

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 12, 2017

I. ROLL CALL

- Absent: Joe Marchese-Schmitt (BATTI), Kasey Groves (COMM), Stephanie Roe (GSAS), Maggie Rowe (LAW), Shaun Kenney (SCPS)

II. COMMUNITY INPUT

- Many students attended the meeting and expressed support for change within the Honor System
 - Demanding change
 - Asking for support for “Democratization Amendment”
 - Concerns about oligarchy
 - Concerns about repeated majority votes for change
 - Worried that caution will result in inaction
 - Wants to make system more democratic by decreasing voting threshold by 5%
 - Wants to increase ownership in the system
 - Want students to feel that their vote counts and to have increased ownership in the system
- Question: Perceived hesitancy of Honor Chair in discussing the proposal
 - Attributed to personal conversation and taken out of context
- Question: Has the Honor Committee acted appropriately and in a timely manner in response to last year’s vote?
 - Response:
 - Matt West (Chair, CLAS): Honor Audit Commission (HAC) Largest audit of the System in recent history
 - Aryn Frazier: Concerns about change taking year after year with no guarantee of eventual change (as a result of a vote by a small margin)
 - Katie Deal (CLAS) spoke from Honor Audit Commission perspective as the Committee member on the Honor Audit Commission
 - Mention of IR Reform currently being considered by the Committee
- Question: Concern over percentages of the vote not representing the perspectives of the entire student body
- Question: Accountability of the HAC in pursuing a multi-sanction system?
 - Katie Deal: HAC is going through case examples in figuring out what worked and what did not, not defining specific options.
 - HAC is developing a best practices report
 - Pros of various proposals/ideas
 - Cons of various proposals/ideas
 - Will be accessible to all
 - References the 2002 audit and its availability online
- Question: Has the HAC discussed a multi-sanction system in a meaningful way?
 - Katie Deal: HAC is research-focused
 - HAC will do case-studies about other schools, hold focus groups, survey
 - HAC should not be forced to transform its results into a sanction system

III. OFFICER REPORTS

- A. Katharine Graham—Vice Chair for Community Relations, ARCH
 - a. Panel with Minority Rights Coalition (MRC) last week went well
- B. Ariana Zetlin—Vice Chair for Education, EDUC
 - a. Changing the wording on the plaques: Transition to language “I’ve neither give nor received **unauthorized** aid on this assignment.”
- C. Sarah Wyckoff—Vice Chair for Investigations, CLAS
 - a. I-Panel coming up this week
 - b. Informed Retraction work will be discussed later
- D. Austin Sim —Vice Chair for Hearings, LAW
 - a. Will be discussed during closed session
- E. Matt West —Chair, CLAS
 - a. International Student Booklet: final draft being sent to printer early this week

IV. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

- Katie Deal:
 - HAC met last Wednesday
 - Divided into teams to work on different focus groups
 - Opened herself up to questions
- Corinne Thomas (COMM):
 - FAC is meeting tomorrow in the Trial Room at 4pm – everyone should go!
- Jennifer Yeaton (BATT):
 - Beyond the Book is happening! First meetings are happening this week and next week, along with some second meetings happening next week too
 - Multicultural Student Center has two of the four groups under their charge
 - Jennifer has two groups under her charge (as an Honor Committee Representative and a Library Council member)
- Chad Hogan (CLAS):
 - Policies and Procedures will look at CMD process for the rest of the semester, specifically looking at the investigative process
 - Opened himself up to questions
 - Sarah brought up that she and Katie have begun working on the feasibility of a CMD process change
- Will Rainey (SEAS):
 - Upcoming Engineering School event
- Hannah Chacon (MED):
 - Working in med school about the ways in which Honor is applicable to the med school

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Committee Response to Proposed Amendment to Honor Committee Constitution
 - a. Proposal from Exec for how to address Proposed Amendment
 - i. Step 1: Committee does not take an official stance on the proposal itself
 - ii. Step 2: Encourage all Committee members to publicly state their own opinions & Create an online repository of Committee Representative opinions that is publicized
 - iii. Step 3: Impartial outreach to encourage voting
 - 1. Educating people about what the amendment does (explanatory function)
 - 2. Push to Get Out the Vote! (Matt West also mentioned that he is working with UBE to help create polling stations, in addition to online voting, to encourage voting)
 - b. Olivia Sabik (GSAS) and Charlie Strickland (GBUS) express support for proposal/each Committee member individually representing their own views
 - c. Ory Streeter (MED) expressed support for the Committee expressing a collective opinion
 - d. VJ Jenkins (CLAS) strongly encouraged the Committee taking an official stance on the proposal because he believes that sends a powerful message
 - e. Will Rainey (SEAS) discussed the usefulness of a constitutional change versus a by-law change
 - f. Ory Streeter (MED) emphasizes that the actually important discussions are that the constitutional amendments that come after this vote
 - g. Many more people expressed opinions, including Katie Deal, Caroline Herre (ARCH), Corinne Thomas, Cameron Kiddy (SEAS), and Sarah Wyckoff (Vice Chair for Investigations, CLAS)
 - h. Ory Streeter proposed that the Honor Committee create a pros/cons graphic for the proposed constitutional amendment
 - i. There was general support for this idea
 - ii. The Committee later circled back after community input and decided to consider writing a “majority opinion” and a “dissenting opinion”

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Brief Update on Discussion of IR Proposals (Sarah Wyckoff)
 - a. Synthesized thoughts from Committee retreat
 - i. Temporal IR
 - 1. Questionable constitutionality (it substantially differs from the IR that students voted on)
 - ii. Versus reverting to original IR language: “Inextricably linked”
 - iii. Versus “Substantially similar benefit”
 - iv. The Committee will return to thoroughly discussing this next week

VII. COMMUNITY INPUT

- Question: How is 55% vs. 60% “arbitrary” (“arbitrary” being language that was used previously by Committee members)?
 - Response that it seemed to be a reaction to the specific numbers from last Spring
 - Comment about it being symbolic

- Question: How do you defend the single sanction after the vote last Spring?
 - Honor Audit Commission
 - IR Reform
- Question: Request for a numerical vote in support or against the particular proposal
 - (see further down in notes)
- Question: Request for a show of hands of who is against the proposal
 - Discussion ensued about whether or not people want to take a stance
 - Attiya Latif made point that this is a great opportunity for transparency and Committee members should take it
 - Some people expressed that they need to return to their constituents to check in
 - 4 people expressed opposition to proposal:
 - With elaboration, one person expressed that the student body should consider this question, and she believes that her support is solely the support of a single student that matters no more than any other student's
 - 8 people expressed support of the proposal
- Nathan Gonzalez, one of the sponsors of the proposed amendment, spoke about the true purpose of this particular constitutional amendment to be democratization. He recognized the emphasis of this discussion on single versus multi-sanction, but wants to acknowledge that his purpose in writing the proposal is intended to be a single step forward among many to make the Honor System accessible to the current student body. He wants the Honor Committee to be more representative of current students' opinions.
- Aryn Frazier:
 - "The land belongs to the living." –Thomas Jefferson
 - Acknowledged that we do not all take all of Thomas Jefferson's words as guidance
 - Step-by-step, related proposal to each of the stated values of the Honor Committee
 - It is critical that the Honor Committee is representative of this entire community
 - Students absolutely have the power to bring forward proposals about honor
 - It is critical that the Honor Committee does not discount any vote because of voter turnout
 - President Obama: "Most important office someone can hold is the office of citizen"
 - It is critical that the Honor Committee does not tell anyone that their engagement is "not enough to matter"
 - Our discussion conflated this particular proposal with the discussion of single versus multiple sanction, and in doing so lost the intended purpose of the proposal
 - All students have the right to govern themselves
 - Representatives need to be more in tune with those they represent
 - Only interaction with Honor cannot be when someone is in trouble

VIII. CLOSED SESSION