HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING
APRIL 26, 2015

I. ROLL CALL
Absent: Adam Buckholz (MED), Michelle Butler (LAW), Mayra Cardenas (SCPS), Martese Johnson (CLAS), Shannon McDonald (NURS), Austin Sim (LAW), Victoria Tran (BATT)

II. COMMUNITY CONCERNS
None

III. OFFICER REPORTS
A. VJ Jenkins—Vice Chair for Community Relations, CLAS
   a. Continue to think about what we discussed last week.

B. Caroline Herre—Vice Chair for Education, ARCH
   a. There are a lot of events coming up for Finals pushes this week.
   b. There will be a feedback form (see what VJ talked about last week) sent to committee members so that we can keep track of feedback received at education events.
   c. Asked for volunteers for Nursing event on May 12.

C. Avery Rasmussen—Vice Chair for Investigations, COMM
   a. There are currently 9 active investigations.
   b. There was an I Panel last week.
   c. There is one case ready to go to I Panel.

D. Russell Bogue —Vice Chair for Trials, CLAS
   a. There are no more trial things for this semester, but there is a strong chance there will be one scheduled at the end of June.
   b. Let Russell know if you will be here over the summer.
   c. There will be a number of trials in the fall when we return.

E. Faith Lyons —Chair, COMM
   a. This is the high report season for Honor. If you feel uncomfortable taking a report there is a great sheet on the wall of the advisor office.
   b. Email Avery if you’ve taken a report to let her know that you’ve put it in OCP.
   c. Please fill out the Demographic survey.
   d. Met with President Sullivan to discuss reaching out to faculty in the coming year.

IV. OLD BUSINESS
A. Referenda Timeline
   a. The end goal is a synthesized document for committee retreat so that we can discuss a set of themes based on what is pulled from other systems and our current system.
   b. Noted were changes with CR/IR Katherine Kamis (SEAS) brought up consideration for who is working on this document and how they will structure it.
c. Matt Comey (BATT) emphasized how each school determines what sanction is given to each school is important.

d. Goal is basic research completed by the time students return in the fall so we have something to engage feedback on.

e. Looking at the election timeline as well is important.

f. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) asked about researching 35 different systems.

g. Faith Lyons (COMM) says these will not all be presented to students but this is important for pulling out different themes.

h. Matt Comey (BATT) wanted to know how often the committee will be receiving updates over the summer about this progress.

i. Sarah Rogers (SEAS) said have a drop box account or something that members can engage in real time progress may be useful.

j. Alison Mehlsak (GSBA) would like to see a way for tying research to an objective i.e. multi-sanction system referenda.

k. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) asked about how many people will be on the subcommittee for this? Faith says 8 volunteers from Pool have stepped forward.

l. We need to engage committee members, community members can be asked after Finals when they are more engaged.

m. VJ Jenkins (CLAS) asked about how do we put weight on different areas so this is not just about sanctions.

n. Faith Lyons (COMM) says this is an ideological/philosophical point that cannot just be measured through research.

o. Faith asked for volunteers from committee, 9 members volunteered. But all of the committee will remain involved.

B. Language Changes

a. Revisiting some of the changes: Changing counsel to advocate does that make this less adversarial?

b. Russell Bogue (CLAS) thinks given his training as a counsel that this term “counsel” emphasizes their function in providing information to the student, which seems LESS adversarial than advocate. “Advocate” being less concerned with the pursuit of the truth but more about what side he/she is on. Feels strongly that this might obfuscate what hearing tries to accomplish.

c. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) mentions that this word “advocate” aligns with the terminology from the new sexual assault sub-committee, empowers the student, is less legalistic, and matches Harvard/Stanford.

d. Grace Muth (CLAS) questions how our current by-laws define counsel as an advocate and says that she does not feel particularly strongly about this.

e. Russell Bogue (CLAS) says that Counsel should NOT be the voice of the student at trial, which is implied by advocate. Also the issue of Counsel for the Community would change to Advocate for the Community, which may not empower the student.

f. VJ Jenkins (CLAS) adds that there are times at trial when a student cannot have a voice in the trial process, and the Advocate is an important voice.

g. Sarah Rogers (SEAS) does not think that advocate is less adversarial but that it is more legalistic.

h. Alison Mehlsak (GSBA) thinks from the student perspective advocate may feel less adversarial and we should go more on the side of the student.
i. Avery Rasmussen (COMM) thinks Russell is spot on regarding the aims of our system. It’s about how to tell the student’s story in the pursuit of the truth, which fits more in line with Counsel.

j. Caroline Herre (ARCH) says no matter what we are calling it we need to keep in mind that the atmosphere in this room can be threatening.

k. Faith Lyons (COMM) adds that we will be re-visiting the room thing next term often.

l. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) mentions that in the 2000 report they recommended changing Counsel to Advocate as well as changing the trial room.

m. Olivia Sabik (GSAS) wants a word that doesn’t build two sides of a case.

n. This is a difficult discussion and we don’t want this to be adversarial language but what happens is in fact adversarial.

o. Russell Bogue (CLAS) adds that if we are changing the terms that doesn’t necessarily change our procedures, which is what he thinks needs to change. Advocate is further from how we have our procedures defined.

p. Katherine Kamis (SEAS) proposes completely changing it to something else like “hearing support officer.”

q. Emily Snow (CLAS) thinks that might be too vague and confusing for accused students.

r. Cabell Rosanelli (GSBA) thinks this research to be done over the summer might be a good gauge and a change now would seem rash.

s. Faith Lyons (COMM) asks if there is enough consensus for a vote tonight? The sense is that we are not going to vote today.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Introduction to IR Audit

a. Tyler Pitt (2014-2015 ARCH Rep) is going to give a presentation on the IR Audit to frame what we might be doing next year.

b. Recommendations included:
   i. Re-writing the IR form so that it is more clear to the student what they are supposed to do
   ii. Eliminating the plea bargain nature of the IR which is not the original philosophical underpinning which would change how reports are taken, and the case process timeline. There is a legal problem here since we have to give the student all the information we have. Our committee must decide if this is worth doing.
   iii. Single nexus of events, the standard used to determine if multiple honor events can be covered under one IR. It seems like this may procedurally prohibit you from discussing the most prohibitive item in the pursuit of truth. Recommend a “factually related events” which would make this more fair and easier
   iv. Further engagement with faculty and deans with the IR

c. The idea is reducing the amount of information for students.

d. Caroline Herre (ARCH) says in past proceedings students were given access to the reporter interview but never asked for it. This change would give the student enough information but …

e. Grace Muth (CLAS) adds that the standard of knowledge is limited.
f. Tyler thinks these changes are really important because he doesn’t think the full potential of the IR has been realized and that we should look at our current system and improve it so that students can make a more informed decision before a multi sanction system is passed. What happens to degree candidates attending their Final Exercises or participating in their CIO events, should these be conditions of the IR?

g. Rachel Setear has not seen these recommendations for legalistic advice according to Tyler, but Faith says some of the main ideas have been discussed.

h. Emily Snow (CLAS) asks questions about what is the student allowed to do in those 7 days.

i. Tyler says there is nothing that needs to be encouraged or discouraged.

j. Faith Lyons (COMM) reaffirmed that we will continue this discussion in the fall.

VI. **COMMUNITY CONCERNS**

Ian Robertson (CLAS III, Support Officer): has a comment about the timeline discussed for the research subcommittee. He thinks it is important that why a student might want a multi sanction system might differ from student to student. He is hesitant to attack any comparison because the pros and cons might be irrelevant to certain students evaluating a particular standard. Faith points out that a longer list of criteria might help meet more of the end goals for students? Ian agreed with this but thinks that what the criteria are is tremendously important.

VII. **CLOSED SESSION**