

**HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING  
NOVEMBER 6, 2016**

**I. ROLL CALL**

Absent: Anna Cavanaugh (SPCS), Ariana Zetlin (EDUC), Katharine Graham (ARCH), VJ Jenkins (CLAS), Chad Hogan (CLAS), Matt Breen (GBUS), Hannah Earl (NURS)

**II. COMMUNITY INPUT**

None

**III. OFFICER REPORTS**

A. Sarah Wyckoff – Vice Chair for Investigations, CLAS

- a. Thanks to those who volunteered for recent I-Panels
- b. The IR working group met on Wednesday, November 2 to discuss advisor training during the IR period.
- c. Met with an administrator to talk about students under stress and best practices for advising and the IR
- d. Look for further email updates from the IR Working Group

B. Austin Sim —Vice Chair for Hearings, LAW

- a. There will be an open hearing on November 19<sup>th</sup> at 10 AM

C. Matt West —Chair, CLAS

- a. Later in the meeting, we will discuss how the Committee can address recent incidents of hate speech on Grounds, after releasing a statement on Wednesday, November 2.
- b. At tonight's meeting with the Support Officer pool, we discussed how the Committee should address hate speech and intolerance in the community. Below is a summary of some of the major topics discussed:
  - i. Devin Rossin (Support Officer, Education Coordinator): Honor's education often involves front heavy discussion, coming at the beginning of the year or immediately after an incident without also including much follow through. We need to be consistent in the support we provide and the values we promote.
  - ii. Important for Support Officers and Committee members to actively model the behavior we want to promote—being a good human being, showing genuine interest in the effort, being an ally to other organizations and individuals
  - iii. Need to avoid complacency and make a concerted effort to change how we talk about the Community of Trust
- c. As an agency organization, the Committee is a branch of the administration—we need to keep this in mind, but that does not mean we can't be an active part of the effort to combat hate speech.
- d. Jennifer Yeaton (BATT) asked how the Committee can work with Eliminate the Hate Campaign, especially given the fact that the campaign overlaps with Honor Week (November 14-18).
- e. Update on behalf of Ariana Zetlin (Vice Chair for Education, EDUC)

- i. Mentorship program for new and current support officers being planned
- ii. Final event list for Honor Week coming out mid-week.
- iii. Please make an effort to attend Honor Week events!

#### **IV. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

- A. Katie Deal (CLAS): The Honor Audit Commission is getting the final stages of approval to send survey questions. Committee members can always send feedback and comments for the Commission to Katie.

#### **V. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Proposed By-Law Addition—Executive Committee Drop Revisions
  1. Matt West (Chair, CLAS) presented a revised version of a proposed change to the Committee By-laws that would grant the Executive Committee new discretion to dismiss reports in certain situations (proposal attached).
    - a. Revisions: removal of the power to decline jurisdiction because of concerns about the uncertainty this could cause for Support Officers and Committee members when taking a report. The removal of this power would not have a major impact on the outcome of a particular case, as Exec could dismiss a report immediately after it was filed.
    - b. Expands the power of Exec to drop cases if they meet the two conditions in the proposed language
    - c. The word “technical” was removed from the first clause because it was more vague; for instance, some cases in the Engineering School could be classified as “technical” and inappropriately dismissed. Now the sentence in question just reads “legal or regulatory matters.”
    - d. The two conditions are now linked by “AND” instead of “OR.” Both conditions must be met in order for Exec to exercise this power—namely, a report that the Committee does not have sufficient training to adjudicate AND that is more appropriately addressed by another disciplinary or administrative body.
    - e. Discussion of threshold – majority/four-fifths/unanimous?
      - i. Four-fifths seems to be most appropriate, higher than normal Exec drop, but not quite unanimous
    - f. Cameron Kiddy (SEAS) asked why this discretion is this just in the hands of Exec and not the entire Committee.
    - g. Matt West and Austin Sim (Vice Chair for Hearings, LAW) explained that this is consistent with the existing Exec drop power, and that Exec members have this discretion because of their direct interaction with and access to information about all ongoing Honor cases.
  2. Matt West explained that the purpose of the proposal is (1) to provide guidance to future Exec members and (2) to increase transparency in the rare event that the Committee is unable to investigate a report.
  3. Ory Streeter (SMED) said that he believed the changes were well thought-out.
  4. Matt West told Committee members to plan to vote on the proposal next week.
  5. Katie Deal (CLAS) mentioned that the passage of this by-law change should lead the Committee to reexamine the By-laws pertaining to stealing, which was studied in 2015-2016 by the Policies & Procedures subcommittee. Michael Treves, a former Support Officer, drafted a proposal that he presented to the immediate past Committee.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Small Group Discussion: Addressing Hate Speech and Intolerance on Grounds
  - 1. The Committee decided, by a vote, to sign the Eliminate the Hate Campaign petition.
  - 2. Katie Deal (CLAS) reminded Committee members that Jen Yeaton (BATT) sent out information about volunteering for the campaign, and she encouraged members to volunteer.
- B. Stephanie Roe (GSAS) commented that the Committee needs to call the problem what it is – racism and bigotry, not simply “intolerance.” She emphasized the need to be conscious of how we talk about this issue in order to effectively combat it.
- C. Questions for small group discussion:
  - a. What role should the Committee play in the effort to combat hate speech?
  - b. How can we contribute to this effort effectively to promote respect and inclusivity?
  - c. What are some actionable events or proposals, and what organizations can the Committee partner with?

**VII. CLOSED SESSION**

**Proposed By-Law Change**  
Presented November 6, 2016

PROPOSED Section IV.A.2

2. Dismissal of a Report. Under the following circumstances, a Report may be dismissed:
  - a. 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.
  - b. The Executive Committee may dismiss a Report that it determines, by a majority vote, to have been made in bad faith or to lack sufficient evidence.
  - c. The Executive Committee may dismiss a Report when the conduct alleged in such report (i) implicates legal or regulatory matters about which the Honor Committee lacks sufficient training or expertise to investigate and/or adjudicate; and (ii) is more appropriately investigated, adjudicated, remediated, sanctioned or otherwise addressed by another administrative or disciplinary process. In deciding whether to dismiss a Report of conduct implicating other University processes, the Executive Committee may consult/coordinate with relevant University officials. Decisions by the Executive Committee to 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 dismiss any Report that meets the requirements of Section I.B., above.