1. **Call to Order**
   ● **Attendance**
     ○ Present:
       ● Andrew Fischer
       ● Silvia Radulescu
       ● Caroline Reppert
       ● Natalie Klingher
       ● Alex Hollister
       ● Conor Craven
       ● Phoebe Greenwald
       ● Jordan Zeng
       ● Elizabeth Ughetta - LATE
       ● Catherine Conroy
       ● Jose Olivares
       ● Evelyn Torsher
       ● Ryan McAlonan
       ● Alex Hirsu
       ● Ilana Schwartz
       ● Michelle Chapman
       ● Kureem Nugent
       ● Mariaelena Hiller-Chacin
       ● Zach Oscar
       ● Isabel Grieder
       ● Lilly Pieper
       ● Alex Black
       ● Maggie Horne
       ● Raza Zubair
       ● Rachel Dawson
       ● Jeremy Cottle
       ● Ellie Ducommun
       ● Chris Lee
     ○ Excused:
       ■ Lauren Mulligan
       ■ Lizzi Tran
       ■ Annalie Garcia
       ■ Zach Hardmeyer
     ○ Unexcused
       ■ Ram Franqui

2. **Old Business & Committee Reports**
Committee Reports
- Constitution
- Cultural Affairs
- Facilities-
  - Update to Jitney tracking app over Thanksgiving Break
    - Fixes issue with students being able to change app password, username, etc.
    - Students used to be able to log in as an administrator, but that is no longer the case
- Food-
  - Having trouble communicating with Derek Roy from BonAppetit
    - There will be more plain cream cheese at all times, but BonAppetit will still keep the other types of cream cheeses because students have demonstrated interest in variety.
    - Students have complained about a lack of variety when it comes to fruit. BonAppetit is trying to cut down their carbon footprint, hence the decrease in availability of tropical fruit. Will keep advocating additional variety.
- Health and Safety
- LITS-
  - LITS rolling out Panopto (software) for professors to use
    - Panopto is a lecture capture software.
    - Not intended to replace lectures but rather to be available as a supplemental resource
    - Interested faculty members should email Ben Salzman (bsalzman@hamilton.edu) for access
  - New movies will be added to the Movie Channel this week! Procrastination station?
- Philanthropy-
  - Upcoming Dumpling Sale
    - Proceeds will benefit Joseph’s Experience (formerly known as Montgomery Experience) by purchasing holiday gifts for families struggling with life threatening illnesses
- Social Traditions-
  - Men's Hockey Date Auction this Wednesday, 12/2 at 8:00 p.m. in the Events Barn
    - Proceeds will go to the Kelberman Center
  - Citrus Bowl this Saturday, 12/5 at 7pm at Russell Sage Rink
    - Free t-shirts will go to the first 200 people at the event- starting to hand out shirts at 6:30 p.m.
    - Appearances by the Buffers, Ice Skating Club, and Alex
- Student Affairs-
Christmas lights on the bridge

- No funding from Student Assembly needed, like previously thought. We just need Student Assembly volunteers to help hang lights.
- If interested in helping, email Kureem Nugent (knugent@hamilton.edu)

3. Public Comment Period
   - Lizzi Tran (via email) - Bike Racks Outside Dorms
     - Bikes are no longer allowed to be stored in dorms/common rooms, so facilities should look into getting bike racks outside the dorms

4. New Business
   - Michelle Chapman - New Junior Class Representative
     - Welcome to Student Assembly!
   - Dean Stephen Orvis and Honor Court Members- Honor Court Constitution Revisions
     - Dean Stephen Orvis- The revised document is the result of many potential changes debated over the course of the semester.
       - Some of the changes include:
         - The rewording of the pledge statement to make it more succinct and to reemphasize the core values of the Honor Code
         - A small change to how the Honor Court student representatives are selected
           - Currently, there are two student representatives per class year (one First-Year). The issue is that there are sometimes more than two qualified applicants for one class year and less than two for another.
           - All classes will still be represented on the Court, but the new language leaves it up to the Court to choose how those students are selected and distributed.
     - Andrew Fischer- Concern about two tense inconsistencies in the revised document
       - Question about the phrase “...strengthen the honor of Hamilton College...” Rather vague. To what does it refer?
         - Conor O’Shea (Honor Court Representative)- The Honor Court is working on the culture of Hamilton
           - We’ve been working to make the Honor Code more prominent at Hamilton throughout the year and especially at orientation. To increase understanding, the willingness
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of students to respect the code and report violators, etc. The phrase ties back to that mission.

- Prof. Russell Marcus- The Honor Court is student run, so it is important that all students participate in the mission of the Court.

- Taylor Elicegui (Honor Court Chair)- The original wording was much more long winded than in the revised version. We changed it to be more efficient and concise. We would like new students to read the code aloud together during Convocation and the new language would be more conducive to that

- Andrew Fischer- Yes. The shortened version is better. The old one included procedure for reporting violations in the actual statement. Too long and complex.

- Conor Craven- The phrase might seem vague because the word “Honor” is written so many times in the statement and used in a number of different ways.

  ○ Alex Hollister- The title “Dean of Students” should be capitalized.
    ■ Andrew Fischer- Agrees. Used as a name.
    ■ Dean Orvis- You should only capitalized it if you are referring to a specific person (as in Dean of Students Nancy Thompson).
    ■ Alex Hollister- Ok. Then we should keep it lowercased. The other issue is that the capitalization isn’t consistent
      ○ Dean Orvis- That is a problem. We will make it consistent.

  ○ Andrew Fischer- In regards to the different sanctions, there is mention of XF* and XF**. What is the difference?
    ■ Dean Orvis- That is a typo. There should only be one asterisk.

  ○ Andrew Fischer- A revised section mentions “tampering with the form or content of digital media” as an offence. What does that include? Would it include cropping a picture from Google Images for a presentation?
    ■ Taylor Elicegui- No. Google Images falls under Fair Use laws.
    ■ Dean Orvis- But it would include cropping, for example, a friend’s original photograph not subject to Fair Use without his/her permission.

  ○ Andrew Fischer- In the “Bill of Rights” section, the language states that the Court may rehear/retry cases only when new, compelling evidence is discovered. Can you clarify who would make the determination that new evidence is compelling enough to proceed?
    ■ Dean Orvis- The Associate Dean of Students and the Honor Court Chair make that determination. They evaluate cases and the accompanying evidence before deciding if they should go before the Court.
      ● They would convene and discuss the value of the new evidence.
● Conor O’Shea- The people who collect the evidence are the Assistant Dean of Student and the Honor Court Chair, so the new evidence would come to them. Then they would decide whether the new evidence is compelling enough to take to the whole Honor Court.
● Andrew Fischer- Is that, in your opinion, clear enough in the Constitution.
● Conor O’Shea- Yes.
● Conor Craven- How did the line read previously?
  ○ Dean Orvis- This section was just reordered. The language itself has not not changed.
  ○ Andrew Fischer- Why was the word “proven” changed to “demonstrated” in the line explaining the burden?
    ■ Professor Marcus- As a logician, the word “proof” sets the bar too high. We don’t work for proof that something happened.
    ■ Conor O’Shea- Disagrees with Prof. Marcus. The Honor Court is a judicial body, so we should keep the original language to reflect that. Choosing to move away from the word “proven” weakens that notion.
    ■ Dean Orvis- The key phrase here is “clear and convincing evidence,” not what word we use to describe how we meet that burden. The burden stands at “clear and convincing” regardless of if we prove it or if we demonstrate it.
    ■ Silvia Radulescu and Evelyn Torsher agree that ‘prove’ is the appropriate choice.
    ■ Zach Oscar- What does “demonstrate” mean in this case? Understand how “prove” fits. Why “demonstrate”
      ● Prof. Marcus- You can’t definitively prove something happened. “Demonstrate” fits what the court does more clearly.
      ● Taylor Elicegui- You can’t know something for sure. In our case, you demonstrate to a clear and convincing standard, not prove that something happened.
      ● Conor O’Shea- But evidence is still being compiled to “prove the burden.”
        ○ The issue at hand is more the spirit of the word than its actual definition. It is a matter of principle that we keep “prove” because it accompanies the burden. “Demonstrate” does not.
    ■ Ilana Schwartz- Agrees with usage of “prove.”
      ● Agrees with Zach Oscar that “demonstrates” is vague. The language used in this document should not be vague at all, since
the Honor Court deals with very serious issues. “Prove” is much clearer.

- Lilly Pieper- Agrees with Ilana Schwartz. “Prove” is more concrete than “demonstrate.”
- Prof. Marcus- “Proof” is a very strong word. We’ve never proven anything in an Honor Court hearing. We just demonstrate.
- Kureem Nugent- Can we vote and see which word people prefer?
  - Andrew Fischer- Let’s finish the talking order and see what else people have to say. We’ll vote in a minute.
- Conor Craven- “Prove” does come with a high bar, but that bar is set for a reason. We need a strong word, to guarantee a certain level of protection for students.
- Phoebe Greenwald- Agrees with Prof. Marcus. “Prove” can be too strong wording. All the evidence that we can assemble can be fallible and we as individuals can be too. “Prove” does not reflect that consideration.
- Caroline Reppert- Supports “prove,” but the thing to keep in mind is that the key phrase here is “clear and convincing evidence.” Regardless of what word we choose, that is the burden and what we are considering in a hearing. “Prove” has a very different connotation that “demonstrate,” and I think it fits better in this case, since you prove a burden, not demonstrate one. But regardless, the phrase to keep in mind is “clear and convincing.”
- Alex Hollister- Is there a middle ground? Can we find a word that is a compromise between “prove” and “demonstrate”?
- Katie Conroy- Likes the word “determine,” if we are going to discuss a potential middle ground.
  - But since the consequences are serious, we should use serious language.
- Hunter Green- Agrees with Dean Orvis’ and Caroline Reppert’s points that they key phrase is “clear and convincing,” more so than “prove” or “demonstrate”.
  - There is a presumption of innocence when you walk into a hearing and need to prove against that assumption in order to be found guilty.
  - “Demonstrate” implies that you are just showing something against innocence, not proving something to the burden that is set.
- Andrew Fischer- Let’s vote on the wording.
  - Result: Change wording back to “prove.” Strike “demonstrate”.
- Phoebe Greenwald- Why was the word “private” changed from “confidential” in regards to the status of the hearings?
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- Conor O'Shea- “Private” means that Honor Court members only tell the most important people on a need-to-know basis, such as when you report a sexual assault to an RA. Confidential, on the other hand, is when you talk to the Chaplain or the someone at the Counseling Center. They will not tell anyone.
- Dean Orvis- The hearings are not technically “confidential” because an XF* goes on a student’s transcript, so anyone who sees the transcript will know that the student received an academic sanction from the Honor Court.
- Phoebe Greenwald- I’m more concerned about making sure that people who are at the hearing don’t gossip.
  - Dean Orvis- That issue is addressed in the last sentence of the section.
  - Hunter Green- The point of the language change was so that the members of the court could talk about the hearing from a procedural perspective during our monthly meetings. It is purely so we can talk about it with other members of the court
  - Andrew Fischer- These changes need to be approved by ¾ of the Student Assembly, then faculty, then the student body.
- Dean Orvis- Yes, we want the changes to be on the upcoming ballot with Student Assembly elections for student consideration. Then, I’ll take it to the Faculty Meeting in February, for their vote.
- Evelyn Torsher- Are we voting on the changes we discussed in addition to the changes already highlighted on the document at the beginning of the meeting?
  - Andrew Fischer- Yes.

Changes approved!

Thank you to everyone from the Honor Court for coming!

5. Funding
Amount Remaining: $8,824.71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Items/Services Requested</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Recommended</th>
<th>Resubmit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCA</td>
<td>Prayer Books</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>React to Film</td>
<td>Film rights and snacks</td>
<td>$268.13</td>
<td>$268.13</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoon University</th>
<th>Spin-the-wheel for free food event</th>
<th>$54.24</th>
<th>$54.24</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microfinance</td>
<td>Lunch with Microloan recipient</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount Requested: $586
Amount Recommended: $586
Amount Remaining if Funding Passes: $8238.34

- Andrew Fischer- What is “spin-the-wheel for free food?”
  - Alex Hollister- You spin a wheel and get the food item it lands on.
  - Andrew Fischer- Is it special food? A certain kind of food?
  - Alex Hollister- It’s a surprise?!
  - Lilly Pieper- When is the event?
    - Alex Hollister- December 3 from 11:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. in Beinecke.
  - Andrew Fischer- Out of curiosity… Are there blanks on the wheel when you don’t get food?
    - Alex Hollister- Unknown.
  - Katie Conroy- Can we fund the snacks for React to Film?
    - Alex Hollister- It’s for an event, not a meeting, so yes.
  - Funding passes as recommended!

6. Announcements

- Silvia Radulescu- Electronic Add/Drop Update
  - Follow-up from Prof. Brewer: The Committee on Academic Planning is still talking to the Registrar about realistic ways to implement electronic add/drop for students. Faculty should expect a survey as to their preferences from the Committee on Academic Planning.

- Andrew Fischer- Will begin planning a short, celebratory dinner for Student Assembly members before final exams.
  - Topics for next week’s meeting: faculty recruitment, YikYak, and more. SA Members- Please watch your inboxes this week for relevant materials.