Community Input: None

Exec Updates

1. Jack Stone, VCCR: None

2. Caitlin Kreinheder, VCE: HRL program running through educators, reminder to let Caitlin know when education events are held so we can keep track of what’s happening

3. Maggie Regnery, VCI: No updates

4. Gabrielle Bray, VCH: Hearing next Saturday 9/11

5. Andrew Chambers, Chair: Selections are this week, please sign up for the interview time slots if you have the time. If you want to be involved, shape the new class of SOs, please consider staffing one. The budget is also 80% finalized and is going to alumni hall tonight. Andy meeting with them on Tuesday, if you think there’s anything that needs to be changed then please let Andy know. Alumni hall is very willing to work with us this year on budget. Andy notes that it is very easy to be reimbursed for Honor events.

School Update

Architecture: SO from Architecture is applying, about which Caitlin is very excited.

Batten: Meet and greet in the works.

College: None

Commerce: None

Education: Would like to do a meet and greet event with Education UJC representatives.

Darden: Darden had their presentation for the first years on Friday and signed the scrolls. They understand the Honor System and were informed on how to get involved with the Honor. Good kick off overall.

GSAS: None

Law: Final interview for SOs from the law school.

Medical: None

Nursing: None

SCPS: None
Presentation of New Sanctioning Options
Caitlin Kreinheder and Gabrielle Bray propose a new sanctioning system with a sanction that does not involve leaving the University. She passes out a proposed flowchart and explains it to the Committee.

Gabrielle Bray emphasizes that this refocuses the point of the investigation away from Act, if a student has already admitted to the Act. This allows hearings to focus more on the Knowledge and Significance in cases where students have admitted to Act.

The transcript notation delays your life, not derails it. This does not allow yourself to represent yourself as a member of the Community of Trust. Your life is delayed but you are simultaneously re-committing to the Community of Trust.

There is an option to refer to the professor in the case where a student is found guilty of Act and Knowledge.

If one pleads guilty in this proposal, expulsion is pulled off the table.

The Committee’s Comments on the New Sanctioning Options
Lucian Mirra wants to know why there is an I-Panel if the student has already pleaded guilty to the Act. He is concerned that there won’t be enough people to staff the number of hearings that would arise from this proposed student.

Andy Chambers responds to Lucian’s concerns that we could cut times of case processing down when the sanction is lesser, similar to the federal court system.

Lucian responds by saying that there’s no reason to have an I-Panel, and that when you admit Act you also usually admit Knowledge.

Caitlin disagrees with Lucian.

Gabrielle says that a panel of students must decide whether something is significant or not. Also, she adds that she has seen students admit Act without Knowledge. She also clarifies that this proposal was conceived with entirely mixed panels.

Maggie raises concerns that the transcript notation would impact students in McIntire more than others.

Achintya asks why when significance is found, the case is referred back to the professors.

Caitlin says that this is a way to include the professor in the system.
Lucian says that professors would not like this proposal.

Achintya says that we should acknowledge the Act instead of pleading guilty.

Dan asks how the transcript notation affects international students.

Achintya clarifies that there are a number of reasons that international students are affected by transcripts.

Christopher says that the proposal is exceedingly complex and that there are a number of areas with due process issues. He wonders how we prevent disparate impacts based on composition of panels and who pleads what, when. He says that the primary goal should be “What should be the point of this plan?” He urges us to consider consistency instead of variability. Chris also raises due process concerns.

**Line of Succession**

Andy would like to address a line of succession within the Honor System. If Andy were to die, there is nobody to chair the Honor Committee. There becomes an immense power vacuum in the event of the death or abdication of an Honor Chair. He sees this as a problem, and would like a game plan.

What Andy proposes is that there is a line which says “The Honor Committee shall establish by-laws which establish the succession of the Vice-Chairs.”

Achintya asks if a constitutional amendment is even necessary.

Andy says that the constitution fortifies the succession, because the bylaws do not necessarily have to be followed.

Lucian asks who runs the election.

Gabrielle says that whoever is on the Honor Committee acts honorably during an election and admits whether there are biases.

Achintya does not understand why we need an amendment. He also says that any three members of the Committee can meet without the Chair.

Andy clarifies that this is about interim decision making.
The Objective of Sanctioning

Andy says that our objective is to uphold the Community.

He believes that sanctioning has two points:
1) Deterrent
   a) Purge the student from the Community of Trust with the Single Sanction
2) Educational
   a) One can learn from their mistakes

He asks us to consider whether or not we want to create a system that Deters or Educates.

Dan asks if for a deterrent system to work, don’t the students have to agree that the Offense in question is worth removal from the Community.

Lucian says this is about carrot versus stick, that the decision making is not fully developed until the age of eighteen. He says that we have a more diverse population than we do now, because we can lead people toward moral development.

Caitlin is pro-education.

Katherine raises concerns about defanging the Honor System.

Shalmi wants to keep the nuclear option of the single sanction for people who unwillingly recommit.

Achintya says that deterrence as a concept is worth holding on to, and that we need to explore other sanctions as an option.

Jack argues that we need to educate students more before they come in, because most students frankly don’t know because our incoming student education is so weak.

Katherine suggests a COLA where students learn more about Honor.

Caitlin says this is the system we have and it’s failing.

Achintya says that we need a recommittal to the system, something where you’re reminded every year.