Honor Council
Haverford College

Public Minutes from [3/20/16]

Members Present: Adela Scharff ’16 (co-chair), Sophie McGlynn ’18 (co-chair), Maurice Rippel ’19 (co-secretary), Arthur Chang ’19 (co-secretary), Chris Hadad ’17 (librarian), Matthew Novak ’16, Sabina Aliev ’16, Irene Evans ’16, Ethan Adelman-Sil ’17, Frannie Gascoigne ’17, Alex Bitterman ’18, Chris Pence ’18, Oliver Child-Lanning ’18, Leah Hudson ’19, Arlene Casey ’19

Public Portion Guests: N/A

A. Moment of Silence
B. “Me too!” Game
   1. Council sharing fun facts that aren’t visible to the eye in the form of a game.
C. Honor Council Photo
D. Committee Updates
   1. Social Issues & Awareness
      i. Flyers
      ii. Community Forum this Thursday on Race and Honor Code
      iii. Working on survey, anonymous questionnaire on if they have ever violated the honor code
   1. Based on something a community juror said in Brunch
   2. Community Education and Outreach
      i. Also doing survey and planning on giving something away
      ii. Abstract discussion this weekend
      iii. Everything we discussed last week (FAQ page, etc., April Fools abstract)
   3. Faculty Outreach
      i. Planned a new meeting time. No updates.
   4. Abstract Editing
      i. No updates (did not meet)
E. Statement Request Forms
   1. Dela: Would only be useful for academic trials. Could be either student/professor confronting the student. What do people think about these?
   2. Sophie: Should we start with one or the other?
   3. Alex: Why you think this is important or a good change?
   4. Sophie: something that came up last semester. Sometimes we get statements where Council reads them, and they may be confused about certain things...eliminate speculation about whether or not trial goals have been met. Goal is to standardize information. In the future if we were to have an alternative process, this would be a better way of ascertaining what is going on and if it fits the criteria. It would address the questions we have—for example, does the professor actually think the goals have been met, or
   5. Oliver: Are all these questions directly coming out of confusions that have happened in the past?
   6. Sophie: A couple of them are what we ask anyways?
   7. Dela: With the exception of do you feel you are on the same page, and if the trial goals have been met, it is what we already ask. We just felt adding those two would be particularly useful.
   8. Chris: I like that
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9. Arthur: My concern is that there’s an open-ended thing at the end. I wonder how we can gage its effectiveness without actually testing it out.

10. Sophie: Talk about why it wouldn’t?

11. Arthur: I don’t have a concrete idea, even though there’s an open-ended form, people may see it as optional, whereas it won’t be as spelled out as it was before.

12. Leah: I honestly think that what they might be leaving out because of the questions may not be relevant to what we discuss here anyway, which would save us time here, and allow us to only discuss the facts.


14. Irene: I have questions about a few points that I don’t understand their purpose. Question 4, about how the confrontations went. I don’t know what information we’re afraid about not getting and the one about the being on the same page and that seems left over from when we thought we would have the alternative.

15. Dela: The confrontation one is out of what we ask for now. It’s one of the things we already asked about. In terms of 5 I see what you’re saying. That’s on both, do people think that’s useful?

16. Arlene: It gives insight into whether trial goals have been met. About relationships between confronting or confronted party. If we’re unsure, and if the students don’t completely understanding the trial goals, this could be helpful.

17. Oliver: In the context of the statement we discussed last week that we eventually dropped, then I can see how this question would’ve been particularly helpful, since this question gives me a definitive yes.

18. Dela: Do you guys think the one about trial goals, which would be helpful to us, but it’s a lot more than we ask them to think about. Fairly high chance about them misunderstanding. Does anyone else have a sense that it’s too much.

19. Novak: I think it’s useful to have parties thinking about it early, and I don’t see it how it’s onerous.

20. Alex: I see a big problem that it encourages the student to be like ‘yes the goals of the trial have been met’. I see people interpreting it that way?

21. Dela: Do you think that putting a student in that mindset is particularly harmful?

22. Leah: I think it comes from the sentence in gray. Can we phrase it in a less leading way? Something like can you talk about where these three things stand? I think the gray sentence is leading.

23. Irene: I feel like this question assumes the student violated the code.

24. Sophie: I was thinking about that, like Brunch statements. And if they felt like they hadn’t, they could write I don’t think.

25. Dela: Or I feel a breach of trust with my professor because they don’t trust me.

26. Irene: They could write that, but it's disrespectful. Maybe earlier, I don’t want it to be a branched survey, but skip if not applicable?

27. Dela: What if we just ask the question of the professor and not the student.

28. Leah: I don’t know how I feel about that but an alternative, which would make it longer, but separate them into three.

29. Arthur: I think about the education aspect it runs into what Irene was talking about, it feels like we are already assuming the student violated the code. I think asking about accountability also raises Irene’s concerns as well.

30. Dela: We could just ask about restoration?

31. Irene: Mix 5 and 6 to address restoration? Kept this question for the confronting party? Also is this only for the professor?

32. Sophie: This is only for academic trials.

33. Chris: Maybe we should say, if you think you violated the code, then what do you think we can do to address these 3 goals. If not write “not applicable”

34. Irene: If we do that then maybe right after question 3?

35. Chris: Yeah, I think giving them an option is very different than not option.

36. Ethan: I think with google surveys it would be easy to remove question 3, then
question 4 we can say do you think you violated the honor code, yes, no, i’m not sure, it's complicated.

37. Dela: I don’t know why, but I feel uncomfortable making somebody check a box saying that yes, I have violated the honor code. But open-form seems less narrative.

38. Oliver: And it allows for a lot more grey if you’re allowed to say it’s complicated...

39. Sophie: Something someone asked if we could suggest just restoration for the student. If we do it that way, I think it still addresses the trial goals but just in a broader sense. Maybe change the question to do you feel there’s a breach of trust? If so, how do you feel this can be best restored?

40. Irene: I feel like any time there’s a confrontation between professor and student, there’s always a breach of trust.

41. Leah: I don’t know how I feel about keeping question 6 only if it’s applicable. Reading this could be helpful, but it could be a really useful resource for the jury to be thinking about resolutions.

42. Sophie: What if we made the main question about restoration or a breach of trust. Then if so, what do we need to address accountability and/or education.

43. Dela: Or if we said is there a breach of trust and if so what do you think needs to be done to address that?

44. Leah: Using phrases like breach of trust, I’m not sure how much that makes sense to anyone else.

45. Alex: I agree, I’m also still concerned that it’s encouraging confronted parties to say they’re close to being restored.

46. Oliver: Or to downplay problem between the two to try and streamline the process.

47. Irene: I think we would see because I don’t think the professor would have that so if we see that.

48. Leah: I’m interested now in just getting rid of question 6, I think students would try to emphasize how good their relationship with the professor is in order to either expedite the process or get out of a trial altogether.

49. Irene: By mentioning whether the trial goals have been met it’s clear that if I say they have it might be dropped.

50. Sophie: To clarify, we’re talking about getting rid of question 6 altogether and having a separate question about how’s your relationship now?

51. Dela: Or making it part of question 5. Does anyone have problems with that?

52. Chris P: I’d still prefer the trial goals.

53. Irene: Do they know the trial goals?

54. Dela: We mention trial goals in our emails.

55. Irene: I know I just wanted to go back to why you wanted them. Like they would know anyways. You mention them in the emails anyways, right?

56. Chris P: I also want to know about what they think about each of the trial goals.

57. Leah: What do you think about Alex’s problem?

58. Chris: I don’t know, it’s a risk we have to take.

59. Oliver: I don’t think it’s weaseling out. It could just be like a natural reflex to say it’s not a big deal.

60. Dela: I think for you guys, if they have that response, if they say it isn’t a big deal, then why is that a problem?

61. Oliver: That’s not a problem.

62. Arthur: We ask for statements in the first place so that we can ask ourselves if we are suspicious of a violation and if so should we send it to trial. Asking this question, will it give us any extra information to answer this question. My question is, does this question add any value to what we do now.

63. Irene: I don’t think it does for the same reason that fact finding and circumstantial separately and might be a mistake to have it too early. You want to separate whether or not a violation occurred and the emotions. And you want to separate out
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the violation from how willing they are to restore.
64. Dela: Maybe if the professor really believes that the goals of the trial have been met, we’ll have enough information based off the students response.
65. Ethan: I feel like we’ve moved a lot, things against this question. As an answer to Arthur’s questions, what are people’s defense?
66. **Silence**
67. Irene: Chris how are you feeling about it?
68. Chris: To Arthur’s question, we are trying to figure out if the goals of the trial have been met. I think the student’s perspective would help, but I’m not morally opposed to remove it.
69. Sophie: Certainly at the moment we don’t ask this question. And it seems people in general didn’t have a lot of reasons that this would be essential for us to get information and knowing what to do. And as some people said the inherent conflict of interest of knowing you’ve done something wrong and evaluating where you’re at in terms of fixing that problem. Seems like that’s how a lot of people are seeing it. Is that right?
70. Dela: does anyone else want to bring up something in defense of keeping it aside from the part of?
71. Irene: Is this something we have to consent to? Or agree to?
72. Dela: If no one speaks up against it, we can use it. If we don’t want to formally consent to it we don’t have to. On consenting form, 6 and 7 should be switched.
73. Leah: For current question 7 of confronted, I would feel comfortable if Honor Council’s name would also be in the confronting party’s last question too. I also have concerns about the jargon regarding the confronted student’s name, and the suspicious student’s name...
74. Sophie: I think a guaranteed way of addressing that is to explain in the email.
75. Irene: The first two questions of the confronting and the confronted ask the same thing, one is a double question, one is two separate questions. So...
76. Dela: That’s very true. That’s something really easy to fix one way or the other.
77. Sophie: In terms of small details, we will consolidate the first two questions. We’ll swap the order of 6 and 7, and for the confronted party, we’ll remove question 6, add “how do you feel about the relationship” in question 5, or something like that.
78. Chris: Sometimes the confronted and confronting party don’t have a significant relationship. Like Transformers. Like the relationship wouldn’t be that applicable.
79. Dela: They could write that, or say that we didn’t have a relationship before but now I can’t trust them.
80. Alex: Could we add a sentence to the beginning saying why the question may not apply to you regarding the relationship between parties?
81. Dela: Maybe something like explain why you don’t feel like you can’t explain it.
82. Sophie: yeah and in the email we could explain that and offer to contact us
83. Chris P: Also it may be better for future generations to have this as a form.
84. Irene: Also so they don’t have to switch between tabs.
85. Dela: Any other comments? Any concerns about using forms for this?
86. Irene: Can we see how it goes and then talk about it/have next semester’s council discuss.
87. Dela: Definitely.
88. Oliver: If we implement them immediately, we can definitely talk about it later this semester.
89. Dela: I don’t think we need a huge sample size to see if it works.
90. Irene: Yeah, maybe a survey size of n=3.
91. Sophie: We will start using these and it will so exciting reading statements.
92. Novak: If we get any statements.

F. Elections
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i. Dela: In three weeks, we are having elections for co-chairs...so if you know anybody that wants to run, or if you are thinking about running...let us know.

ii. Alex: Has anyone been co-chairs for more than a year?

iii. Chris: Not in our records.

iv. Dela: If you want to run for co-chairs, we exist. If you know anyone else, let them know.

G. SIA discussion

1. Maurice: We had a discussion with Ben Hughes, a couple co-heads. It was a discussion about race and honor code discussion on Thursday. Essentially we started talking about the honor code. Started towards a discussion about multiculturalism on honor council and things like that. Essentially we talked about why don’t we get more social violations or why people of color don’t feel like their voice is being heard. We brought up a lot of things but from that discussion I started talking to friends and other community members. One, what they bring to honor council but haven’t. We have these potential violations out there but never reach council because students don’t feel like there’s a level of comfortability on council. They also feel like they shouldn’t have to confront these individuals or educate them because there’s a sense that they should already I guess know to a degree not to do these things. The goal is to create an environment where people are comfortable share these things. Also show honor council takes these things seriously. This and others have got me thinking about a multicultural liaison, but a position to be listening ears to these who wouldn’t be comfortable confronting others, etc. That would be the position and the goal would be to build on mutual understandings. A lot of ideas, like this discussion we’ve had on SIA.

2. Sophie: Just to add to that, in our meeting we talked about one way of approaching a position like this as a person who explicitly is not on honor council and that’s the point, that they’re a liaison but not a part of the body so seen as more approachable. Another possibility which sort of inherently, like mutually exclusive, is having like someone act as a check on Honor Council, how we’re talking about things, etc. They would be more closely linked.

3. Oliver: One question. Just because you’ve talked about it. Is it that they don’t think Honor Council knows how to deal with it or uncomfortable bringing it?

4. Maurice: More comfortable talking with someone who deals with that type of issue more directly and can convey it to Honor Council.

5. Sophie: Can we, just because there’s a lot there. Can we take a moment of silence to think about what our thoughts are?

6. Ethan: I don’t know, will people actually go to this person? Or will this person just be a person and have this role and it won’t actually solve the problem.

7. Maurice: I can answer that. From the people I’ve talked with directly, and I’m talking to more. For some, yes, they would feel comfortable. For other people, it was more even if more statements aren’t coming forward, it’s a sign to the community that we want to take these issues seriously. From my experience and discussions there’s a lack of trust in honor council as a body because of its history and the history of the institution. Just the existence of this position would be a step in the right direction to break down the stigma.

8. Irene: What exactly in the history?

9. Maurice: Spring 2014 had two people of color on council, the code made up by white dudes for white dudes originally. Also muppets.

10. Leah: Talk more about what this person would be might be helpful. One potential image I have in my mind is if anyone on my hall has questions, I’m a resource. This person would be a resource just for people who feel less represented. I think in terms of these violations and microaggressions or other aggressions they could be a mediator and that could be one position. The person who would be confronting
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11. Oliver: I was thinking another potential function would be not to address the problem, but to figure out the root of the problems, and then try to address them. Like, just to talk to the student body.

12. Dela: Leah mentioned that students of color don’t feel represented, but that’s still a pretty large group.

13. Arthur: I was actually thinking about that, and like in response to Leah’s statement...maybe it’d be somebody in like each building to act as a liaison. I don’t know how it’d address the racial stuff, but idk...if we could appoint someone in each dorm to act as a liaison?

14. Sophie: in answer to what you’re saying that’s definitely an issue. One possible way to address that is to have more than one person. But sort of a person can represent someone’s interest without looking like them. Without having someone whose explicit job is to represent who don’t feel like council doesn’t care about their issues, that’s something where many people could be that representative. I would hope it would feel different, they’d feel more approachable.

15. Dela: Does anybody else have a feeling...the way to solve the problem is to address it specifically.

16. Oliver: the specific examples we talked about race but I’m comfortable assuming that that’s not the only thing that’s not represented for similar reasons.

17. Arthur: I think I can supply one with respect to gender.

18. Leah: I was going to say in response to that relating to gender, it doesn’t cross my mind to bring it to Honor Council because we’d getting statements every week.

19. Irene: Same thing as I was going to say. It would be too much on us.

20. Maurice: something else we were discussing. In my meeting and discussions, not every one of these warrants a trial. At the same time, confrontation itself, at least I have a lot of problems as it stands because it’s a power dynamic. What the liaison might look like is SIA offers a class monthly, educating about race, or I don’t know. If a student brought an issue about race to the liaison, it wouldn’t necessarily require a trial. It would suggest to the student we have this class run by SIA, could go to that. It’s in the early stages, still meeting with a lot of people. I agree with you, we should try to empower students. It’s nice in principle, students don’t feel that way.

21. Irene: Yeah, I think also confrontation doesn’t work for everyone. Do we need to revisit the social code, which operates under the assumption that people will confront anytime it’s necessary. People

22. Frannie: how does alcohol play into this?

23. Ethan: Getting back to discussion at hand, I’m thinking about how much of this is a fundamental problem with the way the social code is structured and how much is it possible this position will fix. A lot of things people have been talking about is someone who can act as a mediator. That is hypothetically what we should all be able to do. Do we want an office or change something about how we’re selecting council members? I’m unclear as to what the problem is.

24. Maurice: In my mind, this position specifically applies around issues people of color on campus face, whether microaggressions or other outright forms of racism that they would otherwise bring to Honor Council but don’t feel comfortable because of the way our structure is set up. Setting up a position to convey their concerns

25. Dela: Potentially controversial. Seems to be a perception among student body that a lot of things get brought to honor council and it gets dropped, that honor council ignores these issues. I don’t know everything but I know in the last two years honor council has not received anything that a student was comfortable with moving forward and council has not. That sort of issue, speaks to me as does this person act as librarian-like person who acts as a check or a liaison which is what in my biased position want.
26. Irene: You were talk about a check, like they could unilaterally change.
27. Leah: I would like a conversation about who this would be for? This isn’t something I had thought of until someone mentioned example of gender. Like we don’t consider it a microaggression when someone makes a sexist joke. Who do we want this to be for?
28. Maurice: We can definitely go broader but I’m trying to focus on one little thing at a time. There are so many other isms that I think should be considered. We need more education, some way of addressing all of that as well. Just trying to keep conversation focused.
29. Chris H: Last year and half council has talked a lot about gender, race, etc. The one thing that people seem uncomfortable to bring to honor council is race. That’s important for me to address. Whether we believe that or not, the perception exists. I agree with Maurice that we should focus on race but they can also handle other cases.
30. Frannie: Is this something that while we figure out something that we ask affinity group co-heads, tell them you can come to us to find the right channels, etc. Kind of make it so that they have somebody they can go to.
31. Dela: On that note, we could go back to the idea Maurice floated about the class that people could be sent to.
32. Oliver: My only issue is that that seems like a one member council resolution. Motivation behind that is good but feel weird if just one person who could create resolutions for confrontations.
33. Maurice: In my mind liaison does not do anything like that. They receive notification that this happened, sit down and talk with student. They immediately tell the student we have this class. If the student doesn’t go to the class, that isn’t grounds for a trial. Two types of student. One time slip up and this class that would be helpful and another type where they have a history of saying this and liaison could track this and confronting party could serve as confronting.
34. Irene: Social things don’t have to go to trial. With liaison and confronting party if they decide through mediation/dialogue that someone attending this class is a good and they don’t, then maybe it’s time to start talking about honor council.
35. Maurice: In my mind honor council is informed of everything every step of the way.
36. Irene: Would that make it less desirous if they know it will go to honor council.
37. Dela: I especially want to hear from everyone from council.
38. Frannie: Feel comfortable having someone understand, it’s not that they don’t want it to come to council but finding it hard to find someone on council to approach.
39. Irene: I see us as talking about same person filling two roles.
40. Sophie: I don’t think we were talking about someone who’s doing generic confrontations.
41. Irene: Maybe there should be a way where honor council doesn’t become involved.
42. Arlene: We don’t need specifics but part of the idea is that honor council is aware of the types of things that are happening.
43. Dela: We’re talking about some official person or body which is the facilitating confrontation. Having a body.
44. Irene: Maybe someone on that body could be the liaison.
45. Leah: Perhaps make a prereq that that person is a person of color to deal specifically with that.

H. How do we get more people to come to our events?
1. Sophie: We want to talk about ways to make them more of a thing in the community, especially getting first-years involved, and getting them started early. One thing I just want to say is, when Community Education and Outreach Committee makes a FB event, you should share that with all of your friends.
2. Irene: We could table in DC
3. Sophie: If people have specific advertisement ideas, we should direct them to the
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committee. Are there ways we can change the format of our events,...more systematic changes.

4. Oliver: I see it more as they are going to be poorly advertised. Less of how can we better advertise but creating a culture.

5. Leah: This may be an unpopular opinion, and constitutionally it’s somewhat tricky...I think the problem is that we have so many events, and I think having so many makes it less valuable. I think there should be a way to group discussions, maybe once a month.

6. Irene: I agree. The best discussion was when we released ten abstracts at once because we hadn't had abstracts for two weeks, having a big abstract every month, etc.

7. Chris: It just says that every abstract will be discussed.

8. Sophie: I think Leah was getting at not just grouping abstracts randomly. People are more interested in community forum-esque events and not just in specific cases.

9. Leah: They were also collaborations.

10. Arthur: Conversations in general make people more interested...

11. Sophie: Something one person mentioned was having a competition for the first year hall with going to the most discussions getting some sort of prized.

12. Alex: I have a couple thoughts about that. The first is that would definitely get people to come. I definitely think we’ve talked about this is that sometimes it’s dominated by council members and community people get scared away. And you guys know this, next year we’re making every HCO pair go to abstract discussion at least once. Either they'll bring freshmen or come and take whatever they hear back to their halls. Benefits both sides. We’ll see how that goes. And that’s a lot of people.

13. Irene: Another thing we can do, we usually have someone that’s on HCO committee and on council on any given year, but the committee can keep an eye out, or the council member on both.

14. Sophie: Just because it’s nearly eight, people seem to like thematically grouped abstracts, less frequent. Give us more chance to plan them more seriously. Maybe abstract editing committee could talk about how to put them into groups since you guys don’t have any abstracts to edit. Other thing I wanted to say really quickly is I think it would be really cool if our discussion questions included personal discussion questions, like in Kirby have you ever had a family emergency that distracted you from your school work? Or what if your friend told you they were dealing with a mental illness? I think those questions could make discussions more interesting, and make it more interesting for HCOs, and creates the ability for more intersectionality...
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