The purpose of the Bi-Co Liaison is to keep the home institution informed, as well as serve as a source of knowledge about the home institution. In prior cases, when a student was confronted for committing an Honor Code infraction at the other Bi-Co institution little to no communication existed. The Bryn Mawr Liaison will be a current member of Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board and will sit in on meetings of Haverford Honor Council proceedings involving Bryn Mawr students. The Haverford Liaison will be a current Honor Council member and will sit in on Honor Board proceedings involving Haverford students. Neither of the liaisons will have the power to consent during the course of the proceeding. Because hearing procedures differ at Bryn Mawr College and at Haverford College the role of the liaison will differ with each institution.

The Bi-Co Liaison will bring any necessary documents from the convening back to the home institution so that in the future, if the same student commits an infraction at his/her home institution the Honor Board / Honor Council will be aware and act accordingly in the convening.

Role of the Bryn Mawr Liaison:

The chief role of the Bryn Mawr Liaison is to ensure that Bryn Mawr is kept up to date on the status of Honor Council proceedings involving a Bryn Mawr student. The liaison will be able to keep records during the course of the proceeding but must bring those records to the Dean’s Office at Bryn Mawr College at the completion of the proceeding. It is the liaison’s job to speak to the jury or panel regarding aspects of the Bryn Mawr Honor Code and basic practices as they become relevant during the course of the proceeding and ensure that resolutions are feasible and can be successful at the student’s home institution. The liaison may make suggestions for resolutions that would be appropriate at the home institution. Because Haverford Honor Council trials often take more than one day it is important to note that a single person must serve as the liaison for any given proceeding, and must agree to go to all of the meetings, to the extent that scheduling makes it possible, as to assure confidentiality and abide by Haverford’s Constitution. While reasonable effort will be made to make it possible for the liaison to attend, a trial will not be paused or delayed if the liaison cannot be there. It is important to note that the liaison is not meant to be a “support person” for the confronted student, but rather an expert on the home institution’s resources and practices. Finally, the liaison is not a consenting member of the jury. While he/she may ask questions, and be called upon as a source of information, he/she does not consent to either a statement of violation, preliminary resolutions, or final resolutions. Because his/her role is not to influence the discussion leading to a statement of violation or non-violation, the Bryn Mawr liaison may not ask questions of the confronted or confronting parties during the fact-finding portion. However, during the circumstantial portion and deliberations, he/she may ask questions and bring up relevant points that the jury may have thus far neglected to consider.

Role of the Haverford Liaison:
The chief role of the liaison will be to ensure that Haverford is kept up to date on the status of Bryn Mawr proceedings involving a Haverford student. He/she will be able to keep records during the course of the proceedings and will bring all documents to the Honor Council Co-Chairs at the completion of the proceeding. It is the liaison’s job to speak to the appropriate **Board members present on the Haverford student’s proceeding** regarding aspects of the Haverford Honor Code and basic practices as they become relevant during the course of the proceeding, and ensure that resolutions are feasible and can be successful at the student’s home institution. The liaison may make suggestions for resolutions that would be appropriate at the home institution. It is important to note that the liaison is not meant to be a “support person” for the confronted student, but rather an expert on the home institution’s resources and practices. Because there are not separate sections for fact finding or discovering circumstantial information relative to the hearing, if the Haverford liaison asks a question during the proceeding that may influence the discussion leading to the statement of a charge the current Head of the Honor Board or current Dean of the Undergraduate College may be able recommend to the confronted or confronting party not to respond. Finally, the liaison is not a consenting member of the jury. While he/she may ask questions, and be called upon as a source of information, he/she does not consent to either a statement of violation or resolutions.

**The Procedures:**

1. When the host institution learns of a case involving a student who attends the other Bi-Co institution the Head of the Honor Board or Honor Council Co-Chairs will notify the other institution’s head.

2. The home institution will look for any relevant infractions that may have occurred in the past and pass them on to the other Bi-Co institution. The relevant infractions of the home institution’s Honor Code will follow the host institution’s **normal policy of notifying juries about past violations**.

3. After scheduling the hearing, the institution convening the hearing will contact the home institution and e-mail Board/Council members in search of a suitable liaison. At this point a list of Board/Council members will be provided for the confronted and confronting parties. Anyone who the parties would not be comfortable with sitting in on the trial will be noted prior to revealing the identity of the confronted and confronting parties to them. Those individuals will not be asked to be liaisons for that proceeding.

4. The liaison, determined by who can best fit the scheduled convening times, and has been cleared by the confronted and confronting parties, will attend all relevant meetings, to the best of scheduling ability, and report back to the home institution’s head about the proceedings. This information includes a charge (statement of violation) and resolution(s).
5. Throughout the convening the liaison has the responsibility to educate the jury about basic practices and other pertinent information, as it becomes relevant. However, the liaison does not play a role in the decision-making process.

6. After the proceedings the liaison will turn over any relevant paperwork to the Co-Chairs or Head so as to not break confidentiality. The records will include the name of the student(s) from the home institution and the Trial Chair's name and contact information, but not the names of the parties from the host institution, jurors, or other involved parties, in order to protect confidentiality. The record will take the form of the Chair’s Report that contains only the name(s) of the student(s) from the home institution and Trial Chair, as specified above. The liaison will also receive the abstract as soon as it has been completed. The liaison’s contact information will be kept on record to facilitate this. These records may be kept or destroyed based on the home institution’s decision.

**Types of Proceedings A Liaison Will Attend at Haverford:**

1. Academic Trial
2. Social Trial
3. Joint-Panel
4. Student Facilitation Panel

**Types of Proceedings a Liaison Will Attend at Bryn Mawr:**

1. Academic Trial
2. Social Trial
3. Dean’s Panel