practices

Presented by Co-Heads of the Honor Board Isabelle Stid '26 and Julia Kotes '27

Summary: This Resolution serves to make a few minor, but crucial edits to the Bryn Mawr College Honor Board to align the Honor Code with both our current practices and to ensure the ongoing relevance of the Honor Code in modernity. This resolution seeks to make three changes.

The first change is to clarify the role of the Dean Designee. Currently, the Honor Code states that the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board is the Dean of the Undergraduate College, or a full-time staff member that the Dean appoints. As the College has expanded, it is rare that the Dean of the Undergraduate College now has the time and flexibility necessary to serve as the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board. This position is typically filled by a designee; however, this resolution seeks to clarify that this designee must have the position of Associate or Assistant Dean or Associate or Assistant Director. This change would ensure that the Dean Designee has enough institutional power to act truly independently with the Head(s) of the Honor Board, as well as enough training and experience to handle complex academic or social cases.

The second change is to clarify that if it is a Dean Designee serving as the Dean Co-Chair, then any appeals to Honor Board processes would go to the Dean of the Undergraduate College, rather than the President of the College. This change, again, is modernizing what is written in the Honor Code to what makes sense in the 21st century, when the role of President of a College is now much more focused on long-term planning and fundraising than adjudicating student processes. Thus, having the President of the College receive appeals is anachronistic to how our institution now functions. Having the Dean of the Undergraduate College receive appeals ensures that appeals are addressed by someone familiar with Honor Board procedures and trained in student services.

The third change is to clarify that if a Social Honor Board Hearing is called, three student representatives from the Academic Honor Board will serve as the Board, along with the Head(s) of the Honor Board. In Spring '25, students voted to change the makeup of the Social Honor Board panel from randomly selected undergraduate students to being members of the Academic Honor Board. This change lessens concerns about confidentiality and scheduling. However, the last update did not clarify how many members of the Academic Honor Board would serve on a Hearing, and this Resolution seeks to clarify that it would be three members. This matches Academic Hearing procedures and would ensure that there could be substitute Honor Board Representatives if some have a preexisting conflict or relationship to either the confronting or confronted party.

Whereas, the Honor Code is the foundation of the Bryn Mawr College community,

Whereas, the Honor Code is a living document that must be periodically updated to represent changing roles and norms in higher education,

Whereas, the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board ought to have a designated level of institutional knowledge, power, and freedom, and thus should only be held by those in the Associate or Assistant Dean or Director position,

Whereas, as the role of College President and Dean of the Undergraduate College have evolved, it now makes more sense to have the Dean of the Undergraduate College receive appeals (if a Dean Designee is serving as the Dean Co-Chair) as they are more knowledgeable and experienced on issues of student life and proper Honor Board procedures,

Whereas, the same number of panelists on Academic Hearings (three) should also serve on Social Hearings to ensure adequate representation while weighing concerns about confidentiality,

Be it resolved that, we, the undergraduate students of Bryn Mawr College, adopt the above outlined changes (to clarify who may serve as Dean Designee, update the Honor Board Appeals process to include the Dean of the Undergraduate College, and specify that three student members of the Academic Honor Board will serve on Social Honor Board Hearings) on March 29th, 2026.

Current Honor Code: <https://sga.blogs.brynmawr.edu/honor-board/honor-code/>

Proposed Changes (in blue):

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/15GMAD482gxS-FrEKABqm2WKxM1loXFxyw7xhSOpe64/edit?usp=sharing>

Isabelle: You can see my changes in blue, woo! So pretty.

Esénia: Alrighty, any lasting questions, amendments, comments, anything. Alrighty,

Autumn, let's open this vote. Alrighty, voting yes, no, or abstain. 10 more.

Angi: Vote! Any verbal votes?

Autumn: It passes.

Isabelle: Let's go people.

Esénia: Woo. Passes. Resolution #7: Changing the Language of the Honor Code in relation to ... '25-'26 Honor Board futures committee.

Marley '26 Alright, so this resolution is very long because the entire Honor Code is pasted at the bottom. You don't need to read all that. So, this resolution is basically shifting the language of the honor code specifically when it talks about elevating an honor board hearing to a dean's panel hearing. So, currently it has the word, I believe the phrasing is "the dean co-chair will consult with the head of the honor board". Our resolution is proposing that the physical steps that ... will be taken for that escalation to proceed so there's less wiggle room available. It says here in recent institutional memory, so specifically looking at spring 23, the vagueness around that word consult and phrasing of that, was utilized and a lot of people felt that the processes that came from that were unfair. So, this resolution basically aims to put in language the physical process that will be undertaken to move an honor board hearing to a dean's panel hearing. So,

Reads resolution 8.

Resolution #8: Changing the Language of the Honor Code in Relation to Dean's Panel

Presented by the 2025-2026 Student Constituency of the Honor Board Futures' Committee

Summary: In recent institutional memory, it has been unclear what the role of the Honor Board is in the decision making process around the escalation to a Dean's Panel. Our resolution aims to increase student power by instituting an actionable step involved in escalating an Honor Board hearing to a Dean's Panel hearing.

Whereas, we, the members of the Undergraduate College of Bryn Mawr College, demonstrate our interest in each individual's capacity for personal integrity and our belief in the principles of self-governance by affirming our student community on a system of academic and social honor;

Whereas, this system depends for on continuing support from every member of the Association for its success, both those attending classes at Bryn Mawr, and those visiting our community;

Whereas, the Honor Code demands that each student live with integrity and discretion in their own life and with respect and concern for others within the larger cooperative community;

Whereas, the Dean's Panel exists at Bryn Mawr College as an escalation of an Honor Board hearing when it is deemed the subject matter of the case is beyond the scope of an Honor Board hearing;

Whereas, in our commitment to self-governance, the student body reserves the right to self-autonomy over disciplinary procedures, which in relation to Dean's Panels will be recognized by the head of the Honor Board;

Be it Resolved, In determining whether a Dean's Panel is appropriate, the Dean Co Chair of the Honor Board and the Head of the Honor Board must come to a signed written agreement that an escalation to a Dean's Panel is warranted.

Be it Resolved, If the Dean Co Chair of the Honor Board and Head of the Honor Board are unable to come to an agreement, the decision will pass to the President of the Student Government Association and the President of the College who must then come to signed agreement

Be it Resolved, If either Dean Co Chair of the Honor Board or the Head of the Honor Board are unable to sign due to external circumstance, their designee will become either the President of the College or the Student Government Association President respectively

Be it Resolved, we, the members of the Self- Government Association of the Undergraduate College of Bryn Mawr College, do hereby adopt this Honor Code:

THE BRYN MAWR COLLEGE HONOR CODE (Proposed Edits for Spring '26)

Whereas, we, the members of the Undergraduate College of Bryn Mawr College, demonstrate our interest in each individual's capacity for personal integrity and our belief in the principles of self-governance by affirming our student community on a system of academic and social honor;

Whereas, this system depends for its success on continuing support from every member of the Association, from those attending classes at Bryn Mawr, and those visiting our community;

Whereas, this demands that each student live with integrity and discretion in their own life and with respect and concern for others within the larger cooperative community; therefore be it

Resolved, that we, the members of the Self- Government Association of the Undergraduate College of Bryn Mawr College, do hereby adopt this Honor Code:

We, the members of the Undergraduate College of Bryn Mawr, have come together in this community in order to create an environment in which each member is able to realize their full potential — a potential which is realized through intellectual and social growth. Such an environment is possible in a community that values respect and concern for individuals and with this respect and concern, a commitment to communication. We have founded our community on the honor and integrity of its members. We trust that each student will be guided by the values of this community. Such trust is essential to maintaining the reciprocity on which our community is based.

Our intellectual and social development requires freedom born from trust. For growth requires more than blind adherence to a code of conduct, it requires reflection upon our actions and how our actions affect those with whom we share the community. Such reflection is only possible when one's judgment is trusted.

Growth also requires that we take responsibility for our judgments, actions, and also for our student community. At the heart of growth is the process of learning. Learning is dependent upon an exchange of ideas, a dialogue that can only occur when there is mutual trust, respect, and concern. These qualities are natural in a community where the members are aware of their interrelation and interdependence. Through the community we are able to create an atmosphere for growth and learning as the maintenance of the community has the identical requirement for success as does the process of learning-dialogue. The quest for the realization of potential that has spawned this community has an intellectual component that extends to a mastery of academic subjects. Fundamental to intellectual development is a social one in which the members of this community reflect upon citizenship and what it means to belong to this community, or any community. The environment for learning that we have endeavored to create rests upon our sense of responsibility to the community, our peers within the community, and to ourselves. Basic to this learning process and the growth of this community and its members are a respect for and value of each member as an individual and also for the wealth of diverse experiences and backgrounds each of us brings to our community.

Although we entered into a community that existed before our arrival, we recreate the community through our participation. Our continued commitment not only to our own development, but to that of our fellow community members, results in the enrichment of our atmosphere, the strengthening of our foundation, and the constant reaffirmation of our community. Although our community is based on mutual respect and trust, tensions often arise between interests of individuals and community needs. Because of the diverse experiences and backgrounds of the members of this community, conflicts centering on differences among individuals develop. We recognize that acts of discrimination and harassment, including, but not limited to, acts of racism, homophobia, classism, casteism, ableism, and discrimination against religious and political minorities are devoid of respect and therefore, by definition, violate this Code.

Our student community does not stand alone — it is part of the larger Bryn Mawr community. The web of interdependence that characterizes our community includes all students taking courses at Bryn Mawr and extends to faculty, administration, and staff. While the jurisdiction of a student Honor Board does not extend beyond the undergraduate student community, this community is enriched when the principles that govern student interactions form the basis for our interactions with all those with whom we share the community.

We recognize that in our interactions with members of our community, problems and conflicts do arise. We have developed procedures by which such problems can be resolved — procedures which are based on the principles of self-governance and the need for communication. Basic to these procedures is a dialogue between the parties involved in the conflict. If such a dialogue does not result in the resolution of a problem, a student Honor Board will assist the parties in arriving at a resolution of the situation.

I. THE HONOR BOARD

- A. The Honor Board is responsible for the administration and facilitation of the Honor Code. This includes an orientation for new students each fall, open meetings where the student body can discuss non-confidential matters relating to the Honor Code, and the periodic review of the Honor Code itself.
- B. Composition of the Board
 1. The Academic Honor Board consists of the following members:
 - a. Seven or eight students from the Undergraduate College who are candidates for the Bryn Mawr A.B. degree, elected by members of the Self Governance Association during SGA Elections, pursuant to the requirements of the positions under the SGA Constitution and Elections Bylaws. The makeup of these students shall be as follows -
 - i. One or two student(s), of any class year, elected as Head(s) of the Honor Board for one year terms by all members of the Self Governance Association
 - ii. Six additional students serving as class year representatives, two students from the senior class, two students from the junior class, and two students from the sophomore class, elected to one or two year terms by members of their respective classes
 - b. Two post baccalaureate students who are members of Bryn Mawr's Postbaccalaureate Premedical Program, nominated and appointed as Postbaccalaureate Representatives for one year terms by the Associate Dean/Director of the Postbaccalaureate Premedical Program
 - c. The Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board, who is either the Dean of the Undergraduate College or an alternate full time staff member of Bryn Mawr College who is Associate or Assistant Dean or an

Associate or Assistant Director, appointed of the Dean of the Undergraduate College, from here on referred to as a the Dean Designee.

- d. Three members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences elected by the Faculty as Faculty Representatives to the Honor Board for three year terms by members of the Faculty, pursuant to the requirements of the positions under Faculty Bylaws.
 - i. In the case that all current Faculty representatives of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences are compromised because of conflicts of interest or scheduling, the Dean's Office will request that a faculty member who has previously served on the Honor Board within the last six years be asked to serve on a hearing.
3. The Social Honor Board consists of the Head(s) of the Honor Board and all undergraduate student members of the Academic Honor Board.
4. Senior Counsel - From the undergraduate student members of the Board, one elected class representative shall be appointed Senior Counsel by the Head(s) of the Honor Board. The Senior Counsel serves as a key support person for the confronted party in that the Senior Counsel makes clear the procedure of the hearing to the confronted party. Since it is important for the Senior Counsel to have an understanding of the experience of Honor Board resolution procedures, the Head(s) of the Honor Board, in consultation with the Honor Board, shall appoint elected members of the Board to this positions based on the length of term, and it will typically be held by the member with the most consecutive experience serving on the Honor Board and/or Conflict Resolution Committee other than the Head(s) of the Honor Board. This individual can defer should they not wish to hold the role.
5. Training of the Board - All student, faculty, and staff representatives of the Board will undergo mandatory training in conflict resolution, implicit bias, and restorative practice at the beginning of each academic year during their tenure. It is the responsibility of the Head(s) of the Honor Board to facilitate the scheduling of these trainings and to find appropriate training facilitators. Should funds be required to compensate facilitators, the Head(s) may request funding from SGA. Funding for training should not be appropriated from other sources. Any member of the undergraduate student body may ask the Head(s) of the Honor Board for detailed information regarding the training facilitation at any time.
- C. Jurisdiction - The jurisdiction of the Honor Board extends to all members of the Undergraduate College. The Board has the authority to justify any sanction up to failure of an examination or paper, failure of a course, exclusion from a residence hall, exclusion from campus housing or expulsion from the College.

II. CONFRONTATION UNDER THE HONOR CODE

A. Academic Cases

1. If a student or another member of the community (including members of the faculty) suspects that the actions of another student are not consistent with the policies agreed to under the Academic Resolutions of the Honor Code, they should talk in person with the student who committed the alleged violation to determine whether or not a potential violation has occurred. In some situations, the confronting party may believe it is not possible for this confrontation to occur in person for reasons such as breaks, study abroad, etc; in that case the confronting party will reach out to the Head(s) of the Honor Board to seek clarity as to whether a positive confrontation could take place remotely using telecommunications. If the confronting party is satisfied that no violation has occurred, no further action is needed. If, after the conversation, the confronting party still believes that a violation may have occurred, the confronting party should ask the confronted student to report themselves to the Honor Board (preferably, in writing). This process of confrontation should be conducted in a completely confidential manner.
- b. The confronted student is obligated to contact the Head(s) of the Honor Board within 48 hours to report that an infraction may have occurred. At that point, the Head(s) of the Honor Board will make contact with both the confronted and confronting parties, soliciting them to submit statements. If the confronting party has not heard from the Head of the Honor Board within 72 hours, they should report the possible infraction and the student's name to the Head. This should be done in writing, if possible.
- c. Both the confronting and confronted parties, as directed by the Head(s) of the Honor Board must write separate statements explaining the circumstances as they perceive them. In ordinary circumstances, the statements should be submitted to the Honor Board within 72 hours after the confronted student and the Honor Board have made contact.

- d. The Head(s) of the Honor Board and the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board, will read both statements to determine if an Honor Board resolution process is warranted. If it is unclear whether a matter should be addressed by the Academic or Social Honor Board, the Head(s) of the Honor Board in conjunction with the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board, shall decide to whom the matter will be referred.
- B. Social Cases
- a. If a student is offended by the actions of another student, either personally or because the student believes them to be detrimental to the community, the student must confront the student directly as the first step toward conflict resolution, in a process referred to as “positive confrontation”. This conversation must take place in person unless the option is not available (i.e. the student is abroad, or actions occur prior to the beginning of a semester or on a break). Confrontation is not a hostile action. The two students should engage in a constructive discussion to try and reach a common understanding. This does not imply an agreement but an “exchange of values” or “expression of concerns” which results in a viable solution for both parties. An Honor Board member may act on behalf of another student if this process would place the student involved in physical or emotional danger. In the case of an Honor Board member assisting in the confrontation, a clear line of communication must be maintained between the students involved in the confrontation.
 - b. In conflicts where a third party may be helpful, the following resources are available:
 - i. Hall Advisors: Hall Advisors’ role involves advising students in their building on how to live under the Honor Code. Hall Advisors may, if asked by one of the conflicting parties, help facilitate, but not mediate, the resolution of prolonged disputes. They are a part of the support network during repeated attempts at confrontation; they may give advice to both sides.
 - ii. If the problem remains unsolved, a formal mediation may be desired. Mediation is a process by which a trained, neutral third party assists the parties in a conflict to arrive at a resolution through facilitating communication. The SGA Conflict Resolution Committee, along with the Office of Restorative Practices, are two resources that can be utilized to foster communication and help solve prolonged disputes with complete confidentiality. Contact information for both resources can be found in the student handbook and on the College’s Website.
 - iii. Customs people, because it is necessary that they maintain good relations with both sides of a dispute, are asked not to participate in mediation or confrontation between first-year students in their halls. They may refer conflicting parties to the appropriate resources.
 - iv. All undergraduate student Honor Board representatives are available to address concerns regarding the Honor Code and confrontation.
 - c. Confidentiality is vital to the success of the Social Honor Code; knowledge of the problem must be confined to as limited a group of people as possible (i.e.: the persons involved, HAs, conflict mediators, counselors, 1-2 confidants, etc.).
 - d. If the issue cannot be resolved, the Head of the Honor Board should be contacted, and upon hearing of the situation, they can either refer parties to a relevant conflict resolution process on campus or initiate a Social Honor Board process. A Social Honor Board process cannot be called unless there has been a positive confrontation. Social Honor Board processes can only take place between two parties. If multiple parties are involved in a social conflict, members of the conflict can serve as witnesses.
 - e. To move ahead with a Social Honor Board process, the Head(s) of the Honor Board will make contact with both the confronted and confronting parties via email, soliciting them to submit statements.
 - e. Both the confronting and confronted parties must write separate statements explaining the circumstances as they perceive them. In ordinary circumstances, the statements should be submitted to the Honor Board within 72 hours after the students and the Head(s) Honor Board have made contact.
 - f. The Head of the Honor Board, along with the Senior Counsel, will review all written statements and determine if a hearing is warranted and which witnesses will be heard.

III. HONOR BOARD RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

- A. Academic Cases
 - a. Decisions on Honor Board Procedure Fitness

- i. It will be up to the discretion of the Head(s) of the Honor Board whether a case should proceed as an alternative resolution conversation or a Full Board Hearing, or be escalated to a Dean's Panel, based on the statements submitted by all parties. Cases will typically be convened as an alternative resolution conversation if there is a clear understanding of the events that took place, the narrative is consistent from both perspectives, and there are few clarifying questions. Cases will typically be convened as a Full Board process if there are differing perspectives, an inconsistent narrative, or if bringing in several individuals from the Honor Board would be helpful in the deliberation process.
 - ii. The Head(s) of the Honor Board will solicit members of the Academic Honor Board to serve as representatives on the hearing based on the guidelines below for the makeup of each procedure by sharing the name(s) of all parties. The Head(s) shall not share the case documents with members of the Board until they have been confirmed to serve on a case. When choosing members of the Honor Board to take part in a resolution process, any members or representatives (including the Head(s) of the Honor Board who have a close interpersonal relationship history with either party will be asked to recuse themselves from service.
 - iii. The Head of the Honor Board will present via email to all parties the slate of Board members who will be present for the resolution process so that all members are able to give their consent. Should any party object, other members of the Academic Honor Board will be asked to serve as representatives.
- b. Procedures for an Alternative Resolution Conversation
- i. The members of an alternative resolution conversation will be comprised of the confronted and confronting parties, the Head(s) of the Honor Board (or, in the case of necessary recusal, one undergraduate student representative to the Honor Board), the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board, the confronted party's academic advising dean, and an additional support person for the confronted party. The Head(s) of the Honor Board or the undergraduate student representative proxy will serve as the conversation facilitator. With the exception of the additional support person, all members of the conversation have an equal say in the resolution creation process.
 1. If the confronting party is a student, they may be represented during the conversation by the professor involved. The confronting student, however, may be asked to write a statement for the conversation.
 - ii. The Senior Counsel and/or the Head of the Honor Board talk to the persons involved prior to each alternative resolution conversation. At the conversation, the statements previously submitted to the Honor Board will be read by conversation members. No new materials may be presented during an alternative resolution conversation without the express consent of all parties.
 - iii. In the alternative resolution conversation, all parties will be given the opportunity to elaborate on their statements and speak openly to each other in a conversational manner regarding the events or actions in question. Then, all parties and other conversation members work together to come to a formal resolution based around what each party feels would be fair, proportionate, and, and restorative. In an instance where parties cannot come to an agreement at the conclusion of the conversation, the Head(s) of the Honor Board can propose a fair and restorative resolution that they feel best represents the desired resolutions of all parties. If at this time, either party remains dissatisfied, the alternative resolution conversation will conclude and will be reconvened as a full Honor Board hearing, scheduled pursuant to the guidelines below for an academic Full Honor Board hearing. Once the resolution has been agreed upon, all parties are provided with a written record of the group's decision by the Head of the Honor Board and/or the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board. Each record includes all written statements and the alternative resolution group's final decision in the case.
- c. Procedures for a Full Honor Board Hearing
- i. The members of a Full Board hearing will be comprised of the confronted and confronting parties, the Head(s) of the Honor Board (or, in the case of necessary recusal, one additional undergraduate student representative to the Honor Board), two undergraduate student class representatives, one Faculty Representative, and the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board.
 1. If the confronting party is a student, they may be represented during the conversation by the professor involved. The confronting student, however, may be asked to write a statement for the conversation.
 2. If the hearing involves a Postbaccalaureate Student, one of the student representatives will be replaced with a Postbaccalaureate Student Representative.

- ii. The Senior Counsel and/or the Head of the Honor Board talk to the persons involved prior to each hearing. At the hearing, the statements previously submitted to the Honor Board will be read by Board members before the arrival of the confronting and confronted parties. Both parties (confronting and confronted) may read all written statements. No new materials may be presented during a hearing process without express consent of all parties.
 - iii. In the hearing, the confronted student has the option to be present for all testimony given. The student's dean is present during the entire hearing, but does not have a vote in the final decision. The hearing is conducted in an informal manner. As soon as the hearing is over, the student is informed of the Board's decision by the Head of the Honor Board and the Dean of the Undergraduate College or their designee from the Dean's Office. The Dean of the Undergraduate College, or their designee from the Dean's Office, informs the professor of the confronting party.
 - iv. When the Head of the Honor Board deems it necessary, the Honor Board may call expert witnesses to testify about the materials in question. To ensure impartiality, this witness may not currently be the student's professor.
 - v. Each record includes all written statements and the Honor Board's final decision in the case.
 - vi. At the end of each semester, the Head of the Honor Board will release a final report of the hearings that took place to the Bryn Mawr Community. This report will include the number of academic hearings, the reason why they were brought to the Honor Board, and a broad description of the decision of each hearing. In addition, the Head of the Honor Board will present this information at the end of each semester to the SGA Assembly. Included in the published report, the Head of the Honor Board must also include five to six random abstracts from no earlier than two semesters ago and no older than six. This random selection should be representative of cases that are still relevant to campus life. All members of the Self-Government Association have the right to ask the Head of the Honor Board for as many abstracts from hearings that have happened from no earlier than two semesters ago and no older than six semesters.
- d. Appeals - If the Dean of the Undergraduate College is serving as the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board, then appeals of decisions of the Academic Honor Board may be made to the President of the College within one week of the conclusion of the hearing. If a Dean Designee is serving as the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board, then appeals of decisions of the Academic Honor Board may be made to the Dean of the Undergraduate College within one week of the conclusion of the hearing. Appeals may only be made in cases where the procedure followed is questionable. The appeal must be presented in writing. The President or Dean of the Undergraduate College will review all materials from the hearing, and the decision of the Honor Board in respect to the complaint of the confronted student. The President or Dean of the Undergraduate College will not hear new evidence. The President or Dean of the Undergraduate College may uphold any decision of the Honor Board, reverse that decision, or call for a new hearing. Decisions involving separation and exclusion are automatically appealed.
- B. Social Cases
- a. Decisions on Honor Board Procedure Fitness
 - i. It will be up to the discretion of the Head(s) of the Honor Board whether a case should proceed as an alternative resolution conversation or a Full Board Hearing, or be escalated to a Dean's Panel, based on the statements submitted by all parties. Cases will typically be convened as an alternative resolution conversation if there is a clear understanding of the events that took place, the narrative is consistent from both perspectives, and there are few clarifying questions. Cases will typically be convened as a Full Board process if there are differing perspectives, an inconsistent narrative, or if bringing in several individuals from the Honor Board would be helpful in the deliberation process.
 - ii. The Head(s) of the Honor Board will solicit three members of the Academic Honor Board to serve as representatives on the hearing based on the guidelines below for the makeup of each procedure by sharing the name(s) of all parties. The Head(s) shall not share the case documents with members of the Board until they have been confirmed to serve on a case. When choosing members of the Honor Board to take part in a resolution process, any members or representatives (including the Head(s) of the Honor Board who have a close interpersonal relationship history with either party will be asked to recuse themselves from service.
 - iii. The Head of the Honor Board will present via email to all parties the slate of Board members who will be present for the resolution process so that all members are able to give their consent. Should any party object, other members of the Academic Honor Board will be asked to serve as representatives.
 - b. Procedures for an Alternative Resolution Conversation

- i. The members of an alternative resolution conversation will be comprised of the confronted and confronting parties, the Head(s) of the Honor Board (or, in the case of necessary recusal, one undergraduate student representative to the Honor Board), the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board, the confronted party's academic advising dean, and an additional support person for the confronted party. The Head(s) of the Honor Board or the undergraduate student representative proxy will serve as the conversation facilitator. With the exception of the additional support person, all members of the conversation have an equal say in the resolution creation process.
 - 1. If the confronting party is a student, they may be represented during the conversation by the professor involved. The confronting student, however, may be asked to write a statement for the conversation.
 - ii. The Senior Counsel and/or the Head of the Honor Board talk to the persons involved prior to each alternative resolution conversation. At the conversation, the statements previously submitted to the Honor Board will be read by conversation members. No new materials may be presented during an alternative resolution conversation without the express consent of all parties.
 - iii. In the alternative resolution conversation, all parties will be given the opportunity to elaborate on their statements and speak openly to each other in a conversational manner regarding the events or actions in question. Then, all parties and other conversation members work together to come to a formal resolution based around what each party feels would be fair, proportionate, and, and restorative. In an instance where parties cannot come to an agreement at the conclusion of the conversation, the Head(s) of the Honor Board can propose a fair and restorative resolution that they feel best represents the desired resolutions of all parties. If at this time, either party remains dissatisfied, the alternative resolution conversation will conclude and will be reconvened as a full Honor Board hearing, scheduled pursuant to the guidelines below for an academic Full Honor Board hearing. Once the resolution has been agreed upon, all parties are provided with a written record of the group's decision by the Head of the Honor Board and/or the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board. Each record includes all written statements and the alternative resolution group's final decision in the case.
- c. Procedures for a Full Social Honor Board Hearing
- i. The Head of the Honor Board informs the confronted student of their option to seek advice from the Senior Counsel.
 - ii. The Senior Counsel and/or the Head talk to the parties involved prior to each hearing. At the hearing, the statements previously submitted to the Honor Board will be read by Board members before the arrival of the confronting and confronted parties.
 - iii. In the hearing, the confronted student has the option to be present for all testimony given and, in the event that the confronted student decides to speak, speaks last. The hearing is conducted in an informal manner. As soon as the hearing is over, the student is informed of the decision of the Board by the Head of the Honor Board and Senior Counsel.
 - iv. Social hearings are confidential. Each record includes all written statements and the Honor Board's final decision in the case.
 - v. At the beginning of the spring semester, the Head of the Honor Board must release Social Honor Board Hearing abstracts from no earlier than two semesters ago and no older than ten. These abstracts should be presented to the SGA assembly and will be released to the Bryn Mawr community. The Head of the Honor Board should take into consideration issues of confidentiality while selecting these abstracts as there still may be collective memory over the incident. The Head of the Honor Board will consult the Dean of Undergraduate Students when doing so. If the Head of the Honor Board does not have any Social Honor Board abstracts to release, then she must state this to the SGA Assembly at the beginning of the spring semester.
- d. Appeal
- i. Appeals of decisions of the Social Honor Board must be directed to the President of the Self-Government Association, in writing, within one week of the conclusion of the hearing unless the confronted student is a current member of the SGA assembly. Appeals may only be made in cases where the procedure followed is questionable; decisions involving separation and exclusion are automatically appealed. The President of the SGA will appoint two members of the SGA Assembly to an Appeal Committee. The student bringing the appeal selects one member of the SGA Assembly to serve on the Appeal Committee. Those three choose two more members from the SGA assembly; the five elect a chairperson. The Appeal Committee invites the Head of the Honor Board to respond in writing to the complaint and reviews this and all other written materials. It may

- interview the student bringing the appeal and the Head of the Honor Board. The Appeal Committee may uphold the Honor Board's decision, reverse the decision, or order a new hearing. It reports in writing to the President of the SGA. The Appeal Committee must complete its work in one sitting.
- ii. Final appeal may be directed in writing to the Dean of the Undergraduate College and the President of the SGA within three days of receipt of the decision of the Appeal Committee. The President of the SGA and the Dean of the Undergraduate College will review all materials from the hearing and the appeal. They may uphold the decision of the Appeal Committee, reverse it, or order a new hearing.

C. Reporting to Other Higher Educational Institutions

- a. During applications to other institutions of higher learning, including graduate and professional schools, students who have taken part in an Honor Board process as a confronted party must report having been involved in a "disciplinary hearing," only if doing so has been specified as a formal resolution item during their resolution process. The Honor Board's policy regarding specifying this resolution item is that all individuals taking part in an Honor Board process will not be asked to report their process to institutions of higher learning if the process is resolving a first-time violation of the Honor Code. On a second or other repeat violation, reporting involvement in a hearing process to other institutions of higher learning may be a part of a student's resolution. This policy is made clear to all students taking part in resolution processes. Exceptions to this policy can be made on a case-by-case basis by the Head(s) of the Honor Board and the current Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board.

III. DEAN'S PANEL

- A. Matters that are beyond the ability of the Honor Board to resolve, including criminal matters, shall be brought before a Dean's Panel. In determining whether a Dean's Panel is indicated, the Dean Co-Chair of the Honor Board shall consult with the Head of the Honor Board.
- B. Procedures for the conduct of a Dean's Panel are found in the Student Handbook.

IV. POLICIES

A. Academic Resolutions

These resolutions are to preserve and ensure the integrity of the College and of the individuals within it. Each student is responsible for the integrity of their own academic work. Thus, it is important that each student read and understand these academic resolutions, as each student will be held responsible for them.

1. Examinations and Quizzes
 - a. Students are not to reveal the form, content, or degree of difficulty of any examination or quiz. Discretion should be used in discussing the examination and in disposing of the examination.
 - b. Examinations at the end of each semester will be conducted without proctors in the examination rooms. However, one or more student proctors will remain in each building to be called in case of emergency and to maintain quiet.
 - c. There should be no talking in the examination rooms. A student may leave an examination but should not create a disturbance. On completion of examinations, students are requested to leave the building promptly and quietly. Examinations will be written in blue books or on other paper provided by the College. Students are urged to occupy alternate seats where space permits. Students should not bring books and papers into the examination room unless told to do so by the instructor.
 - d. In a scheduled examination, the instructor or the instructor's representative may stay in an examination room for about fifteen minutes at the beginning of an examination to answer questions, and may return at the close of the examination to collect papers. Students, upon completing, shall leave all blue books on the instructor's desk or as otherwise instructed.
 - e. Quizzes will be conducted in the same manner except that the instructor may remain in the room. Quizzes will ordinarily begin at ten past the hour, and students are responsible for observing time limits.
 - f. In self-scheduled examinations, students must stop writing at the time specified by the instructor. Both the self-scheduled examination questions and the 'blue books' will be returned to the proctor in the building after the students complete them. The same standard of integrity is expected of students in cases of take-home or open book examinations, or any type of examination. The time allowed for a take-home examination or quiz is considered to run from the time the student opens the examination

through the time limit specified by the instructor. A student may not use course materials, or seek any other outside help, unless specifically instructed to do so.

2. Other Academic Work
 - a. In reports and other written work, sources of information and of ideas and opinions not the student's own must be clearly indicated; the source of direct quotations must be acknowledged. Failure to do so constitutes plagiarism.
 - b. In laboratory work, each student, unless otherwise directed, is expected to make all the necessary measurements, drawings, etc., independently, from their own observations of the material provided. All records, including numerical data for working out results, are to be used by the student independently and as initially recorded.
 - c. Collaboration among students in the preparation of work may take place as approved by the instructor.
 - d. Permission must be obtained in advance from all professors concerned if a paper is to be submitted for credit in more than one course. If the paper has been used in a previous course or another school, the current professor should be made aware of the fact.
 - e. Any student who is uncertain about the application of the preceding rules to any particular assignment should ask the instructor for more explicit directions.
 - f. Generative AI tools should not be used in the completion of any course assignments, exams, or written work, including laboratory work, unless an instructor for a given course has specifically and explicitly authorized their use for the assignment in question. Presenting AI-generated content as original student work, submitting AI-generated content without citing its source in artificial intelligence tools, and relying on generative AI tools for closed-book quizzes, tests, and exams all constitute violations of the Honor Code.
3. Library — Use of library resources is subject to the Honor Code, as well as normal library regulations. It is the responsibility of the students to acquaint themselves with the regulations regarding the use of library materials, especially those materials on reserve. If a student fails to return a library book on time, despite requests from the librarian, it will be considered an infraction of the Academic Honor Code, and will be dealt with accordingly.
4. Faculty — Members of the faculty are not under the jurisdiction of the Honor Code but may participate in confrontation. Complaints about a faculty member should first be made to the professor and then to the Dean of the Undergraduate College.

B. Social Resolutions of the Honor Code

The Social Honor Code attempts to reconcile the often-conflicting demands of community and personal responsibility to create an atmosphere in which individuals interact effectively. Policies approved by the vote of the Self-Government Association are the only policies that fall under the jurisdiction of the Honor Board. The social resolutions represent guidelines for conduct in areas where a need for community agreement on behavior exists, and may at times restrict the maximum freedom of each individual. Confrontation is appropriate whenever a student feels that their rights have been infringed upon. The following resolutions do not exhaust all situations in which confrontation may be appropriate.

1. Confidentiality: The right of each student to privacy shall be preserved except in cases of dire emergency. When answering phones, no information concerning any student may be released without an express directive from the student. This same concern should be considered when replying to written or verbal requests for information about another member of the Association or the larger community.
2. Guests: Every guest on the campus is bound by the Honor Code regulations while staying on the campus; future visits by guests who have violated these regulations may be restricted. Each student is responsible for seeing that their guests are acquainted with the resolutions of the Association. The student will not be penalized for a guest's failure to comply with the resolutions if the guest has been informed of them. This statement refers only to the student Social Honor Code procedures. The student and their guest may be subject to College administrative procedures and penalty. Guests may be received in students' rooms at any hour. For the security of the halls, any stranger should be escorted to the public rooms, to the room of the person being visited, or out of the hall. It is a College rule that guests may stay in halls for short visits only. Violations may be reported to the Dean of the Undergraduate College.
3. Dormitory Life: Decisions pertaining to the specific door-keeping practices, smoking areas, and quiet hours of each dormitory will be determined at the first dorm meeting of each academic year.
4. Policies on Alcohol and Drugs: The College's policies on alcohol and drugs are also included in this Honor Code.

V. OTHER INSTITUTIONS

- A. If a Bryn Mawr student is in violation of the honor system of another institution, including those with which Bryn Mawr has cooperative agreements (except Haverford, with whom there is a special agreement), that violation will be adjudicated at that institution. The student should report the case to the Bryn Mawr Honor Board, but ordinarily no action will be taken at Bryn Mawr.
- B. Special Agreement with Haverford College (College A may be either Bryn Mawr or Haverford College, depending on where the case originates.)
 1. When College A concludes a hearing of a case involving a student from College B with a recommendation for action which requires enforcement by College B, the student will have five days to appeal to the President of College A, using College A's appeal procedures. If, after the appeal period, there remain some results which must be enforced by College B, that recommendation is forwarded by the appropriate person in College A to the appropriate person in College B (i.e. when an appeal was heard, by the President of College A to the Dean of College B; when there was no appeal, by the Dean of College A to the Dean of College B).
 2. At College B, an inquiry will be made by the dean and the student head of Honor Board or Council. It is understood that this should not constitute a second hearing of the case, but all materials from the hearing should be available to the inquiry, which may also call upon anyone involved for further questioning. The inquiry will not affect the resolution of the case in those areas where enforcement is within the authority of College A, but will only decide whether the recommendation for action referred to College B will be accepted, modified, or rejected. The student has five days to appeal the results of the inquiry to the President of College B, whose decision is final.
 3. Students should be familiar with both the Bryn Mawr and the Haverford Honor Codes, as one is expected to adhere to the Code of the campus one is on. There are several significant differences between the Colleges' Honor Codes of which each student should be aware.
 4. The Bi-Co Liaison will be utilized as appropriate.
 - a. The purpose of the Bi-Co Liaison is to keep the home institution informed, as well as serve as a source of knowledge about the home institution. The liaison will be responsible to attend any necessary meetings, transporting any necessary documents back to the home institution, and bringing up relevant points that the jury may have thus far neglected to consider.
 - b. The liaison at both institutions will be governed by the same set of procedures that were consented by both, the Bryn Mawr Honor Board and the Haverford Honor Council, and will be made readily available to the community. Changes to these guidelines that do not conflict with what has already been stated can only be changed with the consent of both the Bryn Mawr Honor Board and Haverford Honor Council.

Marley '26: Then, we have the whole long honor code there.

Jai: Changes are in blue.

Marley '26: Changes are in blue. Questions, comments, concerns.

Isabelle: Just wanna give it my thumbs up as a member of this committee.

Marley: Thank you.

Isabelle: ...and my one question was the president vs, for the who does it go out to if we can't decide. Was the President of the College a purposeful choice versus having it be the Dean of the Undergraduate College?

Marley: I believe the President of the College was what Dean Rocco and I discussed, that being said I don't think it wouldn't be amendable to switch that to the dean of the undergraduate, so if you wanna introduce that I'm happy with that being an amendment.

Isabelle: Is that?

Jai Abbott '27: That's fine with me.

Isabelle: I'm pitching that as an amendment just because we're all solidified across all things of how that goes.

Marley: That sounds good.

Esénia: Let's start with writing down this amendment quickly. Basically, it's to change it to... change the President to the Dean of the College.

Jai: President to the Dean.

Esénia: Just to give everyone a refresher, what ... are they sending notice or... what specifically is part of this?

Marley: Oh yes, so what this is is if the Dean Co-Chair, so the Dean that is appointed as an honor board basically acting member, if that person and the Head of the Honor Board cannot come to an agreement about whether or not something should go on deans panel, they bring in two proxies. Initially in the resolution, we said the Dean Co-Chairs proxy would be the President. We're changing that to instead their proxy is going to be the undergraduate dean. So basically, if the dean co-chair and the heads can't come to an agreement, it is now the undergraduate dean of the college and the student body president or the SGA president who needs to come to a final agreement.

Isabelle: Effectively, it's like both parties' bosses come to an agreement.

Marley: Yeah, yeah.

Esénia: This amendment! This is not the resolution itself, but the amendment. To change that language to be the Dean.

Angi: 15 yeses.

Esénia: 8 more. We need one more. Wait, what?

Jai: If we don't have enough people, can I vote on my own amendment?

Esénia: Yes. 38, one more. Verbal yes?

Jai: Yes!

Audience cheers.

Esénia: Questions, clarifications?

Maia: There, I'm mostly toward the end, there's sometimes the self government association is called student government and...

Jai: It shouldn't be. You're right.

Maia: That should be changed before it goes out.

Marley: Yes.

Esénia: Should we recommend that as an amendment to change those to self-government association? We're just gonna have it changed later and consider it a typo. Any other questions, comments, concerns, or reactions? Nothing? Alrighty, so open your mentimeter, vote yes, no, or abstain on that resolution to send it to plenary. Again, just changing the language around the Honor Code. We need 14 more.

Jai: Verbal yes.

Esénia: Perfect. 3 more. 1 more please. Alright. Oh, yes. Passes. 38 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain. Perfect.

Blanca: Proxy for me for Denbigh Dorm President.

Esénia: Going all the way down, going all the way down. Resolution #8: creating guidelines for college investigations, introduced by Jai, Autumn, and Marley.

Autumn: Reads resolution #9.

Resolution #9: Creating Guidelines for College Investigations

Presented By: Jai Abbott '27, Autumn Kelley '27, and the rest of students within the 2025-2026 Honor Board Futures Committee

Summary: There is no process for investigative procedures in the student handbook when something is not officially a Dean's Panel or Honor Board case. This leads to an appearance of total administrative control over the process, which can take any form that is expedient for the college in the individual case. This lack of institutional clarity can cause students who are accused to not know what rights they have, who has accused them, when investigations have been initiated or concluded, or even who is investigating them. This resolution would create guidelines that must be followed in college investigations prior to the initiation of Honor Board or Dean's Panel procedures.

Whereas, There is currently no established procedures for investigations in the student handbook;

Whereas, Recent investigative procedures utilized by the college have included unexpected usage of private investigators, reliance on anonymous reporting, overuse of confidentiality, and intimidation of student activists¹;

Whereas, "Our intellectual and social development requires freedom born from trust. For growth requires more than blind adherence to a code of conduct, it requires reflection upon our actions and how our actions affect those with whom we share the community. Such reflection is only possible when one's judgment is trusted."² ;

Whereas, Positive confrontation and constructive discussion are essential aspects of the Honor Code and campus life. These are not possible when investigations solicit anonymous reports;

Whereas, Police involvement is extremely dangerous and can jeopardize the lives of students, particularly for students of color.

Be it Resolved, Students who become part of college investigative procedures should be informed in writing prior to their first meeting:

- A. Whether they are under investigation or are providing information for someone else's investigation,
- B. If they are under investigation, what exactly they are being investigated for,
- C. That they are not bound by confidentiality and have the right to talk about their experience,
- D. That they have the right to a support person which includes but is not limited to: friends and family members, Bryn Mawr faculty and staff, as well as legal aid
- E. The names, roles, and affiliations of those they are meeting with (including but not limited to whether they are employed by the college or externally contracted),
- F. Whether they are permitted to refuse to attend the meeting, or not answer certain questions, and what consequences will be faced if they do not,
- G. What their rights are, either as related to the Honor Code and/or other Bryn Mawr disciplinary policies OR relating to the law, if the possibility of disciplinary consequence extends beyond Bryn Mawr College;

Be it Resolved, When the investigation is concluded (after no more than one month), all students who took part in the investigation should be formally notified so as to reduce the anxiety of investigation;

Be it Resolved, Anonymous reporting mechanisms, such as forms, should not be solicited during an investigation;

Be it Resolved, In cases of physical or extreme emotional danger when positive confrontation is not possible, then to begin investigative processes, a faculty or staff member may confront the intended confronted party;

Be it Resolved, due to legal obligations, incidents of bias, or Title IX responses should be reported to the Title IX director rather than through a positive confrontation. Efficient bias response is essential to maintaining a safe and diverse campus, however restorative justice still has a role in responding to bias incidents, and the Title IX director is encouraged to confer with the head of the Honor Board in taking next steps, including determining the viability of Honor Board and Dean's Panel responses;

Be it Resolved, If outside investigators are brought onto campus, they will be considered college employees and be bound by these same guidelines. Outside investigators should only be utilized when a conflict of interest occurs, mandating that current investigators must recuse themselves;

Be it Resolved, If the college will be employing outside investigators, this must be clearly communicated to the entire campus prior to the beginning of official investigations, including the

names and roles of the principal investigators with ways to contact them with questions and concerns;

Be it Resolved, To ensure the safety of all students, the college should only solicit police involvement in cases where there is immediate physical danger to members of the campus community, or where the violation in question constitutes a legal felony.

Marley: Questions, comments, concerns?

Natalie '26: I guess, very specifically, in like the be it resolved, where it said that the investigation much be completed after no more than one month. I feel like there could be scenarios where the investigation could take longer than a month and I wonder if it would be better to say after no more than one month without contact with the students or like something that it clarifies, like, because we don't want them to have, like, investigations very rushed and come to wrong conclusions. I think imposing a timeline on them more being like, they can't leave it open ended, so the students never know whether it's done, but like no more than one month in which a student not contacted for the investigation. They must be notified there.

Jai '26: My concern with that is that people, theoretically, under investigation could just get a monthly email that this is still happening, which would not reduce anxiety or require that the college investigators wrap up investigations in a reasonable time frame, sort of leaving it open ended. I see your concern about like one month being perhaps an unnecessarily short timeline, and maybe some exception might be necessary, that's just my opinion.

Natalie: Yeah, I guess I was also thinking I think we've only experienced investigations as something that is sort of hostile to the student body. I don't know what a scenario would be, like if it's title one it just goes to title one, but if there's a scenario, like if there's an investigation that then that's like weaponized by the college to like dismiss the investigation, but I don't know if that would be like not really within the purview of this.

Marley: Oh, so, like you mean because an investigation is lasting for longer than a month, the college would ... your fear is that the college would use this policy would dismiss that investigation.

Natalie: Yes.

Marley: That makes sense. I think that, so, I will say investigations related to either title 6 or title 9 do not fall under the purview of this resolution because they're run through completely separate offices, so that could be, that an incident like sexual assault, the college could not dismiss that under this resolution because that has title 9 does not interact with the disciplinary policies we're changing in this resolution. However, I do also see your point that that could be ... there could be a situation that arises that does not fall under either of those categories. Perhaps we could say ... could we say that if an investigation is not able to be concluded after one month there needs to be a report issued to the people being investigated explaining why?

Jai: I think that's reasonable, would you like to support that as an amendment?

Natalie: Yes.

Marley: So, if an investigation is not be concluded after one month, a written statement must be provided to all involved parties as to why the investigation needs to be extended.

Esénia: Alrighty, we're going to vote on this amendment. Again, this says ... or a statement that will be released to parties involved explaining why there isn't a ... Please open your mentimeter and vote now. We're missing 25, we need 13 more.

Angi: Any yes, no, or abstains verbally?

Esénia: If you are a proxy for someone and don't have access to the mentimeter, please say yes, no, or abstain. 2 more please.

Autumn: Oh, Jai, you're a verbal vote right?

Jai: Verbal yes.

Autumn: One more vote. Going once, going twice.

Esénia: Perfect. Passes, 38 yes, 1 no, 0 abstain. Awesome, perfect. Alright, alright so.

Any other proposed amendments? Any questions?

Devyn '26: Yeah, Devyn '26. Just for the last line about soliciting police involvement, it says "either an immediate physical danger or violation ... to members of the campus community, or where the violation in question constitutes a legal felony." Unfortunately, graffiti is a legal felony in Lower Merion, so I'm just wondering the power that Bryn Mawr could use police when, maybe to students, graffiti may not be that big of an issue, but they have historically used police to look in students' dorms or follow them. It seems like physical danger, graffiti in my mind. I'm interested in your thoughts on that.

Marley: I absolutely agree and I think that I can speak for the other people who worked on this resolution. I would say that constituting a legal felony in our conversations as a large group like in this Honor Board Futures committee where we have, um, administrative and faculty involvement, being able to respond quicker than our current disciplinary policies allow that is a big thing for them that is way for them to be a response that is... that they are able to respond not using college disciplinares, being able to call it other things, in the cases of a felony or actually I think they have said in the case of there being a breach of the law and then we were like ok a felony, instead of like a state legal issue, so point being, I personally would be fine if we got rid of the legal felony, like in the case where there is immediate physical danger to members of the campus community. I can't speak for the other people in the group or other resolution writers. I think they're on board... that this gives it is basically it makes it more likely to be passed through

and become actionable, however, I think perhaps there's another way we could phrase that so there can still be a way to contact outside parties in the case of a legal felony that won't involve the cops.

Jai: Or we could perhaps somewhat be more specific ...

Marley: A legal felony, like to specify which under that.

Jai: ... like it's definitely important for certain members of admin to be like "a crime happened last week and it was a really serious crime, but no one's in physical danger now. They need to have some way to respond to that. I mean we're abolitionists, we don't think that's a good way to respond to that. We need to have something in addition to in immediate physical danger and I would love to hear a proposal if people have ideas.

Isabelle: I was also gonna say, on the graffiti thing, it's, like, criminal mischief is a felony, like I'm checking right now. if it's over \$5000 worth of damage, so, like, it's not that in this any graffiti would be like "oh now we can call the police", the felony language specifically is what we were talking about because using the graffiti example, it would require that the graffiti be of certain size that it would cost \$5000.

Marley: We could also, sorry, spit balling here, add an amendment that says that if law enforcement is contacted, I think that at the moment it has to go into campus safety reports, but we could potentially make an amendment that there needs to be communication to the entire student body. that might be breaching confidentiality, I'm thinking about that as I say that now, but there has to be reasoning for why external law enforcement was employed.

Jai: How about ... I think that's a great idea. How about changing the word legal to violent?

Marley: Violent felony?

Jai: Yeah.

Marley: I like that.

Jai: It still lets them take action after the fact. There's no way graffiti is violent.

Isabelle: I think the one thing I'll say, I mean, let's just call a spay to spay, we're all thinking if someone writes "free Palestine" somewhere and to the extent that we want to protect that, I think in pretty recent institutional memory, people have also written like racial slurs or like things unwelcoming to trans students things that we would not agree with obviously, and so I think we need to think carefully about any changes we make because of the extent to which it might limit the ability to respond to things that many of us could find politically abhorrent.

Devyn: My concern with the legal felony because we have ... they could easily say it's \$5000 worth of damage and using the language of violent, they could argue that anything is violent toward a specific group if it was "free Palestine" or transphobic.

Isabelle: Yeah.

Devyn: I don't know what the suggestion is, though.

Jai: I definitely see the point about violence in that it could be applied to anything. A lot of this language is ambiguous enough to be abused unfortunately and almost all policies. I think violent brings us closer to what we mean than legal, which is more technical.

Esénia: Is there an amendment going to be presented? Are we ...

Isabelle: No.

Esénia: So there is no present amendment. any further questions? Anything else resolution writers?

Maia: Just as a comment, I think if we're feeling a lot of discomfort about sending this in as it stands or feeling that there's more conversation to be had, we could take the section of the

resolution out and have it be an ongoing convo with the Honor Board futures committee, where like.

Jai: Keep everything but eliminate the section on police?

Maia: Yes. That's perhaps an ideal solution.

Jai: Definitely something that I thought about, definitely the last be it resolved is the most controversial part of the policy, but I'm open to hearing what people think. I also think it's one of the most important, so that's difficult.

Rai '27: More like, just to respond to that like ...

Jai: Could you speak up a little bit?

Rai: Oh, yeah. To respond to that, I understand like wanting to take out the most controversial part of this, but also, like, it would be difficult, like we should have it in writing and like there should be something in writing because if we don't address it, like, even like the ... of what we conceive like, should occur, just to protect students as well. I think that, like, we can reword this and there should be an amendment to reword it, um, I think like changing legal to violent felony would be appropriate as well, but I just think that like it is important even if it is controversial. We're not deciding on if the resolution is passed or not, we just have to make sure it is going to plenary. I think it should stay or it can be amended. It could be reworded. I think ... it should get... there should be something that is present.

Maia: I think, just, this isn't something that would go away, if we take it out, the group that's writing these resolutions, the Honor Code futures committee will continue meeting for over a year and continue working on these and this is still an ongoing discussion in the committee, so my proposal was not that we stop talking about it or not that this is no longer a

priority for us but that it's saying yes this is still really complicated and we want to take more time to think about it.

Marley: Can I ask a question that maybe you have the answer to just about college policy? Is there currently a policy for in what situations the campus is allowed to call the cops?

Isabelle: They have an interim action policy which is more for people getting temporarily not allowed to be on campus, which, kind of only would be utilized that in a situation that would warrant police involvement, but not really, that's like one of the policies that is being worked on.

Marley: So then I think, similar to what you both are bringing up, the question here then is this policy on the college's ability to call the police better than having not a policy at the moment and coming back to it? How important is it to have something down in writing that we might not fully like versus to wait and be able to fully articulate ourselves to the best of our ability but wait to have something in writing?

Isabelle: I think it's more important to say something now just to both put a stake in the conversation, rather than wait to say the most perfect thing because these choices will be made with or without our involvement, so it's better to, at least, stake our claim rather than wait and respond.

Marley: I agree. Then, can I propose, do we wanna propose an amendment to change it from legal to violent?

Rai: Yes, I'll propose that.

Marley: Thank you.

Devyn: Can I propose something different? I would say a legal felony of bodily harm because, again I would say that violence can be anything especially as someone who's looked at

the sociology of what violence is. Violence could be intentional or it could be like a specific cause or specific effect in mind. If we recap the language of physical danger, then that also eliminates them saying, well you damaged a building that puts our community at risk.

Natalie: I do think violent felony is a specific legal phrase. I don't know if it ... I think it's specifically physical force against a specific person, or that threatens physical force. Something that could be good to look up really quick to make sure what the language is.

Marley: I'm going to look that up right now.

Isabelle: To join in on this conversation, not that I don't think we should change it to violent felony, but I think that the question we should all be weighing, eventually this policy will apply not just to students but also to staff and faculty and so the immediate rebuttal, outside of today's political connotations of student protest, is if a staff member embezzled \$200k from the college, if we had the language be, like what the response would get from admin would be if we brought this, well a staff member embezzling \$200k is not a violent felony, and so we couldn't bring in the police by this policy to investigate that and get legal outcomes that we, as a college, want to protect our assets, so the response would get from them "there are felonies that they want the police involved in that are not violent and are not enacting bodily harm" and whether or not we think the police should be brought in on those situations, that is, I think, not going to be their interpretation of it.

Rai: Um, also like violent felony can be burglary as well I don't know if that's like, ... um, I think that like these are very like nitty gritty points of like, as well, I think that is something that I feel like we can address later on. I think making it just like violent felony and then like later on again, like, we're going to do the same draft thing ... making it more so it's like ... make it come up. We won't be able to anticipate every situation. I think right now the best we

could do is violent felony, unless like because obviously like there would be more conversation happening after this is passed.

Marley: I will also add, so, according to fbi.gov, we have the FBI's uniform crime reporting program violent crime proposed four offenses: murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, so those are the four that are covered by the legal definition of violent crime, if my source is correct.

Esénia: Just to center everything back, we do want to introduce an amendment to change it from legal felony to violent felony. How should we do this? Because, if we introduced both of them, they would challenge each other, so I think, this ... this is kind of hard to navigate. Generally, if we should ask the students here or resolution here? Which one would generally be or, I guess, resolution writers, which would you choose as well?

Isabelle: I think resolution writers should pick the amendment they bring forward.

Autumn: Your amendment is to change the wording to a felony of bodily harm.

Devyn: That wasn't a suggestion, it was just recapping the language of physical danger, but I agree bringing up embezzling, that doesn't hurt anyone's body, just the college's wallet. I don't know if I specifically agree with violent felony.

Esénia: Is there any further clarification before we do this vote to change language from legal to violent felony? Ok, perfect. Verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain. 12 more please.

Autumn: Three more left, one more guys.

Angi: You can do it!

Esénia: If you're having issues please speak up. Proxies, just say verbal yes or no. This amendment passes with 24 yes, 6 no, and 6 abstains. Awesome.

Autumn: Any other final questions?

Esénia: Let's start with the vote on the general resolution.

Angi: Voting is live now.

Esénia: Remember proxies: verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain

Jai: Verbal yes.

Esénia: Verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain, 2 more please. 32... there's 2... three more... Verbal yes, verbal no, verbal abstain. One more. Guys, who wanna vote?

Evan: Esénia, check the signal.

Esénia: Oh, sorry, um, 10pm. Sorry. Alright. Resolution passes, 37 yes, 2 no, 0 abstain. Moving forward, we have remove the name of James E. Rhoads from Rhoads Hall. Come over here, yeah.

Sophia '28, Katerina '28, and Maya '28: *Read resolution #10.*

Resolution #10: Remove the name of James E. Rhoads from the Rhoads Hall Building

Submitted by Maya Cotter '28, Katerina Achliopa '28, and Sophia Burt-Gracik '28

Summary: Rhoads Hall, including the dorms Rhoads North and South, were named after James Rhoads, the first president of Bryn Mawr College in 1885¹. Information about James Rhoads, found on the “past presidents page” of Bryn Mawr’s website, says that Rhoads was “an advocate for the education of newly freed slaves and the promotion of rights for Native Americans”.

In truth, Rhoads was the co-founder of the Indian Rights Association (IRA), a group committed to the “civilization” and Christianization of Native Americans². He also served as the association's president for several years³. While part of the goal of the IRA was for federal recognition of Native Americans, their actions were fueled by extreme beliefs in white Christian superiority. They shared the belief that the practice of moral sanitation was required for all native-american tribes and made sure that this was achieved through “all means necessary”.⁴ They worked toward this goal by dismantling tribal structures, creating industrial education, and erasing what they viewed as “barbaric” cultural practices. That industrial education took the form of conversion board schools, where Native American children were taken from their families, forced to speak only English, and to adopt all American cultural habits.

As if that is not enough to fully condemn the IRA, they are also responsible for the reallocation of Native American land through the Dawes Act in 1887.

All of the IRA's actions have left lasting damage on the Native American community through generational trauma, PTSD, and struggles with addiction.⁵ All of this being said, we as the student body cannot stand to commemorate James Rhoads in the naming of a building in his honor. It is crucial that, as a community, we examine all the other people whose names we speak every day.

Whereas James Rhoads is the co-founder of the IRA;

Whereas James Rhoads should not be celebrated for his actions against Native American Peoples of the United States;

Be it resolved that the name Rhoads should be removed from the building and the college website.

Be it resolved, the building will temporarily be referred to as the north-south dorm.

Be it resolved if need be, a survey would be sent out to the Bryn Mawr student body to vote on renaming the building.

Esénia: Thank you so much, alright, we're opening it up to questions, comments, amendments?

Evan: Can you speak louder?

Quinn '27: Sorry, I'm Quinn '27. I'm curious who you want to have to do the survey?

Maya: We were under the impression that that responsibility fell onto us, I don't know if that's correct or not.

Isabelle: A survey to rename the dorm? That would be rezlife.

Katerina: We wanted to be foolproof, in the way that some people would not like a temporary name. We wanted to cover all of our bases.

Esénia: Any other clarifying questions that can be asked? Alrighty ready to vote on this resolution?

Angi: Voting is live. 6 more, 3 more, 1 more. Any verbal yes, no, abstains. We need 2 more. I lied, okay.

Jai: Yes.

Angi: One more. Alright, perfect. It passed, 33 yes, 1 no, and no abstains.

Autumn: Now, we are moving onto resolution #9, allow rugby as a club at Bryn Mawr. Elena and Charlotte, are you guys here?

Esénia: I wanna take one second before we continue. As for the constitution, everytime we go over two hours, we have to run a vote to extend for a third hour. Of course, we are on resolution 9 of 11. Regardless, I think we should still run this vote and see if we want to continue this. If we don't pass this, if we don't want to continue another hour, we have to continue another day. So again this by the constitution, we should follow it. We are going to do a mentimeter vote right now.

Isabelle: If you vote no, you still have to come back for another day.

???: 11 was the Big Cheese one, so we technically only have one more.

Evan: Guys, it'll be 10 minutes. Please don't vote no.

Esénia: There's literally two more.

Isabelle: If we vote no, it'll be during rock st patty's.

Evan: It'll be Friday at 2am.

Isabelle: Or else. Or else the horned toads will get you.

Esénia: Verbal yes.

Angi: 5 more. Any yes, no, verbal abstains? 3 more. 2 more. 2 more votes. One more, please. I'm begging, okay! One more vote. Yes! Elena and Charlotte, rugby! Are you here?

Elena: Yeah, hi.

Esénia: Thank you, sorry about that.

Autumn: I'll scroll for you guys.

Elena Rexach '28: Hi, I'm Elena '28.

Charlotte Hanssen '28: Hi, I'm Charlotte '28.

Resolution #11: Allow Rugby as a Club Activity

Presented by: Elena Rexach and Charlotte Hanssen

Summary: This resolution proposes an amendment to Bryn Mawr College's club activity guidelines, which currently list rugby as a prohibited club activity. Until 2016, there was an active rugby club: the Horned Toads. The club dissolved for a variety of reasons, one of which being their probation by Bryn Mawr College, allegedly due to unsafe and reckless behaviors. Bryn Mawr College however, did not list rugby as a banned activity on their club policy webpage until 2021. Seemingly, there is no public college documentation to explain this sudden change. Though it may be a contact sport, Rugby can certainly be played safely with the necessary protective equipment. Many colleges, including Haverford College and all of the Seven Sibling Schools, have active rugby teams. These teams are incredibly welcoming, supportive and empowering for their players. Moreover, they encourage physical activity and wellness. All of the students involved in the Horned Toads graduated several years ago. This resolution opens up the possibility for current or future Bryn Mawr College students to form a new rugby club or play rugby as a club activity.

Whereas numerous current students have expressed interest in playing rugby

Whereas Bryn Mawr College has allowed rugby as a club activity in the past

Whereas Bryn Mawr College currently does not permit rugby as a club activity

Whereas there is no publicly available explanation as to why rugby is prohibited

Whereas club rugby provides an opportunity for Bryn Mawr students to participate in exhilarating physical activity, build connections with each other through team sports, and feel a sense of belonging and empowerment

Whereas Haverford College, Swarthmore College, the other Seven Sibling Schools and many other universities and liberal arts colleges allow rugby as a club activity

Whereas the potential dangers of rugby can be negated through the use of protective equipment

Be it resolved Bryn Mawr College will adjust its club guidelines to permit rugby as a club activity

Be it resolved Bryn Mawr College students will be allowed to form a rugby club or play rugby as a club activity beginning in the 2026-2027 academic year

Esénia: Alright, thank you. Isabelle first.

Isabelle: Did you guys talk to Romi about this to learn the background of the policy?

Elena Rexach '28: No, I don't know who that is.

Audience laughs.

Isabelle: Okay, I'm just... To offer some context, so, the reason rugby got banned is because it had really bad WTF Week hazing ...

Elena '28 and Charlotte '28: Yes.

Isabelle '26: ... and so, since that doesn't... I don't think that would be assumed starting a new club, talk to Romi and just remove that policy for you.

Elena: Oh, okay!

Audience laughs.

Isabelle: I still think go for it for the plenary resolution, but it's not like they're like, fuck rugby, it's like, the rugby team had a horrible hazing problem, so I just think that would be a much quicker get around for you.

Elena: I think what was strange is they like, the fact that it was banned 5 years after the club was dissolved, so I guess that was maybe part of the WTF Week restructuring they did around 2020?

Isabelle: Also, definitely, the problem, not the problem, but like, with clubs, what does it mean to be unaffiliated with Bryn Mawr? Who cares? I don't know. I would assume people were still playing rugby, who cares about that, but they were still doing the weird hazing, but that was why they were even stricter. It was weird hazing. It was the same stuff that happened at Radnor. Oh my God, there's crazy news article. Like, Radnor made the people, um, keg stand. That's...

???: Um, I was just wondering, sorry, is this gonna be under the SGA funds?

Elena: It's just opening up to let people have the club or play. There's no funding involved. It's just weather or not rugby can ... The other banned activities are hot air balloon rides.

Audience laughs.

Elena: It's not like we're gonna be on the rugby club, we're just gonna allow people to play it.

???: So like, this is just an avenue for you to be like, sports, like, get rugby in the like, club? Or is it just for like, fun, like...

Charlotte: It's just that rugby is currently a banned activity and you can't play it.

Elena: So like, it, yeah.

???: So it's just for recreation.

Elena: Yeah.

???: Okay.

Katerina: ... go to plenary, not like actual logistics of what's happening.

Marley: Just to clarify, this resolution, with the... it is to just get it off the banned list.

Elena: Yes.

Marley: Okay. That's the extent of this resolution. Okay.

Caroline: If it passes and Romi is like, actually rugby is cool, can we take it off before it goes to gen plenary, being like, it's actually all cool now?

Esénia: There's nothing in the constitution that says you can't retract a resolution ...
Bi-Co plenary and...

Maia: There's nothing that says can or can't .

Isabelle: It'd be up to the discretion of the writers.

Maia: Like, if you wanted to take it out.

Esénia: Evan, you had your hand up?

Evan: Do you guys play rugby?

Audience laughs.

Elena: Not yet. I'm hoping soon. I don't know how and I'm scared of it.

Esénia: Maybe if it passes at general plenary.

Elena: It was a really cool club minus the hazing stuff.

XXX

Evan: Period. The audience laughs. Type, type, type.

Angi: Voting is live. Let's vote, vote, vote.

Esénia: The only resolution after this is literally the affirmation of the constitution.

Verbal yes no abstain? If you don't wanna vote, abstain is there for a reason.

Voices overlapping.

Evan: Guys, I can't take the transcript in this condition.

Isabelle: Let her play!

Esénia: Wait, guys, shush shush shush.

Angi: Three more.

Esénia: Verbal yes, thank you!

Angi: 33 yes, 1 no, 3 abstain.

Esénia: This goes to plenary, awesome! Very quickly, reaffirmation of the SGA constitution!

Voices overlapping.

Evan: Guys, I need to take the transcript! Please!

Autumn: *reads resolution 12*

Resolution #12: Reaffirmation of the SGA Constitution

Presented by the 2025-2026 & 2026-2027 SGA Executive Boards

Summary: The Bryn Mawr College Self-Government 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 community members. This resolution is to reaffirm our commitment to the spirit of self-governance and the SGA Constitution.

Whereas, the Self-Government Association of the Undergraduate School of Bryn Mawr College is the first and oldest system of self-government in the United States, a legacy worth continuing,

Whereas, the spirit of self-government is present in almost every aspect of the Undergraduate Bryn Mawr College experience,

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

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

Be it resolved, we, the members of the Self-Government Association of the Undergraduate School of Bryn Mawr College present today, the 29th of March, 2026, on behalf of the entire Self Government Association, reaffirm our commitment to self-governance and the SGA Constitution.

Esénia: Questions, comments.

Angi: Amendments?

Esénia: Amendments?

Angi: No, not amendments. Any concerns?

Esénia: Voting on our last resolution of the night and you get to go home.

Yeses around the room.

Esénia: How many verbal yeses? Make sure you still vote on your mentimeter. 6 more people, please. 5 more. 5 more ,people. We cannot end until we get 5 more votes.

Angi: 5 more!

Isabelle: 5 more votes, people, let's go!

Multiple voices overlapping, people laughing.

???: She already voted!

Autumn and Angi: We need two more! Two more! Two more!

Esénia: Verbal yes over there! Okay, we're done, 39!

Audience applauds.

RepCo Plenary ended at 9:26pm.