HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING  
APRIL 19, 2015

I. **ROLL CALL**  
Absent: Victoria Tran, Laura Ochs, Michelle Butler, Monica Melmer, Shannon McDonald, Mayra Cardenas

II. **COMMUNITY CONCERNS**  
None

III. **OFFICER REPORTS**  
A. VJ Jenkins—Vice Chair for Community Relations, CLAS  
   a. ADAPT tabling: short a few people, would be great if we could have committee members sign up

B. Caroline Herre—Vice Chair for Education, ARCH  
   a. Education teams are going well  
   b. Keep working on finals pushes for individual schools  
   c. New Education Coordinators have been chosen  
      i. Want to increase communication with the ECs and the committee  
      ii. Look out for more updates from the ECs working with the SO pool

C. Avery Rasmussen—Vice Chair for Investigations, COMM  
   a. 10 active investigations  
   b. New Investigation Coordinators have been chosen

D. Russell Bogue —Vice Chair for Trials, CLAS  
   a. Were going to have a trial this weekend that did not occur – student LAGGED  
   b. Gauging who from the Support Officer Pool will be here this summer, also going to ask committee – email Faith and CC Russell if you will be here

E. Faith Lyons —Chair, COMM  
   a. Green Dot overview talk (Bystander Intervention Program meant to lower Power-Based violence on grounds) at Pool – want a number of them to go through full training in fall  
   b. Will be sending email with the full information about the IR audit to Committee Members  
      i. Tyler Pitt will be at Pool next week to talk about the year-long audit of the IR  
   c. Selected senior support trainers in the past week  
      i. Will reach out to committee members about the best way to do recruitment in schools  
      ii. Will send an email with all the new positions  
   d. Developing demographic survey  
      i. Have a need to understand who is in Honor to help get an idea of how we represent the university and use the connections that people have  
   e. Pick up a Take Back the Night buttons – “On my Honor, I pledge to take back the night”
IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. 2015 Election Referenda

a. First Referendum

i. “Popular assembly open to the general student body”

ii. What do we want to do about the popular assembly?
   1. Feedback – didn’t reach all the graduate students and groups on grounds

iii. When do we want to have the popular assembly?

iv. Austin Sim (SMED) – does it have to be one singular event?
   1. If we want by-in from different graduate schools – have different events with the same purpose in different areas to attract those students
   2. Faith - Is there an opportunity for those voices to interact with different events?

v. Martese Johnson (CLAS) – not necessary to come up with a concrete idea of what it will be because it will change year to year

vi. Alison Mehltsak (GSBA) – always going to be trade-off between outreach between the different locations and interactions between different groups.
   1. Make sure the event is held at a time that can be good for all the schools

vii. Maggie Rossberg (NURS) – would have more nursing and med school turnout if it is located at the hospital

viii. Matt Comey (BATT) – why every two years? Not every year
   1. Full school every other year and than singular schools every other year

ix. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) – for SCPS needs to be online to get attendance

x. Faith Lyons (COMM) – not having it facilitated by Honor, but to have it work with other students to get involved with it. Who is holding the assembly? Is Honor putting it on or is it a community event

xi. Avery Rasmussen (COMM) – do we want feedback / what are we doing with the event?

xii. Adam Buckholz (SMED) – get buy-in, with the help of the student government or other members. Making sure we bring in the right people to the event. Wouldn’t exclude anyone from attending but would make sure the people who carry weight within the schools are there and brining a point
   1. Austin – worrying with a loss definition of popular assembly

xiii. Emily Snow (CLAS) – will this Honor conference help us in proposing a multisancction system? Need to consider the timing of the event. Consider that when you go to the students with a problem and asking for feedback, if it isn’t act on students will be frustrated if it isn’t heard.

xiv. Russell Bogue (CLAS) – would it be useful to have a set of questions that we are engaging interest on. Do we want to act on the popular part (get as much information) or focusing on specific information.

i. Shows that we believe in a community of trust beyond lying, cheating, and stealing
xv. Matt Comey (BATT) – come with ideas that we’re thinking about and put them forward to the student body and get feedback and then open discussion to bring new ideas to the table. Ideally, we should have models and frameworks of a multisanction system that we can get feedback on.

xvi. Martese Johnson (CLAS) – if we decide that that’s the interpretation of referendum 3, then we should use the summer to do research and have the assembly in the fall

xvii. Caroline – don’t need to decide the format of every single congress will look like

xviii. Austin Sim (SMED) – worry about coming to the student body with a fully formed plan. Just like the “reform the ideal.” While having concrete ideas is important, a fully formed plan will be difficult to implement.

xix. Faith Lyons (COMM) – students view wanting to give feedback on the model and also want to help in the general idea

xx. Emily Snow (CLAS) – we wouldn’t be coming in with just one model, it could be multiple different models. Going in and asking questions to get feedback.

   1. Austin – that’s what they did originally with restore the ideal

xxi. Faith Lyons (COMM) – what issues are we trying to solve with a multisanction system. What the sanctions look like - what will be fixing by changing what our system looks like when looking at other schools with multi-sanction that still have the same problems

xxii. Grace – will a multisanction system fix our problems and are they things that we want to be fixed – what are we trying to get out of all this

xxiii. Martese Johnson (CLAS) – past Honor conference themes – it was difficult to pull those opinions and need quantitative feedback, need to get quantitative and qualitative feedback

xxiv. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) – talk about the single sanction at the same time as a multisanction system – some people believe in the non-toleration clause with SCPS.

xxv. Katherine Kamis (CLAS) – getting an online form and also publishing all the note online so that they can see the conversation and comment on it

xxvi. Russell Bogue (CLAS) – broader question we’re going to have to address – do we want to have a committee on what we put forth. Does the committee want to have a stance on the issue and putting it forward to the student body. Or do we want to have individual opinions from the Honor committee. If we put forward a multi-sanction system and then don’t support it, how will that appear

xxvii. Jess Drews (EDUC) – people ask what the opinion of the Honor committee is. The people appreciated the email with the different opinions. There are people that agree with whatever you tell them, but if they disagree they won’t look at both sides. We should not have a committee opinion.

xxviii. Faith Lyons (COMM) – during restore the ideal it felt as though we were running a vote yes campaign. Awkward if we propose something that then we don’t support. We should be putting forward what we think the best system is.
xxix. Emily Snow (CLAS) – The multisancion system reflects the student’s opinion so we have to give students the option but that doesn’t mean that we have to support that option.

xxx. Alison Mehlsak (GSBA) – In terms of the number of models proposed – if there isn’t an obvious consensus where does that leave us? If we have a lot of people providing feedback on a lot of different options. We want to be very mindful on what we give to students to receive feedback on, even if we don’t proactively point students in one direction or another.

xxxi. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) – put a binding question of “should we implement a multisancion system.” If we’re trying to get a majority of students behind this then we need more than 18% of the students voting.

xxxii. Cabell Rosanelli (GSBA) – committee support of something that may or may not make it way onto the ballot – is that awkward. If the committee says that they’re going to support it, we need to consider what the schools or personally we believe. If we have universal support, could create more awkward situations.

xxxiii. Matt Comey (BATT) – Owe it to the student body to have an option of a multisancion ballot of the one that is most likely to past not the one that makes the most number of people happy. We should consider putting something on the ballot that is a small shift from the current system and that give the option to grow. It’s a dangerous thing to put the question that Landon proposed onto the ballot – we owe it to the students to put something on the ballot that the student body can vote on. It is dangerous for the committee to take a stand on the decision because we need to represent our schools.

xxxiv. Adam Buckholz (SMED) – helpful to spend the last little bit of time, when would we want to have this conference and what can we do this summer to get ready for this?
  1. What do we want to have prepared and when do we want to have it prepared by

xxxv. Caroline Herre (ARCH) – plan going forward about how we’re going to gather student opinion. Asked in a couple round tables what do you think of a multisancion system – and students weren’t prepared to answer this question

xxxvi. Faith Lyons (COMM) – we have a number of support officers willing to help with the research. Getting the feedback from the students will take the majority of the fall; therefore, we need to do the research over the summer so we come back prepared. We’ve talked about forming a subcommittee on this issue. Believe this needs to be ready for mid-September

xxxvii. Grace Muth (CLAS) – agrees in the need for a subcommittee with SO, committee members, and community members

xxxviii. Cabell Rosanelli (GSBA) – will other schools over this information to us? Faith not sure, UNC is willing because of a personal connection
  1. Alex has connections through professional networks
  2. Grace – getting the presentations from other school at the conference that old exec went to

xxxix. Faith Lyons (COMM) – Ideas on sub-committee – formal or non-formal
1. Adam – summer availability plays into this – who can be around to work on it.
2. Faith – some of the research can be done online.
   xl. Matt Comey (BATT) – we should publish a report based on what we have done no matter what we decide. The research shouldn’t have to be repeated in the future. Believes that the discussions should happen with the full committee
   xli. Sarah Rogers (SEAS) – Likes the idea of a subcommittee, but have 4-5 people on the committee to do particular things and collect research and then have full committee discussion.
   xlii. Olivia Sabik (GSAS) – ground us in the discussion so that the discussion isn’t all over the place like it was today.
   xliii. Faith Lyons (COMM) – not going to have a solution and plan at the end of this meeting. Still have a lot of learning from commerce school classmates before having a full discussion. When we have the best understanding moving forward. Email with summer availability and research over the summer. Can use that next week to set up a timeline.
   xliv. Emily Snow (CLAS) – in terms of interpretation, thinking of this as we will propose. Landon raised a point asking if that is how we’re interpreting it.
      1. Faith – has not talked to Rachel about it, but there what the students thought they were voting on.

b. Third Referendum
   i. How do we want to propose what we put on the ballot?
   ii. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) – What are the interpretations of the referendum and if we’re trying to reach more than 18 percent of the student body
   iii. Martese Johnson (CLAS) – we don’t want to jump ahead and talking about the interpretation of that, because two years from now we still have to have the congress

V. COMMUNITY CONCERNS
a) Michael White (COMM III, Support Officer): The committee’s view on these issues is not couple with the issue. May be worth putting together a group of people who want this to be approved and gets rid of biased and view of biased
b) Ian Robertson (CLAS III, Support Officer & Co-Author of Referenda): First referendum – three goals stated in the text. Generate potential ideas to put forward to the community. Most important thing is that this is not an attempt to receive student body opinion and then just push it under the rug. Need to use the information and opinion that the student body expresses during the congress. Mechanism for concrete change during this assembly. The more that we’re in student spaces, the less appealing that it is. Being knowledgeable about the system in a way that the student body isn’t, is intimidating. Second referendum – Would be safe to say that it is a gross misinterpretation of the referendum to not propose a multisanction system that can be put onto the ballot. The concern about the 18% of the student body, only two students working on the campaign, without the help of the committee. The important number is how much the referendum pass, not the 18% of the student body that voted. The idea and intent behind the second referendum is to propose a multisanction
system. Jaeyoon and Ian have two proposed constitutional amendments and by-law changes that will help put into place a multi-sanction system. Finding information should be straightforward from gathering information from other schools.

c) Kate McDaniel (CLAS I, Support Officer): Agree with Ian that we need to facilitate the first referendum in a way that is open to all student opinion. The question that we put on the ballot and the discussions should be based on the statistics that we have now. Need to use statistics that are more that 11 years old, and that Honor has completely and not just specific statistics that just support one opinion. Concern – complete view of education that gives the students the full view of what is happening. A clear education effort and complete representation of the statistics and what does statistics mean.

d) Aryn Frazier (CLAS II, BSA President-Elect): Believes that the Honor congresses should be in multiple different places and one for everyone. Working with an idea of a black and white binary – is it possible to create multiple systems that the students can check yes or no on the different systems. So that more people can be stratified with the information. Use the power that Honor has (blocking emails) to get a better response rate through this instead of just people who vote for their friends. Can get a better idea of the type of system that we should be putting in front of the student body and the degree of the type of system (extreme or mild). Need to do a lot of talking to the different groups that she represents, but some ideas about what Honor means to black students. Everyone’s introduction is Faith’s speech. The black students get a peer advisor that will tell them to not sit with other black students while taking tests. Professors are retiring at the UVA – most have been professors for 40 years who grew up during segregation. They’re not going to change the views that they’ve had for all of their lives. In looking at reporting – when the only opinion is expel or not report, in a personal opinion, would not report. Need to think about he racism in the system of Honor. Honor in the south was based on racist ideas – a black man or woman could not be honorable. When we look at the words and what they’re rooted in – Honor was not made for black people in terms of it’s definition and the institution that it came into in the University. Need to think about it in who reports. Classic undertones – if you do not have the money for an internship with the IR you will not have an internship during that time or the scholarship to come back to the school. It is not equitable in the way that the system is set up now.

VI. Closed Session