

# Honor Council

H A V E R F O R D C O L L E G E

## Honor Council Sunday Meeting, 5:00pm Public Minutes from October 30, 2005.

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** D. Jacob Rabinowitz, Jonathon Williams, Stephanie Rudolph (Co-Sec), Leah Gold, Travis Green (Co-Chair), Andrew Yeats (Co-Chair), Brandon West (Co-Sec), Micah Sieber, Daniel Studenmund, Abby Krumholz, Emma Eisenberg, Ben Pyenson, Justin Dainer-Best, Adem Bunkeddeko **ABSENT MEMBERS:**, Dan Logan, Lindsey Merikas **Librarian:** Dan Sacks '08 in attendance

**1. Committee Reports.** JSAAP: Micah reported about activities on JSAAP including sending an email to the community about hospitalizations. Dan Sacks brought up the issue broken class outside the DC after the Halloween party. Is there anything that can be done about this aside from individual confrontations? Most people agreed that confronting is all that can be done.

Safety and Security committee: yet to meet.

Admissions Committee: met to discuss goals of meeting with Jess Lord. Want Travis to come since he's done this type of meeting before. Talked about admissions honor code signing process: whether it should change or not. New Haverford website: making information about Honor Code accessible. Establish how new admissions website will work. Change the admissions will be next fall.

Faculty Outreach: didn't meet do to miscommunication

Community outreach: still hasn't met. For some reasons John Francone and the committee has not be in communication. Its possible John didn't get the email. Moving forwards on the T-shirt which will say "Burst the bubble Code, around the globe" Funds go to hurricane victims in Guatemala. Will talk to Amy Ham. Talk to Julie from the bookstore. 2 weeks ready?

STUMP: Met and read STUMP constitution and critiqued it. Travis came down on the side that it was too long and restrictive (10 pages). He wanted something less procedural; basically a mission statement. He's going to write it and we will review it.

**2. Confidentiality within Council Reprise:** Two weeks ago, we discussed the fact that executive council (Co-secs/co-chairs) know more information about confronted parties than the rest of council. We were unable to reach consensus about anything concrete because we don't have anything concrete to debate. Andrew, Travis and Jacob will work on writing up a concrete proposal for Honor council to talk about to clarify what council should know and what it shouldn't.

**3. The case of the missing abstract:** Pierre U/Harry Potter may have never been released. Due to other Honor Council obligations, Andrew and Travis have not had time to investigate and so Dan Sacks will be doing the investigation. Council has yet to hear from anyone in the community about whether they have seen it. He will interview the co-chairs from that time including Mary Green.

**4. Minutes:** Council members who post minutes said they need more copies of the minutes for distribution.

**5. Librarian Report:** Dan Sacks is required to produce a document for the community about council what can and cannot go in there?

- Hypothetical posed by Dan: Suppose that the people involved in a serious, public social violation of the code could not be taken to trial immediately because they had already been separated in an academic trial. If the person does not come back to Haverford, the social issue is never tended to and it seems like Honor Council is negligent. Is that something Honor Council should explain to the community?
  - Issues mentioned: Doesn't a statement linking a person in an academic trial to a social transgression make it really obvious who the person that got separated?

These minutes reflect the opinions of Stephanie (srudolph@hc) and Brandon (bwest@hc) and are not reviewed or approved by Council.

- Jacob: It should not matter if the person is not covering back. Confidentiality applies to people in the community.
- Should Dan mention how many trials have occurred in a semester (its been confidential in the passed).
  - Council seems to think yes but worries that designating the nature of the trial gives away time confidentiality (there would be no point in delaying a social trial if it was the only one that happens in a given year because the report would say when it happened).
  - The number of trials was discussed but there were reservations to discuss the kind of trials. People have a good idea with the kinds of trials that happened (academic to social ratio).
- The idea of some people in the community are confronted more than others was discussed. i.e. athletes getting confronted more because of a stigma.
  - It was suggested that the report should keep track of race, class, activities, high schools (public vs. private), financial aid, of confronted parties to be sure we are being fair.
    - Steph: what if we are being bias→we would never know under this
    - Dan: how would this be applied?
    - Micah: I see no good coming out of this
    - Jacob: How is knowing the truth a bad thing.
    - Travis: Telling professors that you're for example, more likely to confront a student of color is a big powerful statement.
    - Jacob: do we need to come to consensus.
    - Dan: they shouldn't have to answer that question. Five year study.
    - Steph: it could misuse statistics.
    - Travis: we will table this discussion.
- Another idea was to state the number of confrontations brought to council.
  - How many people completed resolutions...
  - In addition, how many people graduated without completing resolutions.
- Andrew said that we would like to see a draft  
Who would get the power to look at special collections with all that information was discussed
  - A member of council mentioned that Deans can't give access to it.
  - It was evident that Co-chair and co-secs have access when they want and should be able to grant access by consensus of all four. It was suggested that the Librarian should get access.

These minutes reflect the opinions of Stephanie (srudolph@hc) and Brandon (bwest@hc) and are not reviewed or approved by Council.