HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING
NOVEMBER 15, 2015

I. ROLL CALL
Absences: Adam Buckholz, Martese Johnson, Katherine Kamis, Alison Mehlsak, Laura Ochs, Sarah Rogers, and Austin Sim.

II. COMMUNITY INPUT
None.

III. OFFICER REPORTS
A. VJ Jenkins—Vice Chair for Community Relations, CLAS
   Avery and VJ recently presented to the University Guide Service: gave tips about presenting Honor on tours, and also talked to them about the upcoming referenda, which shed some light on things for members of the organization. The Diversity Initiative Award has graded essays and announcing awards will be soon.

B. Caroline Herre—Vice Chair for Education, ARCH
   Days on the Lawn were reached out too. Athletes for Honor have been in contact with Caroline. Dorm Reps have been putting on events as well. Event examples include Mulan Movie nights. COLA presentations are wrapping up. FOAs also in the works.

C. Avery Rasmussen—Vice Chair for Investigations, COMM
   There is 1 active investigations with an I-Panel happening sometime this week, with a possible incoming report tomorrow. Avery has been working on implementing the Feedback system among Support Officers. 2 I-Panels were held this past week. The Lawn Chair program has been going well, plaques have been installed on all of the chairs. Most locks have been removed as well. One person has used the insurance system as well. VJ asked about following up with students who have not yet removed their locks.

D. Russell Bogue —Vice Chair for Hearings, CLAS
   On 12/5/15 the Committee will have one Hearing scheduled that Monica and Adam (MED) will be chairing. There might be perhaps one other Hearing happening Sunday 12/6/15, TBD.

E. Faith Lyons —Chair, COMM
   Please fill out the Honor Network survey tonight if you have not yet, tonight is the last chance to fill that out. There are 2 more Committee meetings remaining this semester; attendance is crucial so please make every effort to attend. Retreat will be 12/6/15 and will be vital shaping our discussion moving forward.

IV. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS
A. Monica said MED and NURS are having their Popular Assembly event this Wednesday in the Learning Studio- please come!
B. Darden is having 9:25 AM event Thursday Popular Assembly, donut holes will be provided.
C. Brynn added that GSAS is having a workshop Wednesday for TAs to discuss Honor.
D. COMM had their Popular Assembly follow-up event last week, which was very helpful.
E. Emily Snow said Physics roundtable went really well last week.
F. Caroline said ARCH feedback board is up and they have already gotten some valuable feedback.
V. **OLD BUSINESS**

A. **Ballot Proposal:** Modified from last week to include some of the suggestions from last week, specifically from Proposal 3. This is to hopefully address the issue of a single and multiple sanction system but still with a constitutional mechanism, not a binding question. The following phrases have been added: Option 1: *“With the exception of the CR and IR”* and Option 2: *“or impose lesser sanctions”* which aims to get at the same question.

There is another proposal to amend our constitution to enact a Committee response within the time frame of one year. Next there are several questions that are repeatedly being asked that were clarified. First, why can’t we put a multiple sanction system on the ballot by February? We need to continue doing research to implement such a system. Pier institutions such as W&M took over 3 years in a similar process for a smaller school. This is also not a legally responsible option. Another point of clarification focuses on the language being used. Since the Committee did not draft the referenda language is used that is not necessarily consistent with our bylaws. Finally, last week we discussed attaching a timeline to the proposal. This is thought not to be a good idea because we are not sure what an appropriate timeline would be to force on a future committee. Any deadline we attached at this point would be completely arbitrary.

Moving forward, **Recommendation to consider:** our term ends in April but we should create an independent review committee to utilize survey results and other completed research to make recommendations to Committee. Faith added that an independent review committee of University student leaders will provide an unbiased source if change is going to happen. We will be voting on all of these recommendations and proposals.

Landon Wilkins (SCPS) inquired how this language will work during the transitional period and how it will impact appeals. Russell Bogue (CLAS) responded that this proposal would give us the power to impose lesser sations but does not require us to do so. This implies that any change that might occur in our by-laws would guide the appeals process as does currently. Faith Lyons (COMM) adds that there is still a way for students to have the power for what goes in their by-laws and this is how.

Michelle Butler (LAW) brought up a concern regarding the no timeline proposal. Russell Bogue (CLAS) suggested an independent review committee to combat this as they would not be limited to a one year term. Faith adds that conversations about better transitions will help committees become better equipped from the start of their term.

Grace Muth (CLAS) thinks the idea of transitioning better is good but if we are thinking five to ten years down the road we need a better plan. She says that Committee has been historically bad at transitioning from term to term because this still suggests a lack of accountability. VJ Jenkins (CLAS) suggests that that is his problem, an arbitrary number is not responsible. Faith adds that she does not see a lack of accountability; we have to assume that future Committees want to do what is best for students. Grace responded that we have identified institutional problems and we should make a responsible decision to do something with it. Emily Snow (CLAS) interjected that she sees our Committee as taking the responsible first step and setting up future Committees to taking the clear next step.

Olivia Sabik (GSAS) said that the independent review committee is another good next step.

Michelle Butler (LAW) and Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) would like to see a student commission set up to review this topic over several years.

Russell Bogue (CLAS) says that we need to consider all of the possible outcomes of this vote. For example, if option 2 doesn’t pass we are no longer obligated to go forward with the review Committee.
Michelle Butler (LAW) and Landon Wilkins (SCPS) brought up fitting existing sub-committees into this proposal. VJ Jenkins (CLAS) pointed out that it would still lack the continuity a standing committee would provide.

Russell Bogue (CLAS) thinks we should also consider what the Committee response should be to these proposals. How will we as a Committee want to present these options.

Matt Comey (BATT) brought up the idea of a none of the above option. Multiple Committee members felt that skipping the question would be the logical way to voice a none of the above response, as the first option represents the status quo and the second proposal represents a change.

Olivia Sabik (GSAS) likes the fact that we are asking the question people want answered. She also felt this is a good way to get the ball rolling while still continuing to gather data.

Caroline Herre (ARCH) also gave a shout out to a COMM student who helped with the verbage of this proposal.

Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) asked if we will have a chance to discuss the “help text.” Avery responded that the help text will be our next step to create and can be as direct as “single sanction” vs “multi-sanction” but that will be our next conversation.

Brynn Cook (GSAS) would like to know if we can let students know why we aren’t putting forth more options.

Jessica Drews (EDUC) would like to know if answering Option 2 is binding to answering a survey, so say that a voter elects multi-sanction, do we make them accountable for providing an option? Russell says this may not be feasible because if Option 1 is passed no further action is required.

Matt Comey (BATT) wants us to make sure that this does not have to be yes/no questions. Faith said she will double check. Matt suggested putting a temporary system in place to conduction multi-sanction penalties. Caroline Herre (ARCH) and Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) vehemently opposed such a suggestion stating that such a panel would not be representative of the student body.

Michelle Butler (LAW) said that she is not comfortable voting on this yet and would like to add an option to extend.

Avery Rasmussen (COMM) pointed out that adding this to the Constitution text may be difficult.

VI. **NEW BUSINESS**

   None

VII. **COMMUNITY INPUT**

   Ian Robertson (CLAS IV) wanted to make a few comments regarding accountability from the referenda writer’s perspective. He says he has seen Support Officers and Committee members violate the Honor Code. He doesn’t feel the Committee as it currently stands has any sense of accountability. Ian feels that this is clearly a call for a multiple sanction system and that part of this Committee has been largely dismissive of that. The original iteration of the referenda was a multiple sanction system and he thinks that this is not good enough.

VIII. **CLOSED SESSION**