

The New Honor Code:

Section 3.01 Preamble

As Haverford students, we seek an environment in which members of a diverse community can live together, interact, and learn from one another in ways that protect both personal freedom and community standards. For our diverse community to prosper, we must embrace our differences and be mindful of our varied perspectives and backgrounds; this goal is only possible if students seek mutual understanding by means of respectful communication. The Honor Code holds us accountable for our words and actions, and guides us in resolving conflicts by engaging each other in dialogue.

Section 3.02 Introduction

Our adherence to this written expression of our shared values establishes an open environment of learning and growing through personal and community responsibility. Because we subscribe to these values, we commit as members of the Haverford community to follow the Honor Code.

We uphold the Code by engaging with the values upon which our community depends: mutual trust, concern, and respect for oneself, one another and the community. These values form the basis of the Honor Code, yet improve our community only if we incorporate them into our daily lives.

Section 3.03 Jurisdiction

The Honor Code applies to every aspect of student life at Haverford College, academic or social. All students at Haverford, including Bryn Mawr, Swarthmore and University of Pennsylvania students enrolled in Haverford courses, are obligated to adhere to the Code, and are under its jurisdiction while on this campus and while doing work for Haverford courses. Haverford students studying at other institutions are similarly compelled to conduct themselves in accordance with the Code.

Our community also includes the faculty, staff, and administration. For this reason, the student body asks that these members of the community work with us in the spirit of the Code.

Section 3.04 Responsibilities

1. Academic

As students we are responsible for proper conduct and integrity in all of our scholastic work. We must follow a professor's instructions as to the completion of all academic work, and must ask for clarification if the instructions are not clear. Students should not give or receive aid when taking exams, unless the professor specifies this practice as appropriate.

A student commits an act of plagiarism as defined by the Faculty Handbook by representing "another person's ideas or scholarship" as that student's own work.

To avoid plagiarism, students are expected to properly cite all sources, including memorized and reproduced material, used in the preparation of written work, including examinations, unless otherwise instructed by the professor who assigned the work. These should be properly cited according to the standards of the discipline. Moreover, each student has the responsibility to learn and uphold exactly what each professor expects in terms of acknowledging sources of information on papers, exams, and assignments.

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, acts of plagiarism, improper collaboration, and using more time and/or resources than allotted. We recognize that acts of academic dishonesty can often be understood as forms of disrespect to the educational goals of Haverford College. We therefore expect that students take extreme care and that, in moments where they struggle to balance their academics with experiences such as mental health concerns or family crises, they 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.

By committing an act of academic dishonesty, such as plagiarism, a student separates themselves from our community values and thus, juries will strongly consider separation from the college, in addition to a recommendation of a grade

change, while taking into account both the severity of the violation and the student's circumstances.

Breaches of the Honor Code in an academic context include, but are not limited to, acts of racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, classism, ableism, tokenism, cultural insensitivity, discrimination based on citizenship status, discrimination based on religion, and discrimination based on national origin, accent, or dialect. We ask that faculty be mindful of these in their interactions with students. Such breaches between students in academic settings fall under the Social Honor Code, as enumerated in Section 3.04(2).

Confrontation should take place in an academic setting when students see a peer commit an act that violates the Social Code. Recognizing that power imbalances impact the academic experience as well, the Code encourages, whenever possible, that students from positions of power directly confront their peers as active bystanders should a social violation take place in the classroom. This is particularly crucial when a violation of the Code threatens the emotional and academic safety of students from historically underrepresented backgrounds.

If a student believes an act of discrimination has been committed by a faculty member, the student should either confront the faculty member or seek assistance from a third party. This third party can include, but is not limited to, another faculty member, a relevant Department or Program Chair, a Dean, or a member of Honor Council. Faculty members are not under the jurisdiction of Honor Council, and may not be taken to trial. Instead, a result of such a confrontation should take the form of a meaningful discussion aimed at mutual understanding.

We recognize that the academic environment benefits from a willingness on the part of the community to lean into discomfort, and therefore do not ask that faculty restrict their syllabi. We urge faculty to consider the values of the code in their approach to sensitive topics, and especially in their personal interactions with students.

In the event of amendments to either the Academic or the Social Code, students, faculty, and staff should be made aware of the changes.

2. Social

As a community, we understand that the Social Honor Code is a guide to respectful conduct between ourselves and the rest of the Haverford community. We must consider how our words and actions, regardless of the medium, whether they be online or in person, may affect the sense of acceptance essential to an individual's or group's participation in the community. We recognize this is exceptionally pertinent when it comes to protecting students from marginalized backgrounds including, but not limited to, students of color, students with disabilities, queer and trans students, first generation students, low-income students, survivors of sexual assault, and international students. With this in mind, we strive for the equality of opportunity among all Haverford Students.

Our community's social relationships are based on mutual trust, concern and respect. We recognize that trust, concern, and respect are not passive, and require profound and daily thought for the betterment of our community within individual and collective interaction. Furthermore, we recognize that the values in this Code apply not only to how we act towards other students, but also to our relationships with staff, faculty, and guests of the college.

In our interactions with others, we must consider how the particular privileges each of us holds affect our words and actions towards others. Understanding this, we strive to foster an environment that genuinely encourages respectful expression of differing values in honest and open discussion. However, as a community, we recognize that this dialogue is not always possible, and that the safety of all students should be paramount. Thus, the Code requires discussion that is active, inclusive, responsible, and safe for all students. We understand conduct that is not in line with these values inherently damages the community and thus violates the Code.

In particular, we recognize that acts of discrimination and harassment, including, but not limited to, acts of racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, classism, ableism, tokenism, cultural insensitivity, discrimination based on citizenship status, discrimination based on religion, and discrimination based on national origin, accent, dialect, or usage of the English language are devoid of respect and therefore, by definition, violate this Code. We understand that these discriminatory acts can take many forms, and smaller acts such as microaggressions are also devoid of respect and thus violate the Code.

We also recognize that there are a range of political opinions at Haverford College. Thus, we expect that when expressing or encountering others' political beliefs, students will be respectful of community standards as befits adherence to this Code.

It is important, too, that we maintain respect for our shared spaces. It is our responsibility to clean up after ourselves in areas like the Dining Center and the Coop; to uphold respect by cleaning our own spaces and making the jobs of people working in Maintenance easier; and to respect others' property and, in the event of damage to it, be honest with them. Acts of disrespect against staff members and student workers are in violation of the Honor Code.

Upon encountering actions or values that we find degrading to ourselves and to others, we may initiate dialogue with the goal of repairing the damage that our actions or words may have caused while also encouraging the restoration of trust.

Section 3.05 Community Standards

As part of the Haverford community, we are obligated to reflect on our own actions as well as the actions of those around us in light of their effect on the community and confront others when their conduct disturbs us. We must also report our own breaches to Honor Council if it becomes clear through self-reflection or through expressions of concern by others that our academic or social conduct represents a violation of community standards. We are obligated to report ourselves even if doing so may result in a trial and the possibility of separation from the college.

Section 3.06 Confrontation

Confrontation, in the Haverford sense, refers to initiating a dialogue with a community member about a potential violation of the Honor Code with the goal of reaching a common understanding by means of respectful communication. It should be understood that achieving a common understanding does not necessarily mean reaching agreement.

Though face-to-face confrontation is beneficial and preferable in most circumstances, there may be times when it is infeasible and/or unsafe for a harmed party to directly interact with a party in need of confrontation. In these cases, the harmed party--which can include anyone present for a

potential violation--may initiate respectful dialogue through *private, direct* electronic media. Harmed parties are not required to confront their peers. If the best plan for their healing would not be to confront their peers, they should not do so. The systems below are exclusively intended for moments where harmed parties feel a need or desire for themselves or others to intervene. This only applies to social cases. In academic cases, parties *must* confront those in violation of the Code.

This process is a dialogue, in which each party first tries to understand the personal standards and values of the other in order to create a restorative process. The Code and confrontation with the intent for a trial are not to be used as a threatening device. To do so would go against the spirit of the Code and the goal of achieving mutual understanding.

Should a student feel safe enough to confront their peers, they are encouraged to do so.

However, the Code recognizes that for various reasons--including, but not limited to, power imbalances and mental health concerns--students may not feel safe approaching their peers and confronting them. Insofar as confrontation should be understood as both a process of self-healing for the harmed party and a process of restoring the confronted party, active bystanders ought to intervene. Though a bystander may not be present at the moment when the Code is breached, harmed parties have the opportunity to solicit external assistance from their peers. That is to say, the harmed party may turn to another student and request that they serve as the confronting party in their place.

Active bystanders should not speak for others without their consent. By this we mean that active bystanders can act on their own accord and initiate a confrontation on behalf of themselves. However, they should not overpower the voices of harmed parties and/or should not talk on behalf of the harmed party.

Should a harmed party who asked for active bystander intervention feel comfortable with re-approaching the confronted party, they are encouraged

to do so. However, in recognizing that harmed parties may still feel uncomfortable and unsafe in situations with the confronted party, no further interaction between the two is required. Instead, active bystanders should first discuss with the harmed party what they feel would be an appropriate resolution. The active bystander should then initiate a dialogue with the confronted party in order to reach some form of mutual understanding and communal restoration. Dialogue need not end with a single exposure, nor should there be explicit time constraints on reaching mutual understanding. Rather, confrontation should take place in a timely fashion and should encourage the sustained conversation between all parties in order to ensure that, when possible, each feels that the results are truly satisfactory.

As active bystanders, we cannot always expect to feel at ease when confronting another student. However, it is our responsibility as Haverford students to confront with those who have violated the Code. It is therefore crucial that active bystanders step in and assist their peers.

Should an active bystander themselves not feel safe confronting another student, however, they are by no means *required* to do so. Instead, they are encouraged to acknowledge and validate the feelings of the harmed party. They should also assist the harmed party in finding a party to confront on their behalf. Because violations of the Social Code often constitute a breach of trust with the community, it is crucial that students who feel safe and comfortable doing so become involved in the process of confrontation.

The goal of active bystanders is not to create a system of surveillance, but to create systems of support for students who have felt harmed by their peers. When we say that violations of the Honor Code are breaches of the *community's* trust, we translate individual experiences into communal harm. In turn, we should expect the community to play an active role in the process of education and restoration for the confronted party has been disrespectful. By fostering spaces for balancing respectful confrontation with the needs of harmed parties, the Code affirms its promotion of healing, education, and mutual reciprocity.

In the case of social concerns, conflicts can ideally be resolved through this initial stage of respectful communication and dialogue; Honor Council should convene a trial only in situations where the trust of the community as a whole may have been violated or where the perceived breach defies the parties' abilities to resolve the situation on their own. However, we recognize that Honor Council, Customs team members, and the Multicultural Liaisons can serve instrumental roles as mediators in conversations surrounding the Honor Code. We therefore encourage students to seek outside help as they look to establish safe spaces and maintain respectful dialogue.

An initial confrontation should also occur in the case of academic concerns. Academic violations of the Code cannot be resolved between the confronted and confronting parties alone because such violations also constitute a breach of trust with the community. Therefore, unless it is indisputable that an academic violation did not occur, the confronted student must report the situation to Honor Council.

If a confronting party has asked a confronted student to report to Honor Council, and Honor Council has not acknowledged this report to the confronting party within one week of the request, then the confronting party is obligated to report the matter to Honor Council.

Members of the faculty follow a similar procedure in cases of suspected academic violations. They first discuss the problem with the student; then, if not satisfied that a breach of the Code did not occur, urge the student to report to Honor Council. If the student does not do so within one week, the faculty member reports the matter to the Honor Council.

As confrontation is often a matter between two individuals or parties, it is advisable to exercise discretion and respect privacy accordingly when initiating a dialogue. In cases where an active bystander or other confronting party is solicited, students should still remain conscious of and respect as much of the privacy of the confronted party as possible. Should no active bystander be present and/or no confronting party be found, a member of

Honor Council, a Multicultural Liaison, or other *trained* student facilitator may also act on behalf of another student in an initial confrontation.

Section 3.07 Upholding the Honor Code

1. The Pledge

We realize that as part of the Haverford College community, our actions affect those around us. We understand that membership in the Haverford community is dependent on our commitment to the Honor Code, and we proclaim this by signing the Honor Pledge, which states:

“I hereby accept the Haverford Honor Code, realizing that it is my duty to uphold the Honor Code and the concepts of personal and collective responsibility upon which it is based.”

We all must sign the Honor Pledge prior to our admission or readmission to the college, and our withdrawal from this commitment will result in separation from the community.

2. Honor Council

While the success of the Honor Code is dependent upon each of us actively engaging with the Code's ideals, some administrative responsibilities must be carried out by a community body. In addition, we may sometimes be unable to resolve conflicts with others, or actions may occur which breach the trust of the community in a particularly serious way.

Honor Council's task is to manage the administrative aspects of the Honor Code and to help resolve difficult situations and apparent violations of the community's trust. Honor Council is charged with interpreting the sections of the Code that leave room for flexibility. It is, for example, Honor Council's responsibility to decide if a situation warrants the convening of a trial or if it can be resolved through other means of dialogue and restoration.

Although Honor Council trials are not intended as punitive proceedings, there are repercussions for violating the Code. The goals of Honor Council proceedings are threefold: to hold any individual who violated the Code accountable, to educate the

individuals involved, and to restore individuals who violated the Code to the Haverford community. Such proceedings should also take into account the needs of the community.

Honor Council is a self-regulating body; therefore, members are obligated to confront each other and the administration regarding errors and points of dissent with proper procedure in relation to the Honor Code and Council's internal affairs, especially if they feel they are not fulfilling their community responsibilities or fully abiding by the Code. Honor Council members are responsible to the entire Haverford community to do so.

3. Consensus

The Haverford community recognizes consensus as a valuable decision-making tool. For this reason, all decisions made by Honor Council, including those approving Council publications, are made by consensus. This method depends on reaching unity, requiring patience and open-mindedness.

It should be noted, however, that unity does not necessarily require unanimity. When discussion has reached a point when a proposed decision clearly has the support of the "weight of the group," remaining dissenters may stand outside consensus in order to achieve unity. In Honor Council proceedings, there may be no more than two such dissenters. If the disagreement is fundamental and a matter of conscience, a dissenter may block consensus and discussion must continue with the object of finding a solution that is satisfactory to all.

4. Confidentiality

As confrontation is often not a public matter, Honor Council cases will be kept in the strictest confidence. This allows individuals in the community to bring issues to Honor Council without fear of attaching a public stigma to parties involved. However, Honor Council must balance this need for confidentiality with the community's right to be informed. One way of maintaining this balance is through pseudonymized abstracts of trial proceedings.

Section 3.08 Ratifying the Honor Code

At Spring Plenary, there must be a vote by two-thirds of those present in favor of opening ratification of the Code. If this occurs, the electronic ratification system will be open the fourth and fifth days following Spring Plenary.

If two-thirds of those assembled at Plenary do not vote to open ratification of the Honor Code, the Code fails the first round of ratification. To subsequently ratify the Code, students must create and circulate a petition requesting the convening of a Special Plenary to enable ratification to open. Forty percent of students must sign this petition conveying their desire for such a Special Plenary and pledging to attend.

During the ratification period, Honor Council will schedule eight hours each day of tabling to answer any questions and receive any criticism of the Honor Code which might arise. This council member will have a computer with network access which students may use to ratify the code. All students are strongly encouraged under the Honor Code to vote or to communicate to Honor Council reasons why they did not or could not.

Ratification ballots will have three options and a space for comments, suggestions, or criticisms. Filling in this space for comments will be required by the electronic ballot. The ballot will read as follows:

A) I have thoughtfully considered my position on the Code and I vote for its ratification for the following reason(s):

B) I have thoughtfully considered my position on the Code and I vote for its ratification, but I have the following objection(s):

C) I have thoughtfully considered my position on the Code, and I do not vote for its ratification for the following reason(s):

If more than two-thirds of the student body chooses option "A" or "B", the Honor Code is ratified. If less than two-thirds of the student body chooses option "A" or "B" but more than two-thirds of the student body votes, the Honor Code fails, and a Special Plenary will be scheduled to modify the Code in such a way as to enable a two-thirds majority to vote for ratification.

If less than two-thirds of the student body votes, the Honor Code fails. Students should strongly consider the wisdom of convening a Special Plenary. Such a Plenary would be convened only if forty percent of the student body signs a petition not only asking for the Plenary, but pledging to attend. At a Special Plenary, three-quarters of the student body would constitute quorum, and votes in favor of ratification by two-thirds of the student body would be required for ratification to occur.

Should the Honor Code fail ratification, the Haverford Community will continue to observe the Honor Code's rules and guidelines for a transition period of 6 academic weeks after the vote. A Special Plenary can be organized at any time within that period to ratify an Honor Code. If no Honor Code is ratified within that transition period, the Code will cease to be in effect. Further Plenaries may still be convened to ratify an Honor Code.

Upon its ratification, we renew our commitment to the Honor Code and we pledge to uphold these ideals through the conduct of our daily lives.