

## HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA - APRIL 14, 2024

### I. ROLL CALL (19/23 Present)

- A. Mary Holland Mason -- Present
- B. Will Hancock -- Present
- C. Seamus Oliver -- Present
- D. Margaret Zirwas -- Present
- E. Laura Howard -- Present
- F. Hang Nguyen -- Present
- G. Vivian Mok -- Present
- H. Simran Havaladar -- Present
- I. Ben Makarechian -- Present
- J. Ian Novak -- Absent
- K. Carson Breus -- Present
- L. Thomas Ackleson -- Present
- M. Sheryl Loden -- Present
- N. Alex Church -- Present
- O. Michael Sirh -- Absent
- P. Suleiman Abdulkadir -- Present
- Q. Alicia Phan -- Absent
- R. McKenzie Jones -- Absent
- S. Cassidy Dufour -- Present
- T. Ayda Mengistie -- Present
- U. LP Pham -- Absent
- V. Nile Liu -- Present
- W. Quana Dennis -- Present

### II. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None.

### III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

- A. Laura Howard, Chair
  - 1. Working on staffing new sub committees. We have new Co Chairs. New Co Chairs announced. Still looking for Data and Research Committee Chair. New Senior SO recruitment starting. Visited Restorative Ethics Seminar. Events with UJC, filming informational videos, filling empty SCPS, ARCH, and education school seats. Meeting SHW and presenting on AI use to the Media Studies Department.
- B. Seamus Oliver, Vice Chair for Investigations
  - 1. Three active investigations.
- C. Alex Church, Vice Chair for Hearings
  - 1. Hearing last Friday.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
  - 1. Sanctioning Panel on Friday.
- E. Will Hancock, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
  - 1. End of year banquet this weekend. Details and RSVP sent out via email.
  - 2. By next week, all Reps should come with a finals push idea.

3. Most schools have been paired with Educators. Expect an email introducing your Educator to each school Reps.
  4. Committe representatives attended RES sessions to hear feedback.
- F. Ian Novak, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
1. Living with Honor initiative. Video filmed with someone who has had Honor impact their life in a unique way. Will be a form to nomination graduate students.
- G. Thomas Ackleson, Vice Chair for Operations
1. One new Co-Sponsorship request that's been approved.

#### IV. **SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**

- A. Policies and Procedures Committee:
1. Margaret: Examine feedback from RES feedback.
  2. Mary Holland: Collaborate with other subcommittees and working groups.
- B. Faculty Advisory Committee:
1. Simran: Excited to hear perspectives of faculty who haven't been very involved with Honor in the past.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee:
1. Ben: Focus on getting non SO leaders to attend CRDAC meetings and hear their thoughts on the system. Focus on pushing the SO program into communities Honor typically doesn't recruit many people from. Focus on creating a pipeline for these groups.
- D. Data and Research Committee:
1. Laura: Try and gather as much research on multi-sanction system. Over the summer start to study sanctioning and start working on data portal.
- E. Ad-hoc Subcommittee on Sanctions:
1. Will: Look at precedent, role of CC in the PS. Thinking about what a sanction can be by brainstorming many new ideas. Met with Anna Prillaman from UJC (former VCS).

#### V. **REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

- A. None.

#### VI. **OLD BUSINESS**

- A. None.

#### VII. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Initiatives for addressing generative artificial intelligence this term
1. Laura: Especially on retreat, we recognized this is a big area to focus on for this term. One idea: want to learn how AI detectors work to determine if they are fair to use in our Hearing procedures. Planning to reach out to professors.
  2. Mary Holland: This is such a new topic, we should consider soliciting student feedback since the student experience with AI can be so varied.
  3. Carson: We should consider a new group for AI. We should try to encourage professors to ensure AI is mentioned on syllabi.

4. Will: FAC did work over the summer on syllabi. Wide-scale convos should take place. Students should be able to have conversations to develop a community-wide discussion. I don't think we need another working group on AI. CRDAC can get the views of student leaders; also D&R and P&P. Worried about the logistics of adding too many working groups.
5. Carson: Create citation guides for students using AI tools.
6. Simran: Planning a lunch and learn with a faculty member for students to see that angle. We could expand that to other schools.
7. Ben: CRDAC can play a big role in determining how groups see AI. Does anyone have ideas about if policy needs to change for cases involving AI? Can we encourage/discourage AI reports?
8. Alex: We should look at what kinds of evidence are allowed into a Hearing. Examining evidentiary guidelines.
9. Laura: Could be good to reach out to faculty with programming expertise.
10. Will: We have the AI Task Force, other resources we can incorporate too.
11. Mary Holland: Honor doesn't have a blanket AI statement. Some classes encourage it, others don't. We could have an AI policy to enforce. Honor doesn't have one blanket stance.
12. Will: Leverage connections we made during Honor Week (library staff, etc.)
13. Carson: There are many ethics and AI courses in a few schools; reach out to those faculty members.
14. Seamus: What are our thoughts on telling Investigators to ask students for the logs of their AI use?
15. Margaret: Can't hurt to ask, but students can deny they use AI.
16. Ben: Is it standard procedure to ask for communication logs, etc.?
17. Seamus: It's on the table.
18. Ben: So the investigator would in all cases ask the student?
19. Seamus: Sure
20. Ben: I don't like that for a variety of reasons I can elaborate on.
21. Mary Holland: It might not yield much, but it might
22. Cassidy: My concern is that not all students will understand that they don't *have* to submit that evidence.
23. Carson: Theoretically you could ask for them but I don't think students would ever do that.
24. Ben: You can selectively delete queries from ChatGPT.
25. Thomas: Is there a particular reason this is different from any standard evidence request?
26. Seamus: Advisors are trained to inform the student that they don't have to submit evidence if they don't want, we're not surprising them. The selective deletion answers my question though.
27. Margaret: If the Investigator thinks it's useful, they can ask. But it shouldn't be an expectation for every AI case.
28. Will: Overall our AI policies are working really well. We can always be making our policies better. I don't think there's an alarm going off in our Hearings in terms of AI.

29. Laura: Incoming students taking the Honor module now have to complete an AI portion of the module. Included in the plagiarism portion.
  30. Ben: Given the module is mandatory, have we considered using the module for data collection? Opportunity to avoid selection bias. Are there reasons not to do that?
  31. Laura: We could include a short survey.
- B. Ideas for filling the “sanctioning gap” between education and temporary removal
1. Laura: Some people have perceived a difference in severity between RES and suspension. Do people have ideas to begin addressing if this is a problem?
  2. Will: I don’t think we should wait to see if this is a problem. Can’t hurt to get lots of ideas out there. Working with UJC and other institutions. UJC’s community service is typically tied to the offense. We do need to look at it, I don’t think we should look for more data.
  3. Alex: I agree with Will, this is a problem. More options in sanctioning can never be a bad thing. The idea of proportionality in the PS is really important. We should make sure every sanction is building toward the aim of restoration. If we focus too much on proportionality, the restoration element may be diminished.
  4. Mary Holland: In the Hearing, there’s panelist training. Having more training before a PS could minimize confusion and allow reps to gauge proportionality more effectively.
  5. Carson: We’re increasing training.
  6. Seamus: There are two UJC sanctions we don’t use: community service, which is hard to apply to Honor offenses, and disciplinary probation, which is hard to apply to Honor offenses. The vast majority of our cases are cheating, and there are only a few brackets of severity for cheating. The cases we get tend to cluster at a few different levels of severity, and so do our sanctions.
  7. Carson: Transcript notations may be underutilized. UJC has (temporary) transcript notations for every case.
  8. Will: I agree we should explore that more; working group can creatively approach that. Comment on panelist training: I don’t think it will fix the sanction severity gap. It should be focused on telling reps what sanctions are, not telling them which sanctions to apply. We should be careful about that.
  9. Carson: Question for everyone: should I wait for training or do it now?
  10. Ben: It should be as quickly as possible.
  11. Seamus: We won’t see many summer cases because of bylaws changes, but we’ll probably see a few that go all the way to IR PS, so I don’t see why we should wait.
  12. Structure of training: all reps at first, then condenses for each PS.
  13. Alex: I’ve looking into academic probation, especially in cheating cases. Setting people up with academic resources could be a good idea, but every school has different policies that would make this hard to implement. Panel should ask good questions to determine the student’s willingness to recommit.
  14. Will: We have pretty explicit bylaws that if a student isn’t willing to recommit to the Community of Trust, they won’t be in that community. The student needs to want to be restored.
  15. Mary Holland: On the topic of tailoring: would people consider sanctioning the student to redo the assignment honorably?

16. Seamus: That might be far more punitive than restorative. Many cases aren't sanctioned in the same semester they're reported.
  17. Margaret: faculty buy in could be difficult.
  18. Simran: I agree:
  19. Carson: Sanction Sub Group could loop in faculty.
  20. Seamus: Using the logic of UJC's disciplinary probation, is there room for adapting that to something like suspension from taking classes in a certain department?
  21. Simran: that could pose financial challenges to certain students.
  22. Seamus: So does suspension.
  23. Ben: Course enrollment is stressful, not sure this is rehabilitative.
  24. Will: Suspension could cause more stress, and we shouldn't apply different rules to each department. The community of trust should be university-wide.
  25. Carson: What about giving them a bad enrollment time?
  26. Ben: That would be a good deterrent, but would add stress that contributes to people cheating. There should be a middle ground between a deterrent measure and a rehabilitative system.
  27. Laura: Multi-sanction is about making the sanction make sense for the offense.
  28. Alex: Providing academic support is a good option, even department by department.
  29. Cassidy: Keep in mind that sanctions should be applicable to everyone, so enrollment time sanctions and such might not be applicable to graduate students vs. Undergraduates.
  30. Carson: We should consider what sets the student up for success, but also the Community. How might disproportionate sanctions affect how likely people are to cheat?
  31. Ben: I agree with Carson, a balance is positive to the student and the community.
  32. Mary Holland: This is a good area for D&R to look at. Are there other options that other institutions use?
  33. Will: I agree, JMU and Naval Academy inspired XYZ case summaries and mentorship.
  34. Alex: Looking back at old records, Honor can a conference from many schools across the country; collaboration with students at other institutions is a good idea.
  35. Cassidy: Other institutions have these conferences (military academies), UVA used to have an exchange program we could look into bringing back.
- C. Plans for finals pushes
1. See (D).
- D. Discussion of a "Multi-Sanction: A Year in Review" event
1. Laura: Would be good to reflect with the community about what we've done, and how we've implemented what they voted for. Tabling this discussion for our next committee meeting.
  2. Thomas: Will make a form to submit estimated costs for finals pushes.

## VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Brittany (potential SCPS rep): From the perspective of a SCPS student, our BIS writing program is very intensive and using AI could be very unfair for those students.
- B. No other public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m. The 2024-25 Honor Committee will have its next meeting in person in Newcomb Hall on Sunday, April 21st, at 7:00 p.m.