Members Present: Leah Budson ’19, Lynnie Woodruff ’17, Dylan Gearinger ’19, Arthur Chang ’19, Anna Saum ’18, Daniel Mayo ’19, Cesar ’20, Hannah Melville ’20, Carly ’20, Hannah Abrahms, Ethan Orion ’18, Riley Wheaton ’20, Alex Bitterman, ’17 Chris Hadad ’17, Oliver Child-Lanning

Public Portion Guests:

A. [Introductions]

B. [Committee Updates]

1. Abstract Editing
   i. Still working through one abstract, have two that we need to go through.
   ii. Dylan: Had an abstract discussion, Sophie Mcglynn was the only non-council member.

2. Sico: Social Issues & Community Outreach Committee
   i. Had a forum wednesday to discuss plenary.
   ii. Received a lot of interesting ideas regarding changes to the alcohol policy and a special plenary
   iii. Meeting with HCO co-heads this upcoming week
   iv. In contact with Haverminds and will have a session upcoming soon.

3. SCAM: Social Code, Mediation, and Confrontation
   i. Ethan: We met with Franklyn about an event next week. A smaller thing this Thursday at. Election related and how to talk about politics. And something bigger after break.
   ii. Cesar: A chance to set up a mediation platform. Will keep you updated.
   iii. Leah: 7 p.m. this thursday?
   iv. Ethan: It could be, it’s going to be run by us, so it could be 8 p.m.
   v. Leah: Hopefully you can let us know if we should include it in our email or not.
   vi. Alex: A couple other things. In charge of planning the Bill Eagles event. We were talking in our meeting about how we want to set up some sort of mediation/confrontation system or make ourselves available as resources in some way.

4. Faculty:
   i. Chris: Frannie and Saumya aren’t here. Thursday November 3rd, Pizza Professors and the Code. Have a faculty survey, interesting data. Want a follow-up survey. Ask if professors want to be on the focus group. Create the focus group. On Bryn Mawr side, Saumya is trying to get in contact with Bryn Mawr’s Honor board, we want to meet their entire honor board.

5. JSAAPP
   i. Meeting Tuesday

C. Ratification Comment Activity

1. [Explanation] Each council member received a printout of a ratification comment from the Spring 2016 ratification of the Honor Code.

2. Lynnie: Anyone who feels theirs is interesting/important, feel free to share

3. Carly: We have a ways to go with a myriad number of things, just because it’s in the code, JSAAPP, and doesn’t mean it exempts the legalities. Interesting because
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it tries to draw lines between JSAAPP and the code.

4. Leah: Came up at plenary.

5. Anna: Similar to mine. Reads hers: Works well in academic settings, but not the social. Confuses who is responsible for these things.

6. Alex: Mine similar. We don’t follow social honor code. Should be practical, not admirable sentiments. Ratify a code that students will actually follow. Calls out specific teams.

7. Leah: Does hazing takes place?

8. Alex: I don’t know. That’s a discussion for another time. I just think it’s interesting. I think it’s interesting we have a code we’re supposed to abide by and for a lot of people it just doesn’t work. What’s the point of having it if it’s not being upheld, or its values aren’t being upheld. For example, at plenary, the business thing, the innovation whatever, I was really against that, because I thought that implicit in supporting a resolution was support for business-minded thought. Is that one of the values the student body holds. It’s interesting what values we as a community value and do we uphold that.

9. Cesar: how to do with how a trial comes to take place? Cesar does not agree with his idea. He wants to see a change such that people who are honest get rewarded instead of people lying and get by.

10. Riley polygraph

11. Cesar: I haven’t been on the council long enough to know how it works.

12. Lynnie: At the retreat we were talking about accountability. And that’s been something on my mind, and how much self-reporting makes up for accountability. How much more accountability do we need for someone who self-reports vs. someone who lies to the jury the whole time. Does it matter if they know that they will get less accountability or not?

13. Cesar: The whole point is restorative justice. They understand they make a mistake. If they’re just doing it for a less harsh sentence, then they don’t learn anything.

14. Hannah: That’s what this person is talking about. Lots of parts, one of them is the whole essence is holding someone accountable and punishment is the same thing, and so code is living contradiction. Cites how council proceedings are not supposed to be “punitive”, but we want to hold them accountable. The distinction is the intent? Or is it the same thing as punishment.

15. Riley: Accountability is there’s a transgression, and then there needs to be some accountability

16. Anna: I think less of a distinction between people who self report without being asked and those whose professors ask them too. They are still acknowledging what they did wrong so I can understand a slight leniency for those who do that.

17. Leah: Another thing that came up on a trial, inappropriate collaboration. Parties had lied, and then revised to be honest. I don’t know. We considered including the fact that they had originally lied to the jury, but I don’t think we didn’t. Instead of giving privilege to the people who self-report, give additional accountability to people who lie?

18. Hannah: Isn’t that more punitive? And that’s what this person is talking about?

19. Leah: Yeah we want to pause and talk about accountability and punishment.

20. Alex: The difference between punishment and accountability depends on who is looking at it. Some will see grade change as punitive when really its holding them accountable for their mistake. I think we need to have more discussions about what level of accountability is appropriate. What do you do when somebody consistently lies? What do you do when jury feels victimized? Important to emphasize to parties that accountability does not mean punishment

21. Leah: How would you define them each?

22. Alex: So accountability is a consequence of a mistake you made, to really simplify
it. You make a mistake, you’re held accountable for it. Punishment is.

23. Anna: For me, accountability is a reaction to action, whereas punishment is action
to an action.

24. Cesar: Arguing over definitions is semantics, everyone defines it differently. This
person was misunderstanding our definitions of accountability. That’s why she is
saying this, because in her mind accountability is punishment, which is unfair, etc.
Resolutions are a reaction to an action. Punishments are a necessary evil,
vindicative, whatever is false use.

25. Alex: So we talk about accountability, education and restoration. At its fundamental
accountability is pure restoration, because you can’t be restored until you’ve been
held accountable.

26. Lynnie: And the best trials I’ve been on is when we have resolutions where we can
say specifically they restore the person in this way, but anything that might be
punitive, like grade change, gets discussed a lot.

27. Ethan: I think punishment is an inflicting of pain so that we feel good about
ourselves. Accountability is about the person, about lessons for the person and
about restoration. We have to be self-aware? Are we punishing someone or are we
holding them accountable?

28. Riley: What I’m hearing you say is difference between punitive and accountability is
the intent?

29. Oliver: Reading Comment- Honor Council is too worried about rules and integrity
and not worried enough about the actual case at hand. I think this person would
disagree with everything that was just said.

30. Leah: Does anyone understand where that’s coming from?

31. Oliver: We focus too much on process, don’t think outside the box or do things that
could actually fix the problem.

32. Hannah A: That could be true of the root cause of what led to the violation
occurring.

33. Hannah M: Talking about how it takes longer to do things with proper intent and
proper procedure. If we cut corners we would get complaints about that as well.

34. Cesar: I haven’t been on a trial. In the two meetings we’ve had, but I’ve heard how
you’re determining the person’s future. So they might not have been on a trial,
because you’re driven by intent, not just process-driven.

35. Anna: I could see how somebody could get this impression if they just glossed over
some abstracts. The care and effort is between the lines and cannot actually be
seen entirely in the abstract. I was on a case where we talked about volunteering,
one person was uncomfortable because they didn’t think it would help. We ended
up doing it because we felt it would help that person be restored, but sometimes we
do just put stuff without asking for the reasons.

36. Lynnie: I also see where this person is coming from because our procedures have
some areas that it cannot handle well. Sometimes we just have to do the best we
can and even though there is a lot of thought behind them it doesn’t handle the
situation all that well.

37. Chris: For me a lot of the goal of the trial are met within the trial itself, not the
resolutions. With people asking you about what happened, what led you to that,
that’s the real restoration. Obviously after the trial is over it’s anonymous, but it
helps in coming up with resolutions and restorations.

38. Riley: There has been a reference to the way cases could and would be handled at
other institutions. We do not address things that bring people here, just deal with
them once they get here. If part of understanding the code is asking why we have
the honor code, then this person is wondering why we have the code if it isn’t doing
a better job of decreasing cheating.

39. Alex: Statistically it is better.

40. Leah: We need to do another survey.
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41. Anna: For me in my experience the reason for having the code, even before preventing cheating is just gathering a community that shares these ideals. Maybe not as objective and nitty gritty, but it’s more important and that’s why it works. And why we’re talking about it a century after it was created.
42. Oliver: I think to say that reducing cheating is the only goal of the honor code is really simplistic and lacks many of the reasons why the honor code is so important. The process is important, and even if it didn’t reduce cheating, it is important that it respects the people involved.
43. Arthur: A lot of these seem well defined in academic situations, but a lot of questions arise about the social code. Student states that greek life should be allowed and that the social code should be abolished.
44. Leah: Clarification question.
45. Cesar: Like the apartments
46. Hannah: The apartments are not greek life. The closest we come is the sports team.
47. Leah: Let’s separate the two part.
48. Lynnie: Yeah the Greek life thing we can put aside, let’s focus on the first part.
49. Anna: Scrapping social code is a concerning idea to me. It is concerning that there may be a group that feels the code is so dysfunctional that it does not need to exist. Many people express great admiration for the code. Having a part of the community feel that way means it is not serving the community enough.
50. Ethan: I also think it’s concerning, and one of the things I think about is that the academic code can’t work without the social code. Like it’s dysfunctional, but it’s important for the academic code because it establishes a baseline for the ideals on which we want to be interacting. That allows us to take a test in 3 hours, etc. Don’t think we could do that without the social code. Reads out comment. Social code seems more like hopes and idealism than a practical application. I’d like to see the code set more practical values.
51. Leah: My comment was a little bit relating to what you were saying an disagreeing. It was I got sad at plenary and left and someone got angry and yelled in my face. We need to get back to the values, but we have these cheat sheet shortcut ways to be a good Haverford student, like going to plenary without really investing in it.
52. Hannah: Mine was similar, they felt like the code is more of a marketing tool to make us different from Middlebury, Oberlin, etc. I thought that was interesting that it doesn’t mean anything just something advertised as making it different. And they don’t feel any connection to it and just something that we have.
53. Lynnie: Interesting conversation to have because we’re not representative. Like Anna, how real is that? For me it’s not real, but for people who don’t know about council proceedings, who follow it but don’t think of it.
54. Oliver: I think without engaging actively with the code, it is still easy to follow the honor code.
55. Leah: Anyone have final closing thoughts?
56. Dylan: I’ll read mine because it’s pretty interesting. Reads comment: about increasing number of trials being held. Abolish grades.
57. Lynnie: interesting ideas, greek life and grades.
58. Leah: Something very unhaverfordian about grades, like a lot of classes that are on curve, so basically a competition. It seems weird that if someone does worse than me, then that benefits me. It doesn’t make sense.
59. Anna: I feel very strongly against grades. It goes against idea that you are here to learn and grow as a person. Grades are not productive in that sense.
60. Leah: there are colleges, like Hampshire, like that.
61. Anna: I don’t think it’s practical to abolish grades, so I think it would lose some of its competitive edge within the liberal arts college, but I definitely agree with where this person is coming from even though I don’t we can do anything about it at this point.
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62. Hannah: One of my classes is ungraded. Conversation was had and it was decided that there will not be a grade.
63. Cesar: I can see how that would work for humanities like that, but hard sciences you’re right or you’re wrong. That’s how they work. Humanities is more of a conceptual thing.
64. Hannah M: but it shouldn’t be.
65. Leah: I see where you’re coming from, but for my algebra class, my professor made a problem set that was optional for us to prepare for the exam, she said she cared more about us learning it rather than the grade, so we could choose whether we counted it in or not.
66. Ethan: i think one way to approach it is to think about it in terms of what is the objective of this class? The point of distribution requirement is phenomenal because it teaches you how to think in a different way. If we can do that while also sending people to grad school or whatever they want to do then that is ideal.
67. Lynnie: I’m sitting here appreciating the conversation, but I’m pro-grade. I’m not sure about grading on a curve, but taking the code and applying it to the class, like there can be problems, but a grade should be a reflection of your learning and your work. I don’t see as much of a disconnect.
68. Riley: So the problem with the grading system is in the nature?
69. Lynnie: And I don’t think grades are incompatible with Haverfordian ideas.
70. Anna: I know what you mean, but I see the problem as the lack of consideration of effort. I came into college without having taken chemistry, and took intro chem here and did horribly, not because I didn’t try, but because it was just outside of my realm of experience. I think that it just doesn’t take into account people’s various background. Doesn’t need to be outside realm of where learning has occurred, usually rule out effort and where you started but just look at where you end up.
71. Hannah M: I think we are getting into the realm of the common core argument. I feel that this conversation is getting off of Haverford and into educational politics.
72. Arthur: This comment has really been bothering me, Honor Council needs to evaluate how much impunity they exercise.
73. Lynnie: I'm going to go out on a limb and say they were upset about knights
74. Arthur explains the Knights Abstract
75. Lynnie explains the change of type of trial, and the release of the abstract trial chair and a juror wrote a letter after having read the abstract.
76. Alex: procedurally, honor council allowed the party to bring a faculty member as a support person which is unconstitutional. General feeling that council + jury pandered to the confronting party. And everyone broke everyone’s confidentiality.
77. Lynnie: So that might be what they were referring to, doesn’t mean it’s invalid. Any final thoughts?
78. Danny: Don’t know about a final thought, but about the emails you guys send, first point on this comment is that the excitement with which abstracts are sent out.
79. Leah: What do people think? Are there better ways for us to send out emails.
80. Riley: That’s similar to what I asked about at retreat, the levity of the pseudonyms of abstracts. I think it’s necessary for people to engage with it.
81. Oliver: reading some of the old abstracts is really difficult. It is a lot harder for me to remember which one i am trying to talk about.
82. Lynnie: I think it’s fair though, like it’s fun to read until you remember that it’s something that actually happened. I think within abstract discussions there’s never been disrespect, but I could see how it could happen in daily conversation
83. Chris: I remember faculty once mentioned that perhaps pseudonyms were making light of the serious issues discussed within the abstract.
84. Riley: Could put out some explanation explaining why we do the things what we do. Might help if people don’t think we take this seriously, could help to explain.
85. Leah: Reminds me of the panels/discussions I’ve led/held. We’d be like this is our
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discussion for the week, we’ll have cookies. I think even if the discussion is intense, having something positive, like it’s going to be great because the discussion is going to be great.

86. Lynnie: Any final thoughts?