UNIVERSITY-WIDE REFERENDUM: SPRING 2016

There are three different referenda proposals on the Spring 2016 Ballot, two of which pertain to the Honor System. The first proposal is a binding amendment being put forth in response to the non-binding question of opinion that was approved by a majority of voting students in the Spring 2015 election. The other referenda effectively repeals and replaces Article VII, Section 2 of the Honor Constitution -- an amendment that students voted to add to the Constitution in the Spring of 2015. Both Honor referenda are sponsored by the Honor Committee. The third referenda put forth on this year ballot proposes changes to the Third Year Council Constitution. The Third Year Council referendum is sponsored by the Third Year Council. Only members of the third year undergraduate class can vote on the Third Year Council Referendum. All members of the University community may vote on the proposed Honor Referenda.

Definition, Ratification and Voter Information:

- Per the UBE’s Rules & Regulations, a referendum is “a question that has been certified to appear on an official ballot in an election administered by the University Board of Elections pursuant to these rules and the qualifications established by the constitution of the relevant student governing body, if applicable.”

- An amendment to the Honor Committee Constitution must be ratified by three-fifths of students voting in a referendum election, provided that at least ten percent (10%) of the entire eligible voting population has voted in favor of such amendment. For more information regarding University referendum, please consult Section III, Subsection E of the UBE’s Rules & Regulations, found here.

- Voters may exit out of the ballot before voting on the proposed referenda. Votes for the other elected offices will be saved. Voters may return to the ballot at any time within the voting period of Friday, February 19th at 10:00am to Thursday, February 25th at 4:00pm. Voting on the proposed referenda is optional – voters may choose to vote on one, both or none.

Honor Referendum UBE Help Text:

The Honor Committee, in response to the non-binding questions of student opinion voted upon last year, has put forth two binding questions that would modify the Honor Constitution.

The first referendum question concerns the Honor Sanctioning system. Students are provided with two options. Students may vote in favor of one of the two options or abstain from voting if they are not in favor of either option.

Option One is a constitutional amendment that maintains the single sanction, but officially recognizes the utilization of informed and conscientious retractions. The Constitution, as it is now, only recognizes the single sanction. This amendment would reflect Honor’s current practices.

Option Two is an amendment that would allow, but not require, the Honor Committee to create lesser sanctions (i.e., penalties less severe than expulsion) for students who have been found
guilty of honor violations. While this is a binding amendment to the Honor Constitution, it does not guarantee that a multiple sanction system will be implemented.

The second referendum question concerns Honor’s response to non-binding questions of student opinion. The proposed amendment effectively repeals and replaces Article VII, Section 2 of the Honor Constitution, which was added by student vote in Spring 2015. The original text of section two requires that if a majority of the student body votes in favor of a non-binding question of student opinion concerning the Honor System, the Honor Committee must put forth that same question the following year as a binding amendment to their Constitution. This proposed update to the Constitution would allow the Honor Committee more discretion in their response to non-binding questions of student opinion. The revision would require only that the Honor Committee enact a response of some sort within a one-year time frame, and would not necessarily result in a student-wide binding referendum question the following year. Students may vote in favor of or not in favor of this amendment.

HONOR REFERENDUM 1: Honor Sanctioning Options

Proposal 1: A constitutional amendment to the Committee’s sanctioning power

Option 1: The Honor Committee shall:
   With the exception of the Conscientious Retraction and Informed Retraction, exclude permanently from student status University students found to have committed Honor violations

Option 2: The Honor Committee shall have the power to:
   Exclude permanently from student status or impose lesser sanctions to University students found to have committed Honor violations.

Option 1 is a vote to maintain the single sanction and update the constitution to reflect our current practices. Note from the University Board of Elections: This option is a vote to maintain the status quo in Honor’s sanctioning system, but will update the constitutional text to officially include the two types of retractions that may be filed in order to gain exemption from the single sanction.

Option 2 is a vote to change the Honor constitution to allow for a multiple sanction system. If this option passes an independent review commission will convene to evaluate and recommend such a system. Note from the University Board of Elections: This amendment does not guarantee the implementation of a multiple sanction system, but would be a permanent change to the Honor Constitution that empowers Honor to consider imposing sanctions lesser than expulsion for students convicted of honor violations.

VOTING OPTIONS:
Option 1
Option 2
HONOR REFERENDUM 2: Accountability Amendment

Article VII. Self-Governance

Section 2. Should a majority of voting students vote affirmatively on a non-binding question of opinion pertaining to the Honor System in a University wide election, the Honor Committee shall enact a response within the time frame of one year.

This proposal provides the Committee the necessary flexibility to respond to non-binding questions of student opinion in both the Constitution, as well as, the Committee’s by-laws, training manuals, and education and outreach material.

Note from the University Board of Elections: The current version of Article XII, section 2, was ratified by a majority of voting students in the Spring of 2015, and reads as follows:

“Should a majority of voting students vote affirmatively on a non-binding question of opinion pertaining to the Honor System in a University-wide election, the Honor Committee shall, in the following year, put such question before the student body as a binding constitutional amendment.”

The revised version of this amendment being proposed would allow the Honor Committee more discretion in their responses to non-binding questions of student opinion regarding the Honor System. The current Honor Constitution requires that if a non-binding question of student opinion is passed by a majority of students, within one year, the Honor Committee must put that question forth in a student-wide election as a binding amendment to their Constitution. This proposed revision would allow the Honor Committee to choose their method of response to non-binding questions of student opinion, so long as they enact a response of some sort within a one-year period. Their chosen method of response would not necessarily result in a student-wide binding referendum question.

VOTING OPTIONS:
Yes
No