**Honor Committee Meeting Minutes**  
*November 3, 2013*

**I. Community Concerns**

Barbara Shadel from Families from Honor spoke to address the proposal for a structural policy change related to plagiarism. In August, Families from Honor met with Evan and Pat Lampkin to discuss the Informed Retraction. Families for Honor met with Laura Fornash, the VA Secretary of Education, last week. She agreed with the design of Family for Honor’s proposal. The proposal relates to citation problems constituting plagiarism.

Mrs. Henderson, a member for Families for Honor spoke to share concerns with the University Honor System. She asked the Committee to consider Families for Honor’s proposed structural policy change.

**II. Officer Reports**

Michelle Butler – there are two potential Honor co-sponsorship events, including Lighting of the Lawn. The first CRDAC meeting was held last Monday. The conversation of the meeting turned to how Honor is discussed outside of the academic realm. Other discussion focused on potential policy considerations by the Committee, including mixed jury panels and a bystander clause. The common sentiment among students was that the Committee needs to be fully open with the community with these proposals.

Brittany Wengel – there was a mock trial in the Law School this week.

Andi Chernau – there is one active investigation, and there was a CR submitted last week.

Conor O’Boyle – there are four upcoming trials in November.

Evan Behrle opened the floor to discussion on the proposal submitted by Families for Honor.

**III. Old Business**

The Committee talked about considering focus groups and surveys. The survey must wait until the end of the month, as the administration limits the number of active University-wide surveys. Evan Behrle opened up the floor to discussion on the types of questions and ideas that the Committee would like to discuss in focus groups. Evan Behrle would like to center the focus groups on issues related to mixed jury panels. A pattern of concern emerged among Committee members last week, dealing with the notion that any new proposed legislation will exacerbate the division between the Committee and students.

Evan proposed to the idea of calling together a great number of students to come together and discuss Honor writ large, in the manner of a constitutional convention.

Marie Fleming spoke, saying that she agrees with the ideal of Evan’s suggestion, but on a practical level she is unsure if it will be effective, given that the composition of the group of students would likely not be representative.

Michelle Butler spoke in favor of this idea, but her one reservation is that the student groups might suggest extreme changes to the current System.

**IV. New Business**
The Committee considered a proposed structural policy change submitted by Families for Honor, which calls for the establishment of a plagiarism review board (PRB), similar to an I-Panel, which would determine whether a reported case of plagiarism is a grammatical plagiarism or an honor plagiarism.

Natalie Whitaker brought up the point that she believes that I-Panels should be screening for grammatical plagiarism.

Josh Myers asked a question of Families for Honor inquiring why they believed that the PRB should be composed of five individuals, including three non-students.

Conor O'Boyle referenced the McIntire Academic Integrity Board as an analog to the proposed body, where a body of non-students will make a determination on a potential act of cheating.

Jessica Alvarez gave the opinion that many Committee members, especially Law or Darden students, would be qualified and capable of determining whether an act of plagiarism has been committed. Evan Behrle spoke, saying that he would prefer that any addition to the System fits within the current logics and rules of the System.