

## HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA - APRIL 28, 2024

### I. ROLL CALL (19/26 Present)

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

### II. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Bryan Ng: I'm an educator, thanks the committee for their experience in Honor. Looking at Cav Daily and I know you want to do a lot of outreach. One of the initiatives you have talked about is Dorm Talks. I think that as an educator, the best moments have been the ones that are spontaneous. Dorm talks might put a burden on some people. I would love to start an initiative to go into Dorms and having an optional meeting. Similar to other CIOs during the start of first year. It could be more fun for everyone involved.
- B. Will: Thank you. We've been thinking creatively about some sort of first year push that we could potentially tie in with our recruitment. Food trucks at dorms, atmosphere of fun things in addition to a required meeting.

### III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

- A. Laura Howard, Chair
  - 1. Met with Professor Ballinger from McIntire.

2. Met with Law School Reps about ideas related to shadowing and Law orientation.
  3. Tabs are mostly set up. Salads, Grit, Bodos, etc.
  4. Madison House community service opportunity.
  5. More info on the website and an upcoming email to the student body.
  6. The multi-sanction year in review event was a success.
  7. Currently revising the Honor module. All students will be required to take it before each academic year.
- B. Seamus Oliver, Vice Chair for Investigations
1. There are six active investigations.
- C. Alex Church, Vice Chair for Hearings
1. An appeal review panel met last Friday and chose to grant relief.
  2. Upcoming by laws changes.
  3. Thanks present SOs.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
1. No updates.
- E. Will Hancock, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
1. If your school has an idea for finals pushes but need assistance staffing or planning it, reach out to me. A logistical spreadsheet will be sent out after committee.
  2. We're having our final classes of the RES this week. XYZ Case Summaries are due. We will be sending those for you to view in the next few weeks ahead of publication.
- F. Ian Novak, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
1. Ben and I met with Dean of BATT. Gave us some ideas for the fall semester.
  2. Video series for grad students is going to highlight some of the wonderful individuals we have to help build a community. Launched in the fall.
- G. Thomas Ackleson, Vice Chair for Operations
1. For school final's pushes: if you have your school's finals push purchases planned out, see me after Committee to use my purchasing card.

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

- A. Policies and Procedures Committee
1. Mary Holland: We have our first meeting this week with representatives and SOs. We will be setting our agenda.
- B. Faculty Advisory Committee
1. None.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
1. Ben: CRDAC met for the first time today. We have a great group. Our first priority is to increase membership of people who are not members of the Committee. We want to add student leaders to CRDAC to incorporate their input into our policies. Potential methods include direct outreach.
- D. Data and Research Committee

1. Hang: we have a meeting later this week. Three goals: acquire more data from the Community; revamp and maintain the case data portal; analyze the data to help meet the goals of Honor including policy making.

E. Ad-hoc Subcommittee on Sanctions

1. Met for the first time today. Discussed guidance for advisors in terms of sanctioning.
2. Discussed our summer plans. Split into four groups that will work on precedent; role of CC and Reporter at PS; sanctioning guidelines; sanctioning procedure.
3. Each group will develop a few possible sanctions to help fill the severity gap.
4. Each group will overlap often. Will have updates for the Committee after the summer.

V. **REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

- A. Law School Reps: we conducted exit interviews for Law school reps. P&P has a list of these findings.

VI. **OLD BUSINESS**

- A. Review plans for finals pushes
1. Laura: College is developing a slime-themed event.
  2. Thomas: SEAS is planning extensive caffeine handouts.
  3. Vivian: GSAS is going to do a Corner Juice Tab for grad students on May 4.

VII. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Brainstorm initiatives for this summer
1. Laura: do people have ideas of initiatives they'd like to start this summer?
  2. Simran: starting to establish a relationship between FAC and school deans. Planning faculty events in the fall. Potentially doing something with COMM's orientation process for new students.
  3. Alex: I'm working on a substantial revision to the SO handbook. Making sure that's up to date for counsel is very important.
  4. Seamus: I can second that for Advisors.
  5. Will: I think that's great, two people from SWG will be working on the sanctioning component of the handbook. We should be sure to all be working on one document.
  6. Seamus: The handbook is on one document.
  7. Will: I know that a lot of us had good talks about orientations, a lot of that work is going to have to happen in the earlier parts of the summer. Planning some sort of Honor-CIO weekend that complements Honor week and is aimed specifically at organizations.
  8. Hang: I'm planning to sit on panels about American academic culture for international students. Helpful to set expectations for incoming international students. The ISO would appreciate more collaboration. Helping Laura with the Mock case studies.
  9. Laura: one part of D&R research could be giving random students a hearing and having data collection throughout their deliberations.

10. Laura: O Day will be held on/around August 25<sup>th</sup> at Morven Farms for community building, retraining, etc.
  11. Thomas: note that an early move in will be needed for third and fourth years living on Grounds.
- B. Discuss Honor's deliberation processes and potential areas of improvement
1. Laura: does anyone have any thoughts about this? Are there areas of improvement we can make here?
  2. Alex: Something that's difficult with a Hearing panel is the knowledge gap between the Committee Reps and the randomly-selected students. How do we make it a holistic panel of 12? We could potentially ask students to speak out first.
  3. Will: I think a lot of that makes sense. I want to give as much discretion to the Hearing chair as much as possible. Students might want to hear what representatives have to say first. I think at times we should remember this depends on the panel. There are probably good practices we can implement, but we should keep in mind that every panel is going to be unique.
  4. Carson: for the PS, whoever speaks first really frames the ways the sanction can go. One thought was to have panelists write down their ideas before discussion, or asking less experienced reps for their thoughts first. Sanctioning can be very emotional. How can I best prepare representatives to handle this?
  5. Will: part of it is just telling us that it's normal for the process to be weighty. We can't ignore the emotional part, so having that out front is a good practice.
  6. Ayda: I think Carson did a good job providing us with a space to help support us. Sanctioning comes with the job, but at the same time being able to provide comfort for panelists is a great thing. It's already a good system in my experience.
  7. Carson: do you feel that the sanctioning guidelines document is too long? How could it be improved?
- C. Discuss and vote on proposed bylaws
1. Laura: we can start with a general conversation. The changes are in the packet sent via email. Explains the voting procedure.
  2. Alex: explains where new definitions are located.
  3. Laura: does anyone have a comment?
  4. Mary Holland: On the banning of AI detectors: I am unsure if the blanket removal of all kinds of detection software. If somehow it was relevant to a case because if a professor used it, there should be a way to mention that if it was relevant to the case for a specific reason.
  5. Hang: if we choose to pass the AI detector change, we should revisit it in the future as technology develops.
  6. Laura: We could add something about the reasonable discretion of the Hearing chair.
  7. Will: we have the option to hardcode this into the bylaws, and I think we have the processes to handle this as it adapts. It makes a lot of sense to not get stuck on this definition. We should codify processes in the bylaws. It needlessly ties us to this specific moment in time. Mentions AI task force quote. We shouldn't be updating our bylaws all the time.

8. Alex: There have been cases in Hearings and PHCs where counsel ask why some of this evidence is inadmissible. I don't think these things can present themselves as facts in this moment of time, so I don't think this point will substantially change.
  9. Seamus: The section on AI detectors is placed next to polygraph evidence on purpose, we should view them in a similar way. We know from the task force that much like polygraphs, AI detectors are not reliable. We should not treat them as being reliable. If the technology changes, we can change the bylaws and allow them again. We should approach this in a similar way to polygraphs. Right now these are bad tools, so we don't need room for discretion. We simply should not use them.
  10. Laura: for time purposes, we won't be voting today.
  11. Mary Holland: I hear those points, we could add more bylaw language.
  12. Will: I see where you all are coming from. If the purpose is guidance, it could go in the handbook. It's a difference between detectors as a category vs polygraph as a tool. That's something that could change. If we aren't going to vote until later, I would really like for P&P to wrestle with this. They have counsel and law representatives to examine this.
  13. Alex: The purpose of getting the committee's views is really helpful for the working groups. Mentions the other proposed by law changes sent to the committee.
- D. Schedule summer Honor Committee meeting
1. Laura: I will have more information in an email, but June 23<sup>rd</sup> is a potential summer meeting date.

## VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None.

The meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m. The 2024-25 Honor Committee will meet over Zoom over the summer in June.