

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING

September 29, 2019

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. COMMUNITY INPUT**
- III. OFFICER REPORTS**
 - A. Vice Chair for Community Relations** (Lucy Krasker)
 - 1. None
 - B. Vice Chair for Education** (Mary Beth Barksdale)
 - 1. All
 - C. Vice Chair for Investigations** (Sally Greenberg)
 - 1. None
 - D. Vice Chair for Hearings** (Alex Spratley)
 - 1. Hearings to be staffed 10/13 and 10/27
 - E. Chair** (Lillie Lyon)
 - 1. No meeting next Sunday
- IV. SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**
 - A. Policies & Procedures Subcommittee** (Committee Co-Chair: Stephen Paul)
 - 1. Meetings 5:00 PM on Wednesdays.]
 - B. Faculty & TA Advisory Committee** (Committee Co-Chair: Lucian Mirra)
 - C. Investigative Procedures Working Group** (Chair: Sally Greenberg)
 - D. Joint Cases Working Group** (Co-Chairs: Elizabeth Thompson and Todd Truesdale)
- V. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**
 - A. ARCH:** Meeting with dean postponed.
 - B. BATT:** Midterm event this week for students
 - C. CLAS:** Faculty meeting presentation upcoming
 - D. COMM:** None.
 - E. GBUS:** None.
 - F. EDUC:** None.
 - G. GSAS:** Upcoming Graduate & Professional School Council.
 - H. LAW:** None.
 - I. MED:** None.
 - J. NURS:** Upcoming meetings with deans and events with food and discussions about patient/provider trust.
 - K. SCPS:** None.
 - L. SEAS:** Successful event with Center for Diversity in Engineering. Awaiting responses from introductory CS course professors.
- VI. OLD BUSINESS**

A. Amendment and Housekeeping By-law Proposal

1. Passed with no objections.

B. Non-Degree-Seeking Student By-law Proposal

1. Passed with no objections.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Internal Disclosure Policy (Conceptual Discussion)

1. DW asked if a disclosure requirement would be legal for confidential disciplinary proceedings, Chair LL confirms that it is.
2. Committee members discussed why it might be important to require support officers and Committee members to disclose whether or not they are in disciplinary proceedings. Generally, Committee members agreed that in principle, it is important for support officers and Committee members to disclose this information for the safety and trust of people they are working with.
3. Chair LL proposes that support officers/Committee members should disclose whether or not they are in a proceeding and which process they are currently in. They should also be suspended until the outcome of the proceeding, with a time limit after which they would be permanently removed.
4. GSAS CM and SCPS LM mention that it might be problematic to broadly suspend all students in any disciplinary proceeding, e.g. should support officers be suspended for traffic court violations? Substantively different from something like a Title IX offense.
5. BATT SS mentions that this may require a constitutional amendment for Committee members.
6. Committee members point out the complexity of disclosures involving external disciplinary processes like police investigations.
7. GBUS BI points out that suspending people during proceeding and before outcome, if people file frivolous complaints to target Committee members or support officers it could result in unjustified suspensions.
8. LAW SP believes that Honor without an amendment cannot remove Committee members or prevent them from voting due to constitutional limits.
9. Chair LL proposes a suspension for everything but voting for Committee members under the disclosure policy to avoid constitutional concerns.
10. Committee members discuss whether the automatic suspension upon disclosure is appropriate or whether the Committee should evaluate disclosures to determine whether or not suspension until outcome is correct for the case.
11. SEAS KN proposes that we can make determinations based on worst-case scenario, what Honor internal disciplinary action would be if the student were guilty.

12. CLAS AS proposes that if we were to consider evaluating cases on a discretionary basis for whether or not students should be suspended during disciplinary proceedings, the Executive Committee should have stringent guidelines for determining suspension.
13. LAW SP proposes that students could have option of disclosing more information to Executive Committee, but if they refused would have automatic suspension. Otherwise, could evaluate facts to determine appropriateness of suspension. SP states the point of policy is to ensure students working on cases are not ethically compromised.
14. Committee members discuss whether such disclosures should go to Standards Panel or Executive Committee. There is also a question on whether the students/reporters/witnesses within cases should know about the disclosures.
15. BATT SS discusses that it might be useful for P&P to discuss different levels of confidentiality within Honor.
16. CLAS AS proposes that after outcome of disciplinary proceedings, Standards Panel should handle next steps for post-adjudication.
17. Chair LL proposes that students have 5 days with reasonable extensions to disclose after beginning of disciplinary proceedings. Committee members agree.
18. SCPS LM brings up whether students found not guilty/not responsible in other disciplinary proceedings should be automatically reinstated or if further investigation by Standards and re-adjudication would happen.

VIII. COMMUNITY INPUT

IX. CLOSED SESSION