Public Portion Minutes from April 10, 2011

Members Present: Anna, Emily, Jon, Noah, Gabi, Alex, Josh, Jacob, Kate, Florencia, Ian, Jamey, Emma, Tom, Lucian
Members Absent: Abby, Rushmore
Guests: Jonathan Laks

1. Student Outreach
   a. T-shirt arrival is imminent
   b. Will make a Doodle to table for next week
2. Faculty Outreach
   a. Casey still hasn’t answered, neither has Fran
3. Abstract
   a. May or may not have met
4. Tri-Co
   a. Martha has a meeting with the Swat dean tomorrow, will talk about the decision
5. JSAAPP
   a. Nothing
6. Safety and Security
   a. Talked about Customs stuff and smoke detector things
7. Back to Tri-Co
   a. Agreement with Bryn Mawr – Anna and Emily review the points in favor of making this liaison position
   b. Anna – maybe now would be a good time to bring up issues with this agreement.
   c. Lucian – How would this be implemented in the trial procedures?
      i. Anna – Could be through Plenary or not tell anyone, but that would be dumb.
   d. Ian – My concerns are that a system potentially exists and doesn’t need to do this instead through the Deans.
      i. Anna – so what you see is communication between the Deans?
         1. Ian – Yes
   e. Alex – well, I like that this gets rid of any scheduling concerns. I think our system is student based and shouldn’t be passed off to the Deans.
      i. Ian – Well, then the Co-Chairs instead of the Deans
   f. Emily – I think what’s missing though with either the Chairs or the Deans is the emotional investment in the resolutions and having them be carried out.
   g. Jamey – I just don’t think there is always need for reasoning. Why can’t they just email us if they don’t understand the purposes of the resolutions? Less time consuming process.
   h. Florencia – Brings up Hera, could understand that if you got those resolutions, you would just think they are ridiculous and punitive and not
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bother to ask questions about why the resolution is in place. Having this position gets rid of that risk.

i. Jamey – well then maybe people should just ask more questions

ii. Anna – But if the Honor Board Head comes to us and doesn’t ask “enough” questions, we can’t know that or get mad at her for not asking enough questions. Relationship with Bryn Mawr is tenuous enough already.

i. Ian – If this person is engaging in the process and not consenting, still has the ability to shape what the consensus ends up being. Respond to Anna – I just don’t think that point person will have any authority to follow through on those things.

i. Emily – True, but I think having something explained over email is much less effective than someone in the room talking to you.

j. Emily – Other people’s ideas/thoughts?

i. Lucian – I don’t see this person influencing consensus that much, kind of like Jacob, not that much of a concern to me.

ii. Emily – Would it make you guys more comfortable if we added a sentence that clarifies the liaison’s job sort of the way Jacob’s is?

1. Ian – Maybe, let me think about it

2. Jacob – That was implicit, but we could make it explicit

iii. Emma – I think this would be a better way to get resolutions fulfilled

iv. Josh – I like it.

v. Alex – all for it

vi. Gabi – I like the liaison

vii. Jon – I like the guidelines

viii. Kate – I like it, I would be for making the talking thing more explicit. I do feel like that role would be good, in that the librarian doesn’t talk much, but is very knowledgeable and helpful when we need him. Thanks Jacob.

ix. Anna – I am for it, especially because she can also suggest feasible resolutions for a case (knowing what resources exist/are available)

x. Jamey – That seems like influence to me. I think the presence, suggesting that we have a writing center is implying that you should use it.

xi. Noah – important that we do want her to influence the jury to a certain extent.

xii. Emily – I just don’t picture that dichotomy.

xiii. Noah – If Bryn Mawr understands Haverford better, it will influence their decision and we want a better understanding.

xiv. Jamey – What I’m saying is that if this were in place, they shouldn’t present knowledge without being asked for it first.

xv. Noah – I think there is a certain extent to which certain questions wouldn’t occur to the jury to ask.

xvi. Jamey – why don’t we just give the other institution a list of resources? And then the liaison can just clarify what they are.
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xvii. Josh – I don’t understand your concern about suggestions to resolutions.
   1. Jamey – I think the power to influence is inappropriate
   2. Alex – I think suggestion can’t hurt, have faith in a jury to be able to dismiss a bad suggestion

xviii. Emily – Can you explain why you are against Haverford students having effect on BMC – for example?
   1. Jamey – It happened on BMC’s campus, thus the issue is with their Honor Code and their community
   2. Tom – Is the concern here that the liaison is going to be pulling for a lesser resolution?
   3. Jamey – No, it’s that you shouldn’t be the one making the decision
   4. Florencia – I don’t understand why we can’t just trust people to be tactful and respect that it’s at another institution
   5. Jamey – Because in that kind of situation he/she can become really controlling
   6. Florencia and Tom – See it as helpful

xix. Anna – It sounds like most of the room is leaning towards passing it at this point
   1. Jamey – Are the resources at HC and BMC so different?
   2. Jon – To give one example the way they do incompletes is different
   3. Florencia – They have very different academic resources and different ways they handle probation and warning
   4. Jamey – Do you not have faith in people to ask a question?
   5. Emily – You can’t think of useful things all the time

k. Read the Document
   i. Lucian – Brings up a clarifying change about the second infraction
   ii. Florencia/Noah/Josh – Looks good
   iii. Ian – The description of the role of the liaison about informing about the home institution’s Honor Code. At the end of the day, that doesn’t matter, because you are under the host institution’s Code.
      1. Anna – For circumstantial portion, it would clarify why an issue came up at Haverford whereas it wouldn’t have at BMC.
         a. Jacob – Brings up the obligation to confront thing
   iv. Jamey – Confused about Number 5. Not sure why they need to ask questions.
      1. Jacob – Priya felt pretty strongly that for circumstantial stuff, some questions wouldn’t necessarily occur to the host institution’s jury.
   v. Jamey – Starting to understand the suggestions for resolutions, think it’s a good idea and be a resource, but this isn’t that.
      1. Jacob – Give a contextualization
vi. Jamey – I’m coming to terms with comments during resolutions but that before resolutions the influence should not exist  
   1. Emily – I’m starting to agree. It’s up to the jury to figure out what information it needs. You don’t want to see the liaison dominating

vii. Jacob – There was a difficulty in getting them to agree to something when they wanted consenting members of the jury

viii. Anna – I don’t know if we should cut it if what they wanted was consenting members...

ix. Jamey – Resolutions are meant to restore, but during the process if there’s a suggestion it turns into the home institution making a decision

x. Alex – They shouldn’t be able to touch the statement of violation portion

xi. Jamey – They could have a more active role during discussions of resolutions

xii. Emma – During circumstantial they shouldn’t talk either?

xiii. Emily – What if the liaison weren’t there until resolutions?

xiv. [Everyone disagrees, although Ian quietly agrees]

xv. [Jacob gives brief overview of how BMC trials work]

xvi. Anna – Jacob, can you speak to how BMC will react to us adding this?

   1. Jacob – Not sure how set the new Honor Board will be about it.

xvii. Emily – I think this is important to keep in mind this is a compromise between the two schools, but I think we can express this as a concern, and see how they react.

xviii. Can’t move on because Josh doesn’t understand the issue with having a liaison ask questions.

   1. Lucian – because I think the liaison could then set the stage for resolutions and put their perspective more heavily.

   2. Emily – I think there is a fine line to walk between participation and being a juror. Concern about asking leading questions. Don’t see it as an essential part of their job, but do think it could hinder the trial process.

xix. Alex – If it’s a BMC trial, they get to define how the liaison functions in their trial.

xx. Jamey – I’m uncomfortable with the idea, I think it could lead to a situation where they become reliant on the HC liaison

   1. Florencia – I think if this is something BMC wants, it gets to be overbearing to say that we don’t want that participation. A thing about the questions: we mentioned earlier that the liaison would brief the jury on the other institution’s honor code, but if a student has a misunderstanding about the other institution’s honor code, I don’t know if that question would come up.

   2. Anna – I think that’s more circumstantial
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3. Emily – We hadn’t totally gotten to that
4. Jamey – I think the big issue is the asking questions in general
5. Anna – I think they should be able to ask questions in circumstantial
6. Alex – I see circumstantial is leading up to resolutions. I see resolutions as an extension of circumstantial. It’s important for the L. to be able to aid in creating the best resolutions possible
xxi. Emily – It sounds like what I’m hearing generally is that the liaison shouldn’t be active in asking questions during the fact-finding, but many seem to feel that the L. should be able to question during circumstantial. Should we add a sentence stating the L.’s role as similar to the Librarian’s?
1. Lucian – I like that
2. Florencia – I don’t feel strongly about it, but if it makes more people comfortable…I don’t feel strongly about the librarian sentence. Still a little confused about what I missed in the two minutes.
   a. Emily – People are uncomfortable with liaison being able to ask questions during fact-finding
3. Jamey – I still see it as having influence during circumstantial
4. Josh – I think it’s also true that the confronted and confronting questions
5. Jamey – They’re much more invested in the process. I think for resolutions it’s one thing, in terms of fact-finding and stuff, it’s not their place.
6. Emily – Can I jump in? I agree that the breach of trust is mainly with the community where the violation occurred, but because we are part of a Bi-Co community then I (as liaison) would be invested
7. Jon – I can see it being valuable in some cases and not in others. It could be neutral in some. I would be comfortable consenting to either one.
8. Tom – I don’t see anything wrong with having them talking the circumstantial either
9. Lucian – I think it would be okay under the guise of suggesting something that’s been overlooked
10. Alex – Jacob gets to bring up something we’re missing, that’s something the liaison should do
11. Anna – What if we said the liaison should not say anything during fact-finding and statement of violation but afterwards it becomes like the librarian?
   a. Gabi – Can we make it that they not be able to speak at all during those portions, not limit it to questions?
b. Anna – Sure
   i. We need to move on, but I think that we’re moving towards this sense and some of these issues need to be run by Priya. I would propose that we move forward with this vague understanding that we’re coming to and revisit it next week. In the meantime Jacob talks to Priya.

8. Community Discussion is on Wednesday with Breadsticks