Members Present:
Public Portion Guests: Leah Budson '19, Alex Bitterman, Maurice, Brian Guggenheimer '16, Dela Scharff '16, Arthur Chang '19, Naji, Alex, Chris '18, Paul, Ethan, Levi

*I would choose flying so that I could catch the blue bus* - Ethan

A. [Cookies, Critique and the Code]

1. Leia: Introduction. Want to create a space to discuss problems. We’re social awareness committee. Figure out what events. Anything want to explain what we are.
2. Maurice: Act as a liaison between Honor council and the community. See what the community is concerned about. Kind of report back to Honor Council. Specifically issues of identity and “social issues” like led a discussion on mental health, and different cultural differences on confrontation.
3. Guiding questions: What problems do you see with the academic/social codes and trial processes?, what can we do to fix them, how do issues of identity play and how can we ensure that the code best serves people of identities.
4. Arthur: Mention question about why don’t we increase the number of people to Honor council to deal with increase.
5. Naji: Hadn’t heard about proposed plenary resolution. It’s motivated by the time/lack of time. Get rid of fact-finding.
6. Dela: Clarify. Creating a new process for some academic cases, if we decide to send it to this process. But only if both professor and student agree. Honor Council agrees with their understanding. Basically everyone has the same established facts, including acknowledgement that there was a violation. Could send it to an alternate process. There would also be regular academic trial.
7. Leah: For people who aren’t familiar, if HoCo sends case to trial, there’s fact-finding. Violation or non-violation (does not continue), circumstantial. Would eliminate the first part in coming to violation.
8. Brian: Do we want to talk more about resolution or raising case load and how to deal with it?
9. Levi: Might as well start with the first one?
10. Leah: What do people think about the idea of this different resolution to the trial process?
11. Maurice: Someone brought up an interesting concern. They cited Chess (abstract). The student had said there was a violation and the jury said no-violation. So everyone gone in assumed same thing, but in this alternative process it would not have been caught.
12. Dela: Another similar thing, there’s another abstract called Fringe. Student somewhat on the same page and believed I plagiarised somewhat. Jury looked at assignment and thought there were different issues of plagiarism, that student had not acknowledged and professor did not see. Neither party saw it as an issue and the jury did.
13. Leah: Does the resolution leave room for a little bit of fact-finding at the beginning of circumstantial?
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16. Alex: I don’t know, but in my mind it would be “a violation of the honor code occurred.
17. Brian: We usually write it so both parties know what happened, but if we don’t have anyone say that explicitly what was wrong.
18. Sophie: I think what was wrong is what both parties say is what happened. And if council agrees, then that’s what the wrong thing is. Does that make sense.
19. Dela: Why is it important to say it in a sentence.
20. Brian: Then you know you’re on the same page. If it’s just in statements, there’s no clarity on what the violation is. You’re working off this ephemeral idea that a violation occurred. There’s a reason. It’s nothing.
22. Levi: If student and professor have to come to some sort of agreement to come to the same page, it’s not that big of a deal to come to a formal agreement to tell Honor council what it is. If both professor and student agree, there’s no need for statement of violation. Sometimes it partially encompasses all the things they’ve done when really there are more reflected in the resolutions. Statement of violation doesn’t always encompass everything.
23. Naji: Share some of Brian’s concerns. Never been present in a trial; but from reading abstract. There seems to be a difference between writing something and being in a room and talking about it. Usually in a trial, everyone’s in a room. You want to build a foundation. I would emphasize that even more than you did, Brian. Fact-finding is supposed to be a foundation. The whole trial is supposed to be a response. If it’s a response to something vague. In some trials, there’s an impression that the trial takes on a life of its own. Also a response to what’s going on in the trial. It’s important those sorts of situations. Interesting to combine fact-finding and circumstancial. Same order. Because of agreement, could put circumstancial right after it.
24. Dela: constitutionally could do that now.
25. Sophie: Can’t have fact-finding and circumstancial, and then statement of violation and then tentative. Sometimes we’ve run trials where someone leaves the room, deliberate, etc. But I think what you’re saying merging fact-finding and circumstancial. Esp. in the cases where fact-finding, and everyone just sits there and everyone knows what’s important is the circumstancial.
26. Brian: Supposed to be where facts are pretty straightforward. By the time it comes to Honor Council, statement should be obvious. In order to start off on this foundation, could draft a statement of violation because it’s not hard, and if parties agree, everyone is on the same page. The cleanest without cutting anything out.
27. Arthur: We’d be consumed by nitpicky things.
28. Levi: Honor council process and spirit is to put trust in the relationship in confronting and confronted party to be mature adult, and approach it that way and talk about it that way and confrontation. That’s what we’re supposed to do if we see. That ability to come together. HoCo should not come to a statement of violation. Professor and student should come to their own. And then it should go to Honor Council. That being a necessary step before going to this alternative. It would be really cool and proof that confrontation can really work.
29. Leah: Would this be for every case or if they’re on the same page and then we ask them to do it.
30. Levi: I don’t know. Could be we think they’re really close and ask them to talk about it.
31. Dela: somethign that we’ve being walking on is asking a more directed statements. Asking same questions but more directed. Making this form asking them more explicitly like “was there a violation” and from that get statement of violation (one
sentence form) either collaboratively or separately.
32. Brian: Just meld them together.
33. Levi: I’m worried about Arthur’s point being way too true.
34. Brian: I understand, but. Never mind. I’m going to stop being angry.
35. Sophie: Another thing. What if someone confronts themselves; then they’re the
confronting and confronted party. They would agree with themselves.
36. Levi: But if they’re confronting themselves; that’s a good step.
37. Sophie: which one do we send it to?
38. Brian: In those cases fact-finding is usually kind of silly. Them telling their story
which could have been done in a statement.
39. Leah: Would people be okay with moving on?
40. Chris: One last thing. I’m uncomfortable with HoCo making the statement. Prefer
jury to do it before circumstantial.
41. Levi: What if they all convene, all read statements and consent to statement
professor and student.
42. Brian: nervous is that we haven’t actually saved any time. How you really sped up
that time.
43. Levi: Hashing it out so many times.
44. Brian: still need prelim.
45. Najj: As you were talking, I think this is drastic. If the relationship between professor
and student is really good enough that they can agree what happened and honest.
Then, does a jury really need to get involved at all?
46. Leah: What would be really cool, if they’re on the same page, just have four people,
come up with resolutions.
47. Brian: One thing that faculty complain about, it’s out of their hands. Kind of wanted
to exist is a way where like how confrontation should go. Student and professor
agreeing with violation and how they do it. Can send it to Honor Council and track it
and stuff. We’ll follow up on resolution, but no jury needs to get involved.
48. Leah: Does the social honor code work? Do we want to talk about identity? Can
talk about multicultural juror requirement, the idea of feeling a burden where
race/gender identity, having to explain that to the jury? Might be in knights
abstract? Feeling burden of explaining hidden disability?
49. Dela: if someone on the jury has the same identity, burden to represent that.
Confronted student might also identify as a student of color, but not of the same
race.
50. Alex: I don’t think juror that identifies as a student of color, should not feel obliged
to speak for confronted. HCOS told me it’s supposed to be neutral. I also know that
there is that problem. The students of color here tend to band together because we
feel as though we’re a minority voice in the school and so there may be ties. Esp.
among people of color, may be friendships at stake. Should not be an issue
because it’s supposed to be entirely a job. Maybe their experiences as somebedoy
of a different culture would have different interpretation that may help with the
confronted party’s understanding but that’s all it should extend to.
51. Leah: Last part is what Dela was talking about. Is having to explain this different
distance can feel burdensome. Although that’s the positive side. What do you
guys think about?
52. Levi: Much larger than just the Hoco proceedings. Can be burdensome if in your
head you’re supposed to be an ally because you’re also a person of color.
Extremely important to have multi-cultural jury requirement. I find it frustrating that
we still need to have a requirement because not everyone is being socially
conscious of problems of being a person of color. But still important to have three
people who can not necessarily understand but emphasize more similarly with the
person of color.
53. Dela: Do people think that the multicultural juror party is only important for cases
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where one of the parties is a person of color?

54. Levi: No. I originally was thinking yes but no because if you have a room full of people who don’t identify, you only have people of that experience looking at the problem. If everyone’s looking at it from the same lens, there might be someone who’s looking at it from a different lens. Doesn’t matter if person on trial is a person of color.

55. Brian: I disagree. You don’t want one perspective on a jury. But multicultural juror requirement only hits diversity on one slice. Race is one of the biggest demographic issues. but the reason multicultural juror requirement was put in was because juries didn’t have anyone who understand where they were coming from. When you have 10 juros, a number of backgrounds and students who have come up with different ways. Only helps you.

56. Levi: Reflects peers and community standards. So yes, I agree race that can account for your perspective.

57. Brian: More important is a student of color.

58. Dela: both of you ihave implied is multicultural juror requirement that is somewhat similar to Haverford as a whole. At the time, 30% identified, now a little more. Levi said wants a jury that represents Haverford. About that issue, proper representativeness through having a quota. Other people who are underrepresented. Why would people of color be underrepresented? If we assume that’s true, there’s some proportional more people of color who would say no than those who don’t, be more of a burden on them. A lot of thoughts about that, like having a quota.

59. Chris: Do you find that multicultural jurors to change?

60. Brian: It has changed over the past three years. Co­sec three years ago, 32-34% identified as student of color. 26% of jurors who accepted identified as people of color. When I was co-chair, that semester it was closer to 35% of accepted students. Even semester to semester it’s hard to collect statistically significant data, but I don’t know. But students of color, it’s become more representative. Have data on past four years. Not names.

61. Alex: If we have multicultural juror requirement, why don’t we have that for Honor council itself?

62. Leah: Because it’s elected. Have a slightly different question. Thinking about academic code by itself, how do we think identity affect academic code and dynamics. PAF talked about having white professor vs. person of color professor is a drastically different experience?

63. Chris: What was the difference?

64. Leah: Don’t want to put words into her mouth. I think what she was saying was that she feels that she relates more what she’s been through as a person at Haverford that identifies as a student of color. No longer what she said to me. I read stuff about achievement gap, interviewed teachers who dealt with people who weren’t dealing well. Student of color, got C, would say that “that’s probably good enough,” they’re going through enough, etc. Had bus rides at 5 am. White students at my town, had tutors, got to slept in. Had lower standards, reached out in a different way. Does it occur at Haverford? Could even see a confrontation going differently, if professor had same mentality at my high school, look at it differently.

65. Sophie: To add to professor part, is resources, like going to OAR or CAPs, stuff that can help people with their lives. We often think that if they had reached out to their dean before, would not have violated. Haverford as an institution is completely built for white students. Those resources often don’t serve students of color or if they would, don’t assume they necessarily trust they should reach out to their dean. Don’t have trust for your institution to treat you a certain way, harder to access those resources.

66. Arthur: Similar to what women face at econ. etc.
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67. Alex: Attest to that statement. Touched on issues of race. Addressed about students of color struggling at Haverford is something that we as an institution have been dealing with for decades. Gotten better, but doesn't mean students of color would feel comfortable now. Over a hundred years ago, all-male white school. Some element of exclusion even though we try to make resources available, CAPS, yes it’s available and a resource. But I do know some societies having a psychological problem is seen as socially unacceptable. It’s a stigma. If someone in your family has a mental disorder, society will look down at you and say they’re a hooligan. If someone comes from that sort of society, they wouldn’t admit that something is going on. Part of hiding that is not even accessing CAP.

68. Dela: really agree with that. Comes up a lot in the trial process. The stuff that Arthur was talking about, how people feel with their party feels with their peers, comes out with multi-cultural juror. Middle white class has most relaxed attitude towards authority. Esp. when that is the predominant culture, so much easier to stand up to an authority figure; including jury and professor, advocate for yourself and argue for your position. Probably do it in the “vernacular” that is familiar to more of the jury members. That includes disclosure (circumstantial). What were the circumstances, etc. A positive thing in a lot of ways. But for many people, if they can’t admit to themselves, circumstantial won’t help them.

69. Naji: wish I brought it up last semester. About relationship between disability clause in the spring 2015 resolution and the admissions office. My greatest concern is not which way should it be. Greatest concern is rule of law. The Honor code may be something if you interpret it a certain way to function a certain way, interpret it differently, would not require. Which way would it be resolved? Discrimination on the basis of disability is a violation of the code.

70. Goes to quote of code

71. naji: specifically about ableism. My understanding of ability is that there’s no clear distinction between a disability and ability. In the case of intelligence. You’ve got highly intelligent, obviously not a linear thing, then moderately intelligible, and not. You can say that people on lower side are disabled. Mental disability, retardation, etc. My understanding is that admissions office looks through their applications for a number of traits: high social ability, high intelligence, high athletic ability, etc. My main concern is that the admissions office’s purpose is to discriminate on three areas of ability.

72. Brian: also with the admission of international students, it’s not need-blind.

73. Dela: And national origin

74. Levi: When you said that, made me think of what Haverford is. We’re going to discriminate until you get here, and then the code protects you.

75. Dela: Ability, ableism, etc. they’re not applied to ability in a casual sense. There are laws, medical understandings behind it. Purpose of admissions office, is to avoid discrimination in a legal sense. Many people with disabilities have trouble coming to places like Haverford due to resources, not admissions office.

76. Leah: Difference in not admitting someone because they’re autistic and autistic having more difficulty coming to the school because of other facets. Like class, difference between not admitting people from a certain class and middle-class background easier because of resources.

77. Naji: the questions, the metaphysics of ability is what I was referring to. Talked a lot with friends, there’s disabilities, with a capital d, whatever, that are different than just a lack of ability. Special things. Often compared to physical diseases. Something that bothers me about...General tendencies; we’ve decided whoever the group of elite psychologists who put together DSM, hired by insurance companies. Picked up a few general tendencies, have drugs that are mildly. Is that quite sufficient for metaphysical than other general tendencies. Can’t be fixed right away. But in the future. Should be talking about reconsider having ableism or elaborating
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on metaphysics of ability to differentiate.

78. Dela: