HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING
NOVEMBER 8, 2015

I. ROLL CALL
Absences: Brynn Cook, Jessica Drews, Shannon McDonald, Alison Mehlsak, Laura Ochs, and Victoria Tran.

II. COMMUNITY INPUT
None.

III. OFFICER REPORTS
A. VJ Jenkins—Vice Chair for Community Relations, CLAS
   There are 3 upcoming community outreach events. First is an upcoming breakfast
   with the Sexual Assault Resource Agency at the Boar’s Head, there are 5 spots open.
   Second is with Lighting of the Lawn. Third is at Colonnade Ball, which this year will be
   supporting the history of women at the University.

B. Caroline Herre—Vice Chair for Education, ARCH
   There are multiple projects in the works with the education teams who have been
   presenting on the COLA classes which are wrapping up and others in the works so stay
   tuned!

C. Avery Rasmussen—Vice Chair for Investigations, COMM
   There are 4 active investigations with 1 I-Panel coming up this Tuesday and two
   upcoming I-Panels TBD. Avery is working on a few projects regarding processing,
   timeliness, and gathering better feedback from the Pool and Investigation Coordinators.

D. Russell Bogue —Vice Chair for Hearings, CLAS
   There was a hearing today for two separate cases. Both students in SEAS were found
   guilty by mixed panel. There is a hearing that will be scheduled for either 12/5/15 or
   12/6/15. Monica and Adam volunteered for Official Observer and Chair, respectively.

E. Faith Lyons —Chair, COMM
   Faith followed up on distribution of Honor admissions materials that will soon be
   available in Peabody Hall. She is also working on improving budgeting process/
   requesting funds for Committee events. Faith is also working on revising the transition
   process for incoming Committee members. In the past PowerPoints have been passed
   down from the outgoing Chair, but nothing school specific per se. Austin points out that
   Steve Nash (former Chair) kept track of materials via Google Doc. At the Undergraduate
   level, we are trying to renew interest in having the Honor Code available in all
   classrooms on plaques on Grounds. Finally, shout out to the LAW school for having
   their Scrolls available and up during interview season.

IV. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS
A. (CLAS) Society of Physics students is hosting a Roundtable this Friday for Lunch.
B. ARCH has 400+ sheets from Popular Assembly that have been printed out and are going
   to be distributed on individual desks and the Fine Arts Library this week. The Feedback chalkboard
   is up as well.
C. COMM is doing follow up on Popular Assembly this week.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Multiple Sanction System Response: Last week Faith felt like our conversation ended without a strong sense of direction, so she assembled a PowerPoint synthesizing our previous conversation and guiding the future direction of our dialogue. There is a spectrum of ways for us to proceed. We are bound by the literal wording of the referenda to pose a direct question on the ballot, which is not necessarily in line with what we have been discussing in our term. There are two other options before us. The first one is that the Committee would be constitutionally bound to further consideration with no change this year, by gauging student opinion periodically. This does fit in line with our constitutional response but is just one path we could take. The second option would be to institute a constitutional change that gives Committee the power to make future change. We would need to petition the Board of Visitors to impose lesser sanctions as currently we are only given the position to expel students. This would be a change in the wording of the Constitution that would allow future Committees to give out other sanctions after a student body vote.

So then the next logical point of discussion would be what is the best way for us to gauge student opinion on these options. Some ideas include voting in elections versus a University wide survey. Faith Lyons (Chair) offered that a ballot option may not be best as it would force the next Committee to put forth an affirmative vote (yes/no) when a necessary option could be no change. Additionally, the idea of binding future Committees is problematic as we have seen first hand. To sum up, we can put forth a constitutionally binding question, we can send out a student body survey, or we can modify section 2 of the Self-Governance section of our Constitution so that in the future the Committee can ask a question via the ballot. This last point is meant to create a mechanism for holding Committee accountable but with more options. The proposed language to add is: “the Honor Committee shall enact a response within the time frame of one year.”

Michelle Butler (LAW) says that looking at the actual text of the Referenda would be helpful so we can more closely examine what we are tasked to do. (The Referenda tasks were pulled up on the projector and examined). Russell Bogue (CLAS) says an explanation to the two constitutional responses regards an institutional response for periodic follow-up. Faith Lyons (COMM) says she believes we are following the spirit of what students wanted us to follow-up on, we have been doing research and having a meaningful conversation. Martese Johnson (CLAS) would like to clarify the difference in the Popular Assembly and the Bi-Annual Session. Faith Lyons (COMM) says that the Popular Assembly could be about anything while the latter would formalize a discussion on sanctioning. Adam Bucholz (SMED) agrees and says that if we are considering implementing such a solution we should consider codifying a committee on Honor Reform that could be open to the Community of Trust. Faith Lyons (COMM) agrees and says the 2000 commission has an interesting stance on that. Katherine Kamis (SEAS) points out that Washington & Lee uses a model similar to what Adam is suggesting. Austin Sim (LAW) says 3 years makes sense but codifying that in the Constitution is unnecessary. Matt Comey (BATT) thinks we should do 2 & 3 together. He also agrees that the Powers clause makes sense. He thinks we should consider putting in language which binds the Committee to codify a multiple sanction system. Russell Bogue (CLAS) says we would need to examine the Powers clause wording before suggesting this as it might lead to a vote every time we needed to
sanction a student. Faith Lyons (COMM) interjects that part of the reason we went with this wording is that it is closely aligned with UJC’s wording. Martese Johnson (CLAS) is concerned that most of the student body probably thinks we have the power currently to issue lesser sanctions. Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) adds are we setting this up for some sort of unconscious bias that is perpetuated; he agrees with Martese that we are justifying a lack of action. Michelle Butler (LAW) thinks this slide is biased by not including the option of voting on a multiple sanction system, isn’t that what students meant when they voted on it? She thinks this is an obvious option we should at least be discussing. Martese Johnson (CLAS) interjects that we should be able to create a new sanctioning system in 4 years and seem more transparent to the student body. Austin Sim (LAW) suggests flipping around the first question to make it more open ended. Faith thinks this may not fulfill the legal obligation if we are instead focusing on the single sanction. Russell Bogue (CLAS) thinks we are having two distinct conversations right now: what is our constitutional obligation, and how do we poll students on the single sanction. Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) interrupts and says we cannot wait until the data is complete, it will never be complete. Katherine Kamis (SEAS) says students are concerned why we are not putting a multiple sanction system on the ballot. Avery Rasmussen (COMM) reminds the room that we are obligated to take this responsibility to represent all of our voices at the University seriously. Sarah Rogers (SEAS) says that she agrees with Katherine’s points that logistically this needs to be done with the Constitution but that there is an enormous amount of education that needs to be done so that students understand this. She also inquired why we are bound to a strictly affirmative vote. Olivia Sabik (GSAS) asks if the referenda tasks requires a constitutionally binding amendment or question to be put forth? She wonders if the wording has additional implications that we have not yet considered. Martese Johnson (CLAS) interjects that we should want to give the students the biggest say that they can have and we sound like we are being underhanded and not caring about the rest of the student body. It seems as if we are putting our view of what the system is above what the student body thinks. He thinks the only thing that will prevent us from considering a 4 year timeline for system turnover is us preventing it from happening. Landon Wilkins (SCPS) says going through the referenda this year has caused frustration and we should not put it on future Committees. He also advocates for the Annual Report and perhaps bringing in a consulting firm for the ballot and the synthesis of our current data. Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) interjects that we need to be cautious not to put up roadblocks for future Committees. Everyone has a different threshold for what is an appropriate amount of data. He thinks Matt Comey’s earlier suggestion (re: using the text to force the Honor Committee to consider something other than the single sanction) will address that. Michelle Butler (LAW) would like a point of clarification on whether a binding question or a general survey question would affect the third option. Russell Bogue (CLAS) says that a question about a multiple sanction system will be posed to the student body it’s just a matter of how to best pose the question. Caroline thinks we need a question about what multiple sanction looks like. Adam Buchholz (SMED) says that we need to have some sort of promise to students on this next ballot. Monica Melner (SMED) was curious whether the third option is legally feasible given that the BOV has not granted us the power to impose lesser sanctions. Alex Carroll Hall
Assistant) says that student body can vote to pass anything and technically the BOV could always veto that, but that is beyond our purview.
Matt Comey (BATT) says the bare minimum we have to do is the Power’s clause change, and then we have to decide how much we want to force on future committees. Faith says if Committee has the power to do this we have to remember that we were voted in by the Student Body and so our personal opinion should be part of the discussion as well. Martese Johnson (CLAS) disagrees.
Michelle Butler (LAW) says we were never asked to apply a mandate.
Faith Lyons (COMM) says that a timeline is a good thing for us to discuss and we will have to see.
Sarah Rogers (SEAS) thinks putting a survey forth for SEAS would be a good idea.
Michelle Butler (LAW) says we already know what students think.
Cabell Rosanelli (GBUS) says this is all unnecessary.
Faith Lyons (COMM) thinks we have much better framed the discussion going forward and should wrap up for tonight.

VI. **NEW BUSINESS**

None

VII. **COMMUNITY INPUT**

Cavalier Daily reporter in attendance says the survey is a good idea, but it is a collective action problem. There is no consequence for not doing the survey, which will prevent students from completing the survey.
Families for Honor representative references last year’s Curry school survey, which was valuable.

VIII. **CLOSED SESSION**

None