Third Round: Honor Code Vote 2018
By Riley Wheaton (’20) Honor Council Librarian

Though this was not a ratification process in the constitutional sense, the student body was asked to vote on the ratification of a code that emerged from a turbulent period of revision by students, faculty, and administration.

Vote Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>% of Student Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have thoughtfully considered my position on the new honor code and I vote for its ratification</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>74.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have thoughtfully considered my position on the new honor code and I vote for its ratification with objections</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have thoughtfully considered my position on the new honor code and I do not vote for its ratification</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Vote Recorded</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (out of 1258 possible voters)</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>85.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For unknown reason votes were not recorded for ten people who tried to vote.

Unlike in the standard ratification process commenting was optional.

I have thoughtfully considered my position on the new honor code I and vote for it’s ratification

- I feel that this rewritten code embodies the values intended by the Haverford student community through the process of Special Plenary, and that its modification has been taken with the best interest of the students, faculty, staff, and entire community in mind.
- It’s important
- I feel that the revised code reflects the sentiment of the previous code, without putting faculty in an uncomfortable legal and professional position. Additionally, academic discourse is kept free while still protecting marginalized students.
- “its” not “it’s”
- *its
- This code represents a committment by the community to ammend the code to suit our values. Many different perspectives have been heard, and this code seeks to address specific concerns raised over the entire ’17-’18 academic year. Furthermore, it is the product of commendable cooperation between the students and faculty to ensure that our student self-governance is practical, not just a lofty ideal. It preserves this self governance and also affirms our community beliefs. Furthermore, Haverford MUST have a student-written Honor Code. Haverford without a Student-written and managed honor code would instantly cease to be Haverford, in any meaningful sense. We have all worked hard to keep this community going, and I am very happy to vote for this document and protect our community
• I think it's incredibly important that we have a student written and ratified honor code, and I think this iteration of the code takes major steps towards rectifying the grievances students had with the previous code
• Haverford is better with the honor code in place
• I wish that this unconstitutional process for editing the Code was not necessary, but after long consideration about the purpose of the Student's Constitution and Special Plenary, I believe that full participation in this Electronic Special Plenary with the aim of ratifying a signable version of this wonderful new Code is the best thing we can do as a community to protect marginalized students and foster a better environment for everyone. This is not the kind of thing that can wait for the next Plenary. That being said, I sincerely wish to see measures taken at the soonest opportunity to make sure that this kind of unconstitutional process never has to happen again.
• It is not perfect but It is good for now
• I have been so moved by the student body’s engagement during this week process. It has truly renewed my faith in this community and our ability to commit ourselves to the code and it’s continued improvement.
• Everything since we all got together at special plenary has been a total shit show. But making a huge confrontation between admin and students isn’t the most productive. We should take this loss, move on, never screw up like this again, and do good next year and the year after.
• I feel that the code we have is an great improvement and, while not perfect, a step in the right direction.
• I love the honor code
• Though I haven't been thrilled with this process (as, I know, many people, including those involved in various committees, haven't been), I think the spirit and principles of this new code are highly admirable and very important for our continued improvement and work as a community. Furthermore, I think this Code maintains the essentials of the Code the student body voted to ratify at Special Plenary, and as such I think it's important to maintain this version, rather than an older one or an administrative policy instead.
• I believe that almost anything we as a student body come up with is infinitely better for all parties than that which the regulations that the administration would produce.
• I feel as though this reflects not only student values, but students ability to be agile in the face of adversity.
• This code is much better than the one we failed in the Spring! It still has things that will need to be fixed in the future, but it is honestly doing so many things better. Also we should have a student run honor code if we possibly can!
• I'm really happy about the discourse that went into the creation of this code. Of course, there is still work to be done, but I believe that this is a really great start, and it greatly improves the code from its previous state.
• Ryan Herlihy
• I wish I knew how to keep the faculty more accountable.
• We have fought hard to be more inclusive of minority/marginalized students and should not sacrifice the time and effort that the student body has put into it.
• thanks for all the hard work from dedicated students!
• I think the new additions address the issues the code faced in the best way possible.
• I feel comfortable with new changes to the code.
• This version of the Honor Code adequately addresses the needs of marginalized students on campus in regards to both academic and social spheres. Yes, it isn't perfect, and the process was rocky, but overall this Code has significantly improved from past versions to best serve marginalized students.
• The new code has the same sentiment and mentions the very important idea of academic freedom. Also, we don't have much of a choice since we really need to have a code in place.
• Briefly, it's a step forward; it helps marginalized identities.
• I think it reflects well on the direction the student body wants the school to go.
• I believe the honor code is a net good for Haverford.
• Ratifying this code does not mean the discussions we're having can't or won't continue. However, it is absolutely crucial that we have this framework in place to protect the well-being of marginalized groups on campus and foster respect for each individual in our community.
• I feel that significant progress was made with the changes in the Social Code made at Special Plenary, as they more accurately reflect our values and desire for making the College more inclusive and supportive of it's marginalized communities. I am also satisfied with the final version of the Academic Code that was produced, as it seems to be reconciled with the faculty's legal concerns and supports an environment of academic freedom while still setting beneficial expectations for the relationship between students and professors.
• Most of what I love about Haverford depends on a functioning honor code!
• Firstly, I believe in the new honor code. Second, I believe that Haverford is the honor code. Admin, faculty, and students should take these words very, very seriously; I believe there is no Haverford without the honor code, and there is absolutely no way to separate the two or make the honor code a spirit or aspirations.
• Nothing is ever perfect. I respect the tremendous amount of effort, resolve, and diligence that went into crafting the code. Ultimately, what is important is not the code, but how we as a community adhere to it, defend it, and apply it.
• It isn't perfect, but I am pleased with everyone who put in so much work into improving it. Academic freedom and accessibility must both be emphasized.
• N/A
• All the effort to get to a place where the faculty actually recognize that the diversity of our student body necessitates a recognition that academic spaces are inherently social ones as well would be for nothing if we don't ratify this new code. Groundwork for substantive change has been laid and it would be counterproductive to reject it.
• We have all put an incredible amount of effort and thoughtfulness into this Honor Code. After meeting with the Faculty, hearing their side of the issue, and then reevaluating, I am comfortable and satisfied with this New Honor Code.
• People are working hard and I believe this is an urgent matter. I also believe that if anyone has objections they should have used the avenues previously given to them in order to be heard. I am apprehensive about the online nature of this process, but I understand that it still functions within the (super old) Constitution, though I think care should be taken to ensure that this strategy is not used as easily in the future.
Despite the ups and downs with the Honor code this semester, I believe that we did our best to instill changes that will be beneficial to the code in future years. Also, thank you Honor Council and SPC for all the hard work that you have done on the behalf of the student body to ensure we can reach a consensus with faculty and Kim Benston.

Thank you all for your hard work put into this!

I really appreciate the thoughtful process by which students consulted others and made amendments. I am so grateful for everyone's time and energy. I feel comfortable saying that the new code reflects our values as an institution.

I’m proud of the progress made on improving the honor code to suit students with marginalized identities. Special shoutout to SPC and SC for their extraordinary efforts.

I like it.

The entirety of this ad-hoc Plenary process has seemed completely backwards to me, but I clearly see and wholly support the reasoning, intent, and commitment that lies behind it. Although I hold that all this should have gone another way, I cannot help but think that this is a fantastic option in a terrible situation.

If anything I support it even more after the alterations by faculty and staff and I believe that the implementation of this code (given the circumstances of its conception) will foster a better communal spirit with regard to the stated haverford ideals of trust/concern/respect.

I think the faculty concerns are well founded and am pleased they have been at least partially addressed.

Ah

I believe that it reflects a good compromise between the desires of students and faculty.

Oh it’s great (adriaaan)

I think many students worked hard to produce a more comprehensive and progressive code, and while I’m skeptical that it will have a tangible effect, I’m very proud that students at this school are so committed to improving the community and improving the lives of everyone on campus.

This revised code seems to reflect the values of the community we wish to foster.

I vote for the Honor Code's ratification, but there is one issue that I believe needs to be resolved at the next Plenary: section 3.05 says that we are obligated to confront when something disturbs us, but then section 3.06 says that a harmed party does not necessarily need to confront. This contradiction should be resolved.

It’s not perfect, but it’s pretty darn good. In any case, there’s always room for more growth in future plenaries. (Also, I’m pretty sure there’s a small grammatical error regarding the word has and confronted party, but it’s not a huge deal. I’d just recommend you check it out.

While I understand the concerns that members of the community have about working outside of the constitution in this current ratification process, I still believe ratification is the right decision. Not only did we pass a ratification to change presidential powers to allow for a circumstance of revision such as this, but I also believe that being pragmatic and implementing this iteration of the honor code will be more beneficial to the community than sticking to the rule of law. That being said, I do actually respect the concern that people have shown for maintaining the integrity of our constitution.

This is da wae
Much thanks to the special plenary committee for their continued work with the faculty and administration to work towards a passable honor code. The Code is a very important part of what makes Haverford a special community due to the high standards it sets for students and the academic freedoms and privileges adherence to it affords the student body. It is not perfect, and we must continue to revisit and revise the Code so that it may work better for all students. While this process of amending the code after special plenary has felt rushed at times and is certainly not ideal, I greatly appreciate the effort this community has made to ensure that we live with an honor code.

I think the code is certainly in a contentious spot at the moment, and even though the faculty have had their objections, I see the code as ultimately a matter to be left to the students to maintain and control. For this reason, I am voting in favor of the honor code, given that I, as a student of the college, find the code to be in a passable state as it currently stands.

I have thoughtfully considered my position on the new honor code and I vote for it’s ratification with objections

- I believe political ideology should be more strongly protected.
- I understand that there is no other way and hold the SPC in the highest respect but this really can’t happen again. The whole process has been really convoluted. Faculty should’ve been considered from the beginning.
- I know it was infeasible to hold another plenary but I still feel like this Google form feels less legitimate.
- I believe that not enough was done to communicate with faculty before special plenary so that we knew what we were actually voting on and its implications. For me, it just feels like special plenary and all the work that went into it was a waste if faculty and Kim could block our efforts easily using legitimate reasons.
- I respect all of the work and the many many hours that have been put into this process, but I feel as if a lot of voices were disregarded. I feel this way particularly about faculty/staff responses, not student work, which I respect incredibly.
- I support the new code and the work done to make it, but I'm disappointed we need to bend the constitution so much to have it. I don't love being a puppet for Kim, but I suppose an honor code is better than no honor code.
- I think the whole process for ratifying the honor code is not completely within the limits of our schools constitution, but I think it is more important that we have this honor code, which a lot of people have put a lot of time and effort into.
- Protect marginalized students in academic environments
- Amid all of this, I still feel like there's this strong pressure behind the Honor Code to avoid talking about one of its founding principles. And, look, I totally see it as incredibly valid and important that all of the changes this semester have been made. I wholeheartedly support them and praise the people who have dedicated so many hours and days of their lives just to make this community stronger with this single document. And yet, I still believe that we, as a community, have not fully considered the ramifications of what it means to hear about academic dishonesty from another person. I know a handful of people who've personally confided in me that they've used extra time on an exam, or wrote in that they did more work for Independent Fitness, for instance, than they actually did in real life, and who’ve made me promise to them that I wouldn’t
report them to Honor Council. They've done this in public tables in the DC; that's the best proof I can give for the fact that people are having these conversations, and that they're not always resulting in reports to Honor Council. I don't know what the best strategy is to handle this phenomenon, but I think there is work to do in terms of making an Honor Council trial feel more accessible to people who've regretted small infractions, and who didn't know where to turn, for fear that 15 minutes extra on an exam would get them a 0 in a class or a semester-long separation from the community. I'm sorry if this is just one big rant, and I do want to reaffirm that so much of the work from this semester was positive, but it's a little frustrating to know that this sort of thing is still a legacy of our current Honor Code, still an unresolved problem.

- I have significant concerns about the constitutionality of the process.
- I am deeply concerned about some of the language stifling open discourse on campus, particularly with regard to microaggressions, checking one's privilege, and the explicit devaluation of discrimination based on political ideology. I believe, however, that the Honor Code is the best medium through which to resolve these issues, as it provides us all with a sense of intentionality about the kind of community we are seeking to create, instead of having rules dictated to us by the deans.
- I am so mad about the faculty having "concerns" about the new code. The Special Plenary committee worked so damn hard on this, and literally I just don't understand why they weren't willing to be held accountable. It isn't okay. I also think it's really shitty that some profs. aren't okay with that considering there have been serious concerns raised about particular profs. and nothing has been done. Just saying.
- I think the new code is far from perfect, as it seems does everyone. I am particularly alarmed by the inclusion of "academic freedom" without making apparent a definition in this document, as I fear that this will be used by bigots (even outside of classes) to pseudo-intellectualize discussions of social issues and dismiss people's lived experiences, and then claim that pushback against that violates their "academic freedom". More broadly: since we lost quorum at Special Plenary, right after we made such a big deal about how we’re going to do better for marginalized students and right before the only resolution that actually directly took action to help marginalized students, I have been deeply skeptical of the relationship between changing language in our governing documents and changing our actual day-to-day actions. I fear that the existence of the Honor Code directs student energy towards language change and away from direct cultural change, though I also think having a code may attract and inspire more positive student energy total. Ultimately, however, aside from the fact that I do think this code represents a step in the right direction, I am voting to ratify because I fear that if we do not do so then President Benston will do one of two things which would be much worse than ratifying this code. The first possibility is that he could impose something along the lines of the interim guidelines. These were terrible both because they lacked explicit attempt to acknowledge power dynamics and protect marginalized students, and because they did not embody trust in the student body. This seems unlikely because of the pushback he received last time, but it is a risk we take if we reject the code. More likely, though, I fear he would for the next year or semester impose some iteration of the honor code - perhaps the new social code and the old old academic code, perhaps just the entire old code, perhaps exactly this new new new code if we fail to ratify it ourselves. Any of these outcomes are very bad, because they would involve a student-run Honor Council
enforcing a code which is not fundamentally student-written and student-ratified. This would separate two aspects of student self-governance from each other that would be very hard to put back together. Once they get away with that, why would the administration ever relinquish the power to control the text of the code, since they’d retain most of the PR benefits of having a (now much less meaningfully) “student-run” Honor Code? This would ultimately be to the detriment of progressive goals, because due among other things to structural factors concerning who gets to be part of it and how fast turnover is - the administration is inherently a far more conservative institution than is the student body.

- I'm frustrated with the faculties inability to understand that not being racist/sexist/ableist/etc would not hinder learning. It is possible to have discussions without being offensive. Their inability to distinguish between the two is a major problem and frankly I'm disappointed in Haverford College. That being said, I think the students deserve the Code at the very least in its amended form and I do not think it's necessary to victimize people who deserve it at its current state. I will not take my anger out on the students and my peers.

- I don't believe there should be any mention of the Faculty Handbook in the Honor Code because there is an implicit statement that students at some point had the power to substitute the powers in the Faculty Handbook.

- I wish the process had been more clear and I knew exactly what I was voting on. I feel like generally, the new new code was not advertised enough to the student body. I appreciate everyone’s work though, and I hope, moving forward, we become more capable of handling such situations as a student body.

- We NEED something better. We NEED protections. We NEED equality.

- I am deeply disturbed by the lack of respectful, civil discourse on campus, and I feel as though some of the changes made to the honor code will exacerbate that problem.

- I recognize that this code is better at supporting marginalized students than the old Code which has been reinstated, but I still feel that it does not do enough to create a safe campus environment for students of all backgrounds.

- It is imperative that a student-written Honor Code continue to exist. However, the revised Honor Code as it stands does not address the desperate need of a system of accountability for professors which is reliable and accessible to all students.

- Honestly, I've been very confused with what changes were kept from the Special Plenary version and how the faculty concerns changed the final version.

- I still believe political ideology needs to be protected

- I think having a code is an important part of the haverford community. My objections to the code are all related to the social code and viewpoint diversity, I have no objections to the academic portion as it currently stands (I'm happy that it now includes protection of academic freedom).

- fail to clarify or standardize the consequence of violation.

- I feel that this honor code is the best for a shitty situation. I agree that the process has not worked as meant, and I hope we (and the faculty!) have learned enough from this situation to prevent another like it.

- As mentioned as a preferred route at the Open Forum, I will be voting to ratify this version of the Code, while looking forward to making some key changes the next time we are able to do so. I also believe that, while this version of the Code does improve on the
previous version, in no way does it solve the problems that are commonly debated, and I question whether time/labor should really be invested in the Code, as it has not ever proven itself to be an especially effective system.

- I understand the importance to make all students, particularly marginalized students, feel comfortable everywhere on campus, including the classroom; however, I continue to have reservations about the section of the honor code regarding discourse between students and teachers. I worry that both teachers and students will feel less compelled to share their diverse opinions with these new additions. I believe that students comfort has the highest priority, thus I am still voting to ratify the honor code, but I hope that an alternative solution can be reached in the future.

- The Honor Code will never be perfect, but hopefully it will continue to be revised to serve the Haverford community in the best way possible.

- I do not believe the current structure and style of the code are the most inclusive and powerful way to state our values and accomplish our goals.

- I am voting yes because I think that passing the new Honor Code is probably the most effective way to ensure that the changes we implemented at Special Plenary see the light of day. However, I wish to strongly voice my concerns with the process by which these changes have been advanced, and beg the community to continue having the conversations sparked by the debate over the academic code. If this passes, we absolutely cannot assume that its success means that classrooms or other spaces are any more conducive to human flourishing than they were before.

- First of all, thank you to SPC, Honor Council, and Student Council for the emotional labor that they have put into this process. The faculty and president have really let us down during this process and have taken the honor code out of the hands of the students. I understand the potential legal concerns, though I do not understand why they were not brought up prior to Special Plenary by the administration. However, the concerns about academic freedom are ridiculous. As students we want spaces where we feel safe, and people definitely do not feel safe in a space where they are microaggressed by their classes. I have definitely found myself in classes where a reading or class comment has made me feel deeply uncomfortable. It is disappointing that the faculty and president do not recognize this. I do not want to accept an Honor Code that overrode the hard work that students put into this process (and I do not think that the president and faculty have adequately recognized the commitment that the community gave towards creating this code), but I feel like the honor code is an important aspect of Haverford that I want to maintain. However, I do not want to set the precedent that it is okay for the faculty and president to do this.

- Because voting against the Code harm the community, I will vote for it. However, I do not whole-heartedly embrace its ideas. Specifically, I object to the discourse and language regarding political speech. I believe the new Code comes closer to protecting political speech. With that in mind, I embrace the newest version of the Code more than I did the Code from Special Plenary. With concern for the future and worry for the state of political discourse, I vote to ratify the Code with objection.

- The fact that faculty feel that the changes in the academic code asking them to respect students impinge on their academic freedom is extremely concerning. The provost's and president's recent emails have only reinforced the fact that the staff and administration feel entirely entitled to do or say whatever they want with no concern for students.
Furthermore, the condescending tone of these emails, the ultimatum that the president gave the student body to sign in the changes, and stories I have heard directly from faculty all reinforce for me that faculty and administration do not take student self-governance seriously and object to anything that might in any way challenge their power. I will not accept this ultimatum but instead hope that by rejecting the changes to the code and protesting the spirit in which they were created, faculty and administration reps will be forced to actually listen to students and confront their own bigotry and comfortable positions of power.

- I'm not happy with how the faculty dealt with this (I think they should have been more involved *before* special plenary happened) but I'm really proud of how much work the community put into this document and I'm happy to vote for its ratification.

- I think this new code is much improved - I especially like the line that basically says the code is as good as we make it. I am frustrated by the legal line because I feel that it is not reflective of a student-driven process of thinking about values but is there to appease the faculty/administration. This has been a frustrating process, but also an extremely illuminating process. To a large extent I am glad we are having these conversations even if I am not 100% satisfied with the result. I am proud to be part of a community that cares so much and engages so actively with our values and self-governance. While I have objections, I think this is a huge step forward.

- These are not ideal circumstances under which the Honor Code was constructed and voted. However, I am in favor of the Code. Hopefully, procedures will be established for when these circumstances do occur.

- Would like to see "We recognize this is exceptionally pertinent when it comes to protecting students from marginalized backgrounds" in the Social Honor Code stated rather as "... students from all identities including....."

- I am concerned by the concessions that have been made to the office of the president in terms of involvement in writing the code. Additionally, the "academic freedom" objection to the code originally ratified at special plenary does not seem terribly strong to me, and I am concerned about weakening the rhetoric of the code on the basis of that. However, I recognize the necessity of the Title IX changes, and in the end, though it may not be as strong rhetorically, I believe the revised code essentially contains the same strong protections.

- After listening to concerns about following procedures I have several objections. 1) We should have ratified the new code with the old academic code and saved the progress made on the academic code for next semester. Then, we could make this changes in a deliberate and well reasoned way, and take the months necessary to make the academic code (and even the social code of need be) stronger and everyone could participate. Given the timing of these rewrites, so close to finals, I know that many people who would have liked to participate couldn’t, because of the complex nature of the concerns, the general lack of clarity until the very recent emails by the provost (which were not made that clearly at the town hall - especially re:academic freedom. The whole conversation that day was focused on title 9, even though professors had more concerns about academic freedom), people just didn’t have the time to participate. While I don’t have a problem with digital voting (and have been pushing it for many years) I think the process of plenary (from resolution proposal all the way to actual plenary) is important because it’s takes time, time for people to participate, Time for resolution Writers to edit and
consult with others and time for the community to reflect fully on the contents of the resolutions. My other fear is that passing this code will give people the false sense that our job is done, since we have ratified all the changes we made in special plenary, but if we had voted for the old academic code then people would realise that we have a lot of work left to do. I hope I’m wrong about this. 2) I think we made huge strides in the way the student body participates in plenary this year. google docs really changed my own engagement with the code, and gave greater transparency to the whole process. I think this should be how all resolutions are proposed so that people can get involved as early in the process as possible. However I think there are several things that were not as ideal, specifically the role of the special plenary committee. I think their role should have been regulatory/coordination-based rather than legislative and being responsible for rewriting large chunks of the code because a) it was too much work b) hopefully this would have encouraged more participation of the community. With SPC to regulate it still would have meant that resolutions were accounted for, that people could get feedback on those resolutions and so forth. Also, SPC was appointed and not elected, they did not necessarily represent the student body. Thus, amendments brought to their resolutions was viewed differently. having a regulatory committee like special plenary committee as a semesterly or yearly committee (the longer the better for retention of information) could be a good thing. It might help us interact with the code more actively, and learn more about the code writing process. Plus, given legal concerns, this committee could be informed of such concerns and thus help legislate around those. 3) id like to take this space to briefly express my extreme disappointment with the admin, especially those for who it is their job to deal with title 9 concerns. we as a student body need to find ways to hold administrative staff accountable when they let us down and bring these issues to the school in an organized way. 4) id also like to see re: the academic code, more dialogue between teachers and students about plagiarism, the honor council and trials because I think there are a lot of important conversations we are not having that are pertinent to this issue, which I know was not the concern for this special plenary specifically, but I do think is related to issues of diversity and inclusion.

- I object to the constitutionality of these proceedings, but I recognize the importance of doing so.
- In the future, this process requires a better dialogue between the Honor Council and bodies like the faculty prior to making any large or significant changes. I am also not sure how I feel about electronic ratification of the Code, though for someone like me with a disability it is admittedly a lot easier. I don’t really know what’s happening anymore; I’m a senior and I haven’t had much time to think about it, but I believe the Honor Code should not be written in a way that incites such conflict.
- I do not believe that a petition for an electronic special plenary should be exist until the president has stated explicit opposition to the Honor Code ratified at special plenary, and has provided reasoning for doing so; that information must go on the record so that future misunderstandings of this sort will be easier to avoid. For this reason, I did not sign the petition, but now that President Benston has made explicit his opposition to the special plenary Honor Code and has provided reasoning for doing so, I am willing to participate in the electronic special plenary.
- I still believe that there are many issues with the current Social Code. I think that the wording protecting political beliefs is too vague and provides little real protection. I think
that in general the way the code is actively used is not always right, and that sometimes students at this institution use the code as a means to harass, bully, and discriminate against others.

- I do not believe the Haverford community is ready to go without some form of the Honor Code. I do believe that this version is better than the old Code before Special Plenary, but I am concerned that the Cyber Plenary limited the number and type of responses we would have received at a normal Plenary (although I realize that those involved did everything possible, and that a Cyber Plenary was the best foreseeable option). Also, I understand that the faculty had legality/anonymity issues with the New Code (after Special Plenary), but I do not agree with the amount of power they, and the administration, held in the formation of this version of the Code (being voted on), especially as they are not held responsible by the Code.

- I am incredibly grateful to SPC and all the work that they have put in on this. I am concerned about the process and the precedent that this sets for future changes to the code.

- Microaggressions is too vague of a term to be contained within the Code without definition

- Sections of the academic code were removed that I consider Important.

- I am worried that in many places the code has become too specific. Much of what is said seems unnecessary and prone to misinterpretation

- The way in which the administration and faculty strong-armed the changes to the Code is incredibly upsetting. The students passed a Code that we could get excited about. But suddenly, when the faculty feel as though they will finally be held accountable for doing and saying things that make classrooms unsafe, there pop up all these arguments about Title IX and academic freedom that (for some reason) never got brought up before, even though the faculty have always had to adhere to the academic code, and they never had any say in it before. If THIS is the effort that raises alarms for faculty, an effort to make classrooms less stifling places for students whose voices aren't prioritized, then that makes me have little faith in the 'learned professionals' we're paying to educate us. Moreover, even if faculty had a reasonable argument that they didn't feel like they had a say in the making of this new Code, can we drop the whole "student self-governance" thing? Yes, there are a select few students who have put in countless hours of unpaid work to try and make this institution work for students, but it's completely disrespectful to them to reject their work, make them put in even more hours that they didn't sign up for, and then continue to advertise student self-governance on our website and in admissions. The only reason I'm voting yes is because I don't want the entire Code to be in the hands of clearly out of touch faculty and administrators.

- academic freedom is silly

- I don't agree with the bystander section in the new social code but I think the honor code is important and an integral part of Haverford and I support the idea of trying to make it better.

- I am voting to ratify the honor code here because I want to respect all of the work that so many students have put into it in the past few months, but my objection is that I am so dissatisfied with the handling of the new honor code by the administration. Honestly I think that there is no way to perfect the code to make Haverford positive for all people,
and that it is more of a people problem than a paper problem, and the administration's response to the code really solidified that for me.

- I am 99% for the new honor code, but the removal of the section pertaining to discrimination based on political beliefs worries me as its replacement is weak.
- This opens the door to a number of problematic classroom speech regulations. SPC exceeded its mandate in expanding the code's jurisdiction to include professors and classroom spaces. We did not choose a Haverford education to be defined by the students. We chose for it to be defined by Haverford as an institution. Otherwise, great work. I am so grateful to SPC for all the time it put in to reduce the burdens incurred by marginalized students.
- I feel that the social honor code is a hypocritical document, since we all know violations will continue to occur. I think the current framework bends too heavily toward restoring people back to the community, at the expense of actually getting people to take accountability for their actions. I like the academic honor code. I
- There seems to now be a fairly large divide amongst the students that I wish we had the time to address.
- My first objection is simply that this process is happening without the convening of a plenary. However, my more substantive objection is to the language "moments where they struggle with their academics due to distressing experiences," since I believe mental health concerns that can make it difficult to complete work are not so much a "distressing experience," which implies a kind of one-time, discrete event, and more of an ongoing situation.
- I believe the procedure by which we have come to this point are extremely suspicious. My objection is not so much that we have stepped outside the constitutional procedure, but that we have replaced these constitutional means (plenary) with something entirely inferior. Digital Plenary allows for no open discussion on the issues, and no amendments can be made. This process has been rushed, to put it lightly, and near finals week, when all other things are rushing to finish before the end of the semester. Nonetheless, I find that I generally agree with the text of the Honor Code given here. I worry, like many others, about the recent revisions to the social code, particularly the ambiguous language (i.e. that regarding microaggressions) that could be construed to suppress free speech and discussion. On that front, however, I feel the revisions to the academic code signify a meaningful re-affirmation of these ideals, and so that is commendable.
- I feel that the language regarding exemptions from confrontation (concerning the safety of either the harmed party or the active bystander) should be condensed in some way. There are many mentions of safety and I think they could be combined in some way. Additionally, I am concerned about why the comments section of this form is not obligatory, as the Old Honor Code states it should be.
- I have serious concerns over the way in which this document was prepared. I agree with almost its entire body, but the writing process following Special Plenary, I feel, was not in keeping with the purpose and meaning of the Code which I signed when I committed to coming to Haverford. I care to this institution because we students held each other accountable and because the administration claimed to trust us to make many of our own rules. I’m disturbed by the level of administration interference that occurred during the revision of the Code. I recognize the legal concerns that the administration had with the amendments passed at plenary (these were valid and needed to be voiced) but the power
of writing the code, of shaping its meaning for the next generation of Haverford students, was stripped from from the community and given to a few students and the administration with very little recourse on the part of the wider community. I have long suspected that student autonomy and self governance was an illusion (I have been an HCO for two years now and I have read the “Knights of the Round Table” abstract and I understand the wode-ranging implications of that case) but the revision process that occurred over the past few weeks made it clear that the trust between administration and student body I was told existed is gone. I am saddened by this. I want to be able to fully trust the administration, but I can’t I’m good conscience if they insist they trust me and the entire community but their actions indicate the opposite is true. I voted for the Code today because I don’t think there is another system to repair the breeches of trust which are damaging our community, and this goes beyond the concerns I have voiced here. I hope that the past few months has taught the student body many lessons about the dangers of this processes. I want the code’s ideals to be realized. As far as I can tell, they never have been in full, but I don’t think that means we should stop trying. I really love the Honor Code. It’s why I came to Haverford, its why I have held three customs positions over the course of just two years. I won’t abandon its values even when some of my peers and the administration have. I hope that such a clearly unconstitutional process does not occur again. Breaking the Students’ Constitution for convenience (as some members of Special Plenary Committee have admitted was their technique) is just wrong. The community, assembled together at Plenary, decides the text of the code, not a handful of students and the administration in a backroom. I’m ashamed that the Code has been degraded to the same status as the corrupt American legal system.

- I vote yes with objections because I feel that the faculty at Haverford should be held accountable under The Code and I disagree with the belief (that many faculty seem to hold) that creating a safe classroom for everyone is harmful for academic freedom. However, I think that this code is a sign of progress from the old code. I think that the changes to the social code are important and I want to make sure they are ratified. Although I strongly believe this Code is far from perfect, I would rather continue to have student self governance than trust the administration with these issues. I also want to thank SPC for their hard work and patience at a stressful time in the semester.
- We are walking down a dangerous and toxic path of black and white thinking when it comes to disagreements.

I have thoughtfully considered my position on the new honor code and I do not vote for it’s ratification

- Honor Code is fake and student governance is a lie. Signing a piece of paper is not going to change how people interact with each other or how the administration treats us. We need to see real changes in our actions as a community, not changes in the wording of the code. I’m sick of people here placing such an emphasis on this document reflecting the beliefs of our community when all it really is is a selling point for the administration.
- It doesn't work but it'll pass because we're too scared to accept otherwise.
- Political ideology must be explicitly protected from discrimination
- After hours of deliberations, our work is going to waste.
- I'm worried that certain language in the new code will encourage censorship on campus and threaten intellectual inquiry. Moreover, it is predicated on the validity of the
ontology of a particular philosophy with which I do not agree. In sum: I will not be a mouthpiece for language I detest. Speech not silence.

- where are the gender neutral bathrooms? I also don't like the confrontation part. I preferred the one from the Special Plenary
- (sidetone: why is this done in a Google form instead of the normal system? lowkey I feel kinda weird having my email recorded with my vote, but whatever). After a lottt of thought and consideration, I think the new academic code is worse for the student body than the old one (I have gone back and forth on this maybe 10 times). To me, it comes down to weighing the "equity in the classroom" paragraph and the "students who feel professors have not upheld the code" paragraph against the "academic freedom" paragraph. When we look at the faculty handbook, the definition of academic freedom is...pretty bad (which is kinda obvious since it says that section was agreed on in 1964). It's basically "profs and students can espouse whatever opinions they want on whatever topics they want because academic freedom and that should not be limited in any way, shape, manner, or form." Additionally, several professors linked the AAUP website to show what they understood academic freedom to be, and the AAUP website had articles talking about how trigger warnings are violations of academic freedom. This paragraph is hugely problematic, imo, and I hope it gets taken out in the future. And the way the code is written, it seems this "right to academic freedom" is much stronger than the equity paragraph, since that paragraph just says people should be "open to dialogue" instead of actually changing anything. And while both that paragraph and the next paragraph are really really good, I feel they are both outweighed (both in terms of benefits vs problems and in terms of how the code will be applied) by the academic freedom paragraph. As for the professor violation paragraph, I really really do want that in the code, and hope it will be in the future. But I also want to recognize that all those resources already exist, so putting it in the code is just a way to publicize it to the student body - and there are other ways of publicizing those resources to the student body (arguably better ways), and when the academic freedom paragraph is so damaging, I think it would be better to utilize those ways for now before putting it (and the equity paragraph) into the code. Additionally, although this did not factor into my vote, I wanted to, one final time, express concerns with the process. Since responses are linked to emails, I assume you won't be sharing this to the entire student body, so I'll be frank. My very first meeting with SPC involved SPC ignoring the needs of marginalized students. I know it's in the past, and I know a lot of you apologized, but that's important to say because it influenced my perspective on the actions SPC has taken since - actions like the order of resolutions at splenary. I'm also concerned with how quickly this final stretch of the process has been, and with extremely little input from the student body. Only 3 days to write amendments that then had to be reviewed by SPC and faculty before even being shown to the student body (and I understand that many people got amendments rejected who were frustrated by the reasoning and the fact that the student body would never get to hear their voices). Less than 24 hours to vote on those amendments (honestly, I'm surprised 30% of the student body voted on them, but still - 30% is far, far off from hearing all perspectives). Even the fact that both that poll and this poll record your email address. I'm concerned about how clandestine this process was - beyond SPC and "some members of faculty," we have no idea whose voices actually influenced the code. I know y'all keep saying "and HC and SC", but frankly, I've spoken to members of both HC and SC and most of them are not
only not involved in these decisions but also don't even know what decisions are being made (in the name of their council, apparently). And as I expressed at the beginning, I'm concerned about the time constraints because we might end up with an academic code that is worse than the old one, and I believe that's what happened. And while I'm so so so grateful for the work SPC has put in (honestly - you all are truly amazing people who have done amazing things, stupendous amounts of labor, and so much energy invested in this school), I think the work over the past few weeks has kinda been for nothing. Which is heartbreaking. After seeing the academic code that has come out of this process, I honestly believe the best way to listen to, support, and protect marginalized students on this campus is to go with new social + old academic for now and fix the academic code next year, taking time and listening to as many voices (especially voices of marginalized students) as possible. But whatever. I do recognize that the privilege and identities I hold influence how I think about this entire thing, for better or for worse. I don't want to take up too much space (apologies for rambling so long), so I'll stop here. Thank you all for everything you've done. I'm sorry that I feel I have to vote no, but after speaking to many students, after pondering carefully, and after much reflection, I think this is the right thing to do. <3

- The paragraph beginning with “A Haverford College education depends upon academic freedom,” in relationship to the paragraph that follows it, places the needs of marginalized students in the classroom as secondary to the desires of certain faculty to have complete autonomy and to avoid having their own assumptions and biases questioned by students. It is telling to me that the phrase “academic freedom” did not appear in the old Honor Code, and faculty never had a problem. Only when certain members of the faculty came face to face with the prospect of students confronting them about the classroom environment, did they insist that this defensive language be added. However, I do not think that this problem is irreconcilable. From what I have gathered, the faculty did not give much thought to our resolutions before Special Plenary, and reacted defensively once they realized we had made changes to the Honor Code that implicated them. Nevertheless, I doubt that the goals of students and faculty are mutually exclusive here. Given a less rushed timeline in the fall, and with more channels of communication open, I think that students and faculty are capable of working together to find language that is satisfactory for everyone. That note of optimism notwithstanding, the Honor Code that I am being asked to vote on is unacceptable for me. It reads as a power grab by faculty, seeking protection rather than striving to “lean into discomfort” themselves. Therefore, I vote against ratification.

- I could waste my time describing the many procedural concerns and constitutional violations and oversteps, but instead I'll just say this: the well-intentioned but misguided changes to the Honor Code and the procedural and constitutional missteps have created a grave situation and represent nothing less than an existential threat to the Honor Code. I wasn't going to vote at all, but I wish to exercise my right to voice dissent, even in the midst of this sham we are still labeling as student self-governance and due process. I absolutely do not vote for ratification and hope that others do the same. To those in charge, especially the unelected students of SPC, get over your inflated senses of self-importance and really consider how fractured and broken this community is.

- The code fails to protect free inquiry and civil discourse.
• TL;DR: This was not a truly student-written or student-approved code, and thus I cannot in good faith vote for its ratification.

[I have a lot of frustrations about the drafting & ratification process of this code, which I will go through below. However, I wanted to first validate the immense amount of unpaid labor that members of student government and special plenary committee have undertaken to get to this point. I also want to validate the emotional labor undergone by students, particularly students of marginalized identities, who have been debating this code and engaging with it in non-governmental routes. Though there are things I strongly disagree with in regards to this process and the code, they are symptoms of institutional problems, and I am grateful for the work that has been put in by all those in this community]

First and foremost, I do not believe this code was “student-written.” A code was presented at special plenary that was written by students and debated and edited by students, in the process set forth by the constitution. This new code came out of many conversations with administrators and faculty, with no true opportunity for student feedback as is set forth by the constitution and plenary procedures, particularly for students who did not have the time or emotional energy to engage with the emails and meetings occurring in the time after Special Plenary.

One way we see this particularly clearly is in the paragraph: “A Haverford College education depends upon academic freedom (as defined in Section III of the Faculty Handbook), and therefore encourages both respectful, open dialogue and free inquiry. We, as a Haverford community, strive to foster academic spaces that are inclusive for all students. We also recognize that the academic environment benefits from a willingness on the part of the community to lean into discomfort.” This is NOT a sentiment that was expressed in the previous code. It is not, I believe, a sentiment that is held particularly strongly by the student body. It is included in an effort to appease faculty, and thereby, it is a weakening of the idea that our code is written by students.

I will note that I am open to the idea of transitioning to a mutual-governance rather than student-governance system. (I overall believe this would be a negative transition, but I have not engaged in discussion about this enough to be convinced either way. Importantly, if we decide on mutual-governance, hourly staff must also be incorporated into this mutual governance structure, as they have not been thus far.) HOWEVER, this code is still being presented as a student code, and this is a lie. Thus, I cannot in good faith vote for the code.

Secondly, I truly believe that this process was such that any code would have been approved by students. The immense amount of pressure from administrators and student government officials to sign this code (specifically through the inordinate number of emails which did not validate the idea that someone could thoughtfully vote against or not vote), and the fear inspired in students by the interim procedures, made it such that the majority of students would vote for the code no matter what. In addition, the fact that the place to provide thoughts on this form was just the “sentence” response rather than
the “paragraph” option (in contrast to how the previous forms looked) and the phrasing of “If you feel so inclined…” very much implies that student thoughts on the code are not of interest. Thus, I do not believe that this voting process and its outcome reflect the beliefs of the student body.

In a less important note (if this were my only concern, I would have voted for ratification with objection), I would like to object to the language in the following sentence of the academic code, which was added after discussion with faculty: “In moments where they struggle with their academics due to distressing experiences, students should be in as much communication as possible with professors in order to avoid breaches. Additionally, we ask that the faculty be open to dialogue when students’ concerns are brought up in advance.” The idea that the faculty should only be open to dialogue when concerns are brought up IN ADVANCE is incredibly frustrating and absurd to me. First off, I think professors should be open to dialogue about almost anything as it relates to their course work. Secondly, there are many concerns which cannot be brought up in advance — for example, if a student has a panic attack during an exam, or if they find out about a distressing event directly prior to an exam. Thirdly, many power dynamics and circumstances make it such that it is often incredibly difficult to bring up circumstances until it feels “too late”. It is also a duty of a professor to be accessible and create a comfortable environment for students to bring up such circumstances — the burden is not all on the students in this case. Though it is of course preferable to notify professors of circumstances ahead of time, circumstances should be considered heavily regardless of when in the process they are brought up.

That’s all. I’m incredibly disappointed by this process and it’s outcome.

With trust, concern, and respect,

—

No Vote Recorded

- Suspicious of this process of getting us an honor code, kind of convinced we would have unlimited special plenaries until one of them voted yes on honor code
- I like the new code. However, I worry that the promise of Academic Freedom may one day come to be misused the same way Free Speech has, and I think it is dangerous to include its protection explicitly in the code. I am also somewhat concerned by the loose reading of the constitution that has allowed us to do this: instead, I would much rather that a) those writing the code had talked to faculty and administration before presenting us with anything so that we could have resolved these issues even before plenary, b) that we have an additional, plenary style meeting for all students and all faculty to discuss issues which affect all of us, such as classroom etiquette. I am concerned that unique protections for exposure to discomfort in the classroom could lead to undesirable interactions outside of the classroom, especially since there is no longer a protection for political speech out side of the classroom.
- I am disturbed that you do not explicitly include women as a specially protected class in the Social Code. I am a woman and not a semester goes by where I do not experience medium-level annoyance or harassment of some kind because of my sex. In a room of all
men and me, a male fellow student made fun of women to my face, as if I wasn't there. My freshman first semester, my male professor loudly announced that women no longer face harassment and don't feel silenced by other groups. When I raised my hand to contest this claim, he laughed and said "you don't feel silenced, do you?" effectively silencing me. I see my female classmates consistently talked over and ignored by male students. I see men harassing women in public, on campus, and hear stories of sexual assault ALL. THE. TIME. Removing explicit protection of women from the social honor code shows that the students we have entrusted with decision-making do not value women's experiences sufficiently to acknowledge the amount of crap we go through, which may be relatively small for some but is life-destroying for others. However, I vote for the ratification of the code because I believe the benefits of having any Code at all outweigh this issue, and we can amend the Code to reflect reality in the fall.