

Honor Council

H A V E R F O R D C O L L E G E

Public Portion Minutes from October 31, 2010

Members Present: Anna, Emily, AJ, Noah, Florencia, Alex, Josh, Abby, Jamey, Seth, Phil, Ian, Charlie, Emma, Hilary, Sam

Members Absent: Connor

Guests:

1. Moment of Silence
2. Introductions
 - a. Costume Discussion
 - i. Once again: seth and Jamey- BROMANCE <3
II) Private Portion
3. Committee Reports
 - a. Student Outreach
 - i. Looking for Tshirts
 - ii. Possibility to do a poster campaign to raise awareness about things about Honor Council that people don't necessarily know
 - iii. Need to talk to Emily about Confrontation Stories
 - b. Faculty Outreach
 - i. Meet this week to talk about survey and when to meet with professors for Professors, Pizza, and the Code (11.17)
 1. One has a wedding on Wednesday night – LIES!
 2. Denney's in Choral
 3. Gerstein has a musical thing
 4. Stemerson – nothing. Jamey plans to show up and demand to see him
 5. Ken Colton From
 6. David Dawson
 7. Gangadein?
 8. Pin MacBeth against Gangadein.
 9. Classics department – Robert Germany or Debora Roberts
 10. Laura McGrain
 11. Beth Wilman
 - ii. Emily's excited about survey but Professors come first
 - c. Trico
 - i. Swat
 1. If Haverford student commits a violation there then they will tell the student's dean
 2. Proposal was for Swat to contact Honor Council
 3. Emily, it would be ok if Swat contacted the Dean of the College rather than the student's personal deans
 4. Anna – Meet with Martha to see what she wants. Schedule meetings with deans at other schools and have Martha come with you so that you don't get shrugged aside
 - ii. Bryn Mawr
 1. Sam's gone!
 - d. Abstract Committee
 - i. We may or may not have met
4. Lawyer meeting - Amy
 - a. Last Monday

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "Jamey and Seth should have a Bromace" Schwartz and Alex "I Knew It All Along" Tonsing, the Council co-secretaries (hschwart@hc or atonsing@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of Council. Questions / comments? Email code@hc!

- b. Talked for 1.5 hours about what we've been bringing up multiple times this semester
 - i. CSSP
 - ii. Past trials. Should jury be checking up if person has been in a trial
 - iii. Grad School
- c. Emily and Anna have proposals!
 - i. CSSP
 1. Committee on Student Standing and Programs
 2. Body that deals with you when you're not doing well at Haverford College
 3. Body that sends students on academic leave and various things like that. Two academic leaves and you aren't allowed to come back. -> permanent separation
 4. Students and administrators. They are trying to come up with the best case scenario for each student individually
 5. Students allowed to talk to CSSP and "defend" their case but students don't usually show
 6. One of the issues of CSSP is that they don't have any information of what grades and other things are results of Honor Council trials. They want to know if it is a result of Honor Council.
 7. Idea that some students have one F but maybe that's an HC trial and not because they couldn't handle it necessarily. If they know about the trial then they may be presented with a good indication that the student does not need to be placed on leave.
 8. CSSP will not second guess Honor Council
 9. We have to figure out how to go about giving information to CSSP – essentially a breach of confidentiality
 10. Idea now is that Martha who's in on all confidentiality of Honor Council and attends CSSP meetings. It's currently up to Martha's discretion to tell CSSP
 - a. Martha should send an email to student beforehand to bring up the academic trial and tell the student what she plans/recommends to do about it with CSSP
 - b. Should student have veto power when it comes to giving information to CSSP?
 - c. Since students don't often show up it is important that Martha can tell CSSP
 - d. Noah – The student can email Martha about what to do in case that the student is not here
 - e. Abby – thinks that the email should say "If you give me permission I will tell CSSP..."
 - f. Jamey – likes original email that says what Martha recommends but give students ability to say no
 - g. Florencia – does not want student to have veto power. The point of the committee is to make the best decision about the student. CSSP also has confidential information already and all of their decisions are confidential. The trial info is important for CSSP to make the correct decision for everyone. By the time a student makes it to CSSP the student's judgment is already questioned by the committee: the student doesn't always know what's best for them by the time they reach this point. No one wants to take leave but they can't always see when leave is the best option for them. The committee needs to have as much info as possible to make the decision

- h. Anna – Ryan said that sometime students come to CSSP because they had a tragedy or something of that nature in their lives so they have a difficult time making the right decisions
 - i. Sam – would it make sense sending in the email the advantages of revealing the trial information to the committee. The student might not see the benefits but he really feels uncomfortable forcing students to reveal their trial record to the committee
 - j. Emily – How about Denney sending email urging student to reveal to CSSP the trial and tell the advantages of revealing the trial. Then if student does not show up at meeting and sends no follow-up then Denney can say we haven't heard from you and unless you have major issues with it I will tell the committee
 - k. Hilary – it would be dangerous for Denney to say that here are the advantages of telling CSSP because she doesn't know what's going to happen
 - l. Anna – there's also a timeline issue because the committee meets twice the week after the grades are revealed
 - m. Abbey – the ideas presented are a little convoluted right now
 - n. Emma – Feels like this is us forcing students give up their control. It doesn't make sense to make people go up in front of this committee that has all this control over them already that we shouldn't take away all control by forcing them to reveal their trial history
 - o. Seth – Bring Dora to mind. While most trials aren't this traumatic he doesn't know if he wants to force students to relive this experience. He doesn't know where he stands exactly.
 - p. Emily – We would need an extenuating circumstances clause
- ii. How much information does the Jury get about trials from a repeat violator
1. Does jury find out that someone has been in front of a jury before and the results of the trial?
 2. If we do this then the jury won't find out about past violation until during the circumstantial portion
 - a. Clarify: discretion of the chair currently? No, we don't really have one. It comes up during the trial if someone decides to ask it or if someone offers it. NO CURRENT POLICY.
 - b. Amy's view: Looked at the policies of other schools and a lot of other schools do have policies where they are going back and checking previous violations
 3. Discussion:
 - a. Phil- if a previous case is related, it should be brought up. If it's relevant, should be brought up. If it's a related case and they're doing it again, somewhere, the restoration went wrong.
 - b. Seth – “related” is difficult. Shouldn't be “HONOR COUNCIL PERMANENT RECORD”. Could just be a simple Social v. Academic
 - c. Jamey- breaking of confidentiality?

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary “Jamey and Seth should have a Bromace” Schwartz and Alex “I Knew It All Along” Tonsing, the Council co-secretaries (hschwart@hc or atonsing@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of Council. Questions / comments? Email code@hc!

- d. Seth: I feel like it will sway the jury's decision but I don't know if that's a problem. Ex: Academic issues. Should give the jury a full abstract of the trial to influence resolutions
 - e. Ian: Would the statement be "This person has been in a trial and here's what it's about" Or "This person has been in academic trial that's related"
 - f. Emily: If the jury's told anything it would be "Here are the resolutions.."
 - g. Anna: Potentially could be brought up in circumstantial
 - h. Jamey: Am I right that it would be a breach of confidentiality? Does the student have veto power?
 - i. Anna: The student could not have veto power but have a say
 - j. Noah: Should confidentiality be protected in all situations? Could be helpful
 - k. **STOP**
- iii. Grad Schools
1. When people are applying to grad schools, there's a box (varies in wording) about whether or not the person has been involved in disciplinary issues. Right now, it's up to Denney. Last year, this resulted in a VERY LONG angry discussion =(.
 2. Haverford has a restorative system, so checking the box for us is very different than what they mean. Academic Trial because someone took 5 extra minutes on an exam does not = Academic Trial because someone plagiarized their thesis.
 3. Potentially Denney can attach a statement but the question is that if you have a really big grad school, do they just throw out all apps with the box checked? BUT Haverford needs to maintain its integrity and legitimacy.
 4. Direction right now: "Boiler Statement" that would be sent with some or all applications- explains that the box is ONLY checked for these things such as rape and sexual assault and gross plagiarism.
 - a. Side question: How many times does this happen? We don't know...
 5. Current question: When should the box get checked? Should we send this boiler statement be sent out?
 - a. Hilary: We should send it out with everyone
 - b. Anna: Would that ruin Haverford's reputation?
 - c. Hilary: I don't think so.
 - d. Seth: They should send it with all of the yes's or everybody
 - e. Jamey: When you say we're a restorative body, does that mean to Haverford or to everybody?
 - f. Emma: Restorative doesn't mean erased
 - g. Phil: Did we talk to any grad schools?
 - h. Emily: It could ruin our reputation
 - i. Alex: "Hi...this is Swarthmore..."
 - j. Jamey: Can the student check the box themselves?
 - k. Anna: Yes
 - l. Jamey: Then it should be the student's responsibility.
 - m. Abby: What if they lie?
 - n. **Jamey: Clusterfuck.**
 6. We're discussing bringing this to the community but don't yet know how.

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "Jamey and Seth should have a Bromace" Schwartz and Alex "I Knew It All Along" Tonsing, the Council co-secretaries (hschwartz@hc or atonsing@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of Council. Questions/comments? Email **code@hc!**

7. How will the boiler statement work? The Boiler statement will explain our Honor Code and proceedings and explain what a checked box means.
 8. Seth: This could make it either really fine or really bad for all Haverford students. What if we have the deans check yes when other schools would check yes?
 9. Hilary: But it shouldn't be up to the dean's discretion
 10. Seth: I want it to be up to somebody who's worked at other schools
 11. Anna: I don't want to work under other school's standards.
 12. Noah: Also, different schools have different systems, we can't arbitrarily choose a random school. The boiler statement makes it honest.
- iv. Abstract Summaries:
1. Anna's on the best committee ever and this idea came up:
 - a. Some of Honor Council's abstracts are really interesting but really long...
 - i. Have "someone" (NOT FLORENCIA) make abstracts
 - b. Another idea: more descriptive explanations on the website
 - c. Hilary: I think descriptive explanations would be good
 - d. Florencia: Intro's are summaries
 - e. Emily: If there's a short version, people are going to use the short version because we're all busy. The abstract is already a short version
- v. What do we want to do with minutes:
1. Hilary: Good public portions would be helpful but some are unnecessary
 2. Emily and Florencia- general agreement
 3. Florencia: Portions?
 4. Emily: It really won't be as detailed as you think.