

Honor Council Minutes

January 23, 1991

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, Seth Stodder, Elliot Weis, Steve Whitton;
Absent: Cheryl Sternman

We began the meeting with a moment of silence.

Since Cheryl Sternman is away in France, Jenny Sartori '91 is Acting Chair until Executive Council elections, when a new Chairperson will be elected. **The elections will be the 31st of January and the 1st of February.**

We talked about the scheduling of elections, Plenary, Plenary Resolutions, and other such administrative details. **Plenary Resolutions are due by noon on Saturday, February 2nd.**

We also talked a bit about interaction with faculty and how to clear up miscommunication and questions between Honor Council and Faculty.

News from the joint Hillel-Honor Council committee: the first forum will be held on **Sunday, February 3rd, at 3pm in Stokes Auditorium.** The topic is the history of the Honor Code at Haverford, and the speakers will be Steve Cary, Sara Shumer, Mary Lou Allen, and Jenny Kehne ('8?), the first female Chairperson of Honor Council. Other grant forums will follow; the next one will be on February 24th, and will concern Honor Codes at other institutions.

We closed with a moment of silence.

Honor Council Minutes

January 27, 1991

Present: Same as above: All but Cheryl ("gone to France") Sternman.

We began this meeting too with a moment of silence. (Fancy that!)

We talked for a short time about ways to improve Honor Council-Faculty interaction. We discussed having lunch with faculty members on a rotating basis, to help create better interaction.

We also talked more about the scheduling of elections and Plenary, with lots and lots of boring administrative details.

Shameless Plug:

Make sure to vote in Executive Council elections on the 31st and the 1st!
Make sure to submit Plenary resolutions by noon on the 2nd!
Make sure to attend Plenary on the 10th!

Pass it on!

We broke early so that the sports freaks could go see the Super Bowl, so there's nothing more to relate.

We closed with a moment of silence.

Honor Council Minutes

April 14, 1991

Present: Anna Blau, Andrew Clevenger, John Devlin, Kate DiLorenzo, Tony Dugdale, Janine Guglielmino, Oren Hadar, Nanette Hess, Laurie Higgins, James Kindt, Kate Lefer, Adinah Miller, Jon Novick, Jonathan Paul (okay I was a little late), Virginia Price, Seth Stodder

Due to Room Draw, our meeting was very short. John Devlin and Oren Hadar were trying for Lloyd (they didn't get it).

We began with a moment of silence, which ended with all of us doing "the Wave" around the table.

We got a "Grant Update" from Adinah: the last Ethics and the Honor Code forum thingy will be the Collection on the 16th, which probably, as you read this, has already happened. It will have been about how the Code affects ethics after Haverford, with 3 alums scheduled to speak. If you went, good for you.

We also talked a bit about a few meetings being scheduled, one with Bryn Mawr's Honor Board on Thursday the 18th, to have some discussion between our Honor Council and their Honor Board, hopefully to the edification of all. We'll be able to report back to you on that next week. Also, a few members of Honor Council will be attending the monthly Faculty Meeting this coming Thursday.

(Somewhere in here, several sarcastic and harsh comments were leveled at John Devlin.)

Seth has been organizing a meeting for the present members of Honor Council with the Deans and those people who were on Honor Council during both *Sam* and *George* (those that haven't graduated, that is.) The idea is to sort of "set the historical record straight," since this will be the last chance to get something of a first-hand account of the procedures that were followed in those cases. Specifically, the issue of mediation vis-a-vis Honor Council will be discussed. Can Honor Council mandate that a mediation take place? Why did *Sam* go to a mediation as opposed to a trial, and what was the process in that case? What should the functional difference be between facilitations and mediations? We'll be bringing this up for comment to the larger community soon.

We discussed some of the results of recently completed trials, and talked about the need to get through our growing backlog of abstracts.

Speaking of abstracts, we also are close to getting more of them into your mailbox soon. One will be coming soon, and another is in the works. (Phew!)

We talked about what Anna has taken to calling our "outreach program," i.e. our process of getting more community input and feedback. Letters from class reps are in the works or already in mailboxes (depending on the workloads of representatives from various classes).

Specifically, we talked about the minutes, what should go into them and what shouldn't, how much detail should be put in and so forth. Kate (Lefer, not DiLorenzo) suggested that we quote or at least attribute by name the ideas that were tossed about. So we'll be doing that from now on. One of the concerns that Tony has raised was the issue of "confidential matters." It's no secret that Honor Council deals with lots of stuff that is confidential. As John Devlin pointed out, however, when we have three two-sentence paragraphs, and then "We discussed some confidential matters," it seems to be a little odd, and as others have pointed out, it seems arrogant. "We know something you don't." Or something. But the fact is, we spend a lot of time discussing stuff we just can't talk about before it's made known to the community. So how do we tell the community

that we're spending all this time? John thought it would be okay to say "confidential matters" as long as we put in enough body in the other stuff. So here it is.

We also talked about the fact that SC meetings are advertised in the Weekly Guide, and lots of people show up for them. The issue has been raised that perhaps we should "advertise" that people can come to our meetings too, if not in the Guide then in the minutes. Kate DiLorenzo, John Devlin, Anna, and Tony all expressed their strong support of this, but both Jonathan and Andrew felt that while it is fine, and indeed great, for people to come visit, we shouldn't go out of our way to advertise. The issue came up last semester as well, and reached about the same conclusion.

Part of the problem with visitors to Honor Council meetings is that 1) meetings have large portions during which confidential matters are discussed, and therefore people have to be asked to leave, and 2) a little-known clause in the Honor Code states that Honor Council meetings are closed:

Honor Council meets on a weekly basis....These meetings are closed to the community at large, as confidentiality must be observed. However, anyone may attend an Honor Council meeting by making prior arrangements with the Chairperson. (The Honor Code, VII C 2, Responsibilities within the Honor Council.)

So please feel free to contact the Chairperson (perhaps via a member of Honor Council) if you're interested in coming to a meeting. As it stands now, we're not going to advertise, but you'll probably be seeing more accounts of discussion about this in the future.

We also talked about the idea of having a separate Honor Code comment board. Both Virginia and John expressed the view that it would be ridiculous, considering the sad state of debate (or lack thereof) on the present Comment Board. As John pointed out, it doesn't seem specifically to be an SC comment board, since SC hasn't put anything up there for months. "The Comment Board is bullshit," he said. Most of us agreed. Adinah put forth the suggestion that if we have an issue to put on a board somewhere, we could always just use the present comment board and see how that works. Her eminently reasonable suggestion was accepted with something approaching relief. If you feel that having an Honor Code comment board would be a good thing, please feel free to contact a member of Honor Council.

Also, John Devlin will be working to develop a system so that people can participate in Mock Honor Code Trials, to both get a feel for the process and to also facilitate discussion about the process. Unfortunately, there's not enough time to start them this semester, so they'll be starting up next fall.

Finally, we talked for a few minutes about the "secretive nature" of the trial procedure. We talked about the issues and policies surrounding confidentiality with a trial. Often the rule of not telling anyone else about being on a trial leads to tension with friends and roommates, and can lead to misleading one's friends about where one has been till 3am every night for the last week. We would appreciate knowing what you all think about this.

We ended with a moment of silence.

Honor Council Minutes October 20th, 91

Present:

Will Best, Anna Blau, Joshua Bridger, John Devlin, Kate DiLorenzo, Paul Dubbeling, Laurie Higgins, James Kindt, Lisa Lopez-Lopez, Kiame Mahaniah, Jeremy Singer, Jessica Turnoff, Iain Wilson,

Also present: Tom Kessinger

Absent:

Connie Kim, Anita Crofts,

We began with a moment of silence.

PART I: WITH TOM KESSINGER

Tommy K opened the floor. His visit was two fold: a) to get to know us, and that was over in 43 seconds and b) to arrange for a meeting between Academic Council (AC from now on) and Honor Council. Academic Council is composed of five elected faculty, the provost and the president. Their *major* concern is with faculty-related issues (tenure, for instance). *The reason for the meeting was that AC wanted to touch base with Honor Council.*

had different understandings of the appropriateness of Although all members of AC have been at Haverford for a decade or more, *these members* when the issue of what procedure to follow on getting advice when engaged in a confrontation (before the trial, during, after). *With respect to a proposed amendment to the Code,* The issue was not as much that faculty wanted a support person during the trial proper but that some felt that to be able to seek guidance or simply speak with *these members* fellow colleagues would be very helpful. Some professors seemed to think this was inherent in the whole process whereas others believed it was going against confidentiality. Academic council would thus like to meet with Honor Council to clarify, or at least discuss, the matter, to try and determine what is expected of them.

The meeting is scheduled for November 16, so if you have any feelings about the issue (should faculty be able to consult colleagues, the head of department, ask them for help, guidance or advice), please write or speak to any Honor Council member in the following weeks.

Anna then asked Tommy K whether plagiarism, the focus of the last meetings between the previous Honor Council and AC had been *successfully resolved* to the satisfaction of AC. He replied that a good airing had certainly taken place, and that whether the results had been satisfactory or not would only be known after the next trial on plagiarism. Nevertheless, some input will be expected before that, as abstract of trials on plagiarism are released next semester.

John Devlin brought the discussion back to the support person for the confronting party. He wished to indicate that terms were misleading when talking of denying a professor the right to have another professor as a support person, since the legislation would probably concern all confronting parties, not only professors. Tommy K agreed, adding that detailed provisions would have to be made as to who can become a support person, citing an example in which the confronted party had brought a "family friend" who turned out to be a lawyer.

Tommy K also wanted to address some issues which had been on his mind since the collection in which Honor Council had aired its grievances. His first point was situated in the realm of political theory: by the way the electoral system worked in appointing us, and the confidentiality which put us in a sort of liminal state in relation to the rest of the community, we were not really representative. Like Judges of the State of Pennsylvania, once we were elected, only the rule of the Honor Code (rule of law for them!) should concern us, and no longer the interests of some constituency. His second point was the definition of his role. He saw himself as a sort of buffer zone between many groups, including Honor Council and faculty. He described his role as that of an interpreter, or weatherman, warning of dark clouds ahead. Inherently, such a position is uncomfortable, since one wished to avoid being two faced and is therefore resented by all sides.

This was a preamble to addressing an issue which John Devlin had raised at that collection. He may be the last word, but he is in no way omnipotent, Tommy K contended, and he was a judge as a last resort. That may well be, Will interjected, but many students still perceive your power of veto as extremely potent. Tom immediately qualified that power: he cannot reverse a decision made by Honor Council, he cannot harden the resolutions (he admitted having faced some faculty pressure to do so in some cases) although he can soften them. He maintained that he is not like the President of the United States who must sign every bill for it to become law! In fact, he exclaimed, he doesn't even get involved most of the time. He nevertheless conceded that from a different perspective, he could appear close to omnipotent.

Anna asked him what he would do if a jury failed to reach consensus that a violation had occurred, but that the matter seemed rather clear to him. He responded that condemnation didn't require a mea culpa from the culprit. Anna followed up by asking what he thought of having a dean's panel as a backup. He didn't think it was such a hot idea.

There ensued a debate between Kate and him about the advantages of having a faculty member as part of the jurors. Their perspective, however divergent their opinions could be, Kate argued, would certainly add a lacking dimension to the jury. Tommy K thought that one faculty member wouldn't

necessarily be representative of the entire faculty. Although John came to Kate's rescue (a rare occurrence!), the two sides ended up agreeing to disagree.

John then questioned Tommy K's assertion that his power was limited. Where were these limits stated, he asked. Tommy K agreed that most of those limits were self-imposed, but that he believed for the good of Haverford as an institution, he would have to respect those limits. All fine and dandy for you to say, countered John, but what about the omnipotence of the Administration? Just Matt [Hamabata] and I, you mean? Tommy K replied. John's major bone of contention was not that Matt Hamabata saw everything Honor Council did but rather that he admit publicly to doing so. Tommy K unabashedly said that it was necessary for the Dean of the College to know those things, since he was often the link between "irate parents" and the Haverford community. But yes, Hamabata does get to see everything, yet not with a eye to changing it.

Since there were no more questions relevant to that setting, Tommy K left. Since we had been there for almost an hour, we took a break.

PART II: THE REGULAR STUFF

"We have nothing of substance to discuss," Anna began. On Friday, she had met with Greg's (abstract code name) support, who wanted Greg's letter to be printed along with the abstract. This was impossible, said Anna, since Honor Council had decided not to give Greg that kind of communicative device (which no one gets, Devlin added) even though there was a resolution stating that Greg should somehow communicate his point of view to the rest of the community. He had breached confidentiality anyway, so it shouldn't even be allowed to be printed. There ensued a furious debate around the issue of confidentiality. Kate felt that although confidentiality was an important aspect of the whole procedure, she did not consider it to be a premise for the existence of the Honor Code. Paul asked whether a breach of confidentiality was a violation? Kate added that by accepting to pay for it, we could control what was being said and therefore protect other people's identities. Laurie vailliantly declared that we could not give in to fear in that way, while James contended that whatever happened, we could not reverse a decision reached at by a jury during a trial, especially one that had been as hard as this one. Kiame reiterated Paul's question: what was the official stand on confidentiality? Anna stated that she had always thought it okay to breach confidentiality as long as it was only one's own, whereas Matt Hamabata seemed to consider even that too much.

We then discussed the lunch discussion, which was remarkably low in attendance. John said that we might have made a mistake by planning a discussion before any reaction had surfaced, "we made a mistake thinking people gave a shit, instead of waiting for them to give a shit," were his exact

words. Then followed a foolishly heated exchange about the advantages and disadvantages of holding these discussions as lunch discussion. Laurie and Jeremy maintained it held the non-interested people, Kiame thought the setting too noisy, and John said that he had felt like a "schmuck and I'm tired of feeling that way." These feelings of inadequacy were caused by the fact that only six people talked, and he felt stupid, and it wasn't the first time. All those present recognized that Ellyn and Andrew did a fine job.

Then followed a series of small matters:

- the questionnaire is forthcoming Kate said
- the simulated trials are planned for Oct. 28, in Founders, with more to come if you missed that wonderful experience. Laurie complained that it was a Monday night and she had classes. John replied that there would always be clashes. The subject was abandoned after some fruitless bickering.
- John volunteered to write the next abstract
- Kiame asked why abstract were held so long, which meant that any given Honor Council was never responsible to the community, because of that lag. Anna answered that confidentiality had to be protected, and sometimes, Honor Council members were just swamped with work so that abstract took some time before they were sent out.
- "Brenda" is coming out soon, and is hoped to be hot, so be vigilant!

We ended with a moment of silence.

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES OCTOBER 27, 91

Present:

Will Best, Anna Blau, Joshua Bridger, Anita Crofts, John Devlin, Kate DiLorenzo, Paul Dubbeling, Laurie Higgins, Connie Kim, James Kindt, Lisa Lopez-Lopez, Kiame Mahaniah, Jeremy Singer, Jessica Turnoff,

Absent:

Iain Wilson

We began with a moment of silence.

Anna rapidly eliminated several administrative problems:

on council *not right name* *of a dean's panel that*
~~Tony~~ *is* an abstract James and his committee have been working on *who had been on the DP* almost finished. Since there are no Honor Council members from that trial still serving, Anna proposed that James send ~~him~~ to the Deans for their okay before bringing it back to Council *it*

-Kiame gave out the typed "Jay" abstract responses (of which there had been nineteen). The same report *figures* *are* presently on the comment board.

-The questionnaire seems to *be* progressing well. Anna suggested that names be taken down of those who responded. This was not for policing reasons, but for that of being able to remind those who hadn't responded to do so *if* they had just forgot *her*.

-The simulated trials will be happening October 28, but as of the 27, only six people were signed, *up* to our general disappointment. Anna noted that the fictional character of simulated trials could lead people to take it less seriously and hoped all those members participating in the simulated trial would stress the importance of imagining ~~it~~ *that it is* real.

-She also reminded Honor Council of a dinner with Honor Board on November 6 at 7 pm. No, 6 pm but November 7!

We then dove into the meat (sorry you vegetarians) of the matter. Anna had vaxed all of us about her carrel being defaced with

swastikas and ^{Profanities (?)} accusations which implied that she was fascist, or even a Nazi. ^{AB}

do we need this?
NOT
NECESSARY
I THINK
JS

Many members on Council felt that much that was said should remain confidential so please refer to any letters on the comment board to get the precise individual or group reactions. The discussion, nevertheless, lasted one hour. Some members thought Honor Council as a body should respond to the vile act which had been committed but others (if you want names, gather your courage and ask us!) were against the motion. Although they did not wish to oppose but only stand outside consensus, a decision could not be reached because too many stood outside consensus. Honor Council as a body ^{did} could therefore not co-sign a letter Student Council intends on sending about the incident.

?
Necessary?
↑
it's ok
by me -
AB

The issue of silence ^{also} came up. Apparently, many members in the community feel silenced by the "dogmatic Honor Code and feel that Honor Council members are the hounds of the Haverford thought police. Whether or not the "attack" on Anna had anything to do with the issue or not is open to speculation, but it allowed us to talk about it. A committee was formed to investigate the issue as well as to formulate suggestions which would remedy the problem, if ~~there is~~ ^{found to be} such a problem. ^{is sound} Will, Anita, Paul, Noah and Connie form that committee, but feel free to approach any of us with your ^{will} concerns. For all those who do feel silenced, this is one of your big chances. It also is for those who think that argument somewhat ridiculous.

of people feeling silenced

The discussion continued long into the night, with the perennial issues of "can some issues be respectfully expressed and if so, what does respectful mean," the value of confidentiality, consensus...

Hiame,
I think these
minutes are
too long to
check consid-
ing how upset
some of us
feel about
the whole
issue.
-Paul
JS

We ended with a moment of silence yet with some ^{of} us feeling uneasy about the discussion. Please feel free to talk to any of us on any issue! We are supposed to be your reps, you know.

lfl
PO
LA
JS.
AB
77

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES NOVEMBER 3 1991

Present:

Will Best, Joshua Bridger, John Devlin, Kate DiLorenzo, Paul Dubbeling, Laurie Higgins, Connie Kim, James Kindt, Lisa Lopez-Lopez, Kiame Mahaniah, Noah Pines, Jeremy Singer, Jessica Turnoff, Iain Wilson

Absent: Anita Crofts, Anna Blau,

We began with a moment of silence.

Laurie and Kate chaired this meeting.

Reserving further discussion about the Swastika incident and new discussion about responses to the Brenda abstract, we dealt with some "business matters."

The first item of discussion was the Questionnaire. James clarified everything by saying that it would be sent out this week.

The date for the the lunch discussion about the Brenda abstract was decided upon: Wednesday, November 6.

Kate then asked Noah where the committee on the silencing issue stood. He answered that the members on the committee had decided to change the focus of the committee from "the silencing issue" to "what the community expects of Honor Council."

We then designated a group to edit an abstract about a trial which had occurred over the summer.

Conneticut College, although they no longer have the financial resources to invite to an intercollegiate symposium on the Honor Code, are still phoning us, asking for benevolent enlightenment concerning therft (and/or other security issues) and the Honor Council's involvement in those cases. The Devlin sage was chosen to communicate his oracles.

Noah asked whether or not harassment was a violation of the Honor Code which would come to Honor Council. We looked at the Student guide, and found that although Honor Council is sometimes involved in the process, other bodies including a dean and EEOC would also be present. In each particular case, the Chairperson and the dean would decide on the actions to take, and then notify the EEOC officer. We recommend that you read the Student Guide; it is an important issue but please, approach us if you needed help on that issue. It is probably easier for us, not being as personally involved in that case, to deal with the administration, figuring out who to contact, etc...

Jeremy was designated as the member to compile the responses to "Greg," while Laurie volunteered to do the same for the "Brenda's" responses.

Kate then asked for a volunteer editor. The background to this is that as a resolution to a trial, "Zoe" had to question faculty about plagiarism, and compile their responses. Honor Council wished this published in the Bi-Co News but the editors were requesting it to be reduced to a third of its length. James volunteered to do this.

Kate then read a letter from Bruce Partridge, à propos of our meeting with Academic Council in eight days. They wish to change a paragraph in the faculty handbook about the

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES NOVEMBER 3 1991

Present:

Will Best, Joshua Bridger, John Devlin, Kate DiLorenzo, Paul Dubbeling, Laurie Higgins, Connie Kim, James Kindt, Lisa Lopez-Lopez, Kiarne Mahaniah, Noah Pines, Jeremy Singer, Jessica Turnoff, Iain Wilson

Absent: Anita Crofts, Anna Blau,

We began with a moment of silence.

Laurie and Kate chaired this meeting.

Reserving further discussion about the Swastika incident and new discussion about responses to the Brenda abstract, we dealt with some "business matters."

The first item of discussion was the Questionnaire. James clarified everything by saying that it would be sent out this week.

The date for the lunch discussion about the Brenda abstract was decided upon: Wednesday, November 6.

Kate then asked Noah where the committee on the silencing issue stood. He answered that the members on the committee had decided to change the focus of the committee from "the silencing issue" to "what the community expects of Honor Council."

We then designated a group to edit an abstract about a trial which had occurred over the summer.

Connecticut College, although they no longer have the financial resources to invite to an intercollegiate symposium on the Honor Code, are still phoning us, asking for benevolent enlightenment concerning theft (and/or other security issues) and the Honor Council's involvement in those cases. The Devilin sage was chosen to communicate his oracles.

Noah asked whether or not harassment was a violation of the Honor Code which would come to Honor Council. We looked at the Student guide, and found that although Honor Council is sometimes involved in the process, other bodies including a dean and EEOC would also be present. In each particular case, the Chairperson and the dean would decide on the actions to take, and then notify the EEOC officer. We recommend that you read the Student Guide; it is an important issue but please, approach us if you needed help on that issue. It is probably easier for us, not being as personally involved in that case, to deal with the administration, figuring out who to contact, etc...

Jeremy was designated as the member to compile the responses to "Greg," while Laurie volunteered to do the same for the "Brenda's" responses.

Kate then asked for a volunteer editor. The background to this is that as a resolution to a trial, "Zoe" had to question faculty about plagiarism, and compile their responses. Honor Council wished this published in the Bi-Co News but the editors were requesting it to be reduced to a third of its length. James volunteered to do this.

Kate then read a letter from Bruce Partridge, a propos of our meeting with Academic Council in eight days. They wish to change a paragraph in the faculty handbook about the

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES NOVEMBER 10 1991

Present:

Will Best, Anna Blau, Anita Crofts, John Devlin, Kate DiLorenzo, Paul Dubbeling, Laurie Higgins, Connie Kim, James Kindt, Lisa Lopez-Lopez, Kiame Mahaniah, Noah Pines, Jeremy Singer, Jessica Turnoff, Iain Wilson

Absent: Joshua Bridger

We began, not with a moment of silence, but joyous banter as we ate Anita's homemade bread and drank coffee laced with hot chocolate. After many vociferous complaints from responsible members, we had our moment of silence.

Our first point was Academic Council (AC). Our meeting with them being scheduled for Monday 11, we wished to determine how many issues we wanted to bring up. President Kessinger had talked about changes AC wished to include in the faculty handbook. Furthermore, Honor Council had received a letter from Bruce Partridge which spoke of somehow also getting the students to know about those changes. We were unsure whether or not this would require changing the Honor Code. If this were the case, Laurie said, she would be worried. Subsequently, we decided to get Bruce Partridge to clarify everything about that issue when we meet AC, before deciding on a course of action.

Kate's main concern tonight was the absence of faculty and/or dean on the juries. Laurie agreed that Kate could bring up the issue, but should make sure AC understood that it was not an Honor Council position but a personal opinion held by an Honor Council member.

The next item on our agenda was the Questionnaire. Apparently, the system, which was devised so as to be enable us to send out copies a second time to those who hadn't answered the first time, had proven too confusing for many of our community. Nevertheless, we are happy to note that answered questionnaire are being sent to Honor Council.

Anna then asked about minutes: they seemed to be conspicuously absent. But it was only because she hadn't been in public area bathrooms for awhile. The minutes in the dorms take slightly longer because two secretaries (of SC as well as HC) are synchronizing their minutes. The way it should be happening is that Honor Council minutes would always be one week late in relation to Student Council ones because of the need of the former to let all members read the minutes and make any changes desired before they went out to the general public. If you have complaints about the absence of minutes in your dorm/house, please contact either your dorm rep or the Honor Council Secretary, Kiame Mahaniah (649-0808). For that matter, if you find the minutes unsatisfactory, please contact me also.

Anna brought out the big guns. She had been thinking of having President Kessinger and Dean Hamabata over for a discussion session on many concerns that Honor Council has. She asked whether we thought that a good idea. The reply was instantaneous: we did. One major area of contention was the extent of their authority over a jury's resolutions. John argues that the issue was more the application of their authority. On the other hand, Kate thought their power to change resolutions well warranted in view of the most recent trials. She believes that the juries were not up to par with the decisions they should have reached. She referred to it as "students not taking responsibility," thus presenting inadequate

conclusions to trials. Furthermore, just as the Supreme Court checks Congress, the President and the Dean of college balanced honor code juries. John contended that he certainly did not think their intervention beneficial in the last trials. Connie interjected that it was extremely hard to determine empirically what "inadequate" would be since the whole system has a subjective basis: trust. Replying to the check and balance argument, Laurie pointed out that their intervention had gotten out of hand, since they had changed the resolutions in three of the four trials on which she had been. This frustrated her, especially since she had spent more than twenty hours on a trial, only to have the decision changed. So, if the administration is going to overturn most decisions perhaps they should just make the decisions themselves and not make Honor Code juries go through such wrenching experiences. John stated that they had had a chance to disagree with Matt Hamabata (who formulated the resolutions) at the end of the Brenda trial but that since no one had done so, he believed it was now too late.

Lisa, on the other hand, was worried that past trial procedure would affect future trials. If the jury were sure that its resolutions would be changed by the Administration anyway, the significance of the whole process could be undermined. There would be no feeling of responsibility whatsoever. On what basis does the dean suggest the changes (the president being the one who makes the final decision based on his perceptions and the dean's recommendations)?, Paul asked. It was not because of problems of conscience, he answered himself. Matt Hamabata could not have any more moral perspective than those who had been struggling throughout the trial. It was because of their alleged ability to have a wider point of view, which include the faculty's perspective. Therefore, it would be better to have a faculty member on every jury, so that we could get that perspective. Anna added that there was also the possibility of the Dean having confidential information which would require changing certain resolutions. Laurie categorically rejected the suggestion. She didn't not believe that having a professor or dean on jury was the only way to include a faculty point of view. She suggested talking to them often, but also pointed out that faculty did not have a uniform position. We need their point of view on each particular trial, Paul countered, otherwise we could run the risk of having generalized procedures. Anna pointed out that Laurie's position seemed reactive and proactive.

Anna concluded the discussion by asking us to think about this and other issues, and Honor Council would decide on next week's meeting whether or not to have that discussion with the President and the Dean of College.

We ended in laughter and good humor, hands linked.

ANNA BLAU

HC/CM

Honor Council Minutes

November 11th, meeting with Academic Council

Present from Honor Council: Anna Blau, Kate Diloranzo, Laurie Higgins,
Noah Pines, Kiame Mahaniah, Jessica Turnoff

From Academic Council: Pres. Kessinger, Profs: Lyle Roeloff, Bruce
Partridge, Doug Davis, Slavica Matacic,
Helen Ansem, Lou Outlaw, Joel Kassiola

We did not start with a moment of silence.

Anna presented the first topic of discussion, which was Bruce Partridge's letter about changes to the faculty handbook concerning the Honor Code. She wished Bruce Partridge to make some points clear. The astronomy professor summed up his point: he wished the professor to have the right to consult any of his colleagues or even the head of the department. The reason for not limiting this consultation process only to the dean is that some cases would require expertise in certain fields. Tom Kessinger added that, especially in cases of new faculty, personal relations would make it easier if colleagues or the head of the department (sometimes the only colleague) could be consulted. Bruce Partridge insisted that this should be done so as to protect confidentiality as far as possible. Anna then asked if the change could be worded so as to recommend consulting a dean before talking to colleagues.

Doug Davis suggested moving away from this particular topic to discuss more general themes which could be of interest for both Honor and Academic Council.

Lou Outlaw asked why there seemed to be so much concern about confidentiality. In his usual style, Prof. Outlaw declared that in our efforts to protect the right of the individual, we are sacrificing the well-being of the community. This was through the insistence on hiding so many aspects, the system was clouding people's ability to carry judgements.

He suggested that maybe the whole department concerned should know about the violation or the trial. Lyle Roeloff tempered that point of view: in some cases, other members of the department should know but that should be left to Honor Council's discretion. Limiting it to one person seemed reasonable.

John brought up the concern that maybe this would not be so desirable since it would become standard practice instead of being a resource to be used only in moments of need. Bruce countered that he would not see that development as a threat to the Honor Code. He stated his agreement with professor Outlaw: he also felt that the right of the individual was encroaching on the rights of the community.

Anna then suggested that maybe the issue is bigger; maybe the very existence of Honor Code is threatened. This crisis was a true social issue. Prof. Outlaw agreed, it was a social issue in the sense that it questioned our methods of reaching decisions: what constitutes evidence, where are the bounds of reasonable doubt? As it stands, any determined individual can take advantage of the system, he declared. The limits are too tight and maybe they should be redrawn. President Kessinger concurred: it's not because someone signed the Honor Code pledge that they should be unconditionally trusted. "We know that," Kate dryly stated. Then how come you couldn't reach a decision?, Prof. Outlaw asked. The issues were not identical Kate replied.

John then intervened. From his point of view, the problem was that, as a community,

Honor Council Minutes

November 11th, meeting with Academic Council

Present from Honor Council: Anna Blau, Kate Diloranzo, Laurie Higgins,
Noah Pines, Kiame Mahaniah, Jessica Turnoff

From Academic Council: Pres. Kessinger, Profs: Lyle Roeloff, Bruce
Partridge, Doug Davis, Slavica Matacic,
Helen Ansem, Lou Outlaw, Joel Kassiola

We did not start with a moment of silence.

Anna presented the first topic of discussion, which was Bruce Partridge's letter about changes to the faculty handbook concerning the Honor Code. She wished Bruce Partridge to make some points clear. The astronomy professor summed up his point: he wished the professor to have the right to consult any of his colleagues or even the head of the department. The reason for not limiting this consultation process only to the dean is that some cases would require expertise in certain fields. Tom Kessinger added that, especially in cases of new faculty, personal relations would make it easier if colleagues or the head of the department (sometimes the only colleague) could be consulted. Bruce Partridge insisted that this should be done so as to protect confidentiality as far as possible. Anna then asked if the change could be worded so as to recommend consulting a dean before talking to colleagues.

Doug Davis suggested moving away from this particular topic to discuss more general themes which could be of interest for both Honor and Academic Council.

Lou Outlaw asked why there seemed to be so much concern about confidentiality. In his usual style, Prof. Outlaw declared that in our efforts to protect the right of the individual, we are sacrificing the well-being of the community. This was through the insistence on hiding so many aspects, the system was clouding people's ability to carry judgements.

He suggested that maybe the whole department concerned should know about the violation or the trial. Lyle Roeloff tempered that point of view: in some cases, other members of the department should know but that should be left to Honor Council's discretion. Limiting it to one person seemed reasonable.

John brought up the concern that maybe this would not be so desirable since it would become standard practice instead of being a resource to be used only in moments of need. Bruce countered that he would not see that development as a threat to the Honor Code. He stated his agreement with professor Outlaw: he also felt that the right of the individual was encroaching on the rights of the community.

Anna then suggested that maybe the issue is bigger; maybe the very existence of Honor Code is threatened. This crisis was a true social issue. Prof. Outlaw agreed, it was a social issue in the sense that it questioned our methods of reaching decisions: what constitutes evidence, where are the bounds of reasonable doubt? As it stands, any determined individual can take advantage of the system, he declared. The limits are too tight and maybe they should be redrawn. President Kessinger concurred: it's not because someone signed the Honor Code pledge that they should be unconditionally trusted. "We know that," Kate dryly stated. Then how come you couldn't reach a decision?, Prof. Outlaw asked. The issues were not identical Kate replied.

John then intervened. From his point of view, the problem was that, as a community,

rather a shock, but it seemed to make sense when one considers that any group who reaches a decision without the consent of one of the group members had a problem. The whole purpose of consensus was having everyone be satisfied. Then what is consensus, John asked? Ah, said Lou Outlaw, one must continuously be talking about, asking for advice. It could not be worded, it was in the living tradition. This so very fine understanding of consensus and the required self-effacement sometimes necessary was the reason the 6/6 issue caused such a stir, President Kessinger said.

Although Doug Davies believes the system beautiful, he believes it needs a certain context, a certain atmosphere. Honor Council should really look at precedents. Which we do, John pointed out. But do you have any continuity, shot Kessinger? Did those who established precedents have precedents, Anna asked? If not, why bother us to follow a line they had created?

The meeting with no definite decisions being reached. All in all, it was a "touching base" meeting.

For Honor Council,
Kiame Mahaniah

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES NOVEMBER 24 1991

Present:

Anna Blau, Will Best (late), Joshua Bridger, John Devlin, Kate DiLorenzo, Paul Dubbeling, Laurie Higgins, Connie Kim (late), James Kindt, Lisa Lopez-Lopez, Kiame Mahaniah (left early), Noah Pines, Jeremy Singer, Jessica Turnoff (late), Iain Wilson

Absent: Anita Crofts

We began with a moment of silence.

We dealt quickly with a few administrative details. Amongst those, the Questionnaire, which has figured in virtually every set of Minutes. Well, you'll still be hearing about it. Out of the two hundred and twenty students who were chosen for this survey, less than eighty-five answered. To these results, James proposed to add another Questionnaire.

We then welcomed Steve Cary, whom Honor Council had invited to provide us with some enlightenment on the subject of consensus. He had several strong points to make.

He started by going through a history of consensus. Consensus, as a decision-making mechanism, emerged first in a religious context amongst the Quakers. They sought the will of God, the Truth. Thus, in accordance with their theology, there could not be a majority and a minority view. If someone were wrong, it would mean that someone had to recognize that their perception of God's will was fallacious. After that clarification, he proceeded to diagnose our particular setting at Haverford College. He believed that using consensus implied several requirements:

- no point of view should be set in stone. Even when one comes with a constituency's point of view, one should not be bound by it.

- there is a need to trust to weight of the group. When one is a lone dissenter, there is an obligation to analyze one's position. If it does not represent a matter of conscience, then the dissenter should trust the group, accepting to underwrite the decision in spite of objections.

He conceded that although he believed the advantages greater, there were several disadvantages to using consensus. It was terribly time-consuming and it was very vulnerable to obstructionists. Yet, "over the long haul," Steve Cary believed that reaching consensus was a community building experience, not a divisive one. With consensus there are also fewer people exhibiting "minority-view frustrations." To a certain extent, politicking is also reduced. Steve Cary reminded us that consensus should not be based on the least common denominator of those seeking to reach a decision.

He then described what he saw as the role of the Chair. The Chair treads a very fine line. She can make two mistakes: 1) she can push too hard for a decision before people have had chance to voice the whole range of their opinions and 2) the Chair can let the conversation go on and on. Yet, at all times, a Chair should be moving the group towards a solution.

Dissent is difficult to deal with, he warned us.

That was the first part of his talk. The second talk was much more heated. He firmly believes that one must operate, in a trial situation, on reasonable certainty. Absolute certainty is very rarely possible and one must always bear in mind the interests of the group, of the community. When he read the "Brenda" abstract, he was uneasy to see that some people blocked consensus because they wanted to establish absolute certainty. He was equally troubled by the attitude 'I don't have an opinion, so I'll just go with whatever you decide'. This position he called cowardice. He presented three points which he believes to be fundamental to the survival of the Honor Code.

- 1) We must operate with reasonable doubt and reasonable certitude. Otherwise, we will never

reach any decision. Steve Cary believes that faculty will lose faith in the system when they observe jurors operating on an absolute certainty basis.

2) He absolutely stands against administrative interference. In his time, the administration never reversed substantive decisions, unless a grave procedural mistake had been made. He proceeded to relate us a little history. In 1983, when the Honor Code was rewritten, the faculty and administration insisted that Honor Code juries should be composed only of Honor Council members. They believed that this was necessary in order to have jurors who have at least minimal experience in working with consensus and to maintain consistency. At the general COMPULSORY meeting which had been called to deal with this issue, this caused heated debate. The students hated the idea: they wished to have some jurors come from the general student body. Robert Stevens, then President, warned that if this course of action was chosen, he would very much insist upon reviewing every Honor Code jury decision. Steve Cary fears that what he had predicted has happened. Administrative interference has severely undermined the whole process. He stated in very strong words that it was his belief that the administration should stay out of it.

3) The third issue was student apathy. Custom teams are doing a better job every year, but after two or three years, people tend to become rather jaded. He doesn't know how to reach the student body, how to make us realize how important everything involving our community is. The Honor Code should not only be a convenience; we should be thinking about it, talking, consulting... He apologized to Anna for going beyond his regular consensus pitch but he feels that we will run into a disaster if those points are not properly dealt with.

Question time followed.

What about matters of conscience, John asked. A person should always be made to realize how much of a burden it is to block consensus. The Chair would then have to consider this person's past record, and sometimes just shouldn't let any one person stand in the way of consensus. John wondered if he could expand on that subject. There is a Quaker tradition of letting people stand outside consensus, Steve Cary continued. There are several things a Chair can do when the discussion seems to have reached an impasse. She can have everyone be silent for some time, so as to be able to think. She can also stop the meeting, and have everyone come together some other day. During that time, the ones closest to the dissenting member should try to understand this person's objections and try to help them trust the weight of the group. There will come times though when the person will maintain his/her block of consensus. The Chair can then simply decide that consensus has been reached anyway, and have it stated that this particular person was outside consensus. It is up to the Chair to decide when and how that can happen. Steve Cary emphasized that in these hopefully rare cases, the Chair would evaluate the feelings of the individual in relation to the will of the group. She would then decide if the decision could go forward or not. This is necessarily a difficult position to be in. The Chair, said Cary, has a very difficult and intricate role.

Anna then questioned Steve Cary about Academic Council's accusation that we used a voting rule. What did he think? Nah, he reassured us. Although he wouldn't have a specific number above which it would no longer be considered consensus, it is still not a voting rule. The mentality is so different, although he agrees that in a small group we really should have many dissenters. It would mean you knocked yourselves out but simply couldn't reach complete consensus. This rule may be especially applicable with a group such as Honor Code juries, which include many people who have had little or no experience with consensus. He also added that he thought it was baloney thinking we were no longer like every other student simply because we were on Honor Council: we were as representative as any other student. After all, we serve at the most one year before the electorate can throw us out.

James stated that many people's confidence seemed to depend on their perception of how many other people respected the Honor Code. This would bring up the issue of temptation. Are take-home timed exams too much of a temptation or did Steve think that it was good for the spirit of the Code? Steve Cary answered that he thought the implicit trust was good. The students needed long heavy talks on how important trust is. Any community is based on trust. He would rather live with the minority of students who cheat than cut back on the Honor Code. He'd rather

trust people, waiting for a major crisis and make drastic changes rather than piecemeal ones.

Before Steve Cary left, Kate made the point that the consensus process becomes a voting system only when people enter discussion with the idea of getting a number of people to agree with their opinion. We thanked him profusely for his visit and speech.

We had our break and I left so hereafter you will admire John's style in note taking.

Honor Council then dealt with some administrative issues:

- the "Brenda" responses are still being compiled
- the "Zoe" survey is very long and hard to edit. We are going to try putting it in the paper in a series.
- "Manuel," an abstract which will be released soon, raised two issues (brought up by a professor in a trial). The envelopes for finals are translucent, which is a problem. The Registrar's office said that the envelopes had already been ordered, so we will send a letter asking them to design their exams so that the front page does not present any revealing material.
- Jeremy hit Paul
- the other issue was the presence of books in the exam taking room. Was there any policy regarding this? If so, can it be amended so that no unnecessary books be brought in? Anna volunteered to see if there is a rule. We subsequently found out that there is a rule. You may only bring in the room those materials which you are allowed to use.
- a pancake brunch was planned for December 15.
- our next meeting was changed to Monday at 10.00pm.
- we discussed the candidate's forum study break. The date is December 4, at 5.30 in the Sunken Lounge.
- we decided to invite Dean Hamabata and President Kessinger to come to a meeting early next semester, as opposed to late this semester.
- the Honor Council members on the smoking policy committee reported. The committee is presently arguing whether some dorms should be smoke-free, if certain dorms should be set aside as smoking or non-smoking dorms, or if there should be no rules. As of the first of February, smoking will be prohibited in any non-dorm buildings on campus. The question was then raised whether Honor Council would handle violations of whatever policy will be devised. No conclusion was brought to this discussion, but it was the general feeling that egregious ones could concern Honor Council.

We ended with a moment of silence.

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES Feb. 2, 1992

Will Best, Joshua Bridger, Anita Crofts, John Devlin (Chairperson), Kate DiLorenzo, Paul Dubbeling, Laurie Higgins, Connie Kim, James Kindt, Lisa Lopez-Lopez, Kiame Mahaniah, Noah Pines, Jeremy Singer, Jessica Turnoff, Iain Wilson

Absent: Anna Blau

We forgot the moment of silence. This has become the parameter by which we can judge that a meeting will be short. This one lasted less than an hour.

The first topic on the agenda was the election timetable. Yes, elections are coming up. Each class will be electing two members to Honor Council except for the junior class, which has only one space left (both the Chair and the Secretary being juniors, as well as from the same Customs Group). The information session was held on Feb. 5 and nominations are due the Monday after Plenary at 10.15pm, at the door of the Student Council room (in the dungeon of the Dining Center, before you come to the Womens' Center). Candidate speeches will be held at 6.30 on Wednesday, Feb. 12, in or in the general vicinity of the Sunken Lounge, depending on what appearance the Dining Center will have. Elections will be held on Thursday and Friday, Feb. 13 and Valentine's day. For any information, please call Kiame (649-0808), or preferably, vax me (K_Mahaniah).

John then summarized the Alcohol Policy crisis. You may not have known it, but there is somewhat of a crisis as the Board of Managers on both colleges struggle to establish a common policy. These proceedings could have quite an impact on our future social life, so if you wish to have any information on possible courses of action, please contact **Marc NEFF (896-1681)**. In the meantime, please go to extraordinary length to not only respect but also to enforce the Alcohol Policy. The price of your apathy could be a dry campus.

Lisa then spoke of the Smoking Policy. Number one point is that the "No smoking in public areas" policy has not yet gone into effect. As of yet, to Honor Council's knowledge, the President hasn't targeted a specific date on which the Smoking Policy will become law. The Policy, which is already in its final form, will be presented at Plenary, in presence of the President. Apparently, several floors in the North Dorms will be reserved for smokers, depending on the demand. As it stands though, first year students would not be allowed to smoke, since that would require smoking Customs people, a smoking UCA...in short, many logistical nightmares. If you feel strongly about it, please come to Plenary. If you are still not satisfied, you can occupy the President's office until he agrees to negotiate. Such are the privileges of democracy.

And that's all for this time folks! We did have a meeting on Tuesday, Jan. 21, but all of it was confidential stuff except for some mundane stuff which will come in effect at the next exam period.

We did not end with a moment of silence.

Food for thought: "The average four-year old laughs 500 times a day" (Univ. of Iowa study)

Yours, very truly,

Kiame



Honor Council Minutes Special

March 5 1992

Present: Will Best, Anita Crofts, John Devlin, Paul Dubbeling, Fritz Kaegi, Connie Kim, Kiame Mahaniah, Allison Mahler, Lowry McAllen, Theo Posselt, Noah Pines, Rick Ruberg, Sam Robfogel, Jeremy Singer, Joe Stern, Jessica Turnoff.

Background: at the community-wide meeting, Colin and John proposed to have Honor Council and Student Council meet so as to vote on the procedure which should be followed in dealing with the Honor Code crisis. Paul and Anita, feeling uncomfortable with this idea, called an Honor Council meeting, with John's approval. *and Sam*

Summary: Honor Council decided that the Code was very clear as to who was responsible for dealing with this crisis. We therefore resolved to call each SC member so as to inform him/her that the meeting on the next day would be one in which their opinion was asked but that the ultimate decision lay in the hands of Honor Council.

Please read the rest of the minutes if you wish to know how the discussion went, and what opinion each individual member held. Note: these minutes are not as complete as they should be given that I (Kiame) also participate in the discussions.

Paul started the meeting by stating how uncomfortable he was with the idea of voting and not seeking to achieve consensus.

Anita concurred. She added that she was worried about the interconnectedness between the two student bodies, ~~Cooperation was good, but union?~~ *and the vote. She wholeheartedly supports cooperation, but saw that in this case*

John reminded everyone that the goal of the meeting on the next day would be to decide whether or not the cards should be reissued. We should discuss what format we wished the decision-making process to take.

Theo launched the discussion by questioning the very basis of this discussion. For him, the Code was very clear about what procedure should be followed.

Sam made his position clear, a position he was to hold throughout the meeting. He firmly believed it was solely an Honor Council matter. Student Council was not responsible for the Code, at least not as an elected body.

Jessica wished to have SC input nonetheless. Otherwise, we could seriously hurt their feelings. She suggested a fairly Machiavellian move: we would try to reach consensus with them about going forward with our decision and if they didn't agree with us, we'd railroad them.

Connie strongly disagreed, on the strategy as well as on the premise. She held that this was a community-wide issue. Therefore, we should as many community representatives as possible. Sam responded that SC had not been elected for this kind of situation.

Paul agreed with Sam, adding that he had spoken to a member of executive council who was also of the same mind. Furthermore, he added, voting was against the essence of Honor Council decision-making as described in the Code. He stressed his ideological stance. He cared not one fig about the politics involved in the decision.

John asked those who had remained silent to express their opinion.

very
(late)
FLR

(

UNRA
MAYBE
SOME
WOULD
BE
BETTER

OH
Kiame
perhaps: be

OK

deal
with
this
issue
on
their
own

ah, I

see
you

fixed
it
here

Fritz questioned the validity of framing the issue as an either/or problem. Wasn't there a third solution which was to let those who hadn't been able to vote because of procedural problems vote? A partial redistribution of the cards seemed the most ideal solution for him. As far as the meeting went, his position was that it was too short in any case. An hour meeting would give everyone two minutes apiece to voice their opinion, which was thoroughly inadequate in Fritz' opinion. It was an Honor council matter anyway.

Joe gave his approval to Fritz' option. The purpose of ratification was not to get people to jump through loops but to tap the community's feelings about the matter.

Allison and Lowry both thought Honor Council should decide on its own.

Jeremy was more hesitant. Although it did seem like our duty, he wanted to get SC input. Sam responded that we had from the community at the Wednesday (March 4) meeting, which was better than hearing it from SC. He saw the meeting as useless.

Paul was of the opinion that we should hold a joint meeting but that it should be clear from the beginning that the ultimate decision was ours.

Fritz insisted on his point: as far as our decision was concerned, he held that we should find out how many people were bothered by procedural mistakes.

Theo asked why Colin wanted to hold the meeting anyway, since he had agreed to abide by any decision we made about SC involvement.

John explained the rationale: a vote either way, was likely to annoy many people. By having a joint decision, we had more protection. Furthermore, Colin was enthusiastic about a joint meeting between HC and SC, and was loath to relinquish such a promising idea. *did I really say that? I'm not disputing, it just sounds harsher than I'd expected.*

Paul disagreed. If we wanted more protection, we should decide by consensus. That way, no member would be able to dissociate her(him)self with the decision. Honor Council as a whole would be the object of the attacks. *Also that angry people should know exactly who was responsible for the decision.* *Tip: but then I was with*

Kiame claimed that he didn't care what the constitution said. We should decide jointly. and it should be a decision by consensus. no long how it took. He didn't think it would take very long, since SC seemed pretty desperate for a decision. *-PS.*

Master Turnoff Machiavelli presented her scheme once more. We should take in SC input. If they agreed, great! If they didn't, we would just announce our decision to exclude them from the final decision. *OH KIAME - THANKS BUT THIS IS TRUE - JT*

Anita then clarified her position: in response to John's point about having the support of both bodies combined, she maintained that Honor Council should have the balls to decide on its own. SC should certainly be listened to, but HC should make the ultimate decision. As to Kiame's assessment of SC's mood, she did not think desperation a sound ground for consensus. Finally, she added, the unrest in the community would probably not be as great as one would fear as a decision-maker. *OK*

Jeremy contented himself with an attack on the resident Machiavellian. He did not think it was a good idea to tell SC: either you agree, or you're gone.

Allison seconded Anita's position: no blame should stop us from taking on the responsibility of making a decision.

Connie, on the other hand, still believed that consensus should be reached with SC, since they were a representative body. Paul disagreed: SC representatives should be heard, but should not make the decision. Will agreed: after all, Honor Council members were just as representative as SC reps. Sam repeated his position: the Code is explicit as to whose responsibility it was. He didn't even want the meeting since it would serve no purpose. If we only wanted to consult SC, why not wait until after break? Joe joined the building consensus: we were the custodians of the Honor Code. John also stated his approval and added that the Code does allow him to make a decision unilaterally but he would rather consult Honor Council.

He redirected the debate by stating that the goal of this meeting was to reach consensus that Honor Council would decide how to proceed on the card ratification issue.

We then turned to political considerations. Kiame was all for surprising SC reps in the morning, since a five minute explanation would prove inadequate to calm any anger. After some discussion though, it was decided to call them on the same night, so that they might be able to decide whether they wished to attend a meeting at which they would only be giving their opinion.

On Friday, March 6, at 7.30 am, Honor Council met with Student Council, and explained the reasons for the decision: the Code made HC responsible for such matters. Student Council was very supportive.

Wgm.

KIAME - I THINK ONE
OF THE POINTS OF CONSENSUS
IS TO ~~LEAVE~~ LEAVE A LOT OF
CONTINUOUS DISCUSSION IN
THE ROOM AND SPEAK UP A
UNIFIED FRONT. THUS,
I DON'T THINK A GREAT
DEAL OF THIS IS APPROPRIATE.
PERHAPS A HALF-PAGE WOULD
BE ENOUGH. THEN, YOU
COULD SUMMARIZE THE MEETING
AFTER BREAK AS WELL.

No mention of the
existing conditions -
midterms, imminent
Spring Break, barfing...
Amen

I CAN'T CORRECT
INDIVIDUAL SENTENCES,
BUT DISAGREE WITH
THE ENTIRE TONE
OF THE MINUTES.

JTD

THE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES March 16 (& 29), 1992

Present: Will Best, Anita Crofts, John Devlin (Chairperson), Paul Dubbeling, Fritz Kaegi, Constance Kim, Kiame Mahaniah, Allison Mahler, Lowry McAllen, Theo Posselt, Noah Pines, Rick Ruberg (very late), Sam Robfogel, Jeremy Singer, Joe Stern, Jessica Turnoff

We first met with Student Council, to get their opinion on which of the three options we should choose in dealing with the Honor Code crisis:

- a) Total re-issuing of the cards
- b) Partial re-issuing
- c) Plenary

Their opinions were split among the three possibilities. The importance of the faculty position was mentioned, as well as the need for Honor Council to appear decisive. Bob Hall announced that he and a group of thirty people were ready to circulate the petition. We then left Students' Council.

The discussion was very heated and extremely divided, but in the end, we all agreed on the Plenary. We reached consensus, with Joe Stern abstaining.

The major argument of the partial redistribution of the cards was to insure that all those who had been screwed by the procedural errors would have a chance to vote. Ratification, it was argued, was not supposed to decide how active or passive one should be on the subject of the Honor Code. It was there only to find out whether or not 2/3 of the student body supported the Code. Since we had not reached the whole community, it seemed only natural to re-issue the cards to all those who had been cheated of the opportunity to vote.

For many others, the procedural mistakes were not enough to warrant a redistribution, even a partial one. It was also felt that it would no longer be considered the same vote, since the circumstances had changed. It was also pointed out that since Honor Council seemed pretty divided on what we should do and that we had all thought about it, maybe we should take into account the faculty's wish, which seemed to be the Plenary option.

One Council member felt very strongly that the vote should be declared invalid, and the ratification process repeated.

At about quarter of two (am), after three hours plus of discussion, Honor Council reached consensus that the Plenary option (petition signed by 2/3 of the community, plenary with 2/3 quorum) was the most appropriate. It is important to stress that Honor Council members were quite divided at the beginning of the discussion. Many had to think their position over and trust that the others' judgement. As the Code says, "unity does not necessarily require unanimity."

March 29 minutes (all present)

This meeting was brief. We began with a moment of silence.

We first discussed the logistics of Plenary: all the doors will be monitored, and enough seating will be provided for the first five hundred people.

We dispatched the confidential stuff quickly.

We ended the meeting by discussing the format of the Minutes. It was felt that Kiame possibly went against the spirit of consensus by associating opinions to specific names on the March 5 minutes. John feared that it would inhibit discussion. It was agreed that those minutes had represented a special occasion. These minutes were written up with those concerns in mind.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE
PA 19041
215-642-2526

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES

April 5, 92

Present: Will Best, John Devlin (Chairperson), Fritz Kaegi, Constance Kim, Allison Mahler, Lowry McAllen, Theo Posselt, Noah Pines, Rick Ruberg, Sam Robfogel, Jeremy Singer, Joe Stern, Jessica Turnoff

Absent: Anita Crofts, Paul Dubbeling, Kiame Mahaniah

The main topic of discussion centered around issuing the Honor Code ratification cards. John had promised those organizing the April 23 Plenary wait until after that date to send out the cards. Many Council members felt that this was compromising the procedure, in order to favor the "healing" procedure. The debate was heated, but since this decision only involved John Devlin, no consensus was needed. The cards will be issued April 27 and 28.

This issue took up the whole meeting.

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES

April 12

Will Best, Anita Crofts, John Devlin (Chairperson), Paul Dubbeling, Fritz Kaegi (late), Constance Kim, Kiame Mahaniah, Lowry McAllen, Theo Posselt, Noah Pines, Rick Ruberg, Sam Robfogel, Jeremy Singer, Joe Stern, Jessica Turnoff

Absent: Allison Mahler

The same discussion continued on April 12. In spite of many Honor Council members opposition, the decision was not changed. The contention centered around the correct procedure as well as the precedent we were setting, by not releasing the cards because of a fraction of the school opposed. It was nevertheless decided that no matter what happened at the April 23 Plenary, the cards would be issued on the following Monday, April 27.

JSAAPP reported that everything was fine, and they were meeting with Customs Committee. The HCO committee has got all the HCOs for next year, and they are in the process of training them.

The bulk of the meeting was taken up by discussion of confidential matters.

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES

April 19, 1992

Present: Will Best, Anita Crofts, John Devlin (Chairperson), Paul Dubbeling, Fritz Kaegi (early), Kiame Mahaniah, Allison Mahler, Lowry McAllen, Theo Posselt, Noah Pines, Rick Ruberg, Sam Robfogel, Jeremy Singer, Joe Stern, Jessica Turnoff
Absent: Constance Kim (again!)

Steve Cary paid us a visit to talk about consensus. He started by stressing that consensus had Quaker roots. Quakers believe that everyone has the capacity to know the word of God. Since God couldn't be of two minds, Quakers insisted upon having unity. At Haverford, we have a more secularized version. We operate not with the idea of revealing God's will but with the good of the community in mind.

Consensus has both positive and negative aspects. As opposed to a majority-rule decision-making process, consensus unites the bodies which exercise it. On the other hand, it takes an awful lot of time. It took the Society of Friends 36 years to decide whether or not slavery was compatible with Quakerism. Consensus is also extremely vulnerable to obstruction. Every person, Steve Cary said, must be "open to other people's insight." One must be ready to change one's mind, and certainly not be bound by representational responsibilities.

He then briefly discussed running a meeting. It was quite a talent, one which had to be acquired. The trick is to strike a balance between letting the conversation drift and forcing a decision.

Dealing with dissent is always a difficult issue, Steve said. We are all clouded in our efforts to reach the truth. So when one in a group dissents, he or she is faced with three choices:

- 1) Go with the weight of the group while stating one's hesitation.
- 2) Stand outside consensus, which constitutes a compromise. The crucial question is: in any given group, how many people can stand outside consensus without the weight of the group being lost?
- 3) Block consensus. This kind of opposition should flow only from one's conscience. The person blocking consensus should be aware of the grave responsibility he or she is taking. Stubbornness must be avoided at all costs. The difficulty, for a group, is how to distinguish pigheadedness from conscience. Steve Cary proposes some sort of adjournment, when such a split occurs.

He then discussed other aspects of the Honor Code. He is strongly opposed to any kind of administrative involvement. Currently, all Honor Code jury decisions are subject to Dean Hamabata and President Kessinger's revision. This involvement is the surest way of undermining the Code. He does think though, that in cases where there could be legal issues, the administration should decide. Yet, those changing the Honor Code jury decision should consult the jury whose decision they are changing.

He briefly talked of the non-ratification and the resolution which Mike Clarke and Sid Brown presented. He would have voted "no," he declared, because he is not yet ready to accept that the division in the community, which he recognizes, can be best addressed in this fashion. He said he hadn't any alternative solution yet, but he thought the community should look at other ways to address the existent racial problems. Maybe a change in the Honor Council member elections... He is highly concerned about the problem.

We thanked him for his talk.

After reminding everyone that Plenary is on the 23rd and discussing some purely administrative matters, we moved on to the confidential part of the meeting.

HONOR COUNCIL MINUTES April 26, 1992

Present: Will Best , Anita Crofts, John Devlin (Chairperson), Paul Dubbeling, Fritz Kaegi (early), Connie Kim, Kiame Mahaniah, Allison Mahler, Lowry McAllen, Theo Posselt, Noah Pines, Rick Ruberg, Sam Robfogel, Jeremy Singer, Joe Stern, Jessica Turnoff

We began with three moments of silence, each one successively being interrupted by bouts of laughter, caused by Theo's timely comment: "Oh my God! The banana's loaded!"

Rick then made a disparaging comment on Paul's efforts to be witty. The latter retaliated by throwing a banana. He missed Rick, who was sitting three feet away. The missile upset Anita's decorous tray, drowning her food in 2 % milk.

-Who threw the banana? she asked, gently.

All eyes pointed to Paul. We laughed. Anita's arm dipped towards her tray and, in the following seconds, blakhi globs flew across the room, covering Pual in seaweed-like vegetables, also splattered Allison's face and Connie's hair.

We took a break.

We returned and discussed the logistics of the Honor Code ratification cards. In the course of this discussion, John mentioned that the cards read "Your signature is optional." He and several other Council members felt this was justified by the discomfort many felt at having to sign the card. Nevertheless, after some discussion, it was agreed that the procedure as described in the Honor Code had to be followed. It is explicitly stated that only signed cards could be considered a valid vote for the Honor Code. It was decided that we would change the 1100 cards by hand, before they were put in the mailbox.

We edited two abstracts which will come out this semester. One of them is over ten pages long so be prepared.

We wrapped up the meeting with confidential matters and two failed moments of silence.

Sam R.
Jeremy S.
Joe S.

97

*do we want to
mention how many
Trials were had?
- Theo P*