

Honor Council

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

Public Minutes from February 22, 2009

Members Present: Hazel, Emily, Jen, Silas, Sarina, Anastasia, Mary, Inez, Gabe, Joe, Ben, Jill, Ryan, John, Sam

Members Absent: Seth

Guests: Daniel Kent '11, Paul Minnice '09, Will Harrison '10

- I. Moment of Silence
- II. Public Portion
 - A. Ratification Mess
 1. HC was told that the last three digits of the confirmation number was the number of votes, so HC thought that we had the votes for the Honor Code to be ratified, but that was untrue. Found out at 1:00am Saturday morning.
 2. Deadline was 9:30 Saturday because they ratification started at 9:30 Thursday.
 3. Posting, door-to-door and e-mails galore to get the Honor Code ratified.
 4. Transfer/exchange kids not able to vote? Transfers should be able to, but some were unable. Rationale for exchange students: because they can't be here next year and shouldn't be voting on a code that they won't be participating in.
 - a. Seniors can vote because they've had three years of experience and are voting on behalf of the incoming freshmen?
 - b. SC was told this was protocol, but no mention of this in the constitution.
 5. Talk to FIG/ACC to have a running total so that this doesn't happen again.
 6. Upset that people aren't ratifying the Honor Code. Why won't people take the two minutes necessary to ratify it? It's a big problem.
 7. Why do we have to vote on the code twice? It's not entirely unreasonable to think that that the plen plen vote was the actual ratification. That was a big issue...not just for freshmen, but seniors too.
 - a. We do it online so that we can guarantee that there's the 2/3 of the actual student body (as opposed to the 2/3 of quorum at Plenary, which could be as little as 1/3 of the student body).
 - b. Apathy toward the Honor Code? There weren't enough people ratifying the Honor Code in the first place.
 - c. Old ratification system that has a visual ballot might encourage more people to vote.

These minutes reflect the opinions of Gabriel "Not Stutman" Schwartz and Inez "Not Steigerwald" Suhardjo, the Council co-secretaries (gschwartz@hc or isuhardj@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of Council. Questions/comments? Email Code@hc!

- d. There was a separate problem, which is that you are required by the Honor Code to submit a comment, but the new ratification system allowed you to submit your ratification card without a comment.
- 8. Ratification procedures with more specific rules (instead of fourth and fifth day, something like “48 hours”, and when exactly they start) would be helpful.
 - a. It would be more in the spirit of ratification/consensus to go to 48 hours.
 - b. When you have a system of rules, you should really follow the rules.
 - c. Though we did follow the rules within the framework of strange circumstances.
- 9. Why is it the fourth and fifth days only? (The space between Plenary and ratification is to get people to mull over the changes presented at spring Plenary before ratification.) Would it be useful to have more than two days?
 - a. It’s good to have people make a decision within a given time frame.
 - b. From a logistical standpoint, Thursday/Friday/Saturday might be easier.
 - c. Resolution for this?
- 10. There were some people very upset about how it was handled (yelling in the middle of the night, waking people up, etc).
 - a. That kind of dedication by people all over campus to get something they cared about ratified is kind of nice.
 - b. Sentiments on the GO! Boards about avoiding special Plenary strongly.
 - a. But the idea is that if there are problems with the Honor Code, that’s the reason it wouldn’t get ratified, and therefore special Plenary could be there to address issues with the Honor Code.
 - b. Problem more with apathy?
 - c. But the lack of votes wasn’t necessarily just apathy.
 - d. Use of special plen plen more as a threat.
- 11. Ratification comments available (anonymous). Put them on GO! These will be edited for clarity, confidentiality, and productivity (no irrelevant notes)
 - a. Emily, Jen, Silas, Jill, Sarina, Anastasia to edit
- B. Honor Council pats itself on the back for hard work. Tabling, papering, other gerunds.
- C. Multicultural Jurors. (“Next we’re going to attack Multicultural Jurors.”) (lolwut?)
 - 1. It passed!
 - 2. We’re following it even though Emerson hasn’t officially approved it yet.
- D. E-mail from an alumnus who wants abstracts so that he can talk to his wife. FYI.
- E. E-mail from faculty because he doesn’t like the funny names in the abstracts.
- F. Someone at admissions says that Honor Code misuses subscribe/ascribe several times.
- G. We have Stephen Emerson for Pizza, Professors, and the Code! :D

III. Ice cream break, private portion, moment of silence.

These minutes reflect the opinions of Gabriel “Not Stutman” Schwartz and Inez “Not Steigerwald” Suhardjo, the Council co-secretaries (gschwartz@hc or isuhardj@hc) and are neither approved nor reviewed by the rest of Council. Questions/comments? Email **Code@hc!**