

Honor Council

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

Roadrunner Abstract Discussion Minutes from November 9, 2010

Members Present: Alex, Hilary, Emily, AJ, Josh, Abby, Anna, Jamey, Florencia, Connor

Members Absent:

Guests: Christy, Liza, Jacob, Franklin, Jacob, Janela, Juliana, Bridget, Fairleigh, Margaret, Sameer, Mark

1. The Coop forgot to cut our pizza....Who forgets to cut pizza?
2. Moment of Silence
3. Introductions
4. Read through abstract
5. Liza laughs rudely in the corner
 - a. Now she's crying
6. What do you think?
 - a. Florencia: Woops
7. Emily: What do you guys think should happen here?
 - a. Wile revealed the name of the confronted party to a potential juror before the confronted party had a chance to review the jury. This was a problem because one of the potential jurors was a teammate of Roadrunner
 - b. Jacob: There's a lot of layers and it's tricky to pick one layer to enter. The purpose of the panel was very procedural. Honor Council was tried for what Wile did. We could look at it from the perspective of whether Honor Council violated the Honor Code or if there's a breach of trust between two parties regardless of who those parties are.
8. Emily has them finish reading
9. Everyone gets pizza (except for me ☺)
10. Alex is very rude. I think Paul is cuter.
11. Emily: What d'yall think?
 - a. Silence
 - b. Jacob: Conflicted about whether Honor Council did something wrong. He sees the point of the student panel that Honor Council didn't do anything wrong but at the same time, Wile acted as an agent of Honor Council
 - c. Hilary: At the same time, by going against Council procedure, did he act properly in his position.
 - d. Janela: It says that he used procedures that hadn't been used for three years so it made it seem that it was common procedure before then. So if it was procedure before then he didn't excalyt step out.
 - e. Emily: It seems to be worded poorly here. What they were talking about was that calling jurors was an old procedure not the order in which jurors are told who the confronted party is.
 - f. Jacob: . The conflict Roadrunner had was with Honor Council. The breach of trust was with Honor Council as a body because the person responding to his emails and communicating with him was someone who

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "Alex is a jerk" Schwartz and Alex "I'm just jealous" 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!

- violated his trust. So in that way he doesn't think it's appropriate to separate Wile from the rest of Council.
- g. Jacob: I tend to agree with Jacob. Honor Council as a body is responsible but not every member is responsible.
 - h. Sameer: If they act as the authority of the body then they are culpable
 - i. Florencia: But they deviated from procedure
 - j. Abby: Would it have been different if it were a secretary instead of the co-head
 - k. Mark: Even though he was acting on behalf of Honor Council, he made a decision to follow an unorthodox practice. So it's not the rest of Honor Council that is responsible.
 - l. Franklin: It's a little confusing. To me, we never get to read why Wile diverged from normal procedure.
 - m. Anna: There's a hint on the second page. It was made for the purpose of speeding up the trial.
 - n. Franklin: But there were theoretically other trials that Wile was chair for and wanted to speed up but didn't deviate from procedure. I guess it's just the situation where you can't fully grasp what happened.
 - o. Jacob: IN the "reflections" section it mentioned convenience. Maybe he was stressed and wanted to speed up the portion of the trial
 - p. Anna: the "Reflections" part is potentially more editorialized than the rest of it. Something to keep in mind
 - q. Jacob: The way this read is that there are two infractions. This should have been resolved in two deliberations. The more he thinks about it the more he thinks that Honor Council violated his trust. But at the same time the trust of Council was violated by Wile. The reason HC doesn't have to discuss every action is because there's a trust among members that they will follow procedures and act as they are expected. Ultimately, for the Chair to deviate from the acceptable actions then he breaches the trust of Council.
 - r. Franklin: When does a co-chair breach of trust require resignation? What kind of internal policing does HC have?
 - s. Hilary: What would happen if one co-Chair resigns?
 - i. Anna: Constitutionally, if one chair resigns then both have to resign.
 - t. Anna: I don't think HC has a clear procedure for when a member isn't doing what they're supposed to do. There's no impeachment process
 - u. Emily: But there probably are. Each Honor Council member is still held to the same standards as the rest of the community and must confront.
 - v. Abby: If a single member of honor council is taken to trial does it have to be taken to Student's Panel?
 - i. Emily: The guidelines for Student's panel is for when Honor Council as a body violates the Honor Code. What to do for an individual member is ambiguous
 - ii. Florencia: Star wars. It was a disaster
 - w. Anna: Did this kind of breach warrant resignation

- i. Mark: No. It was a mistake. The cochair obviously stepped out of his role but the decision wasn't so counter to the Honor Code to force him to resign.
- ii. Florencia: Council's first priority is maintaining confidentiality so if that is broken then it's not appropriate for you to stay
- iii. Jacob: Once you're a chair you should have some sort of expertise with regards to procedural matters...or you should. Even the abstract shows how far we go to maintain confidentiality. The fact that they were teammates means they have to see each other all the time. We don't know what year he was so there could be multiple years of dealing with that mistake that's designed not to be held against him by the rest of the community. I'm not sure but if a resignation took place it would make sense.
- iv. Sameer: Practically, if a cochair resigns and the cochairs resign then it would bring more attention to the situation. Maybe it would bring more attention to the issues of confidentiality.
- v. Emily: That's true. You either have to tell people or be cryptic
- vi. Anna: You could just say you're too busy
- vii. Jacob: You can just say you breached the trust and then not go any further
- viii. Janela: But that's not fair to Wile E. That would be unnecessary embarrassment. It's not like he did this with malicious intent. Resignation is enough.
- ix. Franklin: Is there any way for this situation to have been involved internally like taking away their position of chairing trials? It could protect confidentiality.
- x. Emily: But if you violate the Honor Code as a cochair you have to accept the consequences.
- xi. Anna: To me it doesn't seem that out of place ot have the cochair reveal the fact he violated the Honor code. It doesn't seem that cochairs have the same amount of protection as others.
- xii. Sameer: But that could draw attention to Roadrunner.
- xiii. Florencia: But resigning doesn't necessarily mean that there's a trial going on.
- xiv. Mark: It's antithetical to lie to the community
- xv. Anna: But we tell jurors to lie if someone asks them where they're going. There's lying to some extent to protect confidentiality. So how is that different?
 1. Mark: But avoiding lying is always ideal.
 2. Jacob: But there's the reality of having to keep everyone's self interest involved. I'm not sure if protecting the cochairs confidentiality would be the most significant concern. Balance about whether lie is with malicious intent or not.
 3. Franklin: Wouldn't it just be easier to say the council chairs are resigning? As far as the community being concerned and inquiring, I think the community gets over it quickly.

It's a small group of students that care about participating in abstract discussions and such.

4. Sameer: That's true. When Go! blows up it's only 20 people who care
 - a. Jacob: and half of them have graduated
- xvi. Abby: The two reasons you could want the cochair to resign is to punish them or because they're no longer fit to serve on Honor Council. It appears people are leaning more towards the first one and that makes me uncomfortable. Only in the case of the second one should resignation be the result.
- xvii. Jacob: It's a little bit of both. If you're a chair and you don't know procedure then it's a problem. Especially when the procedure has to do with selecting jurors. I guess I want a consequence for that action but I understand if others want them to resign as a consequence of that action.
- xviii. Jacob: Does the student panel have a circumstantial portion
 1. Anna: They would if they reached a statement of violation
- xix. Abby: In response to what you're saying about procedures. Wouldn't this person now know procedure better than anyone else? This isn't the way you should learn it but Honor Council is a restorative body, maybe he figured it out.
- xx. Jacob: That's true but I have doubts that that's the one procedure they don't know.
- xxi. Alex: I have an issue saying that the cochair didn't know procedure. It wasn't ignorance. It was probably oversight
- xxii. Franklin: the community elects people to serve in good judgment. If they don't show their good judgement then they shouldn't be in that position. I don't buy the education aspect of the argument
- xxiii. Florencia: In this situation, when you've made a mistake that could be as detrimental as this could have been, you should step back and resign.
- xxiv. Christy: Agrees with Florencia and sophomore Jacob. Two opposed solutions: either nothing happens because they believe the incorrect party was confronted or someone could have resigned. Since there weren't two confrontations then we'll never know what would have happened.
- xxv. Anna: We've talked a lot about the cochair but it wasn't Wile E. who was brought to a students panel, it was Honor Council. Should the panel have come to a different decision?
 1. Florencia: Council as a body didn't breach trust. It was a Wile E. issue not a council issue.
 2. Emily: But could the situation have gone forward after this?
 3. Forencia: Well that's the fault of Roadrunner for confronting the wrong party
 4. Jacob: I'm not sure I think that Honor Council was in the wrong but you can't single out a member during this

proceeding because HC was confronted as a body. But I would think that Wile E was acting as a representative of HC.

5. Jacob: When president went wrong, even if they didn't act with the consent of America, they are still representative of America.
 6. Florencia: If the president makes a mistake, he appointed his administration. HC did not appoint the cochair
 7. Sameer: But he signed it as Honor Council. It makes it seem that HC put their faith behind the cochair.
 8. Mark: In that case the student body had trust in the person and then everyone violated the student body.
 9. Alex: But he's still an individual. Individuals make mistakes. It doesn't make the whole body culpable
 10. Mark: Just because he signed as Honor Council doesn't mean he had the authority to do so.
- xxvi. Anna: What's the difference between how someone perceived the situation and how it really is? What happens if Roadrunner thought that HC was in the wrong when it was really Wile E.
1. Florencia: But they could have talked about it and led Roadrunner or someone in his situation to confront the right person.
 2. Janela: Honor council could potentially confront Wile E.
 3. Mark: I think it's a bad idea to say something is on behalf of Honor Council without consensus
 4. Franklin: But he's an administrator of the body. By signing as the body it's an easy way of recognition
 5. Mark: Claiming that you're doing something on behalf of someone who you don't have permission to do so, then you're in the wrong.

12. Moment of silence