

Honor Council Minutes

Sunday, September 16th, 1990

Present: Cheryl Sternman (Chair), Jonathan Paul (Secretary), Chris Young (emeritus Secretary), Al Bing, Jen Sartori, Carrie Kenny, John Devlin, Theo Noell, Mike Sklar (Apologies to anyone I forgot; it's my first time: forgive me.)

Absent: Everyone else (I don't have a list of who was on Honor Council before, and after the elections it won't matter too terribly.)

We started the meeting, surprisingly enough, with a moment of silence.

We then introduced around the table the new Secretary: Jonathan Paul '92; i.e. Me.

After the pleasantries, we discussed meetings and Honor Code mock-juries that had been held over the weekend with Alumni Council. We were pleased that most of the mock-juries reached much the same conclusions that Honor Council had in the original cases; it's nice to see a bit of inter-generational consensus. We also talked of the differences and similarities between and among alums of different generations and ourselves. Additionally, we spoke for a time about the possibility of cases of plagiarism "slipping through the cracks" because professors "did not distrust" students, and what role the Honor Code plays in such situations. We talked for a bit about our responsibility as Honor Council to educate people about the issues involved.

On a related note, we talked of the possibility of doing similar mock-juries with interested members of the community, shortly before the release of full abstracts; the members of the mock-jury would receive the synopsis of the trial or mediation, without Honor Council's resolutions. We pointed out that people could get a taste of what it would be like to be on a jury without the rigors that come with being on a (real) Honor Code Trial.

We then discussed community reactions to *Darrin*, with reported responses ranging from apathy to complete agreement to "are they blind?" to "they were way too lenient" and a even a few "they were too harsh". We received a fairly low number of written responses, but most expressed agreement satisfaction with the resolutions. We also discussed HCO meetings regarding upcoming abstracts.

We talked about confidential cases in progress, and then broke for dessert.

When we came back from dessert we talked about the upcoming Honor Council Elections, with the details of the Candidates' study break (Monday at 10:15 in the Sunken Lounge), and the balloting, and publicity being discussed.

Then we talked for a bit about timing of soon-to-be-released abstracts, and adjourned.

Honor Council Minutes September 23rd, 1990

Present: Al Bing (L), Janine Guglielmino, Nanette Hess, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul, Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori, Drew Sommers, Cheryl Sternman, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton; Absent: Andrew Clevenger

We gathered this week with Pizza to welcome the new Honor Council members, fresh from elections.

We began with a moment of silence, as is our tradition

Cheryl described what we were going to be doing, and then we played the Name Game, introducing ourselves. Then the new members told a bit about themselves, and why they chose to run for Honor Council, and some of their interests.

First on our agenda was appointing new members to JSAAPP (the Joint Student-Administration Alcohol Policy Panel). Drew and Seth, who were respectively Honor Council and at-large members last semester, explained a bit about JSAAPP, and promptly volunteered for two of the three openings. No one else jumped to volunteer, so the matter of the third Honor Council member of JSAAPP has been postponed for a week.

Next we discussed the grant that Hillel and Honor Council have received from the B'nai B'rith Foundation to study ethics and the Honor Code. Five Honor Council members (Al Bing, Nanette Hess, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, and Elliot Weis) have volunteered to be part of the joint Hillel-Honor Council committee to implement the grant. They will be comparing our Honor Code with that from other schools, and how our Honor Code has changed over the last decades as Haverford's student body has grown more diverse, especially with regard to Haverford's relatively recent co-ed status.

We talked a bit about intra-Council communication, with stress on the use of Vax Mail.

We also talked about Facilitation Training (by the same group that trains members of Communication Outreach) for members of Honor Council. Some of the "veteran" members of Honor Council explained the functioning of mediation with regard to Honor Council functions.

After that we broke for dessert.

We came back from dessert, and Elliot told us a story (an "Honor Code" story) that illustrated well the common conflict between the Code's ideals and what we personally think is right.

We talked a bit of confidential matters in progress, and then talked quite a bit about trial procedures, by way of orientation for new members.

Next, the issue of computer ethics was raised, and we resolved to talk more about this important issue in the future, specifically with regard to software piracy, the consequences of our Vax being connected to the Internet, and for electronic forums like Vax Notes.

We decided that it would be a good thing for certain members of the Administration to come and talk with us. We resolved to invite several of the Deans, at different times, as well as President Kessinger, and Phil Fitz, the director of Academic Computing.

The last thing on our agenda was a letter received by Cheryl from an Alum who graduated somewhere in the '50s. The letter recounted a time when the Honor Code was one sentence long. We discussed the changes in the Honor Code and our reactions to the letter. There emerged something of a consensus that while the Code may be longer than it used to be, it's a lot shorter than a lot of Codes at other similar places, and that since issues have seemed to have grown in complexity, so should our Code.

After the discussion of the letter, we had another moment of silence, and adjourned.

Honor Council Minutes

Sunday, September 30th, 1990

Present: Al Bing (L), Andrew Clevenger, Janine Guglielmino, Nanette Hess, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul, Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori, Drew Sommers, Cheryl Sternman, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton

As usual, we began with a moment of silence.

This meeting, Dean Steve Watter joined us for a time. He talked to us a bit about himself and what he does at the college, and how he sees his role vis-a-vis Honor Council.

Cheryl read us a response she wrote to a letter from an alum who had participated in an Alumni Council Honor Code mock-jury. We discussed it a bit, and several of us signed it as well.

Cheryl then told us about someone she had spoken to at Gettysburg College regarding our respective Honor Codes. It was interesting to hear about the similarities and differences between these Codes, and in how they seem to work.

JSAAPP was looking for a third member from Honor Council, and they found one, in the erstwhile person of Nanette Hess. (Yay, Nanette!)

We then spoke of an upcoming Honor Code mock-jury (like that with Alumni Council) that some members of Honor Council will be doing with members of the Board of Managers of the College.

We will be posting information sheets with a list of the Honor Council members, their campus addresses, phone numbers, and Vax usernames, around the campus, in dorms and in non-dorm buildings. We won't be doing campus-wide mailings any more for environmental reasons—except for Abstracts and important letters, of course.

PLENARY is NEXT SUNDAY! Make sure you and everyone else you know will be exercising their right to self-government and show up at Marshall Auditorium on Sunday, October 7th by 1:30pm!

A very serious issue has been coming up all too often of late in the community. A letter from Provost Bruce Partridge has alerted us to the widespread disapproval of resolutions from the *Darrin* abstract. Plagiarism is *the* ultimate academic offense in a community such as ours.

Correspondingly, Honor Council will be writing a letter to all faculty asking for more feedback on abstracts, and also a letter to the student body explaining the seriousness of the issue, and what we see as Honor Council's responsibilities with regard to it.

After coming back from a dessert break, we heard from the committee working on the Hillel-Honor Council grant. They have been chugging along quite efficiently; they have outlined their plans for the coming semester and beyond, and have started working on getting speakers.

Honor Council has been talking to Delsie Phillips, head of Admissions, about getting Honor Council financial help in distributing copies of the (current) Honor Code to all prospectives (not just admitted students!), and in general making the Honor Code more accessible to students.

[By the way, the Code is included in your Students' Guide.]

We talked a bit about JSAAPP and its relation to the Honor Code, and reasons for their separation.

Honor Council is planning a Lunch Discussion, soon after Fall Break, to discuss an abstract that will be coming out soon.

Honor Council Minutes

October 7, 1990

Present: Al Bing, Andrew Clevenger, Janine Guglielmino, Nanette Hess, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul, Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori (L), Cheryl Sternman, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton; Absent: Drew Sommers

We began the meeting with a moment of silence.

Cheryl presented us with several sheets of information, "historic" letters from faculty to the student body, and suchlike.

We spent a long time discussing timing of upcoming abstracts, and regarding confidentiality issues. There was a lot of discussion about timing of upcoming events pertaining to Honor Council.

Matt Hamabata visited us this meeting, and stayed and talked for almost an hour with us regarding several different issues. He spoke of his role vis-a-vis Honor Council, and of some of the issues that he thinks will be facing the College and Honor Council in the next year (specifically free-speech issues like the Mapplethorpe obscenity trial and the Dartmouth *Review* incident, and issues regarding harassment and "-isms").

He told us that the Board of Managers will be focussing on the Honor Code in its December meeting.

Honor Council is *very* concerned about plagiarism, both the act itself and the way people view it in the community. We are working on letters to the faculty and the student body, and are planning to have a Lunch Discussion about these issues, when we release the next Honor Code abstract.

Plagiarism has been on the rise, alarmingly, in the last year. We are sure to be talking more about this in the future, but for now, it is probably a good thing -- for your own protection -- to follow the idea that **when in doubt, cite it**. Also, **check with your professors if you are unclear on their assignments**. It is *our* responsibility as students to make sure we are following their wishes.

We talked about the Consensual Relationship Policy, regarding sexual relationships between faculty and students. We are planning on getting even more student feedback (after all, *we are* students), and after discussion, we wrote down recommendations for the panel that produced the Policy.

There will be a meeting with Bryn Mawr's Honor Board in the near future, to discuss intra-school Honor Code issues. There are also plans in the works to have a study break with the Bryn Mawr Honor Code as the focus.

Remember the Alum who sent Cheryl a letter recalling the time when the Honor Code was one sentence long, and her reply back to him? Cheryl read us his reply; in her words, "we made his day."

After that, we adjourned.

Honor Council Minutes

October 21, 1990

Present: Andrew Clevenger, Janine Guglielmino, Nanette Hess, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul, Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori, Drew Sommers (L), Cheryl Sternman, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton; Absent: Al Bing

We began with a moment of silence.

Cheryl read over the list of things we had to accomplish (it was a long one; this meeting was three hours), and we began.

Adinah reported on the progress regarding the Hillel-Honor Council grant. Because they want to make sure to "do it right", they have decided to not schedule the first of the panels until next semester.

Cheryl read a student's statement that will be included in the next abstract, and we began to do final editing on that abstract. We also talked of scheduling for other upcoming abstracts.

At this point, President Kessinger joined us for dinner. He talked about how he sees his role with regard to the Honor Code and Honor Council (as one of the representatives of the College who often has to articulate and implement trial resolutions, and as a "court of last resort").

He spoke for a bit about consensus, and about the tension between the needs of the community and the needs of the individual within a framework like the Honor Code.

Andrew and Virginia presented the letter to the community [that they had been working on], discussing the increase in plagiarism trials in recent years, and our concern about this issue. The President asked at this point about the reality of this increase; what were its dimensions? how did it compare to plagiarism in the past?

We spoke of the need to reach out to new faculty regarding the Honor Code, to acquaint them with some of the issues that faculty may encounter in teaching in a community like this, with our Honor Code.

After President Kessinger left, we returned to editing the upcoming abstract. This was a long process, interrupted only by a short break for ice cream. In addition, Jonathan made a silly mistake, said "Okay, call me stupid," and Cheryl proceeded to call him "stupid". She also, during this meeting, said "shit" three times.

Cheryl raised some issues regarding the bi-college cooperation, with specific regard to issues such as Haverford students at Bryn Mawr, the differences in our Honor Codes, and jurisdiction.

We spoke also about joking about, and cynicism regarding, the Honor Code, and what, if any, position we should take, and also some of the issues raised regarding people who hear these jokes and the discomfort with these comments.

We finished editing the letter to the community, talking about issues like Honor Code Paranoia (which we do not want to induce in anyone), and the emphasis on the seriousness with which we take the issue of plagiarism.

With that, we adjourned.

Honor Council Minutes

October 28th, 1990

At this meeting, the only thing done (after the moment of silence) was to do final editing on the *Kelly* abstract, and to reach consensus on the changes.

This -- and the fact that 13 of Honor Council's 16 members had undergone Facilitation/Mediation training over the last weekend (9am-5pm Friday, Saturday, and Sunday), is the reason that there were no Honor Council Minutes last week.

November 4, 1990

Present: Al Bing, Andrew Clevenger, Janine Guglielmino, Nanette Hess, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul, Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori, Drew Sommers, Cheryl Sternman, Elliot Weis (L), Steve Whitton (L); Absent: Seth Stodder

We began, oddly enough, with a moment of silence.

We had three visitors at our meeting tonight: Jonathan Lawrence '93, Colin Rule '93, and Manuel Mattke '91.

First on the agenda was discussion of a very "heavy" letter received by Honor Council in response to *Kelly*, *Leon*, and *Darrin*, a letter which targeted Honor Council's "inconsistency" in its resolutions. It called Honor Council a "Haverford Gestapo."

In our discussion, Al pointed out that on every trial there are random members of the community serving on the jury -- 1/3 of each jury is *not* on Honor Council -- which is one explanation for why resolutions may appear "inconsistent." Also, Honor Council does *not* rely on precedent. Jenny stated that she was disturbed by the uncompromising stance set forth by the (anonymous) writer of the letter. And Virginia pointed out that we had discussed the possibility that people might see Honor Council as inconsistent when releasing these abstracts in succession.

Jon Lawrence then took a moment of our time to announce a speaker sponsored by the Bryn Mawr Deans and the Bi-College Christian Fellowship. Dr. Os Guinness, a famous writer who has dealt with issues of religious pluralism, will be speaking about religious pluralism on November 13th at 7:30 pm in Thomas Great Hall at BMC. After this announcement, Jon took his leave of us.

We then took a while to discuss the Lunch Discussion on *Kelly*, *Leon*, and *Darrin*. Reviews from Honor Council members were generally positive. However, there were also several other concerns voiced, such as the different numbers of people from different classes (the relative lack of frosh, in particular); the amount of legalistic language being thrown around; the issue of people looking for

punishment of confronted parties; and intent and how much Honor Council should take it into account.

Cheryl also brought up the concern that since there were only a few hundred people who attended during the two hours of the discussion, that left nine hundred or so who did *not* attend: can we take the views of those who came as fairly representative of the views of the community as a whole?

We got into something of a sub-discussion when Manuel Mattke brought up the issue of the way Honor Council is seen in the community. He brought up several concerns about the way that Honor Council works right now, specifically as to how members are chosen.

We also discussed the discrepancy between the social and the academic portions of the Honor Code, specifically with regard to the idea that the academic portion of the Code is more a list of rules than the social portion. We talked about the trend toward specificity in the Code, and Colin Rule expressed his opinion that it is because people opt for rules because it's easier than thinking at all times about the Code and what they *should* be doing.

Colin specifically brought up the Alcohol Policy and how people think of it as connected to the Honor Code, and how he sees this as damaging the Code; because the Alcohol Policy is much more a set of rules, and is not so much based on "community standards," this spills over to the way people perceive the Honor Code.

As Adinah adroitly put the problem, "What *are* our Community Standards?"

Manuel made a summary of what he thinks should be in the Code: 1) absolute personal responsibility, 2) complete respect for others and their responsibilities, and 3) complete and open discussion of all issues, including people disagreeing.

After Cheryl brought this discussion to a close, Manuel and Colin left.

We then spoke about the issues surrounding the fact that the Code and the Student Association's Constitution state that the Chairperson of Honor Council is also part of the Executive Council of Students' Council, and is First Vice President of SC. We all felt comfortable suggesting that the Honor Council Chair should no longer be called "first VP of Students' Council" but instead just "Honor Council Chair." We decided to suggest this to SC.

Then we discussed some confidential matters, and adjourned.

Honor Council Minutes

November 18, 1990

Present: Al Bing, Andrew Clevenger, Nanette Hess, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul (L), Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori, Cheryl Sternman, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton; Absent: Janine Guglielmino, Drew Sommers

We began, surprisingly, with a moment of silence.

Colin Rule '93 and Anna Blau '93 joined us again this week as visitors.

After the moment of silence, we all introduced ourselves to Dean Randy Milden, who had come to speak with us. She talked to us for a while about her role as "Deputy Dean," and how she acts as a faculty/academic liaison for the administration, as secretary of CSSP, and Affirmative Action Officer for Tenure-Track Searches. She specifically spoke about how her role as academic liaison connects with Honor Council, especially in cases of suspected academic violations, when professors call her with questions about the process.

She also spoke of her roles and concerns regarding gender issues, concerns with coeducational issues, and issues surrounding harassment and assault. In addition, she also is involved with other harassment issues such as heterosexism and anti-Semitism.

In response to several questions, Randy talked about the difficulties of assessing the campus climate (especially with regard to "-isms"), and about cooperation with the BMC deans' office and administration. In addition, she talked about her role vis-a-vis Honor Council, in terms of when and how she could and should get involved with issues that come to Honor Council -- and when she would involve Honor Council with issues that came to her.

Adinah brought up the idea that perhaps there is a need for faculty members (or confronting parties in general) to have "support people" in trial situations, as confronted parties are allowed and encouraged to have. Randy felt that this was a good idea, and that there should be more explicit guidelines on confidentiality -- perhaps a faculty member could designate a person to whom they could talk about a trial they are involved in, without necessarily bringing that person with them to the procedure.

After that, we had no more questions for Randy, and she took her leave of us.

Kwame brought up the fact that it's hardly common knowledge that people can sit in on Honor Council meetings (except for the confidential parts, of course). We discussed whether we should advertise this, or just let it come out in the minutes (ain't self-referentiality fun?). We felt that it would definitely help alleviate some people's concerns that Honor Council is a "secret society." (Adinah mentioned something about a "secret handshake." There isn't *really* a secret handshake. Or at least one that *I've* found out about, anyway.)

Adinah suggested that perhaps Honor Council members could occasionally invite someone that they knew was interested, as long as they checked with the Chairperson first. Someone else suggested that it could be a good thing for candidates running for Honor Council to sit in on meetings -- just to know what they were getting into.

Adinah, Jenny, Elliot, Al, and Carrie reported on the progress being made on the Hillel-Honor Council grant. They've decided that, rather than have four panel discussions, they would do something different for the portion dealing with religion and the Code. They plan, in this "innovative new idea" to "inundate"¹ the campus with questionnaires asking about the relationship between religion, ethics, and the Code. They will compile the responses and come up with a report about the issue.

They've moved this portion to next semester, and are now concentrating on comparing the Honor Codes of several different schools from around the country, ranging from West Point to Brigham Young University. Carrie suggested that they have a separate part for religious Honor Codes. And the issue of "speech codes" such as Stanford's was briefly discussed.

Adinah then read us a letter she will be sending to Faculty members regarding talking to students about the issue of discussing exams before everyone in a class has taken them. Cheryl will be forwarding a copy of this to Bryn Mawr's Honor Board, asking them to distribute it or something similar to the Bryn Mawr faculty as well.

We talked about some scheduling details for a bit. We took a break, and Anna and Colin took their leave of us.

After we came back, we discussed some confidential matters, and then adjourned.

¹Adinah Miller, Honor Council Meeting, 11/18/90

Honor Council Minutes

November 27th, 1990

Present: Al Bing, Andrew Clevenger, Janine Guglielmino, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul, Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori, Drew Sommers, Cheryl Sternman, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton; Absent: Nanette Hess

We met on Tuesday night due to Thanksgiving break. Of course, we started the meeting with a moment of silence.

We did a bit of scheduling (we seem to do a lot of that).

Due to the fact that Cheryl is going away next semester to France (and we're going to miss her dearly), we needed an acting chair for the first two weeks of next semester, until Executive Council elections in the first or second week of February. Jenny Sartori '91 will be ably filling that role.

Since the Board of Managers' Meeting this Friday (the 30th) is going to be dealing with free speech and the Honor Code, there will be one member of each class from Honor Council attending, as well as four at-large community members and some members of Executive Council. Virginia Price '94, Ronjon Paul '93, Jonathan Paul '92, and Al Bing '91 volunteered to attend.

Students' Council has decided to form a committee to help write a new policy for the deans and the administration pertaining to issues of confidentiality and the deans' office (precipitated by the Leshko/Knatz controversy). There will be one Honor Council member on this committee; Seth Stodder '91 volunteered.

Due to concerns voiced by Glenn Normile and campus fire marshals, we talked for about people who deliberately set off fire alarms and whether or not this problem is an issue that Honor Council should deal with. The consensus that emerged was that this problem is something that would be best handled through other channels.

We talked about some confidential issues for a while, and then got into a big discussion (one that will, surely, continue for several weeks) about the issue of whether or not there should be "flags" on academic records for Honor Code academic violations (which there currently are not).

Several points were raised. One was that a "flag" on a record is purely punitive and will have a great effect for a significant period of time. Another point was that the whole philosophy of an Honor Code trial is that the violation and breach of trust is dealt with within the context of Haverford, within our four years here.

A major question was whether the automatic presence of a "flag" on a record would inhibit 1) people confronting their fellow students, and 2) people turning themselves in for academic violations. Another question was raised regarding Bryn Mawr's policy (Bryn Mawr *does* place "flags" on academic transcripts.)

The people working on the grant gave us a quick progress report: everyone is fired up and talking to lots of people at other schools with Codes, and there has been significant progress.

We spent a little bit of time planning a Party (with a capital P) for the end of the semester, both as a bon voyage for Cheryl, and to celebrate the fact that we survived till the end of the semester.

After that, we adjourned.

Honor Council Minutes

December 2, 1990

Present: Al Bing, Andrew Clevenger, Janine Guglielmino, Nanette Hess, Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul, Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori, Drew Sommers, Cheryl Sternman, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton

We started with a moment of silence, as is our wont.

Today we had four visitors, Noah Leavitt '91, Matt Gerber '91, Colin Rule '93, and Kristin Fearn '93.

We started off with a discussion of a freedom of speech policy being developed by Haverford and Bryn Mawr deans, faculty, and students. (Cheryl and Matt Gerber are both on the committee.) Specifically, this policy is being written in response to the incident with the CIA at Bryn Mawr last year, in which several students disrupted a talk by a CIA employee to the extent that the talk was cancelled. The policy will be essentially a set of guidelines for interaction with outside speakers. We spoke mostly of the connection (or lack thereof) such a policy would have to the Honor Code.

The issue which did seem to tie the proposed policy to the Honor Code was that several of the protesting students in the CIA incident refused to give their names, and "blocked" Honor Code confrontations.

Colin asked if this policy would only apply in cases of speakers from outside the community (the answer is yes), and commented that he thought "the law" shouldn't be "laid down". Adinah raised another issue: What if the speaker is directly threatening or offensive? How can students confront them?

Al made an important distinction between the student-student interaction (confronting protesters, etc.) and the interaction between the students and the speakers. The former, she argued, would definitely come under the Honor Code, and thus, there is a link to the Code. She felt strongly that students should have recourse to protest directly threatening speakers.

Virginia said that although we worry about silencing or stifling the viewpoints of numerical minorities, that should not mean that we should silence the majority.

Seth talked about the difference between dissent and silencing; the former should be supported and encouraged, whereas the latter should not be tolerated. Ronjon concurred, saying that shouting someone down is not the same thing as holding them accountable for their views and actions.

Al said that if students are responsible for a speaker coming, then there is an avenue for dialogue [the CIA was invited by the Bryn Mawr Career Development office]. Janine felt strongly that if some students wanted to hear a speaker, they should be able to hear a speaker, even if others didn't want the speaker here.

Colin asked a question, from his perspective as Collection Committee Head. What if he brought someone here to speak who was offensive? Could the speaker be confronted? Could Colin?

Matt Gerber made a point that this proposed policy would not be part of the Code, since it is indeed a list of rules, but also that it is answering administrative concerns, since the administration of the College has an obligation to speakers from outside the College.

Andrew suggested that this policy perhaps wasn't even needed, and students could be held responsible by other students. Matt responded with the idea that Security needs guidelines in order to act at all. Several people felt that Security shouldn't act in any case.

Carrie pointed out that the Honor Code *was* involved because there was the issue of students' rights -- the rights of some of the students to listen to the speaker.

Jenny recalled when Phyllis Schlafly spoke a few years ago, and how it was a very good experience, with a quite a bit of dialogue, and without disruption of the speech. She said that it's important to hear people we don't agree with; otherwise we don't learn.

(It was a *long* discussion.)

Noah Leavitt then brought up his concern, regarding what we mentioned in the minutes last week about open meetings. He thought that they should be *more* open, and should be advertised. He pointed to the lack of specific information on when and where the meetings are.

For the edification of all: Honor Council Meetings are at 5pm on Sundays, in the Smith Room of the Dining Center. If you wish to come to a meeting, let an Honor Council member know, and do join us.

Andrew pointed out also that most of our meetings deal with boring administrative concerns. The rest is confidential, and we'd have to "kick people out" for those "juicy parts."

Several people wondered what would happen if we got a crowd too large for everyone to speak. Matt pointed out that we would have no obligation to call on visitors to speak.

Colin told us that once he found out he could come to our meetings, he was hooked -- "I'm like herpes -- you can't get rid of me, I keep coming back."

Several people expressed concern over the possibility that our meetings, which are already long, would get much longer if we had lots of visitor. In response, Al pointed out that we can often get good input from visitors -- and besides, it can be fun. "It's fun having herpes," is what she said.

We took a break for a bit, and Colin, Kristin, and Noah left us.

When we came back, we talked about the brewing Bryn Mawr Honor Code crisis. Due to many factors, including a student survey, the student members of BMC's Honor Board are calling an emergency meeting of Bryn Mawr's students this

Thursday (the 6th). The survey had indicated widespread discontent with their Code, and little support for it.

We talked for a little while about the issues this would raise for us if Bryn Mawr's Honor Code was dismantled. We decided that we should table discussion until after BMC's emergency meeting.

We got some volunteers to make the "Please do not discuss the form, content or degree of difficulty of your exams...." posters for Stokes in anticipation of exams.

We talked about the meeting several of us had with the Board of Managers, focussing on free speech and the Honor Code.

Ronjon spoke of how the motives of some of the members of the Board seemed a bit odd, since one of the members kept speaking of a young man who went to Swarthmore instead of Haverford because he was "scared off" by the Honor Code.

We spoke of how the major issue of the meeting was figuring out if the Honor Code was stifling expression of different opinions.

It was recalled that one of the members of the board gave us several examples of racial/sexual/etc. epithets, and kept asking us if these were violations.

Matt recalled a point that in order to have dialogue, the two parties have to start from the assumption of equality -- dialogue is impossible if one party thinks the other is inferior.

Ronjon pointed out that "campuses have slants" to them, and Haverford is no exception -- and any stifling which might be going on is not necessarily because of the Honor Code.

We then talked about the issue of "flags" on academic records, for a second week.

New reactions included concerns about the employer's or grad school's point of view, fairness to people from other schools that *do* flag academic records, and the question of forgiveness (and that a flag may constitute a permanent mark of non-forgiveness).

Several people expressed concern that they did not want flagging to be mandatory. Some felt that a flag on a record would not necessarily be punitive, but rather could allow a student to explain in an interview what had happened. However, some replied that employers or grad schools would not care enough to find out why a student failed a class or had a flag on their record.

Some felt strongly that there should be a mark on a record, with the possibility of a differentiation between intentional major plagiarism and unintentional minor violations.

We talked quite a bit about recommending to med school/law school advisors, and to department heads, that they strongly emphasize that honesty is expected in filling out applications, especially when the applications specifically ask if the student has committed an academic violation.

We then edited an abstract that will be arriving soon in mailboxes everywhere....

One of the issues raised surrounding the abstract was a question about using international names, in addition to using names from "Middle America" and Flintstones cartoons. The question was raised that some people might be bothered if we seemed to single out a particular group by using distinctive names, like Mohammed or Shlomo.

What do *you* think? Would using more international names seem discriminatory, or offensive?

After three and a half hours of meeting, we finally adjourned.

Honor Council Minutes

December 9, 1990

Present: Al Bing, Andrew Clevenger, Janine Guglielmino, Nanette Hess (L), Carrie Kenny, Adinah Miller, Kwame Nyong'o, Jonathan Paul, Ronjon Paul, Virginia Price, Jennifer Sartori, Drew Sommers, Cheryl Sternman, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton

Today we had visitors again, Colin Rule '93, Anna Blau '93, and James Reingold '91. In addition, Visiting Professor of Latin American Studies Rodolfo Pastor came to talk with us (we had invited him because of his very interesting written response to the *Leon* abstract).

We started with a moment of silence (really we did!).

Cheryl had passed out a sheet of compiled responses to the *Brian and Jasmine* abstract (a copy of the responses is posted on the Comment Board and should be in dorms), and we read over that as members filed in.

We talked a bit about faculty-student interaction, specifically with regard to differing expectations of Honor Council's role. We talked of the need for a forum for faculty and Honor Council to talk to each other to clear up misconceptions about each others' roles, and to clear up any miscommunication. The idea of inviting faculty members to lunch or to meetings with members of Honor Council was raised; the idea will certainly be talked about next semester.

A related issue is that of faculty displeasure at some of the recent plagiarism abstracts, and possible mixed signals being passed between faculty (and the administration) and students. Honor Council needs specifically to get a clear idea of what the faculty is feeling on these issues, because they play a huge role in our having an Honor Code in the first place.

At this point, Professor Pastor felt this was the "proper moment" to speak. He started out by saying that he had only been here a few months, and also emphasized that he comes from a very different cultural background, and thus came into this discussion with a very different point of view.

He related that he had been "shocked" to learn of Honor Council's existence, when he read the *Leon* abstract earlier this year.. In talking to other faculty members here, he has come to feel that in many ways the faculty have abdicated what he sees as their responsibilities to "supervise directly students' integrity," and that many of the faculty seem relieved that Honor Council exists and thus obviates the need for them to be burdened with "this unsavory activity."

He also worried about what the Honor Code trial process does both to the confronted parties, and to our own senses of honor. He feels that, regardless of the measures taken for confidentiality, by releasing an abstract to the community, we are holding up the student to ridicule. The student knows, and the professor and the members of the jury know who the student is, and that is "enough of a public" to be a humiliating, and counter-productive, experience.

He feels very strongly that honor is not something one is born with, but rather is a habit, a trait we acquire -- and we acquire this through a long process of maturing. In the specific case of *Leon*, he felt that this process was ill-served, especially with regard to Leon's letter to the community, which he saw as "fundamentally dishonest." The jury, he felt, was implicated in Leon's dishonesty because they had asked him to write the letter.

There followed a long discussion with Professor Pastor. Here are some highlights:

Several people said they agreed with Prof. Pastor's ideas on honesty and integrity, but felt he was not fully understanding the basis from which Honor Council was operating. One member pointed out that the purpose of an Honor Code jury is to help the confronted party along in the educational process -- most trial resolutions have an educational component.

Several different members stated that Honor Council was working from premises that were different from Professor Pastor's. Professor Pastor was coming from a strong standpoint that the individual was paramount, and the individual must not be sacrificed to the needs of the community.

Several people pointed out that an action like plagiarism is not just a violation of the trust of the professor, but of the community as a whole. Professor Pastor admitted that he did not really completely grasp this, although he respected it. He also admitted that he saw in Honor Council a reflection of organizations in his culture, which have in his view damaged intellectual life and perhaps more than that.

Another issue Professor Pastor raised was that it seems as if students here are raising themselves up on a pedestal in some sense, in condemning actions like plagiarism and denying that they have the capability to perform those actions. One person responded that we are not assuming superiority in our dealings under the Honor Code, but rather we are assuming trust.

Professor Pastor and James Reingold took their leave of us at this point.

We talked for a while longer about the issues that Professor Pastor raised. One person thought that Professor Pastor had not included compassion in his way of looking at the Code, while others thought that that was his main point. Another person brought up the issue of the faculty not being directly involved in the Code – and perhaps they should be, for several different reasons.

We also talked about the “real” Darrin, Kelly, and Leon. They will hear themselves talked about when the abstract comes out, and while people may not be talking about *them* as individuals, they are still being talked about, even though the names are changed.

It was pointed out that Bryn Mawr withholds abstracts until after the person involved graduates, but more for confidentiality's sake than for protecting the person from this problem.

We took a break, and Colin left us.

When we came back, we continued our discussion of using international names on abstracts. Some members of Honor Council who had talked to other people in the community about this came back with the sense that there is a possibility of offending people if we attach a name to an abstract in a way that seems to support a cultural stereotype.

One member pointed out that if we are living in a multi-cultural society like we claim to be, then we'd better get a good cross-section of names and not worry about it. Several people suggested that we should just pick them out of a hat.

The point was made that the most controversial abstract released recently was *Sam*, with a very “normal” American name. The question was asked if we want to, in order to avoid possible repercussions, only assign international names to “positive” abstracts. Most people responded that this would be inappropriate: whatever we do, we've got to be consistent.

Another person (it was Andrew) suggested that we just use the names of Honor Council members.

One of the issues that came out of this was that people are not aware of how much we change identifying information in abstracts, in the interest of confidentiality. Anna, for instance, was not aware that we changed gender at all. The things we always change are names, courses, texts cited, and academic department. *Sometimes* we also change gender and class.

We got volunteers to put up the reminder signs in Stokes. Several of them are quite creative, so look for them.

We talked for a while about Bryn Mawr's Honor Code “crisis,” and the emergency meeting last Thursday that several members of Honor Council attended. The issues seemed to be the lack of abstracts, the fact that the Alcohol Policy is written into Bryn Mawr's Honor Code (ours isn't), and the fact that people are not following up on confrontations. The lack of a “policeman's clause” in Bryn Mawr's Honor Code was cited as the cause (Haverford's Code does contain a policeman's clause).

We talked for a while about confidential matters.

After that, we adjourned (only a two-and-a-half-hour meeting this week...).