

Updates:

Executive Board

Isabelle: Google for common read, fill it out if you haven't!

Madhav: Restocking swag!

Zainab: No updates, More ipanels coming up in the future look out for emails.

Andy: No updates

Ryan: Selection for support officers, please sign up for interview slots if you get the chance.

Subcommittees

P&P (Zoe): Had first meeting on Wednesday. Spoke about a general sense of P&P, hope to work on some of the new hearing information.

FAC (Schyuler): None

Representative Reports

ARCH: None

BATT: None

CLAS: None

COMM: None

EDU: No longer the Curry School, now the UVA School of Education!

DARD: None

MED: None

GSAS: None

SEAS: None

LAW: Selections Information

SCPS: None

Hearings Update

Presentation from Andy (presented with a powerpoint)

- Default is virtual hearings
 - Will entertain petitions for in person hearings
- Evidence Packets will be temporary access either through Box or Google Drive
- Offices will be available for acceptable use (spread out, masks, etc)
 - When speaking folks will be spread out so they can remove their mask
- Only person required to be in the building will be the hearing chair
- Required Cameras on
- Will operate on 6 hour blocks with an hour in between
 - Question (Zoe): What will fall under the six hour block?, What time will we start?
- Hearings may need to take place over a 2 day period
 - Participants will ask for 6 hours each day to block out
- Zoom Protocol
 - Honor virtual background

- Will be renamed to "Participant #1) etc.

Discussion/Questions:

- (Chris, Law) Question (Andy, can you read this aloud?): will the petition for in-person/virtual be something that the student will complete in writing (i.e. like the IR form, etc.)? Just want to make sure the student and advisor have a detailed conversation about the pros and cons about each option. And also that a "default option" doesn't mean the student feels pressure either way, and gets equal information about the opportunities available.
 - Andy, Response:
- (Achintya, GSAS) Question: How has the determination of who can be wearing masks in spaces of the office made?
 - Andy Response: Following University guidelines, taking all of the steps available (distance, directions, etc.)
- (Todd, Law) Question: Do we have a phone/computer policy? Use of preloaded ipads?
 - Andy Response: Expected that the camera is on, no use of the phone. The standard is that people will go to UJC if they use their phone/other technology during a trial for confidentiality issues.
 - (Zoe, Question) What do you mean by inadvertent sharing, @Todd?
 - Not intentional sharing made by someone on the call, but an accident made and information was accidentally shared digitally. Possibility for inadvertent sharing is very high

Chegg Issue

Ryan Overview: At the end of last semester there were issues that professors thought students were using it to cheat. Seemed like people were using it during tests and assessments. Professors recognized this and tried to get the information from Chegg as to who wrote it. Chegg will not release the information unless there is an open investigation by the university body (honor).

- (Achintya,GSAS) Question: Can we use a username for the basis of a complaint?
 - Ryan, Response: Cannot make a report without a real students name.
 - Achintya Response: People should be able to report with a username and an act of cheating.
- (Abdullah, COMM) Question: what kind of information would Chegg release that might help us identify someone? What do we do about the fact of connecting someone to an IP address, what if it wasn't them on that computer?
 - Zainab, Response: Chegg has a community liaison: if a professor believes that a question is from their exam they can get the IP address and timestamp from the community liaison
 - Andy, Response: Chegg supplies MAC Addresses, timestamps, names, IP addresses. In this experience went through the dean
 - Abdullah, Response: If this is a situation where professors need our help to get this information and we could be together on protocols this could be really helpful. Make this useful and available to students to deter them from cheating.

- (Lena) Question: What would an amendment like this look like? Policy wise how would we make this happen).
 - Ryan, Response: Could we give professors the ability to report just a username, we could add away where if a report is necessary we can start a report so that these details can be given
- (Todd, LAW) Statement: We should really focus on reminding students that even digitally cheating will not be tolerated
- (Christian, CLAS) Question: Test questions on chegg or people on chegg when they arent supposed to be? What is the focus?
 - Ryan, Response: We are focusing on when people post things especially test questions
 - Christian, Response: Does Honor really have the reach to be able to look at people's private information just on the assumption that they might be cheating. Could this further divide the gap between honor and students.
 - Ryan, Response: We should definitely consider how the students will react and the balance.
- (Achintya, GSAS) Statement: Question about the flow of information. Who should have access about what the investigators find. If honor is reaching out to get this information are we helping professors report?
 - Ryan, Response: If Chegg gives us an IP address we can give it back to the professor and the professor can go from there whether or not they want to submit the evidence.
 - Achintya, Response: Does this follow our current practice of flow of information. Does this make us coordinators with the reporter to help us facilitate the report
 - Ryan, Response: It is within our right because investigators reach out to others as it is. In my opinion that is completely within our bylaws and the investigators right to get the information such as an IP address
 - Achintya, Response: Are we facilitating a one sided feeling that we are "on the side" of the professor
 - Abdullah, Response (chat): I share Achintya's concern because how can honor help identify a suspect with our "investigation" if there is no suspected student to investigate in the first place - ie, student was not identified by the reporter.
 - Andy, Response (chat): that portion would likely mandate a by law change as discussed earlier
 - Ryan, Response: Right now our bylaws may not follow this thought of ideas but our bylaws are flexible .
- (Bridget, BATT) Question: Slippery slope into us becoming a "chegg watchdog". Blurs the lines that Honor itself does not initiate cases. Precedent is that our investigations are impartial. Blurs the line of where we are being impartial. We understand the cheating is an issue but the line is hard to draw here. Concern of interest of us finding the case and taking the case.

- (Todd, LAW): It is impartial fact finding to reach out to Chegg and find the IP address. Impartiality comes out in the strength of our processes and our procedures. Thinks that this is currently in the realm of acceptable in our bylaws. As long as we are clear about it. We do not want to be a chegg watchdog. Professors delineate their own parameters.
- (Schuyler, CLAS): this comes with online learning territory. Usernames are identifiable enough to make a case especially in the online world.
- (Chris, LAW): report for unidentified student. This has happened before and has been sorted out. No concerns there. We have the authority to highlight things within a case. We have identified IP addresses in the past for other situations, does not see an issue with that. If we cannot adjudicate things that come online we have major issues here. Does Not see this being an incredibly large issue.
- (Caitlin, ARCH): okay with this being in the investigative process
- (Andy, CLAS): our bylaws would currently allow people to be reported by username only change would need to be to OCP.