

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING

February 2, 2020

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. COMMUNITY INPUT**
 - A. None
- III. OFFICER REPORTS**
 - A. Vice Chair for Community Relations** (Lucy Krasker)
 - 1. CRDAC meeting within next few weeks
 - B. Vice Chair for Education** (Mary Beth Barksdale)
 - 1. Elections outreach events upcoming to educate on referenda and candidates
 - C. Vice Chair for Investigations** (Sally Greenberg)
 - 1. I-Panels coming up in next few weeks
 - D. Vice Chair for Hearings** (Alex Spratley)
 - 1. Updates for upcoming hearings
 - E. Chair** (Lillie Lyon)
 - 1. Thank you for sending in thoughts on policy
- IV. SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**
 - A. Policies & Procedures Subcommittee** (Committee Co-Chair: Stephen Paul)
 - 1. None
 - B. Faculty & TA Advisory Committee** (Committee Co-Chair: Lucian Mirra)
 - 1. None
 - C. Investigative Procedures Working Group** (Chair: Sally Greenberg)
 - 1. None
 - D. Joint Cases Working Group** (Co-Chairs: Elizabeth Thompson and Todd Truesdale)
 - 1. None
- V. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**
 - A. ARCH: None
 - B. BATT: None
 - C. CLAS: None
 - D. NURS: HIPPA and Honor event upcoming
 - E. LAW: None
 - F. SEAS: None
 - G. MED: None
 - H. COMM: Stock pitch contest set up for 3/27
 - I. GSAS: None
 - J. EDUC: Faculty council meeting upcoming for Curry
 - K. SCPS: None

L. GBUS: None

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Cases Arising Out of Title IX Proceedings By-law Proposals

1. Original language discussed last week on the table, as well as a modified version put forward by Chair LL which drops the example in the by-law language and includes that “relevance” in addition to “considered” by Title IX office. LAW TT proposed language that would not create a specific standard for taking cases from Title IX but would just base decision on recommendation from Title IX office without defining standard. New proposal from LAW SP, same process as already discussed and agreed upon but defines a different standard:
 - a) LAW SP proposal would exclude cases requiring factual determination about existence of any element of behavior of Prohibited Conduct, or any cases requiring factual determination about immediate circumstances during time period where alleged Prohibited Conduct would have occurred.
2. Original proposal from last week taken off the table in favor of the modified proposal from Chair LL which includes relevancy. GSAS CM argues that the relevancy standard clarifies the original policy and creates stricter bar for cases that could be excluded. LAW SP argues that relevancy in federal legal rules is still extremely broad and does not narrow the “considered” standard in terms of what cases can be taken. LAW TT states that his proposed policy removes the ambiguity of having an overbroad standard and allows for Title IX office to have discretion over cases. Some Committee members raise concerns about the vagueness of not having a standard. Committee members discuss the costs of benefits of the various policies. Any final policy would likely have to be accompanied by longer memos explaining context of Committee’s reasoning to future Committees and Title IX offices.
3. Committee members debate the merits and drawbacks of the three policies on the table. Some Committee members express concern over how the significance criterion of guilt would interact with any case implicating Title IX issues, as accused students and reporters may or may not want to bring up the Title IX process as part of their arguments during a hearing. After further debate about the extent to which Title IX processes could be brought up during an Honor case process and how that could affect survivors, the Committee concluded debate.
4. The Committee moved to vote on the proposals. The Committee adopted the modified proposal from Chair LL by a vote of 16-6-1, to take effect the next day February 3rd, 2020.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. None

VIII. COMMUNITY INPUT

A. None

IX. CLOSED SESSION

A. None