

Golden Rule Review Committee
3/3/2016

10:36: Meeting called to order

Roll call: Rodolfo and Taylor absent
Quorum reached

Minutes Approved

Agenda Approved

Jorge: I brought a draft for the medical amnesty section.

Jacob: Should we specify the type of drugs?

Jorge: I looked at other universities and they left it vague.

Jacob: Good on that. We won't change anything today.

Jad: We researched other universities and their policies and contacted the Director of Student Conduct from University of Florida, He said that the policy they use pairs with the relationship they have with their student organizations. That policy has proven to be more effective because organizations hold members more accountable. This is because of the ability of organizations to hold their own investigations and hold their own members accountable. If anything comes their way they will give the organizations a chance to investigate, rather than coming down with the chopping block. If you look at way UCF has it written now, it's basically saying if the culture of the organization gave the context for the violation then the organization should be found in violation. The way it's written down is more in line with that. After we wrote this we ran some hypothetical cases against it. For example under the current wording Sigma Chi was found in violation but under the revised version we were not.

Jacob: We ran several cases through and some that failed before failed again.

Jad: If it's an individual that's a rotten egg they should be held accountable. So looking at B there is a distribution of responsibility. It's not all the organization or all the individual. There are members of every Greek organization that are bottom feeders, bringing the organization down and giving them a bad name. But this would allow organizations to hold these bottom members accountable. I think Jenkins will appreciate this but we'll see what pointers he gives. It's especially good that it comes from other universities.

Sara: How would you address if the individual is an executive board member?

Jad: 2 and 3 talk about that but I do think they should be held to a higher standard because they help build the culture and set the example.

Jacob: And that's what the section says.

Lauren: Should we take out the amnesty part?

Jacob: I think we should try to get it passed without it. The plan is to meet with Jenkins after Spring Break and then we vote on it after.

Regarding the proposal sent in online

Lauren: Do you have to have the meeting meet within 10 days or plan to meet within 10?

Jacob: I don't think it's the reply or meeting so much as the student has to do that.

Jorge: Also it depends on the different colleges because they all have different rules.

Jacob; I don't know if each college has a standing roster, but we can look and see how they choose and run their roster.

Final roll call: Same as initial

11:00: Meeting adjourned

Next meeting on March 17, 2016 in the Siesta Key Board Room, room 225.