

THE PLENARY NEWS

sc.haverford.edu

PUBLISHED BY STUDENTS' COUNCIL AND HONOR COUNCIL

Since 1887

Ratification 2012: Honor Code Strong Incumbent

by Haver Dan '13



The annual ratification of Haverford's Honor Code is on track to pass at this semester's Plenary.

Other resolutions up for debate include two resolutions about environmental sustainability at Haverford College.

With a total of nine resolutions and the ratification of the Honor Code (*see Students Guess How Long Spring '12 Plenary Will Be*), the plethora of topics to be discussed is wide-ranging.

A source inside Students' Council, speaking on the condition of anonymity, describes the slight wave of panic when SC realized that each student might have to use 76 paper ballots to vote on every facet of the resolutions.

Spring 2012

Continued on A18

Students Guess How Long Spring '12 Plenary Will Be

After last fall's short Plenary –totaling only 1 hour and 26 minutes –students wonder whether this semester's Plenary will be equally short.

"We have way more resolutions this semester than last," Students' Council Co-President Florencia Foxley '13 says. "I doubt we will be able to beat last semester's record."

Meanwhile, some students wonder whether they would actually prefer a longer Plenary.

Continued on A19

Inside this Edition:

Spring 2012 Plenary Agenda	2-3
Rules of Order	3
Plenary People	4
Resolutions	5-16
Paper Ballots	17-20

SPRING 2012 PLENARY AGENDA

- I) Moment of Silence
- II) Welcome to Plenary!
- III) Rules of Order and Agenda
 - a. Three minutes to look over Rules of Order and examine Agenda.
 - b. Five minutes for questions concerning agenda or Rules of Order.
 - c. Call for amendments to change Agenda or Rules of Order.
 - d. A vote to accept any amendments to the agenda must have 2/3 majority vote.
- IV) Presidential Announcements
- V) Resolution #1 (Statement of Support for Financial Aid Policy) – majority vote
 - a. Presenters have five minutes to introduce resolution.
 - b. Question and Answer session: ten minutes to be extended no more than once by 1/2.
 - c. Pro-Con presentations: 15 minutes with motion to extend by 15 minutes no more than twice by 1/2.
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by resolution presenters: three minutes.
 - e. Call for Friendly Amendments: support of all presenters and approval of chairs needed – five minutes allowed to turn in
 - i. Presentations of recognized Friendly Amendments
 - ii. Question and Answer: five minutes
 - iii. Pro-Con debate: ten minutes
 - iv. Vote on Friendly Amendment – majority vote
 - f. Call for Unfriendly Amendments: 75 signatures needed – seven minutes allowed to turn in Unfriendly Amendments with a motion to extend by seven minutes no more than once.
 - i. Presentations of recognized Unfriendly Amendments
 - ii. Question and Answer: five minutes
 - iii. Pro-Con debate: ten minutes
 - iv. Vote on Unfriendly Amendment – majority vote
 - g. Moment of Silence
 - h. Vote on Final Resolution
- VI) Resolution #2 (Undocumented Applicants to Haverford) – majority vote
Procedures a.-h. same as above.
- VII) Resolution #3 (Composting at Haverford) – majority vote
Procedures a.-h. same as above.
- VIII) Resolution #4 (Our Environment and the Honor Code?) – majority vote
Procedures a.-h. same as above.
- IX) Resolution #5 (Changes to Jury Procedures) – 2/3 majority vote
Procedures a.-h. same as above.
- X) Honor Code Ratification
 - a. Honor Council Co-Chairs Present Honor Code
 - b. Question and Answer session: ten minutes to be extended no more than twice.
 - c. Pro-Con debate: 15 minutes with motion to extend by 10 minutes no more than 3 times.
 - d. Response to Pro-Con debate by Honor Council Co-Chairs: three minutes.
 - e. Vote on ratification of Honor Code – 2/3 majority vote
- XI) Resolution #6 (Communal Space in HCA) – majority vote
Procedures V. a.-h. same as above.
- XII) Resolution #7 (PE Requirement Timeline) – majority vote
Procedures V. a.-h. same as above.
- XIII) Resolution #8 (Returning Graded Materials) – majority vote
Procedures V. a.-h. same as above.
- I) Final Moment of Silence

RULES OF ORDER

1. In order for quorum to be reached, at least 50% of the students living at Haverford must be present at Plenary. If quorum is lost at any point during Plenary, the meeting will be suspended until quorum is again reached. After 30 minutes without quorum, the chairs may evaluate the situation going forward.
2. An amendment to the agenda will follow the rules for “Unfriendly Amendments” except that the final vote will pass with a 2/3 majority. Any portion of the agenda may be changed.
3. During any given pro-con debate a person will not speak for longer than two minutes at any given interval, nor shall they be recognized by the chair more than two times. Upon each extension of a pro-con debate, a person may be recognized by the chair one additional time.
4. Plenary may add “Friendly Amendments” or “Unfriendly Amendments” to a resolution by a vote of the majority. All friendly and unfriendly amendments must pertain to the current resolution as seen in the eyes of the chair. Once an amendment has been approved it may not be reversed, nor the resolution be withdrawn.
5. The chair shall call for a paper vote on all items deemed necessary by the chair. When so requested, the vote will be taken by secret ballot. Quorum (50 %) must be reached on all paper votes.
6. If the chair (or one member of the chair) wishes to speak to the content of the resolution, he or she must step down until the proposal is resolved. The Vice President(s) shall then preside for the remainder of that resolution.
7. The time limit for Plenary shall be four hours. If this time limit expires, the assembled Plenary shall vote to extend the time limit half an hour no more than one time. If the assembled Plenary fails to extend the time limit by majority vote, the pending resolution (if any) will be voted on immediately, without further discussion.
8. Once a resolution is passed by Plenary while quorum is present, the resolution is an action taken by the assembled Plenary. The passed resolution will be in effect at the close of Plenary unless it is subject to other procedural regulations. All resolutions will be presented to the President of the College within seven (7) days of the close of Plenary.

PLENARY PEOPLE

Elizabeth Douglas and Florencia Foxley	Plenary Chairs and SC Co-Presidents
Benjamin Van Son and Jacob Weisenthal	Plenary Vice-Chairs, SC Co-Vice Presidents
Allison Kandel and Hannah Zieve	Plenary Co-Secretaries, SC Co-Secretaries
Jacob Axelrod and Emma Richards	Honor Council Co-Chairs
Austin Boyle and Samara Flug	Plenary Co-Secretaries, HC Co-Secretaries
Elizabeth Crooks and Gebhard Keny	JSAAPP Co-Chairs

Students' Council

Elizabeth Douglas '13 and Florencia Foxley '13, SC Co-Presidents
 Benjamin Van Son '13 and Jacob Weisenthal '13, SC Co-Vice Presidents
 Franklyn Cantor '12, SC Treasurer
 Allison Kandel '14 and Hannah Zieve '14, SC Co-Secretaries
 Mary Clare O'Donnell '14, Officer of Academics
 Howard Brown '12, Officer of the Arts
 Josie Ferri '12, Officer of Athletics
 Jacob Horn '13, Officer of Campus Life
 Sadé Stevens '14, Officer of Multiculturalism
 Elizabeth Wingfield, Class of 2012 Representative
 Alex Tonsing, Class of 2013 Representative
 Catherine Schepp, Class of 2014 Representative
 Kyu Hyun Chang, Class of 2015 Representative

Honor Council

Jacob Axelrod '14 and Emma Richards '12, HC Co-Chairs
 Austin Boyle '15 and Samara Flug '15, HC Co-Secretaries
 2012: Theodore Feder, Lucian Grand, Sharon Warner
 2013: Daniel Bedrossian, Angelique Bradford, Rachel Davis, Joost Ziff
 2014: William Bannard, Vincent Dioguardi, Philip Drexler
 2015: Emily Ferguson, Tamar Hoffman
 David (Max) Findley '14, HC Librarian

JSAAPP

Elizabeth Crooks '12 and Gebhard Keny '14, JSAAPP Co-Chairs
 Hannah Hammel, Senior Representative
 Amy Greulich, Junior Representative
 Celia Ristow, Sophomore Representative
 Shelby Lyons, Freshmen Representative

Student Representatives to Major College Committees

Administrative Advisory Committee: Katherine Mundell '12, Papa Buckman '13, Chelsea Mitchell '14
 Educational Policy Committee: David Thorstad '12, Mary Clare O'Donnell '14
 Faculty Committee on Admission: Franklyn Cantor '12, Joshua Mussa '13, Ian Gavigan '14
 Long Range Planning Committee: Elizabeth Douglas '13, Jacob Lowy '14
 Senior Class Representative to the Board of Managers: Jennifer Zelnick
 Junior Class Representative to the Board of Managers: Joshua Mussa

Plenary Resolution #1 – Student Body Statement of Support for a Robust Financial Aid Policy

Presented by Ian Gavigan '14, Stuart Hean '14, and Wynne Lewis '12

Recognizing Haverford College to be an institution primarily devoted to the pursuit of scholarship and truth, producing work and graduates who advance these in their lives,

Recognizing the centrality of access to the College, based on the Community's criteria for acceptance, which are blind to applicants' economic means, and acted upon by the Office of Admission,

Lauding the administration and friends of the College for their support in building and sustaining a “need blind” admission policy and a financial aid policy that provides full support to those with demonstrated need through the no-loan policy, thereby helping to address the need of the College to provide access to the Community to those deemed qualified,

Let it be resolved that the Students' Association firmly calls upon the Board of Managers to maintain the aforementioned policies, even in light of an unfavorable economic climate. The policies are fundamental to fulfilling the mission of the College to create a liberal arts education that informs and is informed by a diverse community uninhibited by the barriers of socioeconomic disparity.

Plenary Resolution #2 – Resolution for Fair Admissions Consideration for Undocumented Applicants

Presented by Gwendolyn Morgan '15

As a Quaker institution, Haverford College is committed to acting with justice and equity in both its internal affairs and its relationship with the wider world. Currently, Haverford has no official policy on undocumented students or applicants. Applicants without documentation are automatically considered within the category of international students, for whom the admission process is need-aware. Without US citizenship or resident status, a student cannot receive the typical financial aid offered by the College, as it is funded in part by the state and federal governments. The small amount of financial aid available to non-citizen, non-resident students is earmarked specifically for international students living outside the US. Since Haverford cannot admit “international” students who will not be able to pay and also cannot offer aid to help undocumented students pay, Haverford admission is next to impossible for even the most qualified undocumented students. Haverford has a long tradition of standing on the front lines of social justice and activism, a tradition that is abandoned if we neglect to address the injustice our policies reinforce for undocumented students. To begin to transform Haverford into a fairer, stronger, and more diverse institution:

The student body asks that the Office of Admissions work with the Financial Aid office to devise a method of giving undocumented students fair, need-blind admissions consideration that takes into account the unique barriers of hardship, discrimination, and systematic oppression that they face.

Plenary Resolution #3 – Composting at Haverford

Presented by Siena Mann '14

Whereas Haverford College does not compost in Dining Services, the Coop, or any on-campus student housing,

Whereas the students of Haverford believe the College should compost campus wide, including pre- and post-consumer waste in the Dining Center, the Coop, and Lunt Cafe and should provide composting options for students living in residential housing up and down campus,

Whereas the Committee for Environmental Responsibility, along with any interested parties, will be responsible for doing the work to ensure that this project is successful,

Be it resolved that we, the students of Haverford College call for the college to compost campus wide.

Plenary Resolution #4 – Our Environment and the Honor Code?

Presented by Lydie Costes '12, Eleanor Durfee '14, Paloma Jeretic '12, Evangeline Krajewski '14, Celia Ristow '14, and David Robinson '14

Can it already be interpreted from the Honor Code that we should respect the physical environment in which we live? Is there a temporal nature to the Honor Code if our environment is not included? How can we create an atmosphere in which we are able to express our values in a respectful way if we are disrespectful to our physical environment?

We think that there is a gap in our community between how we respect each other and how we respect our physical environment, and we found that this is reflected in the Honor Code. We believe this is problematic because these--respecting each other and respecting our environment--cannot be mutually exclusive. (When we use the term “environment”, we mean to include that which is built and natural.) All of our actions influence and affect Haverford community members and our community’s environment, whether it be directly or indirectly. We hope that adding this language to the Honor Code will allow community members to be more aware of the implications of our actions that extend beyond direct human interaction.

The word “environment” is currently in the Honor Code, but it is used to mean “atmosphere” or “ambiance”. We propose to change this so that with our added phrases, the word “environment” specifically means our physical surroundings. We propose to add the following phrases or words in **bold** (current language that we would like to change is underlined):

The Haverford College Honor Code

Article III of the Students’ Association Constitution

Section 3.01 Preamble

As Haverford students, we seek an environment **(to create an atmosphere)** in which members of a diverse student body can live together, interact, and learn from one another in ways that protect both personal freedom and community standards. If a diverse community is to prosper, its members must attempt to come to terms with their differences; this goal is only possible if students seek mutual understanding by means of respectful communication. By holding us accountable for our words and actions, the Honor Code acts as an educational tool, instructing us to resolve conflicts by engaging others in dialogues that yield greater awareness for all parties involved. By encouraging respectful conduct, we hope to create an atmosphere **(a climate)** conducive to learning and growing.

SPRING PLENARY – February 19th, 2012

Section 3.02 Introduction

We believe the values articulated in the Honor Code create an open and supportive environment (atmosphere) that promotes personal and community growth; hence, we ascribe to the principles in the Code.

Section 3.03 Community Standards

The Honor Code depends for its effective operation on our personal concern both for each other, for ourselves, **and for the environment in which we live**, along with our collective concern for the maintenance of the community standards reflected in the Code. These three four concerns (regarding ourselves, others, **our environment**, and community standards) are central to the functioning of the Code, and have meaning only as they form the basis for the conduct of our daily lives. When we speak of “community,” we imply the student body, faculty, staff, and administration, each of which contributes to the collective conception of community standards. The Code makes it possible for a climate of trust, concern, and respect to exist among us, a climate conducive to personal and community growth. Growth arises from honest exploration and analysis. Only by treating ourselves with dignity and self-respect can we experience genuine honesty with ourselves and others.

1. **Confrontation** In order to maintain an atmosphere of trust, concern and respect, we must be willing to face situations that may be uncomfortable. We cannot always expect to feel at ease when confronting another student about his/her actions. Despite the difficulty sometimes entailed in challenging the behavior of a fellow community member, we must take upon ourselves individually the responsibilities stated in the Code, or be ourselves in violation of the Code because of our failure to act. 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. Confrontation is one of the primary means by which community members can learn from one another and thereby facilitate the realization of a truly diverse environment (and thereby facilitate the realization of true diversity). It should often take the form of a constructive, engaging discussion, especially in non- academic concerns. “Confrontation,” in the Haverford sense, can be defined as initiating a dialogue with another community member, with the goal of reaching some common understanding by means of respectful communication. It should be understood that achieving a common understanding does not necessarily mean reaching agreement....

Section 3.04 Jurisdiction

The Honor Code applies to both the academic and social realms of Haverford College. 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 abroad are also compelled to behave in accordance with the Code

- ... 2. **Social Concerns** Our social relationships should be based on mutual respect and concern. We must consider how our words and actions may affect the sense of acceptance essential to an individual’s or group’s participation in the community. We strive to foster an environment that genuinely encourages respectful expression of values rather than unproductive self-censorship. (We strive to foster respectful expression of values rather than unproductive self-censorship.) Upon encountering actions or values that we find degrading to ourselves, to others, **and to the environment in which we live**, we should feel comfortable initiating dialogue with the mutual goal of increasing our understanding of each other. The social concerns of the Code extend to all forms of communication, including, but not limited to: spoken discussion, posted writing, and internet discussion forums. If a violation of the code occurs, it should be resolved via face to face confrontation...

Plenary Resolution #5 – Changes to Jury Procedures

Presented by Jacob Axelrod '14 and Emma Richards '12

The Honor Code and Constitution of the Student's Association contain the procedures and mandates meant to regulate Honor Council proceedings. It is necessary to periodically update these documents to conform to the changing needs and demands placed on juries by the community. These issues have been brought to the attention of Honor Council through its role as the judicial body of Haverford College.

The proposed additions seek to add further consistency to trials where appropriate, ensure that visiting and first-year faculty members are able to fully participate in trials, and add student input into decisions to report Honor Code violations on Graduate School and Transfer applications.

Let it be resolved that the constitution reflect the following changes:
(These are the relevant sections with the changes in *bold/italics*)

Honor Code

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 tests, quizzes, homework, and laboratory reports, 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. In addition, students should not exceed the time limitations specified by the professor. If a student represents "another person's ideas or scholarship as his/her own" (p. 53 Faculty Handbook), that student is committing an act of plagiarism. Students are expected to properly cite (in footnotes, quotations, and bibliography) all sources used in the preparation of written work, including examinations, unless otherwise instructed by the professor who assigned the work. It should be noted that some professors consider the memorization and reproduction of material without citing its source as an act of plagiarism. It is each student's responsibility to find out exactly what each of his/her professors expects in terms of acknowledging sources of information on papers, exams, and assignments. An act of plagiarism constitutes a student's withdrawal from the commitment to the academic honesty required by the Honor Code, and will normally result in separation from the community and *the recommendation of a grade change*.

Article 7

(a) Academic Trial

Honor Council will decide an academic situation needs to be resolved in a trial. A trial is necessary if a student is suspected of having violated our community academic standards and must, therefore, answer to the community for his/her actions. Almost all cases of suspected academic dishonesty are resolved in a trial. The Honor Council will designate a Council member to explain to the confronted individual the alleged charges, to explicitly inform the person of his or her rights, to familiarize the individual with the trial procedure, and to describe the implications and purpose of each step of the trial process. If Honor Council decides that a trial must be held to resolve a problem, 5 of its 16 members, along with 5 randomly chosen members of the community, will be the jury. The random jurors will be chosen from a random jury list maintained by the Honor Council (Co-)Secretary(ies). The Honor Council will pursue the goal of achieving a more diverse jury by ensuring that at least three members of the 10 members of the jury will be representative of Haverford's multicultural population. When Honor Council emails potential jurors, randomly selected from the Haverford student population, they will ask students to fill out a self-identification portion. It will ask whether or not the student in question "identifies as a student of color" and "identifies as a given gender". This information will never leave the email and will not be used again in any form by Honor Council or anyone else. There will be no list.

When selecting a jury, Honor Council will make sure that there are at least 3 self-identified students of color on a jury and at least 3 students who do not identify as a student of color. In addition, there will be no fewer than four students who identify as male and no fewer than four who identify as female.

In cases when dealing with highly sensitive or potentially legal issues the jury may consent to involve a dean in such matters. The choice of dean will be determined by the chair of the trial and Dean of the College based on objectivity and pertinence to the issues involved. The dean will have access to all facts of the case, and may attend meetings if he or she chooses to gain a better understating of the jury consents. Their role is to provide an administrative perspective as well as to inform the jury of College policies and resources. The dean will not be a consenting member of the jury, and will not be part of deliberations unless consented to by the jury.

Universal Trial Procedures

Role of the Support Person: The role of a support person is to be available (whether attending a trial or not) for emotional support. Broadly speaking, support people are not supposed to be “witnesses” or “legal counsel,” although their specific role in any particular trial is up to the chair.

i. For the Confronted and Confronting Parties

The confronted party may bring another community member to the proceedings for support. If the confronting party is a student, s/he may bring another student to act as a support person. It is strongly recommended that a support person have no direct connection to the issue involved in the trial. At any given time during the trial, the confronted or confronting party may request time to meet with their support person. However, this opportunity is under the discretion of the chair.

ii. In cases when the Confronting party is a First-year or Visiting Professor

When the confronting professor is a visiting or first-year professor, he or she will be given the option of having a permanent faculty member also present during all or part of the proceeding, as permanent faculty members are more familiar with the way the Honor Code functions at Haverford and the practice of handling potential violations through Honor Council. The permanent faculty member may clarify points made by the first-year or visiting professor. *It will be the role of the jury to determine and consent to appropriate times for the faculty member to speak directly to the jury.*

v. Presentation of the Resolution

The confronting and confronted parties will then be asked to return to hear the jury’s resolution and, if they disagree with this resolution, present their own to the jury. The confronting party, the confronted party and the jury will discuss their reasons for making their decisions; the confronting and the confronted party will leave; the jury will decide if it wants to change its recommendation. The jury will then reach a final consensus on a recommendation which the chair will present in writing to the parties involved and the Dean of the College. *In addition the jury will be responsible for drafting and consenting to a recommendation to the Dean of the College concerning reporting the violation on Graduate School’s or Transfer School’s application based on the guidelines consented to by Honor Council.* Before the trial is

adjourned, the jury will choose one of its members to act as a liaison between the jury and the President in the event of an appeal or administrative offering of alternative resolutions. The liaison's function will be to speak with the President to explain the jury's position and answer any questions. At that point members of the jury will also be chosen to write the abstract.

vi. Post-Trial

It will be the responsibility of Honor Council to make its own recommendation to the Dean of the College concerning reporting the violation on Graduate School's or Transfer School's application based on the published guidelines. During review of the abstract, Honor Council will receive the jury's recommendation and make its own with consideration of the jury's. If Honor Council makes a decision contrary to the jury's decision or the guidelines, it must give explicit reasoning. The Dean of the College shall be notified after Honor Council consents to its recommendation. This decision will not be linked to consenting to the abstract, as they are separate decisions.

In an academic case, if the Dean of the College feels that the jury's resolution(s) is unsatisfactory, he/she may make a recommendation of his/her own to the professor, after discussing the recommendation with the jury. A student's final grade in a course is the professor's decision, as neither the jury nor the Dean can do more than recommend to a professor that a certain grade be given in a course. However, in cases where the jury and/or Dean recommend that a student be separated from the College, or any other sanction which does not involve a grade alteration, the professor has no jurisdictional power to change that resolution(s). In such cases, and in social cases, if the Dean strongly disagrees with the jury's recommendation, s/he may offer alternative resolution(s) to the President. The Dean's recommendation will be presented only after discussion with the jury about the resolution(s), and not longer than one week after receiving the chair's report detailing the trial. Before making a decision, the President will speak with the jury or its liaison. Following their discussion, the President will have one week (while present at the College) to make his/her final decision on what will be done. The involved parties have a period of five business days from the time of the trial's completion in which to appeal to the President to change the resolution(s). The appeal must be presented orally and in writing, and may be made on either substantive or procedural grounds. Abstracts will be written for all academic trials, social trials, and summer trials, and Student Panel, Student Facilitated Panel, and Joint Panel hearings. These will be distributed to the community in accordance with current constitutional guidelines. The procedures for abstracts released from Dean's Panels will follow different guidelines due to the sensitive nature of the issues covered. These guidelines are outlined in Section 7.01.e.

Honor Code Ratification

Presented by Jacob Axelrod '14 and Emma Richards '12, Honor Council Co-Chairs

Article III of the Constitution of the Haverford College Students' Association

Section 3.01 Preamble

As Haverford students, we seek an environment in which members of a diverse student body can live together, interact, and learn from one another in ways that protect both personal freedom and community standards. If a diverse community is to prosper, its members must attempt to come to terms with their differences; this goal is only possible if students seek mutual understanding by means of respectful communication. By holding us accountable for our words and actions, the Honor Code acts as an educational tool, instructing us to resolve conflicts by engaging others in dialogues that yield greater awareness for all parties involved. By encouraging respectful conduct, we hope to create an atmosphere conducive to learning and growing.

Section 3.02 Introduction

We believe the values articulated in the Honor Code create an open and supportive environment that promotes personal and community growth; hence, we ascribe to the principles in the Code.

Section 3.03 Community Standards

The Honor Code depends for its effective operation on our personal concern both for each other and for ourselves, along with our collective concern for the maintenance of the community standards reflected in the Code. These three concerns (regarding ourselves, others, and community standards) are central to the functioning of the Code, and have meaning only as they form the basis for the conduct of our daily lives. When we speak of "community," we imply the student body, faculty, staff, and administration, each of which contributes to the collective conception of community standards. The Code makes it possible for a climate of trust, concern, and respect to exist among us, a climate conducive to personal and community growth. Growth arises from honest exploration and analysis. Only by treating ourselves with dignity and self-respect can we experience genuine honesty with ourselves and others.

(a) Confrontation

In order to maintain the atmosphere of trust, concern and respect, we must be willing to face situations that may be uncomfortable. We cannot always expect to feel at ease when confronting another student about his/her actions. Despite the difficulty sometimes entailed in challenging the behavior of a fellow community member, we must take upon ourselves individually the responsibilities stated in the Code, or be ourselves in violation of the Code because of our failure to act. 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. Confrontation is one of the primary means by which community members can learn from one another and thereby facilitate the realization of a truly diverse environment. It should often take the form of a constructive, engaging discussion, especially in non-academic concerns. "Confrontation," in the Haverford sense, can be defined as initiating a dialogue with another community member, with the goal of reaching some common understanding by means of respectful communication. It should be understood that achieving a common understanding does not necessarily mean reaching agreement.

(b) Honor Council

Although we are each responsible for doing our part to uphold the standards of the community, 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 very serious way. It is Honor Council's task 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 on a less formal basis.

(c) Consensus

All decisions made by Honor Council, including those approving Council publications, are made by consensus. This method depends on reaching unity; it is time-consuming and requires that all present avoid obstructionism in a common search for agreement, but it has the great advantage of not leaving behind an unhappy minority. It should be noted, however, that unity does not necessarily require unanimity. When discussion has reached a point where the chairperson proposes a decision that clearly has the support of the "weight of the group," remaining dissenters can withdraw their disagreement in order that unity be achieved. If the disagreement is fundamental, and becomes a matter of conscience, the dissenter may block consensus and discussion must continue with the object of finding a new formulation that is satisfactory to all. If consensus among all jury members cannot be reached after lengthy discussion, then, with the agreement of all jury members, consensus can be declared with any dissenters being recorded as standing outside of it. There can be no more than two dissenters.

(d) Confidentiality

As confrontation is often not a public matter, Honor Council will keep all cases brought before it 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.

(e) The Pledge

We realize that as part of the Haverford College community, our actions affect those around us and the spiritual quality of this institution. We understand that membership in the Haverford community is dependent on commitment to the Honor Code, as illustrated by our signing the Honor Pledge card, 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.

Section 3.04 Jurisdiction

The Honor Code applies to both the academic and social realms of Haverford College. 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 abroad are also compelled to behave in accordance with the Code.

(a) Academic Concerns

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 tests, quizzes, homework, and laboratory reports, 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. In addition, students should not exceed the time limitations specified by the professor. If a student represents "another person's ideas or scholarship as his/her own" (p. 53 Faculty Handbook), that student is committing an act of plagiarism. Students are expected to properly cite (in footnotes, quotations, and bibliography) all sources used in the preparation of written work, including examinations, unless otherwise instructed by the professor who assigned the work. It should be noted that some professors consider the memorization and reproduction of material without citing its source as an act of plagiarism.

It is each student's responsibility to find out exactly what each of his/her professors expects in terms of acknowledging sources of information on papers, exams, and assignments. An act of plagiarism constitutes a student's withdrawal from the commitment to the academic honesty required by the Honor Code, and will normally result in separation from the community.

(b) Social Concerns

Our social relationships should be based on mutual respect and concern. We must consider how our words and actions may affect the sense of acceptance essential to an individual's or group's participation in the community. We strive to foster an environment that genuinely encourages respectful expression of values rather than unproductive self-censorship. Upon encountering actions or values that we find degrading to ourselves and to others, we should feel comfortable initiating dialogue with the mutual goal of increasing our understanding of each other. The social concerns of the Code extend to all forms of communication, including, but not limited to: spoken discussion, posted writing, and internet discussion forums. If a violation of the code occurs, it should be resolved via face to face confrontation.

Section 3.05 Upholding the Honor Code

As individuals who are also members of a community, we are obligated to examine our own actions as well as the actions of those around us in light of their effect on the community. If it becomes clear through self-reflection or through expressions of concern by others, that either our academic or social conduct represents a violation of community standards, we are obligated to report our own breach to Honor Council, even if doing so may result in a trial and the possibility of separation from the college.

Similarly, we must confront others when their conduct disturbs us. Ideally, conflicts like this will be resolved through an initial stage of respectful communication and dialogue. When we confront another student whose behavior has disturbed us, we must recall that this process is a dialogue in which each party first tries to understand the standards and values of the other in order to avoid self-righteousness or the appearance of moral superiority. Additionally, a member of Honor Council may act on behalf of another student in an initial confrontation if this process would cause the student involved undue emotional anguish or place him/her in physical danger (i.e., cases of physical assault). The Code and confrontation with the intent for a trial are not to be used as threatening devices against people. To do so would go against the spirit and purpose of achieving mutual understanding. If a problem arises which cannot be resolved by the students involved, the confronted student is asked by the confronting party to contact an Honor Council member to help. If a confronting party has asked the confronted student to contact an Honor Council member, and a Council member 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 him/herself.

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 him or herself to Honor Council. If the student does not do so promptly, the faculty member will take the matter to the Honor Council. Since we do hold ourselves responsible for each other, the failure to confront or to report another student involved in a breach of the Honor Code is itself a violation of the Code.

Honor Council is expected to confront other members of council in cases they witness discrepancies between what Council practices and the procedures outlined in the Honor Code and its guidelines. Council 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 its internal affairs especially if they feel they are not fulfilling their community responsibilities or fully abiding by the Code. Honor Council is responsible to the entire Haverford Community to do so.

Section 3.06 Ratifying the Honor Code

At Spring Plenary there must be a 2/3 vote in favor of ratifying the Code, followed by 2/3 of the student body signing and returning their ratification cards. If 2/3 of those assembled at Plenary do not ratify the Honor Code, the Code fails the first round of ratification and it is the responsibility of the Students' Association to create and sign a petition requesting the collection of a Special Plenary. 40% of the Students' Association must sign this petition conveying their desire for and pledging to attend a Special Plenary. If 2/3 vote in favor of ratifying the Code, electronic ratification cards will be due the fourth and fifth days following Spring Plenary.

Any member of the student body that wishes to submit an Honor Code ratification card will do so electronically at any time during the fourth and fifth days following Spring Plenary. Honor Council will create and actively publicize instructions on how to access and use the electronic ratification cards. During the voting period, at least one Honor Council member will be available at least two different campus locations to answer any questions and receive any criticism of the Honor Code which might arise in discussion. This council member will have a computer with network access at his or her disposal which students may use to ratify the code.

Ratification cards will have three options and a place for comments, questions, suggestions, or criticisms. This place for comments will be required by the electric ballot, and ratification cards without them will not be accepted by the ratification system. Each student is strongly encouraged under the Honor Code to return the card or communicate to Honor Council reasons why she did not or could not.

- (a) _____ I have thoughtfully considered my position on the Code and I vote for its ratification for the following reasons:
- (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, but I cannot vote for its ratification for the following reason(s):

If more than two thirds of the student body checks either option "a" or "b", then the Honor Code is ratified. If less than two-thirds of the student body checks either option "a" or "b" but more than two-thirds of the student body returns their cards, then the Honor Code fails, but 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 returns their cards, the Honor Code fails. Students should strongly consider the wisdom of convening a Special Plenary. Such a Plenary would be convened only if two-thirds of the student body signs a petition not only asking for the Plenary, but pledging to attend. At such a Plenary, two-thirds of the student body would constitute quorum.

Revised at Plenary on February 13, 2011. Passed Electronic Ratification on February 13, 2011

Plenary Resolution #6 – Communal Space in the Haverford College Apartments

Presented by Caileigh Feldman '14 and Emily Mayer '14

Whereas well-utilized communal spaces are integral to the vitality of Haverford's social and intellectual community,

Whereas there is currently a lack of frequently utilized and designated communal spaces, especially in the Haverford College Apartments (HCA),

Whereas a significant portion of the student body lives in HCA,

Whereas both the HCA and larger Haverford community suffer from a lack of places over which students feel creative ownership and collective responsibility,

Whereas, upon the instatement of the new dorms, HCA will have vacant apartments,

Be it resolved that we, the students of Haverford College, call for the first floor of one HCA apartment to be reserved for communal student space before the coming academic year. The purpose of this space, open to the entire Haverford community, is to make HCA more accessible and inviting to everyone on campus, and to facilitate student creativity, conversation, and collaboration. This space will be managed and maintained by a student board, who will work in conjunction with the administration to reserve, plan, and organize the possibilities of such a space. Appointments Committee will be in charge of deciding who is on this board. Although renovating the floor of the apartment where this space would be located would be ideal, we understand that funding for this project is limited. Thus, we propose that this space be located in either apartment #14, #23 or another apartment that already has relatively open space on its first floor. We will get furniture for this space for free from Craigslist. Further, we will have an event at the beginning of the academic year for all students to come and help decorate the space.

Plenary Resolution #7 – Resolution to Recommend Reform of the Timeframe for Completion of the Haverford Physical Education Requirement

Presented by Ian Oxenham '15

While acknowledging the importance of physical education to a holistic liberal arts education, we must also recognize that the complete liberal arts experience extends beyond the classroom and athletics field to include other learning opportunities. Furthermore, in acknowledging that students have widely varying demands on their time, we must also concede that the Physical Education Requirement as it stands can disincentivize students who already have demanding time commitments from taking advantage of such opportunities.

Therefore, in the interests of better balancing the (at times) competing needs of the College to ensure students receive a decent level of physical education with enabling and encouraging *all* students to participate in extracurricular activities,

Let it be resolved that the Haverford Student Body endorses the following recommendations and urges the Educational Policy Committee (as well as any other relevant administrative body) to consider the adoption of the following:

Recommendation One- *Reduce the number of Physical Education credits students are required to complete by the end of Sophomore year from six to four, and instead require that the final two PE credits be completed by the end of Junior Year. Rising Juniors would thus only face a room draw penalty if they had three or fewer PE credits by the end of Sophomore year, while rising Seniors would face the penalty if they failed to earn all six PE credits by the end of Junior Year.*

Recommendation Two- *Allow Juniors studying abroad to earn PE Credits at their host institutions by participating in athletics and/or other physically strenuous activities.*

Plenary Resolution #8 – Request to Return Relevant Graded Materials Prior to Finals Week

Presented by Elizabeth Lamkin '13

Whereas we are a community that strives for continuous intellectual growth,

Whereas this goal depends on the ability to learn from past mistakes,

And whereas there are no specifically stated guidelines regarding the timeline for returning relevant coursework prior to the exam period,

Be it resolved that:

- The student body would greatly benefit from a more uniform policy that encouraged all professors to return relevant graded materials—such as previous exams, problem sets, or other related exercises—prior to the exam period,
- To this end, the student body requests that the Provost, in his/her capacity as academic leader, remind the Faculty of this goal and set the appropriate expectations,
- The Provost should announce this set of expectations each semester in both written email communication and at the appropriate Faculty meetings (in November and December, and March and April).

Vote #1

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #2

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #3

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #4

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #5

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #6

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #7

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #8

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #9

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #10

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #11

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #12

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #13

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #14

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #15

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

Vote #16

Yes _____

No _____

Abstain _____

