

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 1, 2024

ROLL CALL (28/30 Present)

Seamus Oliver	P
Alex Church	P
Carson Breus	P
Thomas Ackleson	P
Ian Novak	P
Will Hancock	P
Laura Howard	P
Alicia Phan	P
McKenzie Jones	P
Suleiman Abdulkadir	P
Michael Sirh	P
Sheryl Loden	P
Simran Havaladar	P
Andrew Cornfeld	P
Rachel Fellman	P
Loi Dawkins	A
Brittany Toth	P
Meredith DeLong-Maxey	P
Clare Striegel	A
Cassidy Dufour	P
Ayda Mengistie	P
Mary Holland Mason	P
Margaret Zirwas	P
Hannah Lipinski	P
Penelope Molitz	P
Nile Liu	P
Lam-Phong Pham	P
Ben Makarechian	P
Vivian Mok	P
Bijoy Ghosh	P

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Shrinidhi, 4th year student. I wanted to point out from a student perspective sees of the Honor Committee. The Committee should accurately communicate what it means to be called to a trial. I think it's important to keep the student perspective in mind. Be aware that all of these are really intimidating terms (trial, accusation, etc.)
- B. Professor Herrington. I wanted to speak about the by-laws from the perspective of faculty. I'm worried about consequences of students about potential false positives. From my perspective, making things faster isn't good if there's a higher chance of false positives.
- C. Madison, UJC Investigator. My perspective as a fellow SO, I think streamlining the process could be really detrimental to SO and student health. Having students wait in limbo adds undue stress.

- D. Saehee, 2nd year. Speaking on the same topic as Trinity. As a student, I don't want to be dragged to a Hearing if it's unnecessary. Setting the Hearing date earlier might give me peace of mind. The P&P counter amendment would make me feel like I have a more complete overview of the process at a stressful time. Priority should align with students over speed.
- E. Neha, Honor SSO. First, on retraining. It's hard to keep people involved in the SO pool, and retraining adds a significant lag. We have to be careful about what we're removing. And second, on hearing vs. investigation. From the Hearing perspective, removing the I Panel and collecting evidence could create a conflict/muddy period. There could be a lot of inefficiencies in that process.

II. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

- A. Laura Howard, Chair
 - 1. Met with Lexie about our first year and a half of multi-sanction, met with Marsh, met with Nile about Med School presentation, P&P Catch-Up.
 - 2. Attended mock hearing for trainees; ISD Visas Cafe, Panel Session, and Roundtable.
 - 3. Met with Student Affairs about the newsletter; attended the final interview for the Director of Accountability position.
 - 4. Sitting on the nominating committees for Sky Alland and Gray-Carrington.
 - 5. Prepared for BOV presentation on Thursday.
- B. Seamus Oliver, VCI
 - 1. There are four cases under Investigation.
 - 2. One case hearing to I-Panel this Tuesday.
- C. Alex Church, VCH
 - 1. There are two Hearings for next January.
 - 2. Mock Trial, final exams for new I/Cs.
- D. Carson Breus, VCS
 - 1. We are officially done with IR PSs for the fall, and have four for the Spring so far.
- E. Will Hancock, VCUC
 - 1. Update on ISD: overall a success. Roundtable was a big success with good attendance and conversations. The VISAS event also went very well. The International Student Panel had an interesting group of panelists. It was something of a focus group. We got new connections and projects out of that.
 - 2. Finals Pushes. You should be in touch with your educators. Be planning on at least one or two events. Reach out to me if you need more Educators.
- F. Ian Novak, VCGC
 - 1. Setting up dialogue dinners for Batten with an Honor twist. We'll have dates soon.
 - 2. iAuthenticate schedule is locked in. Also working on a social media campaign.
 - 3. We have a lot of interest in the grad subcommittee. We will
- G. Thomas Ackleson, VCO
 - 1. LOTL; co-sponsorship and 37 event.
 - 2. Will be reworking the co-sponsorship guidelines over break.

3. Contact me ASAP about purchasing stuff for finals pushes, shipping, etc.

III. **SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**

- A. Policies and Procedures Committee
 1. Mary Holland: We had a meeting this past Friday to finalize our plan for the rest of the semester. We will have a report on our accomplishments coming over break.
 2. Margaret: We'll have a dinner to celebrate the semester this Friday.
- B. Faculty Advisory Committee
 1. Simran: DS faculty appreciation lunch. Anyone is welcome to stop by Room 201 at the DS School from 1:00 to 3:00.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
 1. Ben: No major updates. We recapped our last meeting and will meet next January.
- D. Data and Research Committee
 1. Max: No major updates. Aiming to collect all data by 02/15 at the latest.
- E. Ad-hoc Subcommittee on Sanctions
 1. Will: No major updates. Putting together a report like P&P.
- F. Graduate Student Affairs
 1. See Ian's Exec update.

IV. **REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

- A. Penelope: We are doing gift bags for the Education School. We will handle them out with a different theme each day.
- B. Nile: Organizing a presentation for med students transitioning from school to clinic.
- C. Carson: Simran and I are doing a coffee and food drop next week.

V. **OLD BUSINESS**

- A. None.

VI. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Discuss two proposals (one from Policies & Procedures, one prepared by Seamus Oliver and Alex Church) regarding efficiency
 1. Laura: Efficiency is something Honor has struggled with for decades. We have two proposals to try and improve efficiency. We've made some efforts the past few years but some smaller scale changes haven't seemed to cut off case processing time as much as we'd like. Alex and Seamus can take over on their proposal.
 2. Seamus: Presentation on proposal.
 3. Rachel: You mentioned that moving the accusation doesn't have an effect. Does it not affect students who are graduating? Will diplomas be withheld until they get through the process?
 4. Alex: The proposal as written would move the degree hold up. There are reasons for this. If this is a process we can do in a shorter period of time with multiple off ramps, we can do degree holds because in all likelihood they'd have their case resolved before graduation.
 5. Nile: Having the VCI as a check is a barrier. I think it would be better to keep that there before it goes to the report panel. The problem is that the student is informed

only after they're accused. First contact is "you're going to Hearing" instead of "the I Panel may accuse you." I think it would be better with that and the VCI jurisdiction check.

6. Seamus: Yes. And I'm happy to keep doing that if we think it makes sense. The one potential problem with earlier notification is if their case gets dropped, they might panic only for the case to be dropped, especially since there's nothing they can do at the report panel stage.
7. Nile: One potential solution is to offer the IR period before the report panel. The value of the IR and CR is that they're doing the right thing. If they think it's going to Hearing anyways, they might just admit to it. The new proposal sort of cheapens the IR.
8. Thomas: What about SO staffing?
9. Alex: Advisor staffing would be more or less the same. On IC staffing, we have more IC that want to staff than cases. I'm not super concerned about that. We have people eager to staff IRs, Hearings, and PSs.
10. Seamus: Our current system isn't particularly resilient to mass reports, there is already a ceiling on how many reports we could take before we'd run into problems staffing. I'm not sure how much this is different.
11. Simran: On informing students: they sometimes know they're going to be reported, so I wonder if not giving them an advisor immediately could be problematic. They might not have a resource to bounce off questions.
12. Seamus: I think that's a very good point. You have to balance the ones where the Report Panel accuses versus doesn't. Sometimes students are told they're being reported but the reporter never files. It's tough to staff an SO for something that isn't a case. If the student were waiting for weeks instead of a few days, it would be a different story, but it's still worth discussing.
13. Rachel: If the case gets dropped, the student is never notified. If a student is reported but not accused even though they were told they'd be reported, is there a way to notify them somehow?
14. Seamus: I like that, that's a good idea.
15. Ben: How do you plan on communicating this change? Your presentation was well put together but it's technical. We had four community members come in to talk about it. How do you plan to communicate to the student body that you're not sacrificing their rights?
16. Alex: It's not something that would come into effect immediately upon passing. We need time to retrain everyone. As far as community outreach, that's a harder problem. We're all familiar with the technical aspects, but the general student body might not. I don't have a great answer right now. But the process needs to be faster. Students want that, and if we're not getting reports because of efficiency concerns, we're failing in our responsibility to uphold the COT.
17. Laura: An op-ed in the Cavalier Daily might be valuable.
18. Community member: I'm coming from a similar organization (UJC). It sounds like the issue isn't the process, it's how people interact with it. This seems like a superficial bandage. If I'm wrong, can you explain it a bit more?

19. Seamus: Something we've seen in efficiency discussions is that a lot of the solutions offered are often just "try harder to make it faster". Through great individual effort you could make a slight improvement. "What if we tried harder?" is the superficial solution. What I like about this is that it doesn't just rely on people working faster. We're layering our processes to avoid the current bottleneck. It's a structural change in that the overall process will be shorter.
20. Community member: It sounds like you're replacing one process with another.
21. Seamus: The current process works well, but is slow. Broadly what we're doing is moving things around to make the whole thing go faster. I don't expect that the scheduling and staffing processes would actually be quicker, but now we're spending those 25 days also doing the investigation rather than just sitting in limbo. Is this the shiny and new one? No, I think it's similar to what we have now but it's faster.
22. Will: I think it's easy to get lost in the weeds. There are some simple parts of this: a panel of reps is going to be staffed for every case; we'll have more Hearings which lowers the standard, and we just had people come in to discuss the process of a Hearing; this overlaps the Investigation and Hearing prep. We've had a public comment from people in UJC. On those three points, this proposal is flawed. Who are we doing this for? We had a faculty member say they care more about a fair than fast system. The P&P committee unanimously opposes this. I don't think a lot of this is as complicated as we're making. There's a lot of good in this proposal. I'd like to see it go through P&P.
23. Margaret: We worked on this as a group with SOs and Reps. Reads the details of the change. We can extend the length of the Investigation if needed. This isn't a firm rule, but a flexible and reasonable goal. It gives students an idea of "if this goes to Hearing, it doesn't mean we think you're guilty." When we schedule a Hearing, it's at an I Panel. Having a Hearing on the calendar does not presuppose guilt. The second part of it is condensing an I Log. It takes forever right now and doesn't need to. The I Log becomes just the background info, the acts in the IR, a short table of contents, and then the evidence and interviews. The investigation can get done sooner this way. This will shorten the process from report to Hearing if it works well. We could also simply give students the option between scheduling a Hearing or waiting, even if it's less efficient. About the presentation: the community isn't going to understand this change. With our change we're not presupposing guilt. All of the same criticisms can also be raised about "accusing" a student. On SO staffing, it's not an issue now but this could be a large issue in the future. We just don't know. Making this change based on our staffing now might not be the best. Trying to enact this now when it hasn't been fleshed out it not a good idea. Enacting this now will be problem after problem that we're going to have to fix.
24. Hannah: I think that we need to do a lot of talking with students and faculty before making a change like this. More of that would be useful. We'll get a more representative sample.
25. Laura: To clarify, we are not voting on this tonight.
26. Rachel: How much more efficient do you think the P&P proposal will be?
27. Margaret: With a four-week investigation, two months. Which is 19 days shorter than our current average.

28. Will: There's the filter of the I Panel too. If it's dropped then, it's way shorter too.
 29. Seamus: The 19 days estimate forgets about the IR period before the investigation. Three or four weeks is far too short for most investigations. If we push to something like six weeks, then your proposal takes just as long as the current system. Will, there was a lot of gesticulating about the thoroughness of the case process. Can you point to me to an actual spot where you are concerned about the effectiveness?
 30. Will: I was talking more about more rep staffing and Hearings. Also concern about overlapping on Hearing prep and Investigation. I'm deferring mostly to the SO pool.
- B. Develop themes for questions for meetings with faculty
 1. Pushed to next meeting.
 - C. Draft "resolutions" for the rest of the term
 1. Pushed to next meeting.

VII. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- A. None.

The Committee adjourned at 8:01 PM. The Honor Committee will meet next on Sunday, January 19 at 7:00 p.m. in the Trial Room in Newcomb Hall.