HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING
AUGUST 30, 2015

I. ROLL CALL
Absences: Brynn Cook, Jessica Drews, Martese Johnson, Laura Ochs

II. COMMUNITY CONCERNS
None

III. OFFICER REPORTS
A. VJ Jenkins—Vice Chair for Community Relations, CLAS
   Went to the source and spoke with a lot of African American students as well as
   LSA and Phillipino student group. Working closely with support officers for this
   endeavor.

B. Caroline Herre—Vice Chair for Education, ARCH
   Crushing it for dorm talks and lawn chats. There is one for Women's Tennis coming
   up tomorrow. Continue thinking about specific SWAG for each school.

C. Avery Rasmussen—Vice Chair for Investigations, COMM
   There are currently 14 active investigations. Support Officers are doing an excellent
   job signing up for those, timeliness is key. I PANEL retraining happened at O DAYS;
   Avery will be reaching out to those who missed it. Sign up for a time you think you will
   be free.

D. Russell Bogue —Vice Chair for Hearings, CLAS
   There is a hearing coming up this Saturday. Emily will be hearing chair and Matt will
   be official observer. It will be a mixed panel. Another hearing is coming up 9/16. This
   will also be a mixed panel. 9/19-20 will be the 4th (?) hearing for 1418.

E. Faith Lyons —Chair, COMM
   Thanks for a great conversation at O DAYS! This year’s Senior Support team would
   like to increase participation from other schools and years in the new pool. Sending out
   emails and having meetings for your schools are important for increasing diversity in the
   overall pool.

IV. OLD BUSINESS
V. NEW BUSINESS
A. Faculty Advisory Committee Update: Katherine Kamis (SEAS) has 4 FACS meetings
   planned. Will be emailed out. She would like school specific mock hearings— watch for
   emails about this. These hearings/discussion would last about an hour. A newsletter for
   professors that are school specific or for all faculty members is in the works!

B. Policy and Procedures Overview: Grace Muth (CLAS) says this committee meets for an
   hour before pool (~6pm) every Sunday in 481. An audit of the merge is in process,
   includes interviewing students and getting their feedback from the process. Also looking
   into making committee less formal. Please come it’s a fun committee and there are
   usually cookies!
C. Proposed By Law Changes: Russell Bogue (CLAS) and Faith Lyons (COMM) have some slides to lead discussion:

a. Regarding making the Appeal process more clear. By giving the process numbers and clarifying which specific verdicts are being appealed. This is really just meant to clarify any potential confusion and better align with the hearing script, especially when there are multiple accusations.

b. Regarding organization of support officers. The by laws should match what we are actually doing when it comes to support officers serving in multiple roles. The purpose is to align things with actual process. There is another by law that contradicts serving in multiple roles, which this proposal is meant to clarify. Matt Comey (BATT) and Adam Buchholz (SMED) suggest specifying this in the by laws.

Russell Bogue (CLAS) points out that codifying this in the by laws could hamper specific roles where the student would like to request a certain support officer to fill a specific position on their behalf.

c. Regarding codifying whether a student will testify last in a hearing. For example if you are calling witnesses on the phone this could lengthen the hearing if you have to wait for the student to testify last. The student could also waive their right to testify last.

D. Informed Retraction Discussion: Faith Lyons (COMM) says that with one act, one IR came the discussion that we should be opening it up are. Now there is a concrete narrow definition for what it means for two acts to be inextricably linked. Are there parameters that exist that would allow us to open this up? Whether we redefine inextricably linked or redefine parameters for factually linked events. Are there circumstances that would warrant this? Legal advisor Rachel has already commented that legally factually related is a broader, more difficult heading to justify. We could do it, but it would be more difficult. Next week at committee support officers will present research on this, and 1:4/1:5 cases since the IR was implemented have multiple offenses. This basically refers to cases where there is for example cheating on multiple assignments using the same source which currently is regarded as a separate IR and a separate offense, where as cheating on two different exams would be regarded as two different IRs. Matt Comey (BATT) suggests that you could take one IR for one report as an alternative. Shannon McDonald (NURS) says that this could be problematic because multiple reporters could report the same event. Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) says moral patterning is an invalid argument. Plagiarism from the same source versus cheating on different classes seems to be an arbitrary distinction. This would open up a whole new can of worms for Austin Sim (LAW) and show an overstepping of boundaries. Olivia Sabik (GSAS) says it would be overstepping to ere on the side of the student, which seems to follow past precedents. Austin Sim (LAW) disagrees respectfully. Adam Buckholz (SMED) would like to know what the number needed to treat it based on the data collected and it sounds like right now it is for two people which is pretty drastic to change the system for. Grace Muth (CLAS) thinks that the current way the IR is framed dissuades students from admitting their act, and she suggests this goes against the fundamental underpinnings of Honor’s philosophy. Avery Rasmussen (COMM) thinks it sounds like we’re discussing a multiple sanction system. Katherine Kamis (SEAS) agrees. Michelle Butler (LAW) adds that an IR
should be an extension of the CR, based around the idea that you didn’t have the opportunity to do the CR for one time you messed up. Sarah Rogers (SEAS) agrees. Austin Sim (LAW) says the only reason the single nexus of events is included is to prevent absurd situations from taking place. Alison Mehlsak (GBUS) would like to know if for the CR can a student take one for multiple acts? (ANSWER YES). That’s where she has a problem with it, thinks the system should be more congruent. Faith says you can submit as many CRs as you want at the University. She thinks this discussion will go in an important direction once we have the data next week. Also we don’t need to decide on IR reform by the November 2nd deadline. Matt Comey (BATT) goes back to the one reporter thing or one report. Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) says this could affect that reporter’s liberties. Alison Mehlsak (GBUS) and Landon Wilkins (SCPS) think ‘one report, one IR’ could incentivize you to seek other people as the reporter. Matt Comey (BATT) doesn’t think that incentive exists for professors. Alison Mehlsak (GBUS) thinks it does because you would be motivated to come forward.

VI. Community Concerns

None

VII. Closed Session