

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING

October 20, 2019

- I. **ROLL CALL**
- II. **COMMUNITY INPUT**
- III. **OFFICER REPORTS**
 - A. **Vice Chair for Community Relations** (Lucy Krasker)
 - 1. Co sponsored culture fest in amphitheater
 - 2. Upcoming: Pancakes for parkinsons, Lotl, OYFA food festival, and more!
 - 3. Popular Assembly: Committee Members (CMs) please purchase food and submit a reimbursement
 - 4. First CRDAC meeting Nov 1
 - B. **Vice Chair for Education** (Mary Beth Barksdale)
 - 1. Popular assembly 2 weeks away
 - 2. We need more faculty from law and darden for our Pop assembly event
 - 3. Please keep sending more people in through Wednesday
 - C. **Vice Chair for Investigations** (Sally Greenberg)
 - D.
 - i. I Panels coming up
 - E. **Vice Chair for Hearings** (Alex Spratley)
 - F.
 - i. Hearing on deck this weekend
 - G. **Chair** (Lillie Lyon)
 - H.
 - i. **TOTOTL (trick or treating on the lawn) is coming up, Honor will be giving candy at 37 West**
- IV. **SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**
 - A. **Policies & Procedures Subcommittee** (Committee Co-Chair: Stephen Paul)
 - B.
 - i. **Fleshing out some of the proposals we have been discussing in committee**
 - C. **Faculty & TA Advisory Committee** (Committee Co-Chair: Lucian Mirra)
 - D.
 - i. **NA**
 - E. **Investigative Procedures Working Group** (Chair: Sally Greenberg)
 - F.
 - i. **NA**
 - G. **Joint Cases Working Group** (Co-Chairs: Elizabeth Thompson and Todd Truesdale)
 - H.
 - i. **Hashing out preliminary details**
- V. **REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**
 - A. **SARCH** – have finalized details for our events; grad student
 - B. **BATT** – NA
 - C. **CLAS** – College faculty presentation, got some engagement from faculty members
 - D. **COMM** – Feedback check in sent mid-semester to faculty
 - E. **GBUS** – Popular assembly event set, doing some engagement
 - F. **EDUC** – Working on faculty engagement and buy into the system; getting date and time for popular Assembly event
 - G. **GSAS** – NA
 - H. **LAW** – Popular assembly; meeting with section reps to talk about Honor expectations and information
 - I. **MED** – Working with NURS to get a joint event for popular assembly
 - J. **NURS** – working with MED for a popular assembly event; having a lunch event later this week
 - K. **SCPS** – meeting with dean to host a remote SCPS event; engaging with faculty

- L. **ENGR – NA**
- VI. **OLD BUSINESS**
 - A. Internal Disclosure Policy (Conceptual Discussion)
 - B. RECAP
 - 1. Discussion last meeting centered around who to internally disclose to
 - 2. Settled on disclosure to one member of the Executive Committee and the Honor Special Assistant (Evan Pivonka)
 - 3. Executive Committee member left unspecified to allow CMs to choose who they feel comfortable with
 - 4. Chair would also have to be informed due to their role in Committee
 - 5. CANNOT:
 - a) prevent CMs going through this process from voting and attending Committee Meetings
 - 6. CAN:
 - a) Prevent CMs from serving on I Panels and hearings (suspension)
 - b) Recommend a recall vote from respective school
 - C. **DISCUSSION**
 - D. **Initial Comments**
 - 1. **Rep. Truesdale LAW** – we should have different judicial proceedings (Title IX, UJC, etc.) put into different categories (we handle all UJC cases a certain way, Title IX a certain way, etc.)
 - 2. **Rep. Mirra SCPS** – There are different levels of seriousness within each proceeding, we should take those into account
 - E. **Further Discussion Points**
 - 1. Logic of Standards Panel evaluating every case themselves, regardless of the result of other proceedings: being in Honor is a privilege, not a right. Having everything going through the Standards Panel accounts for the inconsistency in outside processes/proceedings. Honor should evaluate the fitness of its members itself. Also would be more fair and equal for all members.
 - 2. Logic of Standards Panel evaluating members after the disciplinary body wraps up its process: Honor should accept what other disciplinary bodies determined. It is not fair to Honor members to go through proceedings for the same act twice.
 - 3. Expressed discomfort at a standards panel adjudicating cases with Title IX, UJC, etc; Potential at undermining the judiciary process of other bodies at the University
- VII. **NEW BUSINESS**
- VIII. **COMMUNITY INPUT**
- IX. **CLOSED SESSION**