I. **Roll Call**

II. **Community Concerns**
   A. Will Lovell—Counsel  
      a. Proponent of Back to Basics proposal
   B. Evan Behrle—Counsel  
      a. Proponent of Back to Basics proposal  
      b. “There’s an urgency to this that I don’t think can be overstated.”
   C. Mark Gruetzmacher—Pre Trial Coordinator  
      a. Proponent of Back to Basics proposal  
      b. “It’s time for a change.”
   D. Andi Chernau—Advisor  
      a. Proponent of Back to Basics proposal
   E. Nick Lee—Counsel  
      a. Proponent of Back to Basics proposal  
      b. “Pat Lampkin has said that the students who go through the system are the students that we want to keep here.”
   F. Will Dantzler (via Evan Behrle)—Counsel  
      a. Proponent of Back to Basics proposal

III. **Officer Reports**
   A. Anne Russell Gregory—Vice Chair Community Relations, CLAS  
      a. Reached out to President of Corner Business Association to meet this week to begin conversation of how Honor can work with Corner vendors
   B. Mary Kidd—Vice Chair Education, CLAS  
      a. Continuing with Roundtables this Wednesday 7 PM  
      b. Working with Nursing reps to host a mock trial in 2-3 weeks  
      c. Working with UJC and first year association councils to host a s’mores night for first year students  
      d. Beginning to plan Finals Push—hope to work with class reps to host one event per school in late November/early-mid December; please contact Mary if interested in hosting an event in your school  
      e. DAB Garden Party this Wednesday at 5 PM in lower Garden VIII—partnering with Sustained Dialogue to discuss recent reform
   C. Lindsey Tumperi—Vice Chair Investigations, CLAS
   D. Clifton Bumgardner—Vice Chair Trials, SEAS  
      a. 2 trials this weekend; 1 student in CLAS found not guilty by random student panel; today 1 student in CLAS found guilty by a mixed student panel  
      b. 4 upcoming trials
   E. Stephen Nash—Chair, CLAS  
      a. Met with StudCo Diversity Student Network this week  
      b. Halfway through term—support officer evaluation to be issued this week  
      c. Gray-Carrington Scholarship nominations
Continued meetings with each pair of school representatives

Ben Heriaud—FAC meeting on Friday
  i. Faculty members present supportive and agreed that change is needed
  ii. Grade issue was raised; not all courses have Withdraw option; issues with students about to graduate

Taylor Morris—present at FAC
  i. Most ardent opponent of Honor as well as strongest supporter of Honor both supportive of proposal; bridging differences, high levels of excitement at meeting

Stephen has been meeting with faculty and has received positive feedback on proposal

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Back to Basics Proposal—Stephen Nash, CLAS
  a. Austin Sim—Med School Rep
     i. Current random jurors inattentive and unprofessional; not engaged
     ii. Different dynamic serving as a Committee juror—change definitely is needed
  b. Ben Heriaud—Law School Rep
     i. Change is needed and the time is now
     ii. Back to Basics a great template, we need to think about how it can be implemented
     iii. Jury reform is what faculty is most excited about
  c. Melina Schoppa—Batten School Rep
     i. Discussions with Batten students showed that symbiotic relationship may not be true concerning both Jury reform and Informed retraction
     ii. Consider different types of jury reform, not necessarily institutionalizing all-committee jurors
     iii. Students may see jury reform as a disenfranchisement
  d. Clifton Bumgardner—Engineering School Rep
     i. We have to keep in mind that Committee members are the ones that interact with Honor the most; student body does not see every trial or every investigation
     ii. Committee members are also peers of accused students and also have the same common understanding as a random student juror; the only difference is that Committee members have experience with the system
  e. Taylor Morris—Darden Rep
     i. The two aspects of the proposal work better together than on their own
  f. Mary Kidd—College Rep
     i. Knowledge and experience of system is what untrained student jurors struggle with the most
  g. Anne Russell Gregory—College Rep
     i. Parallels this proposal draws to other parts of the University—maintaining the same two semester suspension as is implemented with academic suspension and maintaining elected jurors just as UJC does
  h. Rebecca Cohn—Law School Rep
     i. Faculty support is a huge plus
ii. If passed, would require a substantial education effort with new and current faculty; we need faculty support and buy-in

i. Kaity Badlato—Architecture School Rep
   i. Consider a trained-student jury panel and open it up to interested students; mixed panels would include perspectives of students who are not constantly involved with day-to-day of Honor

j. Stephen Nash—College Rep
   i. Any benefit a random student has, a Committee rep has, as well
   ii. Last decade has showed that the entity of random student juries are not as competent as trained Committee members
   iii. Has been and will continue to reach out to different student groups to see how they will be affected by an academic suspension
      1. International students
      2. Athletes
      3. Students with scholarships
      4. SCPS students

k. Justin Pierce—College Rep
   i. System unfair to many students
   ii. This holistic reform addresses problems that build off of each other and creates a system that is more fair for everyone involved
   iii. It’s important that we think about this and challenge this as much as possible so that this proposal works as best as it can for our system

l. Taylor Richardson—Commerce School Rep
   i. We must be careful the way we word and present this proposal; communication is key

m. Nate Daughtry—Batten School Rep
   i. Many structural problems present in the system that weren’t as apparent a few years ago
   ii. For a successful system in the long-run, we need to shift the focus from punishment to rehabilitation
   iii. A plus of IR is the ability for a student to continue their education here
   iv. Issues—Committee needs to start pushing back more to flesh out any possible issues; students won’t be able to have a “jury of their peers”

V. COMMUNITY CONCERNS

VI. CLOSED SESSION