



Designed by Officer of Arts, Julie Edelstein '26 and Co-President, Victoria Haber '26

Table of Contents

Agenda	2
FAQs?	5
Rules of Order	7
Community Guidelines for General Plenary	9
Resolution #1: A Clear and Concise Constitution	10
Resolution #2: SEPTA UPass Resolution	12
Resolution #3: Reallocate and Raise the Nest Food Pantry's Funds	14
Resolution #4: Implementation of Post-9/11 GI Benefits as commitment to equitable collegiate access	16
Resolution #5: Accountability Procedure for Honor Council Members	18
Plenary People	19

Agenda
Sunday, March 23rd @ 2:00 PM

1. Moment of Silence
2. State of the Fords: Yehyun Song '25 and Victoria Haber '26, SC Co-Presidents (8 mins)
3. Open Mic for Community Comment (20 min, 2 minutes per speaker)
4. Overview of Rules of Order
 - a. Call for Amendments (2mins)
5. Presentation of Agenda
 - a. Call for Amendments (2mins)
6. Presentation of Community Guidelines (5 mins)
7. Resolution #1: A Clear and Concise Constitution
 - a. Resolution Introduction (4mins)
 - b. Q&A (6mins)
 - c. Pro-Con Presentations (10mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con Debate (3mins)
 - e. Call for Friendly Amendments (Supported By Presenters and Approved by Chairs) (5mins)
 - i. Presentation of Friendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - f. Call for Unfriendly Amendments (75 Signatures Needed) (5 minutes)
 - i. Presentation of Unfriendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment
 - g. Moment of Silence
 - h. Vote on Final Resolution (Requires 1/2 majority to pass)
8. Resolution #2: SEPTA UPass Resolution
 - a. Resolution Introduction (4mins)
 - b. Q&A (6mins)
 - c. Pro-Con Presentations (10mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con Debate (3mins)
 - e. Call for Friendly Amendments (Supported By Presenters and Approved by Chairs) (5mins)
 - i. Presentation of Friendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment

- f. Call for Unfriendly Amendments (75 Signatures Needed) (5 minutes)
 - i. Presentation of Unfriendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment
 - g. Moment of Silence
 - h. Vote on Final Resolution (Requires 1/2 majority to pass)
 - 9. Resolution #3: Reallocate and Raise the Nest Food Pantry's Funds
 - a. Resolution Introduction (4mins)
 - b. Q&A (6mins)
 - c. Pro-Con Presentations (10mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con Debate (3mins)
 - e. Call for Friendly Amendments (Supported By Presenters and Approved by Chairs) (5mins)
 - i. Presentation of Friendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - f. Call for Unfriendly Amendments (75 Signatures Needed) (5 minutes)
 - i. Presentation of Unfriendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment
 - g. Moment of Silence
 - h. Vote on Final Resolution (Requires 1/2 majority to pass)
 - 10. Resolution #4: Implementation of Post-9/11 GI Benefits as commitment to equitable collegiate access
 - a. Resolution Introduction (4mins)
 - b. Q&A (6mins)
 - c. Pro-Con Presentations (10mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con Debate (3mins)
 - e. Call for Friendly Amendments (Supported By Presenters and Approved by Chairs) (5mins)
 - i. Presentation of Friendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - f. Call for Unfriendly Amendments (75 Signatures Needed) (5 minutes)
 - i. Presentation of Unfriendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)

- iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment
 - g. Moment of Silence
 - h. Vote on Final Resolution (Requires 1/2 majority to pass)
- 11. Resolution #5: Accountability Procedure for Honor Council Members
 - a. Resolution Introduction (4mins)
 - b. Q&A (6mins)
 - c. Pro-Con Presentations (10mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - d. Response to Pro-Con Debate (3mins)
 - e. Call for Friendly Amendments (Supported By Presenters and Approved by Chairs) (5mins)
 - i. Presentation of Friendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment
 - f. Call for Unfriendly Amendments (75 Signatures Needed) (5 minutes)
 - i. Presentation of Unfriendly Amendment (2mins)
 - ii. Q&A (3mins)
 - iii. Pro-Con Debate (5mins, 1.5 minutes per speaker)
 - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment
 - g. Moment of Silence
 - h. Vote on Final Resolution (Requires 1/2 majority to pass)
- 12. Opening Ratification of the Honor Code*
 - a. Reading of Ratification Process by Co-Presidents (3 mins)
 - b. Presentation of the Honor Code by HoCo Co-Chairs (5 mins)
 - c. Vote to Open Ratification of the Honor Code (Requires 2/3 majority to open)
- 13. Final Moment of Silence

**"At Spring Plenary, there must be a vote by two-thirds of those present in favor of opening ratification of the Code. If this occurs, the electronic ratification system will be open the fourth and fifth days following Spring Plenary." (Section 3.08)*

FAQs?

(Cuz this Plenary stuff can be confusing)

- **What are the rules of order?**

- The rules of order are the guidelines we agree on as a student body for the process of Plenary which includes the method of voting, time limits, and the requirement quorum. You can find the full list of rules on page 6.

- **What is a resolution?**

- Resolutions can be separated into two categories. The first is constitutional amendments which are changes to the constitution. These typically affect internal parts of student governance. Then there are the most common resolutions which are changes that the student body wants to see. Past examples include pushing for Haverford to be a Sanctuary Campus (2022) and to increase the student minimum wage (2023).

- **What does Q/A and Pro-Con look like?**

- Q/A is an opportunity for students to ask questions to the resolution writers for clarifications before voting. Pro-Con debate is then a way to share with the student body where the resolution is strong or where it is weak. There does not need to be a certain amount of cons or pros for every resolution in order for us to move forward. For example, in Fall Plenary 2022, there were no cons for the HaverSanctuary resolution and we then proceeded to voting.

- **What is with all the moment of silences?**

- At Haverford, moments of silence are part of our community's Quaker values of reflection and active listening. This is especially important in Plenary where we are all coming together to vote on matters that can affect the whole campus!

- **Wait... is there a friendly and unfriendly amendment for every resolution?**

- No! These are included in the agenda so that anyone who feels led to draft an amendment to a resolution can present it at Plenary. Most often this does not happen but there are cases where a student may agree on parts of a resolution but want to make edits to it, which are then called amendments. A friendly amendment is one that the resolution writer approves and is then simply presented with a Q/A and Pro-Con which is then followed by voting. An unfriendly amendment is one not agreed on by the resolution writer and must be presented with 75 signatures **already collected** and then goes through the same process. **All amendments should be sent to sc@haverford.edu by Saturday,**

March 22nd.

- **Im trying to read the resolutions but what does “whereas” and “be it hereby resolved that”?**
 - No worries, most people wonder that too! “Whereas” statements are to provide context from the resolution writer as to why this resolution needs to be presented. The “be it hereby resolved that” statements are the actual changes that the resolution writer is proposing to be made.
- **I have questions about a resolution, do I have to wait to Plenary to get them answered?**
 - Not at all! We encourage everyone to reach out to resolution writers ahead of time to ask for any clarifications. They would be happy to hear from you and also welcome having student input so they can be as prepared as possible when Plenary rolls around! Just send them an email or sc@haverford.edu would also be happy to connect you with them.
- **How do we know the changes we vote on will actually happen?**
 - After a resolution is passed by the student body, it is sent to President Wendy for approval. Her approval is a guarantee that the President’s Office is committed to making those changes at Haverford. However, it is then up to the resolution writer to continue the next steps to ensure that the resolution is implemented. As Students’ Council, it is part of our responsibility to make sure that all resolution writers have done their homework/research! We can assure you that we require them to meet with administrators before Plenary to make sure that they are in it for the long haul and that it is a feasible plan before presenting it to the whole student body. Students’ Council also worked with writers after Plenary to check in and provide support on making sure these next steps are taken.

Rules of Order

These proposed rules of order by Students' Council have been brought over from those in Spring Plenary 2024, pursuant to section 4.02h(iv) in the Students' Constitution.

(i) Quorum

In order for quorum to be reached, at least 66% of the students living at Haverford must be present at Plenary. When computing quorum, students studying away will not be counted when determining the total number of the Students' Association. If quorum is lost at any point during Plenary, the meeting will be suspended until quorum is again reached. After 30 minutes without quorum, the Chairs may evaluate the situation going forward.

(ii) Voting Options

When voting, students may choose one of three options: "Yes," indicating approval of the matter at hand; "No," indicating disapproval and "no Vote," indicating a conscious decision to not vote.

(iii) Majority Rules

The outcome of all votes is determined by the proportion of students present at Plenary voting in the affirmative. Ratification of or amendments to the Alcohol Policy, the Plenary Rules of Order, and the Students' Constitution will require a two-thirds (2/3) supermajority. Ratification of all other resolutions and amendments will require a simple one-half (1/2) majority.

(iv) Voting Procedures

Votes at Plenary shall be conducted electronically for remote attendees and overseen by the Elections Coordinators. Each ballot will be required to reach a 66% quorum of the students living at Haverford, and Students' Council shall ensure that only those physically present and counting for quorum at Plenary may cast ballots for that vote. When electronic voting is impossible or impractical due to time limitations, the Students' Council Co-Presidents may permit a vote to be conducted using an informal method (e.g. raising of packets). If the outcome of the vote is abundantly clear in the eyes of the Elections Coordinators, they may proceed as if that outcome were decided by a formal vote. After any such determination, the Co-Presidents will call for any dissent as to the adjudication of the vote. If eight (8) or more members of the Students' Association come forward, or if the Elections Coordinators determine that the result of the informal vote is unclear, then a paper or electronic ballot must be conducted.

(v) Amendments to the Plenary Rules of Order

These may be presented and voted on prior to the presentation of the first resolution. Any portion of the agenda may be changed.

(vi) Pro-Con Debate

During any given pro-con debate, a person will not speak for longer than 90 seconds at any given interval, nor shall they be recognized by the chair more than two times. Upon each extension of a pro-con debate, a person may be recognized by the chair one (1) additional time. Pro-con debate shall initially be restricted to ten minutes and thirty seconds of speaking time, or seven (7) speakers. It may be extended by a simple majority of the Students' Association.

(vii) Amendments

Plenary may add “Friendly Amendments” or “Unfriendly Amendments” to a resolution by a vote of the majority. All friendly and unfriendly amendments must pertain to the current resolution as seen in the eyes of the chair. Once an amendment has been approved, it may not be reversed nor the resolution be withdrawn. Friendly amendments are passed with the consent of the resolution writers, whereas unfriendly amendments are passed without, but require petition of seventy-five (75) plenary attendees.

(xiii) Recusal

To speak to the content of a resolution, a chair must step down until the proposal is resolved. The Co-Vice President(s) shall then preside for the remainder of that resolution if both chairs of Plenary step down.

(ix) Time Limit

The time limit for Plenary shall be **three and a half hours**. If this time limit expires, the assembled Plenary shall vote to extend the time limit for half an hour no more than two times. If the assembled Plenary fails to extend the time limit by majority vote, the pending resolution (if any) will be voted on immediately, without further discussion.

Community Guidelines for General Plenary

In our conversations with community members, a concern that came up was whether students would feel safe and respected in expressing their opinion. We reassured them that as Chairs of Plenary, Students' Council is bound to ensure that the values of respect are met even when people disagree with one another; this is at the center of the value and meaning of Plenary. While every member is always bound to the standards of the Social Code, given the concerns brought up we believe it is important to delineate community guidelines for all discussion at Plenary so that we can be intentional in how we communicate and show care and respect to our fellow peers.

Value (or Guiding Principle)	Practice (or Guideline)
We listen to understand and learn from one another.	When another is speaking, listen without interruption . Write questions, use hand raising or other agreed upon signaling to be recognized.
We inquire from a place of curiosity rather than argument.	Ask questions grounded in the resolution. Indicate root of question (ie. clarity, additional information, correction, etc.)
We question ideas, claims, and statements NOT people, perspectives, or experiences.	Structure questions and comments in relation to stated or otherwise articulated matters.
We speak with compassion, care, and thoughtfulness. We contribute hopes, stories, and ideas with integrity, wisdom, and respect.	Avoid inflammatory, derogatory, or otherwise charged language while speaking authentically and using "I statements" when appropriate so we don't speak for other people.
We make space for all voices, especially those often unheard and/or under-valued.	Individuals speak for 2 minutes (Open Mic) or 1.5 minutes (Pro-Con) to ensure time for other participants. We will have VPs holding cards so that folks can see when their time is out. Co-Presidents will ensure quiet while individuals speak and will have moments of silence so that folks can have time to process and a chance to speak.
We recognize humanity and the light in one another so we treat each other with kindness and care.	Any forms of doxxing, especially through social media, will not be tolerated.

These guidelines have been modified using a list established by Nikki Young, Vice President for Institutional Equity and Access

Resolution #1: A Clear and Concise Constitution

Presented by The Students' Council Constitution Committee: Grant DeVries '26, Emma Almo '25, Thea Schwallie '25, Oliver Wilson '26, Yasmin Silva Nilsson '26, Claire Reisberg '27, Adam Trencher '25, Caroline Yao '27
sc@haverford.edu

WHEREAS, the Students' Association Constitution has been updated repeatedly over the past decades with little attention given to clarity, redundancies, or conflicting language.

WHEREAS, previous amendments to the Constitution have been in a piecemeal fashion, with small immediate fixes taking precedence over a comprehensive update to the Constitution. As one example, there are four separate sections explaining elections which all contradict each other.

WHEREAS, multiple situations have arisen within just the 2 years—special plenary, confusing election timelines, constitutionally out-of-date practices, etc.—that have led to many Students' Council and Students' Association actions either not being represented in the Constitution or unknowingly unconstitutional.

WHEREAS, there are multiple sections of the Constitution that are either out of date with current practices or entirely missing, such as resolution amendments, election guidelines, the Students' Council Executive Board, and appointment procedures.

WHEREAS, The Honor Code, previously a separate document, takes up nearly two-thirds of the Constitution and potentially misinterprets jurisdiction as policies enacted by Honor Council, not Students' Council.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, the current [Students' Association Constitution](#) is upon the passage of this resolution considered void and replaced with the revised [Students' Association Constitution](#).

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, this new Students' Association Constitution does not propose any major policy or language changes, but, instead, removes redundant, conflicting language and brings the Constitution in line with all current practices, and improves enforcement mechanisms.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, the Constitution is shortened from an 86-page document to 34 pages and reformatted to improve readability and comprehension.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, The Honor Code and Honor Council proceedings, subsections of the current Constitution, will be split into a separate document titled The Honor Code ([linked](#)). For all purposes The Honor Code will share the same powers and procedures for amendment of the Students' Association Constitution, and, as described in Section 6.01, shall be considered a subsection of the same document.

[End of page]

Resolution #2: SEPTA UPass Resolution

Presented by Daniel Bhatti '25 and Santiago Melendez '27

dbhatti@haverford.edu | smelendez@haverford.edu

WHEREAS, Haverford College is situated a mere 8 miles from Philadelphia; the nation's 6th most populous city, containing vast cultural, ethnic, language, and viewpoint diversity; the College advertises its proximity to Philadelphia across tours and promotional materials;

WHEREAS, carbon emissions created by motor vehicles are one of our principal contributions to climate change; public transportation is a proven low-emissions alternative to driving;¹

WHEREAS, The College aspires for opportunity equality for the entire student body, critical engagement with the real world forms one pillar of a Haverford education, and removing barriers to student access requires all student activities be zero-cost;

WHEREAS, vast opportunities exist beyond The College for student internships, careers, and further education including Accelerated Master's Programs with UPenn and the Tri-Co Philly Program; students benefit from making early and repeated connections with these career advancement opportunities; networking is a core element for full-time job-seekers and graduate applicants;

WHEREAS, UPass is a university partnership program offered by SEPTA to supply students at partner schools with virtually-unlimited access to its services at a heavily-discounted rate (valued at \$204/month); The College's sister schools, Swarthmore College and Bryn Mawr College have adopted UPass for their students in Fall 2023 and Fall 2024, respectively;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, The College enter into a contractual agreement with SEPTA Key® Card beginning the Fall 2025 semester at an initial period of four months at a rate of \$15/student per month (\$60/student per semester);

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, The College finance this agreement by charging a transportation fee to all enrolled students at \$60/student per semester for the first academic year;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, The College renegotiate this agreement each semester with SEPTA Key® Card so as to best align with student transportation interests, considering aspects such as Fall/Winter/Spring Breaks, Quaker Consortium course schedules, Customs,

¹ Marlon G. Boarnet, Xize Wang, and Douglas Houston, "Can New Light Rail Reduce Personal Vehicle Carbon Emissions? A Before-After, Experimental-Control Evaluation in Los Angeles," *Journal of Regional Science* 57, no. 3 (2017): 523–39, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jors.12275>; Margaret J. Douglas et al., "Are Cars the New Tobacco?," *Journal of Public Health* 33, no. 2 (June 1, 2011): 160–69, <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdr032>.

pre-Customs and early athletic arrivals;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, students purchase SEPTA Key® cards – priced at \$4.95 – to take advantage of the UPass program; The College has the discretion to not renew its contract with SEPTA if student ridership is consistently low;

[End Page]

Resolution #3: Reallocate and Raise the Nest Food Pantry's Funds

Presented by The Nest: Heewon Yang '25, Keyla Ramirez '25, Christian Castillo '25, Valeria Heredia-Pineiro '25, Rosa Garcia '26, Magnolia Valdez-Lane '27, Kriti Shahu '27, Barthelemy Ryumugabe '28
hc-nest@haverford.edu

WHEREAS, the Nest defines food security as having consistent access to affordable, nutritious, and culturally attuned food options without financial, social, and/or systemic restrictions.

WHEREAS, the Nest was created to address a still-existing concern of food security experienced by Liftfar eligible students and to achieve a more diverse range of food options, contributing to Haverford College's work of meeting full demonstrated need.

WHEREAS, the Nest is primarily funded by Students' Council with \$30,000 per semester, and is only accessible by Liftfar eligible students. However, Students' Council funds are for student life activities, which the Nest is not, as it addresses a concern of basic needs.

WHEREAS, the Nest is open year-round but Students' Council funds are only available when classes are in session, significantly limiting the Nest's provisions to Liftfar eligible students residing on-campus during breaks.

WHEREAS, the Nest has been negatively impacted by the increase in student wage, currently allowing food purchases of \$5 to 301 Liftfar eligible students per week, after a deduction of operational expenses and student wages from the Students' Council funding.

WHEREAS, the pursuit of food security by Haverford College aligns with the mission of the Nest, but greater coordination is needed between existing efforts.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, a task force consisting of Nest staff, Liftfar eligible students, and administrative staff designated by the President of the College is formed by April 11th, 2025 and remains active until a semester after this resolution has met the needs of the Liftfar community to satisfaction. Conversations should include the Division of Finance & Administration, the Dean's Office, and the Chesick Scholars Program.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, the task force aims to create an increased, sustainable budget plan for the Nest within the next six years so the budget can 1) afford at least \$10 of food purchases for every eligible student per week, 2) provide student workers the rising minimum wage without sacrificing the number of student workers, hours, or the weekly minimum of \$10 food purchases per student AND 3) afford up-to-date appliances and furnishment for optimal operation.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, the task force seeks funds not reserved for student life activities, without reducing Students' Council budget, so the Nest can sufficiently operate year-round. Simultaneously, the current budget from Students' Council should neither cease nor decrease until a sustainable replacement fund is established within the next six years.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, Haverford College recognizes the rights of the Nest to remain student-operated with continued administrative support and guidance from the Chesick Office and agrees to not force a halt in operations during any food-related institutional policy revisions affecting the Nest.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, the College's administration will consult with the current and future leadership of the Nest to work out any further details of this resolution, and collaborate towards a compromise that is satisfactory to the Liftfar community.

[End Page]

**Resolution #4: Implementation of Post-9/11 GI Benefits as commitment to equitable
collegiate access**

Presented by: Anna Keneally '26
akeneally@haverford.edu

WHEREAS, Post 9/11 GI benefits were created to allow those who serve in the military along with their descendents more equitable economic access to higher education through financial aid with values up to \$28,937.09.² This prevents military veterans and their descendents from being forced into enlistment and reenlistment as a means of gaining education and income by curbing loans and financial inaccessibility.

WHEREAS, The military has been known to prey on people of low income³ statuses through their appealing tuition aid packages and benefits granted in enlistment. **WHEREAS**, Haverford accepts “payment through most veteran benefits programs” but reduces Haverford Grant financial aid on a dollar-per-dollar basis.” As Such, Haverford treats Post-9/11 GI benefits as “outside scholarship” and only allows \$500 in such aid before further reduction.⁴

WHEREAS, such reductions in financial aid pushes students to rely on other payment methods (out of pocket or taking out loans), which perpetuates a cycle of inaccessible education for service members and their families.

WHEREAS, Bryn Mawr⁵, Swarthmore⁶, and the University of Pennsylvania⁷ have proven their commitment to equity through allowing students to use their GI bill benefits without dipping into their possible financial aid and dedicating a position for the purpose of veteran affair information.

WHEREAS, only 5 Haverford students use GI benefits vs the 17 students at Swarthmore and 32 students at Bryn Mawr.⁸ This shows the impact that the current

² “Post-9/11 GI Bill (Chapter 33) Rates.” Veterans Affairs. Accessed March 3, 2025. <https://www.va.gov/education/benefit-rates/post-9-11-gi-bill-rates/>.

³ “Bareis N, Mezuk B. The relationship between childhood poverty, military service, and later life depression among men: Evidence from the Health and Retirement Study. J Affect Disord. 2016 Dec;206:1-7. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2016.07.018. Epub 2016 Jul 15. PMID: 27455351; PMCID: PMC5704990.

⁴ Aid from sources other than Haverford. Aid from Sources Other than Haverford | Financial Aid | Haverford College. (n.d.). <https://www.haverford.edu/financial-aid/aid-from-sources-other-than-haverford>

⁵ “Types of Aid.” Bryn Mawr College. Accessed March 3, 2025. <https://www.brynmawr.edu/inside/offices-services/financial-aid/graduate-students/types-aid>.

⁶ “Military and Veterans.” Registrar :: Swarthmore College. Accessed March 3, 2025. <https://www.swarthmore.edu/registrar/military-and-veterans>.

⁷ “Veterans and Military-Affiliated Students.” Penn Student Registration & Financial Services. Accessed March 3, 2025. <https://srfs.upenn.edu/financial-aid/veterans>.

⁸ “GI Bill Comparison Tool.” Veterans Affairs. Accessed March 3, 2025. <https://www.va.gov/education/gi-bill-comparison-tool/compare/?facilities=31941138%2C31001838%2C31003938>.

policy has on accessibility to our institution.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, Haverford accepts the full sum of Post 9/11 GI Benefits without taking away from a students' potential grants or financial aid, mirroring the policies of Bryn Mawr college and Swarthmore college.

[End Page]

Resolution #5: Accountability Procedure for Honor Council Members

Presented by: Caroline Yao '27, Sofie Quirk '28, Mei-Li Mikos '28, Eustace Ubah '27, Katelyn Kim '26, Fiona Pando '25, and Spring 2025 Honor Council
code@haverford.edu

WHEREAS, the current Honor Code lacks procedures for holding Honor Council members accountable for Code violations.

WHEREAS, the current circle and panel procedures would create unavoidable conflicts of interests,
due to the fact that Honor Council members all serve closely together.

WHEREAS, Honor Council members bear responsibility to adhere to the Honor Code both as students and as representatives of the community that elected them.

WHEREAS, a failure on the part of an Honor Council member to uphold the Code would result in a severe breach of trust.

WHEREAS, the choice to remove a member of the Honor Council should rest upon the student body that elected them.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT, a procedure for holding members of Honor Council accountable be amended in [The Honor Code](#):

[End Page]

Plenary People

Students' Council

Co-Presidents: Yehyun Song '25 and Victoria Haber '26

Vice-Presidents: Grant DeVries '26 and Yasmin Silva Nilsson '26

Treasurers: Oliver Wilson '26 and Jorja Revels '27

Co-Secretaries: Emma Almo '25 and Thea Schwallie '25

International Student Representative: Coco Liu '26

Officer of the Arts: Julie Edelstein '26

Officer of Academics: Jack Weinstein '27

Officer of Athletics: Dominique Monroy '25

Officer of Student Life: Kelly Zukowski '25

Officer of Multiculturalism: Bukky Olugbecko '25

Officer of Access and Disability Inclusion: Grace Haupt '25

Sophomore Representative: Aaron Tokay '27

Junior Representative: Abigail Litchfield '26

Senior Representative: Adam Trencher '25

First Year Representative: Mena Kazista '28

Junior Representative to the Board of Managers: Ben Fliegelman '26

Senior Representative to the Board of Managers: Yuriko Zhang '25

Honor Council Co-Chairs: Caroline Yao '27 and Luke Smithberg '25

Librarians: Tim Foster '27 and Claire Reisberg '27

JSAAPP (Joint Student-Administration Alcohol Policy Panel): Tristan Charles '25 and Keyla Ramirez '25

Elections Coordinators

Julia Knihs '25 and Conner McWhan '27

Community Outreach Multicultural Liaisons

Ben Perez-Flesler '27

Deyana Abdelhady '27

Eshal Asim '26

Ellie Baron '25

Helpers

Lovely SECs students who helped us with set up!