

**HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING  
OCTOBER 30, 2016**

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. COMMUNITY INPUT**
- III. OFFICER REPORTS**
  - A. Katharine Graham—Vice Chair for Community Relations, ARCH
    - a. SARA breakfast coming up on November 18.
  - B. Ariana Zetlin—Vice Chair for Education, EDUC
    - a. Professor Green, who specializes in mindfulness, is helping with an Honor Week event on Friday, November 18.
  - C. Sarah Wyckoff—Vice Chair for Investigations, CLAS
    - a. Committee members should shadow an I-Panel if they haven't already
  - D. Austin Sim —Vice Chair for Hearings, LAW
    - a. None
  - E. Matt West —Chair, CLAS
    - a. Will discuss proposed by-law changes during “New Business”
- IV. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**
  - A. Corinne Thomas (COMM): Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) meeting on Wednesday, Nov 16 at 4PM. Committee members are encouraged to bring topics to discuss, or they can send them to Corinne.
  - B. Caroline Herre (ARCH): Lawn and Range Chair Insurance program updates – need to follow up with Tom Faulders from the Alumni Association to discuss continuing the program this year.
- V. OLD BUSINESS**
  - A. Wrap-Up of Last Week's Discussion-- Priorities for Remainder of Term
    - a. Maggie Rowe (LAW) recommended expanding co-sponsorship opportunities.
    - b. Corinne Thomas (COMM) suggested more frequent partnerships with Greek organizations. Since they have weekly mandatory chapter meetings, this is a good place to introduce Honor for a couple minutes and make a personal connection. The Committee and Support Officers could redesign the current FOA presentation to create a more informal Q&A period. Honor should also consider having a greater presence during the spring recruitment period.
    - c. Vendarryl Jenkins (CLAS) requested an update on the Diversity Initiative Award. VJ, who helped design the program as the Vice Chair for Community Relations in 2015-2016, discussed the purpose of the awards and mentioned the issues with follow up with last year's recipients. Matt West (Chair, CLAS) mentioned the potential for the awards to

- create problems for students receiving financial aid. He plans to discuss this further with administrators at Student Financial Services. Jen Yeaton (BATT) and Caroline Herre (ARCH) asked if students on financial aid received exceptions for grants (for research and other purposes). They suggested that shifting the focus of the DIA to a grant rather than award could address the current problems.
- d. Vendarryl Jenkins (CLAS) proposed improving information sharing by regularly sending the minutes from weekly Committee meetings to Support Officers.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Proposed By-Law Addition—Discretion to Decline or Defer Jurisdiction
  - a. Matt West (Chair, CLAS) presented a proposed By-law change that would allow the Executive Committee to decline jurisdiction over or dismiss reports that are too complex/technical for support officers to investigate or reports that have already been handled by another university body or would fit best under another disciplinary process.
    - a. Question: what should be the required voting threshold (majority, four-fifths, or unanimous?)
  - b. Caroline Herre (ARCH) and Charlie Strickland (GBUS) asked if the new language would allow a reporter to appeal a decision to decline jurisdiction over a report or dismiss it for the proposed reasons.
  - c. Vendarryl Jenkins (CLAS) voiced his concern that the new language moves away from the Committee's jurisdiction over all cases of lying, cheating, and stealing. Honor is a part of everything we do at the University and an aspect of students' life in all ways. This change may limit this vision in a way and may undermine the Honor System's ability to prevent lying in situations such as Title IX cases.
  - d. Sarah Wyckoff (Vice Chair for Investigations, CLAS) asked when a report is considered "accepted." Matt West (Chair, CLAS) stated that a report is effectively accepted when Support Officers are assigned to the case, which occurs after a report has been submitted
  - e. Austin Sim (Vice Chair for Hearings, LAW) said that the new language doesn't stop the Committee from handling any particular cases; rather it, allows Exec to drop the rare reports that are so extreme or difficult that the Committee can't investigate or adjudicate them.
  - f. Matt West (Chair, CLAS) said that assumption of honesty through other processes – that's still there. We will still have presumed jurisdiction over all cases of lying, cheating, and stealing.
  - g. Will Rainey (SEAS) mentioned that the Exec Drop function currently in the By-laws may already achieve the purpose that the new language is intended to create.
  - h. Matt West (Chair, CLAS) emphasized that the proposal is intended for cases where the facts at hand are inextricably linked overly technical or problematic disputes, such as claims of sexual assault or complex landlord disputes.
  - i. Vendarryl Jenkins (CLAS) was concerned that in the future, Exec may come to view this as a standard drop function for tricky cases, leading to its misuse. He asked if the Committee doesn't already have the tools to handle this situation.
  - j. Matt Breen (GBUS) believed that the rationale makes sense and the Committee should have the option to dismiss or decline jurisdiction in certain situations. We should trust that future Committees will want to adjudicate all appropriate cases within their power. Overly technical cases can potentially be tough, and giving Exec a way to address them makes sense.

- k. Will Rainey (SEAS) was concerned that the new by-law would allow administrators to place pressure on Exec to drop a case they don't want the Committee to take because of fears of the legal ramifications.
- l. Maggie Rowe (LAW) mentioned that a Law student going through Student Conduct Committee process could see this caveat and claim they don't have to go through both disciplinary processes.
- m. Caroline Herre (ARCH) and Maggie Rowe (LAW) recognized that problems could arise if a student appeals after an Honor case got messy, as they could point to the new section and claim that the Committee should have dropped the case before it was accepted.

## VII. COMMUNITY INPUT

- A. Soleil Reed (Second Year Support Officer) shared her opinions of the by-law proposal. She said that the wording of the proposal raises questions about what other disciplinary bodies apply—University processes vs. non-University processes. Also, she argued that the decision by Exec should be unanimous to exercise the proposed function, since Exec would be unilaterally deciding the outcome without Investigators recommending it to them (as is the case for the existing Exec Drop function).
- B. Steven Seril (Second Year Support Officer) mentioned that, after listening to discussion in the ongoing Support Officer dialogues, it appears that the priorities of the Support Officer pool differ from those of the Committee. He suggested that the Committee come to the dialogues and help Support Officers put the ideas to action. Support Officers don't have the time to come to another hour-long meeting and there should be more open communication.
- C. Lucie Oken (Third Year Support Officer) said that Support Officers come up with many ideas for Honor, and there's a frustrating disconnect between them and the Committee. Support Officers don't think there's a way for them to make substantive change within Honor because of this disconnect.
- D. Sarah Wyckoff (Vice Chair for Investigations, CLAS) said that Support Officers and the Committee need to all be in the same space and get to know each other. Maybe minutes from dialogue groups can help the Committee know more about what's going on in the dialogues so it can begin talk about them.
- E. Steven Seril reiterated the need for open conversation and dialogues between Committee and Support Officers.
- F. Ory Streeter (SMED) mentioned the need for someone to represent Support Officers at Committee meetings on a weekly basis—some sort of liaison between the two groups.
- G. Steven Seril said that he believes Support Officers want more interaction on a larger scale.
- H. Soleil Reed said that the Committee, which makes the decisions, should hear more input from Support Officers before doing so.
- I. Matt West (Chair, CLAS) mentioned that Exec can and should serve as the connectors and liaisons between the Support Officers and the Committee, and that Exec can work on improving how it creates connections between the two groups.
- J. Jen Yeaton (BATI) asked Steven, Soleil, and Lucie what topic is most pressing.
  - a. Steven identified outreach, taking stances/providing support to certain groups, incidents of racial bias, and the fact that Honor doesn't come forward to stand up with students on those issues. Honor should take a more active role in social justice issues.
  - b. Lucie Oken identified the disconnect between Honor and the greater community, and the fact that many students believe that Honor isn't relevant to

them. She asked if the Committee can make statements about issues on Grounds. If we can't or don't react, people will view us as more punitive and not as a support system.

- K. Vendarryl Jenkins (CLAS) suggested assigning a group of Support Officer to each Committee member to create more direct access.
- L. Caroline Herre (ARCH) reminded everyone that Support Officers are the Committee's most engaged constituents
- M. Matt West (Chair, CLAS) promised to send more information with Committee about the dialogue groups to increase attendance at the dialogues.

## **VIII. CLOSED SESSION**

Proposed By-Law Language—October 30, 2016

INSERT as I.C (after “B. Jurisdiction” and before what is currently “C. Special Programs”):

C. Discretion to Decline Jurisdiction. The Honor Committee may decline jurisdiction to accept, initiate or pursue, or may dismiss, any report of an alleged Honor Offense when, *in the sole reasonable discretion of the Executive Committee*, the conduct alleged in such report (i) implicates technical, legal or regulatory matters about which average University students may lack sufficient training or expertise; or (ii) has been or will be investigated, adjudicated, remediated, sanctioned or otherwise addressed by another University administrative or disciplinary process. In deciding whether to decline jurisdiction over or dismiss reports of conduct implicating other University processes, the Executive Committee may consult/coordinate with relevant University officials. Decisions by the Executive Committee to decline jurisdiction or dismiss a report hereunder shall be made by [majority/four-fifths/unanimous] vote. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to require the Executive Committee to decline jurisdiction over or dismiss any report that meets the requirements of Sections B.1, above.

REVISE Section IV.A, as follows (revisions in bold):

1. Making a Report. Any person may report an Alleged Honor Offense that meets the requirements of Section I.B., above, provided that such Report is made within two years of the date of the alleged Act. To make a Report, the reporting witness or “reporter” should contact either an Honor Advisor or a Committee member. Once a report has been submitted, it cannot be retracted by the reporter.
2. Dismissal of a Report. Under the following circumstances, a Report may be dismissed:
  - a. The Executive Committee may dismiss a Report that it determines, by a majority vote, to have been made in bad faith.
  - b. The Vice Chair for Investigations may dismiss a Report if he or she determines that the Honor Committee lacks jurisdiction pursuant to Section I.B., above, or that the two-year limitations period described in Paragraph 1, above, has been exceeded.
  - c. The Executive Committee may dismiss a Report pursuant to the provisions of Section I.C, above.
3. No Re-Investigation Following Acquittal. ....