

# Honor Council

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

Public Portion Minutes from December 12, 2010

---

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

**Members Absent:**

**Guests:** Jacob Horn, Jacob Axelrod

1. Jacob Axelrod is a pretentious nerd. He won't use A1 because he needs Worcester sauce.
2. Moment of Silence
3. Last meeting!
4. Ian and Florencia are new Co-Secretaries
5. Jacob Axelrod is new Librarian. But that's old news
6. Alex and Hilary. It's been real
7. Committee Reports
  - a. Trico
    - i. Pretty Phil: We met. But not with Martha
    - ii. Emma: We're trying to work with Martha before the end of the semester
    - iii. Noah: Talked to dean at Swat. College Judicial Committee will talk about it tomorrow. Swat has very little info on the website. There may be some students
      1. Florencia: No
      2. Anna: I think there are. They said students are involved in sexual assault cases. If they're involved in that they should be involved in other things too.
    - iv. Noah: If they don't get back to me tomorrow, I'll email them Tuesday
    - v. Emily: What are the hopes for next semester
    - vi. Emma: Hopefully getting reps from all the schools together in the same room
    - vii. Emma: Bryn Mawr had very different changes. They wanted Bryn Mawr representatives on cases (actually on the juries) at Haverford. This is shit.
    - viii. Abby: But do we want our students tried at Bryn Mawr without Haverford reps?
    - ix. Florencia: No. We shouldn't have representatives for our students on their trials because when we take a class at Bryn Mawr then we fall under their Honor Code and visa versa.
    - x. Noah: We need to work out the differences with Bryn Mawr. Also, we might possibly need to do the same thing with Swat.
    - xi. Pretty Phil: They want to avoid paper work problems.
    - xii. Sam: Well, since we currently don't have any paperwork, it couldn't get any easier

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "I got my key today!" Schwartz and Alex "Imma miss Hilary soooo much next semester" 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](mailto:code@hc)!

- b. Student Outreach
  - i. Hilary: AJ and I couldn't pick a t-shirt so they will have to do that next semester. But we'll start putting up Charlie's posters starting immediately next semester
  - ii. Noah: Some people mentioned confrontalogue and the Haverford Listening Project
- c. Faculty Outreach
  - i. Anna: did you look at the survey yet?
  - ii. Ian: No.
  - iii. Anna: First thing next semester, that's what you have to do.
  - iv. Ian: Will Seth be on HC next semester?
  - v. Anna: He has to run again?
- d. Co-Chair meeting with senior staff tomorrow
  - i. Anna: Will talk to them about Honor Code, particularly Social Honor Code. Faculty Outreach sent us a list of talking points for tomorrow. Look over it now.
  - ii. Florencia: They look fine
  - iii. Anna: Anything you want to add?
  - iv. Abby: This would be a good time to emphasize academic violations - that faculty have to bring these things to HC.
  - v. Hilary: But this is just staff
  - vi. Abby: Oops
  - vii. Jacob: One of the questions that came up about selecting grad students was whether they would be bound by the Honor Code because they interact with students on a more residential level. I raised it to the staff selecting them and we decided that it wouldn't make sense for them to be bound by the Honor Code as long as they were aware. But having the conversation we realized how important it is for them to realize how the Honor code works because staff in general doesn't necessarily have a clear idea of how the Honor code works. There are words that float around that they hear from the Code but they don't really have a clear grasp about what the Honor Code is and what it's actually about. I think it would be helpful to explain it to them and tell them how it is related to them.
  - viii. Emma: Do they read abstracts?
  - ix. Anna: They receive them
  - x. Emma: Well I think we could give them examples of abstracts they could read. Tiger and Chichi
  - xi. Hilary: I think it only matters to have an abstract so they understand what the process is like
  - xii. Josh: I like the idea of giving each person a copy of the Honor Code but I don't know how logistical it is. Maybe we can just try to give each person a copy.
  - xiii. Anna: I like it.
- e. Emily: Reminder, we have lunch with the deans on Wednesday at 12 noon.

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "I got my key today!" Schwartz and Alex "Imma miss Hilary soooo much next semester" 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](mailto:code@hc)!

- f. Anna: Either DC catering (which is really good) or a place with wraps and sandwiches possibly.
  - g. Hilary: Whine Whine Whine, I want Bagels. Waaaahhh
  - h. Safety Security
    - i. Florencia: Did not meet
  - i. Abstract Committee:
    - i. Florencia: We may or may not have met
  - j. JSAAPP
    - i. AJ: We have not met, just selling t-shirts
  - k. Committee to draft changes to the Honor Code
    - i. Emily: We need a game-plan but we need to start immediately at the start of the semester
    - ii. Anna: We decided that we want old council to go over the changes
    - iii. Abby, Florencia, Noah, Phil, Ian
8. Hilary Runs Away
- a. Emily: We want to say thank you so much
  - b. Florencia: COOKIE CAKE!!!!!!
  - c. Everyone: AWWWEEEEEE
  - d. It says “Thank you Honor Council!”
9. Ice Cream Break!
10. Sticky Issue
- a. Recap: Moving forward with discussion under assumption of “If we’re going to make this work, how would it work?”- hope to get to the spirit of something.
    - i. Shift: Instead of when would we not share to what are the circumstances under which we would share? Compare past violations with current violations
  - b. Abby: Key issues on the table seemed to be who is the we that’s comparing these statements of violation? Differing opinions: Librarian, jury...
  - c. Emily: What do you think of having the librarian do it? Should it be somebody who’s involved with the trial? Should it be the co-chair?
  - d. Seth: Isn’t the librarian’s purpose a check on Honor Council? Seems to be outside the librarian’s job description
  - e. Florencia: If we’re overlooking a really big resolution because something didn’t work, that is somewhere the librarian should step in
  - f. Baby Jacob: KICKS SETH’S ASS (quotes the librarian job description to prove that this relates to precedent, past cases, and that its ultimately, completely, under the librarian’s job descriptions)
  - g. Abby: I’m worried that they become the ultimate person- works counter to group consensus
  - h. Anna: Not just the librarian deciding. It’s a conversation.
  - i. Emily: Probably a conversation ultimately steered by the librarian...
  - j. Anna: What about Honor Council doing it?
  - k. Ian: It would be against the spirit of conversation if it’s more than one person

- l. Abby: In most cases, the confronted party wouldn't want past trials to come up
- m. Emily: It is do we or don't we talk about this past trial and more let's look at these statements of violation and figure out if one is relevant to another.
- n. Anna: I like Ian's point, it does have to be just one person talking to them. Having this decision with whether or not more information is presented to a jury, I'm comfortable with that and it does seem to fit within the librarian's job description
- o. Charlie: Would the librarian have all previous statements of violations in front of them?
- p. Anna: Librarian should theoretically have records of all past cases. Librarian should say "Oh I have a case involving this person..."
- q. Charlie: Does the librarian already have these files?
- r. Anna: Yes although it's kind of under revision
- s. Alex: I'd feel more comfortable with the librarian and the co-head having a conversation...
- t. Ian: How would it work with one of you knowing something and not the other?
- u. Emily and Anna: Manageable...
- v. Emily: What if the other co head found out after the case? They can brief the other co-chair. What if they were told during the trial?
- w. Abby: Then they'd have to hide it from the jury... which might already be the case anyway though.
- x. Emily: Does anyone feel like it should be someone involved in the trial? Or should it be someone uninvolved?
- y. Almost everyone: uninvolved.
- z. SO DECISIVE!
- aa. Anna: Someone is brought to trial, librarian finds out (because they already know), librarian talks to Martha finding out if this person has any past cases, presents it to THE OTHER CO-CHAIR (or the secretary or something), and then that person would sit down with the confronted party following statement of violation, having a conversation about whether or not the past case is relevant. Have it be presented entirely as a conversation as to how and to what extent the previous violation is discussed with the jury. Ideal: They would reach an agreement. If they cannot, and the co-chair feels that this needs to be discussed
- bb. Hilary and Alex: What is the timeline?
- cc. Emily and Anna: Isn't necessarily a timeline but normally circumstantial is the next day
- dd. Alex: There's a lot of stuff to do.
- ee. Emily: Can the librarian tell the other co chair before the statement of violation?
- ff. Alex: I think we could fit it all in after the fact finding if we add another day in between.
- gg. Emily: Librarian shoots confronted party an e-mail like "heads up- expect a conversation if there is a statement of violation"
- hh. Abby: So do you just tell the co-chair, wait in this case, add an extra day?

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "I got my key today!" Schwartz and Alex "Imma miss Hilary soooo much next semester" 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](mailto:code@hc)!

- ii. Alex: Make a meeting that they don't necessarily have
- jj. Anna: That's an issue we can tackle as it comes up/if it comes up
- kk. Ian: One concern- where did we end on the role of the conversation in determining what's going to happen? The way I heard it, the other person (the non confronted party) could still override the confronted party's decision...
- ll. Anna: Haven't reached a decision. We should talk about this. Ideally, we could say these two people will reach a decision.
- mm. Abby: Approach it as "are these the same?"
- nn. Emily: Or "are these related?"
- oo. Abby: Does the other co-head have the statement of violation or abstract? Seems important to have the abstract...
- pp. Hilary: Not necessarily an abstract
- qq. Emily: Or a summary?
- rr. Anna: Are you guys comfortable with that? Looking at an abstract or a summary?
- ss. Jamey: I don't agree if it means that if they disagree, the student doesn't get their say. It seems like the student doesn't have power.
- tt. Emily: That's what we're discussing
- uu. Ian: You're asking about having the abstract?
- vv. Anna: So what happens if the two people don't agree whether or not it's related?
- ww. Ian: They should try to continue having a conversation. And then if they can't decide, the student wins.
- xx. Bring it to Honor Council?
- yy. Emma: Holding up the schedule isn't just inconvenient. "Terrible miscarriage of justice"
- zz. Either one person gets the ultimate say or another party has to review it...
- aaa. Anna: What if the co-chair says the co-chair gets to make the ultimate decision but have to run this decision by the librarian? Say they're in complete disagreement as to whether or not these issues are related... the co-chair can make that decision after speaking with the person if they're in disagreement but has to talk to the librarian and explain the case and the conversation and ask is it ok to move forward? And the librarian can say yes or no
- bbb. Connor: So the librarian gets the ultimate say?
- ccc. Hilary: No because it only happens after the conversation
- ddd. Connor: So like a tiebreaker?
- eee. Anna: More productive to look at it as a sanity check
- fff. Josh: Which is the librarian's job- to be a check on Honor Council
- ggg. Emily: Jamey, how do you like that idea?
- hhh. Jamey: I don't like it very much
- iii. Anna: Bring the librarian to the conversation?
- jjj. Hilary: Makes them a tie breaker rather than a sanity check
- kkk. Anna: So have the co-chair tell the student
- lll. Seth: Does the librarian then have veto power?
- mmm. Florencia: Yes but there job is to be a check

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "I got my key today!" Schwartz and Alex "Imma miss Hilary soooo much next semester" 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](mailto:code@hc)!

- nnn. Seth: But Emma can't block consensus...
- ooo. Florencia: If Honor Council is doing something completely against what we're supposed to do, then they're supposed to jump in and do something. That's their job.
- ppp. Jamey: My main problem is still that the student loses any ability to dictate how things go.
- qqq. Noah: One of the reasons we're doing this, not the only reason, is that a student will break the code multiple times and no one can realize the extent of their breaking the code
- rrr. Jamey: If they're not getting any say why are we discussing it?
- sss. Emily: They're going to get plenty of say, the co-chair will be very hesitant to go against the student's wishes
- ttt. Jamey: That sounds fine, just doesn't seem to be what we're saying
- uuu. Abby: The idea is that all relevant info should be shared. Are you against relevant information being shared?
- vvv. Jamey: I think the student should have a say
- www. Noah: Nothing more that could happen dude.
- xxx. Abby: In a situation where a case is "super-relevant", do you feel like in that situation, the student should have the choice to say no?
- yyy. Jamey: They're going to want that
- zzz. Abby: Do you think it's appropriate to have them say yes, this happened before, but no, I don't want the jury to know
- aaaa. Jamey: That's a leading question. I don't think the student should not have "veto power" over things being shared. Using the language "sanity check" and such still takes away the student's power.
- bbbb. Emily: True that the student doesn't have veto power but the student does have a lot of power in this conversation. We're conceiving of a situation where the co-chair and student don't agree. You're not comfortable with any situation in which the student doesn't have veto power. Given that somebody may stand outside of consensus in this decision, I feel like at some point, if it keeps coming down to that one thing, the weight of the group might never be along with that. Do you feel like your voice has been heard.
- cccc. Emily: Summary- Librarian will shoot the person a heads up e-mail, the co-chair will sit down with the confronted party and talk about relevance of past case, to the extent that they're related, they can talk about how and how much is shared. Presented as a conversation. If it comes to the point where they can't agree, it becomes the co-chair's decision- and then maybe meet with the librarian?
- dddd. Ian: No I want veto power
- eeee. Anna: Do you feel like your voice has been heard?
- ffff. Ian: Yes
- gggg. Emily: I'm going to ask one more time, are people other than Jamey and Ian largely comfortable with this so far?
- hhhh. Seth: Still a little bit uncomfortable with the librarian's position in this
- iiii. Emily: Haven't gotten to that point yet

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "I got my key today!" Schwartz and Alex "Imma miss Hilary soooo much next semester" 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](mailto:code@hc)!

- jjjj. Anna: From this point, Co-Chair approaches librarian and explains conversation and explains what they want to do. Librarian essentially acting as a sanity check and if the librarian says no, the co-chair doesn't bring it upon
- kkkk. Ian: Is there any way to bring the student back in before the absolute final decision is made?
- llll. Emily: In what sense?
- mmmm. Ian: After the conversation between the co-chair and the librarian, the student comes back in and explains their position
- nnnn. Emily: It becomes more that the librarian is a tiebreaker rather than a check.
- oooo. Jamey: When the co-chair and the confronted party first speak, is the co-chair trying to work from getting as minimal information as possible? Or are they working from what's the minimum of information we can give? If they're coming from the minimal information then the confronted party doesn't need to be brought back in...
- pppp. Emily: I would frame it as unnecessary information doesn't need to be shared so finding the information that's relevant, related and useful. I wouldn't frame it as we need the least possible. We're going for the relevant.
- qqqq. Connor: What if we share just some details and then they go find the abstract?
- rrrr. Anna: Present as "respect this person's confidentiality"
- ssss. Abby: Have the party present it...
- tttt. Anna: I think that's already part of the conversation which is how much is shared and how it is shared. Putting it into the statement might be good but it might require the confronted party to do more work during a potentially hectic week.
- uuuu. Abby: I thought it might give more agency and make people feel more comfortable.
- vvvv. Connor: Returning to the librarian, and maybe have the confronted party talk to the librarian. But I guess that gets back to the third party thing (tie breaker) but I don't know what's wrong with that. Give the student as much say as possible
- wwww. Anna: We could tell the student we're meeting with the Librarian at a certain time so the confronted party could email the librarian in advance
- xxxx. Emily: I think we should discuss that separately because I'm not sure I'm comfortable with them speaking to the librarian first because the librarian is supposed to be a check of Honor council
- yyyy. Anna: but we can't stop a student from emailing the librarian
- zzzz. Florencia: But a confronted party might misconstrue the conversation
- aaaa. Ian: I don't see why we can't have both meet with the librarian
- bbbb. Jamey: Could the librarian sit, but not participate in the first meeting and then allow them to talk in the second meeting as a sanity

check? They could just sit there and listen to both sides so neither side can construe the conversation

ccccc. Pretty Phil: that would make the situation so uncomfortable having a conversation with someone just lurking

dddd. Sam: What if the Librarian just hid somewhere secretly

eeee. Jamey: How would you feel about tape-recording the conversation

ffff. Emily: But I'm so uncomfortable with that. Also having to explain the librarian would be so weird

ggggg. Ian: What about the librarian being a mediated discussion

hhhhh. Alex: Also can a mediator input his or her own opinion?

iiii. Abby: But it assumes conflict before there is one.

jjjj. Anna: So, if they disagree, the co-chair could talk to the confronted party and say they will talk with the Librarian and say that the confronted party should be able to go talk to the librarian in advance too.

kkkkk. Emma: I think that both parties should meet with the librarian. Don't mandate it but highly suggest it.

llll. Ian goes to the bathroom.

mmmmm. Anna: Florencia says that she consents to the flow of the conversation as it is going now

nnnnn. Many people: that makes me uncomfortable

oooo. Anna: This happened before

ppppp. Emily: When?!

qqqqq. Anna: all the time (Josh agrees)

rrrrr. Emily: I would work with a reduced council before we consent without her

sssss. Emily: Ok. Back to both confronted party and co-chair talk to the librarian

tttt. Abby: and it has to be represented as a legitimate option, not going over the co-chair's head

uuuuu. Emily: Does anyone have concerns about making the librarian as more of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party than as a sanity check

vvvvv. Seth: I'm fine with it. But having read through the librarian section of the constitution it seems the Librarian is supposed to look at trends of the student body and overall violations rather than looking back at precedent of a specific person

wwwww. Emma: But if we make this a specific procedure and the librarian thinks that it is within the constitution to present this information about a confronted party then it is completely within the constitution

xxxxx. Seth: I'm fine with a third party being able to hear both sides and decide but I'm uncomfortable of making it a person not on Honor Council or on the jury

yyyyy. Emma: but Honor council has the power to change the role of the librarian at any time

zzzzz. Seth: I just question whether or not if it's appropriate

aaaaa. Emily: Think of it less as "I'm going to look back and see if there's a violation" but more as a check on the co-chair and that Honor council is functioning properly

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "I got my key today!" Schwartz and Alex "Imma miss Hilary soooo much next semester" 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](mailto:code@hc)!

- bbbbbb. Seth: I'm fine seeing it go forward but I probably want to stand outside, but given our circumstances that would be problematic. It makes me uncomfortable because it seems like we're setting the librarian up as another jury
- cccccc. Anna: But most of the time we should assume that both parties should come to an agreement. But that the co-chair will talk with the librarian as a check that can meet with both people. Then the co-chair will run it by the librarian and the librarian can say that it is fine within their rights as a check on Honor Council or that it's not ok and, as a check, it is not ok for you to do this. The librarian is more of a sounding board on the co-chair
- dddddd. Seth: Making the librarian a 3<sup>rd</sup> party decision maker is problematic. The librarian should not take statements from both sides
- eeeeee. Hilary: But who should it be? The secretaries?
- ffffff. Seth: I would be much more comfortable with that
- gggggg. Emma: But that would be much more HC teaming up. The librarian is just making sure that the co-chair is making a statement that's within the bounds of the constitution
- hhhhhh. Pretty Phil: The idea of having the confronted party speak with the librarian is so that the librarian gets the full opinion and not one that is biased to either side
- iiiiii. Emily: I see it not as asking for statements but more something about the co-chair will talk to the librarian and the confronted party has an option to speak with the librarian and voice their concerns
- jjjjjj. Abby: The librarian is supposed to see if it is out of line for Honor Council and they need to talk to both sides for that.
- kkkkkk. Anna: Why is it an issue with the Librarian
- llllll. Seth: I'm not uncomfortable with it either way. But I'm more comfortable with the co-chair speaking with the librarian but when it comes to a real un-resolvable conflict where they can't agree on whether a statement is relevant then it's quite likely that the confronted party is going to want to voice their concern to the librarian and I feel like that's then putting the librarian in a position where the chair will make a statement, the confronted party will make a statement, and the librarian will make a decision. That's not quite that the librarian is a separate jury but that's putting a lot of power in the librarian's hands.
- mmmmmm. Jamey: when the librarian is looking at the statements and whether they want to send it to the co-chair, how are they making that since there's no precedent yet?
- nnnnnn. Anna: The librarian is just looking to see if they are similar
- oooooo. Jamey: Then why would the librarian be a better check than anyone?
- pppppp. Anna: Because they're acting as a check
- qqqqqq. Anna: The librarian is selected by SC to serve as a check of Honor Council to act as a check on the Co-chairs and as a representative of the student body. Maybe it's more appropriate to say that this person is more

capable of making a decision regarding a conflict between HC and the student body

rrrrrr. Seth: but how do you say that the librarian is a better rep of the student body than an elected HC member like the secretary?

ssssss. The librarian is already within confidentiality unlike HC. The secretaries are elected to serve as members of a body rather than an individual. They secretaries might blur the line between secretaries and co-chairs.

tttttt. Anna: how is everyone feeling about this now?

uuuuuu. Noah: I can see Seth's point, but I think it's reasonable to extend the librarian's role. I'm also alright with it being the co-secretaries because all we need is someone to make a decision about this because they were elected

vvvvvv. Anna: But they weren't elected for this

wwwwww. Hilary: I'd be uncomfortable with that

xxxxxx. Emily: But no HC member is elected to make a decision unilaterally because we were elected to be a voice in the group. I'm ok with the librarian thing because that speaks to the librarians job specifically and I'd be uncomfortable with anyone else on council

yyyyyy. Ian: I'm uncomfortable with the idea as a check. If whatever the librarian says goes then it's not a check. We should just say what we mean, which is that the librarian has the final decision because that's where the power lies

zzzzzz. Pretty Phil: The librarian isn't making a decision. The librarian could disagree with the librarian's decision but if they understand the reasoning and it's within the constitution then the librarian can't stop it. The librarian isn't saying yes or no unless the reasoning is way off

aaaaaaa. Alex: The librarian isn't supposed to make a personal decision but make a decision about whether sharing the information is within the spirit of the constitution.

bbbbbbb. Ian: But in that case the confronted party should not have any say

ccccccc. Anna: But what if we have an issue like Dora where she has a very extreme circumstance and it would be against the spirit of the constitution in such a way as to violate the confidentiality in such a gross way.

ddddddd. Emily: I'm feeling less unity in the group.

eeeeeee. Go around:

i. Josh: Since AJ leaves, I think we need to decide if we're going to operate under reduced council

ii. Emily: With two people gone, I think we need to operate under reduced council.

ffffff. Emily: I think we're not at a point yet where we can consent.

Seem to be more than two people who have significant concerns

ggggggg. Anna: Where we are, Librarian gives confronted party heads up, co chair and party have a conversation, presented as a conversation, if they disagree, co chair talks to librarian as a sanity check and party is also given the opportunity to talk to the librarian. Go around and say if you feel ok about it and if you have a concern, what's your concern:

- i. Josh: I would consent
  - ii. Charlie: I feel pretty confident. I trust the co-chairs enough that if it did have to go the librarian it wouldn't be ridic reasoning. I'm not sure how often the librarian is going to be a sanity check
  - iii. Abby: I don't adore the idea, but I'm comfortable with it and can't think of a better alternative
  - iv. Anna: I feel comfortable with the idea and it works with the roles
  - v. Emily: I agree
  - vi. Sam: I think it's very complicated, but I'm more comfortable with it then any other idea
  - vii. Pretty Phil: <3
  - viii. Alex: I'm for it
  - ix. Hilary: For it
  - x. Jamey: I think this would make me as happy as I'm going to be with it- would still stand outside.
  - xi. Ian: I don't like it. I'm not comfortable with the idea that this is the best we can do so we should just go for it. I'm also not comfortable with calling the librarian's decision a check.
  - xii. Connor: I'm ok but I think I might be sympathetic to his view that the librarian's becoming a bit of a decider. I think we're accommodating this as best we can.
  - xiii. Seth: I'm still mulling over the same issues. Not ready to consent to anything.
  - xiv. Noah: I feel good about the idea. I agree that it changes the librarian's role a little bit but I think not too much.
- hhhhhhh. Anna: I think the people who spoke about the role of the librarian is largely about the librarian being a "decider" or "you're crazy." I do think that I'm saying what mean. I wonder if it would make you more comfortable if we said in the text that the librarian is not the decider. Would that make you more comfortable
- iiiiiii. Ian: I think I'm more comfortable saying that the librarian does this in the job description. When you say it's not a decision does that mean the chair can ignore it?
- jjjjjj. Alex: What happens if the librarian sees the council is violating the Honor Code?
- kkkkkkk. Emma: The Librarian just says so and changes the direction of the conversation
- lllllll. Pretty Phil: The chair will ask if it's within the spirit of the Honor Code. The librarian can't just say Yes or No flat out
- mmmmmmm. Seth: I'm more comfortable with a clear yes or no about whether they are or not breaking the honor code. It needs to be cut and dry.
- nnnnnnn. Emily: But is making a decision like this more in line with a hc member?
- ooooooo. Seth: yes
- ppppppp. Emma: Federalist papers Smack Down!!!!!! It's not for HC to decide if its internal actions are within the honor code. It needs someone

These minutes reflect the opinions of Hilary "I got my key today!" Schwartz and Alex "Imma miss Hilary soooo much next semester" 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](mailto:code@hc)!

from outside to be the judge. In this case it is super important to check to have an outside voice who has not consented on what's going on is vital. This is the very reason the librarian's position exists to do. If you think that this is expanding the position of the librarian then you have not read the description of the Librarian.

qqqqqqq. Josh: Thank you!

rrrrrrr. Pretty Phil: Quote from the description!

sssssss. Seth: I almost feel this is not the librarian making a check on HC but making a decision

ttttttt. Anna: But how about the librarian says that it is fine or it's not within the constitution

uuuuuuu. Emily: The librarian will decide whether or not the co-chair is in line with HC. It's a decision that is exactly what the librarian's job description.

vvvvvvv. Ian: Thank you. That's what I was trying to 10 minutes ago

wwwwwww. Anna: What if the librarian is in the room during the discussion and in the course of this discussion if the librarian sees a conflict with the Honor Code they would speak up? BUT: It would be really awkward to have the librarian there, so the check it just happening afterwards rather than during the conversation. We're just moving it to a different setting

xxxxxxx. Emily: So it sounds like the weight of the group is moving toward the decision but perhaps the order in which things happen. Ok we get to the point where people can't make the decision, co-chair checks with librarian but stated very clearly that the librarian is deciding whether or the co-chair is in line with the honor code? Enough people are uncomfortable that we can't move forward...

yyyyyyy. Seth: I'm becoming more comfortable with it. I think that Anna just described helped a lot and making it explicit that that's the purpose.

zzzzzzz. Anna: Take a step back to see how this scenario would finish up. The way that I'm seeing it- we have this conversation where the co-chair runs this by the librarian. Assuming this is going to be brought up before the jury.

aaaaaaaa. Jamey: If they raise an issue, is there then a conversation?

bbbbbbbb. Anna: Yes, between the co-chair and the librarian

ccccccc. Anna: SO Assuming it's going to be brought up, this co-chair would go talk to the chair of the trial and tell them what they need to know, and this is brought up at the end of the circumstantial portion. Before proposed resolutions.

ddddddd. Anna: Sounds like the weight of the group is leaning toward this decision as it stands. We could potentially consent.

eeeeeee. Ian: Quick overview?

fffffff. Anna: When someone is brought to Honor Council, the librarian is going to check if they have past violations. If they find there is, they will give the confronted party a heads up, if there is a statement of violation, the other co-chair will want to talk to you. Librarian talks to co-chair after the statement of violation for this other case, you should talk to the

confronted party. Co-chair compares statement of violation for the two cases. Talk about- are these two cases related? Is this relevant to be shared with the jury? Presented as a conversation, let's talk about whether or not this is relevant and whether or not it should be shared. If the two parties agree as to whether or not it should be shared and how it should be shared- co chair talks to other co chair and passes it on. If they disagree, co-chair will talk to librarian and say this is the nature of my conversation, I'm going to move forward, sanity check? Librarian says ok its cool or no this is somehow against the spirit of the constitution or honor code. They talk about it and if the librarian still feels its against the spirit, it gets dropped. If it continues, the co-chair talks to the co-chair of the trial, here's this information we found, we had this discussion this is what came out of this discussion and how we want it presented. How are you feeling about this? Do you guys feel comfortable consenting on this idea?  
gggggggg. We reached consensus with two people standing outside!!!! We'll consent to the wording of this over e-mail